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We are very pleased to present this traveling exhibition of artwork from the collection of the Museum of Nonconformist Art, Pushkinskaya-10 Art Centre, St. Petersburg, Russia, presented within the context of a re-created “apartment” exhibition from Leningrad.

Since the collapse of the former Soviet Union, exhibitions of Russian art from large and small collections, such as the State Russian Museum and the State Tretyakov Museum, have become relatively frequent in the United States. The Guggenheim’s Russia! presented in 2005 was one of the most recent opportunities for museum goers to become familiar with the history of that culture’s art, ranging from Russian Orthodox icons to contemporary installation art. American museums with a special focus on nonconformist art include the Jane Voorhees Zimmerli Art Museum at Rutgers University, which houses most of the Norton Dodge Collection, and the Nasher Museum of Art at Duke University.

To our knowledge, however, The Space of Freedom is the first exhibition organized in the United States to focus on both the artwork shown in communal apartments and on the exhibition space of the apartments themselves as a significant part of the history of Russian art. However, this is not a re-creation of a specific apartment exhibition; the art on view is a representative selection of work that was displayed at various such exhibitions between 1964 and 1986, including several pieces by the most important figures in the history of these exhibitions and in the history of nonconformist painting. These forty-six works have never before been exhibited together or in such an installation outside of Russia.

Fundamentally, the choice of the communal apartment as the setting in which these paintings appear is a deliberate attempt to restore that context where the paintings were created, exhibited, and discussed. As Dr. Troncale elaborates in his essay, the re-creation of a communal apartment exhibition in an American museum gives a visual representation of the process of socialization and of economic life during the Soviet period that was integral to the birth and development of nonconformist art. This exhibition is as much about the painters as it is about their art; the two are inseparable.

The successful realization of the exhibition is due to the invaluable contributions of numerous people. First our thanks go to the exhibition’s curator Joseph C. Troncale, Associate Professor of Russian and Co-Director of the Russian Studies Program at the University of Richmond. Dr. Troncale initiated the idea of the exhibition, assisted in securing funding for the project, and researched the art and artists to provide his thoughtful essay that brings us a clearer understanding of the lives and accomplishments of artists during the Soviet period.

We are indebted to Evgeny Orlov, Director, Museum of Nonconformist Art and Vice President, Pushkinskaya-10 Art Centre, St. Petersburg, Russia.
As with our previous collaborative exhibition *The Brotherhood of Free Culture: Recent Art from St. Petersburg, Russia*, Orlov was an invaluable contributor to this project's organization and manifestation. Without his continued enthusiasm to share the art and history of nonconformist art, *The Space of Freedom* would not have been possible.

We also thank Sergei Kovalsky, President, Pushkinskaya-10 Art Centre, for his assistance in organizing the exhibition and for his insightful essay and additional research that he conducted for the catalogue. Orlov and Kovalsky were both originators of the apartment exhibitions in Leningrad, and their input and perspective on nonconformist art are critical to documenting and understanding that important period in Russian art history. We also extend our appreciation to Nikolai Sychov, Tania Komarova, Barbara Hazard, Gennady Orlov, and Lora Kucher in St. Petersburg for their help with the exhibition and research.

We would like to thank Daniel Sack, Program Officer at the Association of Colleges of the Midwest for his assistance in our applications for support from Global Partners, funded by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. Additional funding for this project was provided by the University of Richmond’s Tucker-Boatwright Festival of Literature and the Arts, the School of Arts and Sciences, the Cultural Affairs Committee, and the Louis S. Booth Arts Fund.

Our appreciation also extends to the staff and institutions on the exhibition tour, including Lesley Wright, Director, Faulconer Gallery, Grinnell College, and Dan Mills, Director, Samek Art Gallery, Bucknell University.

At the University of Richmond, our special appreciation goes to Dr. William E. Cooper, President; Dr. June R. Aprille, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs; and Dr. Andrew F. Newcomb, Dean of the School of Arts and Sciences for their continuing guidance and support of the University Museums, comprising the Joel and Lila Harnett Museum of Art, the Joel and Lila Harnett Print Study Center, and the Lora Robins Gallery of Design from Nature.

We extend our thanks to the University’s Theatre and Dance Department for the design and fabrication of the apartment structure, with special thanks to Walter L. Schoen, Associate Professor and Chair; W. Reed West, Associate Professor and Technical Director; and Phil Hayes, Shop Foreman.

As always, we give our thanks and appreciation to the staff of the University Museums, especially to N. Elizabeth Schlatter, Deputy Director and Curator of Exhibitions, and Henley Guild, Museum Preparator, for their assistance in the exhibition, its national tour, and the catalogue. We also thank Teresa Hudson for her help in bringing this project to fruition.

Richard Waller

(PHOTOGRAPH BY ANATOLY SHISHKOV, PUBLISHED IN THE "ON BRONNITSKAYA STREET," CATALOGUE, "SAMIZDAT" PUBLISHERS, LENINGRAD)
КВАРТИРНЫЕ ВЫСТАВКИ ЛЕНИНГРАДСКОГО АВАНГАРДИСТСКОГО АНДЕРГРАУНДА...

С самого раннего детства, познавая окружающий мир, человек пытается осознать, измерить своё пространство. От размера и состояния пространства зависит его дальнейшее развитие, развитие и осознание своего дальнейшего пути.

Воспринимая состояния пространства, человек пытается расширить своё понятие о пространстве до бесконечности.

Дом, квартира, комната могут стать окном в беспределность или пределом, концом познания пространства, тупиком.

Для художников-конконформистов 1960 – 1980-х годов комната, квартира, своя или своих друзей, стала стартовой площадкой в мир большого искусства, в мир беспределного. Квартира со своими ограниченными размерами развилилась до беспределного пространства, до космоса и вызвала ответную реакцию у многих людей того времени, которые посещали эти комнаты и квартиры, стены которых были завешены снизу до верху произведениями искусства неофициальных художников, которым было запрещено показывать свои произведения в выставочных залах и музеях.

1960-е, 1970-е, 1980-е годы – время героической борьбы за свободу самовыражения, время надежд и свершений. От ограниченного пространства квартиры до первых выставок неофициальных художников в ДК им. Газа и ДК "Невский", а дальше Дворец молодежи, ДК им. Кирова; к созданию художниками своих первых творческих организаций: Товарищества экспериментальных выставок (ТЭВ) и Товарищества экспериментального изобразительного искусства (ТЭИИ), фонда "Свободная культура", Арт-центра "Пушкинская 10"...

Пространство квартиры расширилось – выставки художников-конконформистов стали проходить в странах Европы и Америки. Картины художников участников квартирных выставок стали приобретать лучшие музейные собрания России, Европы и Америки.

Прошло 30 лет и в ЦВЗ "Манеж" (центральный выставочный зал Санкт-Петербурга) прошёл фестиваль независимого искусства посвящённый первой официальной выставке в ДК им. Газа, где в центре экспозиции была показана инсталляция "квартирной выставки".

По завершении фестииваля Музей конконформистского искусства поступило предложение от руководства музея Университета г. Ричмонд, штат Вирджиния, США, о демонстрации инсталляции "квартирной выставки" в университетских музеях США.

Данная выставка-инсталляция "квартирной выставки", которая будет показана в США, отличается от предыдущей в ЦВЗ "Манеж", прежде всего, временным ограничением исполнения картин входящих в инсталляцию (все произведения искусства созданы до 1987 года) и размерами самой инсталляции (42 м2), что обусловлено размерами помещений где будет показана выставка, и для успешной транспортировки в различные музеи США.

Авторы картин входящих в инсталляцию "квартирной выставки" все без исключения принимали участие в аналогичных выставках в советское время, которые исторически зафиксированы в истории выставок неофициального искусства 1960 – 1980-х годов и известны как участники и организаторы квартирных выставок.

На выставке-инсталляции представлены все направления неофициального изобразительного искусства 60-х – 80-х годов XX века, которые имеются в коллекциях Музея конконформистского искусства без всяких стилевых предпочтений.

Пространство квартиры и небольшие метрические размеры, завешанные большим количеством картин, надеюсь, смогут передать состояние квартирных выставок 60 – 70 годов XX века.

Директор музея конконформистского искусства

Е. М. Орлов
From its beginning, humankind has attempted to figure out, to define its space in order to comprehend the world around it. Man's movements, developments and future continue to depend on our definition and condition of that space.

Whilst attempting to understand the condition of his space, humankind has also attempted to extend its concept of space to eternity. One's home, apartment, or room could either become a window to infinity or a limitation, a finite space, a dead end.

For the Russian nonconformist artists of the 1960s through 1980s, a room or an apartment — whether one's own or someone else's — was a departure point into the world of art, a world free of limitations. An apartment, while limited in space, opened up a world of infinite space — the entire cosmos. Many who visited these rooms and apartments during that time had the common experience of being transported to a world beyond those walls. The transformation of those apartments was accomplished by covering their walls from floor to ceiling with the art of unofficial artists who were forbidden to show their works in exhibition halls and museums of the Soviet Union.

The 60s, 70s and 80s was a time of heroic struggle for freedom of self-expression, a time of hope and accomplishment. Our accomplishments and hopes grew from the confined spaces of apartments to include the groundbreaking exhibitions of unofficial art at the Gaz and Nevsky Palaces of Culture, and later at the Palace of Youth and Kirov Palace of Culture. It went on to include the creation of our first professional independent art organizations: the Brotherhood of Experimental Exhibitions (TEV), the Brotherhood of Experimental Fine Arts (TEI), the “Free Culture” foundation, and the Art Center “Pushkin 10.”

The space of those apartments continued to expand as the exhibitions held by nonconformist artists spread to Europe and America. Paintings by the artists from the apartment exhibitions found their way into the finest museum collections of Russia, Europe, and America.

Thirty years passed, and a festival of independent art dedicated to the first official exhibition at the Gaz Palace of Culture was held in the Manezh (St. Petersburg’s Central Exhibition Hall). At its center was a salon-style exhibition of paintings modeled on the “apartment exhibitions” of St. Petersburg. At the conclusion of this festival, the University of Richmond Museums invited the Museum of Nonconformist Art to exhibit paintings from its “apartment exhibition” archive at the University’s main art museum.

The exhibit-installation of an “apartment exhibition” at the University of Richmond differs somewhat from its predecessor at the “Manež” in that it will represent exhibitions which took place until 1987. Also, the exhibition’s size is limited by the dimensions of the gallery where the “apartment” will be constructed, and by the need to transport it safely to the other American universities where it will travel.

Without exception, all of the artists represented in this exhibit-installation took part in analogous exhibitions of unofficial art in the Soviet Union from the 1960s to the 1980s. These painters are all recognized as participants and organizers of apartment exhibitions, and all of the stylistic developments of unofficial art that took place during that time are equally represented here.

I hope that the limited space of this “apartment,” hung with a large number of paintings, will convey to viewers the historical context and feel of the apartment exhibitions of the 60s and 70s.

E. M. Orlov
APARTMENT EXHIBITIONS OF
RUSSIAN UNDERGROUND AVANT-GARDE ART

A hole, a cave, a house, or an apartment are examples of man's habitats which he can establish and own. Accordingly, he can use them as he wishes, hidden from the eyes of ill wishers. One's lodgings must be private property, and the right and freedom to use them as one wishes, sacred.

In Soviet Russia in the second half of the twentieth century, unofficial artists decided to use this right to paint and exhibit their paintings in their own apartments. They were not officially recognized as artists because they refused to adhere to the government ideology in art; as a result they were denied normal lives as professional Soviet artists. They were not affiliated with the Artists Union and lacked the right to have their own studios or to exhibit their paintings publicly, and so were unable to earn a living from their profession. Their names were put on "black-lists" which were kept by a special KGB department dealing with ideologically subversive activities. Holding an exhibition in one's home was considered to be a subversive activity, and the occupation "unofficial artist" denoted a subversive member of society, even though it was the authorities that had made him so.

The independent artists' insistence on the validity of their own opinions put them at odds with official doctrine. This, precisely, is nonconformism, the main principle of which is to establish the absolute value of a human being.

The need to proclaim this value was so great that the artists, who in their daily lives were, as a rule, not social activists, became such in protest against unacceptable life circumstances. A heightened sense of justice prompted such activities as the organization of apartment exhibitions, outdoor happenings and events, artistic protests in public places, and the direct reflection of injustice in their art.

Adherence to principles of nonconformism defines the social temperament of a person. The conceptual demonstration organized by Yuly Rybakov and Oleg Volkov during the night of August 2 to August 3, 1976 is an example of this. The artists wrote graffiti on the walls of Sts. Peter and Paul Fortress, protesting a ban on exhibitions near the fortress. The demonstration was also a memorial salute to Leningrad nonconformist leader Evgeny Rukhin who perished in a fire in his apartment. The KGB was suspected of arson and considered responsible for Rukhin's death. Rybakov and Volkov wrote: "You crucify freedom, but freedom knows no boundaries." The letters were one and a half meters in height and
easily visible to everyone on the opposite bank of the Neva; the artists were imprisoned for six and seven years, respectively.

While apartment exhibitions did serve to unite unofficial artists, they were not initially conceived as acts of protest, but they inevitably became acts of civil disobedience against an authoritarian system that suppressed individual creativity. The very existence of nonconformist art was evidence that culture was still alive.

Of course, not everyone is born to be a nonconformist. One famous St. Petersburg artist said: “Wherever nature leads me I should go...” It is difficult to disagree with that. However, Soviet ideology was so shortsighted that by preventing people from responding to their true nature, it made dissidents out of otherwise obedient people. Nature, especially one’s creative nature, demands the absolute independence of the artistic personality.

Nonconformist art appeared in contrast to Socialist Realism, the style Soviet ideologists advocated. These ideologists did not understand the Russian avant-garde which had supported the fledgling Russian revolution for some time by creating a progressive image of Soviet Russia. They were afraid of what they did not understand, so they turned to the more serene style of the “Peredvizhniki,” late nineteenth-century Russian painters who realistically portrayed the patriarchal landowners’ way of life. The Peredvizhniki movement was never recognized by the Petersburg Arts Academy patronized by the Tsar, a circumstance which recommended the genre to the builders of socialism.

For the nonconformists of the 1950s-1980s, the development of creative thought was connected with trends native to Russian art. Like the avant-garde movements such as Suprematism and cosmoism in the early twentieth century, this development was based on an understanding of the sacredness of art.

Prior to 1924 (before the Iron Curtain was drawn closed), Russian vanguard art found its niche amongst the diverse contemporary movements of Western art. It added its own particular tone to these movements only to fall into a deep sleep for the following fifty years. Its renaissance began in the last quarter of the twentieth century, and was marked by the impetuous shows of unofficial painters in private apartments, and by the famous exhibitions held at the Gaz and Nevsky Palaces of Culture and others between 1964 and 1986. The subsequent mass emigration of cultural leaders and artists to the West was the beginning of Russia's return into the international art world.

The development of other art trends that appeared under the influence of Western art of the twentieth century was reflected in the nonconformists’ search for new abstract, Neo-Expressionist, Modernist, and Neoclassical styles. With the exception of Socialist Realism, all of these trends were equally represented at apartment exhibitions.

The series of exhibitions organized by writer Vadim Nechaev is of special interest, because he proclaimed his flat in Leningrad to be a Museum of Contemporary Art and himself as its director. One of these exhibitions coincided with the
Venice Biennale of 1977, where Russian unofficial art was presented for the first time outside of the USSR. Nechaev’s exhibition was supported by the Committee for the Protection of Human Rights and by Andrei Sakharov, prior to his exile. The authorities attempted to burn down the flat, and Nechaev and his family were forced to emigrate soon after.

Nonconformist art collector George Mikhailov also supported Nechaev’s Biennale exhibition. He had previously converted his apartment into a gallery where such exhibitions regularly took place, and had provided painters with free advertising. During the course of Nechaev’s exhibition, Mikhailov informed the Biennale committee in Venice as well as Western reporters about the event via telephone. He was later imprisoned for his activities.

Valentin Maria Samarin, nicknamed “Til,” was a photographer and chronicler of unofficial exhibitions. Samarin also suffered a complex fate. He offered his apartment for the expansion of the Venice Biennale in Leningrad. As a result of his activities, his citizenship was revoked and he was expelled from the USSR.

