ASPECTS OF MODERN RUSSIAN AND CZECH LITERATURE

Selected Papers of the Third World Congress for Soviet and East European Studies

Edited by

Arnold McMillin

Slavica Publishers, Inc.
1985

The Theme of Terror in *Starik*

Herman Ermolaev

Iurii Trifonov's interest in terror stems to a large extent from the fate of his family. His father Valentin Trifonov, a Bolshevik since 1904 and a member of revolutionary military councils on various Civil War fronts, was shot in 1937 or 1938 at the peak of the purges. His mother spent eight years in prison camps and exile. His uncle Evgenii Trifonov, an old Bolshevik revolutionary and a writer, died of a heart attack in December 1937 while awaiting arrest.

Trifonov's approach to terror mirrors his view that "the past exists in the present as well as in the future," that "history... shapes contemporaneity."[1] This kind of linkage raises the question of the continuity of terror.

The themes of terror or terrorism are treated in a number of Trifonov's works in varying degrees. Terrorism is the dominant subject of the historical novel *Neterpenie* (1973), which portrays the terroristic activities of the People's Will. Soviet terror of different periods is touched upon in the documentary historical narrative entitled *Otblesk kostra* (1965), in the story "Golubinaia gibel'" (1968), in the short novels *Obmen* (1969) and *Dom na naberezhnoi* (1976), and in the novels *Utolenie zhazhdy* (1963) and *Vremia i mesto* (1981). Trifonov's *magnum opus* was to be *Ischeznovenie*, an unfinished novel about the year 1937[2] published in *Druzhba narodov* (no. 1, 1987). As it happens, the novel *Starik* (1978) is the only one of his completed works in which Soviet terror, particularly that of the Civil War period, constitutes a major theme.

Starik came into being as a result of combining two projects intended originally to produce two separate books: one dealing with the present and the other with the past. Roughly one-third of *Starik* depicts contemporary Soviet life, centering on the struggle for the possession of a hut left without heirs in a resort village near Moscow. The rest of the novel describes the story of Filipp Mironov, a Red Army commander during the Civil War, to whom Trifonov devoted a few pages in *Otblesk kostra*. In *Starik* Mironov bears the name of Sergei Migulin.

The past and the present are linked by the seventy-two-year-old Pavel Letunov. He knew Migulin personally during the Civil War and participated in important historical events. In the contemporary part of the novel Letunov is a widower, a retired engineer, living mainly on memories of the past, especially of Migulin. With some interruptions the novel's chronological framework spans almost sixty years—from the autumn of 1914 to the autumn of 1972.

The novel's central event pertaining to terror is the Bolshevik repression carried out in the occupied part of the Don Cossack region during the winter of 1919. Trifonov shows concrete examples of mass executions and says that they were conducted in compliance with a secret directive. In all probability he is the only Soviet writer to speak about the directive in his work, and he might be the first to reproduce the bulk of it in a book published in the Soviet Union. Even Soviet historical writings hardly ever refer to the directive and limit their quotations from it, if at all, to a few lines.

How did Trifonov manage to reveal so much about a secret document whose existence is virtually unknown in his homeland?

Two factors made it possible. First, the most ominous points of the directive are either omitted or modified. Thus the first sentence of the directive's first point is given in the novel as "Mass terror against the Cossack upper strata" (69).[3] The original is more specific and emphatic: "To carry out *mass terror* against wealthy Cossacks, exterminating them to a man."[4] The novel paraphrases the second sentence of the first point of the directive to read: "persecution of all who had anything to do with the struggle against the Soviet regime" (67). The paraphrase keeps silent about the nature of the persecution: "To carry out pitiless, mass terror against all Cossacks who have taken any part, direct or indirect, in the struggle against the Soviet regime."[5] Point eight is cited in the novel without its concluding phrase which urges all the commissars in the Cossack settlements "to implement these instructions undeviatingly" (69).[6]

