Contents

American Missionaries in Revolutionary Russia

Dr. Lyubov Ginzburg

Americans in the city of clerks and foreigners

As an American Studies scholar and native of St. Petersburg, Russia, Leningrad at my birth, I always wondered why so little attention had been devoted to the American presence in the "city of clerks and foreigners." I thus dedicated myself to write yet another chapter in the international history of Russia's northern capital, which would reveal an extensive yet unjustly overlooked narrative about a colony of American nationals residing in the city, where they were engaged in political, business, cultural, spiritual, and charitable pursuits in the decades surrounding the turn of 20th century, an era of widespread warfare and social upheaval.

In the course of their sojourns to Russia, many American expatriates gained a deep attachment to their host country and respect for its inhabitants, developing an interest in its history, politics, social order, and rich cultural traditions. Often their engagements with Russia took place beyond the purview of governmental policymakers, near the dawn of an age of public diplomacy that today is becoming a sought-after mode of international communications. Finding themselves in the midst of dramatic events that changed the course of world history, Americans represented a vanguard of good-willed citizens directing their efforts toward a decisive manifestation of benevolence and determination that left a pronounced and long-lasting impact on the legacy of Russian-American dialogue. As true patriots, they inserted themselves and their ideals upon St. Petersburg's social milieu by promoting American values and interests. At the same time, through their direct involvement in the life of the city and close relations with natives, Americans often liberated themselves from the most notorious misconceptions about Russia, finding significant implications for new views of themselves.

Many pioneers of public diplomacy were passionately devoted to sharing what they saw and experienced. Being attentive and articulate commentators who experienced life in the Russian capital first hand, many left memoirs, diaries and articles, becoming chroniclers of the turbulent developments of the wartime years and the revolution. Comprising subjective sentiments and observations, these accounts provide an essential link between personal and public discourses in interpreting and understanding history. They also reveal their creators' intentions to foster an appreciation for Russia's ancient culture in the West, while dispelling

widely-spread and firmly established notions of the country as a backward and hostile place.

This essay is dedicated to the history of the American religious establishment in Russia, the role of American missionaries in large-scale relief operations, and the promotion of "good feeling [toward America and Americans] among Russians." After all, it was their charity and efforts to help Russian communities that prompted gratitude toward the American nation and people, diminishing the misunderstanding and mistrust among Russians (Perovsky, 1920). Thanks to the considerable growth of its congregations, support for orphanages and lazarets, provision of humanitarian aid, and theological training of ministers, the American Methodist Episcopal Church gained a favorable reputation and secured a prominent place among multiple denominations of a culturally and religiously-diverse city. American missionaries contributed not only to foreign communities, whose social and spiritual needs they came to meet, but also enhanced the lives of natives of St. Petersburg / Petrograd, who greatly appreciated their efforts.[1] Work in Russia also benefitted Americans themselves. Although their missionary campaigns often overlapped, in the words of David S. Foglesong, with "political crusades and economic drives to remake Russia" (1997, 361), their experience in that country also helped Americans reflect critically upon assumptions, implications and inferences about their own homeland, its mores and values.

While examining materials in major Russian and American archival depositories such as the Library of Congress, the National Library of Russia, and the Russian State Historical Archive, among others, I also utilized many less known sanctuaries of preserved evidence of the past, indispensable in the challenging process of untangling the knot of fragmentary episodes, assembling them into a meaningful and cohesive narrative about the lives of previous generations. One of those, the United Methodist Church Archives, in Madison, New Jersey, is the primary depository for reconstructing the history of American missionaries, in particular the United Methodist Church in pre- and revolutionary Russia.

An American church in the Russian capital

As with many foreign communities in the multinational metropolis, it was the church that became a center of social and religious life for American expatriates, as well as for natives comprising various nationalities and ethnic groups. Missionaries' enthusiasm "extended well beyond denominational mission boarders," with "over one hundred and eighty million souls in Russia […] eagerly looking toward

[1] Russians both at home and abroad praised the efforts of various American non-governmental organizations. After the Bolshevik Revolution, many of those Russians who fled abroad relied on American relief activities and hoped that with their help a devastated Russia could be brought back to normal life. Thus for example in a letter addressed to Isabel Hapgood, who herself was involved in various enterprises helping émigrés, émigré groups, and those left behind in Russia, Count Perovsky, who was a head of a Russian colony in Norway cited the impressions of his son fighting with Yudenich and bringing his first hand impressions from Ukraine: "the only 'allied' organization there he is able to speak about with praise is the American Red Cross society." (Perovsky, 1920).

America for political, commercial and religious help" (cited in Foglesong, 1997, 360). There was a dramatic increase in missionary activity following the tsarist government's 1903 broadening of religious freedom, and the April, 1905 edict on religious toleration (Foglesong, 1997, 356). The congregations and American parishioners in the city had a rich spiritual history and a reputation for religious tolerance.[2] Foglesong describes close connections between their mission, the involvement of the American colony, and unfolding relief activities. Among religious and charitable organizations with operations in Russia at the turn of the twentieth century were the YMCA, founded by American philanthropist James Stokes and known to Russians as Mayak,[3] the American Red Cross Society, the Salvation Army, and the American Methodist Episcopal Church. Besides the Anglo-American Church, founded by British Protestants in 1753 near the Admiralty, frequented by John Quincy Adams and members of his household, and the Congregational Anglo-American Church that occasionally served as a gathering place for the Russian chapter of the British corps of the Salvation Army, Americans also flocked to the Methodist-Episcopal Church, known as the American Chapel, or Church of Christ Our Savior. It was situated on Vasilievski Island in a wooden building that has not survived (Bertash, 155).[4] The church was solemnly founded in December 1914, and on 1 March that year 125 people attended the dedication ceremony (*Christian Advocate*, no. 73 (January 1915), 11). By that point there were more than 130 parishioners from at least nine nationalities attending services in a variety of languages (Teryukova, 144).[5]

---

[2] Foglesong describes the new religious repression following the outbreak of the Great War, but at the same time, referring to Pastor George Simons' correspondence, he concludes that missionaries in Petrograd continued to enjoy 'a certain amount of liberty' (Foglesong, 1997, 359).

[3] In 2013 Matthew Lee Miller published *The American YMCA and Russian Culture*, which is the most comprehensive history of the YMCA in Russia and its relief work, including assistance to the prisoners of war, and its impact on Russian and Soviet life.

[4] The building was demolished in 1931. John Dunstan, the author of an article "George A. Simons and the Khristianski Pobornik: A neglected Source on St. Petersburg Methodism," wrote that the purchase of the property was possible thanks to an American benefactress, Mrs. Fanny Nast Gamble (35).

[5] It is mentioned in an article that the services were offered in Finnish, German, English, Swedish, Russian, and Estonian (Teryukova, 144). The history of earlier American missionaries and those, who, similar to Methodist F.W. Flocken, preached as early as in 1860s in the Danube delta, or Seventh-day Adventist Ludwig Richard Conradi, who proselytized in Southern Russia between 1886 and 1905, is described in the works of David S. Foglesong. See, for example his book *The American Mission and the 'Evil Empire'.* (2007). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, or his earlier article "Redeeming Russia? American Missionaries and Tsarist Russia, 1886–1917," *Religion, State and Society*, vol. 25, No. 4 (1997): 356-359. Foglesong states that "Russia's enormous territory and population were crucial inducements" (Foglesong, 1997, 355). Among other sources on early Methodism in Russia, see Steven T. Kimbrough, Jr., ed. 1995. *Methodism in Russia and the Baltic States: History and Renewal.* Nashville: Abingdon Press; Teryukova, Ekaterina Aleksandrovna. (2009). Angloiazychnye protestantskie obshchiny Peterburga nachala XX veka: verouchenie i sotsial′naia deiatel′nost′ (English speaking Protestant communities of

The House of Methodists, Petrograd, 1915. *Christian Advocate*, no. 75 (March 1915)

As Donald Carl Malone mentioned in his article on the history of Methodism in Russia, the "ministry […] was an unqualified success. […] followers increased rapidly, and their work extended into social concerns and publishing interests" (240). The mission quickly evolved into the cultural and social center of the American colony in St Petersburg, and a favorite of neighborhood residents, who would drop by either for Sunday school[6] or for free English classes open to all. John Dunstan, the author of the most comprehensive research on the St. Petersburg / Petrograd Methodist publication *Khristianski Pobornik* (*Christian Advocate*), mentioned the Finnish-speaking residents, as well as the Swedish community, and tied the history of Methodism in the Russian capital to the considerable social diversity of the city's population—especially on the island where the church was situated (23).[7]

American pastor at the foundation of public diplomacy

Its founder was George Albert Simons (1874–1952), an American Methodist pastor from New York, who became superintendent of the Finland and Petersburg

Petersburg in the beginning of the 20th cent.: religious doctrine and social activity). Sankt-Peterburg: IPTS SPGUTD.

[6] The Sunday School was run by Vladimir Datt with a board of eight men and seven women teachers. Dunstan referred to Methodists' publication *Christian Advocate* and wrote that American pastor George Simons himself led classes and that the Sunday School had raised 175 roubles to support a school in China and 3,200 roubles for "self-support, benevolent and missionary purposes" (32).

[7] Dunstan analyzed the content of the publication of Petersburg / Petrograd Methodists *Christian Advocate* and concluded that by 1910 the Conference of the Finland and St. Petersburg Mission claimed a congregation of 500, of nine different nationalities (32).

Mission.[8] Simons eventful Russian experience is well-documented in his extensive correspondence, reports sent back to the United States, publications, press clippings from his time in Russia, and photographically, in images, some of which have not been previously published. Most of these materials are in the Missionary Files Series of the United Methodist Church Archives in New Jersey.

Simons' friend and biographer, the editor of the *Riga Times*, Leslie A. Marshall, believed that "there must be such thing as Fate." When Bishop William Burt, the director of Methodist missions in Europe, secured missionary funds for Russia and encouraged George Simons "to take charge of that formerly languishing territory" (Foglesong, 1997, 356) in 1907, Simons was not very enthusiastic about his new assignment, as he was "deeply prejudiced against the Russian character, language, and customs, and aware of the danger lurking in a land that might flare up in a revolution any hour" (Marshall, 20, 43). Nonetheless, Simons spent twenty years pioneering the Methodist Episcopal Church in Russia and the Baltic States, serving as the superintendent of the Finland and Petrograd Mission between 1907 and 1911, and remaining a pastor of the American Methodist Episcopal Church in Petrograd until October 1918. After eight years in the country, Simons himself recollected that in the course of his tenure in "dear old Russia [he] has had ample opportunity to study that great Slavic nation at first hand." The first Russian phrase that the pastor learned was the often-quoted phrase: "'*shirokaya russkaya natura*—the broad Russian nature'—an expression, which pithily characterized the wonderfully generous soul of the [Russian] people" (*Christian Advocate*, № 85, (January 1916), 13). After the February Revolution, the American pastor perceived the challenges that his mission had to endure as an unprecedented opportunity he faced "for the gospel's sake" (Malone, 240). Sharpe Wilson, a member of the British committee for carrying on the affairs of the English-speaking community, who happened to conduct a service at the Congregational Church in St. Petersburg and at the Church of England during the rule of Bolsheviks, described his friend and "brother-in-arms" George A. Simons as a man "gifted with a fine command of language in which he express his thoughts in prose as well as in verse" (cited in Marshall, 12). Simons remained in Russia, among a few other missionaries, continuing his duties in spite of enormous hardship. Along with the

[8] Although Dunstan named Bengt August Carlson (1833–1920), an American of Swedish birth, to be the first ordained Methodist missionary to work in St. Petersburg, the permanent mission in the Russian capital was "easier contemplated than done" (24). In 1904 there were just 20 members. Only in 1906, with the "Edict of Toleration" released in April 1905 the situation began to improve and in March 1907 a Finnish- and Russian-speaking pastor, Hjalmar F. Salmi, born in St. Petersburg and educated at a Methodist school in Finland, was joined by George Albert Simons. The latter found a mission which consisted of "ten aged women and a feeble man, not one of whom belong to the church" (cited in Dunstan, 25-26, Simons, Albert George. (1910). "Report of the Superintendent". In Annual Report of the Board of Foreign Mission of the Methodist Episcopal Church for the Year 1910, 478. New York, The Board of Foreign Mission, 1911). Dunstan provided extensive information about Simons, including his training at Baldwin-Wallace College, Berea, Ohio, New York University, and Drew Theological Seminary, as well as about his assignments as ordained pastor (Dunstan, 26).

YMCA, which persisted with its work throughout 1918, "proceeding as usual, with fair attendance" (Lowrie, 1918), the American Methodist Episcopal Church was the last to close its operations. When Americans were forced to leave the capital, in the aftermath of the Bolshevik uprising, Simons was one of the last to depart. Seeking an opportunity to remain in Russia, he wrote Grigorii Zinoviev on 14 September 1918:

George Albert Simons (1874–1952). Simons File 1185-1-3:19. Missionary Files Series, United Methodist Church Archives, Madison, New Jersey. Courtesy of the United Methodist Commission on Archives and History.

> …my sympathies are naturally with the laboring classes, among who our church in America and in other parts of the world, I am proud to say, has always been known as a staunch champion of the workmen. …you will clearly see how very necessary it is that I should remain here… I wish to assure you and your colleagues that we are always willing to cooperate in every possible way to help our dear Russian friends. (Simons File, 1918)[9]

Besides the workmen who paid visits to the House of Methodists to hear Simons' passionate and inspiring sermons, or attend an English class, the pastor was acquainted with the president of the Academy of Science, Grand Duke Konstantin Romanov, Pyotr Stolypin, and befriended a deputy of St. Petersburg's Duma, prominent businessman San-Galli. The American pastor was invited to preach at an English club, an American Luncheon club, and the Anglo-American Church. He became truly infatuated with the city and its people, considering it his duty to educate Americans about Russian politics and culture utilizing a modest publishing enterprise. The first quarterly publication was entitled *Methodism in Russia* and published in Rome in English. It was followed by the Methodist periodical *Christian Advocate*,[10] with the first issue released in 1909.

Christian Advocate—a newsletter of the American colony

Established initially for acquainting its readers with doctrine, hymns and sermons by famous Methodists, the publication later evolved into a bilingual newsletter, reporting on social news and unfolding events, such as the American entrance into WWI, or *Tsar Nicholas II's Abdication Proclamation*. During the war years, it was an especially challenging enterprise. Simons explained that publishing such a paper was "almost a nerve-breaking undertaking," with "practically all experienced printers and compositors having been called into the army" (*Christian Advocate,* № 86, (February 1916), 40(24)). Such a "modest bilingual monthly" as *Christian Advocate* played a unique role in the city. While published in Petrograd, it also sought to serve Americans in Moscow and other Russian centers. Since 1915 it had been dedicated as a monthly Russian-English religious periodical, an official publication of the American Methodist Episcopal Church and the American Colony in Petrograd. It reported on events taking place within the American community and in diplomatic circles, such as appointments, resig-

[9] Only a few months after writing the aforementioned letter, in February 1919, Simons would testify before the Senate Overman Committee, describing the Bolsheviks as "demons", and explaining his own position as one of a Christian Socialist. The Pastor finally returned to New York in October 1918. United States Congressional Committee on the Judiciary, 1919. *Bolshevik Propaganda. Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary United States Senate, Sixty-fifth Congress, Third Session and Thereafter, Pursuant to S. Res.439 and 469. February 11, 1919, to March 10, 1919.* Washington, 121.