Unofficial art was ignored by museums in Leningrad. During the Soviet era there were no commercial galleries; the only gallery space available for exhibitions was under the auspices of the Artists Union. Those interested in seeing or collecting the art were from the scientific and technical intelligentsia. Dozens of collectors appeared, and many devoted their lives to their collections. From floor to ceiling the walls of their apartments were filled with paintings, sometimes in two or three rows where one painting covered another. Several collectors arranged exhibitions which were open to the public. Many such exhibitions were held in the apartments of I. and R. Login, S. Sigitova, and others.

Leningrad’s nonconformist art is a remarkable thing in itself. If one searches for analogies in art history, one might draw a comparison with the art of the ancient Greeks made two thousand years ago, which can be understood only by its devotees.

The smooth beauty of lines and harmoniously balanced forms contain religious symbols of a universe imagined by its creators, who were closely identified with nature. The mystery of perfect Hellenic art has attracted many generations. It has served either as a model for imitation or as a basis for contrast with other styles.

Just as one must understand the philosophy of the people to gain a sense of ancient Greek art, so one must also understand the unofficial artists to gain a sense of St. Petersburg’s nonconformism in the second half of the twentieth century. Like the Greeks, the nonconformist artists were creating all the basic laws to construct a new world, as if for the first time, leaving the game of discovery to the scientists.

It was the nonconformist painters remaining in the Motherland who imagined and created the world anew, a world governed by natural laws. It was a world with its own gods like the ancient Greeks: Kandinsky, Malevich, Cézanne, Dali, Dushan, Joyce, Filonov, and Falk. Pablo Picasso undoubtedly played the role of Zeus. The two Picasso exhibitions in Leningrad’s Hermitage in 1956 and 1964 impressed painters with a freshness
These gods were known only from a few Western catalogues which artists sometimes found in the Bukenist rare book stores. For example, the so-called “Golden” Dalí album could only be looked at behind the counter if you were acquainted with the shop assistant, because it was banned. It was necessary to plan to see it. The rare works of Cézanne that appeared in the Hermitage after the Picasso show were poorly exhibited without the necessary lighting. It was impossible to appreciate the scale of the phenomenon in all of its depth. I remember how, many years later, I was able to visit a huge Cézanne exhibit in Washington, D.C. The marvelous display of both familiar and unfamiliar paintings greatly changed my opinion about the painter. It turned out that we were not mistaken in what we had imagined him to be. Cézanne was and still is a god!

Like the ancient Greeks, the nonconformists created the laws of their own worldview and constructed their own language, form, and style. If they had imagined the earth flat with two suns revolving around it, they would not have been able to renounce their convictions, even if they were burned at the stake.

In time, nonconformist art may become as important to Russian culture as ancient Greek art has become to world culture.

Nonconformist art harbors deeply within it the paradoxical formula of love-hate. In order to experience the fullness of this paradox one must delve into St. Petersburg mythology. Apartment exhibitions and the dramatic stories of those who created them and became its main characters are a part of that mythology.

The very first apartment exhibitions were those the “INAKI” group held in 1973 and continued to organize in the subsequent years, leading up to the largest apartment exhibition, “On Bronnitskaya Street,” held in St. Petersburg in 1981. That period was the peak of the apartment exhibitions.

One day my grandmother became ill, and one of the rooms in our apartment on Baskov Lane stood vacant for a long time. So there, three of us: Victor Bogorad, Boris Mitavsky, and I, decided to show our paintings to some friends and acquaintances. Bogorad said that even if only thirty people visited the exhibition, it would be great. To shake up the public, we chose the name “INAKI” (“The Others”) and wrote a manifesto at the beginning of the guestbook. A phrase by Flaubert was used as the epigraph: “A fool is someone whose ideas are different from anyone else’s.” For a special touch, we chose pseudonyms.
like Brago-Mitavsky-Kalinovich, and invited visitors to the exhibit by telephone.

The eleven-square-meter room was hung with paintings and graphic arts from floor to ceiling. At first some of our friends came, then our friends' friends came, and during the second month absolute strangers visited the exhibit.

The guests found it interesting to talk with us, and it was no accident that teachers, engineers, mathematicians, and psychologists came. Although it was the first time most of them had ever done such a thing, just as it was for us, they were all people who were not satisfied with the smorgasbord of Soviet culture. They were curious and critical, and sometimes during our conversations we discovered that our views on contemporary art were quite different. Yet we had much in common with mathematicians and physicists about how widely the forms of artistic expression can vary.

Every spring I left the city to join topographic expeditions working in remote parts of Russia. It was time for me to leave, but we could not close the exhibition because people continued to call and call. More than 120 people had already visited us. It was a great success! One day when I returned home I found a policeman in the hall of my apartment asking my mother something and writing it down.

"What's the matter?" I asked.

"Well, you caused a hell of a mess here. People are coming endlessly to see you," barked the policeman. I tried to explain that only my friends came to see the paintings. "Your neighbors have complained, and you must cease immediately," he responded. Of course, I bristled since at that time I did not understand the real reason. My mother was upset and frightened. When Bogorad and Mitavsky came that evening we decided to close the exhibit. The last visitor came at about 10 p.m. and turned out to be a painter. He looked at our paintings for a long time and then said that he knew of one other apartment exhibition in the city. We were really surprised and interested, so, even though it was late at night, we traveled to another district. The owners of the apartment did not want to let us in because it was so late, but I pleaded with them. Thus, we saw paintings that were similar in spirit to ours by some painters we did not yet know: Ovchinnikov, Putilin, and Ross, who were the future "Gaz-Nevsky" painters.

Many years later it became obvious that our groups had been following different roads but our goal was the same. At some point our paths had to cross.

After I visited this exhibition I came back to my apartment very excited, but sad. In a couple of days I had to leave on an expedition. As I was departing I looked back, but my soul leapt forward.

In the 1970s we were constantly occupied looking for jobs called 24/3's (24 working hours and three days off) which gave us more time for our art. We also looked for a studio where we could paint, or an apartment where we could arrange an exhibition. If we saw an attic as we walked through the city, we automatically wondered whether it was empty or not. Noticing the dark windows of an apartment we wondered if the owners might be moving, and whether we might be able to hold an exhibition there. It seemed to me that the air
in the city was being compressed into these city blocks, which made breathing difficult.

My soul was excited with the atmosphere of Woodstock, a thing I could hardly imagine as I listened to the “Voice of America” and the BBC. Jimi Hendrix’s burning guitar, Janis Joplin’s indecent voice, hippies, flower children...I felt a part of everything happening “THERE” — so far away! A bit later, I was ecstatic to find underground rock groups in Leningrad such as the “Woods Brothers,” “Argonauts,” “St. Petersburg,” and “Time Machine.” I remember climbing up a drainpipe to the second floor of a House of Culture somewhere in the town of Pushkin to get into a concert of “Time Machine.” When I managed to reach the hall I discovered that the concert had been shut down after the second verse of the first song in the program.

We unofficial painters and musicians who lived outside the administrative controls sought an uncontrolled space where we could breathe freely, live free of endless paperwork and create our art. After spending several years working on expeditions, I had earned enough money to buy a cooperative apartment in a neighborhood called Piskaryovskaya. My first idea was to transform the flat into an exhibition space. By that time the “INAKI” group had undergone certain changes. Bogorad had given up painting in oil and had begun to work as a graphic artist. He attracted the attention of different artists; this led to the organization of a club of caricaturists and cartoonists. During that time Aleksandr Lotsman and Natalia Balashova joined Boris Mitavsky and me in our group.

My new two-room flat was filled with paintings and graphic arts. Only a few people visited us. We had agreed with George Mikhailov to advertise each other’s exhibitions. The people who visited Mikhailov’s exhibition came, sometimes accompanied by Mitavsky or Lotsman, from his apartment on Revolution Square to ours at Piskaryovskaya, or vice versa. The arrangement suited us all well, so we decided to organize a permanent exhibition to be open on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday from 18.00 to 22.00.

Visitors had to leave an hour before the noise ordinance took effect. After that hour the police did not have the right to enter private apartments.

By then I had realized it was impossible to combine an apartment exhibition, my professional painting, and my work on expeditions. Something had to be sacrificed, so I left my interesting and well-paid job in order to devote myself fully to the art which, in our circumstances, was inseparably connected with the social and, as one might surmise in Russia, political problems.

The music of the rock group Pink Floyd on their album “The Wall” was especially relevant to someone like me who did not want to flee from his native country, but who also did not want to continue to live there with the feeling of having his hands tied. We used to tell each other that the “INAKI” might be forced to emigrate, but only if they gave us an ultimatum: “Go to West or to prison in the North” (fortunately, that did not happen).

The first serious doubts about the advantages of the Soviet political system arose during the “Czech events” of 1968. Our position was formed somewhere between the hawkish patriotic articles in the Soviet press and the radio reports
broadcast by such “hostile radio voices” as “Voice of America,” “Radio Free Europe,” and the BBC. From the words of eyewitnesses who were as young as myself and served in the divisions of the Red Army that were sent to Czechoslovakia, their presence for the Czechs and the Slovaks seemed a strange way of demonstrating international friendship. Some of those soldiers of the most considerate Soviet Army were particularly taught not to think. If they had been ordered to shoot the population of a friendly country, they would have done it!

What really did it for me was a song that sounded like a requiem for freedom, sung by Martha Kubishina, the exiled Czech singer. The song was broadcast on all radio stations except Soviet ones and the emotions it conveyed were so strong and sincere that they made me believe in “the injustice of good” (as Yuri Shevchuk of the rock group DDT later sang) which the Soviet soldiers had brought about.

Later I discovered that, even earlier, similar events had happened in Hungary as well as in other places in the USSR. These events and some other messes in the USSR were incomprehensible to me because of the complete lack of information.

Placing my ear directly on the loud speaker of my radio (a VEF-206), I listened through the crackles from the jamming to the wonderful stories of people who had managed to cross the Berlin Wall in different ways. For example, one man was carried in two small suitcases which seemed to be attached to each other, although it was in fact one long suitcase. Someone else managed to fly noiselessly over the wall during the night using a glider he had invented. People were looking for freedom, and either they got it or they died trying. It made me think. Thus, the music from “The Wall” I understood only as a call to overcome any walls that might prevent people from living freely. I could not know how many invisible walls all of us would have to overcome.

Shortly thereafter, I was attacked by the local community in my apartment in Piskaryovskaya. In spite of meticulously following all the rules and closing the exhibition exactly at 22.00 to avoid disturbing anyone, and never having any noisy parties, I was visited by various housing commissions which were a kind of court whose judges were the very housewives who, according to Lenin, had to know how to run the government. They looked at the paintings on the walls and when I naively tried to involve them in art, they said: “You’re not doing anything here to make this a decent place to live. And this wild music....” Once my neighbor told me that two men in civilian clothes called on me when I was not at home, then left in a black Volga. It could have only been the KGB. I began to get depressed.

My depression deepened, but the exhibition continued.

My friend Duke Ellington performed the second concert of spiritual music ("Second Concert of Spirituals;" Duke Ellington, 1968), and when he sang the word “freedom” in Russian, I began to realize that I was not alone in my desire to change things with my own two hands.

I was working as an electrician in a semi-secure office on 24-hour shifts. During the day being at work was boring, but at night I was busy as hell. I needed to make some ads for our exhibition that could be distributed from hand to hand, something like a business card.

During my night shift I printed the coded text onto paper tape, then copied it back to front. At night during my two-hour break I put the paper into teletype devices that printed the code onto rolls of paper. In the morning I cut the paper into the right size and brought the invitations home. Later, when the Association of Experimental Fine Arts (TEII) was formed, such technology was of great value for copying texts, since leaflets were impossible to print in English. For those who do not understand this process, I would like to add that in those days there were no photo copying machines, computers or any other kinds of copiers available to the general public. Such machines as “Era” and “REM” were located only in secret offices, and it was strictly forbidden to use them. I knew a man who was imprisoned for three years for being in possession of a book by Solzhenitsyn that was copied in such a way. The person who printed it must have been imprisoned for a longer period.

The unification of the unofficial groups of painters from all generations proceeded inevitably. I remember an excited Mitavsky calling and saying: “Hey guys! We’ve been invited to an exhibition. We have to be there at 10:00.” We took our paintings and went to Zhelyabov Street. The exhibition was supposed to have taken place in Tolya Maslov’s apartment, but when we went up to the apartment the police were already there. They forbade the exhibition on the premise that only one room in the empty communal apartment belonged to Tolya and he was not allowed to use any of the others.

The painters slowly removed their works from the walls and went outside. Armen Avetisyan had the idea to display the paintings on the street benches as if we had failed to wrap them, so people would be able to see them. And that’s what happened; people had a chance to see them. Then, after some time, some undercover agents began to sit down near us on the benches as if they were strangers. They pretended not to be looking at us but it was obvious that they were listening carefully to our conversations. We were afraid of any provocation on their part, so in order to protect ourselves Volodya Ovchinnikov went to call his acquaintances in the American Consulate. His call was probably listened to by the party officials. Thirty or forty minutes later the consulate’s car and another car of Americans could be seen moving slowly along the boulevard from Nevsky Prospect. They were closely followed by a black Volga from which a KGB officer was filming our “stand” through an open window. The procession passed by without stopping. We were entertained by the “film plot,” so we began to wave to the passing cars. Only there were no
flags, neither American nor Soviet. When it got colder, everyone left, but the culmination of this story for Boris and me happened a little bit later.

Mitavsky and I turned off of Zhelyabov Street and ran into a company bus without any indication of which organization it belonged to. There were twenty civilians inside with billy clubs. We casually continued to walk towards the vehicle, and passing by it we were scared, expecting to be attacked or arrested. However, the passengers on the bus were jolly and smiled at us ironically — their shift was probably over. We even heard them say, “That’s it? Finally you’re going home?!”

In any case, not long after this a large exhibition was held and the “old timers” who organized it invited “the young” artists. It took place in the apartment of Alla Osipenko and John Markovsky, two soloists in a ballet troupe. The next apartment exhibition, the largest in history, “On Bronnitskaya Street,” was organized by the “young,” who invited the “old.” Finally, nonconformists of different generations had begun to trust each other.

It was 1981, a time when the KGB department that dealt with ideologically subversive activities was being reorganized. The new chief of the department pursued quite a different policy towards the representatives of unofficial culture. Musicians, writers and painters were allowed to organize groups. However, it was clear that he only wanted to expose all of us and then keep us under his control.

Because they were already experienced in publishing the journal The Clock in the underground press and had established a literary club, unofficial writers decided to deceive the KGB. They pretended to have “unionized” a group called “Club 81” in order to procure a dilapidated apartment on Lavrov Street #5 for their literary meetings. We painters also used this apartment for large meetings, as well as for examining the works of younger painters who were eager to join us.

Once, in the large apartment of the artist Afonichev on Zhukovsky Street there were between thirty and thirty-five people. There were mainly “young” painters though there were several “old timers.” Igor Ivanov and Slava Afonichev were particularly active and seemed to be the transitional link between the “older” and the “younger” generations. We spoke about the need for an apartment exhibition. Then, Yury Novikov, an art historian who had been expelled from the Russian Museum, suggested that we write a letter to feel out the cultural department of the Central Committee and the Minister of Culture of the USSR.

The letter contained an analysis of the situation in Russian/Soviet fine arts, beginning in the 1920s. It ended with the proposal to discuss the necessity of establishing an alternative organization to the Union of Artists.

The typing of the letter fell to me because I was the only person who owned a typewriter. I edited the letter together with B.I. Ivanov, editor of the samizdat (underground) journal The Clock. Even now I recall the heated discussions regarding the main points of the letter, but most of all I remember how I had to type twenty pages using two and a
half fingers, then retype them six times over the course of several months. It was hellish work!

Mitavsky, Lotsman, and I (the members of "INAKI") were designated as messengers to Moscow. This was probably because our illegal studio was located near the Moscow Railway Station. So, we were really in for it. We decided not to tell anyone when we were going, because we were afraid of informers, being tailed, and that our letter would be confiscated. The endeavor was planned as follows: several copies of the letter were prepared. One copy was left with Yury Novikov, I hid another in someone's apartment, and the third copy had to be delivered to Moscow by Mityavsky and Lotsman. I had to stealthily follow my friends until they left for Moscow and await their phone call telling me that the letter had been delivered to the Central Committee. If they were arrested I was to leave for Moscow with the fourth copy of the letter and try to do my best. But everything went smoothly from the very beginning.