Secondly, the novel does not say anything about the directive's origin. The reader can easily get the impression that it was composed by the Bolshevik authorities in the Don region, such as the Donbiuro of the RKP(b) headed by Sergei Syrtsov, an outspoken advocate of the harshest measures against the Cossacks. In reality the directive came from the highest level of the Bolshevik regime. It was adopted at the end of January 1919 by the Organizing Bureau (Orgbiuro) of the TsK RKP(b). The crucial role in its adoption must have been played by Iakov Sverdlov, who at that time was not only chief of the Orgbiuro of the Party's Central Committee but also chairman of the All-Russian Central Executive

Committee.[7]

The directive ordered a virtual annihilation of adult male Cossacks. A large category of those to be shot consisted of men who had served in the White Don Army regardless of whether they volunteered or were drafted into it. Their kinsmen, relatives of priests, former military cadets, and those who criticized the Soviet regime or refused to surrender their horses or weapons were also executed (71-72). Matvei Braslavskii, a representative of the Civilian Administration of the Southern Front, marches, as he puts it, "like Carthage" through Cossack villages with his punitive Steel Detachment, "a dreadful and inexorable force" (66, 68). In one village he orders the local population to dig a mass grave for a hundred and fifty hostages (71, 72).

Yet Trifonov, like Mikhail Sholokhov in *Tikhii Don*, could not demonstrate the real magnitude of the Red terror. It was impossible for him to present its fuller picture by showing, for example, how more than 400 Cossacks were executed in two villages within six days[8] or how the tribunals of the Eighth Army shot over 8,000 persons "for the good of the social revolution."[9]

In *Starik* the majority of the Communists support or carry out terror. Its most notable theorist and practitioner is Leontii Shigontsev, a professional revolutionary and a representative of the Don Revolutionary Committee.[10] Trifonov stresses the wickedness of his ideas by likening his elongated skull to a badly baked loaf of bread. Shigontsev believes that the survival of mankind is contingent on its renunciation of feelings and emotions (56). He buttresses his views with numerous examples from the French Revolution. Lyons, he says, was destroyed for protesting against freedom. The Cossacks should cease to exist because they protested against the Revolution (66). Shigontsev equates the Don region with the Vendée, pointing out that the French Republic prevailed only because it knew no mercy (72).

Edvard Ianson, a member of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Southern Front, admits that in the struggle against the Vendée the troops of the National Convention committed terrible atrocities. But they are justified by history because they were perpetrated by a new, progressive class. The same applies to the Bolshevik outrages in the Don region (137).

The views of Shigontsev and Ianson on the Reign of Terror corresponded to those of Marx, Engels, and Lenin. The early Marx and Engels unreservedly admired the Jacobin terror as the expression of the will of the proletariat and the plebeians.[11] In their later statements Marx and Engels continued to approve of plebeian terror, but came to regard the Jacobins as proponents of the limited aims of the bourgeoisie and

attributed the cruelties of the Reign of Terror primarily to the frightened members of that class.[12]

Lenin's attitude toward the Reign of Terror was close to that of the early Marx and Engels. In his opinion the Jacobins were on the side of the most progressive, revolutionary classes of their time. He compared the Bolsheviks with the Jacobins and the Mensheviks with the Girondists.[13] Citing Marx's definition of the French terror as the plebeian method of dealing with the enemies of the bourgeoisie, Lenin wrote that in the case of a decisive victory of the revolution, "we shall deal with tsarism in the Jacobin, or, if you like, in the plebeian manner."[14] To Lenin the Convention was a model of revolutionary daring and determination; it exercised a dictatorship of the proletariat and the petty bourgeoisie. To act in accordance with the Convention's practice would mean "to deal merciless blows to the counterrevolution."[15]

Trifonov does not introduce Lenin's assessments of the Reign of Terror into *Starik*. There is, however, little doubt that Lenin's numerous glorifications of the repressions conducted by the Jacobins and the Convention strengthened the beliefs of people like Shigontsev and Ianson in the necessity of terror. All the more so since in September 1917 Lenin wrote that the Cossacks might be seen as "a social and economic foundation for a Russian Vendée."[16]

It is not clear what role, if any, Lenin played in the emergence of the Orgbiuro directive regarding the treatment of the Cossacks. Sergei Starikov and Roi Medvedev assume that Sverdlov adopted the directive on his own, without consulting Lenin.[17] Even if this were so, it appears improbable that Lenin would have been kept in the dark about the existence of such a significant document for a long time.