[10] The author undertook a thorough research of an almost complete set of the publication, which has been preserved at the National Library of Russia, spanning the years 1909–1917.

nations, obituaries, and updates on social gatherings in the capital, etc. Thus, from the January 1916 issue, under the column "Items of Interest," American residents learned about Captain David Hough's late return from the United States and his failure to return to Russia soon enough to spend Christmas with his family, due to "the heavy holiday travel and extreme cold which froze up the piping on the locomotives" (*Christian Advocate*, № 86, (February 1916), 40(24)). They also could read about an exhibition of a fashionable English painter, whose pictures "were noted for their remarkable color-tones," displayed at the house of Mr. and Mrs. McAllister Smith, of Guarantee Trust, that promised to be "a striking illustration" of his art. It was a fund-raiser which opened with a program featuring "Mrs. W.C. Whiffen and Mrs. Barnes, performing several classic selections on the piano, with Mary Knechen singing Russian songs, and Mrs. McAllister Smith, wife of Mr. L. McAllister Smith of the Guarantee Trust, rendering Elizabeth Barret Browning's poem entitled 'Mother and Poet,' with genuinely dramatic expression" (*Christian Advocate,* № 85, (January 1916)). The event raised 943 roubles for the American Refuge.[11] The same issue announced David Bell McGowan's transfer to Moscow following his appointment as a vice-consul there. The journal reported: "As a newspaper man of twenty-five years' experience and having been in Russia and other parts of Europe for some years, Mr. McGowan will prove himself a most official man in the consular service. His many friends in Petrograd join in heartiest congratulations, regretting however that he is leaving them so soon again" (*Christian Advocate*, № 85, (January 1916), 40 (24)). Readership included subscribers in Canada, France, Switzerland and America. The monthly also carried news about Russian cultural matters. In 1915, Simons published a set of poems by the Great Duke Konstantin Konstantinovich.[12]

It is worth noting the changing attitudes regarding the political situation in Russia, especially in the course of the turmoil of revolutionary events. If in 1911 the journal was honoring the Romanov dynasty, when the first Russian revolution took place in February 1917, the periodical released a "truly people's anthem," "Brotherhood, Love, and Freedom," composed by the pastor himself (Teryukova, 145).[13] The piece was dedicated to "the great resurrected free Russia." The royalties were donated to pay tribute to the victims of the revolution (Teryukova, 145). Also in the April-May issue was an account of a mass meeting in the Duma (State Council), upon the occasion of America's entry into the war, at which pastor Simons spoke, and a poem by Aksakov entitled "Free Speech," which had been banned for 70 years (Dunstan, 39). In the English section, Simons published an

[11] The same issue announced about the Refuge opening on the 1 January 1916 stressing "a large number of Americans and Russian advocates being present," and acknowledging that it was "highly gratifying to know this worthy cause has already received sympathetic and generous support of American and Russian friends in Petrograd (*Christian Advocate,* № 85, (January 1916)).

[12] The author has not been able to locate this 1915 bilingual edition of selected poems composed by Konstantin Romanov and translated by Franklin A. Gaylord, the 'poet laureate' of the American Colony.

[13] It is not known who is the author of the words, but it is believed that Pastor composed the music himself.

article on 'Russia's Resurrection,' in which he declared that the February revolution was "the most thrilling thing" he witnessed in his ten-year sojourn in Russia and defined the political metamorphosis as a transformation "from the gloomy tomb of despotic tyranny and medieval terrorism into the joyous light and life of freedom and democracy" (*Christian Advocate*, no. 100–101 (April–May 1917), 37, 42-45). As the chief editor, Simon established similar editions in Latvian, Estonian and Lithuanian, issued hymnbooks, Wesley's sermons and catechisms in all these languages, and served as editor of the *Baltic and Slavic Bulletin* in English (Marshall, 25-26). As one appreciative reader mentioned in his letter to the editor, there was "no other paper just like it!" The *Christian Advocate* also served as a bibliography of English language sources on Russia.

Other publishing initiatives

Occasionally the publishing house released a limited number of editions which might be considered a bibliographical rarity and early effort to challenge the political discourse dominating area studies and international relations with elements of social and cultural history. In the course of the war, the church and its pastor became part of the American committee that established a hospital for wounded soldiers. Pastor Simons worked closely with the American Red Cross, American embassy and other members of the American colony. Methodists' publications recounted the devotion to serving the underprivileged and the American response to the needs of victims of the ongoing conflict, alleviating the sufferings of refugees, prisoners of war, and wounded Russian soldiers. A selection of *Letters from Russian Soldiers* addressed to American personnel at the American City Hospital is an example, translated by a Ms. Potter, a sister-in-law of a long-time member of the American colony Frederick Corse, the head of the Russian branch of New York Life. The translator attempted to preserve the letters' somewhat "archaic character," derived from Russian peasants' familiarity with the Bible and traditional folk tales. Soldiers and their families expressed gratitude for the care and treatment received in the midst of squalor and misery, revealing "simple, poetic style and the genuine depth of feelings." These living documents of "inestimable historic value," preserve a record of the manifestation of goodwill, and also emphasize American appreciation for the privilege of working with and learning from those "big-hearted" fellows who were "so easy to please and so truly grateful for what was done for them" (City Hospital of the American Colony, 3).[14]

Equally important, at least for the era, was a publication disseminated at the World's Seventh Sunday School Convention in Zurich in 1913. The brochure is entitled "*And the Rest of Europe: The Response for Russia in the Roll Call of Nations.*" Simons recalled that it was prompted by a curious episode during convention registration. Passing the Scandinavian booth, the pastor saw a sign "the rest of Europe." Intending to elaborate upon such an 'indefinite definition' of that

[14] *New York Times* also acknowledged the release of the pamphlet ("Russian Soldiers Are Grateful to Americans: Letters to Sisters of American Hospital Are Examples of a Literary Style Which Follows the Bible and Old Fairy Tales." *New York Times*, June 25, 1916, SM12).

Dressing ward of the American Hospital in Petrograd. *Christian Advocate*, No. 74 (February 1915)

corner of the world, where he was sent as a missionary, Simons provided a brief but informative reference brochure about Russia, including a note on its geography, diversified with a variety of climate zones and population distribution, and referred to as a "cosmopolitan constituency," religions, with an emphasis on "the Mohammedan Problem," and favorable conditions for the evangelical movement. Simons noted the tsar's advances toward freedom of conscience, and described a handwritten copy of the Greek Bible *Codex Sinaiticus*, which he considered the most valuable treasure of the Imperial Library.

Promoting mutual friendly relations between Russia and America

When Nikolai Andreevich Borodin, a vice president of the *Society for Promoting Mutual Friendly Relations between Russia and America*, asked Simons to comment on initiatives that brought America and Russia closer together, especially in religious and charitable matters, Simons mentioned several publications of the Orthodox Church in the United States, such as *The Russian American Messenger* of the Cathedral of St. Nicholas, the semimonthly *Zealot of the Christian Orthodoxy*, and *The Constructive Quarterly*, published in New York, with well-known Russian scholars on its editorial board (*Christian Advocate,* no. 86, (February 1916), 32(16)). Similarly, the *Christian Advocate* announced other non-religious editions, initiated to increase American awareness about Russia, its social and economic life, literature, culture, and science. Simons mentions the New York-based *Russian Review,* edited by journalist, economist and translator Leo Pasvolsky (*Christian Advocate*, no. 90, (June 1916), 95(7)). Simons reported about efforts of American diplomats, statesmen, publicists, and businessmen, who became acquainted with Russia and attempted to dispel the most harmful preju-

dices. One such effort was undertaken by Dr. Curtis Guild, a former ambassador to Russia, who shortly before his death was engaged in raising funds for the relief of the war-stricken people, delivering lectures and writing articles on Russia. When WWI broke out, the American Methodist Episcopal Church participated in disbursing funds among destitute families throughout Russia, and Simons himself issued appeals for shoes and clothing for refugees (*Christian Advocate*, no. 86 (February 1916): 24).

When American Ambassador David Francis came to Petrograd in 1916, Simons offered the governor his services as a guide to the city's "most important historic sites and famous arts treasures." Inspecting the scrapbooks of the Methodist Foreign Mission Board maintained by the United Methodist Archives, I came across several images that, although immediately recognizable, seemed out of place in their collections. These were photos of three famous Russian sculptures, namely 'Ivan the Terrible' by Mark Matveevich Antokol'sky (1843–1902), 'A Peasant in Distress' by Matvey Afanasievich Chizhov (1838–1916), and 'The First Step' by Fyodor Fyodorovich Kamensky (1836–1913). Puzzled, I assumed that the photos were taken by Simons, since a book with annotated comments for each photo was lost when the archive was moved from New York City, where the Board of Global Ministries was once situated, to New Jersey. The photos were considered unidentifiable, so I volunteered to provide the depository with a brief commentary about each of them. While the lives and work of Mark Antokol'sky and Matvey Chizhov are well-researched, the fate of the third artist, Fyodor Kamensky, is less well-known to either specialists or the general public. It was in the process of compiling a summary of the sculptor's biography and artistic legacy that the idea of conducting a more thorough investigation first arose, along with the awareness that the research might shed significant light upon the story of an extraordinary Russian-American. The findings surpassed all expectations, revealing the American odyssey of Fyodor Kamensky, a Russian socialist humanist, who renounced his promising future as an artist under the patronage of Alexander II and immigrated to the United States, pursuing "gradual and unpretentious self-improvement," while dreaming of a "regenerated" and just humanity.

Among other factors that drew American attention to Russia, Simons mentioned church music. Russian liturgical music remained the pastor's most profound passion, and some of it even 'migrated' into Methodist hymnals. One such song was *Коль славен (Kol slaven*), by Ukranian composer Dmitrii Bortniansky, known to English-speaking worshipers as tune *134*, or *St. Petersburg*. Simons not only loved to perform the tune during services, but modernized the lyrics, giving the hymn the new title of "The Toilers' Friend," and dedicated a new verse "to the dear Russian people."

At the turn of the twentieth century, as the author of *The American Mission and the Evil Empire,* David S. Foglesong wrote, "American political, commercial, and evangelical energies surged overseas," and Russia was one of many countries Americans sough to explore "to liberalize, develop and redeem" (2007, 4). American citizens from all strata of society, including business interests, journalists, missionaries, philanthropists, and academics flocked to the Russian capital.

As Harper Barnes described it, the mass of Americans in Petersburg / Petrograd at the time presented a "proliferating number of official, semi-official, unofficial, and downright clandestine" visitors (Barnes, 277). The American colony in St. Petersburg had a distinctive social life. The unprecedented influx of Americans into Russia was noted on the pages of the *Christian Advocate*, which had evolved by that time into a bilingual newsletter, reporting on social events, and anything concerning the American colony: "…scores and hundreds of friends and tourists from America have dropped in[to] Methodist headquarters… these welcome visitors represent various professions and denominations. Among these there have been bishops, university and college presidents, secretaries of various boards, editors and journalists, men of the diplomatic and consular service, missionaries, and business people. Practically all have expressed one and the same opinion: Russia is a great and wonderful country and we shall only have kind words to speak of this land and nation" (*Christian Advocate*, no. 76 (April 1915), 42 (18)). Many of those official and unofficial messengers "of the open eye, ear and heart became acquainted with the country, thus removing many prejudices that might otherwise tend to do harm" (*Christian Advocate*, no. 86 (February 1916), 32 (16)). In 1910, Pastor Simons wrote that their Petersburg mission became a "sort of Mecca for the passing missioners of our church and other fellow sojourners, many of whom visited me this year" (*Christian Advocate,* no. 8 (20), (August 1910), 68).

Americans came to the House of Methodists for their national holidays celebrations, such as Thanksgiving and Christmas.[15] Among other distinguished visitors, Doctor Simons welcomed former Ambassador to Russia John Wallace Riddle (1910), Ambassadors Marye and Francis, Commercial attaché H.D. Baker, and Franklin A. Gaylord, General Secretary of the Russian YMCA. Doctor Jacob Sargis passed by on his way from the American Methodist medical missionary in Persia with his wife and three sons, as well as the well-known Swarthmore College professor Dr. Benjamin F. Battin, who represented the World Alliance of Churches for Promoting International Peace. Prominent American sociologist Mary Boyle O'Reilly, a scholar of women in industry and in prison, as well as children's lives in large cities, paid a visit to the church, while delivering lectures in Russia. Dr. L.H. Murlin, the president of Boston University, whose lecture "Impressions from Petrograd" was in demand "fully up to the limit of [his] time and strength," also visited (*Christian Advocate*, no. 76 (April 1915), 42 (18)). In March 1915 a delegation of Red Cross doctors and 25 nurses passing through Petrograd on their way to Kiev, where Americans operated a field hospital, paid a visit to the American church in the city. Numerous American and British expatriates and other foreign sojourners gathered at the church on Thursday afternoons for a pleasant time and friendly company.

Pastor's family as good will ambassadors

The story would not be complete without mentioning Simons' companions, such as his mother, Mrs. Ottilie Simons and Miss Ottilie Aurora Simons, the pas-

[15] Simons described the Thanksgiving celebration that took place in the Chapel in Petrograd, in 1915 (*Christian Advocate*, no. 87 (March 1916), 54 (14)).

Pastor Simons and his sister Ms. Ottilie A. Simons in their apartment in Petersburg, 1911. Simons File 1185-1-3:19. Missionary Files Series, United Methodist Church Archives, Madison, New Jersey. Courtesy of the United Methodist Commission on Archives and History.

tor's sister. Although both women were ardent participants in missionary work in St. Petersburg, its environs, and the Baltic States, there have been few references to their Russian experiences. They became actively involved in mission affairs and selflessly dedicated themselves to social work and humanitarian aid. Both mother and sister were well known to residents of Vasilievsky Island, who credited the women for their explicit faith, strong will, common sense, and good spirits. It was Simons' mother who encouraged her son to go to Russia, in spite of his hesitance. Knowing neither the language nor customs of the strange land, the pastor's mother dedicated herself wholeheartedly to serve its destitute.

Mrs. Ottilie Simons (1852–1913), mother of pastor Simons. Simons File 1185-1-3:19. Missionary Files Series, United Methodist Church Archives, Madison, New Jersey. Courtesy of the United Methodist Commission on Archives and History.

Both women organized Easter and Christmas celebrations, distributed New Year's presents among neighborhood children from impoverished households, and provided short- and long-term care for the sick. The first issue of *Christian Advocate*, in 1911, reported about a magnificent Christmas celebration organized in the American Church, attended by more than 500 children and adults (*Christian Advocate*, 2 (1), (January 1911), 4). When Mrs. Simons died in 1913, she was buried in St. Petersburg, mourned and remembered by many. She was proclaimed the mother of Methodism in Russia. A shelter in Finland was named after her in Khandrovo, where her son George Simons had preached his first sermon upon arriving in Russia (*Christian Advocate*, 10 (34), (October 1913), 1 (37)).

Epilogue

The American Methodist Episcopal Church remained in the capital after the embassy left Petrograd in 1918. Simons estimated that there were still "around 30 American nationals resided in the city." He appealed to his compatriots remaining in Petrograd, urging them to be "mutually helpful," and announced that the American church would gladly continue to tender its services to all Americans "irrespective of race, color, or creed" (Simons, 1918). After finally being ordered to leave the country, he passed the mission along to Sister Anna Eklund, a Finnish deaconess educated at the Methodist Institute and Hospital at Frankfort-am-Main, Germany and appointed as a deaconess in Russia in 1908 (Malone, 241). Although Simons could not officially return to Russia, he remained close by in

Deaconess Ida and the children at the Ottilie Simons Children's Home in Handrovo, Russia. Simons File 1185-1-3:19. Missionary Files Series, United Methodist Church Archives, Madison, New Jersey. Courtesy of the United Methodist Commission on Archives and History.

