

Polly Jones

'Life as big as the ocean': Bolshevik Biography and the problem of personality from late Stalinism to Late Socialism¹

'The biographical sketch is the most accessible form of propaganda to educate young people about the heroic traditions of our party. The dry, Talmudic narration of party history has harmed and hampered the cause of studying party history. In biographical sketches, a good author, if also a writer, can put together a description of a period of party history in a much brighter and more interesting way. Good biographical sketches can be many times more forceful than thick, fat monographs'.² This statement, by an editorial board member at the State Political Literature publishing house (Politizdat) in 1965, was made at one of the many in-house discussions of biography that the publisher held in the Khrushchev and Brezhnev eras. Biography now promised a personalised, livelier alternative to traditional party history—or at least, an alternative way of narrating it that would be more 'forceful' in its effects on its mass audience.

However, it was also subject to strict criteria, as the speaker Lobarev, a manager at Politizdat, went on to explain: 'Here's how to write an artistic biography of revolutionaries: historically accurate, multi-dimensional, with skilful typification of characters and images. And the language should be such that not even the most picky reviewer can find anything to complain about'.³ This ambitious biographical ideal harboured several unresolved tensions. Was biography primarily the life-story of an individual, or a way of teaching broader historical developments? How could the inherent individualizing impulse of biography be squared with the need for 'typical' heroes? Would assumptions of

education and 'forceful' propaganda hamper realistic portraiture? And should biographies contain only verifiable historical fact, and would 'skilful' writers be interested in writing them if so?

These were dilemmas that had faced Soviet biography throughout its existence, but they became especially urgent after Stalin's death and particularly for biographies of Bolshevik heroes. Between Stalin's death and the start of the Brezhnev era, Bolshevik biographies were identified by publishers and critics as the most 'dry' and 'Talmudic' of all Soviet life stories, yet also amongst the most important for disseminating Soviet values and propagandising party traditions, especially as the Soviet project and Soviet past were being re-defined in light of Stalin's death and de-Stalinization. In what follows, I analyse the substantial changes to the theory and practice of publishing Bolshevik biographies from the end of World War II to the early Brezhnev era within their two main producers: the main Soviet political literature publisher Politizdat and the Komsomol's publishing house, Molodaia gvardiia (home since 1938 to the *Lives of Remarkable People* series).

It is late Stalinist and Bolshevik biographies that have both been most harshly criticised in Western scholarship, as formulaic, de-personalized and hagiographic, although many analyses dismiss all Soviet and indeed socialist biography in these terms, without regard for periodization.⁴ Only occasionally have attempted or actual reforms been acknowledged, such as the shift towards more personalised and popular biography writing after 1978 in China, the launch of new biographical projects in late socialist East Germany in order to reconnect the population, especially youth, with the revolutionary past, or the flourishing of biographical collections and series in post-Stalinist Hungary and other parts of the

Eastern bloc.⁵ Such studies suggest that the post-Stalinist period was a time of particularly intense attempts at biographical innovation, driven by mounting anxieties about the efficacy of propaganda and by the turn to more individualised forms of transmission of socialist values. At the same time, they emphasise the influence of underlying assumptions about the poetics and purposes of socialist biography, which limited substantive change and thus often fuelled the very disillusionment that they had tried to address.

This article analyses similar tensions in Soviet biographical publishing from late Stalinism to the dawn of late socialism. It examines public and private discussions of Bolshevik biography, and of its (in)ability to evoke personality, and publishers' attempts to eliminate their texts' late Stalinist flaws and create true portraits. Criticisms of Bolshevik biography's formulaic, clichéd narrative and tendencies to de-personalisation—rather similar to criticism outside the Soviet bloc, except that biography's propaganda functions were derided by these critics but never questioned in the Soviet debate—started to be articulated and debated by Soviet publishers and critics themselves soon after Stalin's death. This growing awareness of the crisis of Bolshevik biography disrupted further standardization and de-personalization along late Stalinist lines, instead spurring rapid growth in numbers of Bolshevik biographies, and experimentation with their genres and forms. Such reforms consistently stayed close to the top of publishers' agendas because biography possessed such potential to be effective propaganda, especially in an era when the blossoming of the individual socialist person(ality) emerged as the central promise of the Soviet project.⁶

What really drove these changes to Bolshevik biography, then, was concern about the recreation of the subject's personality. This has been the most nagging

concern in biography and biographical criticism, especially in the 20th century: theorists (and practitioners) of the form have repeatedly lamented the failure of biography to evoke the real, living self, noting that political biography is particularly prone to such failures.⁷ These Western critics' concerns were driven by a commitment to the unique human personality—and its portrayal for its own sake—that was considerably more liberal and less pragmatic than that of Soviet publishers. Nonetheless, the Soviet discussion of biography's failings and renewed ambition to bring Bolshevik subjects to life, discussed below, suggest some striking parallels. This article thus aims to inscribe Soviet biography into the broader currents of 20th-century life writing and biographical criticism: from concerns about the evocation of personality, to the ever tighter embrace of literary technique and even fictionalization to achieve that end.

Bolshevik Biography from Revolution to Late Stalinism

Biography was theoretically problematic for a regime based on an ideology of collective class consciousness and behaviour and supra-personal historical laws. However, by the early 1930s, both the early Bolshevik prioritization of the masses over the individual and the ultra-anonymised masses of Cultural Revolution propaganda had been downplayed and displaced in favour of an emphasis on individual heroes, who were supposed to encourage citizens to work towards such devotion to the cause and coming to consciousness.⁸ Scholars have disagreed over whether these individualised visions of Stalinist identity emphasised the flourishing of the complex, individual self (in a neo-Romantic vein, especially in the mid-1930s) or implied a more traumatised or atomised subjecthood.⁹ Despite

these ongoing disagreements over Stalinist subjectivity, it is clear that the individual hero loomed large in Stalinist culture, and accordingly so did the biographical principle (on the collection of citizens' biographical narratives of World War II, an undertaking underpinned by similar principles, see Jochen Hellbeck's contribution to this issue).

Biographies were produced in large numbers by Soviet publishers throughout the post-revolutionary period, and biographies of Bolshevik leaders were always listed as the top priority in publishing plans. However, Bolshevik biography was also beset by a number of inherent difficulties that made delivery of these plans difficult, sometimes in terms of quantity and, as we will see, very often in terms of quality. The personality type of the 'professional revolutionary', established and disseminated in biographies and *Bildung* fiction even before the revolution, was based on hard work, determination and the suppression of individual needs.¹⁰ This usually dictated the lack (or at least extreme limitation) of personal life and personal concerns, and although work for the party was supposed to generate enough drama, passion and happiness to compensate for (and indeed eclipse) such sacrifices, it often made for flatly 'iconic' figures whose life stories varied only in minor details.¹¹ Additionally, while Bolsheviks' devotion to the cause could be dramatized for the pre-revolutionary, revolutionary and Civil War periods, with their 'adventure story' potential, the more bureaucratic party work after the Civil War was inherently harder to enliven.¹² In this sense, Bolshevik biography represented a peculiarly troublesome iteration of the broader, ongoing dilemmas of Soviet conceptualizations of the individual personality (*lichnost*): should heroes adhere to a type or set of ideal characteristics or could they express their individuality?; to what extent should the masses take

priority over the individual?; how much agency and importance should be accorded to an individual in the working out of historical dialectics?¹³

At the same time, the problem of how to represent personality was by no means exclusive to the Soviet context; biography as a genre continues to confront the problem wherever it is produced. These dilemmas came into particularly sharp focus during the 1920s, in Russia (as Angela Brintlinger's article in this issue explores) and in the myriad visions of a 'new biography' that sprang up across much of Western Europe in reaction to the failures of Victorian-era biography to capture the unique personality.¹⁴ However, in the 1950s and 1960s, at the same time as the Soviet debate over biographical form and personality really took off again, Western critics of the biographical genre largely concurred that biographies still often failed to bring to life the personality of their subjects.¹⁵ Both these waves of Western criticism blamed above all the inertial force of several typical features of biographical narrative: linear chronology; the 'chronicle' and 'compilation' form; and, above all, an intense wariness of literary devices, let alone any extrapolation or fictionalization.¹⁶ As explored below, the post-Stalinist debates about Bolshevik biography that took place in the press and in internal publishers' discussions identified all of these problems from an early stage, and took determined (if embattled) measures to eliminate them.

Despite, or perhaps because of the particular challenges of creating a compelling Bolshevik life story, a wide range of sub-genres was deployed by biographers from the start, from life summaries for agitprop meetings to journalistic sketches (*ocherki*) and more fictionalised or dramatised biographical tales (*povesti*) usually consumed in more private settings. In the first post-revolutionary decade, sketches, such as those by Gor'kii and Lunacharskii, were a

particularly popular form of biography-writing used to acquaint the party and general population with the leading personalities of the new regime, though large biographical dictionaries of Bolsheviks also started to appear by the mid-1920s.¹⁷ After the Cultural Revolution of the early 1930s briefly but radically downplayed the role of the individual, one of the key auguries of the new age of biography was the 1933 realisation of Maksim Gor'kii's long-standing dream of reviving Florentii Pavlenkov's pre-revolutionary *Lives of Remarkable People* (LRP) series (the subject of Ludmilla Trigoss and Carol Ueland's contribution to this issue); Gor'kii's broader 'biographical anthology' of the 1930s also included the monumental *History of Factories* and *The History of The Russian Civil War* projects.¹⁸ Another sign of the blossoming of biography was the proliferation of sketches and tales about Bolshevik heroes, which resumed early post-revolutionary efforts at commemoration, and added new figures, such as the more recently deceased Kirov and Frunze, to their roster.¹⁹