In *Starik* the strongest protest against the directive is voiced by Aleksandr Danilov, the uncle of Pavel Letunov and chairman of a district revolutionary tribunal. A professional Bolshevik revolutionary, he is patterned on Trifonov's father in many ways. He calls the directive "the fruit of immature thinking," an error that will provoke a Cossack insurrection. One must not treat all the Cossacks as counterrevolutionaries. Each case should be considered on its own merits (67-68). Danilov intends to write about the directive to Lenin, but his falling ill with typhus prevents him from doing so. It must be said that Danilov is opposed to the directive not for any humanitarian reasons but out of fear of the adverse effects that a Cossack uprising would have for the Red cause.

Danilov's arguments are vigorously challenged by Shigontsev. Giving examples from the Reign of Terror, he maintains that the purpose of the revolutionary court is not to examine cases but to punish enemies of the

people. "Don't be afraid of blood! Milk serves as nourishment for children, while blood is food for the children of freedom, as deputy Julien said..."—these are the words with which Shigontsev caps his dispute with Danilov (67).

Shigontsev also engages in a polemic with Volodia Sekachev, a young friend of Pavel Letunov and a member of Migulin's staff. In response to Volodia's passionate objections against executing people without investigation or trial, Shigontsev brands him a Menshevik, a greenhorn, and a rotten *intelligent* (34). The last appellation is symptomatic of the contemptuous attitude toward the intelligentsia during the early years of Soviet rule, when most of their members were deemed too soft for conducting pitiless terror against the enemy. When in *Tikhii Don* a Red Cossack expresses his concern over the shooting of his fellow villagers in February 1919, the orthodox Bolshevik Shtokman upbraids him for displaying a deplorable weakness: "You're a worker, lad, but you drivel like one of the intelligentsia."[18] Earlier editions of Iurii Libedinskii's short novel *Nedelia* (1922) contained a chapter presenting the confession of a young Cheka investigator, Sergei Surikov, who resigned from his post because he could no longer endure executions. His nervous breakdown is explained by his belonging to the intelligentsia, and he is unfavorably contrasted with his rockhard chief, a genuine proletarian.[19]

Pavel Letunov, who replaced the sick Danilov as chairman of the district tribunal, continues the policy of his predecessor. He refuses to carry out summary mass executions and is prepared to kill himself or Braslavskii in order to prevent the shooting of the hostages (73).

The Bolshevik terror brought about a Cossack uprising in the area of Veshenskaia *stanitsa* on the night of 12 March 1919. The uprising led to the revocation of the Orgbiuro directive by the Party's Central Committee on 16 March, and some of its most ferocious implementors were punished to create a favorable impression of Bolshevik justice among the local population. All the scapegoats, however, were only middle or lower level functionaries. Trifonov indicates this fact by mentioning the execution of Braslavskii. But nothing happened to Shigontsev, and he continued to justify terror. The Cossacks, as he saw it, rebelled because the sabering of them and the burning of their homes had not gone far enough (73).

The opposite view of terror is held by Migulin. A former Cossack lieutenant colonel and a convinced socialist, he becomes a successful Red Army commander in the Don region. He represents the political idealist, fighting for freedom, equality, and social revolution. Trifonov frequently quotes from Migulin's letters, reports, and appeals, which are actually authentic historical documents of Filipp Mironov, Migulin's prototype. In

the passages on terror Trifonov, or the censors, leave out Mironov's strongest condemnations of the Bolshevik actions and regime. For instance, the phrase "villages stood in flames, the churches were shelled by artillery during services"[20] is absent from Migulin's report to Lenin and Kalinin of 8 July 1919 (117). The following accusation of Lenin by Mironov is not found in Migulin's letter to the leader dated 31 July 1919: "All the activity of the Communist Party headed by you is aimed at exterminating the Cossacks, at exterminating mankind in general."[21]

In the novel the above letter appears without the disclosure of its addressee, and some documents, which Mironov addressed to Lenin and other Bolshevik leaders, have collective addresses, such as Moscow (114) or TsIK (117).[22] These omissions and alterations were made to prevent the reader from asking the question: why did Lenin and the Bolshevik government allow terror to continue, though on a smaller scale, after the official cancellation of the Orgbiuro directive?

