

Published issued: Strikes and social conflicts Towards a global history. Publisher: International Association Strikes and Social Conflict Instituto de História Contemporânea da Faculdade de Ciências Sociais e Humanas da Universidade Nova de Lisboa ISBN: 978-972-96844-1-8. Coordination /António Simões do Paço. Raquel Varela. Sjaak van der Velden. Lisbon, June 2012. Pp 637-646.

Themes of destruction, fighting, hatred and disruption in theatrical productions of the 1920's-1930's within the context of Communist mythology.

***Vera Kliment'evna Krylova*¹**

The political and economic reforms of the 1920's - 1930's in Russia drove human beings into a tragic situation, a situation of their complete and utter undoing. It was a time when human consciousness was "shattered into pieces" along with people's psychological health, their faith in God, their sense of kindness to one another along with their sense of right and wrong. People were rapidly forced to change their points of reference and their values under a new set of socio-psychological and economic rules. Ideals were unrecognizably altered as were societal roles – all of which led to an explosion of aggressive behavior.

Morals fell by the wayside and the boundaries between good and evil became irrevocably blurred, as did those between day-in-day-out life and culture. A new "proletarian" and "Communist" sense of morality took shape in this environment that was basically nothing less than relentless propaganda led by V. I. Lenin – the man who inspired the revolution. "We say that morality is that which served to destroy the old society which was based on human exploitation... Communist values are those that will continue the fight" (Lenin 1957: 387-388).

The battle was a viscous one between ideas, a battle of two not only irreconcilable forces, but of two entirely opposing perception of Russia's fate and especially the fate of her people, their culture and moral values. It was a battle on all "fronts" – political, economic and cultural. Despite all laws of logic, in the social paradigm in the 1920's-1930's, such concepts as "battle", "destruction",

¹ 1 Ph.D. in Art Study, expert on the theater, historian, journalist, senior research associate, Sector of History, Institute of the Humanities and the Indigenous Peoples of the North of the Siberian Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Education: Ph.D. 2004, State Institute of Art Studies, Moscow; Irkutsk State University, 1979; Irkutsk Pedagogical Institute, 1972; Research interests: theater studies; history of theatre in the context of the political and social history of Russia of the twentieth century; theater culture; history of theatre; theatre and power. In addition to numerous articles, she has authored selected publications: *Vremennaya svyaz' iushchaia nit'... Stranitsy istorii Russkogo dramaticheskogo teatra v Yakutii ot istokov do 1990-h godov* [Bonds of times... The pages of history of the Russian Drama Theater in Yakutia from its sources till the 1990s] (Novosibirsk, 2004, 380 p.); *Russkiy dramaticheskii teatr v Yakutii (osobennosti razvitiya v natsional'noy respublike 1891-2001 gg.)* [Russian drama theater in Yakutia (the peculiarities of development in a national republic in 1891-2001)] (Moscow, 2005, 265 p.); *Russkaya klassika na tsenah dramaticheskikh teatrov Yakutii* [The Russian classics on the stages of drama theaters in Yakutia] (Novosibirsk, 2010, 368 p. – in the process of production).

"enemy of the people" were a basis for the "new Communist morality" and "Marxist-Leninist ideology". Those in power were like the orchestra conductor, directing a symphony, as it were, creating "a new state" in which artificial aggression was stirred up among the masses to create antagonism toward make-believe "enemies – government traitors". On top of this, a multitude of "enemies of the Soviet state" were culled from the very crowd that was making the accusations. This in turn, forced people to grow accustomed to a constant state of instability and fear. The regime essentially placed hypocritical masks on the faces of the people, turning them into actors in a never ending tragic play that followed a strict mythological script with "narration" in the form of certain canons, taboos, and restrictions.

