

DRAFT: NOT FOR CITATION WITHOUT
PERMISSION OF THE AUTHOR

NUMBER 139

THEATER AND REVOLUTION:
FROM CULT TO PROLETKUL'T

Lars Kleberg

Conference on
THE ORIGINS OF SOVIET CULTURE

Sponsored by
Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies
The Wilson Center

May 18-19, 1981

Every attempt to discuss the cultural revolution in Russia which only focuses on the boundary November 7th or the year 1917, risks blocking an understanding of the divergencies and inner dynamics of the period. No matter how true it is that a new chapter or a new act began in the history of Russia after the Bolshevik seizure of power, it is equally true that those who were active in the events which later came to pass were already on the scene before the October Revolution.

This observation may seem extremely banal from the point of view of political history. Yet all of us who are involved in the more specialized areas of 20th century Russia such as the arts, mass media or everyday life, must admit that, in our disciplines, the time limit "before or after 1917" has been dominant up until the most recent years. Certainly this has partially been a matter of an unconscious or conscious dependence on the Soviet periodic divisions.

It is obvious that Soviet researchers' dualistic division of all material into "pre-revolutionary" and "Soviet" has blocked the understanding of the dialectics of the period--so obvious that one is prompted to ask for the ideological function of the dualistic model; but this is a question for the historians of science.¹ Even some newer West European works with an apologetic approach towards the cultural revolution 1917-1921 draw a sharp boundary at 1917 and then relate the cultural events primarily to the contemporary political and social levels.² Common to both perspectives is the fact that the question of the evolution of Soviet culture risks falling outside of our field of vision.

Another extreme in the opposite direction, which also magically removes the question of the internal and external preconditions for the

cultural revolution, is the thesis which maintains that the Russian cultural avant-garde anticipated or even spearheaded the October Revolution. "Cubism and futurism were revolutionary art movements which heralded the revolution in economic and political life in 1917," declared Malevič in 1919; other artists said the same thing.³ The purpose was, of course, to legitimize the privileged position of avant-garde art in the new state (the argument had been found among the French utopian socialists and their parallel linking of the political and cultural avant-garde).⁴ Malevič's thesis is, of course, not that of an historian, but rather must be viewed within the framework of the self-conception of modern art. Yet as an ideological fact, as a part of the mythology of the Russian intelligentsia, Malevič's thesis is interesting when one wishes to discuss the roots of the cultural revolution.

The purpose of this presentation is to point out certain utopian notions about the social function of the theater which emerged in Russia around 1905 and which were revived and further developed after the October Revolution. The ideas in question are very much a part of the mythology or ideology of the artistic intelligentsia, but viewed critically they can provide some knowledge about the status and ambitions of this group.⁵

The Idea of a People's Theater

Before the opening of Verharen's Les Aubes at the Teatr RSFSR-1 in Moscow in 1920, the director Vsevolod Mejerchol'd declared that the theater workers were forced to revise their earlier practice since the foundation for all theatrical arts--the relationship between the stage

and the auditorium--had altered radically after the Revolution. What Mejerchol'd had in mind however was not simply the fact that the sociological composition of the theater audience had changed and that the theater therefore ought to be made more understandable for the masses, for example. The importance of the transformed audience, Mejerchol'd emphasized prior to the opening of Les Aubes, was that it was homogeneous and representative of the new society; yes, the fact that "every spectator is like a model of Soviet Russia."⁶ What was the meaning of this assertion? Well, that the audience represented all of society. Thus a long-nurtured dream about the true people's theater was to have come true. One of the foundations of the modern political theater is the myth about the representativeness of the audience. By the myth of the representativeness of the audience I mean that the conception of the superior social importance of the theater--as compared to other art forms--has to be the result of the spectators in the auditorium representing the collective as a whole. Of course, the relationship between the auditorium and society is far more indirect than a lot of theater people had imagined it to be. Yet the myth of the representativeness of the audience has nevertheless generated many grandiose dreams during the last hundred years about a theater capable of reaching all of society and re-creating a once lost ideological and moral unity. The view of the theater as a desirable meeting place for the entire population, the way it once was in ancient Greece, has its roots in German Romanticism. Richard Wagner, in his pamphlet Art and Revolution from 1849, made it a vital part of the ideology of the modern theater.