In order not to tarnish the image of Lenin, Trifonov keeps silent about the fact that he repeatedly demanded an immediate, ferocious, and merciless suppression of the Cossack uprising, without making any allowance for the reasons which compelled the people to take up arms.[23] Trifonov likewise says nothing about Lenin being an ardent champion of settling Cossack territories with peasants from other provinces, a measure that is ordered in the Orgbiuro directive and that Shigontsev calls "an excellent idea" (66). On 24 April 1919, when the Cossack uprising was in full swing, Lenin signed the drafts of the decree of the Council of People's Commissars concerning the resettlement of the peasants to grain-producing provinces and the Don region.[24] A month later he urged the Revolutionary Military Council of the Southern Front to speed up the resettlement to the Don region and he spoke about this subject at the session of the Council of People's Commissars on 3 June.[25]

In *Starik* Danilov is as upset about the resettlement of the peasants to the Don region as he is about the other points of the Orgbiuro directive (69). He and the author are clearly not on Lenin's side on this issue. In *Otblesk kostra* Trifonov approvingly quotes his father's opinion, stated in a report to the Orgbiuro of the TsK on 10 June 1919, that one must give up the idea of settling the peasants in the Don region immediately after its conquest by the Reds. The resettlement would always provide a cause for uprising.[26]

Trifonov shows not only the Bolshevik terror but also terror by the Whites, drawing scenes of brutal killings of the Reds by the Cossacks. Yet the White leaders never issued any directive ordering a mass extermination of people based on social, economic, or political considerations.

The winter of 1919 is called in *Starik* "Russia's ferocious hour." Its portrayal is permeated with images suggesting blood, heat, suffocation, madness, blindness, hatred: "The ferocious time flows like volcanic lava, flooding and burying with its fire" (69). Few of those who carry out the Orgbiuro directive are horrified by its instructions "because the lava blinds the eyes. There is nothing to breathe with in the crimson haze" (69). The implementors of the directive are blinded by the successful revolutionary actions in Europe, by the seemingly near victory over the domestic counterrevolutionaries who must be finished off with bayonets and bullets, and by the thirst to avenge the murders of their comrades by the enemy. "The red foam dims my eyes too," confesses Pavel Letunov when thinking of how the Cossacks mutilated one of his friends (69). To re-create the drama of the time, Trifonov frequently resorts to short sentences, at times without a verb. He is also fond of using a dash, an exclamation point, and an ellipsis mark. All these devices call to mind the dynamic, chopped (*rublenaia*) prose of the 1920s.

The annihilation of the Don Cossacks in the winter of 1919 appears to be the progenitor of subsequent acts of terror which Trifonov brings up in scattered allusions but which form a single uninterrupted chain. The reader learns that in the winter of 1921 Migulin was arrested on concocted charges of organizing an anti-Soviet conspiracy. What happened to him can be guessed by scattered remarks such as "in May occurred the tragedy you know about" (27) and "Migulin did not escape his fate" (153). These euphemisms conceal the fact that Migulin's prototype Mironov was shot without trial on 2 April 1921 in the courtyard of Butyrskaia Prison.[27] In one of his interviews Trifonov said that Migulin "perished from distrust, from the fact that he was not understood."[28] Distrust must have been the most harmless feeling the Bolsheviks experienced for Migulin. Distrust was merely a consequence of the hostility that Migulin aroused in the Bolsheviks by his opposition to their violence, dictatorship, and terror. Sooner or later he had to be liquidated.

Trifonov writes about the persecution of the engineers falsely accused of industrial sabotage at the beginning of the 1930s when Pavel Letunov barely escaped being arrested (70).

The Great Terror of the second half of the 1930s is reflected in a number of cautious phrases concerning Letunov and the family of Martyn Izvarin, a former official in the Workers' and Peasants' Inspectorate. Trifonov writes that Letunov had once worked "cutting wood in Ust'-Kamen'" (74) or that he spent three years in an "involuntary separation" from his family (81). Allusions to the fate of Izvarin and his wife are even less transparent. Their son Aleksandr remembers that "in winter mother was no more" and he began a new life in another town (99). A hint at the wide sweep of the terror is contained in his calling the resort village a *gibloe mesto* where "people perished in a strange way": some drowned, others were cut down by a sudden illness, and certain individuals took their own lives in the attics of their dachas (93). Here, of course, people fell ill or committed suicide out of fear and anxiety in the face of impending arrest.