The mythology of the script was geared toward the complete and utter destruction of existing civilization and the creation of a new world order – it reflected a new battle between good and evil. Despite major physical, moral and spiritual losses, resistance was considered a necessity – the only viable and justified path. The new regime expected the theatrical arts to reflect the new, transformed social mindset. Moreover, theatrical arts were supposed to be subservient to the new regime and its ideologies. Just like a freight train, the controlling power was able to crush all existent humane values and, individual thought was replaced with collective thinking. As a result, a broad based artistic milieu was created based on Marxist-Leninist Doctrine. It was like a model for socio-cultural unity, whose cultural paradigm was rooted in obliterating the old and shaping an entirely new kind of identity – "a Soviet citizen". Moreover, this was accomplished in a dictatorial way. Negating all folklore, traditions and even history itself, the authorities raced to physically and morally destroy anyone and everyone who did not fit the mold of a Soviet.

In moments of crises, art in general, and theater in particular, offered its version of the world to society, forcing reality into artistic images. Now, under the new regime, the stage was supposed to spew forth social moods, the entire "scum of human existence" was setting the code of human conduct. This code required any writer or playwright to become an "artful fighter, which meant that they had to combine the creative process with direct participation in social turmoil. One had to be a warrior in the fight to create one's own masterpieces fueled by life's tribulations and to choose whether to use the pen to sting like a sword" (Alpers 1934: 171).

And this pen-and-sword was first and foremost aimed at "enemies of the revolution," at "enemies of the people" who were not just the big capitalists, but also at hard working laboring peasants who were labeled the so-called "kulak-bloodsuckers", members of the intelligentsia who did not accept the revolutionary postulates, representatives of non-Bolshevik parties, the nobility, the petty bourgeois and many others. Typical themes were October, events from the Civil War, military Communism, common socialism, and the New Economic Policy – NEP. New realities were projected into all forms of art, including into drama, and thereby into theater. That is why the 1920's-1930's became the "icebreaker" period

for the theater - the driving force behind the breakup not only of the prerevolutionary theater system, but also the symbol of the stage. The soul of the people vanished from the theater. It was replaced by the Communist warrior and by the crowds. And the crowd was either aggressive or silent.

This phenomenon can be traced very clearly through many theater productions, in particular in *The Storm*, by V. Bill-Belotserkovsky, *The Armored Train 14-49*, by Vs. Ivanov, *Death Squadron*, by A. Korneichuk, *The Demise*, by B. Lavrenev, *Mutiny*, by D. Furmanov and S. Polyvanov, *The Crushing Defeat*, by A. Fadeyev, and in others viewed by audiences gripped with mixed feelings of both interest and fear.

The premier of the production of *The Storm* took place on the Soviet stage in 1924. Back then critics wrote that "this was the greatest, most triumphant event in the history of Soviet drama and theater. It paved the way for a series of other outstanding works of Soviet art, which will always be considered Soviet theater classics. *The Storm* gained its notoriety on the stage not only as "the birth of proletariat revolutionary drama, but also as the birth of the Soviet-revolutionary theme" (Litovsky 1934: 110).

The action takes places in one of Russia's *uyezd* (administrative territorial division) cities. Among the lead characters were heroes of that time – the Chairman of the Uyezd Committee (Committee Chair), his secretary the Sailor-Mate, the Requisitioner of agricultural products -- foodstuffs being forcefully and brutally taken from the peasants, Senior Party Member Rayevich, a Komsomolets, and the Chairman of the Cheka – the Soviet secret police. These were the images that migrated from production to production personifying, of course, the Soviet leadership, the masses, collectivization, and inspirational role of the party, its reserves and its punitive agencies. They controlled people's fates, and the free will of circumstances in the maelstrom of a frightening revolution. In the farewell message the Committee Chair would convene his "fellow fighters" to battle against the enemies of the Soviet regime -- "to take them by the tails and by the mane," and to go "boldly into battle for the first in the world government of workers and peasants, for the power of the Soviets!" (Bill-Belotserkovsky 1954: 2).