However, though the basic 'use' of biography for inspiration and emulation never disappeared once thus established, this intense interest in, and optimism about, the genre did not last long.²⁰ The terror of the late 1930s significantly disrupted the official narrative of party history, and sharply reduced the canon of heroes deemed worthy of public celebration; as a result, hundreds of Bolshevik biographical texts were stopped mid-way through drafting, heavily revised or removed from public circulation in the last years of the 1930s.²¹ At the same time, the installation of Stalin as *primus inter pares* of Bolsheviks, through publication of his *Short Biography* in 1939, eclipsed his colleagues' biographies.²² Stalin's biography set a template for the narration of Stalin's life in other publications and propaganda, for biographical propaganda across the newly Sovietized Eastern

bloc, and for the limited number of biographies of other Bolsheviks produced domestically after it: impersonal, hagiographic, heavy on historical context, and dominated by chronological enumeration of party and state work.²³

The war further interfered with biographical publishing. LRP stopped publication in 1939, and did not resume until 1946, though short-lived biographical collections of 'great Russians' appeared in the last two years of the war under the umbrella of the series.²⁴ Nonetheless, as Jochen Hellbeck and others have argued, biography was a key feature of the war effort, including biographical sketches of Soviet citizens by war journalists and book-length accounts of pre-revolutionary heroes that proliferated with the rise of 'national Bolshevism', such as the biographies of Aleksandr Nevskii and Ivan III and IV published by Politizdat.²⁵

The cumulative effects of the Stalin cult, terror and war on Bolshevik biography left it in a troubled state by the end of the war. This was evident in the fact that Politizdat's late Stalinist biographical output was almost entirely limited to reissues (and, in 1946, a new edition) of Stalin's biography. In apparent contrast to this absence of biography in Politizdat, when LRP revived, its first post-war plan was headed by a list of party and revolutionary heroes, including Sverdlov, Kalinin, Ordzhonikidze and Kirov. However, the top priority articulated by its editor M. Penkin in his 1947 explanation of the plan to party authorities was in fact biographies of *Russian* heroes, such as distinguished scientists, alleged inventors and writers; such books, he explained:

[M]ust foster patriotism and a sense of national pride in youth. One of its main aims is to glorify Russian culture, to propagandise the great contribution of the Russian people to the treasures of the world of culture.

For that reason, when choosing names, particular attention is devoted to Russian figures. The publisher strives to ensure that the young reader is free of veneration of the West and is conscious of the great merits of Russian science and technology, literature and art before the whole of humanity and feels pride in them.²⁶

This list of heroes, which Penkin had redrafted after serious criticism of his original plan for its excess of foreign 'remarkable people', was in line with the Russian nationalism and chauvinism that dominated late 1940s ideology and propaganda, but also fitted with the series' traditional emphasis on culture rather than politics.

Even though the number of Bolshevik biographies planned for the post-war decade was small, Molodaia gvardiia failed to reach even this modest target. It did not commission authors to write biographies for several of the subjects identified in the plan, such as Kirov, Kalinin and Sverdlov, and biographies that were successfully assigned were then delayed by onerous review processes.²⁷ In fact, in the first decade of its post-war revival, LRP published just two biographies of Bolsheviks: the pre-revolutionary heroes Bauman and Babushkin, long since identified by Lenin as priorities for biographies and so already the subject of several biographical accounts.²⁸ Both of these biographies were by Mikhail Novoselov, whose previous biographies had included a much earlier (and shorter) biography of Bauman.²⁹ A third text, a biography of Frunze by the writer Viacheslav Lebedev, author of a 1940s *povest'* about Frunze and of several other Bolshevik biographical stories, was started in 1946, before either of Novoselov's texts, but not published until well after them, in 1957.³⁰

All three of these late Stalinist Bolshevik biographies texts were long (over 300-page) birth-to-death chronicles of their heroes' lives. Like Socialist Realist literary texts of the time, they emphasised influences on the formation of revolutionary consciousness and the acquisition of typical Bolshevik traits of 'firmness', 'calmness', resilience and self-sacrifice (including in the realm of intimate relationships, though this was barely covered in the texts). Despite these fundamental similarities, the editing—and the final versions—of all three texts illustrate that the criteria applied to late Stalinist Bolshevik biography and its exploration of character were demanding, but also heterogeneous, if not contradictory.³¹ This suggests that, despite the apparent stagnation of Bolshevik biographical production (akin to the 'film famine' of the late Stalin years), the fundamental question of how to represent personality convincingly—even Bolshevik leaders' personalities, with their strong tendencies to hagiography and standardization—remained subject to genuine discussion and disagreement in the early post-war years.

The only post-war LRP Bolshevik biography to be published in Stalin's lifetime, Novoselov's biography of Bauman was criticised by internal reviewers mainly for its excessive attention to the hero's childhood and its 'saccharine', 'pre-revolutionary style' account of his family background, and the author was urged to 'strengthen the formulation of general political questions of the history of the party' while 'restricting [the text] strictly to the domain of party-historical literature'.³² The latter instruction for redrafting suggested that biographies had an important general educational function and that the narrative of party history had been firmly established a decade after publication of the *Short Course*. At the same time, the editors relied heavily on Old Bolshevik knowledge of the distant

pre-revolutionary past, meaning that such reviewers could enrich the historical context with their personal memories (for example, Elena Stasova corrected the description of pre-revolutionary prisons in both of Novoselov's biographies).³³

The requirement for lives to be placed in broader context also applied to Novoselov's slightly later biography of Babushkin, to which a preface was appended on publication, after the author failed to provide enough of the revolutionary background requested by reviewers. It was authored by the prominent historian Anna Pankratova (also an internal reviewer of both manuscripts) who intended its narrative of the broader changes to the proletariat during the hero's lifetime 'to help young readers to understand correctly and evaluate the role of Babushkin as a proletarian revolutionary of a new type'.³⁴ Strikingly de-individualizing for an introduction to a biography, the para-text represented an extreme variation on Lenin's identification of Babushkin as a model of the professional revolutionary type.³⁵ However, internal reviewers also praised both of Novoselov's texts for the emotion that they infused into the individual hero's life story, acclaiming the Bauman text for 'rising to passionate pathos' and praising the Babushkin biography for 'forcing the reader to relive the fate of its hero' rather than just recounting life events (in this, Novoselov was greatly aided by Babushkin's own memoirs, heavily cited in order to dramatise the hero's thoughts and feelings).³⁶

These twin, and competing, criteria of historical background and personal drama were also applied to Lebedev's biography of Frunze, but took far longer to be realised. The first version submitted in 1946 was deemed a complete failure by all its internal reviewers, including one, a certain Bobunov, who wrote an extraordinary 144-page denunciation. Part of the problem lay in the subject

matter itself. Unlike the short, pre-revolutionary lives of Bauman and Babushkin, Frunze's life stretched well beyond 1905, taking in the revolution, civil war and NEP era; his death in the early Stalin era was shrouded in controversy; and, despite publication of some biographical accounts in the 1920s and 1930s, he lacked a canonical biography of the kind that the biographer of Bauman or Babushkin could draw upon (such as Lenin's obituary of Babushkin). Lebedev's first attempt was accused of failing to evoke either context or character satisfactorily. In contrast to Novoselov's critics, some reviewers deemed the amount of historical background excessive for a text that should focus above all on a single individual, rather than replicating general party history texts.³⁷ At the same time, the historical context that *was* necessary to understand Frunze's life had to be stripped of errors and infused with greater understanding of party and military history, based on the *Short Course*.³⁸ The military reviewers of the manuscript were especially critical of Lebedev's 'military helplessness and illiteracy' in writing about the Civil War and about Frunze as a military commander and strategist.³⁹

Yet as important as these multiple historical misunderstandings was the biographer's failure to grasp the hero's character. Unlike the limitations that reviewers placed on Novoselov's account of Bauman's childhood, several reviewers of this text saw the virtual absence of childhood scenes as one of its worst flaws. Nonetheless, their differing views of subject formation during childhood led them to propose different revisions. The Frunze military academy historian Timoshkov criticised the fact that the 'formation of the child's personality [*lichnost*]' focussed only on family background, with 'nothing about the political and socio-economic situation in Turkestan, which certainly shaped

Frunze', thus taking a conventional Marxist-Leninist view of the influence of the social environment on the personality.⁴⁰ By contrast, the reviewer Bobunov saw the family as the key locus of subject formation, reiterating the point several times in his monumental critique. 'One can't describe his life and works without mentioning anything about family, which undoubtedly influenced the formation of his character', he claimed, while appealing to Lebedev to describe the full range of Frunze's relatives and their emotions: 'what were they like? Did Mikhail love them, and if he did love them, why?'.⁴¹ In a more forceful formulation later in his review, Bobunov termed the lack of information about Frunze's early life 'the most serious gap in the manuscript, its most significant flaw. It's unthinkable to give a detailed description about the life and works of a great man without having shown his childhood and youth in detail, which was when the foundations of the conscious, thinking person were laid'.⁴²

This view of the personality also led Bobunov to criticise the manuscript for failing to 'uncover the inner world of Frunze', the 'spiritual' and 'moral' aspects of his character. In a strikingly holistic view of the Bolshevik self, he listed the many aspects of 'Frunze the person' (*chelovek*) that the biography had not covered: his personal life (*lichnaia zhizn'*) and Frunze the family man (*sem'ianin*), as well as Frunze the comrade, the leader and the military commander. In not showing Frunze in all these domains of his life, Lebedev had blurred the outlines of his personality (*lichnost'*), failing to evoke his unique features and his 'integrated' character, and painting only a few 'brushstrokes' of a biographical 'portrait'.⁴³ Bobunov's response was thus intended not only to point out the text's errors, but also to provide a model of the holistic biographical enquiry that such a figure truly deserved.