In the year 1920 in Moscow when Mejerchol'd maintained that "every spectator is like a model of Soviet Russia", it had at least two

important implications. One was that the audience was representative, i.e. that those who now sat in a Soviet theater were not a diverse audience but represented the whole collective. The other followed as a consequence of the first: the role of the theater and the theater worker grew immensely in importance. It was not just the prestige of the theater which increased because the entire population was gathered in the theater as if it was a temple. The theatrical artist's power to influence and intervene in society also appeared to have increased tremendously. If every spectator was a model of Soviet Russia, the theater could speak with total authority. The entire population was not just sitting in the auditorium; it was subjected to the will of the theater and--ultimately--to the will of the director!

I have already hinted at the origin of this total or totalitarian view of the theater which, in different versions, was extremely influential in Russia during and immediately after the Civil War. Today Richard Wagner is most known as the grand German opera reformer and creator of the notion of Gesamtkunstwerk, the synthesis of the arts. It is often forgotten that young Wagner was a revolutionary, a social utopian. This utopian notion of the correlation of art and society was, in my opinion, just as important to his influence on his own times as his opera reform and his notion of the synthesis of the arts. The ultimate synthesis striven for by Wagner was not that of the arts but a reunification of art and society, of the artist and his audience. The link between art and the people which had existed in Attic tragic theater had been dissolved during the following centuries. The European revolution was to re-create this link, Wagner maintained in his pamphlet from 1849, and perhaps this

was the real mission of the revolution for him.

Art was to be returned to its sources, the spirit of community. The only question was what would guarantee the synthesis of art and life that Wagner had visualized. To the extent that this guarantee was identical to the spark of the lone genius, man's cult of his own freedom, his prophet was Friedrich Nietzsche. But, as we know, there occurred a rift between Nietzsche and Wagner when the latter turned to the religious myth as the superior binder for the artist who wanted to effect a unification of human beings in the ecstatic experience of art.

Wagner's and Nietzsche's influence in Russia during the first decades of the century was enormous.⁷ Writers like Blok, Belyj and Majakovskij, composers like Skrjabin and Prokofjev, critics like Ivanov and Lunačarskij, theater people like Stanislavskij, Mejerchol'd and Ėjzenštejn were, during different periods, under the strong influence of various facets of this aesthetic-philosophical complex. The person who drew the most far-reaching consequences of Wagner's dream about the great, all-unifying drama and of Nietzsche's reconstruction of the cultic sources of the theater was the philologist, symbolist critic and poet Vjačeslav Ivanov. While other people were more interested in Wagner as an aesthetic reformer, Ivanov interpreted and developed Wagner's and Nietzsche's "renaissance" ideas into a grand utopia of a religious and social character. Ivanov heralded a new cultic theater, where the world's dualistic split between body and mind, matter and spirit would be eliminated at the same time that spectators and actors were united in a collective ritual. Ivanov's ideas gained support during and after the 1905 Revolution among people like the "mystical anarchist" Georgij Čulkov

and the "god-building" Menshevik Anatolij Lunačarskij, who believed that the future society would transform "the temples into theaters and the theaters into temples." The talk of the necessity of uniting the stage and the auditorium and the split between them having caused the crisis in the theater soon became a commonplace cliché.

The cultic theater as an ideological program in connection with the Revolutions in 1905 and 1917 has been studied rather thoroughly.⁸ I would just like to focus attention here on one aspect of Ivanov's program which has similarities with other "avant-garde" projects in Russia at this time. I am thinking about the contradiction between collectivism and elitism.

The Utopian Hothouse

In principle Ivanov's utopia of a unification of art and life, of the synthesis, was all-encompassing and democratic. But his and the other symbolists' speculations about the necessity of art's affinity with the collective, sobornoe, developed precisely because their contact with the audience, with the collective was no longer self-evident and secure. In reality the universal claims, for example, of Ivanov's theories about the new "creation of life" were in reverse proportion to the size of the acquiescing audience. But the question of the importance of the symbolist projects is not exhausted by establishing the contradiction between their global ambition and their esoterical exclusiveness.