At the same time we had begun searching for an apartment for an exhibition. The requirements for the apartment and its owners were:

1. The rooms had to be large with high walls and the least possible amount of windows and furniture;
2. It could be either a private apartment or an apartment with neighbors who had moved out;
3. A back door was desirable (a second exit);
4. The owners should be people who wanted to emigrate but had not been allowed to; as a result, they would be interested in attracting the attention of the authorities in order to be evicted from the country;
5. The owners needed to be experienced in legal matters and not afraid of any negative consequences.

Different groups of us examined about ten apartments, but something was wrong with each of them. At the same time, we spread a rumor in the city about an apartment exhibition that was being prepared for some yet unknown time in order to distract the KGB. To support this rumor, we began to bring some paintings to Miller's apartment on Mayakovskaya Street in August, as if the exhibition was going to be held there, just so the officers would spy on us.

One evening Garic Yukhvets and B. Mitavsky were invited to an attic to look at one more apartment which met stipulations 1, 2, 3, and 5. Together with Natasha Kononenko, the owner of the apartment, we decided to go ahead and set a date for the exhibition.

Suspecting that the militia might block the entrance to the apartment in advance, we decided to inform the painters and visitors about the exhibition only late in the evening before its opening on Friday night, November 13. At that time, only the desk officers were on duty and the department heads were at home for the weekend. We thought that if the desk officers on duty were the only ones who found out about it, a decision to close the exhibit could be made by the authorities only on Monday.

During the night the organizers (I was out of town) delivered all the paintings stored in Miller's apartment to Kononenko's apartment
on Bronnitskaya by truck. Other painters were informed about it later. In the morning, all the while checking to see if we were being "tailed," we went to arrange the exposition. Overall, our plan was successful.

The first policeman appeared only on Sunday evening. He stood in the kitchen examining everyone's documents. Some agents in uniform were watching the entrance outside. Then the electricity was switched off. Aleksandr Lotsman and Boris Mitavski went to buy some candles in the Frunze supermarket. People continued to view the exhibition by candlelight. However, Lotsman, our "expert" in electricity, rigged something to get the lights back on, and humorously remarked, "Like hell you'll turn our lights off." We had a lot of visitors, and were on duty all night guarding it.

Once, when I was out of town from Saturday to Sunday, the Hermitage art historians visited the exhibition incognito!

The exhibition lasted four days. During the night between Tuesday and Wednesday we returned the paintings to Miller's apartment to give them back to the artists. The men watching the apartment didn't expect this, and slept through it. The owner of the flat left as well. When the militia appeared in the morning there was nothing to speak about and no one to speak to. This was done to defuse the difficult circumstances around the exhibition and to spare the owner any unpleasantness.

Thus, in a single action the unofficial artists combined the word (our letter to the Central Committee) and the deed (the exhibition "On Bronnitskaya"). The letter ended with the statement that if our demands to recognize the Association and legalize its exhibitions were not accepted, we would consider it (TEII: The Association of Experimental Fine Arts) to exist de facto and would continue our work on its behalf.

At the closing ceremony of the exhibition, Yury Novikov proposed a draft of the TEII charter, and long discussions began in Afonichev's and Novikov's apartments.

The charter was adopted at a meeting of the painters. We decided to consider the participants of the exhibition "On Bronnitskaya" the charter members of TEII. This, of course, depended on their agreement. In order to continue its work an initial group of directors was elected which included Novikov, Grigorev, and me. Several months passed but there was still no answer to our
letter. In order to clarify the matter and determine if it was possible to get an answer, Lotsman and Mitavsky were sent to Moscow again with a new letter. However, they came back with nothing. But literally after a couple of days an answer was delivered to Afonichev’s address. Our visit to the central Committee had not been in vain.

Never before had anything like this taken place in the history of relations between unofficial artists and the authorities! Nevertheless, it was clear from their reply that the authorities had no intention of recognizing us as professional artists or to recognize TEII itself, although they did not formally ban our organization. The initial group began to prepare a request to the Department of Culture for an official exhibition to be held under the auspices of TEII.

At the same time, to increase the pressure on the authorities and to give them no peace, we decided to continue organizing apartment exhibitions. But we fumbled the next exhibition at Igor Smirnov’s apartment at 3 Sovietskaya Street in the spring after our triumph “On Bronnitskaya.”

We were not about to get caught up in some conspiracy; the entrance to the apartment was closed by the police long before the exhibit’s opening. The authorities said, “We have no intention of bothering you, but we’re not letting any visitors in.” Even when one of the painters started to leave the apartment, they would not let him. A policeman told him, “You can leave the apartment safely only if you take your painting and go home. Only on that condition.”

The situation was absolutely stupid. That time, the KGB won on each point. However, there were no problems for the participants or the apartment’s owners. Soon after that Igor Smirnov immigrated to America.

It was 1982. Of the many apartment exhibitions held, it is worth mentioning three which became landmarks in determining the organization of artists who represented Leningrad/St. Petersburg nonconformist art.

1. “On Kustarny Lane” – one of the first unofficial exhibitions that was the impetus for a whole series of apartment exhibitions that exerted pressure on the authorities (1970-1971).
2. At ballerina A. Osipenko’s apartment, where essentially a new group of unofficial painters formed from both the “older” and “younger” generations; December, 1980.
3. “On Bronnitskaya,” where the independent organization of nonconformists of the 1980s began and formed the basis for TEII.

The last apartment exhibitions were organized by TEII in 1986. Those were the “days of open doors” in the apartments of painters wishing to participate. The exhibitions were held to protest the stupid censorship of the official exhibition of TEII. The artists decided to close down that exhibition because of their disagreements with the authorities’ demands. It was the first time such a thing had ever happened!

The city committee which had to approve officially sanctioned exhibitions consisted of representatives from the Communist Party, the Komsomol, the KGB, the Department of Culture, and the official Union of Painters. Altogether
there were about ten to fifteen people.

The paintings at the exposition were examined with three criteria in mind: 1) whether there was any anti-Soviet propaganda in the subject matter; 2) whether the subject could be considered as religious propaganda and, 3) whether any of the images were pornographic.

It's worth mentioning that the members of the commission must have had very vivid imaginations, as forty-four paintings by twenty-five artists (out of one hundred and eighty-six) were banned from the exhibition. One thought that a fantastic old man flying on a bird resembled the writer and dissident Solzhenitsyn. Someone else demanded that a cross be removed from an image of a church and that a halo over a character's head be removed. Any naked body that differed from the academic style was considered pornography. After four days of negotiations everything ended with the "self-removal" of the paintings from the exhibition hall, and a letter written by the painters to Mikhail Gorbachev, the new leader of the USSR and perestroika. The painters demanded that their union be recognized. There was no reply to their letter.

TEII was the second union formed of unofficial Leningrad artists. It determined the cultural landscape in Leningrad during the 1980s, along with the unofficial literary clubs "Club 81" and "Rock Club."

Over the course of those ten years TEII held thirteen large exhibitions of nonconformist art in Leningrad, in which about three hundred painters participated. Hundreds of thousands of visitors came to those exhibitions. This proved that they were interested in native vanguard art. It was how we made our stand in the Motherland because we did not want to immigrate to other countries.

It was only in 1991 that the Association of "Free Culture" (FCA) became officially registered. This was the third incarnation of the professional creative union of independent modern artists from various professions. It happened at the very same time when the city regained its original name of St. Petersburg.

It is possible that St. Petersburg nonconformist art as a phenomenon is now in the past. But the philosophy of nonconformism will continue to exist as long as man's consciousness aspires towards perfection.

The painters' association continued its activities. Its main goal remained to establish conditions where professional artists can work and to guarantee them a place in society. The independent figures of contemporary art united around the idea of a "New Utopia."

One day in the spring of 1989, we (Yuly Rybakov, Zhenya Orlov and myself) were coming back from an exhibition. We were all a little depressed, and found ourselves in the small square on Pushkin Street where there is a monument to Alexander Pushkin. We were discussing the concept of a cultural center, which I was obsessed with at the time. I had already visited half of America trying to find sponsors for our project, while at the same time becoming acquainted with how such centers are organized abroad. We were considering how to establish something similar but in our own style. We examined the area around Apraksin Dvor, and thought about locating it in the neighborhood of New Holland. There were certain advantages
and disadvantages everywhere, but we could not reach an agreement.

Just as our heated discussion had led us once more to a dead end, the clock in the bell tower of Vladimir Cathedral struck midnight. A shadow moved above us, and we heard Pushkin curse and say, “Here is a house for you! What more do you want?” We looked up, and saw the poet’s finger pointing to Pushkinskaya Street #10.

Upon entering the courtyard of that mysterious building, we immediately realized that it was the very place we needed. It looked like the Ark. It was floating slowly on waves of time. We felt as if we were embarking on the future.

Many years have passed, but the ship is still sailing.

To memorialize the tradition of apartment exhibitions we decided to occupy the huge complex, which city authorities had long planned to renovate. The project was completed in seven years. And that is how the Art Centre “Pushkinskaya-10” came to be.

In the apartments of the building today there are studios for painters, musicians, and actors, as well as galleries, the Museum of Nonconformist Art, concert halls, publishing companies, and book and music stores. The atmosphere we created at “Pushkinskaya-10” is harmonious and helps put into motion the potential energy of an artist. Here one can find everything necessary for a painter living within a finite time — from self-expression to self-actualization.

“Pushkinskaya-10” itself is a work of art. It is a syntopia created by painters along the lines of the organization of apartment exhibitions.
FROM EPOCH TO EPOCH

Moving along the banks of the Markizov Pond
From Kronstadt’s sea level marker...
That measures the water level for the return home
To the mouth of the Neva and farther,

We entered the river, stealthily passing the bastions of the fortress
Under the sharp gazes of Peter and Paul,
And sailed against the tide from the 20th century to the 21st
In search of the lost Earth where our ark,
As Nostradamus foretold, had to return.

We found the earth in that very place
Where the tunnel of the metro opens up onto Ligovsky;
As new generations with different, new ideas we returned
From the underground to shout from the rooftops.

And the bronze god of speech,
A generation of Ethiopian warriors and Russian bureaucrats
Blessed us to build a temple of art on the ruins of a century.
And there the bricks of hundred-year-old walls
Began to radiate warmth
And there the music of freedom began to resound.

Above the roof of the Petersburg ark
We raised a flag into the cosmos
Joining the past, present and future
As they enfold the lost planet earth
In endless possibilities of intersecting horizons,
Each now passing over the house on “Pushkinskaya Ten”
Forming a Parallelosphere of Peace
In which we continue to work
Preserving everything that teems with life.

SERGEI KOVALSKY
Вячеслав Афоничев / Vyacheslav Afonichev (Russian, born 1946)

Бык / A Bull

1976, oil on cardboard, 25 1/2 x 34 1/4 inches

(cat. no. 1)
The future historian of our otherworldly art will undoubtedly face an impossible task if he or she wishes to penetrate deeply into the psychology of our time, into the compelling motives of the artists to create, and of the viewers to see what was done by these artists. They will come face to face with the astonishing phenomenon of our time that bears the name “apartment exhibitions.”... A strange exhibition set up, as a rule, in some dingy apartment to be found at the end of dead-end lanes and dark courtyards after tripping over slippery staircases and piles of garbage. It was worth every moment to see an exhibition in this dilapidated room when the lights go out for a while, and not a one of the many visitors heads for the exit, but, instead, they begin striking matches — the dancing, miniscule flames light up fragments of the paintings. The canvases immediately take on a marvelous multi-dimensional spatial quality — something that just couldn’t have happened at even the most outlandish official exhibition!

The exhibition *The Space of Freedom: Apartment Exhibitions in Leningrad, 1964-1986* invites visitors directly into the carefully re-created interior of a Soviet communal apartment. Within the kind of environment where the paintings first breathed freely, visitors have the opportunity to experience works by unofficial artists of the Soviet era who boldly executed and exhibited art that did not conform to the ideological prescriptions of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. These artists had to substitute the private space of their apartments for the public space controlled and denied them by the Party. Planning and staging these exhibitions, the artists defied the cultural impositions of an authoritarian regime that
repeatedly demonstrated its resolve to suppress them.

Out of a compelling need and consuming desire to survive, these artists had to organize themselves not only to exhibit their work, but also to promulgate and perpetuate it as a second culture deserving to exist in its own right. Apartment exhibitions provided a space for unsanctioned artists to come together physically as a community. In that space they inspired each other to continue to learn, to create freely, and to boldly assert their right to do so. From the 1950s through the 1980s the private space of the communal apartment became a primary space for personal and group salon-style exhibitions, installations and performance art, for serious discussions about the social and artistic concerns of outlawed artists, for poetry readings and for “happenings” in general, as they were known in the 60s. The salon-style exhibitions in the apartments are reminiscent of the 1860s Salon des Refusés in France. Artists also used these occasions to devour rare copies of such new official Soviet publications as Abstractionism: The Demise of Civilization replete with high quality color illustrations of what was a decadent Western substitute for true art.

The University of Richmond Museums’ The Space of Freedom illustrates the Leningrad apartment exhibitions as a phenomenon of historical and artistic significance. These exhibitions were literally a staging ground for the birth and development of a new culture of art in Russia and throughout the Soviet Union during the period 1964-1986. The paintings in the exhibition represent the choice of a generation of artists to stay “at home,” both in their own country and in the space of their own apartments, rather than to emigrate. They are the product of the artists’ commitment to create a new culture from the inside out rather than from the outside in. By staying in Russia and explicitly asserting their creative impulse, the artists had, in their own words, “migrated” to a new homeland where bureaucracy and ideology could not touch them.

In her essay on the unofficial art of Leningrad Tatiana Shekhter emphasizes the lack of a definition or concise term for the art created during this period, which is still too recent to fully examine from a historical perspective. She argues that the term unofficial does not suit the situation entirely because its use assumes a democratic context in which the merits of the art are debated and arrived at by the public and by critics in an open forum. As it wrestled with the restrictions of official art and, by its mere production, contravened the tenets of that art, it was referred to as nonconformist art in the West. This name sits uneasily with historians because it resulted more from the point of view of official Soviet mainstream culture rather than from a description of the essential nature of the art or of the intention of the unofficial artists themselves.

As heirs of the Russian avant-garde of the 1910s and the 1920s, the artists and the work they produced are also referred to as the Russian “post-avant-garde.” Existing concurrently with the mainstream Soviet culture yet lacking official validation, this artistic movement had to survive without the support mechanisms enjoyed by the mainstream culture. To survive and create, these artists organized themselves professionally, privately exhibited their art to engage the public, promulgated their ideas and documented their own existence, and prepared a new generation of artists to develop and continue their culture into the future. From this perspective, the movement can be referred to as a “second culture.”
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The art in _The Space of Freedom_ represents only a fragment of the unofficial or “second culture” that became an important feature of painting during the Soviet period of Russian history. The apartment exhibitions in Leningrad and in Moscow played a significant role in reconnecting painting of the second half of the twentieth century in the Soviet Union with that of its first two decades, particularly with the Russian avant-garde and other experimental art of the early Soviet period.

From Arefiev and Shvarts to Kovalsky and Orlov, from the Order of Destitute Painters (1956) to the Association of Experimental Fine Arts (1981), the artists in this exhibition represent the broad spectrum of creativity that constitutes the legacy of nonconformist art in the Soviet Union. Nonetheless, the paintings have at least one thing in common: they all existed in the marginal space of illegality and as such were apparently only tangential to mainstream Soviet culture. However, it must be noted that when creating these works the authors were impervious to the term “illegality” and, ironically, the works themselves were quite possibly one of the few points of contact with an uncompromised culture that art during the Soviet period may be able to claim.

Much as the Russian Orthodox churches were the “sanctuary” of meaning associated with icons, the communal apartment became such a “sanctuary” for nonconformist artists and their work. Installing nonconformist art in a museum is similar to displaying icons in a museum because the institutional setting diminishes the art’s critical content. _The Space of Freedom_ is set in a re-created room of a communal apartment as an attempt to restore the context in which the paintings were created, exhibited, and discussed. In addition, the re-creation of a communal apartment in an American museum gives a visual representation of part of the enigmatic process of socialization and of economic life during the Soviet period that was integral to the birth and development of nonconformist art.