These proposed revisions were enormous in scope and bewilderingly inconsistent, but were nonetheless initially scheduled for completion within a mere month. After revisions in Spring 1947 and summer 1948 failed to satisfy editors, Lebedev requested a co-author in 1949, and Konstantin Anan'ev (who had published multiple books on the Civil War), was brought on board with the aim of bolstering the military aspects of the biography in particular.⁴⁴ The pair embarked on further research, including fieldwork, and produced a new version within a year.⁴⁵ Reviews in 1951 still found the work unsuitable for publication, however: one reviewer, the military historian Sidorov, observed that the manuscript 'gave the impression that you're reading a book not about Frunze, but articles about Soviet history, and the narrative of historical events in many places is of poor quality, simplistic'.⁴⁶ Though the manuscript finally went to press in 1952, it was further delayed by editors' lingering anxieties about its historical coverage.⁴⁷ Soon after, however, the death of Stalin meant that 'all the material had to be reassessed in light of the latest guidelines, adding new criticisms to the old ones', and the Secret Speech then further delayed publication, in order to prioritise biographies of newly rehabilitated cult victims.⁴⁸ Compounding the authors' woes, and fuelling their escalating complaints to Molodaia gvardiia in the mid-1950s, the commissioning editors also voided the previous contract and asked the authors to adapt the manuscript into a *povest'*, in one sign of how quickly literary quality came to the fore after Stalin's death. Indeed, the authors' acceptance of the final set of demands reacted to this stylistic volte-face with some exasperation: 'One cannot but note', they observed acidly in June 1956, 'that at the start of work on the book about Frunze, there could have been no talk of a *povest'*, and all the efforts

of the author to make the book about Frunze even slightly artistic were simply cut off by the editors'.⁴⁹

The final text, published in 1957, covered Frunze's military career in much more detail than the original text, and also now contained a long section on Frunze's childhood and a later section on his hobbies and friends, but his own child and wife were not mentioned until the last third of the text, and then only very briefly. The author therefore only partly answered the appeals for Frunze's multiple identities to be covered, and satisfied the requirements of the *povest'* even less. Indeed, in the same year that this account of Frunze's life came out with LRP, a popular Stalin-era *povest'* about his Civil War exploits was reissued in a large print-run, highlighting the LRP's text's shortcomings in style and characterisation.⁵⁰

These editing practices in the late Stalinist and early post-Stalinist period suggest that historical accuracy—construed as fact-checking against the canonical historiography—was paramount in biography and that historical context played a central role in the narration of individual lives; without correct and comprehensive general historical analysis, biographies would not be passed for publication. Indeed, all three of these biographies in their final form contained extensive analysis of general historical and political background, alternating with the party activities of the individual hero. In the Babushkin biography, the only post-war text published before Stalin's death, such historical analysis was heavily influenced by the *Short Course* and the *Short Biography*, though these texts' influence waned quickly in early post-Stalinist biographies.

In addition to this intertwining of individual and context, however, biography was also supposed to evoke personality so that its readers could

develop a personal connection to the subject. The paramount importance of an emotional response to texts had long been enshrined in the Soviet notion of 'agitation', and had been a key factor dictating the turn to less faceless heroes in the 1930s.⁵¹ These principles, already present in late Stalinist biographical propaganda, grew markedly in importance in the early post-Stalin period, as the later shift in criteria for the Frunze biography suggests. Ultimately, however, and despite the substantial disagreements about psychology and personality amongst their reviewers, these post-war texts presented their heroes' personalities in very similar ways, especially after the youngest years. They all charted coming to consciousness, documented the 'forging' of revolutionaries through trials such as prison and exile, promoted devotion to the cause over family or personal life, and celebrated the 'professional revolutionary' type. Such standardisation of both the Bolshevik personality and the Bolshevik biographical narrative began to attract criticism even before some of these biographical projects had been completed, from Stalin's death onwards.

Debating Biography after Stalin's death

The death of Stalin had profound effects on party propaganda, which were then accelerated by de-Stalinization from the mid-1950s onwards. Alongside hostility to the 'cult of personality', and in partial compensation for its effects, the first post-Stalin decade saw the (re)emergence of hundreds of 'personalities' from historical neglect or stigmatization: from the enemies of the recent terror to the hundreds of Old Bolsheviks whose contribution to the revolution and Lenin era had been distorted or silenced in the *Short Biography* and *Short Course*. This drive to expand

the biographical canon accelerated markedly after Khrushchev's appeal at the 1961 Twenty-Second Party Congress for elite cult victims' life stories to be rescued from decades of oblivion. In this decade of biographical renewal, these far-reaching changes to content and expansion of the roster of biographical subjects largely overshadowed analysis of the genre and its poetics. However, once the ideas of expanding the biographical canon and of (re)identifying the Leninist era as the regime's key usable past were accepted, the problem of effective, entertaining and edifying narration of these new heroes' lives and personalities moved quickly up the agenda.

In the early years after Stalin's death, a number of high-profile criticisms of Bolshevik biography—especially the post-war LRP texts examined in our previous section—appeared in the Soviet press. These included a letter of complaint about the series' unsystematic choices and small numbers of Bolshevik heroes, apparently sent by ordinary readers to the main Soviet history journal, a common technique used to signal a policy shift.⁵² Press reviews of the small number of published post-war Bolshevik biographies similarly lamented their limited numbers, but also increasingly pointed out their narrative flaws.⁵³ They expressed a growing intolerance of their 'dry', 'colourless' language and their unimaginative form.⁵⁴ Bolshevik biographies stood accused of adopting a 'protocol-like' tone, and an enumerative, informative style, compiling and listing facts and events rather than organising them into a more inventive narrative form.⁵⁵ Another problem was that Bolshevik heroes' childhoods and the early formation of their personalities, as extensively dramatised in the Babushkin biography for example, consistently generated more 'involving' and 'bright' narrative and gave a better sense of the heroes' 'psychological makeup' than the account of their later careers,

which tended toward the 'protocol' style of reporting facts, often in rapid succession (*skorogovorka*).⁵⁶ This, asserted one 1955 critical overview of LRP, was exactly contrary to what should happen: the post-revolutionary era merited more 'brightness' and 'uplift' than all other periods.⁵⁷ As such, LRP was falling well short of party requirements; its Bolshevik biographies were failing to touch the minds *and* hearts of Soviet readers.

These early post-Stalinist criticisms suggested that biography had not yet (or not recently) been practised as a genre in its own right: authors had merely engaged in recapitulation (*pereskaz*) of the hero's party and state record.⁵⁸ At most, they had been practitioners of 'life description' (*zhizneopisanie*), and compilers of 'biographical data', rather than experts in the craft of biography, alleged one critical article in the authoritative journal *Kommunist*.⁵⁹ By the late 1950s, the pressure on LRP to increase its coverage of Bolsheviks, but also to create convincing 'images' (*obrazy*) of their personalities, was intense: at the end of the decade, an article in the newly founded official party history journal reviewed all of the Bolshevik biographies that had come out the late 1940s and 1950s, and praised the recent growth in numbers, but concluded that the new output lacked psychological and narrative interest. The recent biographies of Frunze and Kuibyshev still exhibited a familiar divide between interesting narratives of childhood character formation and the dry account of later party work with no sense of individual 'features'. Overall, too, LRP biographies still failed to penetrate the 'inner world' of their heroes.⁶⁰

These were far-reaching demands, but initially publishers responded with familiar Soviet measures: changes to plans and quotas, and bouts of *kritika* and *samokritika*. Under pressure from concerted press criticism, LRP included more

Bolshevik figures in their publication plans for the series of the late 1950s and early 1960s.⁶¹ The former dominance of Russian heroes was thereby much reduced, and the goals of the series shifted away from Russian patriotism and towards 'great revolutionaries' and Bolsheviks who 'give models of self-sacrificing service of the people and are an inspiring example for youth'.⁶²

Politizdat, though it had been formally criticised much earlier than LRP, in a CC resolution of December 1953 criticising its general party history failings, needed first to move to publishing biographies in significant numbers. Internal meetings in the second half of the 1950s lamented the many 'notable figures' neglected during the long lapse in its biographical publishing.⁶³ The biographical sketch, in particular, promised to appeal to a much broader audience and needed to be deployed more fully.⁶⁴ As these discussions of biography and 'mass literature' continued, Politizdat started planning and publishing biographical series (notably 'Heroes and Feats' and 'Tales of the Tasks and People of the Party', as well as 'Heroes of Labour') and then put out at least 15 individual biographies and collections of sketches about Bolsheviks in the first half of the 1960s, outdoing LRP's eight Bolshevik biographies published in the same period.⁶⁵ The two publishers' virtually simultaneous drives to prioritise Bolshevik and revolutionary biography unsurprisingly led to duplication across their plans, with rival biographies of figures including Frunze, Kirov and Ordzhonikidze published in close succession.

However, despite the early emergence of a new discourse of psychological portraiture, early post-Stalinist changes to biography did not focus much on improving the evocation of personality; this was mainly due to the intense disruption to the broader Soviet historical narrative that biographers, as in the

Stalin era, had to use to frame the lives of biographical subjects. This was evident, as we have seen, in the latter stages of the tortuous editing of the LRP Frunze biography, where the pervasive instability in party and military history consistently outpaced the authors' revisions. It also caused the next LRP Bolshevik biography, of Kuibyshev, to be significantly delayed.⁶⁶ Pavel Berezov, a biographer with many sketches and short biographies of Bolsheviks to his name, was commissioned to write the Kuibyshev biography in 1955, but the first round of reviews, within months of the Secret Speech in summer 1956, found its treatment of the individual problematic in several respects, traceable to Stalin-era practice.⁶⁷ On the one hand, the biography 'enumerat[ed] the actions of Kuibyshev, instead of showing them concretely'.⁶⁸ On the other hand, though, Kuibyshev was 'divorced from his surroundings' and shown as 'a leader [*vozhd*]' standing above the masses', in the vein of the now denounced 'cult of personality'.⁶⁹ Only after multiple rounds of editing was the reworked biography deemed acceptable and finally published in 1958. While superficially stripped of the *kul't lichnosti*, Berezov's text nonetheless largely stuck to the Stalinist template, endowing the hero with stock traits (calmness, a strong will) and enumerating the stages of his party involvement chronologically and exhaustively. Only in the insistent lyrical motif of Kuibyshev's love for writing poetry, and the 'in medias res' opening, could the reader glimpse the textual innovations that would proliferate over the next decade.