The number of different advanced utopian groupings in Russia at the turn of the century--political, artistic, philosophical--can be likened to a number of hothouses situated in the inhospitable tundra. These

isolated "islands" of the intelligentsia--circles, society, cells-- present certain common features. In all of the "hothouses" they were convinced that only their own project and no other would be able to save Russia and its people--a people who until then would have to await the day of the Revolution, the Synthesis or the Revelation out in the tundra. The eschatological view of the future and the strict elitism were inseparably connected to the intelligentsia's (often unconscious) fear that the glass walls of the utopian "hothouse" would be smashed by a rock thrown from outside, from the "tundra", from chaos. It did not take much to destroy the artificial, though for its purposes extremely favorable, atmosphere of the hothouse.

We find the hothouse environment of symbolism concretized in Vjačeslav Ivanov's literary salons, the Wednesdays at his St. Petersburg "tower". At these symposia, in which the city's artistic intelligentsia took part, a free and elevated manner of speaking about art, philosophy and religion was developed. One of the permanent guests at the salons called them "a refined cultural laboratory"⁹ whose exquisite forms of intellectual exchange and art experience contrasted sharply with the everyday life on the streets of St. Petersburg. The "hothouse" principle entailed not only isolation but even advanced experimentation, innovative creation-- all making claims to anticipate future developments "in the open", when that day arrived.

One concrete episode gives a flash exposure of the contradiction between elitism and collectivism in Ivanov's "hothouse". In 1910 a theater performance was arranged in Ivanov's apartment. It was not the usual familiar theatrical entertainment since they had chosen to stage

Calderon's mystical-religious La devoción de la cruz, and Mejerchol'd served as director.¹⁰ In this intimate family circle an attempt was made, half jokingly and half seriously, to put the ideas of the cultic theater into practice. What is more, the performance took place on Easter Monday. And here we run into a contradiction which is typical of the "hothouse environments". The drama they had chosen to stage during the most important religious holiday of the year was an extremely Catholic play whose symbolism was totally foreign to the Russian orthodoxy. Only in a utopian perspective could the symbolists' syncretism, in which all religions were compatible in principle, be conceived to acquire the scope dreamt of by its theoreticians; in the actual Russian reality of the times, their universalism was exclusive to the point of being private.

Wagnerianism After October; Cult and Mass Festivals

The small part of the theater arts intelligentsia who joined the side of the Revolution after October 1917--for a long time most of the professional theaters successfully pretended that the Revolution had never taken place--had been marked by Wagnerian and symbolist synthesis ideas. It was no coincidence that one of the first publications from the Commissariat of Enlightenment in 1918 was a new edition of Art and Revolution. In the new preface the Commissioner of Enlightenment, Lunačarskij, compared the pamphlet to the Communist Manifesto, declared that Wagner was no less a brilliant example than Marx and Engels and recommended the pamphlet "for the edification of both artists and the victorious workers' democracy."¹¹

There were a lot of people around who were ready to agree with the

Commissioner. Mejerchol'd, the symbolists' ally and director at the imperial theaters, had rapidly acquired a leading position in the theater life of the new regime after the Revolution, first as vice chief of TEO in Petrograd.¹² Instead of the disparate and uninvolved bourgeois audience he now wanted to meet the long awaited "representative" audience, which was to guarantee the theater's direct communication with the whole of society. The poet Aleksandr Blok, a faithful Wagner admirer, was also to be found among the organizers of the Commissariat of Enlightenment TEO in Petrograd.¹³ Vjačeslav Ivanov was in the Moscow TEO and on various occasions in 1918-1919 he declared that now was the time for the people "to express their new, fervent ideas, their new-fledged will"¹⁴ in games and festivals the likes of which had never before been seen.

The pathfinders for these new mass festivals were to be Beethoven of the Ninth Symphony, Wagner and Skrjabin, whose unfinished Mysterium was meant to break the limits of art and transform the artwork into a mass action with no borders between artist, chorus and audience.