The four close, humble walls that formed the individual living space within the _kommunalka_ or the communal apartment were the bastions of this forbidden and forgotten heritage of an entire culture. For all of the seeming deprivation they represented, they were the workshops of a nation of artists whose determination to create freely widened those four walls to infinity. Beyond those walls, past the kitchen stove and the common toilet, beyond the suspicion and betrayal, beyond the shouting and drunkenness, these artists reached out of their time and space and connected with a generation of their predecessors long silenced behind the veil of ideological edicts on art.

To the Soviet citizen, the _kommunalka_ was both
a “space of freedom” and “a space of involuntary confinement.” As the latter, the *kommunalka* is a rather public space, as Boris Groys writes, where the inviolability of one’s person was neutralized. Anyone could use or manipulate whatever form of communication the living of one’s life in such common space yielded against anyone else. The inhabitants speak, are listened to, and overheard whether they are uttering hope or despair, love or hate. In this common space, one loses control of practically all communication about oneself. It enters a public domain to be used to define an individual as one’s neighbors determine. His humor and irony notwithstanding, Yury Kabakov’s 1990s installation, “*Kommunalka,*” illustrates the communal apartment as a definition of painful psychological and physical human extremes.

Exhibiting their paintings together, collectively, in communal apartments, the artists altered the nature of the space they lived in. *The Space of Freedom* recalls and dramatizes the reconfiguration of the communal apartment not as a space of confinement, but as it became a space of freedom in the hands of free creative artists who exhibited there. Whether consciously or subconsciously, those artists transformed that space of exposure and isolation into one of transparency and unity. The exhibitions became a venue to see and discuss each other’s work, enjoy the camaraderie and encouragement of their peers, and plan their future.

In some respects unofficial artists, or, perhaps even more accurately here, the artists of the second culture were “homeless” except for the home they created collectively in those apartments. That “home” was a form of consciousness predicated on the integrity of the creative personality as discovered by the individual and on the free play of the creative impulse as exercised by the artist. They had to discover this consciousness as a mooring to a reality that the sterile world of Soviet ideology denied them. In a hostile atmosphere that forbade the open expression of individual and independent creative vision, culture had to continue to advance, to push the envelope to connect with that reality, with that truth in whatever form it found necessary to assume. Given such an environment, it is not surprising that from time to time suspicions of the presence of KGB stoolpigeons hung heavily above some of the apartment exhibitions.

The cataclysmic changes in Bolshevik Russia dramatically affected the direction of Russian art from 1917 to the present. In 1918 Lenin declared Moscow the administrative center of Soviet political, economic, and social power. After 206 years as the capital of Russia, St. Petersburg was forced to bow out of the political and cultural limelight for which she was born and regally outfitted. In the new Soviet ideological climate, the culture of St. Petersburg that had developed in close company with the great cultures of the world since its birth, became isolated and was forced to submit to Moscow’s control.
After a 1932 decree abolishing all revolutionary artistic groups, the Party moved to impose uniformity in artistic production; art was to be “engineered.” In 1934, after consultation with members of the artistic community, the Soviet cultural establishment adopted Socialist Realism as the official party line according to which all forms of creative expression would be directed to best serve the building of socialism. All artistic production was polarized: official art bore the Party’s ideological approval and unofficial art did not and suffered the consequences.

The criteria for the creation of any work of art whether it be painting, film, poetry, prose, sculpture, theatre, cinema, or music, were narodnost’, partiinost’, klassovost’, and ideinost’. Narodnost’ (literally translated as “people-ness” or populist) is the quality of being accessible to the people and reflecting the essential characteristics and interests of the peoples of the Soviet Union without partiality for any ethnic group. Partiinost’ (“party-ness”) is the quality of being imbued with loyalty, dedication, service, and sensitivity to the Party as the leader of the masses on the road to socialism. Klassovost’ (“class-ness”) reflects the understanding of the history and principles of class warfare and the struggle to eliminate bourgeois individualism in favor of social collectivism. Ideinost’ (“idea-ness”) demands that any work of art must be steeped in the fundamental ideology of the Party as it guides the Soviet Union to its revolutionary future.

After Stalin’s death in 1953 and Khrushev’s denunciation of his “excesses” at the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party in 1956, the arts enjoyed a period of euphoria that was cut short by harsh reminders that the hard times were not yet over. It soon became clear that there was still no tolerance of creativity that pursued aims other than those of an already bankrupt Marxist-Leninist ideology. The Party controlled everything through the government. Every theatre, every museum, every newspaper, every television and radio station, and every film studio — all had both a Party and a government apparatus as part of the directorate for the proper ideological use of those outlets of culture, education, and information.

There was no commercial art world, there were no private galleries — nothing was private, at least as far as the Party knew. Artists working outside the parameters of that ideology were, at best, ignored, or, at worst, suppressed. The Union of Soviet Artists controlled all exhibition spaces, which essentially belonged to the government since it held and controlled all assets within the country.

Some artists avoided membership in the Union of Artists as a matter of principle since the Party used it to co-opt the creativity of its members by promising them highly prized perks in return for submission. When artistic work was deemed ideologically inappropriate, the Party denied permission to publicly exhibit that work and excluded the artists from the extremely privileged world of government commissions.

The official response to the unofficial artists’ request to create their own independent professional educational structures and artistic organizations was that they had many opportunities within the system of “samodeyatel’nost’” to pursue their artistic interests just like other Soviet citizens. This meant that they were free to join their comrades in any one of the many amateur groups to take up painting in their spare time from their normal eight-hour-a-day workweek. Without diplomas from official state art institutes, however, they had no right either to behave as professional artists or to exhibit or sell their work.
to the public. If they pursued a career only as a professional artist without the proper official documents, the Party considered them parasites and, as such, criminals.

Even their own self-obsession with being followed by government agents began to hound unofficial artists. Like Fanon's native, nonconformist artists in the Soviet Union existed in a nervous condition because of the constant threat to their culture. The nervous energy from such a precipitous existence became a catalyst for them to create and sustain a remarkable new culture. As Solzhenitsyn wrote of his heroes in the world of the GULAG, unofficial artists became human beings in the white heat of this "condition." Oddly enough, many of the artists who experienced this now often find themselves at a loss without its stimulus and are nostalgic for it.

Denied public expression and demonstration of their creativity, the ever resourceful and resilient artists began exhibiting in their own apartments in 1964. Similarly, banned musicians performed "apartment concerts" and illegal troupes of actors gave "apartment plays." The point of their efforts was not necessarily to oppose the system; they were simply creative artists who presumed that they had the right to express themselves and to demonstrate their creativity in whatever form that might take.

There were great risks in presuming they were free to create. The Party defined the exercise of this freedom as defiance, and, thus, as illegal. From the artists' perspective, the creation of a nonconformist art was not necessarily intentional; the majority of the artists were apolitical. Nonconformist art was defined as political from the point of view of the Party's collective paranoid imagination. Many of the artists would agree that, ironically, the Party's dogged and cruel attempts to eradicate non-sanctioned art and to punish its creators became a primary contributing factor in the creation of the nonconformist movement. In fact, in many instances, the government's disapproval of literary or artistic works was often considered a reliable indication that they must have had significant aesthetic merit.

The demand for adherence to the criteria of Socialist Realism was unequivocal. In the second half of the 1930s, the punishments for violation were draconian. The Party decimated the nation's creative genius and erased the names of an entire generation of creative artists by exile, imprisonment, or execution. During World War II, when the USSR was in a life and death struggle against an outside fascist enemy, there was a brief reprieve for alleged internal enemies of the state. However, with Hitler's defeat, the Party stepped up its efforts to control those enemies and to keep out the effects of so-called decadent bourgeois and cosmopolitan Western influences.

One of the earliest groups of nonconformists in postwar-Leningrad was the Order of Impoverished
Painters (ONZh, later known as the Arefiev Circle) that included Aleksandr Arefiev, Rikhard Vasmi, Valentin Gromov, Vladimir Shagin, and Sholom Shvarts, and the poet Roald Mandelshtam, who provided inspiration for the group and a place for them to gather. Generally recognized as the fathers of the Leningrad underground, each of these artists is represented in The Space of Freedom. Innovative in form and content, their work was instantly recognized as problematic and threatening. Inspired by Cézanne's experiments in color and form, their work tended more toward the grotesque and often portrayed the abject moral and material poverty of everyday existence in the Soviet Union — a forbidden theme in any sense of the word.

Resisting official culture was a tremendous challenge, the mere undertaking of which contributed significantly to the stature and historical value of the second culture. Yury Novikov, a leading historian of the movement, writes:

*In the unofficial sphere, as nowhere else in our country, the development of art is left to its own laws in the purest form... There's just one difference today. Now the process is hamstrung by... social pressure that significantly distorts the immanent laws of the development of this art. On the other hand, it cannot be denied that the impulse to respond to the needs or pressures of society is a traditional aspect of Russian culture. That is what has given Russian culture its longevity and its stamina.*

Unofficial artists lived as if they were part of a society that supported free expression. They believed, as Hegel did, that consciousness makes life rather than the other way around. By choosing to live and create freely, they were determined to re-create their society. Vladislav Sukhorukov, a nonconformist, said that, "Immortality begins with consciousness and consciousness begins with artistic creativity." Eventually, their consciousness and their choice changed life in their country. It was their sense of the true nature of culture that made their efforts necessary and their eventual success certain. Mikhail Epstein writes of the kind of disposition such a commitment entails in the realm of culture:

>To live within society and to be free of it — this is what culture is about. It enters the blood and bone of society, in order to liberate individuals from the constraints of their social existence, from its repressive tendencies and historical limitations, much as spirit is not free from body, but represents a liberating force able to transcend external obstacles."

*The Space of Freedom* focuses on what these artists were doing in their own time as part of the development of art in all of time. In a sense, their work was simply a part of an inevitable and universal natural process. They were attempting to find a way to engage their own particular process and search for self-awareness and self-knowledge both as individuals and as artists, and to develop and apply an artistic form or systems of forms and approaches for the expression of both the process of their search and its results. The context of suppression in the Soviet Union simply complicated matters. The task of these artists was to reflect and represent public and private life in artistic form no matter the conditions of their time and space. Given the traditions they were born into, they were well equipped to undertake that task.

The conscious configuration and assertion
of their right to express their ideas in whatever form they chose is the legacy that unofficial artists left for all future generations of artists in Russia. They undertook the arduous and dangerous task of ensuring that culture would not be denied its process of perpetual renewal and growth. Paradoxically, the true significance of the underground may be that, as such a cultural force, it served the dominant culture as a source of innovation and renewal necessary organically for the mainstream Soviet culture to survive.\(^7\)

Historians agree that through its process of self-evaluation and renewal this new form of culture moved art forward in the Soviet Union beyond the prescriptions of Socialist Realism and whatever the artists themselves or the Party could have even imagined. Unofficial artists assumed the responsibility of generating progress within their culture, creating what could be called an aesthetics of transition.\(^8\) Scrupulously maintaining the integrity of their artistic vision, they, nonetheless, had to work in isolation from the rest of world. This isolation complicated the indispensable intersection of influence from other cultures with the discoveries they were making. On the other hand, unofficial artists saw their predicament as analogous to that of cavemen beginning a new culture from scratch or to that of the ancient Greeks. In any case, they pride themselves on rejuvenating their culture and reconnecting it with those of the rest of the world.

Compared to the plight of oppressed writers during the Soviet era, the history of unofficial visual artists remains relatively unknown. Through the Western media, international attention to the plight of creative writers under the USSR amplified their voices. A single bulldozed exhibition, periodic beatings and harassment were not enough to capture and hold the attention of the Western press as were the suppression, imprisonment or exile of a dissident writer in open defiance of the system. The artists' insistence on maintaining the integrity of their right to self-expression, not necessarily as a form of opposition but as a form of free expression of ideas, distinguished unofficial painters from writers such as Alexander Solzhenitsyn, whose work was openly critical of the Soviet regime. Solzhenitsyn and other dissident writers used their work to criticize and pummel the system; painters, in general, simply created as a naturally inherent right of self-expression without overtly dramatizing righteousness. While unofficial artists were hardly ever mentioned in the Soviet press, dissident writers and their works were regularly and vehemently denounced and, thus, had an instant audience, both at home and abroad. However, dissident writers and marginalized unofficial painters together were responsible for the process that led to the political and social changes of perestroika and glasnost begun in 1985 under Mikhail Gorbachev.

A phrase that repeatedly appears as the context of the discourse in Russian art history is duxovnaja kul'tura or "spiritual culture" as a specific product of the dynamics of all the phenomena of Russian culture. The phrase has an elasticity that accommodates practically anything that affects the evolution of the human spirit or soul. Characteristically, Russian cultural figures consciously accept a level of responsibility for the creation of this duxovnaja kul'tura by relating everything — even the very byt or daily grind of Russian existence — to the fundamental principle of being itself.

Today, unofficial Russian artists often speak of their compulsion to express the spiritual
dimension of human existence in their work. Russian Orthodoxy was, in general, the chief dynamic cultural force that gave birth to this compulsion in the visual arts. The second culture that seemed to appear spontaneously in the 1950s through the 1980s is part of a continuum begun in the first three decades of the twentieth century by the Russian avant-garde and the artist-cosmists who likewise inspired the later generation. In fact, recent histories of the movement go so far as to define the second culture as “an illegal institutionalization of the ideas and experiments in culture that have continued in Soviet art since the 1920s.”

While living in the shadow of Socialist Realism, nonconformist artists were committed to preserving and keeping alive the process of discovering the beautiful rather than advertising a prefabricated and engineered ideology of beauty. It was a spiritual and conscious process. In the early 1920s Nicholas Roerich (1874-1947), a major figure in Russian cosmism, recast the well-worn adage attributed to Dostoevsky that “art will save the world” when he wrote “consciousness of beauty will save the world.” This “consciousness” was the subject, the substance, and the context of the process that artists engaged in creating a second culture in the Soviet Union.

Contemporary critical readings of the first generation of the Russian avant-garde of the second decade of the twentieth century and of the second culture of the 1960s and 1980s are often skeptical of this spiritual aspect expressed by those artists in their work as well in what they have said or written about their work. Beginning with Kandinsky, the avant-garde was deeply engaged in a process of creativity to which the dimension of spirituality, not necessarily in some mystical form, was ontologically fundamental to their understanding and definition of the creative artist. For subsequent generations of the avant-garde this definition and understanding became the sine qua non of the artists' lives. They did not merely see their world as matter, as Marx would have it, but as the manifestation of a higher reality to which they were accountable for their “vision” of the earthly reality. Dostoevsky codified that connection for the Russian artist when he wrote in The Brothers Karamazov (1881) of a “paradise on earth” that is the manifestation of the eternal verity in the passing show of earthly existence. From Dostoevsky’s perspective, a spiritual search cast by means of artistic endeavors has as its single goal the realization in real time and space of the truth discovered beyond the search, the transfiguration (preobrazhnenie) of the “earthly reality.”

In the work of Malevich, Filonov, Goncharova, and Larionov during the second and third decades of the twentieth century, there is a pronounced disenchantment with the traditional views and conventions of form. This arose from their understanding that the forms of conditional existence that serve as the creative constructions to convey visions of a greater reality had either failed or betrayed humankind. Somehow the artistic conventional arrangements of the elements of form at their disposal no longer served the revelation and understanding of truth.

The Russian avant-garde attached a broad significance to their work. They based their creations on life-building principles, on the utopian idea of rebuilding reality by means of art. A distinctly unique sense of civil or social responsibility was part of the motivation for their spiritual search. Rarely did these artists remain solely within tame or purely aesthetic boundaries of art for art's sake. Kandinsky's and Malevich's theories of the spiritual extended far beyond
the confines of visual art and directly addressed humanity, demanding spiritual growth. Their investigation into the spiritual dimension of art was to create a socially significant art with a spiritual dimension. In Russian culture this goal had become the unconditional internal tradition whose influence reached across all trends, styles, and different artistic concepts.  

By the beginning of the twentieth century Russian science and philosophy had in the form of Russian cosmism begun to formulate its own version of the creative transfiguration of existence by man in the image of the divine. Russian cosmism sees the universe as a union of all living beings in a single non-anthropocentric process of secular and spiritual evolution toward a higher state of consciousness with humanity actively moving it forward morally, physically, and psychically. A fusion of unwavering faith in the potential of humankind and the cosmos with a remarkably creative synthesis of empirical and abstract thought, Russian cosmism is an ultra-utopian dream of the perfection of humankind and of conditional existence altogether. It can be seen as part of the deep-seated impulse to Socialism and as germane to the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia.