The mass terror of the 1930s and of the post-war period under Stalin is once again intimated by Aleksandr when he thinks that of all the *intelligenty* of proletarian origin who founded the resort village in 1926 only one remained unscathed. In Trifonov's prudent and figurative language this man "bored his way through these years filled with red-hot coals and blazing with heat and emerged *unmaimed* from the fire into the cool of extreme old age and new times" (97). It is worth noting that in his descriptions of both the Bolshevik terror during the Civil War and the Stalin terror in time of peace Trifonov employs fire metaphors symbolizing destruction. Like Solzhenitsyn, he seems to be saying that real peace is not the absence of war but absence of violence. Trifonov also conveys a certain idea of moral degeneration and fear in the years of the Great Terror. Here and there he speaks in *Starik* about false denunciations, ostracism of the families of purge victims, or the breaking up of old relationships for the sake of self-preservation.

In *Starik* Stalin's terror is linked to that of Ivan the Terrible. At the beginning of the novel a doctoral candidate praises the Tsar for having done much good for Russia and explains his atrocities by the cruel ways of the time and by the need to extend the frontiers of the Russian state. This apology echoes the arguments used in the later phase of Stalin's reign to justify and legitimize his repression and aggressive foreign policy. Pavel Letunov's son, Ruslan, vehemently rejects the views of the doctoral candidate. He condemns the territorial expansionism of Ivan the Terrible and blames him for corrupting the Russian people, for splitting them into executioners and victims (31). Although Ruslan's diatribes imply a parallel between Ivan the Terrible and Stalin, one should not impute to Trifonov the notion that Stalin's terror is rooted in Russian history. As *Starik* suggests, Stalin's terror was first of all a further development of the early Bolshevik terror which was inspired and justified by the genocidal practice of the Jacobin dictators. Stalin would have engaged in terror regardless of whether Ivan the Terrible had ever existed.

Trifonov was not in a position to write directly about the present-day repression in the Soviet Union. Nevertheless, the cruel nature of its regime and the willingness of many citizens to serve as tools of terror, should the need arise, are demonstrated in the scene of the extermination

of stray dogs by order of the Moscow City Council. The people who indiscriminately shoot the animals, including those with owners, are eagerly assisted by the chairman of the resort cooperative and even by the children, among them a grandson of Pavel Letunov (128).

The liquidation of the dogs calls to mind an earlier scene in which the students in a pre-revolutionary school in Petrograd were confronted with the question of whether or not to cut up a live rat in an anatomy class. Those who favored dissection propped up their arguments with references to science, the guillotine, the Paris Commune, and the principle that great aims require victims. The defenders of the rat retorted that the victims might not agree with this principle and that the rat should not be sentenced to death because it lacked the ability to state its case. The rat was spared by majority vote (41-42).

The difference between the killing of the dogs and the saving of the rat shows how much more liberal and humane the pre-October society was. At the same time the story with the rat seems to portend the defeat of humanism in the Russian Revolution. The freed rat was immediately caught by a cat. With regard to history, this unhappy ending signifies the destruction of Russia's liberal forces and the triumph of the party that instituted despotism modeled on the Reign of Terror.

Another episode from the life of the school in Petrograd suggests an inference which has been recurrently stated by Solzhenitsyn, namely that by their ideology and politics Russian liberals paved the way for the dictatorship of the Bolsheviks and subsequently became victims of their terror. In the first days after the February Revolution the liberal director of the school talks to his class about the French Revolution instead of giving a lecture on the great reforms of Alexander II. At the end of the class the students learn the Marseillaise in French (45). The romantic cult of violence could not but further the Bolshevik seizure of power and the subsequent implementation of terror in the name of the Revolution. Soon after the director's talk on the French Revolution a pro-Bolshevik crowd beats to death his nephew, a college student, because he accused them of betraying Russia for German money (48).