In the first few minutes of the scene we are bombarded with themes of destruction, battle, hatred and disruption. The audience has not only been warned, but there will be no mercy for anyone: each and every enemy will be destroyed. That is how the motivation behind their behavior was dictated. Thus, from episode to episode on the stage there ensued a "sharp irreconcilable class struggles between two enemy classes" (Ponomarenko see: <http://mstrrishenova.narod.ru>), the struggle against the "forces of the old world", so fervently written up in the newspapers and shrouded in the mythological mystery of Communist equality and justice. Here, the Chairman of the Cheka is perhaps the most important figure. It is his very "ranking in the revolution, the iron hand of the proletarian dictatorship" that sets into motion the repressive mechanism against "undesirable cheaters who built the nest of counterrevolutionaries prepared to carry out traitorous uprisings" (Ibid). Among other things, in this play there is yet another powerful image – the crowds donned

in the gray overcoats of soldiers. Of course, if there is to be a fight, it cannot be one-sided. A fight, after all, has many colors and many angles, just as was depicted on the stage at the soldiers' barracks, when the crowd "started moving and started speaking". It became clear who was with whom: where was the "Soviet peasant", and where was the "kulak and the saboteur" (Ibid).

All of these "heroes," who were leading the "war both against bandits, sabotage, typhoid, diversionists, and for fuel and transportation," were personified in the figurative image of the Sailor-Mate – all hating their fellow men in an identical fashion – and were embodied by the "Captain of the Revolution" – V. I. Lenin. Every now and then, the "fighting and hardworking people" would lift their eyes to his portrait hanging under the huge red flag that read "The Russian Communist Party of the Bolsheviks", as if it were both an icon and a live person (Yursky see: <http://mstrishenova.narod.ru>).

And so, the play *The Storm* waged "a storm of revolution" across the Soviet stage, lighting along its path "fires of class confrontations", painting the workdays with a deep red color. These kinds of performances destroyed the traditions of the old time theater that were once wrapped in high culture, and it reduced the theater to the crude realities of life. The degree of political content :in the repertoire was the very watershed that divided the Soviet from the non-soviet world of drama and between the actively revolutionary portion of proletariat playwrights. Critics forgave playwrights and the theater when it came to the artistic quality of the production. Often they would disregard the most flagrant blunders, if the topic and content contained enough political realism" (Litovsky 1934: 110a).

When theatrical works such as *The Storm* appeared, characters emerged onto the stages of Soviet theaters whose personalities did not even begin to fall into the traditional rubric of drama. The directors of the new revolutionary works demanded that the actors take on an entirely different frame of mind, since the content of the plays was now day-to-day life, a very destructive force, which, flouting human dignity, established a new world order, artificially propagating asceticism not inherent to people in regular life. Themes of destruction, battle, hatred and disruption determined the degree to which one play or another was pertinent.

Hence the play *Mutiny* was based on the story written by D. Furmanov and censored by C. Polivanova. Just like in *The Storm*, here the only characters in the play other than the main characters are those that make up the Red Army mass of people. And, despite the fact that the content of the action represented one particular army unit (the action took place in 1920 in the town of Verny in the mountainous area of Semirechensk), one could still get a sense of the great plight of the army and of its legal standing.

There were many reasons for this explosive uprising. As D. Furmanov wrote in his documentary tale "the peasantry had cursed the Soviet dictatorship, and did not want to give up its bread supply to the hungry towns. Cursing, the peasants drove out and beat unmercifully the requisitioners. When they were armed they felt

a sense of hope. The White Army was 60,000 strong. This posed a major headache for the local authorities. The morale in the Red Army was such that they could all defect to their respective homes at a moment's notice, since many were so unhappy. The Soviet regime forcefully requisitioned agricultural products, and made all kinds of accusations, without giving anything and without doing anything, but just shouted threats from the podium" (Furmanov 1972: 425). Because of all this, the command got together and planned on restructuring the army, with the intent of transferring some active military units into labor units, thereby acquiring a free labor force. In order to accomplish this, an order was issued to disarm the army and ship them out of Semirechiye and send them off to Fergana. This was the last straw that tested the mutineers patience. The army's command had three days to accomplish this, during which time they were supposed to figure: out who was who and who would be with whom.