As important as the link between the first generation of the Russian avant-garde and artists living and painting today in Russia is the link that can be traced back to a little known group of painters called "Amaravella" that formed in 1923. By 1927 the members of this group included Pyotr Petrovich Fateev, Boris Alekseevich Smirnov-Rusetsky, Vera Nikolaevna Pshesetskaya (Runa), Aleksandr Pavlovich Sardan, Sergei Ivanovich Shigolev, and Viktor Tikhonovich Chernovolenko.

Amaravella arose in the 1920s when the atmosphere was one of revolution rather than evolution. Suprematism, Futurism, and Constructivism with their formal concerns and their geometrization of the language of painting dominated artistic expression in Russia. However, Amaravella sought to reveal the subtle, esoteric aspects of the cosmos in human form, in landscapes, and in the graphic depiction of abstract images of humankind's inner world or microcosmos. "In striving for this goal," the members of Amaravella declared in their manifesto of 1923, "the element of technical form is secondary, not claiming any totally independent significance. Therefore the perception of our paintings must follow not the path of a rational, formal analysis, but the path of feeling-intuition and of inner empathy..."  

Amaravella dedicated itself to developing a new aesthetic language to depict the immortality of the human soul, the infinity of the cosmos, and the relationship between them. Their work depicts the cosmos as an organism and projects a future of infinite promise. Under the influence of the writings of Nicholas and Elena Roerich, Amaravella created an art based on unity rather than fragmentation, and became a form of spiritual practice in the service of humanity. The group's goal was to expand human consciousness by developing a cosmic point of view. They sought to remove humankind's anthropomorphic, geocentric blinders, by penetrating the reality of the cosmos beyond the merely Euclidean and empirically verifiable, and to expand the potential of the senses through an understanding of psychic energies. This penetration to the other side (v tu storonu) through art necessitated the development as well of a new aesthetic of the beautiful that recognized the suspension of the restrictive parameters of conditional existence as the true purview of human consciousness. These ideas resonate powerfully with those of Dostoevsky, particularly in The Brothers Karamazov when Alyosha looks to the stars and is
attracted to “distant other worlds” that are beyond humanity’s preoccupation with its own geocentric traumas and dilemmas.

In the 1920s the artists of Amaravella, known also as artist-cosmists, shared the frame of mind that lead to broad experimentation and serious investigation across all disciplines into the rift existing between human beings and between humankind and the cosmos. It was apparent to leading cultural figures such as Scriabin, Kandinsky, Bely, Vernadsky, Feodorov, and Tsiolkovsky that some form of relationship and understanding had to be restored between humankind and the environment, God, ancient wisdom, the universe, and the cosmos, in general. Restoring their links to Amaravella and Roerich, unofficial artists continued the development and application of the worldview of Russian cosmism. Understandably, the birth and development of a new culture demands to be perspicaciously chronicled and objectively evaluated within the context of other existing cultures. Unofficial art and unofficial artists engendered unofficial art history and art historians including Andreeva, Shekhter, Khlobystin, Basin, Skobkina, Rosenfeld, Rapoport, Kovalsky, Unksova, and Y. Novikov. The difficulty with the development of such a historical narrative has been that such a discourse was not permitted prior to 1985 and has developed publicly only since the beginning of glasnost’ and perestroika. Archived samizdat publications establish the historical context of the collective efforts devoted to the creation of a second culture. Some publications are collections of painstakingly created catalogues and peripheral materials for apartment exhibitions, brochures, and letters to and from Soviet officials as well as articles in personal archives about apartment exhibitions.12

A full and thorough objective evaluation of unofficial art in the Soviet Union and its place in art history has yet to be made, due in part to the personalities of the artists from that era. These artists who founded the second culture are often portrayed as larger than life because of their tenacity in maintaining their integrity against overpowering odds. To some degree, such recognition is entirely appropriate; what they accomplished is heroic. However, in the past their legendary personas have prohibited impartial consideration of their work and many unofficial artists today admit that they knew they were not all Picassos or Cézannes.

Also contributing to the dearth of objective analysis is the fact that much of what was written about unofficial art revealed the individual taste of critics and those connoisseurs, usually foreign diplomats, who provided more of a compendium of who was “in” and who was “out” among the struggling artists of the underground than a critical perspective.

To complicate matters, the general public was ill equipped to understand or accept unofficial art. Those who did communicate publicly about the unofficial art focused on its literary and social aspects without addressing the context of the search for a new artistic identity through the exploration of the full spectrum of form and color. Consequently, Alex Rapoport wrote that “...artists who became the focus of the movement were often those whose work was understandable to ‘men of letters’ as illustrative pamphlets or on anecdotal levels, or as simple single-minded political satire. It was easier for them to write about the art from that perspective.”13 The literariness of nineteenth-century Russian painting that was familiar to the Russian public and demanded and promulgated by Soviet Socialist Realism was a stumbling block to the reception of the innovative experimentation
that lies at the heart of unofficial art. In the history of any cultural movement there are milestones that reflect the dynamics of the process that leads to a fledgling movement's development and eventual institutionalization. The historical narratives of the trajectory of unofficial art from the late 1940s to 1986 agree on certain moments as turning points in the history of Russia's second culture. The more than one hundred apartment exhibitions from 1964 to 1986 form the bedrock of the movement in Leningrad. As Tatiana Shekhter writes,

Each large apartment exhibition led to one or another turn in the life of the underground. By bringing artists together, these exhibitions synchronized creative energies, clarified the supporters and opponents of the movement, and attracted new participants into the ranks of nonconformists. Indeed, not every artist who said he was a nonconformist would risk falling into the sights of the KGB by hanging his works on the grungy wallpaper of a discarded apartment or in one of the rooms of an overcrowded communal apartment.

In addition to apartment exhibitions, exhibitions at Palaces of Culture were also critical moments for Leningrad's unofficial art. The second culture took its nickname, Gazanévštchína, from two such exhibitions in Leningrad held at the Gaz Palace of Culture in 1974 and the Nevsky Palace of Culture in 1975. These were the first exhibitions to be officially sanctioned in Leningrad, known for its rather obdurate cultural officials. Artists with many different styles came together for these exhibitions to celebrate the diversity of the underground movement. The exhibitions demonstrated the adrenalin rush that resulted from and powered the search for individual expression and creative freedom. The impact of these two exhibitions in terms of validating and promoting nonconformist art in Leningrad overrode the uneven quality of the art exhibited.

Official approval for these exhibitions of unofficial art was due in part to the recent international outcry at the KGB's brutality during an open-air exhibition in Moscow in 1974. At the "Bulldozer Exhibition," as it was subsequently known, the KGB's hired thugs physically assaulted the artists and destroyed their paintings with bulldozers.

Sources estimate that the combined attendance at the two Leningrad exhibitions exceeded ten thousand over several days. Fifty-two unofficial artists participated in the exhibition at the Gaz Palace of Culture that lasted for four days. Eighty-eight artists exhibited at the Nevsky Palace of Culture, the largest exhibition of unofficial artists ever, lasting for ten days. Despite official approval, agents of the cultural ministry observed and photographed the visitors and the artists participating in the exhibitions. Such "observers" are humorously referred to as "art critics dressed in state uniforms" (iskusstvovedy v shtatskom), but their presence outside the exhibit halls was no laughing matter.

Once the furor over the "Bulldozer Exhibition" abated, the KGB and the police again applied pressure on unofficial artists. A leading Leningrad artist Evgeny Rukhin, one of the chief organizers of the Moscow exhibition, died under questionable circumstances in 1976. While Rukhin's death shocked and frightened Leningrad's artistic community, it nevertheless further galvanized the movement. Equally determined to live and work as if they were free to do so, the younger generation that had appeared
resumed the apartment exhibitions together with the older generation.

From November 14 through 17, 1981, in an apartment vacated for major renovations, one of the largest exhibitions of Leningrad’s unofficial art was held at #1/3 on Bronnitskaya Street. Collectively, the sixty-one featured artworks represented the breadth of creative diversity that formed the soul of the second culture in Leningrad. Though it occurred at the beginning of the last decade before the demise of the Soviet Union, in a very real sense “Bronnitskaya” was the culmination of the apartment exhibitions in Leningrad that began in 1964. Although city officials periodically permitted group exhibitions of unofficial artists afterwards, battles over censorship continued until the late 1980s. Including many works from the Bronnitskaya exhibition, The Space of Freedom: the Apartment Exhibitions in Leningrad, 1964-1986 is dedicated to the twenty-fifth anniversary of this historical moment in Russian art.

ENDNOTES

2. Tatiana Shekhter, “Neofitsial’noe iskusstvo Petersburga: Ocherki istorii” from the Archives of the Museum of Nonconformist Art, St. Petersburg, (author’s translations) 2.
3. Unofficial art was exhibited only rarely in apartments that were not communal. Initially, the apartment exhibitions were held at private apartments of refusniks, who felt they had nothing else to lose.
5. Novikov, 10.
7. Tatiana Shekhter, 1.
11. Jurii V. Linnik, Katalog vystavki proizvedenii gruppy “Amaravela” iz kollektis Y.V. Linnika, (Petrozavodsk: “Kareliya” 1989) 1-2. Linnik, a prolific writer and professor of philosophy at the University of Petro-Zavodsk, holds the largest and most complete collection of the works by this group of artists. Practically every inch of every wall in his fairly large apartment is covered with these extraordinary paintings.
12. The archive at the Museum of Nonconformist Art in St. Petersburg has an extensive collection of such samizdat primary materials on Leningrad’s unofficial art. Many in the city have their own private collections as well. For example, Sergei Kovalsky, the president and one of the founders of Pushkin-10 Art Centre and of the “Brotherhood of Free Culture” and other earlier organizations of artists in St. Petersburg has three large volumes: “Galleraya I”, “Galleraya II” and “Dokumenty”, in which he has gathered meticulously prepared samizdat materials that chronicle the development of unofficial art in Leningrad. The volumes include details and photographs of the apartment exhibitions; articles and responses to the exhibitions and the works exhibited; articles on artists; correspondence with Soviet cultural officials; excerpts from the Soviet press, and much more.
15. Shekhter, 15.
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1. 1957, Leningrad Electrotechnical Institute.
11. 1975, In the apartment of E. Abezgauz. Prospect Stachek, #76.
16. 1977, At the Kazarov's on Dresden Street, #28.
17. 1977, At the apartment of the Loginovs on Kustodiev Street, #20.
18. 1977, At the apartment of G. Mikhailov on Revolution Highway, #43.
19. 1977, At the Derzhinsky Palace of Culture.
22. 1977, At the apartment of S. Kovalsky on Piskaryovsky Prospect, #48.
23. 1977, At the apartment of T. Valenti on Lensoviet Street, #56.
24. 1977, At the apartment of Yury Novikov on Mokhovaya Street, #22.
25. 1977, At the apartment of I. Korneva on Tallinsky Street, #6.
26. 1978, At the Kalinin House of Culture.
27. 1978, At the Krupskaya Palace of Culture on Obukhovsky Defense Prospect, #105.
28. 1978, At the Leningrad House of Independent Art (LDKhS) on Rubinstein Street.
29. 1978, At the Railroadworkers' Club on Tambov Street, #63.
30. 1978, At the apartment of M. Ivanov on Pravda Street, #12.
31. 1978, At the apartment of Katsenelson on Rubinstein Street, #38.
32. 1978, At the apartment of K. Miller on Mayakovksy Street, #16.
33. 1978, At the apartment of V. Valran on Zamshin Street, #52.
34. 1978, The Church of the Shestakovksy Madonna (Sts. Cyril and Methodius) on Starorusskaya Street, #8/2. The groups "Chronicle" and "Alipius."
35. 1979, At the apartment of A. Maslov on Zhelabov Street, #5 (Bo'lishaya Konyushennaya Street).
36. 1980, The Leningrad Palace of Culture for Youth (LDM).
37. 1981, At the apartment on Bronnitskaya #1/3.
38. 1981, The Kirov Palace of Culture on Bol'shoi Prospect, V.O. #83.
39. 1982, Lenergo on the Field of Mars.
40. 1983, Leningrad Telephone Network on Hertsen Street.
42. 1984, The House of Architects.
43. 1985, The New "Passazhi" on Liteiny Prospect, #57.
44. 1985, The House of Composers.
45. 1985, At Evgeny Orlov's Apartment on Dzerzhinsky Street, #28.
46. 1987, Lenergo at the docks.
47. 1987, The Tsiturupa House of Culture.
48. 1987, "Vernisage" at the Sverlov Club.
49. 1988, On Piskaryovsky Prospect at the corner of Nepokorenny Prospect.
50. 1988, The Central Exhibition Hall "Manezh."
52. A monument to nonconformism of the 1970s. On the wall of the "Pertsov House."
53. 1999, Art-Center "Pushkin 10" on Ligovsky Prospect, #53.
54. 1980s, Rock Club on Rubinstein Street, #13. A meeting place for amateur painters and writers.
55. 1980s, Club 81 on P. Lavrov Street, #5. A literary club in a dilapidated apartment where unofficial writers and painters met and where the works of younger painters were examined.
56. 1980s, "Saigon" on Nevsky Prospect, #51. A regular meeting place for discussions and readings among unofficial artists and writers.
57. 1966, The movie theatre "Molnya" on Bol'shoi Prospect, PO.
58. 1981, At the apartment of A. Osipenko on Zhelabov Street, #7.
1932
The Central Committee of the Communist party disbanded all artistic organizations and created a single union of artists. This sealed the fate of many artists. One can recall very many artists, who remained in their Motherland and for whom art was a lifeline. Thus, they became the spiritual moorings and teachers of the postwar generation of artists. Thanks to the integrity and perseverance of P. Filonov, V. Sterlingov, N. Akimov, G. Traugot, the following artists were able to find their way: A. Arefief, R. Vasmi, S. Shvarts, V. Shagin, V. Gromov, N. Zhilina, V. Gavrilchik. A. Rapoport, I. Ivanov, G. Bogomolov, E. Rukhin, V. Rokhlin, M. Shemyakin, G. Ustyugov and many others.

1964
L.I. Brezhnev becomes the leader of the USSR.

The first exhibition in the Hermitazh of the porter-artists M. Shemyakin, V. Ovchinnikov, O. Lyagachev, E. Zelenin, V. Uflyanda, V. Kravchenko.

1968 - 1969
Three exhibitions chiefly of the students of Sidlin at the Kozitsky Club.

1969 - 1974
A series of apartment exhibitions, the first of which occurred in the studio of Vladimir Ovchinnikov on Kustarny Lane. [See map for more complete listing of apartment exhibitions.]

1974
On December 22, the first official exhibition occurred at the Gaz Palace of Culture. The works of 52 artists were presented. The exhibit lasted four days. Visitors began lining up at six in the morning. The exhibition obviously had a powerful effect not only on the public, but also on the party officials and the KGB.

1975
From September 10 through 20 the largest exhibition of unofficial artists of the 1970s occurred at the Nevsky Palace of Culture. Eighty-eight artists participated.

The official Union of Artists could no longer ignore what was happening. The following appeared in the newspaper The Leningrad Pravda on October 16, 1975: “Art has a class character. It is a form of ideology. It is easy to divide the innovators of the recent exhibition into two classes: some openly follow abstract tendencies, the so-called ‘non-representational art;’ others preserve the appearance of realistic representation though they clearly lean in the direction of the sick phenomena in art. The demonstration of these pseudo-innovative works bears witness primarily to the spiritual poverty of their authors.”

Yury Zharkikh drafts the charter of the “Association of Experimental Exhibitions (TEV).” The charter together with a letter demanding
recognition of the new organization was sent to the Ministry of Culture. A verbal response further set the nonconformists in opposition to the Union of Artists, which was already hostile to them. In response to the Leningrad directorate of culture’s refusal to allow more exhibitions and to officially recognize TEV there was a series of letters of protest to the Central Committee of the Communist Part and to the Twenty-Fifth Party Congress (1976). There was also the arrest of Vadim Filimonov for organizing on February 18, 1976, the apartment exhibition “Contemporary Religious Painting.”

1976
On May 23, under strange circumstances, Evgeny Rukhin, one of the initiators of the nonconformist movement, died tragically in a fire in his apartment. As a sign of protest against the silencing of TEV and in memory of Evgeny Rukhin, on May 30 an exhibition was held “in the open air” by the walls of Sts. Peter and Paul Fortress. Consequently, a number of artists were subjected to repression by the police and the KGB. Subsequently, two group exhibitions were permitted at the Ordzhonikidze Palace of Culture. However, the possibility of staging new exhibitions even with a few participants grew even more remote.