Trifonov uses the lynching of the student to express his irony over the political naïveté of another liberal, a jurist. Taking into account the magnitude of the revolutionary upheaval, the jurist deems the murder a regrettable but minor incident. Russia, in his opinion, is a fortunate country, for its greatest revolution turned out to be virtually bloodless. "Read Aulard to see what went on in the time of the French Revolution...," he says to his family (48). Within the next four years his wife and one of his daughters emigrated to Europe, the other daughter lost two husbands—one, Volodia, was murdered by the Cossacks and the other, Migulin, by the Bolsheviks—his son was killed fighting in the White Army, and he himself died of typhus.

Contemporary Soviet society is painted in gloomy colors in *Starik*. It is dominated by materialists, self-seekers, profligates, and political opportunists. They look down on old Bolsheviks of Letunov's type as on moribund blockheads totally divorced from real life. One can easily infer that the Bolshevik Revolution and its terror created a society that bears no resemblance to the promised millennium in the name of which they were carried out.

This inference is supported by Trifonov's own words: "I accept the February Revolution, but I do not accept the October Revolution." The author said this during a visit to Oberlin College in 1977 in the presence of Professor John B. Dunlop. Trifonov's nonacceptance of the October Revolution gives us the right to assert that he puts the blame for the terror and other misfortunes which befell Russia mainly on the Bolsheviks. Significant in this respect is a dialogue between the father of Pavel Letunov and a Bolshevik sailor, Savva Ganiushkin, in January 1918. When the conversation turns to the lynching of two Kadet Party leaders in a Petrograd hospital, Savva says that they were murdered by anarchist sailors for whom he is not responsible. To this Letunov's father replies: "No, you are responsible for everything. For everyone and everything" (53). In all probability Letunov Sr. speaks here for the author.

I believe that *Starik* relates to today's international terrorism in which the Soviet Union takes a most active part. This assertion is based on Trifonov's statements about Dostoevskii. Trifonov considered Dostoevskii his favorite writer. *Besy* was to him a prophetic work of genius which "sounds today more contemporary than the works of many contemporary writers."[29] In Trifonov's view the contemporary terrorists of every stripe—all the bands of Baader-Meinhof and the Red Brigades are direct descendants of Nechaev, Shigalev, and Verkhovenskii. Like Nechaev, the present-day terrorists try to achieve their ends by all possible means. But, Trifonov says, one cannot achieve real social aims with the aid of terror or terrorism. This is what he wanted to demonstrate in *Neterpenie*.[30] And this is also, we may add, what he intended to show in *Starik*. It is hard to imagine that Trifonov, who had come to the rejection of the October Revolution, would not have implied in that novel a connection between Nechaevism and Shigalevism on the one hand and the Bolshevik terror on the other.

How, then, would one explain that *Starik* was published in the Soviet Union?

According to the émigré writer Igor' Efimov, the chief reason for its publication lies in the fact that all the evil of the Revolution is shown as

stemming from non-Russians. All virtuous characters are Russians; but those who persecute Migulin, shoot people, or pillage are Jews, Latvians, Chinese, Hungarians, and Austrians. They are all headed by the Jew Trotskii, while the most vicious executioner is the Jew Braslavskii. Thus *Starik* conveys the idea that the Revolution was a great feat of the Russian people, whereas all that was bad and cruel in it resulted from foreign influences. Since many officials on Soviet editorial boards encourage writers to portray the Revolution from this angle, *Starik* was accepted for publication. Efimov thinks that Trifonov embraced the nationalistic view with fervor and sincerity, possibly because it "coincided with the feeling of guilt that his Jewish half experienced before his Russian half."[31]

Efimov's view, however, is open to a number of objections. First, Trifonov described the actions of non-Russians just as they were in reality. The principal characters among the members of national minorities have real people as their prototypes. Ianson is modeled on the Latvian Ivar Smilga, and Braslavskii resembles a certain Marchevskii, a member of a revolutionary tribunal who used the expression "to go like Carthage through that village."[32] During the Civil War many non-Russians served with the Reds, particularly in high posts and in punitive institutions and units. This is a historical fact.