Every theater was anxious to get their production leaders to show this "force and power" of the Worker-Peasant Red Army, even though it had nothing whatsoever to do with reality. For example, in the Russian drama theater in Yakutia in order to create a grand effect during the premier performances of *Mutiny* had bands of "mutineers" break into the fortress through the seating area of the audience. And in the finale, the Red Army soldiers headed off on a hike to Fergana. This director's decision was supposed to intensify the reaction of the audience. On the one hand, he might have been successful in convincing some of their faith in the invincibility of both the Soviet regime and the Worker-Peasant Red Army, on the other hand, he may have dashed their hopes of others to the ideas of returning to the good old days. By demonstrating unity of the army with the people, the theater corroborated that "Soviet power is serious and intends to linger for a long time".

Mutiny was performed from stage to stage, in which the mutineers and especially the rank officers who did not want to fight against "their own" in "their own" home, were represented in the performances as "in tatters", "torn to shreds", "with their animal stares", "their conniving smiles", "with their predator teeth" (Krylova 2004: 104). All of the plays and in *Mutiny* in particular, were staged in the "image of the enemy" and could not be associated with the defenders. To a large extent this was accomplished by the politization of mass consciousness based on the mythology of the objective destruction of everyone "who is not with us".

All of this violence, both in real life and on the stage was not only presented as such, but was supposed to be perceived as the legal revenge against the opposition to the dictatorship of the proletariat. It was supposed to serve as an "example" to the younger generation, so that they would remember "their heroes", and not forget the "enemies" against whom they fought in order to defend the honor of the Soviet regime.

The suppression of the uprising bore witness to the unbelievable depths of the human conflicts within society. Nowadays, there is no longer any doubt that after October "the Bolsheviks, led by V.I. Lenin, begin to purposefully ignite enmity. Having an enemy, they frightened people into believing, was as critical as was the

air they breathed. Already by November 28, 1917, "The Decree about the arrest of leaders of the Civil War who had opposed the revolution" was signed by "Members of the ruling agencies of party cadets declaring that enemies of the people were subject to arrest and were to be handed over to the courts of the military tribunal" (Shambarov see: http://zhurnal.lib.ru/k/klub_i/shambarowbelogwardejshina .shtml) Civil War in Russia was a complex process of resistance (as well as coordination) among political currents, movements and parties, and between military and quasi military formations, various social and ethnic strata and groups having a variety of social interests" (Skorik, Tikidzhyan 2009:104-114). "And how fatefully it impacted all aspects of Russian life, torn asunder by many, many years of terror – like an uncontrollable cork being released from a bottle.

Massive obliteration of "enemy elements" in the revolutionary years gave rise to and widespread execution "industry" (Teplyakov see: http://www.golosasibiri.narod.ru/almanah/vyp_4/027_teplyakov_01.htm), because right from the beginning, the "Soviet government was created by career politicians, idealists and executioners" (Ibid). There is no way to disagree with the assessment of Aleksei Teplyakov that is so utterly convincing because his work is based on a vast number of sources about the procedures used to carry out corporal punishment. Moreover, Mr. Teplyakov is certainly not alone in his conclusions. The American *professor emeritus* of political science at the University of Hawaii, Rudolf Rummel (Rammel 1990, see: www.hawaii.edu/powerkills), presents extremely shocking figures in his research "The Death Policy: Soviet Genocide and Mass Murders Since 1917". According to his data the victims of the Civil War alone numbered at 3,284,000 people. In order to explain such horrific acts which resulted from the consequence of power and Marxist ideology becoming intertwined. The researcher even introduced his own term "democide" which encompasses the concepts of genocide, politicide and mass murder. And this is using exclusively official data. Now, no one can begin to count how many people were executed "in silence, in the basement and without a sentence".