In the 1960s, as problems of quantity were addressed with the insertion of multiple new Bolshevik biographies into publishers' plans, and as the broader narrative of Leninist and Stalinist history started to stabilise into a steadier background for biographical accounts, the question of how to write a compelling

life and evoke character loomed much larger. In his first plan of the 1960s, LRP's editor-in-chief pledged to tackle the chronic problems of unsystematic coverage of party heroes and 'dry', 'grey' 'standardized' and linguistically 'inexpressive' biographies.⁷⁰ While improved coverage of revolutionaries was to be assured by increasing the number of such subjects from the nine featured in the 1957-61 plan up to thirty five, language and form would improve through better editing and reviewing, including a pledge to respect the 'individuality and creative manner' of each author.⁷¹ Meanwhile, in Politizdat in the same period, criteria for good and bad biographical practice began to be formulated: biographies should be broadly gripping (*zanimatel'nyi*), entertaining (*uvlekatel'nyi*) and emotionally affecting (*volnuiushchii*). The list of what biography should *not* be was longer, and sharper in its criticisms. Now that biography was so much more prominent in Politizdat's plans, it could not afford to be of poor quality, yet the genre was so difficult that it might 'torture' inexperienced authors and end up full of clichés.⁷² As in the earliest post-Stalin criticism, texts must not be 'grey', 'dry' or 'bureaucratic' in tone, which had by now come to mean listing facts in boring succession and thus replicating the party *anketa* or the press obituary (*nekrolog*). The 'artistic depiction' of personality had now become critically important.⁷³

Such psychologization depended on a willingness to broaden both the typical authorial cohort and the generic limits of Bolshevik biographies (to take in literary techniques). One obstacle to such expansion was the fact that many post-Stalin biographies in both LRP and Politizdat were still written by historians and academics, notably employees of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism, and by those who had started work as biographers in the Stalin era.⁷⁴ Manuscripts were still reviewed mainly by such figures too, who concentrated on monitoring factual

accuracy and adherence to the party line, rather than assessing narrative quality (which they were ill-equipped to do in any case). The need for an injection of literary excellence into biography was recognised in Politizdat as early as the mid-1950s; thereafter, the identity of the required 'masters of the pen' slowly crystallised, as did the necessary practical links with literary organizations.⁷⁵ As these writers started to write for Politizdat, they also began to range into genres beyond the LRP-style quasi-academic biography and the life summary used in agitprop. The most significant generic innovation came in one of the first major biographical ventures at Politizdat to involve significant numbers of members of the writers' and journalists' unions: a series of five biographical anthologies, each containing roughly 25 short stories about Leninists and Old Bolsheviks. These collections, which opened with the 1963 anthology *At the Sources of the Party*, fused the discontinued tradition of biographical collections and dictionaries with the genre of the biographical tale, both types of biography that had been much more popular in the Lenin era and early Stalinism than in the recent past.⁷⁶

Overall, then, Politizdat responded to the criticisms of the 1950s with a more multi-faceted approach to biography than *Molodaia gvardiia*, where the biographical template of LRP (the comprehensive, documentary-based text) had been set years earlier and was still adhered to assiduously in the sensitive realm of Bolshevik biography. Politizdat's shortage of previous biographical experience liberated it somewhat from this weight of tradition, and, as the next section explores, allowed its texts in particular to include new approaches to psychological portraiture.

The new Bolshevik biographies

In their pursuit of more convincing psychological portraiture, critics of biography have often urged biographers to move away from a 'chronicle' form and towards a more selective and imaginative presentation of moments when the subject's personality is sharply illuminated.⁷⁷ Until the emergence of post-modernist approaches, however, the use of fictional techniques per se remained beyond the mainstream of Western biographical practice, and was typical only for the often maligned sub-genre of the *biographie romancée*.⁷⁸ In the first post-Stalin decade, the chronicle form attracted increasing criticism, but was still widely employed, especially by LRP. Publishers also began to view literary techniques as a panacea for the ills of Bolshevik biography; in time, fictionalization would flourish, especially in Politizdat, but its texts of the early 1960s displayed a cautious embrace of literary techniques in its first attempts to access the inner life and 'soul' of the subject.

Despite the strong critical consensus that had formed within a few years of Stalin's death against summarising and enumerating—and thus ultimately only 'describing'—a life, the majority of post-Stalinist biographies in both Politizdat and LRP remained chronologically linear and comprehensive. Only a few of the shortest biographies dared to select episodes of the hero's life (such as some stories in Politizdat's Leniniana collections, including a tale about Kalinin that focussed only on the few years when he worked in a factory, and the sketches about Bauman and Babushkin in the same volume, which covered only a few years each).⁷⁹ This comprehensive coverage was shaped partly by the template of Stalin's biography, and partly by the well-established 'cradle to grave' narrative tradition of LRP. It also reflected an abiding belief in biography's informational

and educational function, which was slow to be challenged, partly due to the moral importance in the Khrushchev era of resurrecting the 'truth' about stigmatized figures. Indeed, it was in the flurry of biographies of Stalin cult victims that Politizdat published in the early to mid 1960s (including full-length biographies of Kosior and Tukhachevskii, and sketches of figures such as Gamarnik, Postyshev, Rudzutak and Skrypnik in the *Leniniana* collections) that this principle of information compilation and painstaking biographical reconstruction was most clearly in evidence.⁸⁰ A parallel might be drawn with Nathaniel Knight's study in this issue of the scholarly biography, and this attempt to resurrect the party's old guard through careful compilation of surviving evidence.

However, biographers tried to introduce structural change and dramatization despite this continuing tendency to recount the whole life. Some texts of the early 1960s began to experiment with the 'in medias res' technique in order to grip their reader at the outset, narrating an episode from the middle or end of a life as a way to characterise the hero in action, or at a key turning point, before returning to birth and early childhood to embark on the chronological narrative proper. Pavel Podliashuk's Politizdat biography of Inessa Armand opened with the heroine in the midst of a police search of her apartment; while the trope of police harassment continued a long tradition of Bolshevik biographical writing, the scene also concisely characterised her as calm, strikingly beautiful and devoted to her children, even under extreme stress. Before returning to the start of her life, the biography took the second of 'two frames of a picture not yet taken, of the life and activities of Inessa Armand, the start and the end of her path': this time, of Armand's funeral, which intensified these tropes of love for the revolution and the family.⁸¹ Anna Itkina's biography of Alexandra Kollontai,

also for Politizdat, began her narrative with the heroine travelling to Russia on a train in 1917, experiencing the triumph of Bolshevism on home soil for the first time with a sense of 'excitement' (*volnenie*).⁸² This was a personal high-point as well as a key juncture in party and Russian history; it immediately evoked the heroine's emotional investment in revolution, a theme explored throughout the rest of the text. In both these cases, the contrast with the bald report of birth that opened Stalin's *Short Biography* was clear. In an even more striking contrast to Stalinist narrative, the opening to Mukhadze's biography of Ordzhonikidze for LRP plunged the reader straight into the hero's tragic falling-out with Stalin and suicide in 1937, in order to set the leitmotif of its hero's willingness to 'look truth in the eye', before the narrative zoomed backwards to bucolic scenes of Sergo's Caucasian childhood.⁸³

In contrast to these attempts to grip the reader from the start, biographies still usually ended in a formulaic way, with descriptions of death followed by reassurance of the continued 'life' of the hero in collective memory. This still, however, compelled biographers to confront their hero's death, even though this was a sensitive issue for many of those newly included or prioritised in the biographical canon. Terror victims' deaths were normally attributed to the 'cult of personality', rather than to specific agents, and authors were instructed to avoid a 'lachrymose' tone.⁸⁴ However, there remained considerable variation in dramatization of such deaths: Politizdat's and LRP's rival biographies of Kirov and Ordzhonikidze infused very different levels of detail (and bloodshed) into their narratives of the heroes' murder and suicide, as did the various sketches of cult victims in the Leniniana collections.⁸⁵

A more noticeable change from Stalinist poetics was the greater personalisation of the biographer's attitude to the subject, moving away from the ex cathedra style of the *Short Biography*; the biographer's admiration of his subject was supposed to trigger the reader's own attachment to the Bolshevik hero. The Old Bolsheviks and former colleagues of the biographical subject, increasingly hired as biographers in the early 1960s, brought a personal knowledge of their subjects' personalities, serving to humanise and even sentimentalise their biographical accounts. Itkina's biography of Kollontai, for example, drew on her close work with the heroine, which both authenticated and personalised the account, helping her to create a 'warm' portrait of her former boss.⁸⁶ Todorskii's biography of Tukhachevskii for Politizdat likewise emphasised from the outset that he had worked closely with the Marshal (to the extent of being implicated himself in the 'all-Army tragedy' of the late 1930s) and grown to love him, as he hoped contemporary readers would too.⁸⁷ Old Bolsheviks, especially the influential Elena Stasova, also provided paratexts for several works including the Kollontai and Armand biographies and Politizdat's Leniniana anthologies, inviting readers to share her personal, emotional connection with the biographical subjects while also authenticating the biographies' claims to 're-create' (*vossozdat'*) their subjects' personalities.⁸⁸