Secondly, there are many Russians among those who persecuted Migulin as well as among those who inspired and conducted terror. The most conspicuous place among the latter belongs to Shigontsev. One of the fiercest champions of indiscriminate terror directed against the Cossacks was the Donbiuro chairman Syrtsov, who is called Kuptsov in *Starik*. Among the implacable enemies of Migulin are Communists known for their atrocities in the Khoper District. They are all Russians and bear modified but still Russian names in the novel. The same is true of Migulin's judges at his trial in Balashov in October 1919. To my knowledge no negative historical figure of Russian origin was given a fictitious non-Russian name by Trifonov.

Starik was printed in the Soviet Union because its author, or the censors, concealed the authorship of the Orgbiuro directive, removed or altered its most barbarous points, and deleted the sharpest criticisms of the Communists from Mironov's letters and proclamations. All these revisions made it possible to interpret Bolshevik terror in accordance with the current official view that neither Lenin, nor Sverdlov, nor the Party had anything to do with the directive and that its architects and implementors were Trotskii, the Trotskiites, the Donbiuro, and various shady persons who had wormed their way into the Party. To Trifonov's credit it should be said that he does not single out Trotskii as the organizer of terror, though Trotskii does not cut an attractive figure in *Starik*.

In his depiction of the Bolshevik terror Trifonov reached a point of truth beyond which he could not go if he wanted to see *Starik* published in the Soviet Union.

Princeton University

Notes

[1]Iurii Trifonov, "Roman s istoriei," *Voprosy literatury*, no. 5 (1982), p. 67.

[2]Gerald E. Mikkelson, "Transtsendental'noe nachalo v proze Trifonova," a paper delivered on 1 November 1985 in the section "Iurii Trifonov, 1925-81" at the III World Congress for Soviet and East European Studies, in Washington, D.C. Trifonov revealed his plans to Professor Mikkelson in 1977. Tatiana A. Patera, a discussant in the above section, said in her commentary that at that time the manuscript of the novel about the year 1937 called *Ischeznovenie* was in the editorial office of the journal *Druzhba narodov* and that its earlier title had been *Iskhod*.

[3]References in the text are made to page numbers of Iurii Trifonov, "Starik," *Druzhba narodov*, no. 3 (1978), pp. 27-153. Here and elsewhere all translations from Russian into English are mine. For an English translation of the whole novel, see Yuri Trifonov, *The Old Man*, trans. Jacqueline Edwards and Mitchell Schneider. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1984.

[4]Roi A. Medvedev, *Zagadki tvorcheskoi biografii M. A. Sholokhova* (*K istorii romana "Tikhii Don"*). N.p., 1976, p. 14. This is a xerox copy of the typescript. The text of the directive appears here in a somewhat shortened form. Its complete text is to be found in Sergei Starikov and Roi Medvedev, *Zhizn' i gibel' Filippa Kuz'micha Mironova: Sovetskaia vlast' i donskoe kazachestvo v 1917-1921 gg.* (1974). This work has not been published in Russian and is unavailable to me. Lengthy excerpts from it, including all points of the directive, are quoted in Vitalii Rapoport and Iurii Alekseev, "Delo grazhdanina Mironova," *Grani*, no. 134 (1984), pp. 212-268, and it was published in English as Sergei Starikov and Roy Medvedev, *Philip Mironov and the Russian Civil War*, trans. Guy Daniels. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1978. The numbering of the directive's points in *Zhizn' i gibel' Filippa Kuz'micha Mironova* differs slightly from that in *Zagadki tvorcheskoi biografii M. A. Sholokhova* and the words "mass terror" (*massovyi terror*) are italicized reflecting the fact that they were underlined in the original (Rapoport and Alekseev, *Grani*, p. 232).

[5]*Medvedev, Zagadki tvorcheskoi biografii M. A. Sholokhova*, p. 14.

[6]Rapoport and Alekseev, *Grani*, p. 233.

[7]See Starikov and Medvedev, *Philip Mironov and the Russian Civil War*, pp. 110-112.

[8]Mikhail Sholokhov, Letter to Maksim Gor'kii of 6 June 1931, in *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, vol. LXX, ed. Ivan Anisimov. Moscow, 1963, p. 696.

[9]Starikov and Medvedev, *Philip Mironov and the Russian Civil War*, p. 148.