1977 - 1980
This period of time is noted for the appearance of the next generation of nonconformists and for the large number of apartment exhibitions that occurred despite the fact that elements of the KGB would intrude upon the exhibitions with their own style of arbitrary “curating.” Exhibitions took place at V. Nechaev’s apartment, which he dubbed “The Museum of Contemporary Art,” and at the apartments of I. Login, T. Valenta, I. Koreneva, S. Kovalsky, Valentina-Maria, I. Ivanov, G. Mikhailov, and M. Ivanov. For this, G. Mikhailov was imprisoned twice for five years altogether. For protesting against repression of the nonconformist movement by the KGB, the artist, Yuly Rybakov, was imprisoned for six years.

1978
The group “Chronicle” was formed and held exhibitions outdoors “in nature” and in the discarded Church of Sts. Cyril and Methodius. The participants were: B. Koshelokhov, Alena, S. Sergeev, Vik, L. Fyodorov, N. Poletaeva, T. Novikov, S. Dobrotvorsky, and A. Aleksandrov.

1979 - 1980
The group “Chronicle” and the artists V. Afonichev and K. Miller held two exhibitions in the House of the People’s Culture.

1980
The department of the KGB that dealt with ideological threats changed hands. In June the authorities permitted a closed exhibition of young artists to be organized at the Palace of Youth for supposed guests of the Olympic Games. Works were accepted even from unofficial artists. In August the exhibition was opened also to the Soviet public.

1981
In January at the Leningrad Palace of Youth there was an exhibition by the artists of the new generation. This was the group “Chronicle” and S. Kovalsky, B. Mitavsky, A. Lotsman, V. Skrodenis, and V. Trofimov. The exhibition ended in an uproar because the administration forbade a meeting between the artists and the visitors and
closed the exhibition three days early.

The organization of unofficial writers called "Club 81" was formed and gave tremendous organizational assistance to the artists.

Excerpts from the letter of December 18, 1981, to the Ministry of Culture of the USSR and to the department of culture of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, (official document #523/3):

We, the group of artists and others working in the arts, request that you take under consideration the extremely unfavorable situation that has recently been created in our city in the area of the fine arts.

Among the primary measures we suggest are the following:

1. the organization of a series of thematic exhibitions devoted to the art of Russian artists of the beginning of the twentieth century for the purpose of further study of the history of and familiarization with native Russian art;
2. the organization of a series of exhibitions by artists who are not members of the Union of Artists; such exhibitions must be executed according to the artistic principles of the artists who participate in them;
3. based on an analysis of the exhibitions, legal status should be given to artists not belonging to the Union of Artists; such recognition is possible through the organization of professional groups of these artists.

The artists received no answer to their letter within the legally specified time period. They sent a second letter requesting a response, for which representatives of the artists went to Moscow. On February 15, 1982, a letter (official document #24) from the Ministry of Culture was finally received. It said:

The Ministry of Culture of the USSR has carefully considered the letter from the group of Leningrad 'artists-amateurs' and informs them that there can be no agreement either with the point of view expressed in their letter concerning the critical situation that exists in the fine arts in Leningrad or with their evaluation of their art as a significant contribution to the professional artistic culture of Russia. The charter and practice of the Union of Artists of the USSR provides every citizen who creates works of high ideological-artistic quality the opportunity of acquiring the rights of professional artists. Such opportunities are available as well to the authors of this letter.

At the same time a group of artists took the initiative and organized an exhibition in the apartment of N. Kononenko in the apartment house on Bronnitskaya Street that had been vacated for major repairs. The following sixty-one artists participated in the exhibition:


From the charter of the Association of Experimental Fine Arts:

The Association of Experimental Fine Arts is a society that unites professional artists of every interest in contemporary fine art democratically beyond any dictates of form or content.

The activities of TEII are devoted to the development of contemporary fine art and to the creation of conditions that allow every artist to make a positive contribution to Russian and world culture.

The aims of the Association of Experimental Fine Arts are:
1. the confirmation of the official status of an artistic organization of professional artists;
2. the support of artists, whose work depicts reality in a wide sense and experiments with the definition of a new language of expression suitable to contemporary life;
3. the organization of exhibitions of TEII and of artists who share its principles;
4. the support of members of TEII to bring their works to fruition;
5. the organization of friendly, artistic, and business contacts with artists and with artistic organizations, galleries, and museums in the USSR and abroad.

1982
Y.A. Andropov becomes the leader of the USSR.

From October 12 through November 5, the first official exhibit of TEII took place at the Kirov Palace of Culture. Thirty-eight artists took part in the exhibition. Works under dispute in the exhibition were those that did not represent Soviet criteria of accessibility and social responsibility or contained elements of religious propaganda, etc.

The group “The New Artists” was formed. The leader of the group was Timur Novikov, and it lasted until 1989. At various times its members included: I. Sotnikov, E. Kozlov, Vadim Ovchinnikov, V. Gurtsevich, O. Kotelnikov, K. Khazanovich, G. Guryanov, I. Savchenkov, S. Bugaev (aka Afrika), A. Medvedev, and E. Yufit.

1983
From April 5 through 20, the second exhibition of the TEII was held in the Leningrad Palace of Youth. Forty-three artists altogether participated in the exhibition. The participants were not the same as those who participated in the first exhibition of TEII. At the same time, in Club 81 the advisory committee of TEII began to look at the works of young artists who wanted to participate in future exhibits.

From August 5 through 21, the third exhibition of TEII occurred with 42 artists including those hitherto unknown as well as veterans of unofficial art.

These exhibitions provide a full view of those nonconformists of different generations that were working in Leningrad.

In the spring of this year, E. Orlov and S. Kovalsky organized the group “The Fifth Quarter” and on December 10 it held an exhibition at the Home of
Scholars in Lesnoi. Participants in the exhibition were: V. Andreev, I. Borodin, A. Vermishev, V. Voinov, S. Kovalsky, S. Lozin, E. Maryshev, E. Orlov, S. Osipov, and V. Shmagin. The following is from the group’s Manifesto:

We hold that the creative process of an artist must find continuity in the analytical perception of the viewer. We want to discover now that part of the viewer’s individuality that is suitable for the larger understanding of the contemporary artist of tomorrow. The goal of our exhibitions is the strengthening of the creative potential of each personality that is indispensable to all of humankind in the future.

1984

K. Y. Chernenko becomes the leader of the USSR.

The fourth exhibition of TEII took place from March 27 through April 20 in the Palace of Youth.

The group “TIR” was formed and held an exhibition at the House of Architects. The participants included: V. Pavlova, L. Krasavina, and A. Kutasheva.

From September 17 to October 8, the fifth exhibition of the TEII “Facades of a Portrait” occurred. Relations worsened with the city commission and the KGB, both of which were demanding that Y. Rybakov be excluded from the advisory committee of TEII for presenting his portrait of the poet and dissident Y. Voznesenskaya, who had been exiled from the USSR. They demanded also that K. Miller be banned from participating in a subsequent exhibition for his parody of the classic work of Soviet painting “Lenin in Gorki.” Miller’s work was seen as an ideological attack.

During the years 1984-1985, TEII organized ten “wandering” exhibitions at offices and institutes throughout the city. Following official action by the KGB, such exhibitions were forbidden.

In this year the group “Necrorealists” was formed under the leadership of E. Yufit. The members of the group at various times included: A. Mertvy, E. Kondratev, I. Bezrukov, K. Mitinev, V. Morozov, V. Kustov, S. Barikov, and V. Maslov. The activities of the group included painting and a “parallel cinema.”

1985

M.S. Gorbachev becomes the leader of the USSR.

From March 15 to April 10 the sixth exhibition of TEII took place in the Leningrad Palace of Youth. Two hundred artists participated in the exhibition that was the largest in Leningrad over the past fifty years. The groups “Mitki” and “The New Wild Ones” first gained notoriety at this exhibition. “Mitki” was founded by D. Shagin, V. Shinkarev, and A. Florensky. The founders of “The New Wild Ones” were O. Maslov, O. Zaika, and V. Kozin. Works were shown by artists from Arkhangelsk, Smolensk, Moscow, Eisk, Kiev, Odessa, Riga, Dubna, and Kaliningrad.

During the fall there were a series of group exhibitions by the following groups: “The Fourteen” from the participants in the gazonevsky period, “The Seven,” “The New,” “Sterlingovs,” and “Mitki.”
1986

From December 24 through January 20, TEII held its seventh exhibition at the “Union of Cinematographers Club.” The exhibition opened without incident. Although no one in Leningrad expressed any hope that the initiatives of Gorbachev would continue, the artists sent a letter to him and to the Twenty-Seventh Party Congress. The letter contained details about the reasons for the formation of TEII and about the enormous work the Association had done over its four years of existence. The letter also discussed the lack of support from the Leningrad authorities for the Association’s concrete proposals to aid the development of innovative tendencies in Soviet art.

The Association of Experimental Fine Arts was to open its eighth exhibition in the Leningrad Palace of Youth on March 15. Looking for dissident maneuvers, the KGB openly manipulated the city’s exhibitions committee. For example, in a figure in one of Vik’s paintings they saw A. Solzhenitsyn; in Solomon Rososin’s portrait of Zoya Kosmodemynskaya, they saw a caricature; and in a work of K. Miller’s one of the KGB recognized himself. For his works, Sergei Kovalsky was called an “enemy of the people.”

On April 14, the advisory committee of TEII sent a second letter to M. S. Gorbachev requesting a response. No answer followed. As a sign of protest, TEII organized a series of exhibitions in the apartments of the following: Y. Rybakov, V. Sukhorukov, V. Mikhailov, L. Krosavina, and K. Miller. These exhibitions were supported by the city’s intellectual community that had been organized through the efforts of TEII into the socially active group “Vernisazh.” To the amazement of the artists, unlike two to three years prior, no repressions followed.

Under the leadership of Timur Novikov, the “Club of the Friends of Mayakovsky” and the “New Academy of Any Art” were founded. Boris Mitavsky and Yaroslav Sukhov organized the group “Island.”

1987

From January 14 to 25, the ninth exhibition of TEII took place in the exhibition hall at the Leningrad’s Harbor. This was a first in many ways for the artists: an agreement was reached on the possibility of the official sale of the paintings; there was no censorship; television was not used to compromise the exhibition; and the KGB were merely visitors. On the street it was thirty-six degrees, but a huge line formed at the entrance for the entire ten days of the exhibition. A record number of about fifty thousand people visited the exhibition.

From May 20 to July 17, “The Gallery of TEII,” the Association’s tenth exhibition, took place. The best works of artists during the life of the Association were shown at the exhibition and everyone was taken with the idea of the necessity of creating a museum of modern art. In this same year, thirty-two artists from TEII exhibited their works at Moscow State University. Also in Moscow, there was the first festival of “parallel cinema” in which the Leningrad “Necorealists” participated.

In December, TEII presented its eleventh exhibition at the exhibition hall at Okhta.
1988

With the assistance of the American artist Barbara Hazard, on April 29, an exhibition of twenty-one artists of TEII opened in the California gallery “Route One.” The exhibit subsequently appeared in seven American cities.

In May, at the Leningrad Palace of Youth, TEII held its twelfth exhibit. On June 14, an exhibit dedicated to the centenary of the Christianization of Rus. The Leningrad Free University opened and the first publication about TEII appeared in the magazine “Yunost.” The group “Island” opened an exhibition at the Tsyurupa Palace of Culture.

1989

From December 26, 1988 through January 24, 1989, in the Central Exhibition Hall of the Manezh, there was a joint exhibition with the Union of Artists. The Manezh was divided into two parts: on the right were the members of the Union of Artists; on the left were the members of TEII. Part of TEII’s exposition was a memorial that included photographs and paintings of deceased artists and of those who emigrated.

Timur Novikov organized “The Free Department of Fine Arts” for the public from “A to Z.”

1990

M. S. Gorbachev becomes the president of the USSR.

In January the thirteenth exhibit of TEII was held in the exhibition hall at Okhta.

The opening of the exhibition “The Keepers of the Fire” took place at the University of Southern California in Los Angeles. The exhibit included works by artists of different generations and presented the broad spectrum of artistic work in the nonconformist fine art of Leningrad.

With the assistance of the Georges Pompidou Center’s Institute of Plastic Arts, an exhibition opened in the State Russian Museum. The groups participating were: the “Necrorealists,” “The New Ones,” and “Mitki.”

At #10 Pushkin Street in Leningrad those involved in contemporary art joined together in the first official registered organization of nonconformists, The Saint Petersburg Humanitarian Fund of “Free Culture.” Many who participated in TEII’s exhibits and young artists of the new generation became members of the organization.

1991

After the fall of the USSR, B. N. Yeltsin becomes the first president of Russia.

The historic name of Saint Petersburg was
restored to Leningrad.

A program was developed by the fund “Free Culture” for the creation at #10 Pushkin Street of a cultural center called “The Ark of the Twenty-First Century.”

1993 - 1994
Excerpt from the letter of the Minister of Culture, E.Y. Sidorov, to A.A. Sobchak, the mayor of St. Petersburg:

The program (the fund “Free Culture”) is an indispensable part of our contemporary cultural process.

The Ministry of Culture of the Russian Federation considers the project — The Cultural Center “The Ark of the Twenty-First Century” — a part of the federal program for the renaissance of Russian culture and requests your assistance in its realization.

The work of the center makes it possible for contemporary art and its history to fill the empty pages of the history of Russian art since the middle of the twentieth century. The ongoing work of the center is to represent the contemporary phenomenon of counterculture as a necessary part of the cultural politics of a democratic government.

The program “A Center of Contemporary Art ‘The Ark of the Twenty-First Century’” was made possible with support from the Tides Foundation, a philanthropic organization located in San Francisco, and from the international organization “Friends of the Fund ‘Free Culture.’”

(translator’s note: While the chronicle ends abruptly here, it is important to note that in 1994 several of the members of the Society of “Free Culture” worked out a long term agreement with the city government of St. Petersburg for a new center adjacent to where the “Ark of the Twenty-First Century” was located. With its entry now from Ligovsky Prospect, the new center known as “Pushkin 10” and the “Art Centre” continues to play a significant role in the cultural life of St. Petersburg. It nurtures and presents in a variety of exhibition spaces every form of contemporary experimental art including sound, cinema, photography, art history, and painting. The Centre which includes the Museum of Nonconformist Art with its archive and unique collection of unofficial art is an unparalleled resource for the study of Russian nonconformist art.)