Enemies were not defined as such by people, but rather by the party. Enemies are always needed. Without an enemy, the system becomes clearly ludicrous. Therefore, they were constantly searching for "enemies" under the pretense of a convenient formula: "He who is not with us is against us". This is the reason that in the 1920's and 1930's on the stages of Soviet theaters one could here with amazing insistency the sounds of the predominant motifs of destruction, fighting, hatred and disruption.

The play *The Crushing Defeat*, based on A. Fadeyev's novel, was also dedicated to the destruction of the "enemies of the revolution", the defeat of the Far Eastern Partisans. By putting on this theatrical production of Fadeyev's tragedy, based on documented facts to which he himself was a witness, theaters emphasized its primary component: "the masses and their leader; their journeys, their fates in the revolution, the growth in their experiences and in time, and their tragic deaths

"in the name of future generations" (Maksimova 1970: 8). This expression "in the name of future generations" became a popular metaphor. The regime used it like a shield, not only to justify its blunders, but also the intentional murders. Armed confrontations between the "Reds" and the "Whites", were provoked by the regime in its battle for a comprehensive dictatorship of the proletariat. The "bandit gangs" and other armed groups which were commonly called "thuggery", and later "political thuggery" (Kireyev 2005: 12-18). This cannot be called anything other than a genocide against one's own people. In the name of "future generations" was ruthlessly applied at that time, obliterating the "current generation".

In *The Crushing Defeat* like in *Mutiny*, the essence of the action is the same – resistance. In the Moscow theater named after Vl. Mayakovsky (The Revolution Theater) the play *The Crushing Defeat* began with a "Partisans dancing wildly, almost Polovtsian in their uncontrolled debauchery" (Maksimova 1970: 8a) At the end of the play, only 19 people remain from the much larger number that initially made up the Levinson unit. A woeful ending to the resistance. However, on the stage as in real life, the most important thing was not the sorrow, but rather the celebration of the revolution. On the one hand theater directors strove to show masses in action, on the other hand – the Lenin-like Bolshevik, Levinson, who is "always testing his fairness", and who emerged from the working-peasant class, having completely dedicated his life to serving the people. He was not a professional military man and was not even a commander, but rather a politician. Nonetheless, both the author and the theater place him at the forefront of the unfolding events, as a representative of the organized working class and party to which holds such a prominent place in society. His "unbending will" turns the "raucous riffraff" into a "fighting unit". Both the author and the stage created the image of "men as a special, well behaved breed" with endurance and a "clear revolutionary conscience".

Levinson's will was the will of the new hero that was portrayed on the Soviet stage in the 1920's and 1930's. This will, that was filled with "savage class hatred" toward "enemies of the revolution, was, especially during the Civil War period, the most valuable emotion. The revolutionary idea of the "bright future" was the driving force behind the heroism of this "superhuman". Today's deaths were justified by this transparent, ultimate goal. He resembled a monument in it. His duty toward the revolution, rather than humanity, was the primary driving force behind his actions. In the end, hundreds of souls fell victim to the "bright future".

According to the author of *The Crushing Defeat*, "...during the Civil War a sampling of human material is collected, all of the hostile stories were swept aside by the revolution, everything that seems to fall short of the real revolutionary efforts that accidentally ended up in the revolutionary camp is sifted out, and everything that rose out of the authentic roots of the revolution, from the masses of millions, becomes something stimulating conversation and grows and develops in this battle. People are entirely "remade" (Fadeyev 1960: 103)

Getting back to the play *The Crushing Defeat*, the theater decided to make it

a goal to get this innovative play by A. Fadeyev out to the people. Using Levinson as an example, Fedeyev was able to reveal revolutionary man "from the inside out" "he presented a subtle and exact analysis of his psychological makeup". After all, the Soviet theater was required to reflect the key moments of modernity which included the ability to organize the will of the workers to fight for grand agendas that would fundamentally alter the shape of government, agricultural and daily life. Theater was supposed to install class consciousness and instill in the people the goal of international Communism. It was supposed to influence the audience by means of artistic stage works in order to form the ideological makeup of a new man -- and the acceptance of socialism.