Finland, and when a massive famine struck Russia in 1921, and thousands were dying from starvation, Simons continued to be actively involved in their fate, through participation in the "American Methodist Relief and Child Welfare" operation that he helped manage from Helsinki and later from Riga. In 1924, Methodist bishop Nuelsen reported to the General Conference that George Simons was still effectively operating from Riga, and was permitted to travel to Russia, where Sister Anna Eklund continued her work in Leningrad (Malone, 259).[16] In 1927, at its annual conference held in Riga, Methodists marked the twentieth anniversary of the Russian Mission, honoring Pastor Simons "for his service and looked back upon the history of the mission with pride" (Malone, 259).

If Simons' friend Marshall was right, and there is "such thing as Fate," then pastor Simons was destined not only to pioneer Methodism in Russia, but also to stand at the foundation of public diplomacy through close personal relations with Russians and direct involvement in the life of the city and region. Having settled in the capital to facilitate spiritual work and relief initiatives, Simons represented a vanguard of good-willed citizens and patriots, securing and enriching an excellent environment for constructive dialogue, and promoting "good feeling among Russians." Finding himself in the midst of a series of politically and socially-charged dramatic events, he directed his efforts toward establishing mutual understanding and trust, while promoting America, securing American interests, and meeting the spiritual needs of his compatriots, other foreigners, as well as Russian natives.

[16] Malone refers to 1924 John Nuelsen's "Report of the Zurich Area," published in Daily Christian Advocate, XX (May 3), 66-70.

The appointment helped the pastor re-discover Russia and reconsider his reserved opinions about the country, which became a crucial inducement to remain an advocate for the nation and its people for years to come. In the *Christian Advocate* in 1916, Simons wrote that he was grateful to be given a chance to "study this great Slavic nation at first hand." After eight years of residence in Petersburg/Petrograd, he confessed: "I, for one, believe in Russia, in her broad nature and in the valuable contribution which she is making, and most generally too, to the sum total of world culture. The world can't yet get along without Russia any more than Russia could get along without the world…" (*Christian Advocate*, no. 85 (January 1916), 13). Similar to many of his compatriots, in spite of hesitations, Simons was grateful for his experience in Russia, "being blessed with a great opportunity to serve the Lord [there]," where his responsibilities were so inspiring, that "[he] would never swap it for a position anywhere in [the] largest, most lucrative and influential missions in the States" (*Christian Advocate*, no. 8 (August 1910), 69 (171)).

The history of American Methodists in St. Petersburg spanned an era of unprecedented social and political turmoil and strife, embodying a case study in public diplomacy that produced a broad spectrum of avenues for American engagement with Russia beyond the reach of governmental institutions. It features the story of pioneering Methodism in Russia's northern capital by American pastor George Albert Simons, who was involved in missionary and charitable activities throughout the course of WWI, the revolutions, and their immediate aftermath. As Simons' Methodist church ultimately became the locus of the American colony in the city, its social and political priorities, publishing activities, and the role its members played as cultural messengers and good-will ambassadors contributed to a growing appreciation of Russia, its people, culture and history among American sojourners and their compatriots back home. Thanks to the mission's direct participation in the life of the city and close contacts with its denizens, Simons' perceptions of Russia would dramatically evolve during the course of his years there. As with many Americans who shared the experience of living and working in the country, by the end of his tenure, Simons would come to see Russia as an American venue, rather than an American problem. And even after the Bolshevik seizure of power, whenever possible, he remained immersed with the country's social, cultural, and economic affairs, in spite of bitter resentments toward the new regime.

References

Barnes, Harper. (2001). *Standing on a Volcano: The Life and Times of David Rowland Francis*. St. Louis: Missouri Historical Society Press and The Francis Press.

Bertash, Alexander V., Elena I. Zherikhina, and Mikhail G. Talalaĭ, (1992). *Khrami Peterburga: spravochnik-putevoditel' (Temples of St. Petersburg).* Sankt-Peterburg: Informatsionno-izdatel′skoe agentstvo "LIK".

City Hospital of the American Colony. (1916). *Letters from Russian Soldiers Who Have Been Cared for at the Hospital.* Petrograd: American Methodist Episcopal Chapel.

Dunstan, John. (1980). "George A. Simons and the Khristianski Pobornik: A Neglected Source on St. Petersburg Methodism." *Methodist History*, vol. 19 (October), 21- 40.

Foglesong, David S. (1997). "Redeeming Russia? American Missionaries and Tsarist Russia, 1886 – 1917." *Religion, State and Society,* vol. 25 (4), 353-368.

———. (2007). *The American Mission and the 'Evil Empire'.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kimbrough, Jr., Steven T., ed. (1995). *Methodism in Russia and the Baltic States: History and Renewal.* Nashville: Abingdon Press.

———. (2001). *Sister Anna Eklund (1867 - 1949): A Methodist Saint in Russia. Hew Words and Witness, St. Petersburg 1908 – 1931.* New York: GBGM Books.

———. (2009). *A Pictorial Panorama of Early Russian Methodism, 1889 – 1931.* Madison, N. J.: General Commission on Archives and History, The United Methodist Church.

Lowrie, Donald A. (1918). *Lowrie to Brackett, 15 May 15 1918*. Donald A. Lowrie Papers, series no. 15/35/53, box. 1. Russian and East European Center. Liberal Arts and Sciences. The University of Illinois Archives, Champaign – Urbana.

Malone, Donald Carl. (1980). "A Methodist Venture in Bolshevik Russia." *Methodist History,* vol. 18 (July), 239 - 261.

Marshall, Leslie A. (1928). *The Romance of a Tract and Its Sequel: The Story of an American Pioneer in Russia and the Baltic States.* Riga: The Jubilee Fund Commission of the Baltic and Slavic Mission Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Latvian Farmers' Union Printing Office.

Miller, Matthew Lee. (2012). *The American YMCA and Russian Culture: The Preservation and Expansion of Orthodox Christianity, 1900-1940.* Lexington Books.

Perovsky Petrovo Solovovo, Mikhail Mikhailovich. (1920). Perovsky to Hapgood. Paris, October 1920 and Perovsky to Hapgood, Christiania, Norway, 1920. Isabel Florence Hapgood Papers. (1864-1922). Manuscript & Archives Division (MAD), folder 1, box 3, New York Public Library (NYPL).

(1916). "Russian Soldiers Are Grateful to Americans." *New York Times*, June 25, SM12.

Simons, George A. (1913). *And the Rest of Europe: the Response for Russia in the Call of Nations.* Zurich: World's Seventh Sunday School Convention.

———. (1918). Greetings to American Nationals in Petrograd, 22 March 1918. David R. Francis Papers, The Missouri Historical Society.

Simons File 1185-1-3:19. Missionary Files Series, United Methodist Church Archives, Madison, New Jersey.

Teryukova, Ekaterina Aleksandrovna. (2004). “Iz istorii protestantizma v Rossii. (A Propos the History of Protestantism in Russia).” *Vestnik Sankt-Petersburgskogo universiteta*, 6 (4): 53-60.

———. (2005). “Angloiazychniye protestantskie obschiny” (English Speaking Protestant Communities). In *Tri veka Sankt-Peterburga: entsiklopediia v trekh tomakh*, edited by Pyotr Evgenyevich Bukharkin., tom 2, kn. 1. Sankt-Peterburg: Filologicheskiĭ fakul′tet Sankt - Peterburgskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta, 140 – 146.

———. (2009). *Angloiazychnye protestantskie obshchiny Peterburga nachala XX veka: verouchenie i sotsial'naia deiatel'nost' (English speaking Protestant communities of Petersburg in the beginning of the 20th cent.: religious doctrine and social activity).* Sankt-Peterburg: IPTS SPGUTD.

United States. Congress. Committee on Judiciary, 1919. *Bolshevik Propaganda. Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary United States Senate, Sixty-fifth Congress, Third Session and Thereafter, Pursuant to S. Res.439 and 469. February 11, 1919, to March 10, 1919.* Washington.

A collection of *Christian Advocate* for 1909–1917.

Louise Bryant and the Russian Revolution

Lee A. Farrow

In 1917, Russia was shaken to its core by revolution and the world would never be the same. The year began with the collapse of Russia's monarchy, the end of a three hundred-year-old dynasty, and ended with the successful takeover of a small group of Marxist revolutionaries called the Bolsheviks. In the year that followed, the new Bolshevik government would withdraw Russia from World War I and establish the foundation for a communist regime that would last for over seven decades and inspire similar revolutions in other countries. As the world monitored these events from afar, there were a few foreign journalists who were on site, witnessing the unfolding of one of the most dramatic and significant events of the twentieth century. Louise Bryant was one of those lucky few.

Louise Bryant was born Anna Louisa Mohan on December 5, 1885, in San Francisco. When she was six, her mother remarried and she became Anna Louisa Bryant, though for most of her life she was known as Louise. Growing up, she lived for several years with her step-grandfather in Nevada, which is what likely led her later to attend the University of Nevada in Reno. At the University of Nevada, Bryant played basketball and was on the staff of several university publications. Subsequently, she attended the University of Oregon at Eugene, where she continued to write. It was also here that Louise exhibited the first signs of the free spirit that lurked within her, developing a slightly scandalous reputation for drinking, smoking, and wearing rouge. She completed a degree in history in early 1909.[1]

After leaving the university, Bryant moved to Portland to find a job as a journalist. She soon began work with a small paper called *The Spectator* and became involved in local theater. She also met and married a local dentist, Paul Trullinger. As Bryant continued to work for *The Spectator* and became its society editor in 1913, she also became more political, developing a passion for the suffragist and socialist movements. Soon, she was working to get subscriptions in Oregon for *The Masses*, a magazine founded in 1911 dedicated to socialist ideals. Among the writers for *The Masses* was John Reed, a young socialist who was quickly making a name for himself in journalist circles. Bryant read Reed's articles, and

[1] Mary V. Dearborn, *Queen of Bohemia: The Life of Louise Bryant* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1996), 10–18; Virginia Gardner, *"Friend and Lover": The Life of Louise Bryant* (New York: Horizon, 1982), 19–25.

finally met him in late 1914 in Portland. Within a month, she left her husband and traveled to New York to be with Reed. Over the next few years, Bryant and Reed lived in New York City and Provincetown, writing and staging plays with friends such as the playwright Eugene O'Neil, and opening a theater. Bryant and Reed married in 1916.[2]

Even before the outbreak of revolution in Russia, Bryant and Reed had been following the events of World War I. They were opposed to war in general and especially to American involvement in the war. In the summer of 1917, both set sail for Russia by way of Stockholm aboard the Danish steamer *United States*. Over the next months, Bryant and Reed developed their skills in the Russian language as they closely monitored the spectacular events unfolding in St. Petersburg, or, as it was now known, Petrograd. (The latter, less German name, was adopted after the war with Germany began.) They attended meetings that often lasted until four in the morning, and when the revolution began they made their way to the Winter Palace as it was under attack. Armed only with special passes from the Military Revolutionary Committee, Bryant and Reed entered the palace and witnessed the surrender of the palace guards. Over the next weeks, they observed the evolution of the young regime and met many of its most important figures, including Vladimir Lenin, Lev (Leon) Trotsky, Lev Kamenev, and Alexandra Kollontai. Interestingly, though Joseph Stalin would become leader of the Soviet Union a decade later and rewrite history to give himself a central role in the revolution, Bryant does not mention him at all.[3]

The political and social collapse that occurred in early 1917 did not appear out of thin air, of course. For decades, Russia had been experiencing the growing pains that often accompany industrialization and modernization. Over the course of the nineteenth century, Russia's intelligentsia had grown from a small cluster of privileged nobles to a much larger group that included men and women from the nobility as well as the children of priests, bureaucrats, teachers, and lawyers. As time progressed, many of these intellectuals, influenced by the various strains of socialism popular in Western Europe, began to challenge the status quo in Russia, demanding the freedoms and civil rights of their contemporaries elsewhere. Frustrated with the oppressive tsarist regime, some of these became revolutionaries, advocating violence to bring down the system by attacking its heart, the monarchy. In 1881, for example, a group of revolutionaries assassinated Tsar Alexander II, throwing a bomb under his carriage as it traveled through the streets of St. Petersburg. Not surprisingly, the new tsar, his son Alexander III, cracked down on the emerging revolutionary movement, arresting the members of various organizations and imposing restrictions on universities and the press. Alexander III's son and heir, Nicholas II, continued to pursue the same harsh policies, thus intensifying the revolutionaries' hatred of the government.[4]

---

[2] Dearborn, *Queen of Bohemia*, 23–38; Gardner, "*Friend and Lover*," 25–44.

[3] Dearborn, *Queen of Bohemia*, 74–88; Gardner, "*Friend and Lover*," 62–125.

[4] Sheila Fitzpatrick, *The Russian Revolution, 1917–1932* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982), 10–26; Orlando Figes, *A People's Tragedy: The Russian Revolution, 1891–1924* (New York: Penguin Books, 1998), 3–121; See also Philip Pomper, *The Russian*

There were other stresses as well. Though Russia had abolished its centuries-old practice of serfdom in 1861, it was still an overwhelmingly agricultural nation with a large population of impoverished peasants and a small group of elites who held social and political power. By the last quarter of the nineteenth century, however, the industrial revolution had begun to make its presence felt, straining Russia's traditional social structure with the creation of new social groups. Industrialization arrived later and more gradually in Russia than it did in other parts of Europe, but the results were the same—the emergence of a working class and an industrial middle class, neither of which fit neatly into the current Russian social system.[5]

These threats, combined with the enormous challenges on the international scene, eventually led to the first revolution in Russia in the twentieth century, the revolution of 1905. In 1904, Russia and Japan went to war over territorial conflicts in Manchuria. It was a humiliating defeat for Russia and it was, in part, Russia's miserable performance in the Russo-Japanese War which led to the outbreak of revolution in January 1905. In that month, a strike broke out in St. Petersburg and tied up several factories employing thousands of workers, and on Sunday, January 22, two hundred thousand of those workers joined in a protest march to the Winter Palace. Though the demonstration was meant to be an innocent and peaceful appeal to Nicholas, with many of the workers carrying icons and pictures of the tsar, when the workers came within sight of Palace Square they found their way blocked by troops and police. When they refused to stop, they were fired upon. Over one hundred people were killed and several hundred injured in what henceforth became known as Bloody Sunday. Such violence perpetrated against an unarmed crowd only intensified public dissatisfaction with the state of affairs in St. Petersburg and Russia. In the following months, Nicholas tried to placate the public with promises of a consultative assembly, but his attempts were fruitless, and strikes and demonstrations continued throughout the spring, summer, and early fall. Finally, faced with an enormous general strike in October 1905, Nicholas issued a document called the October Manifesto which created a nationally elected consultative assembly called the Duma. Though the Duma appeared promising on paper, in reality it changed little. The Duma had limited powers, and ministers remained solely responsible to the autocrat. After the first two Dumas were deemed insubordinate and arbitrarily dissolved, a new electoral system that virtually disfranchised some groups and heavily overrepresented the landed nobility was introduced. Thus, politically, the creation of the Duma failed to address Russia's problems. Yet another thing that the revolution of 1905 failed to put an end to was revolutionary attacks. In 1908, for example, 1800 officials were killed and 2083 were wounded in politically motivated attacks. While Nicholas's "com-

Revolutionary Intelligentsia (Arlington Heights, IL: Harlan Davidson, Inc., 1970); Richard Pipes, *The Russian Revolution* (New York: Vintage, 1991), 121–52.