Vjačeslav Ivanov was naturally not a practical theater person, but spoke--as always--about that which is utopian, that which is unattainable in principle. Over the next few years there were other men who came to dominate the new theater with claims of addressing the masses. On one hand we have the Proletkul't Movement, on the other the great director Mejerchol'd, the leader of the "October of the Theater".

Spokesman for the Proletkul't within the theater area was Platon Keržencev, also active in the Narkompros TEO and author of the book Creative Theater, which was published for the first time in 1918 and which came out in four more editions within a few years' time.¹⁵

Keržencev's project for a "creative theater" was, by its mixture of aesthetic eclecticism and idealistic proletarian ideology, a typical product of the early Proletkul't Movement. The "creative theater" derived directly from the people's theater program that began with Wagner.

Keržencev was aware of the fact that in recent times the theater in bourgeois societies had been changed by various radical reformers like Georg Fuchs in Germany and Mejerchol'd in pre-revolutionary Russia, but they had all "nevertheless conserved the fatal division between stage and audience, between those who create and act and those for whom there is nothing left but to watch and clap their hands."¹⁶ The established popular theater movement in Russia, which had presented "good theater for the people", was dismissed by Keržencev as a philanthropic affair which could in no way liberate the theater from its bourgeois dualism. What was needed was a theatrical revolution which went hand in hand with the socialist revolution. Keržencev sought the concrete prototypes for the "creative" theater in different quarters, mainly in Romain Rolland's descriptions of French revolutionary chronicle plays and mass festivals in his book People's Theater.¹⁷ Of course Keržencev strongly emphasized the idea of mass festivals that were to transform passive spectators into active participants.

The influence of the earlier Russian conceptions of cultic theater is very strongly felt in Keržencev's book. But even though the term "creative", tvorčeskij, was one of the catchwords in Vjačeslav Ivanov's synthetic utopian vision, the name of the symbolist critic and present colleague of Keržencev in TEO was not mentioned in the Proletkul't manifesto of the new revolutionary theater. The reason was, of course,

the Proletkul't Movement's official vigilance against all "class-foreign" influences on their "pure" proletarian ideology.

Keržencev maintained that the October Revolution had given a totally new meaning to all the theatrical forms that he had gathered together from different sources. Only socialist society could abolish the division between artist and masses, between stage and audience by developing a purely proletarian culture. But once "the people" had been exchanged for "the proletariat", Keržencev was prepared to accept both the Wagnerian notion of the great, synthetic work of art and the "cultic" unification of spectators and actors, not to mention the concept of the audience as representative of the whole collective. The difference was that whereas Ivanov and the pre-revolutionary Wagnerians had an abstract People as a basis for their theatrical utopia, Keržencev had an abstract Proletariat.

The Russian theory about the proletarian culture undoubtedly belongs in the rows of Russian "hothouse" projects. The thought of developing a separate, "pure" proletarian ideology within bourgeois society, which had been formulated in the wake of the abortive 1905 Revolution, was marked by the contradiction between collectivism and elitism already from the start. After the October Revolution, when the Proletkul't rapidly grew into an imposing mass movement on a power/political collision course with the Bolshevik Party, the theoretical contradictions became even more obvious.

The kernel of the Proletkul't program for artistic work was the spontaneous, collective creation. What was to be considered "spontaneous" and "genuinely proletarian" however became an issue to be decided by the Proletkul't theoreticians who had been formed by the Capri school and the

Paris emigration. This curious spontaneity presumed that the workers would come to the Proletkul't studios like blank pages.¹⁸ But in reality they were, of course, marked by their social experiences in the sphere of art as well. Thus the "spontaneous" mold into which the young worker-artists of the Proletkul't came to cast their "spontaneous", proletarian, superman ideology which had been developed by the Bogdanov students, Kalinin, Lebedev-Poljanskij, Keržencev and others, usually took the form of reproductions of well known prototypes--pre-symbolist poetry, stylized art nouveau ornament, etc.