The paradox of realigning society, just as with transforming the image on the stage in the 1920's and 1930's, does not fit with humanistic values. Not infrequently would some heroes of the play bring their honor to the altar of the revolution in the name of revolutionary ideas in exchange for "trench warfare" and the "raw discipline of the party". Others adapted by betraying their husbands like Lyubov Yarovaya in the play bearing her name. Others rejected their parents and hid their social origins. In the period of social upheaval, around the time when *The Crushing Defeat*, *The Storm*, *Mutiny* and *The Demise* and others were performed on stage for the first time, daily life was so drastically altered, that no one was up to counting the losses from the blows "to the very heart itself from such a frightful revolutionary hurricane did nothing but sow seeds of terror everywhere.

Society rapidly developed new layers of class differences. The 1920's-1930's was a time when the politics of terror and administrative ideological suppression of spiritual life became even more oppressive. Many people asked themselves "How can I live and still remain a human being?" "This life, both in their understanding of it and in our understanding of it," wrote Sheila Fitzpatrick, "was not normal. For anyone living in a time of such chaos, normal existence becomes a luxury. Fundamental shifts and hardships [...] destroyed the normal course of life and turned human beings into something, that only Soviet citizens could tirelessly, and, as a rule, unsuccessfully, strive to be" (Fitzpatrick 1999: 3).

Prior to productions of *Fear*, based on A. Afinogenov's work premiered in the Leningrad Academic Theater of Drama (Akt drama) in May 1931 before it was performed around the entire country. The theme of daily life among intellectuals was touched upon in *The Man with the Briefcase*, by A. Faiko, as well as in *The List of Good Deeds*, by Yu. Olesha. In these plays, the intellectual was utterly destroyed. It was believed that "the most respected segment of the old technical intelligentsia had become infected with acts of sabotage". This was provoked by the "miners affair". At this point, according to the words of Stalin, "the State had knowledge of certain indications that would turn it in favor of the Soviet regime" (Stalin 1934: 69-70). Consequently, Soviet theater was supposed to reflect this "turning point", as was achieved by the play *Fear*. Together with its drama the theater started placing masks upon the intelligentsia so that they portrayed faithfulness to revolutionary ideas. Therefore, in the play *Fear* they addressed

the issue of "re-educating old scientists in the new ideological and political thought. This was to convince them to join the side of Socialism, and to defeat, once and for all, the remaining vestiges of counterrevolutionary and sabotage-like elements in the world of science, and to create a new class of scientists from among the workers and the peasants" (Boguslavsky 1952: 53).

Therefore, the primary conflict in drama was build on the ideological struggle between young Communist graduate students, Elena Markova, Kimbayem and the old Bolshevik Clara as well as the non-party member Professor Borodin, who was trying to push for "reactionary theory" "of eternal" physiological stimuli by creating, for that purpose, a "laboratory of human behavior".

The results of Borodin's research in the field of physiology were his "anti-Marxist", "anti-science", and "reactionary theory" about "eternal unconditional behavioral stimuli" in humans – "from the first morning of human existence to the final dusk of civilization" (Afinogenov 1935: 138). He was determined to explain human behavior on the basis of the simplest animal stimuli, the greatest of which, of course, was fear. Fear for one's life. Fear of losing one's job. Fear that in any moment you could be accused of sabotage. Fear to take the newspaper in your hands, because you might just find that someone has denounced you. Fear that because of your social origins your relatives might reject you, like Tsekhova disowned her mother. "People are deteriorating right before our very eyes, as if dead bodies are poisoning the air". Fear even pushed Borodin to publish research in the form of a report. In his report he came to the conclusion that "the number one stimulus for behavior in modern day humans is fear". "Eighty percent of all of the people studied lived under eternal fear if they cried out or feared losing social support". "We are living in an age of great fear". Hence, the professor not only defended science to politics, but outright "rejected class struggles and their influence on science". He discovered his "apolitical nature" and consequently placed a weapon in the hands of the enemy of the classes" (Boguslavsky 1952: 53a).