[5] Figes, *A People's Tragedy*, 46–48, 5–54; Pipes, *The Russian Revolution*, 91–120.

promise" may have satisfied some moderates, for others it was too little, too late, and only fanned the flames of their revolutionary fervor.[6]

All of these problems were brewing at the surface when war broke out in August 1914. Most Russians greeted the war with patriotism and enthusiasm. Soon, however, the tide turned as Russia began to suffer defeat after defeat at the hands of the Germans. It was at this point that Nicholas made a fateful decision. In September 1915, the tsar dismissed his commander in chief and took command of the troops himself, leaving his wife, Alexandra, in the capital. The tsaritsa was a German princess by birth and largely reviled by the Russian public for her cold and haughty appearance. By 1915, there were already rumors of treason in the palace. Matters were only made worse by Alexandra's (and Nicholas's) strange fascination with and reliance on Grigory Rasputin who insinuated himself into the royal family through his seeming ability to stop the bleeding and pain of the hemophiliac heir to the throne, Alexis. Rasputin held great power at court, serving as a spiritual advisor to the royal family but also influencing political decisions and political appointments. Though Rasputin was murdered in 1916, the royal family's association with him weakened public perception of the monarchy.[7]

All of these problems together resulted in the collapse of the monarchy in early 1917. In late February (according to the Julian calendar, which was still in use in Russia at the time), while Nicholas was still at staff headquarters, riots and demonstrations broke out in Petrograd. These demonstrations, spontaneous and unexpected, consisted of factory workers on strike and housewives angry about food shortages. The government attempted to disperse the demonstrators by sending in reserve battalions, but the soldiers began to fraternize with the demonstrators instead, and there were no other troops in the city. With Nicholas at the front, authority largely collapsed and many officials went into hiding. The population of Petrograd then turned to the Duma for leadership. Recognizing the potential danger in this situation, the tsar tried to dissolve the Duma, but its members ignored his order, and on February 27, 1917, they created a Provisional Government. Meanwhile, another important group was also being formed: the Petrograd Soviet, a group of soldiers and workers with an ill-defined, yet evolving, political agenda. As these events were occurring, Nicholas attempted to return to Petrograd, but he was stranded by railroad strikes in the city of Pskov. There, faced with the realities already described, and aware that he no longer had the support of his army commanders, Nicholas abdicated both for himself and for his son, in favor of his brother Michael. When Michael failed to accept the throne with any decisiveness, the Romanov dynasty, which had lasted over three hundred years, from 1613 to 1917, came to an end.[8]

---

[6] Fitzpatrick, *The Russian Revolution, 1917–1932*, 26–32; Figes, *A People's Tragedy*, 173–96; Pipes, *The Russian Revolution,* 3–51.

[7] Fitzpatrick, *The Russian Revolution, 1917–1932*, 32–33; Figes, *A People's Tragedy*, 246–78; Pipes, *The Russian Revolution,* 195–232.

[8] Fitzpatrick, *The Russian Revolution, 1917–1932*, 34–60; Figes, *A People's Tragedy*, 310–351; Pipes, *The Russian Revolution,* 272–337.

The situation which followed was a strange one, consisting of dual power between two newly formed bodies, the Provisional Government and the Petrograd Soviet. The Provisional Government consisted mostly of Duma members and other officials from the more liberal and moderate parties. Since it had ignored the tsar's order to disband the Duma, the Provisional Government technically had no legitimate authority. It was thus supposed to be a temporary body in office until a Constituent Assembly could be elected, and because of its temporary nature, it put off dealing with critical questions, the most important of these being land reform and the war. The Provisional Government also recognized that it lacked the large popular support of its chief rival, the Petrograd Soviet, which had effective control over the capital. The leaders of the Soviet were mostly Socialist Revolutionaries and Mensheviks, two very different groups of socialists, and consisted primarily of workers and soldiers. Its authority came from the fact that hundreds of these soviets had developed throughout the country, and it was more or less the leading group. Its weakness lay in the fact that it was an unwieldy body of three thousand delegates and that its leaders were not in agreement about what should happen next. Many of the leaders of the Petrograd Soviet believed that the rule of the Provisional Government was a necessary stage according to Karl Marx's theory of a two-stage revolution. In their view, because tsarist Russia was still largely an agrarian society and industrialization had just begun at the end of the nineteenth century, both the bourgeoisie (middle class) and the working class were young and small. Consequently, these faithful Marxists believed that the revolution in February 1917 had ushered in an era of bourgeois rule, and therefore, they had to wait a period of time before overthrowing this bourgeois government. How long they had to wait was debated. For this reason then, the Petrograd Soviet tolerated the existence of the Provisional Government as it decided upon the proper moment to act.[9]

On the other hand, there was Vladimir Lenin, the Marxist theorist and revolutionary who was eager to establish a workers' state. Lenin had already gathered a faction of followers around him under the name of the Bolsheviks. When the Revolution broke out in February, Lenin was in exile in Switzerland. Writing from Switzerland, Lenin made it clear that he opposed the Provisional Government and hoped to topple it; he also expressed his intent and desire to take Russia out of the war. This last declaration of Lenin's meant that France and Italy, both allies of Russia, would not allow him passage to Russia. Germany, however, was more than happy to help Lenin get home; the only condition was that he travel in a sealed train car so that he could not incite any workers' movements in Germany along the way. So Lenin, along with his wife and several close associates, arrived in Petrograd in early April and began to try and persuade the other Bolsheviks in the Petrograd Soviet that it was time to stage the revolution. He explained his program for action in a document known as the "April Theses"; in it he presented his alternative to the two-stage revolutionary pattern of classical Marxism. Lenin broke with the traditional view that a period of bourgeois rule was necessary and

[9] Fitzpatrick, *The Russian Revolution, 1917–1932*, 34–60; Figes, *A People's Tragedy*, 354–61; Pipes, *The Russian Revolution*, 385–438.

instead insisted that Russia could immediately go to the second stage of revolution. Thus he urged the Petrograd Soviet, as the representative of the working class, to take power immediately. Once in charge, Lenin promised to accomplish three things: to take Russia out of the war, to distribute land to the peasantry, and to give workers control over the factories. It was, of course, these things which the Provisional Government refused to do, and this would ultimately result in its downfall.[10]

Throughout the summer of 1917, the Provisional Government continued to pursue the same unsatisfactory policies. In late June and early July, it launched the last Russian offensive of World War I, an attack on Austro-German forces along a broad front in Galicia, which ultimately failed. This misstep resulted in more riots and a failed attempt by the Bolsheviks to overthrow the Provisional Government. When the rebellion was put down, Lenin fled to Finland and some other Bolsheviks, including Trotsky, were arrested. Following this political and military disaster, the prime minister of the Provisional Government, Prince Georgy Lvov, resigned and Alexander Kerensky took his place. During the same period, the All-Russian Congress of Soviets emerged as the body that would represent the hundreds of smaller soviets across the country, with delegates of various political leanings, including Socialist Revolutionaries, Mensheviks, and Bolsheviks.[11]

In the next months the Provisional Government faced challenges it simply could not overcome. In early September there was an attempt to overthrow the government by a Russian military commander, Lavr Kornilov. In an effort to save the government, Kerensky appealed to the Petrograd Soviet for help, releasing a number of Bolshevik leaders from prison and then arming the workers' militia known as the Red Guard. This tactic worked and the coup was stopped, but the Provisional Government paid the price nonetheless. It came out of the crisis looking weaker than before, while the position of the Bolsheviks was greatly strengthened. In fact, it was their leadership in putting down the attempted coup which gave them the strength and popularity to finally win control of both the Petrograd and Moscow Soviets.[12]

Finally, in October the Bolsheviks took action. In early October Lenin returned to Petrograd and began to convince the other leading Bolsheviks of his plan. It was finally decided that the insurrection was to take place in late October under the cover of the coming Congress of Soviets. Up until the last minute, however, there were many dissenters within the Soviet leadership. The Great October Socialist Revolution, as it came to be known in Soviet mythology, was in reality a small-scale event, a military coup that passed unnoticed by the majority of residents in Petrograd. The popular image of the Bolshevik Revolution as a bloody struggle by tens of thousands, with thousands of fallen heroes, is completely fab-

[10] Fitzpatrick, *The Russian Revolution, 1917–1932*, 34–60; Figes, *A People's Tragedy*, 384–87; Pipes, *The Russian Revolution*, 341–84.

[11] Fitzpatrick, *The Russian Revolution, 1917–1932*, 34–60; Figes, *A People's Tragedy*, 279–82, 421– 438; Pipes, *The Russian Revolution*, 385–438.

[12] Fitzpatrick, *The Russian Revolution, 1917–1932*, 34–60; Figes, *A People's Tragedy*, 451–61; Pipes, *The Russian Revolution*, 385–438.

ricated. On the night of October 24–25, the coup was carried out under Trotsky's leadership, as the Red Guard seized the vital centers in Petrograd, including the telephone exchange and the electricity and railroad offices. The Provisional Government held out briefly in the Winter Palace, but their defenses were weak; the majority of the soldiers in Petrograd supported the Bolshevik takeover.[13]

Over the next nine months, Lenin and the Bolsheviks worked to consolidate their control and began to shape Russian life. Immediately after the coup, Lenin set out to establish a new government, naming himself as prime minister and Trotsky as commissar of foreign affairs. The first challenge Lenin faced was to tackle the problems which had brought down the monarchy and the Provisional Government. So, the new government approved the seizing of land by peasants, which had already been taking place, and put factories in the hands of workers' committees. It also issued a Decree on Peace which called for an immediate end to the war with Germany and for a peace settlement without annexations or reparations. In late November, an armistice between Russia and Germany was declared and peace negotiations began in the city of Brest-Litovsk, the site of German military headquarters. Trotsky, as Russia's representative, tried to hold his ground, but Germany demanded large areas of land. When Trotsky continued to refuse, the Germans launched an offensive that soon came dangerously close to Petrograd. Lenin then persuaded his new government to accept the harsh terms; he intended to evade the terms as much as possible, and he did not want to lose the gains of the revolution by provoking a German invasion. He ultimately thought Germany would soon be defeated, and a workers' revolution would emerge there as well. Thus in March 1918, the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk was signed. As a result of the treaty, Russia lost some 1.3 million square miles of land, including Finland, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, most of Poland, and Bessarabia. Russia also agreed to recognize Ukrainian independence.[14]

Even this harsh treaty was only a minor setback for Lenin; over the next months, he continued to consolidate his power with increasingly radical measures. In March 1918, he renamed the Bolshevik Party the Communist Party, and in May he began a program of forced grain requisitions in order to get food for the cities. That summer, in July 1918, a new constitution was adopted by which supreme power was placed in an All-Russian Congress of Soviets. Among other things, the constitution restricted civil rights and the right to bear arms to members of the working class. Even as Lenin worked to stabilize his new regime, however, opposition forces rebelled and began a civil war that would last three years. It was during this early period of the Civil War that Lenin and his new government decided to eliminate the largest remaining threat to their power, the existence of the royal family. Since April 1918, Nicholas II and his family had been sequestered in Ekaterinburg, a city located near the Ural Mountains, where they were kept as prisoners, locked away in a small house with painted-over windows. In early July,

[13] Figes, *A People's Tragedy*, 469–500; Pipes, *The Russian Revolution*, 439–505.

[14] Fitzpatrick, *The Russian Revolution, 1917–1932*, 34–60; Figes, *A People's Tragedy*, 500–51; Pipes, *The Russian Revolution*, 567–605. See also John W. Wheeler-Bennett, *Brest-Litovsk: The Forgotten Peace, March 1918* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1971).

with the permission of Moscow party officials, the entire family was awakened in the middle of the night and told that they were being moved to a safer location. Once they were assembled in the basement, armed guards entered the room and executed the entire family, along with their pets and several servants, with gunfire and bayonets. The first stage of the revolution was complete.[15]

Bryant's story does not end with the success of the Bolshevik Revolution and the beginning of totalitarian rule in Russia and, ultimately, the Soviet Union. She returned to the United States in February 1918 and immediately began working on the book that would become *Six Red Months in Russia*. Reed would return two months later. Working with impressive speed, Bryant published her book in October of the same year, and in early 1919, began giving talks on Russia, discussing her book and expressing her opposition to Allied intervention. By this time, of course, the Paris Peace Conference was underway, and politicians and leaders in all of the Allied countries were fearful of the spread of Bolshevism into Europe during this period of postwar instability. In the United States, this fear sparked the creation of a committee under the leadership of North Carolina Senator Lee S. Overman to investigate Bolshevism and other forms of anti-American radicalism. Eventually, Bryant would be called to testify before the committee in February 1919. Before being called on the carpet for her Bolshevik sympathies, however, Bryant found herself in trouble for her involvement in a suffragist march on the White House. She was among the forty or so women arrested and spent several days in jail, engaging in a hunger strike with the others to draw greater attention to their cause.[16]

Through 1919, Bryant and Reed continued to believe in the inevitability of a world revolution, despite a failed communist coup d'etat in both Hungary and Germany. Bryant continued to travel around the country giving speeches, but was dismayed by the continued fear of communism in the United States. She was deeply disturbed by the anti-communist Palmer raids of 1920, in particular. Carried out by the Justice Department's Bureau of Investigation headed by J. Edgar Hoover, the raids included document confiscations at the offices of the American Communist Party and the Communist Labor Party in New York. During this period, Bryant continued to write, covering the trial of one of her socialist acquaintances who had been rounded up in the Palmer Raids.[17]

In the summer of 1920, Bryant headed to Russia yet again, intending to meet up with Reed, who was already there. During her stay in Russia, Bryant interviewed Lenin and published the interview in the *Washington Times* in mid-October. Only three days later, Bryant was dealt one of the harshest blows of her life when Reed died of typhus in a Moscow hospital Though devastated, Bryant remained in Moscow filing cables almost daily with the International News Service and serving as one of the few reliable sources on Russia for the American

[15] Fitzpatrick, *The Russian Revolution, 1917–1932*, 61–84; Figes, *A People's Tragedy*, 556–642; Pipes, *The Russian Revolution*, 506–65, 671–788.

[16] Dearborn, *Queen of Bohemia*, 117–35; Gardner, *"Friend and Lover,"* 146–53.