The Bolshevik personality itself was also represented in new ways, indicating the post-Stalinist imperative to humanise the subjects and indeed to reflect a more complex notion of the human self. Some biographies, though far from all, allotted more space to describing the subject's *lichnaia zhizn'*, such as their marriage and children (the subjects' own childhoods were covered to a similar degree as in the biographies of the 1950s examined earlier). Reinforcing

traditional gender stereotypes, family and children featured most prominently in new biographies of prominent Bolshevik women, such as Kollontai and Armand, whose 'personal [*lichnaia*] drama' was featured at some length (albeit without confronting their challenging ideas about sex and gender, or Armand's true relationship with Lenin, described only as close friendship and mutual assistance). Armand's biographer conceded that motherhood and children 'aren't inscribed at first glance into her image as a professional revolutionary', but claimed that Inessa's maternal devotion was in fact an important facet of her biography.⁸⁹ The domestic life of male revolutionaries was still largely elided, however. Mogilevskii's biography of Leonid Krasin for Politizdat contained just one, belated reference to his marriage and wife ('by this time, he was already married'), while the two publishers' biographies of Kirov both shrank the role of his wife to almost nothing, with Sinelnikov asserting outright that 'the most immaterial thing for him was the strictly personal [*lichnoe*]'.⁹⁰ However, one story in the *At the Sources* collection anchored its narrative around marriage, with Lenin and Krupskaja helping Bauman to propose to his partner (an episode not covered in the earlier LRP biography of Bauman, despite its considerable length).⁹¹

Another 'personalisation' technique that now featured in some biographies was the inclusion of information about the subject's hobbies and (always scant) leisure time. Such information was usually brief and might leap from dietary preferences (in the case of Kirov) to love of music or theatre (a common sign of *kul'turnost'*, shared by Kirov, Kosior, Kollontai, Armand), or deep feelings about nature (a trope also present in some 1940s and 1950s texts, such as the Bauman biography, but more lyrically expressed in new biographies including those of Kollontai, for whom nature was 'a requirement of the soul', and Ordzhonikidze,

inspired by the beauty of the Caucasus).⁹² It often therefore had the paradoxical effect of hiving off the 'personal' into the text's periphery and reinforced the primacy of politics.

However, there were also attempts to personalise the political itself as a realm of emotional experience and personal drama. This emphasis on the profound impact of ideology on the 'soul' was not new in Bolshevik discourse, which had often imagined coming to consciousness in spiritual and quasi-religious terms, but the ways in which the 'soul' was dramatised in early post-Stalinist biographies stretched across a wider emotional and psychological range.⁹³ Some still paid little more than lip service to the new requirements for emotional sincerity, such as Mogilevskii's biography of Krasin, which referred only rarely, and vaguely, to the state of his 'soul' without further elaboration.⁹⁴ However, others took the idea of the 'soul' of the subject more seriously, trying out new methods to explore it. Romantic and Promethean tropes featured in some texts' dramatization of coming to consciousness, reflecting the broader Khrushchev-era revival of *romantika*.⁹⁵ One of the first Politizdat biographies by a literary writer, Irina Guro, sought to dramatise Anton Kostiusko's emotionally tumultuous journey to revolution through the metaphor of a boat turning to ride into the storm (echoed later in a description of him as a 'lone voyager' on the stormy seas of revolution), and later, with the imagery of the hero opening his wings to set flight into freedom.⁹⁶ Another literary writer who started to write for Politizdat at this time, Arsenii Rut'ko, directly drew on Gor'kii's revolutionary Romanticism in his sketch about Krzhizhanosvkii for the *At the Sources* collection. The hero was characterised as a 'dreamer' (*mechtatel'*), through the use of the Gorkyan motif of a childhood campfire exploding into the national conflagration of revolution. The

sketch ended, however, by extrapolating the Romantic trope of the lone dreamer into a 'type': all the Old Bolsheviks commemorated in the Leniniana project were dreamers of the same ilk.⁹⁷

Other biographers used techniques drawn more from realism than Romanticism (though many combined both, as remained typical in post-Stalinist Socialist Realism). In the biographies of Kollontai and Armand, in a further reflection of the gendering of the new biographies, the 'soul' featured particularly frequently in accounts of the heroines' involvement with revolution. Both were depicted as emotionally sensitive to injustice, with this distress propelling them instinctively toward the party (as much as learning from what they had read, which earlier texts, such as the 1950s Bauman and Babushkin biographies, had shown as the main influence on revolutionary consciousness). Passages of free indirect discourse (adapted carefully from diaries) dramatised the troubled state of Kollontai's 'soul' as she observed the problems of pre-revolutionary society. Podliashuk, meanwhile, explicitly refused to impose a linear narrative on the account of Armand's development into a revolutionary; there was no single turning point (*rubezh*) that transformed her, but rather a process of personal development that the biographer must compose 'like a mosaic-maker' from the sources available.⁹⁸ In both these cases, and in most other biographies of the time, the biographers continued to emphasise the strong documentary foundation to their claims about personality, only showing inner life where they had concrete evidence for it.⁹⁹

The attempt to infuse the process of coming to consciousness with affect was perhaps most visible in Poltizdat's Leniniana project, which explicitly positioned itself as a first foray into a new type of Bolshevik biography: in her

foreword to the second volume (published in 1964), Stasova denied that the sketches in the collection were 'life descriptions' (*zhizneopisaniia*), but described them instead as intimate explorations of how each figure had developed a love of revolution and Lenin(ism).¹⁰⁰ Lev Davydov, editor of the series, attempted to set an example for this type of biography with his sketches about Kurnatovskii and Dzhaparidze in the first and second volumes respectively. While acknowledging that it was hard to access the 'movements of the soul', especially of Dzhaparidze whose 'life [was] as big as the ocean', he tried to show how the heroes had fallen in love with the revolution, and with Lenin as its leader.¹⁰¹ The sketch about Kurnatovskii opened with the hero spending the night in heartfelt conversation with Lenin in a hunting lodge. The narrative later moved back to Kurnatovskii's earlier life and the beginnings of his relationship with Lenin, and then forward to the end of his life, to trace how his feelings about the leader had intensified over the years, and to show his devotion to the revolution as highly personal, and deeply emotional.¹⁰² Even post-revolutionary party work was occasionally reimagined as a personal as well as political drama. Thus Kollontai's struggle with oppositionist ideas in the early 1920s was recounted largely as a 'tussle in her soul' and as another expression of her 'perpetually stormy, restless soul'.¹⁰³

However, where such ideological drama or doubt was absent, the period after the revolution and civil war usually proved stubbornly resistant to dramatization, with later chapters of many biographies cantering through party posts, and clearly struggling to infuse vitality into leaders' relentlessly hard work in party control, city-planning or taxes, for example.¹⁰⁴ And whether or not they had traced the subject's emotional life in detail, biographies usually closed with the heroes' and heroines' (and indeed their relatives' and successors') feelings of

unalloyed 'happiness' about the continuation of the Soviet cause even after their lives had ended.¹⁰⁵

Conclusion: Biographical Reform and Stagnation in the 1960s

By the end of the Khrushchev era, then, Bolshevik biography had risen from almost nothing to become the fastest growing sector of Politizdat, and it had evolved into a more prominent subsection of the LRP series too. The reception of this growing and diversifying corpus of Bolshevik biographies in the early 1960s saw critics and editors identifying innovations to pursue further, even as they grew increasingly impatient about the stubborn obstacles to biographical reform.

As already established by the end of the 1950s, compilation of dry detail was now decisively unacceptable as a biographical method. This was clear when rival biographies of Kirov published by LRP and Politizdat in the early 1960s both attracted criticism for failing to move beyond such 'compilation' and fixating on trivial details of the life, rather than 'recreating' Kirov's personality for readers.¹⁰⁶ Meanwhile, critics' praise for new biographies valorised above all the texts' ability to show their subjects as real, living people. The biographies of Kollontai and Ordzhonikidze, in Politizdat and LRP respectively, were both praised for resurrecting their subjects.¹⁰⁷ This idea was most extensively developed in a high-profile paean of praise for the *At the Sources* collection, which contrasted the 'didactic life description' of past biographies to the 'agitation' of the reader's encounters with real-life Bolsheviks via vivid sketches. For Old Bolsheviks, such as Stasova, such textual encounters revived poignant memories of revolutionary comradeship; new generations of readers, meanwhile, would fall in love with

these vividly depicted personalities and would instinctively desire to emulate them. The cross-generational transmission of revolutionary values, the aim of the biographical innovation undertaken since Stalin's death, would thereby be achieved.¹⁰⁸

Within Politizdat, such prominent praise—and, just as important, the high sales achieved by the Leniniana collections and biographies such as *Comrade Inessa*, quickly reissued after selling out its first run—endowed editors with greater confidence to define what its recent biographies had done right and wrong. Internal reviews of the early 1960s publications now decisively prioritised affect and the evocation of personality as the best way to achieve propaganda goals. The goal was to 're-create' a 'clear' and 'lively' image of the individual: by looking into the 'soul' of the subject, biographies would in turn touch the souls of their readers.¹⁰⁹ On the other hand, according to his colleague Lobarev (whose comments on biography opened this article), clichéd language and superficial characterisation would 'skim along the surface of the imagination, not touching the most complex clavier of our brains'.¹¹⁰ It was better for biographers to verge on the sentimental, as Itkina and Podliashuk had in their accounts of Kollontai and Armand respectively, or to be heartfelt, as Todorskii had been in writing about Tukhachevskii, than it was to produce cold life summaries in 'officialese', as had Melchin's biography of Kosior.¹¹¹ The text that best epitomised this move away from unimaginative and unevocative biographies was *At the Sources*, praised consistently within Politizdat for achieving high sales, critical acclaim and literary quality and for representing a genuinely 'new type of artistic-political book'.¹¹²

Politizdat quickly moved to capitalise on the success of this Leniniana collection, by publishing several successor volumes within a short period and also

by hatching plans for a similar biographical initiative under the same editorship (of Lev Davydov), but on a far more ambitious scale, encompassing a greater range of 'revolutionary' subjects and book-length biographical accounts.¹¹³ In 1963, Politizdat managers already started to discuss a series, initially entitled 'Remarkable Revolutionaries' (*Zamechatel'nye revoliutsionery*).¹¹⁴ Although their new series borrowed the initial name, ambitious scope and guiding concept of the 'remarkable' from LRP, Politizdat editors soon adopted a strategy of distinguishing themselves from the older series, denouncing its failings in Bolshevik biography, and promising to compensate for them.¹¹⁵ In their attempts to dispel anxieties about duplication, Politizdat editors cited LRP's ongoing failures to prioritise Bolshevik biography and to raise its aesthetic standards.¹¹⁶ Requesting party and state permission for the series, they confidently described revolutionaries, and Bolsheviks in particular, as a peripheral strand and 'political appendage' in LRP, where texts were more turgid than the rest of the series' output.¹¹⁷ Politizdat's new series by contrast would concentrate exclusively on revolutionaries, and would be written in 'artistic prose', building on the innovations of the Leniniana collections, such as the use of psychologization and affect, and the commissioning of literary writers.¹¹⁸

At the same time, the editors of LRP themselves acknowledged to the party authorities that its Bolshevik biographies were indeed continuing to fall short in terms of both quantity and stylistic quality.¹¹⁹ However, its promises of improvement were vague, and its proposals for innovation limited to publishing biographical collections as an occasional 'exception'.¹²⁰ Consequently, LRP again came under fire in the Soviet press at the start of the Brezhnev era for similar problems as had been identified a decade earlier.¹²¹ While Politizdat's

biographical innovations continued to gather pace in the early Brezhnev era, LRP's Bolshevik coverage therefore increasingly seemed backward and stagnant.