As far as drama and theater are concerned, the fate of the professor was not of such great importance, but his ideological platform was. In order for it to be more clearly defined, the "accuser" selected was none other than the barely literate sixty-yearold long-standing party member Claudia (Clara) Spasova, the Chairperson of the working class at the Red Rolling Mill plant. She understood Borodin's overarching "stimulus in the social environment" from her class-oriented positions and, from an ideological standpoint, and she portrayed it as "fear of the proletariat dictatorship" which was entirely consistent. We should "go after the petty and dastardly minions, and those who betray the people, and who are waiting for the old world order to be restored". She herself knew no fear. For people like Clara fear did not exist. It had long since turned into bravery, because her words contained the themes of fighting, hatred, and disruption.

Clara's monologue was the culmination of the play and put everyone in his place, after which the views of the professor's camp started to "collapse". This

"fear of the proletariat dictatorship" prevented Borodin from falling asleep the night before his arrest. On the next day the keys from his office were turned over to the party member, graduate student Elena Markova, who had become the Director of the Institute.

This is how the original play *Fear* ended, in which fear, the "overarching stimulus in society", survived and became one of the vehicles for controlling people. This is exactly what Professor Borodin proved. However, the paradox of the 1920's- 1930's did not permit his theory to be recognized as a socio-conflict condition. Therefore, the victories of Elena Markova, Kimbayev and Clara Spasova were none other than "a blow to the philosophy of idealism". This victory convincingly proved that "fear is not simply a biological feeling, but a social and class one as well" (Kruti 1935: 12). Hence, this foundation for Socialist life became the basis for the theory of Bolshevik Clara Spasova regarding "fear of the proletariat dictatorship".

As we see, "by depicting a real conflict, the playwright, assigned the lead roles to the strongest representatives of the working classes, who, during the course of historical events, took over the reigns of leadership and power" (Volkenshtein 1934: 208-09). This was necessary for the purpose of demonstrating the class struggle in its decisive moments, in moments of social crises and upheaval. "Political forces and the government strove to debase art to the role of a simple weapon for influencing the masses, knowing the incredible power that a writer, poet, artist, actor or singer, could have over the soul of an audience member. (...) Hence, for the first time in history ideas of freedom, equality and brotherhood were publicly equated with religion. Actors "played the roles of the priests of the new cult" (Kudryavtsev see: <http://www.rusk.ru>), by portraying the rituals of the new religion. This is the reason that in the 1920's and 1930's on the stages of Soviet theaters one could here with amazing insistency the sounds of the predominant motifs of destruction, fighting, hatred and disruption.

Therefore, the heroic characters and the situations in the plays provide researchers with an unbreakable link between the past and the present. The truth of stage life, when art was tested by the realities of life, transfixed all the images and events. This filled the plays with themes of destruction, fighting, hatred, and disruption. One stage brought together the collective farmer (kholkhoznik) and the worker, the commissar and the intellect, Lenin and the VChK, GULAG and the blood and pain of Russia. Here was displayed Her tragic inheritance with the social burden which has been borne by more than one generation of Russians through their self-awareness, their feelings, their conscience, and their sense of dignity.

Thus, it was through plays like these, in which art was interwoven with reality, "that the theater spoke about the most banal aspects of life – about the drying up of the springs of conscience, honesty, and patriotic duty, without which the human soul becomes stale, begins to die and perish, while he himself becomes the destroyer of the living" (Lyubomudrov 1991: 289-290), especially when on the stage predominate motives of destruction, fighting, hatred and disruption

List of abbreviations

GULAG General Directorate of Corrective Labor Camps, Labor settlements and places of detention.