[17] Dearborn, *Queen of Bohemia*, 136–52; Gardner, *"Friend and Lover,"* 171–93.

press. In 1923, her second book on Russia, *Mirrors of Moscow*, was published. Written in a more sober tone, it was a collection of portraits of Russian leaders and other people she had interviewed, including Lenin, Trotsky, Kollontai, and Felix Dzerzhinsky, the head of the Russian secret police, the Cheka. The book received favorable reviews, demonstrating once again Bryant's skills as a journalist, now free from the shadow of her lover and competitor, John Reed.[18]

The year 1923 was a turning point in Bryant's life for two other reasons; it was the year she began to suffer from recurring bouts of illness and the year that she married the wealthy diplomat William Bullitt. The illness, which would plague her for the rest of her life with depression, irritability, lethargy, and weight gain, would be diagnosed in 1928 as the rare disorder Dercum's disease. It would not only contribute to the decline of her once-admired beauty, but it also undoubtedly played a role in her increasing consumption of alcohol in the later years of her life. The marriage would end in divorce in 1930, and in estrangement from her child, who lived with Bullitt. Bryant died in France in 1936.[19]

Though much of Bryant's talent was overshadowed by her sex and her relationship with Reed, she was, in fact, a remarkable woman for her time. Writer, suffragist, socialist, worldly and adventurous journalist, dissenter from social norms—all of these labels can be applied to Bryant, yet none of them alone fully identifies her accomplishments. Bryant moved throughout sophisticated circles during her life, befriending many of the luminaries of the early twentieth century, men like Eugene O'Neil, Ernest Hemingway, Clarence Darrow, Claude McKay, and Ford Maddox Ford. She interviewed not only Russian leaders but also the Italian Fascist dictator Benito Mussolini and the leader of the 1908 Young Turk Revolution Enver Pasha. Unfortunately, her contemporaries—male and female—often dismissed her as just a pretty face or the attractive appendage of an important man. Her book *Six Red Months in Russia* has long been eclipsed by Reed's *Ten Days That Shook the World*, and even the well-known Warren Beatty film *Reds* portrays Bryant, played by Diane Keaton, as more of a dependent than a freestanding character, with little identity separate from Reed's.[20]

Bryant did, in fact, have her own voice and was a skilled observer and journalist in her own right. While Reed's book is certainly an important work, documenting the revolution as a major historical event, it contains little personal commentary on the events he witnessed. Bryant's account, on the other hand, is also a documentation of the revolution, but it goes further than Reed's in many ways, incorporating interpretation and observation. Bryant communicates to readers what life was like during the days of the revolution—the people, the food, the excitement, the fear. She is keenly aware of her American audience and speaks directly to them, urging them to pay attention to this world-changing moment in history and not to be fooled by the rumors and misinformation about the nature of Bolshevism and the new regime. *Six Red Months in Russia* conveys Bryant's confidence in her own writing and in her understanding of the revolution and

[18] Dearborn, *Queen of Bohemia*, 153–87; Gardner, *"Friend and Lover,"* 194–236.
[19] Dearborn, *Queen of Bohemia*, 191–301; Gardner, *"Friend and Lover,"* 239–95.
[20] Dearborn, *Queen of Bohemia*, 5, 172–74, 208–11, 234–35, 304–09.

reminds us of the utter enthusiasm that many Russians, and Americans, felt for socialism and its yet-untainted, utopian ideals.[21]

Now, at the centennial of the Russian Revolution, it is important for us to reconsider accounts such as Bryant's. The spectacular events of 1917 have played themselves out and students of Russia can analyze and examine the revolution and its aftermath with the perspective and the benefit of a long historical lens. It is an opportunity to consider the role of the observer in historical events and, in particular, when those events occur in a country that is not one's own. Is the outside observer able to see with greater clarity? Or does one need to be deeply rooted in a country's history and culture to truly understand monumental changes like revolution? The works of Bryant and others may not answer these questions, but in a world of growing political, cultural, economic, and social interconnectedness, the questions are worth asking.

There is another reason to re-examine the Russian Revolution and our (America's) reaction to it. Russia and the United States have a long and complicated history together. After establishing official diplomatic relations early in the nineteenth century, they remained on more or less good terms until 1917. The Russian Revolution was a turning point as it changed the way in which the two nations interacted for some seventy years. Communism in Russia has come and gone; the Cold War is over. Nonetheless, though Russia and the United States are no longer mortal enemies, their relationship is always complex and uneasy. Understanding the history of that relationship is key to navigating the choppy waters of Russian-American diplomacy in the future.

[21] Dearborn, *Queen of Bohemia*, 85–88, 93–96.

An Early Sociologist, Edward Alsworth Ross, Describes the Russian Revolution of 1917

Rex A. Wade

"The Russian, with his sociable nature," wrote Edward Alsworth Ross, "takes a lively interest in what happens to his fellow-man, so when I am trying to make myself understood at a buffet, some one is sure to come to my rescue with English or French. Indeed, this *camaraderie* and good will is the outstanding feature of my twenty thousand miles of travel in Russia." Thus Ross, a noted American sociologist and scholar, summarized his six months in Russia during the second half of 1917. Nearly six and a half feet tall and considered handsome by many, he would have been a striking figure at the time, both in the United States and during his Russia trip.

When Ross arrived in Russia at the beginning of July 1917, a critical time in the Russian Revolution, he already was a famous sociology professor and author of many books and articles. Others were to follow later, eventually totaling twenty-seven books and hundreds of articles. He was one of the founders of sociology as a recognized academic field and was president of the American Sociological Society in 1914 and 1915. His *Principles of Sociology*, printed in 1920, was widely used as a textbook for a long time. He departed for Russia only three years after he helped found the American Association of University Professors, the leading institution still protecting academic freedom in American universities today. The latter grew in part out of a famous academic freedom conflict Ross had with Mrs. Leland Stanford over his pro-American labor views while he was at Stanford University early in his career. This led to his departure from there first to the University of Nebraska and then to the University of Wisconsin, where he lived out the rest of his career and life.

The Russia trip was not Ross's only or even first trip he made abroad to explore and write about other countries and cultures, usually for about a similar half-year length to fit with academic semester leave periods. Most were used in his writings, as separate books and as material in others. in others, although none, perhaps, as much as this Russia trip, which led to three books on the Russian Revolution and Civil War plus input into his broader sociological thinking and writing. His trips included China in 1910 to "look into the relations of the sexes, the family system, native faiths, missionary work, the sway of custom and public opinion, education old and new" and other questions. He came to the conclusion that the Chinese were "quite as gifted as ourselves," which would not have been

common thought at the time he wrote that.[1] He traveled around South America for several months in 1913, a trip which included lunch with former President Theodore Roosevelt, with whom he was acquainted, in Santiago, Chile. Then came Russia. After the war he took trips to and wrote about society in Africa, India, and elsewhere, spending a year as professor on a round-the-world boat trip. In all these trips his focus was on understanding and explaining societies. All of this came on top of an earlier lengthy period studying in Germany and then traveling around Europe as a young man. He had a remarkably international outlook for the time.

Throughout his career Ross was dedicated to academic freedom and social reform, and to sociology as a way to comprehend its need. He also was a strong proponent of women's rights, including the right to vote, which partially explains his lengthy chapter on women in Russia and their achievement of universal suffrage. After returning home he became a proponent of recognizing the Soviet government during the long era between 1918–33 when the United States refused to do so. He also engaged in a wide range of social reform movements and, as he wrote later, was a deeply committed speaker. He intermingled with and exchanged correspondence with a wide range of leading figures of his time: Theodore Roosevelt, Clarence Darrow, Oliver Wendell Holmes, and William Jennings Bryan among many others. He also had numerous conflicts with the political conservative movement of the 1920s and 1930s: during one of them he was called before a committee from the Wisconsin state legislature for questioning as a possible communist, an event he proudly and humorously describes in his memoir.[2]

Ross went to Russia under the sponsorship of the American Institute of Social Service "to examine and report upon the prospects of practical social progress there." Arriving early July 1917 and crossing back out of Russia January 1, 1918, he was there during a key period in history.[3] He traveled extensively across the country, talked to a wide range of people, and wrote a very unique account that focused more on the people and less on politics and political figures. As he states in his brief introduction:

> I have taken it as my business to describe impartially the major social changes going on in Russia during my sojourn there in the latter half of 1917, and leave it to others or to time itself to judge them…. No doubt my account will seem drab to a public

[1] Edward Alsworth Ross, *Seventy Years of It: An Autobiography* (New York: D. Appleton-Century, 1936), 120-21.

[2] Ross, *Seventy Years*, 313.

[3] He arrived in late June by the Russian calendar, July by the American. Russia was still using the Julian calendar, which in 1917 was thirteen days behind the updated Gregorian calendar in use in America and most of Europe. One result is that what Russians and most historians today call the October Revolution is called the November Revolution by those using the Gregorian calendar. Ross uses the Gregorian dates throughout, and only in special instances do I add the Julian date.

> that has become accustomed to the iridescent stories of revolutionary Russia that have been appearing in our periodicals. Unfortunately for my readers I conceive it my duty to present the typical rather than the bizarre. I could easily have unreeled a film of astonishing and sensational happenings, such as present themselves in troublous times, which would leave the reader with the impression that the Russians are fools or madmen. It happens, however, that I found the Russians behaving much as I should were I in their place and furnished with their experience.

He follows through on that remarkably well: the ordinary people, Russians and others, are nicely described in a period of rapid radical change. In contrast to most books published at the time, major political figures and big political events (July Days, Kornilov Affair, Bolshevik Revolution) are given little space. The focus of the book is more on telling about the people and society than the politics going on. His observations clearly had an immediate impact: on July 5, 1918, Charles R. Crane, a special advisor to President Woodrow Wilson and long time friend and patron of Ross, requested some notes for Wilson on methods of helping Russia.[4]

Although his book probably was of relatively little value to the competing pro-Soviet or anti-Soviet movements that quickly emerged to dominate discussion of the revolution in the United States or to the later Trotskyite-Stalinist battles, for more serious readers it was invaluable. For someone wanting to understand the broader social context of the revolution it is very illuminating and one of the best early accounts… In the longer-term context, it is a predecessor of the social history focused academic studies that emerged in the United States and Great Britain in the 1980s. After this book, Ross published in 1921 a more traditionally structured history book that also presented an excellent account of the 1917 revolution, and then in 1924 one on the civil war and early Soviet years.[5] Clearly, the revolution fascinated him.

The book initially seems to have two parts that reflect his travels and the development of his understanding of the revolution. The first five chapters at first seem almost travelogues, heavy on descriptions of the country, the people, and a life that was changing as it entered the revolutionary era (with civil war to come). In the process, however, he shows his sociologist's skill in looking at people and

[4] Crane had played an important role in Ross's time and experiences in Russia. Crane was a sort of sponsor of Ross, encouraging his trip to Russia, then visiting him in Moscow in the early fall of 1917 and providing extra funding for him to stay on to the end of December (the rapid inflation of the ruble in 1917 had undercut Ross's monetary resources and threatened to make him return home earlier than intended). On Ross and Crane, see Normal E. Saul, *The Life and Times of Charles R. Crane, 1858–1939* (Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books, 2013), especially 257.

[5] *The Russian Bolshevik Revolution* (New York: The Century Co., 1921), and *The Russian Soviet Republic* (New York: The Century Co., 1924).

cultures. In the first chapter he moves from east to west across Russia by train, from the newest and least developed areas to the oldest and most densely settled. In doing so he provides an excellent description of the varying land and farming systems, and indicates initial changes coming out of the revolution. Later in the same chapter, in an unusual organizational structure, he recounts his return trip to Vladivostok six months later. It places right up front both the differences between Russian summer and winter and the social-political changes that had occurred during his time there. The chapter opens with a fascinating description of his first impressions and ends with an equally fascinating revelation of how conditions for a train ride had deteriorated. It includes a description of his and his train-mates' celebration of their crossing the border out of Russia, similar to what many later visitors to the Soviet Union did on leaving. Throughout, he provides excellent descriptions of the land and peoples, and especially of their interactions.

After about a month in Petrograd, as the then capital of Russia was known at the time, during which he interviewed "outstanding [Russian] liberals and extracted their views,"[6] he began a three-month trip down the Volga river and on to the Caucasus and Central Asia. Although he does not mention him by name, his companion was M. O. Williams of the *Christian Herald*, from whom, as he notes elsewhere, he obtained most of the photographs in his original book after many of his own were lost. (The original book's pictures were mostly of Central Asia and the Caucasus and only a few of them are used here.) The trip, described in chapters 2–5, provides a broad picture of the Russian Empire and its variety of peoples. These are first seen and described as he travels to Nizhnii Novgorod on the upper Volga River and then on his trip by boat down the lengthy Volga, following a major trade route to the Caspian Sea. Along the way he observed a variety of small ethnicities and ways of life. He later attributed one of his major sociology articles about labor relations to what he saw, staying up all one night on the boat to draft it.[7]

Along one portion of the Volga, because of the German-descent population, he was often able to speak with people without a translator (the same was true in Petrograd and Moscow, where German, French, and English served him well with the better educated population, especially his own professional middle class). From the bottom of the Volga he crossed over into the Caucasus Mountains area, especially into Georgia, whose people he clearly loved and was fascinated by: "The Caucasians are the handsomest people my eyes have ever lighted on." While there he observed the installation of the new patriarch of the Georgian Orthodox church, which office had been abolished under the Russian tsars. Then he goes on east across the Caspian Sea to Central Asia and, again, provides a sociologist's accounts of the people and their activities. These chapters would have presented a new and exotic world to his readers in the United States and Britain. He also

[6] Ross, *Seventy Years*, 152. An account of the initial month is skipped over at first in the book while he starts his Volga-Caucasus-Central Asia trip, but helps shape much of the book from chapter 6 onward. St. Petersburg was renamed Petrograd at the outbreak of the war, then to Leningrad in 1924, and again to St. Petersburg in 1991.

[7] Ross, *Seventy Years*, 160. He published the article in 1922.

picked up on the unfortunate impact the runaway inflation was having on them. In chapter 5 he makes an analysis of how the demand for famous Tekke rugs during wartime and inflation affected local society for the worse—a good example of his sophisticated observations of what he is seeing. Ironically, in his later autobiography he admits that he bought several rugs.

In chapters 6 and 7, Ross turns to describing the Russian people and the land question for peasants, one of the greatest issues for Russia before, during, and after the revolution. In "The Russian People" he offers a somewhat contradictory picture, starting with how they were helpful, gregarious, and in other ways nice, but then slides in a more negative picture of the backwardness of ordinary people with faces "dull, unlit, the mouth a little open." There are some naïve statements, usually based on things he was told. At the end, however, he remains very optimistic about the Russians becoming more modern and quickly democratic. Here he introduces a not unusual theme among Americans visiting Russia at this time, namely, the idea that America was like a wiser older brother to the Russians as they developed. Chapter 7, on agriculture, was influenced by a trip to the countryside and an examination of varying farming and landholding methods. He describes both the traditional communal system with its strip farming and the development of huge, modern agricultural operations. He again makes comparisons to America, especially farming in the Midwestern states. At the end he speculates about the extent to which the land redistribution going on, much as the peasants wanted it, would lead to a reversion to poorer quality agriculture.

In chapters 8–10, drawing upon both what he was told there and earlier research, he takes up the question of the roots of revolution, the returning revolutionaries, and revolutionary movements. Chapters 8 and 9 provide a history of the political problem and the revolutionary movement. In chapter 9 he gives a graphic account of the Siberian exile system under the old regime, including extensive biographical accounts of two revolutionaries, one a man and one a woman, who were sent to Siberia but then escaped, and who, it is implied, were active in the revolutionary process going on in 1917. He concludes this section with chapter 10, which brings the revolutionary movements up into the events of 1917 and includes a remarkable multipage interview with Leon Trotsky in December 1917.

Then, in chapters 11–14, he turns to a series of social issues: "Caste and Democracy," Russian women, "Labor and Capital," religion, and the Orthodox Church. These chapters reflect his interest in people, and in all of them he takes an interest in and shows a remarkably good understanding of life and the issues of 1917. Here and there in these chapters he got some features off-key, but remarkably few for an author of the time. These are noted in footnotes in this edition. Throughout, most of this would have been completely new to most readers, not only because there was so little information on Russia available in English at the time, but because he offered up so much more on social features and the way people lived than did most books of the era.[8]

[8] He actually wrote some of these chapters while in Russia and sent them on ahead to the U.S., and at least one or two were published separately as magazine articles in *The Century* before he got back home and other later **<<incomplete?>>**

This is reflected throughout his book, but nowhere is this better illustrated than in chapter 12 on women. It is one of the longest and most fascinating of the book. On this topic it compares favorably to most books of the time. He was there just as Russian women gained a remarkable right—Russia was the first major country to grant women equal and universal voting rights. He extolls Russian women and discusses them in the context of women's positions and social development in the U.S and Russia, with the U.S. not necessarily coming out ahead. He sees a remarkably advanced women's situation in Russia, of which he fully approved. Clearly he interacted extensively with the more educated women, but nonetheless his account is quite complex. As one might expect from a liberal social science professor, he is sort of avant-garde for the times in his attitude toward women and their rights and position in society. At the same time, it must be noted, he also sticks in here and there traditional views of the role of women in society. His focus, or perhaps just his circle of contacts, tends to be educated women, and he touches relatively little on peasant women or working-class women, both of whom were a different story. Still, it is a fascinating chapter deserving wide readership.