The theater was probably the area where Proletkul't artistic activity was most extensive, partly because of the thousands of amateurs or the samodejatel'nyj groups, and partly because of the big mass spectacles which were arranged in many places in the Soviet Union during 1920-1921. In the fourth edition of Creative Theater Keržencev lauded these mass spectacles as the new theater form of the revolutionary society and he was, of course, particularly enthusiastic about the attempt to engage the spectators in the action. Chronicle plays about revolutionary history including everything from the Spartacus revolt to allegorical presentations of the victorious proletariat were the dominating genre. For example the bourgeois state could be portrayed as a wall which toppled after the final struggle against Capital and opened the road to the Commune, which was symbolized by an athletic worker with a sledge hammer in his hand or a barefoot girl in red Isadora Duncan veils standing against the background of a rising sun. "The International", sung collectively by actors and audience, constituted the mandatory conclusion to these mass spectacles where singing, declamation, music and ballet made up a

veritable Gesamtkunstwerk, the content of which was the mythical interpretation of the participants' and the audience's own history.¹⁹ The climax of these mass spectacles was, of course, the performance of The Storming of the Winter Palace on the third anniversary of the October Revolution. With 8,000 actors--plus motorcycles and armoured cars--and 100,000 spectators, whose non-participation was only a matter of degree not of kind, this became a representation of the revolution as myth, "the storming of the Winter Palace truer than it had ever been."²⁰

The Masses As Object

When Vsevolod Mejerchol'd became head of Teatr RSFSR-1 in Moscow in 1920 and thereby began his career as a Soviet theater director in earnest, he was, as we have seen, a warm supporter of the notion of the representativeness of the audience: "every spectator is a model of Soviet Russia." On the other hand he was relatively cool towards the "cultic" and Proletkul't ideas about the elimination of the distinction between actors and spectators. He was and remained an adherent to theatrical professionalism: its importance appeared to him to have increased tremendously since the theater began addressing the entire collective. Mejerchol'd was not interested in letting the audience experience its own fate in mythological form on the stage. As a specialist he instead wanted to interfere with and transform the audience; his efforts followed two directions. One was the biomechanical theater, whose acrobatically superior artists demonstrated New Man's victory over the inertia of matter. This was still unattainable for those sitting in the audience, but one day this would belong to everyone.

Under laboratory conditions the actors exhibited perfect control of their bodies, the objects and the situations; not a fictitious "future story" to submerge yourself in but an experimental and playful demonstration.

The other approach in Mejerchol'd's relationship to the audience which soon became dominant, certainly placed the spectator in the center, but only as an object. The entirety of the new era's rationalism and effectiveness was reserved for the artists who were to make the audience feel as strongly, but also as distinctly as possible. Mejerchol'd even rallied behaviorist psychology and the first empirical audience surveys in order to control and manipulate the audience's reactions. But in the long run the claims of the theater to reach the whole collective became more and more difficult to defend. In the NEP-reality it became increasingly clear that it was only the great director's complete hold on the audience, by all means, which in itself had come to replace the social and moral sense of community which Wagner had stated to be the desired goal.²¹

Thus within the theater at least, the utopian pre-revolutionary programs' disparity between collectivism and elitism was given this poor solution: collectivism for the receivers, elitism for the producers. The sublime ideals developed in the ideological laboratories--the "hothouses"--which were supposed to become everyone's property after the revolution, were only partially realized. Of course nothing else could have been expected; it is inherent to the utopian nature of the programs. Instead what is interesting is why only certain features of utopian programs and not others are realized; if this issue was systematized it would probably result in a serviceable matrix for the characterization of

different types of revolutions. But that is a task which extends far beyond the framework of this presentation.

Allow me instead to briefly summarize these reflections on how some pre-revolutionary ideas about the social function of the theater were transformed and became parts of the Soviet cultural model. With the followers of the Wagnerian people's theater, the notion of the total synthesis changed into the sole director's dominance over the audience by all possible means; with the theoreticians of the proletarian culture it changed into innumerable attempts to force the "correct" forms of spontaneous creation on the masses. In both cases the masses were transformed from originally having been considered, in theory, the chosen heirs of the hothouse experiments into objects of history. Whatever their merits--and they were quite a few--and regardless of how they were later attacked by the standard bearers of socialist realism, it was precisely this transformation which came to be the most important contribution of the Russian Wagnerians and the Proletkul't Movement to the development of the Soviet cultural model.