NEP The New Economic Policy

VChK All-Russian Extraordinary Commission

References

- Afinogenov, A., 1935, *Fear*, Plays, Moscow, Fiction Literature.
- Alpers, B., 1934, *Lyrical Themes*, Moscow, Soviet Theater: Second Discussion Collection of the SSP Organizing Committee's Autonomous Group of Playwrights, edited by B. Alpers, S. Amaglobeli, A. Afeinogenova, Soviet Literature.
- Bill-Belotserkovsky, V., 1954, *The Storm*, Moscow, Collection, Fiction Literature
- Boguslavsky, A.O., 1952, *A.N. Afinogenov (features of life a creative expression)*, Moscow, Publication of the USST Academy of Sciences.
- Fadeyev, A., 1960, *Sobranie sochinenii*, vol. 4, p. 103.
- Fitzpatrick, Sh., 1999, *"Everyday Stalinism" Ordinary life in extraordinary times: soviet Russia in the 1930s*, N.Y., Oxford University Press.
- Furmanov, D., 1972, *Mutiny*, Moscow, Moscow Worker.
- Kireyev, A., 2005, *Political Groupings and Peasants of Primorye 1920's-1930's*, Russia and APR, no.4. pp. 12-18. See: <http://eps.dvo.ru/rap/2005/4/pdf/rap-012-018.pdf>
- Kruti, I., 1935, *Dramaturgy A. Afinogenov*, A. Afinogenov, Plays Moscow, Fiction Literature.
- Kudryavtsev, A., *"Goddess of the Mind"*. See: <http://www.rusk.ru/st.php?idar=110932>
- Krylova, V., 2004, *"Mutiny"*, Vremeni svyazuiushchaia nit'... Stranitsy islorii Russkogo dramatiicheskogo teatra v lakutii ot istokav Jo 1990-x godov (From the time of the connecting thread...), Novosibirsk, Nauka [Science].
- Lenin, V.I., 1957, *On Literature and Art*, Moscow, p. 387-388.
- Litovsky, O., 1934, *Questions about Soviet Dramaturgy*, Moscow, Soviet Literature.
- Lyubomudrov, M., 1991, *Dialectics of Renewal*, Resistance, Moscow, Molodaya Gvardiya.
- Maksimova, V., 1970, *"The Crushing Defeat"*, Moscow, Theater, no. 6. p. 8.
- Ponomarenko Yu., *In the Flame of Class Skirmishes*. See <http://mstrishenova.narod.ru/>
- Rammel, R.J., 1990, *Lethal Politics: Soviet Genocide and Mass Murder Since 1917*, New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers. See: <http://www.hawaii.edu/powerkills/NOTE4.HTM>
- Skorik, A., Tikidzhyan, R., 2009, *Red Partisans in Soviet Reality 1920-1930's*. (based on materials from Southern Russia) Russian History, no. 4, p.104 -114. See: <http://dlib.eastview.com/browse/doc/20473338>
- Stalin, I.V., 1934, *Essays*, vol. 13. p. 69-70.
- Shambarov, V. E., *White Guardists*, See: http://zhurnal.lib.ru/k/klub_i/shambarowbelogwardejshina.shtml
- Teplyakov, A., *Siberia: Corporal Punishment Procedures in the 1920's-1930's*. See: <http://www.golosasibiri.narod.ru/almanah/vyp4/027teplyakov01.htm>
- Volkenshtein, V., 1934, *On the History of Drama*, Soviet Dramaturgy ГИИЯ: Second Discussion Collection of the SSP Organizing Committee's Autonomous Group of Playwrights, edited by B. Alpers, S. Amaglobeli, A. Afeinogenova, Moscow, Soviet Literature.
- Yursky, Yu. *About People of Battle and Labor*. See: <http://mstrishenova.narod.ru/>