In the last two chapters he turns to looking at Russia's possible future, maybe even as "The United States of Russia." In chapter 15 he confronts the very complex and still developing question of national and ethnic identities and the controversial debates about their futures. During 1917 there was a movement among many peoples of the empire toward some sort of autonomy, with pressures for more extensive autonomy growing monthly. After the October Revolution, and especially after the Constituent Assembly was dispersed on January 6/19, 1918, many argued that the former state no longer existed and moved to declare independence. The outbreak of civil war— *wars*, really—furthered that. Ross had a good sense of the rapidly changing issues but could not get it all down in detail. His weakest section is on Ukraine, which he did not visit. He does, however, give a somewhat eerie prediction of the Russian state becoming a federal republic structured along ethnic lines, which is what happened in 1922–24 under the Communists with the formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Soviet Union. In part he is applying, as some in Russia and these areas did, the American notion of states within a federal union, with power distributed. This is all the more striking in that the original version of this chapter was written and published in Russia in late 1917 for the local American Committee of Publicity, and also translated and published in Russian.[9]

In chapter 16 he concludes with a number of broader issues about Russia's future and Russian-American relations. In the process he explicitly rejects the then popular, but erroneous, claim that Lenin and Trotsky were German agents. He ends with a discussion of labor and wage issues, rich and poor, in the United States, in effect tacitly suggesting that if those were not addressed, a revolutionary situation could develop here; this in effect foreshadowed some of the controversies and problems of the immediate postwar period in the United States.

[9] Ross, *Seventy Years*, 168-69.

Politics plays a relatively small role in his book compared to the writing of other Americans and Westerners who went over to see the revolution. Still, he cannot and does not ignore it. His account of the political reality in late summer and fall was one of the best available to an American of the time. Similarly, his section on the origins of political parties in chapter 10 is very good, and again suggests he may have done significant research before going and conducted lots of interviews while there. His discussion of the revolution of 1905 in chapter 8 suggests the same. One of the special features that grabs the reader is the multi-page interview with Leon Trotsky in December in chapter 8. It is remarkable and beautifully catches Trotsky's thoughts, assumptions, and plans in the early days of the Bolshevik regime, before the Constituent Assembly affair and the Civil War changed everything. The interview is all the more striking in that politics and the major political figures of the Russian Revolution—Miliukov (the leader of the liberals, whom he apparently met and talked with), Kerensky, and Lenin (who successively headed the government while he was there), etc.—are largely absent in the book, very unlike other books written by foreign visitors of the time.

The reader might be surprised by the absence of extensive discussion of the war and its relation to the revolution. In a level of honesty unusual in writings about Russia of the time, Ross notes in his introduction that "[t]he reader may be disappointed that I have not discussed the effect of the Revolution upon Russia's attitude toward the belligerent nations nor the question of Russia's future relation to the war. On these momentous topics I have remained silent for the simple reason that I have nothing authoritative to offer." Few authors of the time showed that kind of modesty, and in fact he did not do so consistently.

One special feature is that he makes frequent comparisons to the United States, which had just entered the war in April before his July arrival in Russia. To help American readers understand what he was seeing or talking about, he often makes comparisons to the United States: "just like they do in Montana," or "a town as new looking as Oklahoma City," among other examples. Sometimes he praises one over the other. This was a way to help readers understand what he was seeing and they were reading. Sometimes it is merely part of his description of what he saw. In some cases, his comparison puts one or the other into a less favorable light. Sometimes the U.S. comes out better, in others Russia does. Chapter 13 on "Labor and Capital" often stresses the progressiveness of American conditions (and his progressive outlook), while rejecting not only the terrible condition of Russian workers, but also what he sees as Marxism's simplicity. In contrast, in the latter part of the last chapter he turns to the income inequalities in the U.S., denounces them, and implies that unless addressed, revolutionary unrest and "a calamitous class strife" could happen in the United States as it had in Russia.

He says little about how he acquired his knowledge and understanding of revolutionary Russia. Clearly, what he saw and heard in his 20,000 miles of travel in the country was of utmost importance. Still, he also obviously acquired information from other sources. This included information picked up from Americans and other foreigners who he talked with, especially people who had lived there a long time, although he sometimes was critical of their "knowledge." In addition,

he had clearly done quick, impressive study of Russian history and society before arriving and so had a framework from which to understand the changes and the new, revolutionary society that he observed. The chapters on the revolutionary movements most extensively reflect that, as he notes in his preface.

The reader should not be put off by certain features of style and language that reflect that book was put together in haste: parts of it were written while he was in Russia and sent to the publisher for publication directly from notes he made while traveling.[10] ndeed, he uses the present tense throughout, probably because he was writing at least the draft of the chapters at the time, rather than waiting until his return home. Some features, such as his frequent use of colons, semi-colons, or commas rather than a period and new sentence, are not in his other publications. I've changed some of those that most obviously might confuse, but left the others as the hurried style in which he wrote the book. Related is his love of describing places and people in long strings of phrases separated by semi-colons. At the end of chapter 2 he has a sentence of sixteen phrases (some of them lengthy) to describe "characteristic features of the Orient," the term then commonly used for the more easterly and non-European areas of the Russian empire, especially the Muslim regions. Perhaps this reflects the sociologist in him trying to describe fully and clearly something foreign to his readers. I have left them.

Ross gives an excellent picture of the peoples of Russia at a critical, rapidly changing, time. It focuses on people rather than politics, which makes it quite different from most accounts by Americans and other foreigners who went over in 1917–18. Indeed, his is the only one written by a real academic, by a person of major scholarly standing and with significant scholarly publications. This helps explain his rather different approach, which offers unique insights into what was happening in 1917. From it a modern reader can gain much understanding of Russia, the revolution, and especially the people.

[10] In Ross, *Seventy Years*, 160, he describes an article on a sociology issue that he was inspired to draft while on the Volga—it was published in a sociology journal in 1922.

Review Essay

Sergei I Zhuk, *Nikolai Bolkhovitinov and American Studies in the USSR: People's Diplomacy in the Cold War* (Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books–Rowman and Littlefield, 2017), 275 pp. + xvii, illustrations, index.

Nikolai Nikolaevich Bolkhovitinov (1930–2008) was probably the best known Russian historian in the United States because of his focus on early American history and Russian-American relations with much of this work translated into English and published by major presses. He also traveled widely in the United States for research in archives, and for lecturing and teaching. He very much deserved his being voted an honorary member of the American Historical Association belatedly in 2005. Bolkhovitinov has now received a special tribute by one of his few doctoral students, Sergei Zhuk, who now teaches at Ball State University in Muncie, Indiana. Though trained as his mentor in early American history, Zhuk is best known for a much praised book on Soviet popular culture, *Rock and Roll in the Rocket City: The West, Identity, and Ideology in Soviet Dniepropetrovsk, 1960–1985* (2010), based partly on his personal experience of growing up in Ukraine.

This book is not easy to review, since it is based largely on unpublished memoirs of Bolkhovitinov, numerous personal interviews with him, his wife, and many associates, private e-mails and other correspondence, as well as telephone conversations in America and Russia. Also, subjectively, I consider Bolkhovitinov as a long time personal friend and have been touched by his and his wife's hospitality and kindness over the years. The result of this book, however, is a well-produced and written work, which its subject would be proud of. The details of such spur of the moment sources can be flawed, as in one case that personally involved me.

The occasion was a conference in Kiev during the summer of 1984 celebrating the 50th anniversary of the recognition treaty of 1933, which had been postponed from a planned meeting in 1983 in Moscow, because of strain in relations produced by the Korean Airliner Incident. The American delegation, headed by the Honorable George F. Kennan, wondered about the absence of Bolkhovitinov at the conference. Zhuk quotes an e-mail from John Gaddis about a meeting arranged with B. after our return to Moscow, recalling that a few of us drove around several blocks in Moscow and picked him up and drove out in the country to a restaurant for lunch. I remember it differently in detail. The meeting was arranged

by Gennady Kuropiatnik, good friend of Bolkhovitinov, who was at the conference. There is no way we would have access to a car in Moscow. Prearranged by Kuropiatnik, we walked up Leninskii Prospeckt a couple of blocks from the Akademicheskaia Hotel. At the appointed time, Bolkhovitinov drove by and picked us up to take us to the country. After a lovely lunch and walk in the woods, he brought us back and dropped us off not far from the hotel. My scenario was recently confirmed by Gaddis.[11] The point, however, was that Bolkhovitinov was clearly under a cloud politically at the time, and if the KGB was really keeping tabs, we all have files in their records.

Zhuk excels at describing a scholar navigating the currents of Soviet life with skill and luck. He had an excellent start, born in a Moscow academic family (his father a professor of physics at the Timiraevsky Institute) and in the house he inherited in a "green enclave" of northwest part of the city of individually owned houses, where he lived most of his life, with summer vacations on the Crimean shore. After mostly home schooling, he enrolled at IMEMO (Institute of World Economy and International Relations) rather than Moscow State University (MGU). Thus, he early came under the influence there of the two leading Russian historians of North America, Lev Zubok (1894–1967) and Aleksei Efimov (1896-1971). The former, a Jew from Odessa who emigrated to the United States in 1913, became involved in worker's movements in Philadelphia, then re-emigrated to the Soviet Union in 1924 to become a historian of American imperialism. By contrast Efimov was the product of a Russian upper-middle class legal family, raised in the Caucasus, and served in a White Army during the Russian Civil War. He survived that to become a respected academic scholar of modern America.

Though benefitting from an excellent education with a Ph.D. dissertation (kandidatskaia) on the Monroe Doctrine (1959) from the Moscow Pedagogical Institute, and his *doctorskaia* on early Russian-American relations, defended at the Institute of World History, where he spent the rest of his career. His relations with its long-time director, Aleksandr Chubarian, and the director of its Center of North American Studies, Grigory Sevostianov (1916–2014), in its founding years deserves more attention by Zhuk, as well as that of the compatible relationship of the Nikolai and Liuda Bolkhovitinov with Vera and Gennady Kuropiatnik, leading Russian scholar on Civil War and Reconstruction, who I consider to be their closest family friends.

One reservation I have on this quite positive portrayal of Bolkhovitinov's role as the leader of American Studies in Russia is his sometimes imperious, overbearing attitude at conferences and at other public appearances that could cause hostility and jealousy. For example, from Nikolai Sivachev of Moscow State University and Alexander Fursenko of the Academy of Sciences branch in Leningrad (St. Petersburg), who both probably deserve more recognition and collaboration.

A particular question produced by Zhuk's account is the role of Sevostianov, who passed the leadership of the Center to Bolkhovitinov in 1988. Granted his emphasis on Sevostianov being a KGB agent, who subjected Bolkhovitinov to

[1] E-mail exchange with John Gaddis, late August, 2017.

reduced travel possibilities and access to graduate students, I am not sure I would agree with him, or with Bolkhovitinov himself, in his cited memoirs where he is apparently as portrayed as an *eminence gris* in Russian-American scholarship in the Academy. He did after all welcome Bolkhovitinov into the Institute, played a major role in the concentration of American Studies in a new, separate Center of North American Studies, nurtured young scholars, and promoted a wealth of documentary publications in Soviet international relations. Perhaps his role as a heavy weight KGB Americanist made a Bolkhovitinov possible? And allowing others to continue Bolkhovitinov's striving for objectivity in the current generation, such as Viktoria Zhuravleva and Ivan Kurilla, members of this journal's editorial board?

Perhaps Bolkhovinov's greatest legacy is *Amerkanskie Ezhegodnik (*American Yearbook) that began under Sevostianov in 1973, was passed on to Bokhovitinov as chief editor in 1988 and edited for the rest of his life—and continues today under Vladimir Sogrin, as the main vehicle of Russian-American scholarship in Russia. Zhuk's book could have been enhanced by a glossary of acronyms, a chronological list of major publications, and a more complete index.
Nevertheless, Zhuk provides a fitting tribute to one of the most remarkable historians of the modern era.

SOME PERSONAL REFLECTIONS

My first encounters with Nikolai Bolkhovitinov were in 1973. I was granted an senior faculty exchange to the Soviet Ministry of Higher Education in Moscow during the fall semester and to Moscow State University. I met with my mentor at the university, Igor Dementev, a very respected intellectual historian and great scholar. He immediately recognized that the person I needed to work with in Russian-American relations was Bolkhovitinov and arranged my contact, thus putting me under the Academy of Sciences (though I continued to collect my stipend at the university).

Nikolai and I quickly arranged a schedule for meeting weekly at the Institute of World History, then located in an old building on a side street off of Leninsky Prospeckt. It was in a large room apparently only frequented by him and others on Wednesdays. We would meet around 3:00 in the afternoon at a table in the institute room and converse, as he preferred, in English. About a half an hour of discussion about my work and the problem of access to archives, he would stand and announce loudly in Russian that we would go out to his rather beat up Volga and drive (an experience—he liked to talk animatedly while driving) to visit the Academy book store down the street and then to a local hotel for an early supper (where usually a loud band was playing). He would then drop me off at a metro station or sometimes at the Universitetskaya Gostinitsa, where I and my family (wife and three children were living in one room—one advantage was a direct telephone line and easy access to transportation). Once he prepared to visit them (with flowers) but was scared off by militia men supervising the clearing of snow from the parking area.

My efforts to gain access to the Archive of the Foreign Policy of the Russian Empire continued through the semester. At last on Christmas Eve (Western), I received a phone call in our room from Bolkhovitinov: "Merry Christmas, you have access to the archive." We had early determined that the main problem in access was two large bureaucracies and my being on the bottom of their list: the American embassy, since my admission had to go through it and then to the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs, since the archive was under its administration. Meanwhile, Bolkhovitinov had been working on it from the archive side. Unfortunately, I was committed to a teaching exchange at University College Dublin to begin in January, 1974. So, I had one week to work in this key archive, but I asked if my admittance would still be in effect for the following summer and was assured that it was.

So, from Ireland I re-applied to IREX and was granted one month on the Academy exchange. We thus resumed our weekly meetings at the institute with the usual routine, while I worked full time during the month of July. But the last week, starting off in his Volga, after having announced at the institute that we were going to a hotel for supper, he said, "why don't we go to my house for supper instead." I naively asked if his wife would be expecting this. He pulled over, borrowed a two kopeck coin from me and "pretended" to make a call. This became my first visit to a Soviet academic home. He showed me through the added on peasant cottage that his father had built and through his extensive library, including a complete Brokhaus-Efron Encycopedia and a rich collection in American history. Then we sat on the veranda on a soft July evening, sipping white wine, while Liuda fixed one of the finest dinners I had ever had in Russia (obviously well arranged in advance). Our conversation was mainly about what is was like living there during World War II with the sound of German guns in the distance, and living on their garden of potatoes and carrots and from several fruit trees.

Three other occasions come to mind. One was a visit again to his home on the occasion of his 70th birthday in July 2000. It was a gala affair with a large group of colleagues from the institute assembled on the veranda and on the front yard to celebrate. I had also just published a volume on Russian-American relations so this was also celebrated. My wife and I were the only non-Russians in attendance.

Then, even more delightful was the invitation to the Bolkhovitinov dacha well out in the country. He picked my us up at Sportivnaya metro, and we journeyed well outside Moscow (again an experience with Bolkhovitinov driving) to a surprisingly large dwelling with a wonderful river and countryside views. I remember the last lap was through a field and across a creek on wooden planks and the need to really gun it to get up the hill beyond. There was no fresh running water there, but he explained how he had constructed a rainfall cistern system with a hand pump to tanks in the attic that supplied water for washing and a make-shift shower on the corner of the house (drinking water was brought from town). The Kuropiatniks joined us for a very tasty Russian picnic lunch on the grounds enjoying a great country view. I never felt more part of Russia *a la Chekhov.*

One more memorable occasion with Nikolai was when he and Liuda came to visit us in Lawrence. He gave a lecture at the university as he had once before.