Materials used in the compilation of this chronicle are from A. Basin’s Gazonevshchina, from L. Gurevich’s chronicle, and from the archives of the Association of Experimental Fine Art and the Humanitarian Fund “Free Culture.”
Виктор Андреев / Viktor Andreev (Russian, born 1955)
Композиция №33 / Composition No. 33
1980, oil on canvas, 23 5/8 x 27 5/8 inches
(cat. no. 2)
Александр Арефьев / Aleksandr Arefiev (Russian, 1931-1978)
Хрущев с Булганиным / Khrushchev with Bulganin
circa 1960s, graphite and mixed media on paper, 15 x 9 1/4 inches
(cat. no. 3)
Leonid Bolmat / Leonid Bolmat (Russian, born 1931)
Импровизация №35 / Improvisation No. 35
1977, oil on cardboard, 23 3/8 x 23 inches
(cat. no. 4)
Сергей Доброворский / Sergei Dobrovorsky (Russian, born 1952)
Идея №4 +Ленинград+Лесник / Idea No. 4 + Leningrad + Lumberjack
n.d., mixed media on paper, 11 3/8 x 16 inches
(cat. no. 6)
Генрик Элинсон / Henrik Elinson (Russian, born 1935)
Композиция 03 / Composition 03
1982, mixed media on paper, 24 1/2 x 32 3/8 inches
(cat. no. 7)
Елена Фигурина / Elena Figurina (Russian, born 1955)

Прогулка / A Stroll

1982, oil on canvas, 19 5/8 x 23 5/8 inches

(cat. no. 8)
Valentin Gerasimenko / Valentin Gerasimenko (Russian, born 1935)

Ommuck / A Print

1984, etching on paper, 11 x 9 3/4 inches

(cat. no. 9)
Евгений Гиндпер / Evgeny Gindper (Russian, born 1949)
Дахау-Кресты / Dachau-Crosses
1970, oil on canvas, 18 x 24 1/4 inches
(cat. no. 10)
Владимир Громов / Vladimir Gromov (Russian, born 1930)

Templ / Theatre

1972, oil on cardboard, 19 x 14 3/4 inches

(cat. no. 11)
Александр Гуревич / Aleksandr Gurevich (Russian, born 1944)
Портрет Юлия Рыbakova / A Portrait of Yuly Rybakov
1986, oil on prepared plywood, 25 3/4 x 21 5/8 inches
(cat. no. 12)
Игорь Иванов / Igor Ivanov (Russian, born 1934)

Кукла Юля / Doll Yulia

1982, levkas (a base of chalk and glue) and oil on canvas, 15 1/8 x 18 5/8 inches (cat. no. 13)
РОСТИСЛАВ ИВАНОВ / ROSTISLAV IVANOV (RUSSIAN, BORN 1941)

ВЕСНОЙ ГЛЯДЯ ИЗ ОКНА / Glancing from a Window in Spring

1983, oil on fiberboard, 31 1/2 x 24 inches

(cat. no. 14)
Борис Кошелоков / Boris Koshelekov (Russian, born 1942)

Ночь, окраина / Night, Security

1978, oil on canvas and plywood, 29 3/4 x 29 3/4 inches

(cat. no. 15)
Серге́й Кова́льский / Sergei Kovalsky (Russian, born 1948)

Boycott '8'. The Olympic Games in Moscow, Composition in the Color of Music: "Revolution No. 9" The Beatles 1979-1980, collage and oil on canvas, 29 3/8 x 19 7/8 inches (cat. no. 16)
Кирилл Лильбок / Kirill Lilbok (Russian, 1931-2003)

Без названия / Untitled

1978, oil on canvas, 26 x 23 1/4 inches

(cat. no. 17)
Александр Лоцман / Aleksandr Lotsman (Russian, born 1947)

Ляличи / Lyalichi, a Village

1981, oil on canvas, 22 1/4 x 34 3/8 inches

(cat. no. 18)
Александр Манусов / Aleksandr Manusov (Russian, 1947-1991)

Дылчи / A Light

circa 1970s, watercolor and monotype on paper, mounted on cardboard, 11 1/8 x 7 3/4 inches

(cat. no. 19)
Анатолий Маслов / Anatoly Maslov (Russian, born 1938)

дерево и куст / A Tree and a Bush

1979, oil on canvas, 21 5/8 x 29 1/2 inches

(cat. no. 20)
Юрий Медведев / Yury Medvedev (Russian, born 1939)

Фигуры / Figures

1983, oil on canvas, mounted on board, 31 1/2 x 23 1/2 inches

(cat. no. 21)
Владимир Михайлов / Vladimir Mikhailov (Russian, 1939-1991)
Софийский собор / St. Sophia's Cathedral
circa 1970s, oil on canvas, 15 3/4 x 9 1/4 inches
(cat. no. 22)
Евгений Михов-Войтенко / Evgeny Mikhnov-Voitenko (Russian, 1932–1998)

Инквизиторы / The Inquisitors

1973, sauce/gravy on paper, 22 5/8 x 15 3/4 inches

(cat. no. 23)
Кирилл Миллер / Kirill Miller (Russian, born 1959)
Ленин на Броневике / Lenin on an Armored Car
1984, oil on canvas, 39 3/8 x 31 3/8 inches
(cat. no. 24)
Борис Митавский / Boris Mitavsky (Russian, born 1948)

Апофеоз / Apotheosis

1978, oil on canvas, 26 3/4 x 33 5/8 inches

(cat. no. 25)
Леніна Нікітина / Lenina Nikitina (Russian, born 1931)

Дюбовь Блокадная / Blockade Love

1982, oil on fiberboard, 24 3/4 x 18 3/4 inches

(cat. no. 26)
TIMUR NOVIKOV (RUSSIAN, 1958-2002)

Portret мавританского художника Муся / Portrait of the Mauritanian Artist Mulya
1981-82, oil on fiberboard, 17 1/4 x 11 1/8 inches
(cat. no. 27)
Евгений Орлов / Evgeny Orlov (Russian, born 1952)
Мальчик и зеленый шкаф / A Boy and a Green Cupboard
1977, oil on fiberboard, 26 1/2 x 19 1/8 inches
(cat. no. 28)
Владимир Овчинников / Vladimir Ovchinnikov (Russian, born 1941)
Летающие тарелки / Flying Saucers
1981, oil on canvas, 19 1/2 x 16 7/8 inches
(cat. no. 29)
Юрий Петроchenkov / Yury Petrochenkov (Russian, born 1942)
Бешеная скачка / A Demonic Gallop
1978, watercolor, india ink, and pen on paper, 16 1/8 x 24 inches
(cat. no. 30)
Юлий Рыбаков / Yuly Rybakov (Russian, born 1946)
Сегодня... завтра... никогда / Today... Tomorrow... Never
1984, oil on cardboard, mounted on plywood with steel frame, 27 x 19 1/2 inches
(cat. no. 31)
Мы в 1980 / We Are in 1980
1980, photograph/collage on paper, 11 1/8 x 16 3/8 inches
(cat. no. 32)
Сергей Сергеев / Sergei Sergeev (Russian, born 1953)
Танцовщица / The Dancer
1984, oil on canvas, 35 7/8 x 29 inches
(cat. no. 33)
Дмитрий Шагин / Dmitry Shagin (Russian, born 1957)

Чаша / A Drinking Bowl

1981, tempera on cardboard, 14 3/4 x 12 1/4 inches

(cat. no. 34)
Владимир Шагин / Vladimir Shagin (Russian, 1932-1999)
Двое в комнате / Two in a Room
circa 1960s, oil on canvas, 9 x 12 inches
(cat. no. 35)
Sergei Sheff (Russian, 1936-1997)

Фигура / Death by Firing Squad

1970, oil on fiberboard, 31 3/8 x 27 inches

(cat. no. 36)
Шолом Шварц / Sholom Shvarts (Russian, 1929-1996)
Расстрел / A Figure
circa 1970s, oil on cardboard, 23 x 13 1/4 inches
(cat. no. 37)
Сергей Сигей / Sergei Sigei (Russian, born 1947)

Униф-сфор портрет / Unif-sfor Portrait

1977, oil on canvas, 39 1/4 x 28 1/2 inches

(cat. no. 38)
Владислав Сухоруков / Vladislav Sukhorukov (Russian, born 1950)
Постижение Хаоса / An Understanding of Chaos
1983, oil on canvas, 39 3/8 x 39 3/8 inches
(cat. no. 39)
Виктор Трошимов / Viktor Trofimov (Russian, born 1953)
Без названия / Untitled
1979, mixed media on paper, 10 3/8 x 14 1/4 inches
(cat. no. 40)
Геннадий Устюгов / Gennady Ustjugov (Russian, born 1937)

Не понятный объект / An Incomprehensible Object

1976, oil on canvas, 35 1/8 x 39 1/8 inches

(cat. no. 41)
Valery Valran (Russian, born 1949)

Fish on a Bronze Plate

1979, oil on canvas, 19 1/4 x 23 1/4 inches

(catalogue no. 42)
Рихард Васмі / Рiкхард Васмi (Russian, 1929-1998)
Натюрморт c тюльпанами / Still Life with Tulips
1980, tempera on fiberboard, 19 1/2 x 15 1/8 inches
(cat. no. 43)
Вик (Вячеслав Забелин) / Vik (Vyacheslav Zabelin) (Russian, born 1953)

Натюрморт с яблоком / Still Life with an Apple

1982, oil on canvas, 15 3/4 x 23 3/4, inches

(cat. no. 44)
Вадим Воинов / Vadim Voinov (Russian, born 1940)
Шпиономания / Sputania
1980, mixed media on plywood, 25 1/2 x 17 1/2 inches
(cat. no. 45)
Наталья Жилина / Natalya Zhilina (Russian, 1933-2005)
Скорбящая Мария / Mater Dolorosa
1985, oil on canvas, 23 3/4 x 17 1/2 inches
(cat. no. 46)
Afonichev, Vyacheslav
Born 1946
From 1954-57 Afonichev studied in the Children's Art School of the Tauride Ecole; afterwards in the Hertzen Leningrad State Pedagogical Institute (LGPI). In 1975 upon hearing from acquaintances about works being selected for the upcoming exhibition, he managed to participate in the exhibition at the Nevsky House of Culture. After the dissolution of the Association of Experimental Exhibitions he grew close to the young artists who were born too late for the Gaz-Nevsky exhibitions. In 1977 he exhibited his works at the apartment exhibitions where the new generation of artists were organizing themselves. He also exhibited at group exhibitions in the House of Folk Art and at the House of Culture for Railroad workers. Afonichev was one of the organizers of the apartment exhibit on Bronnitskaya (1981). In the same year he collaborated with S. Kovalsky, S. Grigoriev, Y. Novikov in organizing the Association of Experimental Fine Art (TEII). He was a participant in many of TEII’s exhibitions and in group exhibitions in St. Petersburg, Moscow and in the USA.

Andreev, Viktor
Born 1955
Andreev moved to Leningrad in the 1970s after finishing art school. He studied at the Repin Institute and became acquainted with Boris Koshelokhov and Evgeny Orlov. Since 1982 he has participated in exhibitions by Leningrad’s unofficial artists. He was a member of the Association of Experimental Fine Arts and a participant in the group of artists known as “The Fifth Quarter.” He is currently a member of the Society of “Free Culture,” a painter, a teacher, and a graphic designer.

Arefiev, Aleksandr
Born 1931-1978
Arefiev received his first artistic training in a studio affiliated with the Palace of Pioneers with S. D. Levin. From 1947 to 1949 he studied at the Middle School of the Arts which was affiliated with the Academy of the Arts. Together with his friends, Arefiev was expelled for taking up Impressionism. He maintained close professional and friendly ties with R. Gudzenko, R. Vasmi, V. Gromov, Sh. Shvarts, B. Shagin and with the poet R. Mandelshtam. He became the de facto leader of the group “A Circle of Artists.” The leading instructors at the Middle School of the Arts (SKhSh) who influenced the formation of A. Arefiev’s artistic views were G.I. Orlovsky, G.N. Traugot, V.N. Yankovskaya, and G.A. Glagoleva. Among his predecessors Arefiev felt particularly indebted to the French painter O. Domei and the itinerant L. Solomatkin.

Arefiev participated in a series of apartment exhibitions, including one of the first such exhibitions in 1958 staged in the apartment of K. Lilbok. His work appeared in the Gaz Palace of Culture Exhibition (1974) and he was one of the organizers of outdoor exhibitions as well as the exhibitions of the group known as “Aleph” (1975-1976). From the end of the 1960s he was a member of the Leningrad City Committee of the Arts on Books, Graphics, and Posters. Arefiev’s most significant influences can be seen in the work of Y. Medvedev, O. Grigoriev, V. Nekrasov, the “Mitki” group of artists. He immigrated to France in 1977.
Bolmat, Leonid
Bolmat, Leonid
Born 1931

Bolmat began his study of art in Kazan. Returning to Leningrad, he entered the Leningrad's V.I. Mukhin School of the Arts. After completing his studies there in 1968, he worked as a designer. Bolmat's acquaintance with A.G. Ender had a marked effect on him as an artist.

Bolmat participated in exhibitions at the Gaz and Nevsky Palaces of Culture (1974 and 1975), in apartment exhibitions of the “Aleph” group (1975-1976), and in exhibitions at the Kalinin Factory Club (1978). From the beginning of the 1980s he exhibited his works in the expositions of the Association of Experimental Fine Arts and in exhibitions following perestroika. As a designer, he has participated in exhibitions in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Japan during the 1970s and 1980s. Bolmat possesses 15 copyrights for industrial designs. He now lives in Germany.

Borisov, Leonid
Borisov, Leonid
Born 1943

Borisov graduated from the Leningrad Electrotechnical Communications Institute (LEIS) in 1968. In 1970 he met A. Leonov who played a decisive role in his artistic development. Through Leonov, Borisov met the Moscow artists E. Shteinberg, I. Kabakov, V. Nemukhin and V. Plavinsky. In 1974 he began to work intensively on his art.

He participated in the Nevsky Palace of Culture exhibition (1975) and in a group exhibition of non-figurative art at the Ordzhonikidze Palace of Culture (1976). His first one person exhibition was held at the Krupskoi Palace of Culture (1978) and his second was in the State Russian Museum (1995). He has presented his work at exhibitions of the Association of Experimental Fine Arts (TEII) and at post-perestroika exhibitions in Petersburg, Moscow (including the State Tretyakovsky Gallery), Vienna, Helsinki, and other cities. He is a member of the Society of “Free Culture.”

Leonid Borisov’s works are in the permanent collections of the State Tretyakov Gallery, the State Russian Museum, the Penzensk Painting Gallery of K.A. Savitsky, the Dresden Gallery, and other museums.

Dobrotvorsky, Sergei
Dobrotvorsky, Sergei
Born 1952

Sergei Nikolaevich Lebedev (a.k.a. Sergei Dobrotvorsky, The Woodsman) is a veteran of nonconformism. He was a member of the Association of Experimental Fine Art, the Society of “Free Culture,” and the Union of Artists. In his work, Lebedev used “aliases” that enabled him to exhibit simultaneously as several different artists.

In 1969 he entered the Gorky Art School. After graduation, he worked for a while in the school as a teacher of drawing and sketching. After serving in the army, he came to Leningrad and became an independent artist following the Gaz-Nevsky movement that grew out of the exhibitions at the
Gaz and Nevsky Palaces of Culture in 1974 and 75 respectively. From 1975 to 1980 he assumed the persona of Sergei Dobrotvorsky on the art scene. In 1976 his first solo apartment exhibition occurred. From 1980 to 1986 the artist assumed the moniker of “The Woodsman.” In 1986 the “orthodox” period of the artist Lebedev began. During this period, the painter created “light-symbolic” compositions that, in their tradition, hark back to Suprematism. Since 1993 Lebedev has been inspired to devote himself humbly to the restoration of icons and church frescoes. He lives in St. Petersburg.

Элинсон, Генрик
Elinson, Henrik
Born 1935
From the beginning of the 1960s, Elinson participated in the exhibitions of the unofficial artists of Leningrad. Under pressure from the KGB he was forced to emigrate. Since 1973 he has lived and worked in the United States. In 1974 he began to participate in museum and gallery exhibitions in Europe and America. He is a graphic artist and a painter.

Фигурина, Елена
Figurina, Elena
Born 1955
In 1979, Figurina graduated from the Leningrad Institute of Aviation Instrument Fabrication. She has taken part in exhibitions since 1978. She has been a member of the Association of Experimental Fine Arts, of the Academy of Contemporary Art, and of the Society of “Free Culture” since the 1980s and the 1990s. She has participated in more than 200 exhibitions in Russia and abroad. Her works are part of private collections in Germany, Holland, Denmark, Belgium, the United States, Norway, Finland, Australia, Sweden, Switzerland, Poland, and Russia. She lives and works in St. Petersburg. Her works are among the collection in St. Petersburg: the State Russian Museum, the Museum of the History of St. Petersburg, the State Museum of Theatre and Music in St. Petersburg, the Far-East Museum of Fine Arts in Khabarovsk, the Museum of Fine Art in Sevastopol, the Jane Vorhees Zimmerli Art Museum at Rutgers University in New Jersey, the Museum of Contemporary Art at St. Petersburg University, the Museum of Nonconformist Art in St. Petersburg, and in the Central Exhibition Hall “Manezh.”

Герасименко, Валентин
Gerasimenko, Valentin
Born 1935
In 1958, Gerasimenko received his degree in geography from Leningrad State University. From the mid-1950s, after getting to know A. Arefiev, V. Gromov, and R. Vasmi, he began to study painting under their influence. At times he visited the studio of N.P. Akimov at Leningrad’s Ostrovsky Institute of Theatre. During the years 1958 to 1970 Gerasimenko worked as an artist in television and cinema. In 1974, he turned to graphics (color offset) which became his primary media.

Gerasimenko exhibited at the Nevsky Palace of Culture in 1975. He was an active figure in the Association of Experimental Fine Arts in the 1980s. He has shown his works in Sweden (1976), Denmark (1978), France and the United States (1988-1989), and Germany (1991). Currently he is a member of the Society of “Free Culture.”