Party and state approval of Politizdat's new series—now entitled 'Fiery Revolutionaries'—came in 1964-65, despite some concerns about duplication of LRP, with its first texts published from 1968 onwards.¹²² These early years of the series witnessed fierce internal contestation over genre, form and the use of imagination, which limited the series' literary innovations and its popular acclaim (as did the fact that its initial cohort was dominated by little-known specialists in Leniniana recruited from the *At the Sources* series and other Politizdat biography publishing). By the 1970s, though, the series had branched into a range of genres, most notably the biographical novel (as opposed to the artistic-documentary texts examined above). It also attracted an unprecedented number and range of celebrated literary writers (including Bulat Okudzhava, Iurii Trifonov, Iurii Davydov, Vasilii Aksenov and Vladimir Voinovich).¹²³

Like many reforms to Stalinist practices in the 1950s and 1960s, both publishers' attempts to reform Bolshevik biography were driven not only by shame at past errors, but also by optimism, even utopianism—in this case, by the belief in reconnecting the population directly to the revolution's vivid cast of characters. In the first post-Stalin decade publishers and Soviet authorities alike believed that Bolshevik biographies, despite their powerful tendencies to depersonalization and their political sensitivity, could and should attempt emotionally affecting and psychologically convincing portraiture. On the one hand, these two publishers' only partly successful attempts to create such portraits offer further proof of the inherent difficulties of the genre, in particular its demands to evoke personality. On the other hand, they demonstrate that Soviet

biography's urgent need to reconnect with its readers pushed it to stretch, and eventually transgress, the generic limits (on fictionalization, for example) still constraining most Western biography of the period.

Ultimately, however, evoking the personalities of Bolsheviks and other revolutionaries was a more urgent task for Politizdat, a CC publisher dedicated to political and propagandistic literature, than for the distinctive niche that the eclectic and cosmopolitan LRP occupied within the Komsomol's main publisher. Politizdat's reforms to Bolshevik biography continued into the 1980s, while LRP's Bolshevik lives always remained one of the least prominent strands in the series. Although other, much more popular aspects of LRP, such as its coverage of cultural figures and international subjects (and its increasing use of foreign authors), made it the most important series of the late Soviet boom in biographical publishing, its portraits of revolutionaries consistently lagged behind those of Politizdat.¹²⁴ Both publishers therefore played an important role in bringing the genre(s) of biography to the forefront of critical and popular attention in the Brezhnev era, and in contributing to the period's broader debates about the significance and complexity of the individual socialist personality.

¹ The author would like to thank the participants of the conference 'Writing and Reading Russian Biography in the 19th and 20th centuries' (University College, Oxford, 2014), the anonymous reviewers for SEER, Anatoly Pinsky, Simon Huxtable and Anna Krylova for their help with this article. The research for this article was funded by the Leverhulme Trust, British Academy and John Fell Fund, Oxford.

² Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv sotsial'no-politicheskoi istorii (henceforth RGASPI), f. 623, op. 1, d. 305, l. 5.

³ Ibid., l. 6.

⁴ William Ayers, 'Current Biography in Communist China,' *The Journal of Asian Studies* 21, August 1962, 4, pp. 477–85; John A. Garraty, 'Chinese and Western Biography: A Comparison,' *The Journal of Asian Studies* 21, 1962, 4, pp. 487–89; Nigel Hamilton, *Biography: A Brief History*, Cambridge, MA and London, 2007; Daniel Madelénat, *La biographie*, Paris, 1984; Janos Bak, 'Political Biography and Memoir in Totalitarian Eastern Europe,' in George Egerton (ed.), *Political Memoir. Essays on the Politics of Memory*, London, 1994, pp. 293–301.

⁵ Dai Wenbao, 'Biography of China in the Last Ten Years,' in *Biography East and West*, Honolulu, 1989, pp. 50–62; Josie McLellan, 'The Politics of Communist Biography: Alfred Kantorowicz and the Spanish Civil War,' *German History* 22, October 2004, 4, pp. 536–62; Catherine Epstein, 'The

Production of 'Official Memory' in East Germany: Old Communists and the Dilemmas of Memoir-Writing,' *Central European History* 32, January 1999, 2, pp. 181–201; Bak, 'Political Biography and Memoir'; Balázs Apor, 'Leader in the Making: The Role of Biographies in Constructing the Cult of Mátyás Rákosi,' in Balázs Apor et al. (eds.), *The Leader Cult in Communist Dictatorships*, Basingstoke, 2004, pp. 63–80.

⁶ E.g. Fedor Vasil'evich Konstantinov, *Lichnost' pri sotsializme* (Moskva: nauka, 1968).

⁷ The literature is enormous, and analysed further below, but some of the best-known meditations on the problem of personality include Leon Edel, *Writing Lives: Principia Biographica*, New York and London, 1987; John A. Garraty, *The Nature of Biography*, London, 1958; André Maurois, *Aspects of Biography*, Cambridge, 1929. On political biography's particular problems with personality, see e.g. Lucy Riall, 'The Shallow End of History? The Substance and Future of Political Biography,' *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 40, January 2010, 3, pp. 375–97; Hans Renders and Binne De Haan, *Theoretical Discussions of Biography: Approaches from History, Microhistory and Life Writing*, Leiden, 2014.

⁸ Katerina Clark, 'Little Heroes and Big Deeds: Literature Responds to the First Five Year Plan' in Sheila Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Cultural Revolution in Russia, 1928-1931*, Bloomington, 1978; Katerina Clark, *The Soviet Novel: History as Ritual*, 3rd ed., Bloomington, 2000; David Brandenberger, *Propaganda State in Crisis: Soviet Ideology, Indoctrination, and Terror under Stalin, 1927-1941*, New Haven and London, 2011; David Brandenberger, 'Stalin as Symbol: A Case Study of the Cult of Personality and Its Construction' in Sarah Davies and James Harris (eds.), *Stalin: A New History*, Cambridge, 2005, pp. 249–270; Jochen Hellbeck, 'Galaxy of Black Stars: The Power of Soviet Biography,' *American Historical Review*, 114, June 2009, 3, pp. 615–624; Anna Krylova, 'Imagining Socialism in the Soviet Century,' *Social History* 42, 2017, 3, pp. 315–341.

⁹ On neo-Romanticism, see Katerina Clark, "'Wait for Me and I Shall Return: The Early Thaw as a Reprise of Thirties Culture?'" in Denis Kozlov and Eleonory Gilburd (eds.), *The Thaw: Soviet Society and Culture in the 1950s and 1960s*, Toronto, 2013; Anatoly Pinsky, 'The Origins of Post-Stalin Individuality: Aleksandr Tvardovskii and the Evolution of 1930s Soviet Romanticism,' *Russian Review* 76, July 2017, 3, 458–483. Trenchant analyses of the peculiar subjectivity of the Stalin era include Svetlana Boym, 'How Is the Soviet Subjectivity Made?,' *Ab Imperio*, 3, 2002, <http://abimperio.net/cgi-bin/aishow.pl?state=showa&idart=68&idlang=1&Code=>; Aleksandr Etkind, 'Soviet Subjectivity: Torture for the Sake of Salvation?,' *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 6, 2005, 1, pp. 171–186.

¹⁰ Clark, *Soviet Novel*; Rufus W. Mathewson, *The Positive Hero in Russian Literature*, 2nd ed., Stanford, 1975; Irina Paperno, *Chernyshevsky and the Age of Realism: A Study in the Semiotics of Behavior*, Stanford, 1988.

¹¹ Clark, *Soviet Novel*.

¹² Matthew E. Lenoe, *Closer to the Masses: Stalinist Culture, Social Revolution, and Soviet Newspapers*, Cambridge, MA, 2004; David Brandenberger, *Propaganda State in Crisis: Soviet Ideology, Indoctrination, and Terror under Stalin, 1927-1941*, New Haven and London, 2011.

¹³ Jochen Hellbeck and Klaus Heller (eds.), *Autobiographical Practices in Russia = Autobiographische Praktiken in Russland*, Göttingen, 2004; Pinsky, 'Origins of post-Stalin Individuality'; Krylova, 'Imagining Socialism'.

¹⁴ Ruth Hoberman, *Modernizing Lives: Experiments in English Biography, 1918-1939*, Carbondale, 1987; Laura Marcus, *Dreams of Modernity*, Cambridge, 2014; Maurois, *Aspects of Biography*.

¹⁵ E.g. Leon Edel, *Literary Biography. The Alexander Lectures, 1955-56*, London, 1957; Garraty, *The Nature of Biography*. See James L. Clifford, *Biography as an Art: Selected Criticism, 1560-1960*, London, 1962, pp. 185–239, for a selection of mid-century critiques, many of which revolve around the problem of personality.