But what I remember most was another aspect. I was editing a book on Russian-American cultural relations at the time and wanted to finish it with a suitable conclusion. So I asked him if he would join me in writing a postscript to the volume. We sat at my computer in my history department office and jointly wrote a "postscript" to Russian-American cultural relations that emphasized he importance of encouraging both Russian and American younger scholars in the field (as does this journal).[2] A real experience for me and I hope for him too. And then we sat on our deck while our wives prepared dinner and discussed Kansas and the Wild West. What memories!

Norman Saul
Professor Emeritus of History, University of Kansas

[2] N. N. Bolkhovitinov and Norman E. Saul, "Postscript: Past, Present, and Future" in Norman E. Saul and Richard D. McKinzie, eds. *Russian-American Dialogue on Cultural Relations, 1776–1914* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1997), 243-48.

Book Reviews

Lori Clune, *Executing the Rosenbergs: Death and Diplomacy in a Cold War World*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016, xv, 167 pp. Index. $29.95, Hardcover.

Virtually every American citizen of a certain age is at least aware of the case of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, convicted of being Soviet spies and executed in 1953 during the height of the Red Scare. Few, however, know the details of the case and, even fewer, the global reaction that it incited. Lori Clune's book focuses on the global reaction and sets the case squarely within the context of the Korean War and the Cold War. Using newly discovered documents from the State Department, Clune demonstrates that the Rosenberg case and questions about its legitimacy and moral and ethical implications were the center of debates and protests around the world at a time when the United States could ill afford a negative portrayal of the American democratic system. This is not a book about the trial but rather an examination of the causes and reactions to the trial and the death sentence handed down to an otherwise normal unassuming couple.

Clune begins her study with a brief review of the Rosenberg case, but swiftly moves to the main point of her book. She points out that when the trial began, on March 6, 1951, Americans were immersed in the fear of the spread of communism and news about the many men dying in the Korean War. Indeed, when Judge Irving Kaufman sentenced the Rosenbergs to death, he blamed them for the Korean War, stating that they were "arch criminals in this nefarious scheme." (33) In the end, most Americans thought the punishment was fitting: "Public opinion indicated an overwhelming concern for ongoing violence in Korea and skewed in favor of executing the spies they held responsible for starting the war." (66)

The main focus of Clune's study, however, is the international reaction to the Rosenberg case. Clune recounts how the conviction and sentence led to protests around the world, including Australia, Tunisia, Iceland, Sweden, France, Brazil, Indonesia, and many other countries. American embassies across the globe began to receive letters after the Rosenbergs' conviction and this continued until their execution two years later. American diplomats were at a loss and sought guidance from the State Department. The opposition was not only from those who were sympathetic to communism, but from people of various political leanings, and in some countries, the criticism came from within the ranks of government officials.

The Jewish community was divided by the issue, some sympathizing with their persecuted brethren, others afraid to support a cause that would certainly fuel the flames of antisemitism. A number of famous intellectuals spoke out against the conviction of the Rosenbergs as well—Pablo Picasso, Bertold Brecht, Jean Paul Sartre, and Albert Einstein. In particular, the condemnation of Pope Pius XII led to greater opposition in Catholic countries. Many supporters of the Rosenbergs questioned Ethel's guilt and the appropriateness of executing young parents and leaving their children orphans. When Truman left office in January 1953, the international scorn and condemnation became Eisenhower's problem. Eisenhower, however, had no sympathy for the Rosenbergs and on June 19, 1953 the couple died in the electric chair.

At the end of Clune's study she discusses the efforts in recent decades to reveal the truth about the case. A key piece of the puzzle was made available in 1995 when the CIA and the NSA released nearly 3000 translated documents about Soviet espionage activities in the United States. These documents, the Venona transcripts, revealed that Julius Rosenberg was the head of a large military and industrial spy ring but Ethel was only an accessory, not an active agent. Subsequently, in 2001, Ethel's brother, David Greenglass, admitted that he had lied in his trial testimony that condemned his sister. In the years that followed federal officials released more key documents, underscoring Julius's guilt, but making Ethel's conviction and execution more problematic. Discussions of the Rosenberg case continue to be complex and divided. Clune concludes that "no one emerges from the Rosenberg story unscathed." The case reveals what can happen when actions are driven by paranoia and fear.

Clune's study is thorough and well-researched, though occasionally her story feels repetitive as she traces the pro-Rosenberg rallies and protests through the years between their conviction and execution. Nonetheless, this is a fascinating account of a shameful moment in American history, one we should remember and strive not to repeat.

Lee A. Farrow
Auburn University at Montgomery

Dorothy Horsfield, *Russia in the Wake of the Cold War: Perceptions and Prejudices*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2017. xxvi, 191 pp. Cloth.

This is an ambitious effort to address an important topic. As Dorothy Horsfield, a visiting fellow at Australian National University, rightly observes, much analysis of post-Soviet Russia has been based on "geopolitical, sociological, and civilizational assumptions," as well as psychologizing of Vladimir Putin, rather than definite knowledge (ix). It would therefore be valuable to have a thorough and rigorous examination of the (mis)perceptions and prejudices that have contributed to the widespread and insistent Western vilification of Putin and demonization of Russia.

Unfortunately, as Horsfield warns in the Introduction, "the book is not structured within any kind of systematic research methodology" (x). Instead, it presents a rambling exploration of "public conversations" among intellectuals in Britain, Europe, America, and Russia (ix), with special attention to the words of Isaiah Berlin, Aleksandr Dugin, George F. Kennan, Gleb Pavlovsky, and John Le Carre. In five chapters Horsfield examines: (1) the legacy of Cold War "liberal pluralism"; (2) the lost causes of Russian liberal intellectuals from the Decembrists to Pavlovsky; (3) Dugin and Russian conservatism; (4) allegations of authoritarianism in Putin's Russia; and (5) post-Cold War espionage, with a focus on Le Carre and Edward Snowden.

Patient readers may find many points of interest in the course of this "eclectic" discussion. Others may be frustrated and disappointed by the lack of "tightly framed arguments and clear conclusions" (x).

Too often the discussion is entangled in quotations and paraphrase of the ideas of other authors, which tend to obscure more than express Horsfield's own ideas.

Horsfield makes a number of loose generalizations. Two examples must suffice. Her statement that "generally, Cold Warriors were a staunchly conservative kind of liberal, who idealized liberalism" (xiii) underestimates the ideological diversity of Cold Warriors, who ranged from anti-Stalinist socialists to conservative Catholic foes of liberalism. Her assertion that "from a Western perspective … the Manichean battle of good versus evil was seen as synonymous with global democratization …" (xiii) neglects how many Manichean Cold Warriors feared "premature" democratization would lead to the spread of communism and therefore preferred right-wing military dictatorships.

Although Horsfield has read widely in published English-language sources, her bibliography does not include books by a number of scholars who have written about Western perceptions, images, and prejudices about Russia, including David Engerman, David Foglesong, Andrei Tsygankov, and V. I. Zhuravleva. Acquaintance with such studies might have helped Horsfield to write a more solidly grounded and more richly conceptualized book.

More generally, the sources Horsfield draws on are often insufficient and at times peculiar. Although she refers repeatedly to George F. Kennan's views, she seems to have read at most two of his many books and to be familiar with only one of the many biographies of him. No Russian-language sources are listed in Horsfield's bibliography. A remark Lenin "reportedly" made in 1917 is taken from a Marxist internet site, not from Lenin's Collected Works (p. 46).

Many scholars may share Horsfield's aversion to glib pontification and her critical orientation against analysts who have remained wedded to Cold War assumptions about an unchanging Russia (x). But they will have to look elsewhere for systematic analysis and direct, explicit arguments.

David Foglesong
Rutgers University

Helen Rappaport, *Caught in the Revolution: Petrograd, Russia, 1917—A World on the Edge*, New York: St. Martin's Press, 2016, 464pp. Index. $27.99, Hardcover.

St. Petersburg, called Petrograd between 1914 and 1924, known as the city of "clerks and foreigners," has always symbolized the dynamics of western life, welcoming visitors from abroad. Veiled in uncertainty and shaken by perpetual sensation, the Petrograd of 1917 also "sheltered a large and diverse foreign community that was still thriving," (2) despite direful deprivations, food shortages, spontaneous armed uprisings, and endless street demonstrations. It is to those foreign nationals who found themselves in the capital of the crumbling empire, that Helen Rappaport, the author of *Caught in the Revolution: Petrograd, Russia, 1917—A World on the Edge,* looks for "new insights" (337) into events that changed the course of world history a century ago.

Although significantly expanded upon by the testimony of additional eyewitnesses and enriched with American archival materials, the book patently resembles its most notable precursor, Harvey Pitcher's *Witnesses of the Russian Revolution,* first published in London in 1994. The eyewitnesses featured in Rappaport's volume, however, are from a broader variety of backgrounds, including ambassadors, the diplomatic corps and their families, both male and female journalists, writers, scholars, social reformers, and various professionals, such as engineers, military experts, bankers, doctors, nurses, relief workers, a chaplain, a servant, and even an unidentified narrator, who published his memoirs anonymously. They hailed from half a dozen countries, and their credos ranged from those of ardent sympathizers with the cause of radical socialists and advocates for women's rights, to more cautious and conservative observers, who refused to accept the winds of change and lamented the loss of the bygone grandeur of the empire and its once opulent capital. These chroniclers and, in some cases, participants in the dramatic events provided a broad spectrum of views, turning Rappaport's survey of the Russian Revolution into a multidimensional collective narrative, which, unlike more traditional scholarly works, based upon official documents, diplomatic dispatches, and military annals, reveals an array of witnesses' emotional responses to the immensity of the social upheaval and its aftermath. Along with fascination, curiosity and hope for a new democratic Russia, foreign observers expressed frustration, anger and a sense of loss, preserving, at the same time, unyielding sangfroid in the face of tangible danger and indiscriminate violence. Regardless of their differences, however, they were generally compelled by an intense sympathy for the deprived masses.

Rappaport challenges male-centric interpretations of history, making sure that in her polyphonic narrative all voices are heard and appreciated. She cites numerous sources, including unpublished papers by nurses, orderlies in military hospitals, and family members of diplomats and businessmen. Many of them have remained "still-unsung" and "long-forgotten," despite the fact that they wrote "so vividly and movingly" of their experiences in Russia (328). The author also features prominent and outspoken female journalists, war correspondents and suffragists who had their own say in analyzing political realities and identifying national characteristics. Introducing female observers, Rappaport reveals the

totality of gendered discourses, to which no event was foreign or unimportant. The integral reconstitution of revolutionary Petrograd would not have been the same without a web of snapshots that make up the quotidian experience, such as the long lines of "scantily clad people standing in a bitter cold" (260), or the "most expensive, out-of-date, wasp-waist" corsets, looming in shop windows, when there was barely enough food for three days and no warm clothes to be bought anywhere (260). Similarly, the conceptualization of revolutionary events would have lost their dramatic effect without accentuation of the grim horror of un-coffined, blood-soaked bodies, frozen stiff "in grotesque, contorted positions" (153), or the screams of women soldiers from the Battalion of Death, "silenced with the butt of a rifle when they grew too troublesome" (292).

The author intersperses the anxieties of the British "gentleman-diplomat" Sir George Buchanan (6-7), the laments of David Francis, a self-made millionaire turned envoy, who terribly "missed his American luxuries" (13), and the political gossip of the French "accomplished socialite" Maurice Paléologue (14) with sincerely inquisitive quests into revolutionary developments and the life of city dwellers, penned by Philip Jordan, the American ambassador's devoted black valet. Jordan expressed deep appreciation for the opportunity to travel, to see foreign lands and to become intimately acquainted with Russia and its capital. No one saw as much of revolutionary Petrograd from the back door as Phil, who learned Russian to be able to secure the ambassador's meals, despite severe food shortages and the growing discontent of hungry mobs. That "loyal, honest, efficient and intelligent withal" fearlessly roamed the streets, bargaining at markets and "mixing in with the multicultural, polyglot crowd."(13). Rappaport quotes from Jordan's "unique and richly detailed" descriptions of what was transpiring in the streets of the capital and within the embassy.

For some foreigners, their Russian sojourn was not only a thrilling experience, but also an opportunity to see their own countries in an entirely different light. This was especially true for a flock of recent college graduates assigned to an American bank, who were enthralled by the sublimity of the city, touched by the benevolence of its residents, and tempered by the revolution. One of them, Leighton Rogers, became so accustomed to the ongoing tension, that he ventured to carry $3 million in cash through a city ridden with unrest to protect his bank's assets in the aftermath of the Bolshevik uprising. Rappaport reveals their unpublished memoirs, including Rogers' journal, which he called "a virtual account-book" the Revolution.

In spite of such a diversified and subjective interpretation of events, their chronology is preserved with scholarly accuracy. Each chapter describes a consequent episode in an unfolding drama that culminated in the Bolshevik seizure of power. The chapters are entitled with pull-out quotes from featured narratives that simultaneously serve as epigraphs, summarizing content and luring readers from one sensational development to the next, following the eyewitnesses in their revolutionary journey.

Lyubov Ginzburg, Ph.D.
Independent Scholar

Field Notes

Two Revolutions and Beyond
(November 2–4, 2017)
Columbia University

November 2

5:00-7:00: Opening Reception (RBML). A Brief Exhibition Tour hosted by Tanya Chebotarev, Curator of the Bakhmeteff Archive

November 3

9:00-10:50
Russia and the West
Richard Wortman (Columbia University) – Chair –rsw3@columbia.edu

1. William Rosenberg (University of Michigan) – wgr@umich.edu
2. Dominic Livien – (Cambridge University, England) – dl449@ca.ac.uk
3. Dan Orlovsky – (University of Pittsburgh) –dorlovsky@mail.smu.edu

Discussant Catherine Evtuhoff (Columbia University) – ce2308@columbia.edu

11:00-12:50
Charles R. Crane and Russian Revolution
Norman Saul – Chair

1. Pavel Tribunskii (Moscow, Solzhenitsyn Center)
2. John Notz (Chicago, Independent Researcher)
3. Zacharie Leclair (Montreal, Universite du Quebec)

Discussant Andrew Patrick (Tennessee State University)

2:30-4:20
Literature and revolution
Mark Leiderman (University of Colorado, Boulder) – Chair

1. Evgenii Dobrenko (University of Sheffield, England)
2. Serguei Oushakine (Princeton University)
3. Andrew Kahn (Oxford University, England)

Discussant – Anthony Anemone (The New School)

4:30-6:20

100 Years Later - Round Table:
Boris Gasparov, Alex Cooley, Alexander Motyl, Henryk Baran, Ivan Tolstoy

November 4

9:00-10:50

Russian Revolutions and Jewish Question

Oleg Budnitsky (Moscow School of Economics) - Chair

1. Gennady Estraikh (NYU): The Berlin Years of Raphael Abramovich, Stalin's Most Hated Menshevik
2. Valeri Posner (France): Revolution on the Screen: Jewish Topics in the films before and after 1917
3. Mihaly Kalman (Harvard University): A pogromless City: Jewish Paramilitaries in Civil War Odessa

Discussant: Ben Nathans (University of Pennsylvania)

11:00-12:50

Russia and Ukraine – Before, After, and Now

Mark R. Andryczyk (Columbia Universitty) – Chair

1. Yaroslav Hrytsak (Catholic University, Lvov)
2. Serhii Plokhii (Harvard University) – plokhii@fas.harvard.edu
3. Timothy Snyder (Yale University) – timothy.snyder@yale.edu

Discussant – Mark von Hagen (Arizona State University)

2:30:4:30

Art in Time of Revolution

Nina Gurianova (Northwestern University) – Chair

1. Владимир Поляков – «Кафе поэтов и художников в Москве и анархистская идеология»
2. Наталья Семенова – «Реальная и воображаемая судьба коллекции французского искусства в Москве: до и после революций»
3. Ирена Бузиньска (Рига) – «Латышские красные стрелки – художники. Взгляд на них сто лет спустя».
4. Edward Kasinec "Collecting, Visualizing and Exhibiting Art and History in Russia Abroad"

Discussant – Alla Rosenfeld (Amherst College)

****

ASEEES Sessions in Chicago, November 9–12, 2017

Revolutionary Days Revisited: Commemorating the Russian Revolution at the New York Public Library, Columbia University and Slavica Publishers
Fri, November 10, 8:00 to 9:45am, Marriott Downtown Chicago, 4th, Belmont

This roundtable will allow the presenters to share their experiences in putting together exhibits and, in one case, a new series of memoirs, commemorating the 100th anniversary of the Russian Revolution. The focus is on the opportunities and challenges of bringing the revolution to the public in this centenary year. I would expect there to be a wide interest, as the topic is one of the themes of the conference. I will present on the exhibit at the NYPL I will curate for November 2017, titled "American Perspectives on the Russian Revolution, 1917-2017," while Tanya Chebotarev will discuss the commemorations at Columbia and Ben Whisenhunt the new series of American memoirs of the Russian Revolution published by Slavica.