FOOTNOTES

¹To mention just one example of special relevance for our subject: G. Chajčenko's Russkij narodnyj teatr konca XIX - načala XX veka (Moskva: Nanka, 1975), which abruptly ends its survey of the Russian people's theater movement and its theory just before the October Revolution. The exception to the rule is, of course, the classical Istorija sovetskogo teatra, part I (Leningrad: GIZ, 1933); the publication was never completed.

²An extreme example is Joachim Paech's Das Theater der russischen Revolution. Theorie und Praxis des proletarisch-kulturrevolutionären Theaters in Russland 1917 bis 1924 (Kronberg/Ts.; Scriptor Verlag, 1974). Paech is associated with the journal Ästhetik und Kommunikation in Frankfurt am Main which has published important articles on Proletkul't and "left art". The articles, however, suffer from the authors' tendency to project a post-'68 "Erwartungshorizont" onto the historical material. Cf. Ästhetik und Kommunikation issues 5/6, 12, 13, 19, 20 (1972-75); Gorsen P. and Knödler-Bunte, E., eds., Proletkul't, 1-2 (Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Fromann-Holzboog Verlag 1974-75); Knödler-Bunte, E. and Erler G., eds., Kultur und Kulturrevolution in der Sowjetunion (Berlin-West, Kronberg/Ts.; Ästhetik und Kommunikation Verlag - Scriptor Verlag, 1978).

³Quoted in Bengt Jangfeldt, Majakovskij and Futurism 1917-1921 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1976), p. 10.

⁴Cf., Donald D. Egbert, Social Radicalism and the Arts. Western Europe (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1970), p. 117 ff.

⁵The following is a restatement and development of some of the theses in my doctoral dissertation--published in Swedish--Teatern som handling. Sovjetisk avantgardeestetik, 1917-1927 (Stockholm: Akademilitteratur 1977; 2nd revised ed. Stockholm: PAN/Norstedts, 1980).

⁶"K postanovke 'Zor'' v Pervom Teatre RSFSR", in V. Ė. Mejerchol'd, Stati. Pis'ma. Reči. Bededy, č. II (Moskva: Iskusstvo, 1968), p. 13.

⁷To my knowledge no monograph on the role of the Wagner-Nietzsche syndrome in Russian culture during the first decades of our century exists. Again, the 1933 History of Soviet Theater must be mentioned as an exception. Some publications have lately contributed to compensating for the Soviet taboo and the Western sins of omission on this question. To mention one Soviet and one Western example: Papernyj, "Blok i Nicše", Trudy po russkoj i slavjanskoj filologii, XXXI. Literaturovedenie (Učenyje zapiski Tartuskogo Gos. Universiteta 491), (Tartu, 1979), pp. 84-106, with many references to other Russian and Soviet publications; Bernice Glatzer Rosenthal, "Theater as Church: The Vision of the Mystical Anarchists," in Russian History/Histoire Russe, 4, pt. 2 (1977), pp. 122-141.

⁸Cf. Rosenthal, op. cit. and Lars Kleberg, "People's Theater and Revolution" in Nils Åke Nilsson, ed., Art, Society, Revolution: Russia, 1917-1921 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1979), pp. 179-197.

⁹Nikolaj Berdjaev, "Ivanovskie sredy," in S. A. Vengerov, ed., Russkaja literature XX veka. 1890-1910, t. 3 (Moskva: Mir, 1916), p. 98; on Ivanov's tower cf., F. Stepun, Vstreči (Mjunchen: 1962), and Rosenthal, op. cit.

¹⁰A detailed description of the performance at Ivanov's can be found in E. Znosko-Borovskij, "Bašennyj teatr," Apollon (1910:8), pp. 31-36.

¹¹A. Lunačarskij, "Vstuplenie " in R. Vagner, Iskusstvo i revoljucija (Moscow: TEO Narkomprosa, 1918), p. 3.