[10]Here Trifonov either makes an error or uses poetic license. No Don Revolutionary Committee existed in the winter of 1919 when Shigontsev is said to represent it. There were village and district revolutionary committees, but the Party's Central Committee decided against the formation of a Don Revolutionary Committee. See "Telegramma predsedatelia VTsIK Ia. M. Sverdlova v Donbiuro o nedopustimosti obrazovaniia separatnykh oblastnykh organov vlasti," 15 February 1919, in *Bor'ba za vlast' Sovetov na Donu, 1917-1920 gg.: Sbornik dokumentov*, comp. I. M. Borokhova et al. Rostov-on-Don, 1957, p. 414.

[11]See, for example, Friedrich Engels, "Das Fest der Nationen in London," in Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *Werke*, vol. II. Berlin: Dietz Verlag, 1958, pp. 612, 613; and Karl Marx, "Die Bourgeoisie und die Kontrerevolution," *Ibid.*, vol. VI, 1959, p. 107. The ideas of Marx, Engels, and Lenin on the French Revolution are discussed in detail in Vladimir Revunenkov, *Marksizm i problema iakobinskoi diktatury*. Leningrad, 1966, pp. 16-49, 73-99.

[12]Engels's letter to Marx of 4 September 1870, and to Victor Adler of 4 December 1889, in Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *Correspondence, 1846-1895*. New York: International Publishers, 1935?, pp. 303, 458. See also Revunenkov, *Marksizm i problema iakobinskoi diktatury*, pp. 33-35.

[13]See V. I. Lenin, "Shag vpered, dva shaga nazad," *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, fifth edition, vol. VIII. Moscow, 1959, p. 370; and "Perekhod kontrrevoliutsii v nastuplenie," *Ibid.*, vol. XXXII, 1962, p. 216.

[14]"Dve taktiki sotsial-demokratii v demokraticheskoi revoliutsii," *Ibid.*, Vol. XI, 1960, p. 47.

[15]"O konstitutsionnykh illiuziiakh," *Ibid.*, Vol. XXXIV, 1962, p. 37.

[16]"Russkaia revoliutsiia i grazhdanskaia voina," in *Lenin o Done i Severnom Kavkaze*, ed. L. I. Berz. Rostov-on-Don, 1969, p. 129.

[17]*Philip Mironov and the Russian Civil War*, pp. 111-112.

[18]Mikhail Sholokhov, *Tikhii Don*. Moscow, 1941, p. 396.

[19]See Iurii Libedinskii, *Nedelia*. Moscow, 1934, pp. 47-55. One may wonder whether the last name of the young investigator was suggested by that of Vasilii Surikov who painted "Utro streletskoi kazni" (1881).

[20]Quoted in I. I. Ul'ianov, *Kazaki i Sovetskaia respublika*. Moscow-Leningrad, 1929, p. 80.

[21]Quoted in Rapoport and Alekseev, *Grani*, p. 244.

[22]Compare Starikov and Medvedev, *Philip Mironov and the Russian Civil War*, pp. 137, 141.

[23]See Lenin's telegrams to G. Ia. Sokol'nikov, Trotskii, and other military leaders, in *Lenin o Done i Severnom Kavkaze*, ed. Berz, pp. 231, 233-237, 239-246.

[24]*Ibid.*, p. 444.

[25]*Ibid.*, pp. 242, 444.

[26]*Otblesk kostra*, p. 160.

[27]Starikov and Medvedev, *Philip Mironov and the Russian Civil War*, pp. 229-230.

[28]Iurii Trifonov, "Gorod i gorozhane," *Literaturnaia gazeta*, 25 March 1981, p. 5.

[29]"Otkrovennyi razgovor: Poslednee interv'iu Iuriia Trifonova," *Literaturnaia Rossiia*, 17 April 1981, p. 11. See also Trifonov, "Roman s istoriei," pp. 67-68, 73.

[30]"Roman s istoriei," p. 68. See also "Otkrovennyi razgovor."

[31]Igor' Efimov, "Pisatel', raskonvoirovannyi v istoriki," *Vremia i my*, no. 71 (March-April 1983), p. 150.

[32]Fedor Biriukov, *Khudozhestvennye otkrytiia Mikhaila Sholokhova*. Moscow, 1976, p. 75.