¹⁶ See previous note's references, and also Paul Murray Kendall, *The Art of Biography*, London, 1965.

¹⁷ Anatoly Lunacharskii, *Revoliutsionnye siluety*, Moscow, 1923; Brandenberger, 'Stalin as Symbol'.

¹⁸ Clark, 'Little Heroes and Big Deeds'; Clark, *The Soviet Novel*, pp. 118–24; Inna Bulkina, 'The Lives of Remarkable People: Between Plutarch and Triapichkin,' *Russian Studies in Literature* 49, April 2013, 2, pp. 87–95.; S. Semanov et al., *ZhZL. Katalog, 1933-1973*, Moscow, 1974, pp. 5–18; G. E. Pomerantseva, *Biografiia v potoke vremeni: ZhZL, zamysly i voploshcheniia serii*, Moscow, 1987.

¹⁹ Clark, *The Soviet Novel*, pp. 122–24; Claude Pénnetier and Bernard Pudal, 'Stalinism: Workers' Cult and Cult of Leaders,' *Twentieth Century Communism* 1, June 2009, 1, pp. 20–29.

- ²⁰ It has often been pointed out that biography is 'used' in many, perhaps all, cultures for similar purposes (Edwin Paxton Hood, *The Uses of Biography: Romantic, Philosophic, and Didactic*, London, 1852; Peter France, William St. Clair, and British Academy, *Mapping Lives William St. Clair, and*, Oxford, 2002).
- ²¹ Pennetier and Pudal, 'Stalinism'; Brandenberger, *Propaganda State in Crisis*.
- ²² Brandenberger, 'Stalin as Symbol'.
- ²³ Ibid.; Pennetier, 'Stalinism'; Apor, 'The Role of Biographies'. A good example of Bolshevik biography after the *Short Biography* is: D Ershov, *Ivan Vasil'evich Babushkin*, Moscow, 1939.
- ²⁴ Semanov, *Katalog*, pp. 103-06.
- ²⁵ S. V. Bakhrushin, *Ivan Groznyi*, Moscow, 1942; V. Snegirev, *Ivan Tretii i ego vremia: obrazovanie russkogo natsional'nogo gosudarstva*, Moscow, 1942; V. V. Danilevskii, *Aleksandr Nevskii*, Moscow, 1943. On the revival of Russian heroes, see David Brandenberger, *National Bolshevism: Stalinist Mass Culture and the Formation of Modern Russian National Identity, 1931-1956* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2002); Kevin M. F. Platt and David Brandenberger, *Epic Revisionism: Russian History and Literature as Stalinist Propaganda*, Madison, 2006.
- ²⁶ RGASPI-m, f.42, op.2, d. 1228, l. 1 and passim.
- ²⁷ RGASPI-m, f.42, op.2, d. 1228, l. 1.
- ²⁸ E.g. D Ershov, *Ivan Vasil'evich Babushkin*. Moscow, 1939; Vladimir Il'ich Lenin, *Ivan Vasil'evich Babushkin*, Moscow, 1940; S. D. Mstislavskii, *Grach, ptitsa vesenniaia: povest' o N. E. Bauman*, Moscow, 1946.
- ²⁹ Mikhail Andreevich Novoselov, *Nikolai Ernestovich Bauman: 1873-1905*, Moscow, 1951; Mikhail Andreevich Novoselov, *Ivan Vasil'evich Babushkin, 1873-1906*, Moscow, 1954.
- ³⁰ M. Anan'ev, V. Lebedev, *M. V. Frunze, 1885-1925*, Moscow, 1957. Compare V. Lebedev, *Komandarm: povest'*, Leningrad, 1940.
- ³¹ Materials on commissioning and editing of LRP texts, and correspondence with Soviet authorities, form the vast majority of available materials in the LRP archive, most of whose whereabouts or even survival remain unclear.
- ³² RGASPI-m, f. 42, op. 2, d. 1239, ll. 3, 8.
- ³³ Ibid., l. 12; RGASPI-m, f. 42, op. 2, d. 1255, l. 55.
- ³⁴ RGASPI-m, f. 42, op. 2, d. 1255, ll. 48-50.
- ³⁵ Novoselov, *Ivan Vasil'evich Babushkin*, pp. 5-15
- ³⁶ RGASPI-m, f. 42, op. 2, d. 1239, l. 2; RGASPI-m, f.42, op.2, 1255/45.
- ³⁷ RGASPI-m, f.42, op.2, d.1642, l. 103-15.
- ³⁸ RGASPI-m, f.42, op.2, d.1230, l. 7; d. 1642, ll. 103-14.
- ³⁹ RGASPI-m, f.42, op.2, d.1230, l. 10; d. 1642, ll. 98-102, 103-10.
- ⁴⁰ RGASPI-m, f.42, op.2, d.1642, ll. 98-102.
- ⁴¹ RGASPI-m, f.42, op.2, d.1230, ll. 9-18.
- ⁴² RGASPI-m, f.42, op.2, d.1230, l. 18.
- ⁴³ RGASPI-m, f.42, op.2, d.1230, ll. 5-7, 65, 76.
- ⁴⁴ On this saga, see RGASPI-m, f.42, op.2, d.1642, passim., and especially ll. 166, 175. 192, 201-03.
- ⁴⁵ RGASPI-m, f.42, op.2, d.1642, l. 200.
- ⁴⁶ RGASPI-m, f.42, op.2, d.1642, ll. 103-15.
- ⁴⁷ RGASPI-m, f.42, op.2, d.1642, ll. 160-61.
- ⁴⁸ RGASPI-m, f.42, op.2, d.1642, ll. 160-61, 22-25.
- ⁴⁹ RGASPI-m, f.42, op.2, d.1642, ll. 1, 22-25, 217.
- ⁵⁰ N. Vigilianskiĭ, *Povest' o Frunze*, Moscow, 1957 (1941).
- ⁵¹ Lenoe, *Closer to the Masses*; Brandenberger, *Propaganda State in Crisis*.
- ⁵² A Melnikov and F Feigina, 'O serii knig ZhZl,' *Voprosy istorii*, 9, 1955, pp. 108-9.
- ⁵³ Other complaints about small numbers of Bolshevik biographies include: I Riabov, 'Narodnyi geroi,' *Partiinaia zhizn*, 23, 1955, pp. 71-76; G Prusova, 'Zhizn geroia: primer dlia molodezhi,' *Voprosy istorii KPSS*, 3, 1958, pp. 216-19.
- ⁵⁴ B Raevskii, 'Soldat revoliutsii,' *Neva*, 8, 1955, pp. 180-81; 'Narodnyi geroi Russkoi revoliutsii,' *Molodoi kommunist*, 6, 1955, pp. 126-27; Prusova, 'Zhizn geroia--primer dlia molodezhi'; Riabov, 'Narodnyi geroi'.
- ⁵⁵ Riabov, 'Narodnyi geroi'; Prusova, 'Zhizn geroia--primer dlia molodezhi'.
- ⁵⁶ Raevskii, 'Soldat revoliutsii'.
- ⁵⁷ Riabov, 'Narodnyi geroi'.
- ⁵⁸ Ibid.; Prusova, 'Zhizn geroia--primer dlia molodezhi'.
- ⁵⁹ 'Knigi o geroiakh Oktiabria,' *Kommunist*, 15, 1958, pp. 123-28.