¹²The most detailed study on Mejerchol'd after the Revolution is Christian Mailand-Hansen, Mejerchol'ds Theaterästhetik in den 1920'er Jahren - ihr theaterpolitische und kulturideologische Kontext (København: Rosenkilde & Bagger, 1981).

¹³On Blok and the theater after the Revolution cf., Ju. K. Gerasimov, "Aleksandr Blok i sovetskij teatr pervych let revoljucii," Blokovskij sbornik, 1, Ju. M. Lotman and Z. G. Minc, eds. (Tartu:1964), pp. 317-343.

¹⁴Vjačeslav Ivanov, "Zerkalo Iskusstva", Vestnik Teatra (1919:4), p. 3. Other important Ivanov texts in Vestnik Teatra are "K voprosu ob organizacii tvorčeskich sil narodnogo kollektiva v oblasti chudožestvennogo dejstva" (1919:26), p. 4 and "O Vagnere" (1919:31-32), pp. 8-9. On Skrjabin's and Ivanov's concepts of mass festivals see A Mazaev, Prazdnik kak social'no-chudožestvennoe javlenie (Moskva: Nauka, 1978), especially pp. 135-152.

¹⁵Tvorčeskij teatr. Puti socialističeskogo teatra (Petrograd: Kniga, 1918. The fourth edition of the book (Petrograd: GIZ, 1920) was translated into German as Das schöpferische Theater (Hamburg: Carl Hoym Nachf, 1922). For a somewhat less skeptical discussion of Keržencev than mine cf., Mazaev, op. cit., pp. 152-157.

¹⁶Tvorčeskij teatr, Izd. vtoroe, dopolnennoe (Petrograd: Kniga, 1919), p. 24.

¹⁷Romain Rolland's Théâtre du peuple, originally published in 1903, was translated into Russian as Narodnyj teatr (Sankt Peterburg: Znanie, 1910), and re-issued with a new foreword by Vjačeslav Ivanov after the Revolution, Narodnyj teatr (Petrograd-Moskva: Izd. TEO Narkomprosa, 1919). Cf., Kleberg, "People's Theater and Revolution," pp. 184-185.

¹⁸One of Proletkul't's theatrical studios frankly declared, "Here one must not teach acting, but merely develop and correct the individuality of the actors-workers in order to preserve their spiritual proletarian directness, which is the only thing that is capable of creating the collective's own theater," Proletarskaja kul'tura (1919:6), p. 35.

¹⁹Chapters "Die Erfolge des deuen Theaters" and "Theaterpolitik" in the German edition of Keržencev's book, which I have used, not having access to the fourth Russian edition.

²⁰Bernard Dort's phrasing in his book Théâtre public (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1967), p. 366. The Storming of the Winter Palace was in fact directed by Nikolaj Evreinov, one of the most refined theoreticians and practitioners of aestheticism in Russian theater, whose concepts have recently been analyzed in Olle Hildebrand's doctoral dissertation--unfortunately only available in Swedish so far--Harlekin Frälsaren. Teater och verklighet i Nikolaj Evreinovs dramatik (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1978), and in a special issue of Revue des études slaves (1981:1) Although Keržencev harshly criticizes Evreinov's

concept of 'theatricalization of life' for its individualism, he unreflectingly accepts Evreinov's revolutionary pageant of 1920, Das schöpferische Theater, pp. 54-55 and pp. 209-212. Some of the participants may have thought otherwise, but for Evreinov The Storming of 1920 was, no doubt, a victory of art over life, a victory of theatricality over reality.

²¹I have discussed the efforts to 'control' the reactions of the audience in Teatern som handling. The main part of this discussion has been reprinted in Polish as "Publiczność zjednoczona czy rozbita?", Dialog (1979:10), pp. 117-126. A Soviet survey of the Mejerchol'd theater's interest in audience research, which treats the experiments more as the beginnings of a concrete sociology of theater than as ideological symptoms of the crisis of the concept of people's theater, is V. N. Dmitrievskij, "Nekotorye voprosy metodiki izučeniya interesov i reakcij teatral'nogo zritelja," in Chudožestvennoe vosprijatie, Sbornik 1 (Leningrad: Nauka, 1971), pp. 366-385.