Americans Recall the Bolshevik Revolution
Sat, November 11, 3:45 to 5:30pm, Marriott Downtown Chicago, 4th, Belmont

This roundtable will address the memoirs of several key American observers of the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917. The participants will discuss the divergent views of the Bolshevik Revolution by journalist Ernest Poole, wife of U.S. Naval Attache, Pauline Crosley, YMCA official, John Mott, photographic assistant, Florence MacLeod Harper, and sympathetic journalist, John Reed. These diverse views of the Bolshevik Revolution by Americans illuminate the varying opinions of the events and transgressions of that era. The roundtable format is ideal for presenting the views of these Americans while leaving time for the audience to discuss their views.

****

Exhibit: The Russian Revolution: American Perspectives
New York Public Library, November 8–19, 2017

Americans had a wide range of perspectives on the Russian Revolution, from the left to the right. This exhibit explores some of these, from John Reed on the left to US Ambassador David Francis on the right. The NYPL holds the John Reed collection of posters and proclamations, including the proclamation issued by the Bolsheviks that the Provisional Government had fallen, which is on display. In addition, the photograph album of Bessie Beatty, who supported a multi-party democratic future for Russia, is on display.

****

2018 Midwest Slavic Conference

The Ohio State University March 23-25, 2018

The Midwest Slavic Association and The Ohio State University (OSU) Center for Slavic and East European Studies (CSEES) are pleased to announce the **2018 Midwest Slavic Conference** to be held at OSU March 23–25, 2018. Conference organizers invite proposals for panels or individual papers addressing all topics related to Central Europe, Eastern Europe, Eurasia, and Southeastern Europe. The conference will open with a keynote address by Tara Zahra based on her latest book *The Great Departure: Mass Migration from Eastern Europe and the Making of the Free World*, on Friday, March 23rd. Two days of panels will follow the keynote address.

Building on the title of the keynote address, this year we also invite interdisciplinary papers or panels that focus on migration from historical or contemporary perspectives. The Conference will open with a plenary panel "Borders, Barriers, and Belonging: A Spotlight on Global Migration" on Saturday morning that will feature five migration experts who will discuss mobility in five world regions. There will also be a lunchtime lecture sponsored by the Slovene Research Initiative featuring Michael Biggins on Slavic literary translation.

Please send a one-paragraph abstract and a brief C.V. in a single *PDF format* to csees@osu.edu by January 16th. Undergraduate and graduate students are encouraged to participate. Prepaid lodging is available for undergraduate and graduate students presenters. A block of rooms is available at a discounted rate for all other participants. More information is available at the Conference website.

DEADLINES
Abstract and C.V. Deadline: **January 16**
Notification of Acceptance: **February 12**
Scheduling Conflicts and Housing Requests Due: **February 16**
Panels Announced: **February 26**
Final Papers to Committee and Presenter Registration Deadline: **March 9**

For more information...

REGISTRATION FEES Students: $20

Faculty/Scholars: $45 **General Attendees:** $20

140 Enarson Classroom Building, 2009 Millikin Road, Columbus, OH 43210
(614) 292-8770 / csees@osu.edu

slaviccenter.osu.edu

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
CENTER FOR SLAVIC AND EAST EUROPEAN STUDIES

****

New Journal on American Literature in Russia

Андрей Алексеевич Аствацатуров (СПбГУ)

Новый журнал американистов

Рец.: Литература двух Америк. Рецензируемый научный журнал. 2016. № 1. М.: ИМЛИ РАН, 2016. – 304 с.

Потребность в такого рода периодическом издании назрела уже давно. Я думаю, нет особо смысла доказывать важность американских и латиноамериканский штудий, учитывая значимость стран обоих Америк в мировой политике, истории, культуре. Однако российские американисты, разбросанные по городам нашей необъятной родины и оказавшиеся в странах ближнего зарубежья, во многом разобщены. Научной конференции американистов, которая ежегодно проходит в МГУ, семинаров, и случайных тематических сборников явно недостаточно, чтобы объединить их усилия.

В условиях кризиса социальных и гуманитарных наук, связанного с недоверием к «большим нарративам», глобальным задачам, в условиях невероятного многообразия подходов, в ситуации методологической растерянности, а также беспрецедентной раздробленности знания, его превращения в сборку частных проблем, необходимость в создании общей дискуссионной площадки более чем очевидна. Блогосфера в этом плане давно опередила наше научное сообщество. В социальных сетях уже много лет активно действуют группы любителей американской словесности, куда профессионалы, разумеется, не заглядывают. А между тем, их подопечные, литераторы обеих Америк, да нередко и сами они оказываются там предметом любопытных и живых дискуссий, иногда, впрочем, слишком «живых», чтобы их воспринимать всерьез.

Некоторый опыт существования в науке подсказывает мне, что существует два типа периодических изданий: в первых что-то происходит, появляются оригинальные исследования, генерируются новые идеи, а во вторых обсуждают то, что происходит в первых. Скучность вторых изданий, с их повторением чужих идей, нередко несвежих, как будто, очевидна. Куда увлекательнее быть законодателем научной моды и бежать впереди всех. Но безоглядная увлеченность собственными идеями часто превращает способных людей в комиков из заезжей провинциальной труппы, а порой, ежели все еще хуже, в пациентов психиатрических лечебниц. Поэтому в идеале научному изданию требуется и то, и другое: собственные частные исследования и обзор того, что происходит за его пределами.

Первый номер журнала «Литература двух Америк» - удачный образец того, как обе эти тенденции сочетаются в нужной пропорции. Здесь есть и собственно исследовательские публикации (А.Кофман, О.Ушакова, Д.Робинсон, И.Головачева, И.Кабанова) и обзоры, знакомящие нас с тенденциями современной американистики (О.Анцыферова, И.А.Делазари, Н.Высоцкая), а также, что немаловажно, архивные публикации (В.Попова, С.Панов и О.Панова). Имена всех этих авторов хорошо известны любому, кто в нашем отечестве занимается американскими исследованиями. Журнал позиционирует себя как периодическое издание, посвященное двум Америкам, но сразу же бросается в глаза, что предпочтение отдается Северной, причем не всей, а именно литературе США.

Журнал организован вполне традиционно и состоит из подвижных рубрик («Поэтика. Прочтения и интерпретации», «Контексты литературы», «Старый и Новый свет», «История американистики», «Хроника. Обзоры. Рецензии»). Сами публикации, в целом, отражают состояние науки, некоторую методологическую разобщенность, ситуацию, когда невозможно придерживаться единой линии. Так, крайне интересная публикация Андрея Кофмана («Тема варварства в испаноамериканской литературе») совмещает историко-культурный, историко-литературный, историко-понятийный и этнографический подходы. Прослеживая трансформацию понятия, его генезис, автор совершает экскурс в различные эпохи, вскрывая культурные коды и анализируя базовые тексты. Совершенно по-иному строится

статья Ольги Ушаковой, чьи публикации всегда отличаются академизмом, аналитической осторожностью и взвешенностью выводов. Ушакова ограничивает поле своего исследования одной эпохой, одним автором и даже одним периодом творчества. Впрочем, избранный ею персонаж по своей сути, по своему масштабу сам как целая эпоха – Т.С.Элиот, автор таких шедевров как «Бесплодная земля» и «Четыре квартета». Однако объектом исследования О.Ушаковой становится не «Бесплодная земля», не «Квартеты», а самый ранний период творчества Элиота, его стихи, составившие тетрадь «Инвенции мартовского зайца», найденные и опубликованные совсем недавно, относительно которых у американистов еще нет научного консенсуса. Ушакова предлагает крайне увлекательный анализ, представляя совсем молодого, мало кому известного Элиота в различных декадентских масках, прослеживая мотивы его текстов, возможные влияния и демонстрируя те импульсы, концепты, которые в дальнейшем сложились в целостную систему.

Заяц Элиота иронично и по всей видимости неслучайно перекликается с кроликом Харви, персонажем статьи Ирины Головачевой. («Кто такой кролик Харви? Претексты и контексте комедии Мери Чейз»). Впрочем, Харви, как известно, персонаж Мери Чейз, а Головачеву интересуют возможные источники этого образа, среди которых, по ее мнению, кролик Манабозо (персонаж индейских мифов), Счастливый кролик Освальд и Багз Банни. Я бы добавил к этому семейству кролика из классического рассказа Амброза Бирса «Чикамога», кролика, как будто вполне милого и домашнего и тем не менее внушающего персонажу, глухонемому мальчику, почти сверхъестественный ужас. Кролик Бирса по каким-то причинам – первый знак кошмарной реальности, скрывающейся за упорядоченным усилиями культуры образом мира, и ему – самое место в ряду предков кролика Харви. Рубрика «Контексты литературы», в которой размещена статья Головачевой, включает также интересное исследование Дугласа Робинсона («Если бы у меня были мозги…»), предлагающего поиск аналогий между идеями романа Р.Пауэрса и теорией симулякра Ж.Бодрийяра. Интересно, что здесь в орбиту исследователя, как сейчас принято в США, попадают не только литература, но и кино, философия, а также нейрологические теории.

Рубрика «Старый и новый свет», обязательная для подобного издания, содержит статьи Ирины Кабановой («Ивлин Во и Америка») и Виктории Поповой («Несостоявшаяся командировка Анри Барбюса в Латинскую Америку»). Статья И.Кабановой, написанная крайне профессионально, скорее закрывает, исчерпывает заявленную тему, нежели позволяет увидеть в ней перспективы дальнейших раздумий. Результат статьи кажется предсказуемым с самого начала: нас знакомят с брезгливым скепсисом английского сноба, сквозь зубы цедящего банальности в отношении культуры, которую он не знает, да и знать не хочет. Возможно научный сюжет стоило расшевелить более широким контекстом или попыткой объяснить, чем вызвана любовь самой Америки к Ивлину Во, так и оставшаяся неразделенной.

В свою очередь история несостоявшейся командировки Барбюса в страны Латинской Америки, изложенная В.Поповой куда более динамична и почти детективна. Автор антивоенного романа «Огонь», коммунистически ратовавший за социальную справедливость и всякие свободы, предстает марионеткой советских чекистов, не просто получавшей от них обстоятельные инструкции, что делать, что думать, что говорить, а всей душой стремившегося их получить. Тексты этих инструкций по-своему интересны: в них напрочь отсутствуют какие бы то ни было идеалы, зато ощущается трезвый цинизм и расчетливость реальполитиков.

Мода на архивные материалы, принявшая было в 1990-е болезненно одержимые формы, похоже миновала, но подобные публикации по-прежнему обязательный компонент любого уважающего себя журнала. Рубрика «История американистики» (будем надеяться она станет постоянной) представлена крайне интересной и информативной статьей Сергея и Ольги Пановых («“История американской литературы” в советской Академии наук. Статья первая»). Не менее интересны и архивные материалы, которые к ней прилагаются. Здесь речь идет о трагической эпопее создания «Истории американской литературы». Публикация эта нам представляется крайне важной. Дело даже не в детективности сюжета, не в трогательно–старорежимных рецензиях В.Жирмунского и И.Кашкина, а в том, что эта статья открывает молодым исследователям культуры генеалогию современной американистики, объясняя, откуда вырастают методологические ориентиры, свойственные нам и нашим учителям, как эти ориентиры сформировала научная конъюнктура и насколько они совпадали с конъюнктурой политической. По сути издание первого тома «Истории американской литературы» (1947) с ее отказом от вульгарного социологизма, от идей Лукача-Лифшица в пользу академизма – это отголосок победы сталинской Культуры-2 над авангардом. Ленинградские западники, возглавляемые В.Жирмунским, возвращаются к идеям Веселовского, слегка припудривая их цитатами из классиков марксизма. Аналогичным образом поступают и советские американисты, беря за основу В.Л. Паррингтона и отводя ему ту же роль, которую Жирмунский отводил Веселовскому. Как известно, «отечественное» происхождение Веселовского не уберегло его последователей от обвинений и проработок. А о том, что произошло с американистами авторы статьи обещают рассказать в следующем номере журнала.

Рубрики «Памятные даты», «Хроника, обзоры, рецензии» крайне интересны. Они знакомят нас с состоянием современной американистики, с крупными научными событиями и актуальными дискуссиями. История биографий Генри Джеймса, описанная Ольгой Анцыферовой, фактически рассказывает нам о различных этапах науки и сменах научных парадигм. Тоже самое можно сказать об обзоре истории Нортоновской антологии американской литературы, сделанным И.А.Делазари. Хроники научных конференций по американистике, составленные Н.Высоцкой и О.Анцыферовой, открывают ряд важных проблем в современной науке.

Существенно, однако, то, что первый номер журнала «Литература двух Америк» высвечивает множество проблем современных научных изданий. Он отражает нынешнее состояние американистики и гуманитарного знания, в целом, отчаявшегося преодолеть методологическую разобщенность. Редакция журнала, судя по всему, ощущает эту задачу как насущную и стремится ее решить. Ведь, строго говоря, о этого зависит, приобретет ли журнал свое лицо, как положено всякому журналу, не превратится ли он в сборник статей, пусть даже качественных. В небольшом предисловии мы читаем: «Приветствуются работы, посвященные школам, кружкам, группам и прочим формам писательских и шире, литературных объединений, литературным премиям, журналам, а также статьи на частные темы – исследования случаев». Ну что ж… Приоритеты, как мы видим, расставлены: обзорность, монографичность – на первом месте, «исследования случаев» - на последнем, в статусе «а также». Похоже это обозначение приоритетов – единственный способ сплотить сообщество американистов и попытаться сделать издание актуальным для всех. По этому пути идет и большинство западных изданий. Видимо другой путь – поиск общих методологических основания – пока невозможен.

«Литература двух Америк» еще раз подчеркивает специфическую отформатированность нашего гуманитарного знания, в котором историки, политологи, филологи, экологи, философы живут под разными номерами и разделены неодолимыми границами. Эта ситуация, мягко говоря, не симметрична тому, что мы наблюдаем в Европе и Америке. «Американские исследования» не ограничивают себя одной областью знания, и хроники научной жизни американистов – живое тому доказательство. Возможно, стоило бы, оставляя литературу в качестве заглавного сюжета, выстроить на площадке «ЛДА» диалог с нашими коллегами-американистами из других сфер, тем более, что составители Нортоновской антологии, судя по всему, перестали брать в расчет чисто эстетическое. Да и те, кто создавал оригинальную американскую литературу (Франклин, Эмерсон, Торо, Уитмен) хорошо понимали, что есть на свете вещи поважнее художественной формы.