- ⁶⁰ Prusova, 'Zhizn geroia--primer dlia molodezhi'.
- ⁶¹ RGASPI-m, f.42, op.2, d. 1281, l. 2.
- ⁶² RGASPI-m, f.42, op.2, d. 1281, ll. 10-14.
- ⁶³ RGASPI, f. 623, op. 1, d. 187, l. 193 (passim.)
- ⁶⁴ RGASPI, f. 623, op. 1, d. 193.
- ⁶⁵ RGASPI, f. 623, op. 1, d. 273 (discussion of 40 series in Politizdat, many of them biographical). The 'Tales of the Tasks' series was often praised (RGASPI, f. 623, op. 1, dd. 218, 284, 295).
- ⁶⁶ P. I. Berezov, *Valerian Vladimirovich Kuibyshev, 1888-1935*, Moscow, 1958.
- ⁶⁷ One letter from the author to the series editor refers to the 1946 commissioning of a Kuibyshev biography, which was never published despite being approved (RGASPI-m, f.42, op.2, d. 1504, ll. 19-20).
- ⁶⁸ RGASPI-m, f.42, op.2, d. 1504, ll. 21-28.
- ⁶⁹ RGASPI-m, f.42, op.2, d. 1504, ll. 9-13, 17, 19-28, 30.
- ⁷⁰ RGASPI-m, f.42, op.2, d. 1281, ll. 10-14.
- ⁷¹ Ibid.
- ⁷² RGASPI, f. 623, op. 1, d. 284, ll. 289.
- ⁷³ RGASPI, f. 623, op. 1, d.284, l. 285; Tsentral'nyi arkhiv sotsial'no-politicheskoi istorii Moskvy (henceforth TsAOPIM), f. 819, op. 1, d. 32.
- ⁷⁴ E.g. A. Melchin (biographer of Kosior) was a historian at IML.
- ⁷⁵ TsAOPIM, f. 819, op. 1, d. 22; TsAOPIM, f. 819, op. 1, d. 34.
- ⁷⁶ L. D. Davydov, *U istokov partii: rasskazy o soratnikakh V. I. Lenina*, Moscow, 1963.
- ⁷⁷ This was one of the key appeals of Lytton Strachey and other 'new biographers' of the 1920s (Marcus, *Dreams of Modernity*; Hoberman, *Modernising Lives*). It was also central to Irving Stone's arguments in favour of the biographical novel (Irving Stone, *The Biographical Novel*, 1957).
- ⁷⁸ On the often pejorative attitude to novelized biography in the 1950s and 1960s (and beyond), see the contemporary analyses: Stone, *Biographical Novel*; Carl Bode, 'The Buxom Biographies,' *College English* 16, 1955, 5, pp. 265-269; and the retrospective analysis of the genre's eventual rise to respectability in Michael Lackey, *The American Biographical Novel*, London, 2016. On the desire, even amongst literary-minded critics of the period, to keep biography from straying into fiction (setting the limit at the novelistic biography), see Edel, *Literary Biography*; Kendall, *The Art of Biography*.
- ⁷⁹ Davydov, *U istokov partii*: pp. 9-30; Davydov, *Partiia shagaet*, pp. 117-31.
- ⁸⁰ Aleksandr Ivanovich Todorskii, *Marshal Tukhachevskii*, Moscow, 1963; A. I. Mel'chin, *Stanislav Kosior*. Moscow, 1964; L. D. Davydov, *Partiia shagaet v revoliutsiiu: rasskazy o soratnikakh V. I. Lenina*, Moscow, 1964.
- ⁸¹ Pavel Isaakovich Podliashuk, *Tovarishch Inessa*, Moscow, 1963, p. 7.
- ⁸² A. Itkina, *Revoliutsioner, tribun, diplomat*, Moscow: Politizdat, 1964, p. 6.
- ⁸³ I. Dubinskii-Mukhadze, *Ordzhonikidze*, Moscow, 1963, pp. 3-6. This material about the suicide had also been the sample material submitted to the press as part of the book proposal, and Mukhadze described the death as the most important aspect of his research for the text.
- ⁸⁴ RGASPI-m, f.42, op.2, d. 1662, l. 5.
- ⁸⁵ The Politizdat biography of Kirov devoted 10 pages to a suspenseful account of Kirov's (unidentified) assassin (S. Krasnikov, *Sergei Mironovich Kirov: zhizn' i deiatel'nost'*, Moscow, 1964, pp. 193-202, whereas Sinelnikov's biography was very brief about it (Sinelnikov, *Kirov*, p. 363). Kirillov's biography of Ordzhonikidze for Politizdat analysed the historiography of his death (G. Kirillov, *Ordzhonikidze-Sergo. Biografiia*, Moscow, 1963, p. 321. The LRP editor, Korotkov, had urged Mukhadze to be cautious on the subject, as 'not everything known [about the death] can be published' (RGASPI-m, f.42, op.2, d. 1664, ll. 17-18), and the biography ultimately devoted three dramatic pages to the suicide (Mukhadze, *Ordzhonikidze*, pp. 4-7). In the numerous sketches about cult victims in the second Leniniana volume, accounts ranged from detailed narratives of the arrests to standardized phraseology about the cult of personality (Davydov, *Partiia shagaet*).
- ⁸⁶ Itkina, *Revoliutsioner, tribun, diplomat*, p. 3, p. 28 (one of their first conversations), p. 75 (her personal impressions of one of Kollontai's speeches) and p. 126 (their last meeting before Kollontai's death).
- ⁸⁷ Todorskii, *Marshal Tukhachevskii*, pp. 3-4. Compare Mukhadze's claim of personal knowledge of Ordzhonikidze in his proposal (RGASPI-m, f.42, op.2, d. 1664, ll. 1-2).
- ⁸⁸ Itkina, *Revoliutsioner, tribun, diplomat*, p. 4; Podliashuk, *Tovarishch Inessa*, pp. 3-4 (Stasova claims to 'remember the multi-facetedness of Inessa'); Davydov, *U istokov partii*, p. 5.

- ⁸⁹ Itkina, *Revoliutsioner, tribun, diplomat*, pp. 48-49, 99; Podliashuk, *Tovarishch Inessa*, pp. 60, 65, 23, 39, 52-54, 73.
- ⁹⁰ B. Mogilevskii, *Nikitich*, Moscow, 1963, p. 64; Sinel'nikov, *Kirov*, p. 352; Krasnikov, *Kirov*, pp. 67-68 (sole references to wife).
- ⁹¹ Davydov, *U istokov*, pp. 20-30.
- ⁹² Krasnikov, *Kirov*, pp. 187-89; Sinel'nikov, *Kirov*, pp. 356, 359, 129-34; Podliashuk, *Tovarishch Inessa*, pp. 80-82; Mel'chin, *Kosior*, p. 53; Itkina, *Revoliutsioner, tribun, diplomat*, p. 19; Mukhadze, *Ordzhonikidze*, p. 18.
- ⁹³ Igal Halfin, *From Darkness to Light: Class, Consciousness, and Salvation in Revolutionary Russia*, Pittsburgh, 1999; Igal Halfin, *Terror in My Soul: Communist Autobiographies on Trial*, Cambridge, MA, 2003; Jochen Hellbeck, *Revolution on My Mind: Writing a Diary under Stalin*, Cambridge, MA and London, 2006.
- ⁹⁴ Mogilevskii, *Nikitich*, pp. 33, 109.
- ⁹⁵ Katerina Clark, "'Wait for Me'"; Pinsky, 'Origins of post-Stalinist Individuality'; Serguei Alex Oushakine, "Sotzromantizm and Its Theaters of Life," *Rethinking Marxism* 29, no. 1 (January 2, 2017): 8-15, doi:10.1080/08935696.2017.1316101.
- ⁹⁶ Irina Guro, *Podvig Antona Kostiusko*, Moscow, 1961, pp. 7, 73.
- ⁹⁷ Davydov, *U istokov partii*, pp. 188, 200.
- ⁹⁸ Itkina, *Revoliutsioner, tribun, diplomat*, pp. 7, 9-11; Podliashuk, *Tovarishch Inessa*, pp. 17, 7, 11, 13-14.
- ⁹⁹ E.g. Lev Davydov's description of his largely failed attempts to locate evidence for the content of Kurnatovskii's conversation with Lenin: Davydov, *U istokov partii*, pp. 222-23. Compare Podliashuk's meta-narrative of trying to fill the 'gaps' (*probely*) in sources (Podliashuk, *Tovarishch Inessa*, pp. 9, 17).
- ¹⁰⁰ Davydov, *Partiia shagaet*, pp. 120-40.
- ¹⁰¹ Ibid., 124, 120.
- ¹⁰² Davydov, *U istokov partii*, pp. 220-39.
- ¹⁰³ Itkina, *Revoliutsioner, tribun, diplomat*, p. 107.
- ¹⁰⁴ Mogilevskii, *Nikitich*; Krasnikov, *Kirov*.
- ¹⁰⁵ Itkina, *Revoliutsioner, tribun, diplomat*; Mukhadze, *Ordzhonikidze*, 376.
- ¹⁰⁶ M Nepriakhin, "Novye biografii Kirova," *Moskva*, 4, 1965, pp. 194-95. Indeed, Sinel'nikov's biography for LRP had nearly not been published, such were the concerns about the text's 'entirely inadequate depiction of Kirov the person'; when readers later wrote to Molodaia gvardiia to complain about errors, the LRP editors turned down their requests for a corrected second edition, on the grounds that the book was not of high enough quality to be reissued, RGASPI-m, f.42, op.2, d. 1749, passim.
- ¹⁰⁷ 'Tarkaia zhizn', *Izvestiia*, 8 July 1964, p. 3; 'Pravde v glaza!', *Izvestiia*, 21 November 1963, p. 4.
- ¹⁰⁸ 'Riadom s Leninym', *Izvestiia*, 4 July 1963, p. 3.
- ¹⁰⁹ RGASPI, f. 623, op.1, d. 285, l. 298.
- ¹¹⁰ RGASPI, f. 623, op.1, d. 305, l. 15.
- ¹¹¹ RGASPI, f. 623, op.1, dd. 298, 305.
- ¹¹² RGASPI, f. 623, op.1, d. 294, l. 8; RGASPI, f. 623, op.1, d. 298; TsAOPIM, f. 819, op. 1, d. 32, 33, 34.
- ¹¹³ RGASPI, f. 623, op.1, d. 288.
- ¹¹⁴ RGASPI, f. 623, op.1, d. 284; TsAOPIM, f. 819, op. 1, d.34; RGALI, f. 2464, op. 3, d. 141; RGASPI, f. 623, op.1, d. 312.
- ¹¹⁵ RGASPI, f. 623, op.1, d. 285, 288, 293.
- ¹¹⁶ RGASPI, f. 623, op.1, d. 299, 306.
- ¹¹⁷ RGASPI, f. 623, op.1, d. 69; Gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Rossiiskoi Federatsii (henceforth GARF), f. 9604, op. 2, d. 365; RGASPI, f. 623, op.1, dd. 305; 306; 312; 313.
- ¹¹⁸ E.g. RGASPI, f. 623, op.1, d. 299.
- ¹¹⁹ RGASPI-m, f.42, op.2, d. 1281, ll. 10-14.
- ¹²⁰ Ibid.
- ¹²¹ G Volokhova, 'Seriia Biografii ZhZL,' *Voprosy Istorii*, 5, 1965, pp. 128-36.
- ¹²² RGASPI, f. 623, op.1, d. 293; GARF, f. 9604, op. 2, d. 365.
- ¹²³ Polly Jones, "The Fire Burns On? The 'Fiery Revolutionaries' Biographical Series and the Rethinking of Propaganda in the Brezhnev Era," *Slavic Review* 74, April 2015, 1, pp. 32-56; V, Zhukova, M. Litovskaia, 'Seriia Plamennye revoliutiosnery: istoricheskii roman kak vospitatel' svobodomyслиia', *Filologiia i kul'tura*, 4, 2012.

¹²⁴ Pomerantseva, *Biografiia v potoke vremeni*; Ludmilla A. Trigos and Carol R. Ueland, 'Literary Biographies in the Lives of Remarkable People Series (zhizn' zamechatel'nykh liudei),' *Slavic & East European Journal* 60, Summer 2016, 2, pp. 207–20.