Gerasimenko’s works are in the Russian Museum, in museum and private collections in the United States, Western Europe, Australia, Brazil, and other countries.

Гиндпер, Евгений
Gindper, Evgeny
Born 1949
Gindper has worked in the fine arts since he was 18. From 1971 to 1972 he studied drawing at the Repin Institute of Painting, Sculpture, and Architecture. He participated in apartment exhibitions and then in exhibitions of the Association of Experimental Fine Arts.
Soon after the end of the blockade Gromov began his studies at the studio of S.D. Levin that was operating at the Palace of Pioneers. In 1947 he entered the Middle School of the Arts where he was acquainted with A. Arefiev, Sh. Shvarts, R. Gudzenko, and the poet R. Mandelshtam, who were also studying at the school during that time. Together with his new artist-friends, Gromov was expelled from the school for formalism and for work resembling Impressionism. From 1951 to 1961, he studied at the Leningrad Polygraphic Institute in the department of book design.

Gromov participated in exhibitions at K. Lilbok's apartment in 1958, at the Lensoviet Palace of Culture in 1965, at the Leningrad Institute of Nuclear Physics in 1966, at V. Nechaev's apartment in 1976, at the Museum of Contemporary Art in Erevan in 1978, and in the group exhibition of the Association of Experimental Fine Art at the Kirov Palace of Culture in 1983. Later, his works were displayed in exhibitions of contemporary art in St. Petersburg. A one person exhibition of his work was presented in the Literary Memorial Museum of Anna Akhmatova in the House on the Fontanka in 2000.

In 1968, Gurevich graduated from the Ulyanov Leningrad Electrotechnical Institute. He frequented the fine arts studio of the Vyborg Palace of Culture. From 1972 to 1978 he studied at Leningrad's V.I. Mukhin High School of the Arts, where he met A. Basin, A. Rapoport, A Okun, A. Manusov and other artists.

Gurevich exhibited at the Nevsky Palace of Culture in 1975. In the same year he participated in exhibitions by the group "Aleph" and, later, in apartment exhibitions, in exhibitions of the Association of Experimental Fine Art and in post-perestroika group exhibitions. Since the mid-1980s Gurevich's works have been shown in Western European countries and in cities of the United States. In 1997 he immigrated to Israel. He is a member of the Society of "Free Culture."

Ivanov began to study art independently at 15. From 1952 to 1957 he studied at the Institute of Film Engineers and worked as a sound technician. He studied painting in the studio of the Ilyich Palace of Culture from which he was expelled for formalism and following Cézanne and Picasso. At the beginning of the 1960s he entered the studio of O.A. Sidlin where he occupied a position independent of Sidlin and was held in very high esteem by his students.

He exhibited in the club at the Kozitsky Factory (1968-1969). At this time A. Arefiev, G. Egoshin, Z. Arshakuni, V. Ovchinnikov were among his friends. After many attempts, Ivanov remained unsuccessful in his efforts to join the Union of Artists.

In 1974 and 1975 Ivanov was one of the active organizers of the exhibitions at the Gaz and Nevsky Palaces of Culture and, subsequently, of apartment exhibitions. He joined the Association of Experimental Fine Arts and participated in the majority of the Association's activities. In the post-perestroika era he exhibited his works in the Central Exhibition Hall. He lives and works, as a rule, in the village of Naziya.

Ivanov spent his childhood in an orphanage near Tomsk where he began to draw. He became a dancer as well as a sketch artist. As a dancer he continued to draw only with his body in space. For eight years Ivanov danced in the the corps de ballet at the Donets Theatre of Opera and Ballet. At a later age, almost like Lomonosov, he pursued drawing in the Art School in Rostov-on-the-Don.
In 1990 he turned to icon painting and studied it in a seminary.

He was a member of the Association of Experimental Fine Arts in the 1980s. He was a participant in the apartment exhibitions of the 1980s. He lives in St. Petersburg.

**Koshelokhov, Boris**

**Koshelekov, Boris**

**BORN 1942**

Koshelokhov is a cult figure on the St. Petersburg art scene. He was born in Zlatoust and studied at the medical institute there. He moved to Leningrad in the 1960s. In 1976 he created the group of artists known as “Letopis” and organized a series of apartment exhibitions. He immigrated to Italy but quickly returned. He has been influential in the work of many Leningrad artists. The “New” and “Wild” groups of artists think of him as their father. He participated in all of the exhibitions of the Association of Experimental Fine Arts as well as in other exhibitions of unofficial artists of Leningrad. He is a member of the Society of “Free Culture.” He lives and works in a studio at the Art Centre “Pushkin Ten.”

**Kovalsky, Sergei**

**Born 1948**

At the end of the 1960s Kovalsky began to work professionally as a painter and a writer. In 1969 he began to develop the concept of Metaelementalism in visual art as the transformation of sound into color through the technology of countercollage. Since the beginning of the 1980s he has been developing a second concept in his work called social folk art. In 1989 Kovalsky conceived of the “Parallelosphere” which is the self-producing and self-developing kinetic object of contemporary culture — the Art Centre “Pushkin Ten.” In 1991 he was one of the founders of the Society of “Free Culture” and of the Museum of Nonconformist Art (MNA) in 1998. Since 1994 he has been the president of the Society of “Free Culture.” He participated in more than 150 exhibitions in Russia and abroad. His work is in the collections of Russian and American museums as well as in private collections.

**Lilbok, Kirill**

**Lilbok, Kirill**

**1931-2003**

Lilbok studied together with A. Arefiev at the High School of the Arts in 1944. He was expelled in 1944 and then reinstated. He graduated in 1952. He became friends with the members of the Arefiev group, but, in his words, “I wasn’t as free as they were, my development happened much later.” He worked as a graphic artist. In 1965 Lilbok organized in his apartment the first apartment exhibit of independent artist which many attended. In 1979 he immigrated to Austria where he lived and died.

**Lotsman, Aleksandr**

**Lotsman, Aleksandr**

**BORN 1947**

Lotsman came to Leningrad after completing art school in Siberia. He studied in the Repin Art Institute. In 1981 he became a member of the Association of Experimental Fine Arts and consistently from that time participated in the exhibitions of Leningrad artists. He is a member of the Society of “Free Culture.” Lotsman teaches and works as a painter and graphic artist.

**Manusov, Aleksandr**

**Manusov, Aleksandr**

**1947-1991**

Manusov received his initial education in the arts at the children’s art studio of S. Levin at the Palace of Pioneers in Leningrad. In 1969 he graduated from Leningrad’s V.I. Mukhin High School of the Arts and worked as a graphic artist. His friendship with A. Okun, his acquaintance with future unofficial artists at the exhibition on Kustarnaya in the studio of V. Ovchinnikov — all to a significant degree defined his future fate. He participated in the exhibitions at the Gaz and
Nevsky Palaces of Culture (1974-1975). In 1975 and later his work was included in the exhibitions of “Aleph,” of the Association of Experimental Fine Arts and in post-perestroika exhibitions. Manusov’s works have been exhibited often in international exhibitions, among which was the “memorial” exhibition in the USA of deceased members of “Aleph” (1989).

Маслов, Анатолий
Maslov, Anatoly
Born 1938
Maslov began his studies in Saratov and continued them at the Leningrad Suvorov Military School. In 1965 he completed his studies in philosophy at Leningrad State University and taught at the State Institute of Theatre, Music, and Cinematography. Afterwards, he began to study painting on his own. In 1968, Maslov was fired from the institute. At the beginning of the 1970s he became acquainted with the artists A. Vasilev, E. Rotanov, A. Zaslavsky and other unofficial artists. Since that time he has worked only as an artist.


Медведев, Юрий
Medvedev, Yury
Born 1939
Soon after Medvedev’s birth his family moved to Novosibirsk. He worked with V. Nekrasov in a factory art group there under the direction of the monumentalist A. S. Chernobrovstev. From 1957–1962 he studied in the Novosibersky Construction Institute while also visiting the studio of N. E. Gritsuk. In 1967, Medvedev moved to Leningrad and renewed his friendship with V. Nekrasov. He also met M. Shemiakin, O. Grigoriev, O. Frontinsky, A. Arefiev, G. Egoshin, S. Arshakuni and others.

His works were exhibited in the Nevsky Palace of Culture (1975), in apartment exhibitions during the 1970s, in the collective exhibitions of the Association of Experimental Fine Arts, and in subsequent post-perestroika exhibitions of former unofficial artists. He has had one person exhibitions in an architect’s studio, in the House of Architects (1971), in the Museum of City Sculpture (1987), at the Composers’ Union in memory of Oleg Grigoriev (1987) and in the Museum of Nonconformist Art (1999).

Михайлов, Владимир
Mikhailov, Vladimir
1939-1991
In the second half of the 1940s Mikhailov worked in the art studio of the Vyborg Palace of Culture with T. Milyutin and G. Shmidt as his teachers. From 1957–1963 he studied at the A. N. Ostrovsky Leningrad State Institute of Theatre, Music, and Cinematography in the studio of N. P. Akimov. In 1965 his works were exhibited at the “Exhibition of Work by Akimov’s Graduates.” A.G. Ender, as well as other unofficial artists were a significant influence on Mikhailov’s formation as an artist.

Mikhailov participated in the exhibitions at the Gaz and Nevsky Palaces of Culture (1974-1975), at the Ordzhonikidze Palace of Culture (1979), in Kokhtla-Yarva (1977) and in the exhibitions of the Association of Experimental Fine Arts. His work was also included in post-perestroika exhibitions and in a touring exhibition in the USA. His work was also shown posthumously in a one person exhibition in St. Petersburg (1992).
Mikhnov-Voitenko, Evgeny
Mikhnov-Voitenko, Evgeny
1932-1998

Mikhnov-Voitenko was a distinguished artist. He is the most sterling representative of post-war Russian abstract art. In 1958, he completed his studies in theatre production at Leningrad's Akimov Theatre Institute. In 1976 he participated in an exhibition of abstractionists at the Ordzhonikidze Palace of Culture and in 1978 he had the only large one person exhibition that took place in the Dzerzhinsky Palace of Culture. He was a painter and a graphic artist.

Miller, Kirill
Miller, Kirill
Born 1959

Miller studied costume and set design at the evening art school on the Fontanka. He completed the Pedagogical Technical School #61 with the professional group “The Restorers” with a speciality as a painter-restorer of frescoes (1972). At 15 he met the artist B.P. Akselrod whom he called his spiritual master.

He also studied with V. Levitin (1974-1975). He joined the Association of Experimental Fine Arts and is a member of the Society of “Free Culture.”

Mitavsky, Boris
Mitavsky, Boris
Born 1948

In 1968-1973, Mitavsky studied at the Lensoviy Technological Institute of Leningrad. In 1973, he participated in the first unofficial apartment exhibit of the group “Inaki” at #41 Baskov Lane, apartment 27 and in his first official exhibition at the Tenth Anniversary of the October Revolution Palace of Culture. From 1973-1981 he was a participant in apartment exhibitions in Leningrad. From 1975-1979 he took evening classes in drawing at the Repin Institute. In 1981 he was one of the organizers of TEII and was a participant in all of the Association's exhibitions from 1981-1988.

In 1985, he was one of the founders of the group “Island” that belonged to the Association of Experimental Fine Arts. In the same year, his work was among those at auction in Guernsey, New York. In 1989, he created the artists' club “Five Corners” and exhibited with “Island” on Pravda Street at the Food Manufacturers Palace of Culture. In 1996, he moved permanently to Hanover, Germany. Mitavsky has participated in more than 46 exhibits in Russia and abroad. His works are located in the Museum of Nonconformist Art in St. Petersburg. They are also located in private collections in more than eleven countries around the world. He is a member of the Society of “Free Culture.”

Nikitina, Lena
Nikitina, Lena
Born 1931

Nikitina's family has lived in Leningrad since 1937. Her father died in 1940; her mother and sister starved to death during the Siege. During the evacuation, she found herself in the orphanage and after the war she, as an adolescent, ended up in a psychiatric hospital. Later, she took evening classes at the Serov Art School for some time. In 1956, Nikitina graduated from the folk instruments faculty of the Cultural Education College. In 1957 she entered the department of Ceramics and Glass at Leningrad's V.I. Mukhin High School of the Arts, where she studied for one year. During her study, she got acquainted with Solomon Rossin and their friendship has lasted her whole life. She was member of TEII (Association of Experimental Fine Arts).

Novikov, Timur
Novikov, Timur
1958-2002

From 1965, Novikov took drawing at the circle of the House of Pioneers, Derzhinsky Region, Leningrad; in 1973 he transferred to the club of young art historians at the State Russian Museum; in 1977 he joined the group of artists known as "The Chronicle;” in 1978 he began to
organize underground exhibitions; from 1980-82 he worked at the State Russian Museum.

In 1982 he formed the group “New Artists” oriented toward folk traditions and the theories of M. Larionov; in 1982 in his apartment he organized the ongoing active gallery “ASSA” that ended in 1987; in 1983 he organized the musical avant-garde group “New Composers;” in 1984 he founded “The New Theatre.”

In 1985 he founded the New Academy of All Arts; in 1989 he founded the New Academy of Fine Arts.

From 1998 together with A. Khlobystin he published the newspaper “The Artistic Will;” in 2000 he gave a series of lectures on the history of art in a variety of educational institutions in St. Petersburg, Moscow, and throughout the country.

In 2002 he opened the first Museum of Contemporary Art in St. Petersburg.

Орлова Евгения

Orlov, Evgeny

Born 1952

Originally, under the tutelage of Nikolai Sychov, Orlov has been doing abstract paintings and compositions since 1976. In 1979 he organized an experimental art studio at the firm “Sokol.” In 1982, he organized an exhibition “Light and Form” at the same firm. It was closed by the KGB on the second day it opened. Since 1983 he has been a member of the Association of Experimental Fine Arts and one of the organizers of all of the association’s exhibitions. He is the vice-president of the art center “Pushkin 10” and the director of the Museum of Nonconformist Art. He works in all areas of contemporary art.

Овчинников Владимир

Ovchinnikov, Vladimir

Born 1941

Vladimir Ovchinnikov is one of the most famous artists of St. Petersburg. Since 1964 (after the scandalous “Artist-Porters” exhibition in the Hermitage) he participated in unofficial painters’ exhibitions in Leningrad. He worked in the Mariinsky (Kirov) Theater under the direction of K.B. Kustodiey and painted frescoes in orthodox churches. He took part in the first unofficial painters’ exhibitions in Leningrad at Gaz Palace of Culture (1974) and Nevsky Palace of Culture (1975). He organized and participated in apartment exhibitions. He is a member of the Society of “Free Culture.” Ovchinnikov is a painter and sculptor.
slogans on the walls of the Peter and Paul Fortress and in other places). Together with O. Volkov he was arrested by the KGB and spent six years of imprisonment in the Murmansk District. After the completion of his sentence, he actively joined the work of TEII (Association of Experimental Fine Arts) that had just been founded.

Later elected as a deputy to the Leningrad Soviet, he was one of founders of the humanitarian Fund “Free Culture.” He was also elected as a deputy for human rights in the State Duma during the first three years of its existence.

He participated in the exhibition at the “Molniya” cinema theatre in 1965 and from 1972 he took part in apartment exhibitions. He exhibited his work in the exhibition at the Nevsky Palace of Culture in 1975 and since 1982 participated in the exhibitions of TEII. Rybakov's works have been exhibited in Europe and USA.

Самарин, Валентин
Born 1928

The son of a military man, Samarin studied physics and philosophy at Leningrad State University, and was a student at the Makarov Naval School and at the Theater Institute. He also studied Russian and Russian Literature at the Teacher's Training College in Leningrad. In 1956 he was jailed for two days by the KGB on Litejny Prospect for a public discussion of questions on modern art after the Picasso exhibition in the Hermitage. From 1960 to 1961 he spent two years in a special psychiatric prison on Arsenalnaya Street for distributing leaflets calling the countries of the world to peace and cooperation. In the spring of 1974, he took his first photographs of the Leonid Jakobson Ballet. In December 1974, he participated in the first group exhibition of unofficial photography “Under the Parachute” which took place in the apartment of K. Kuzminsky. In 1976, Samarin held an exhibition in the apartment of N. Kazarinova. From 1977-1979 he had his own photo atelier “974” on Vasilievsky Island where exhibitions of underground artists and photographers took place. In 1978, he participated in the exhibitions organized in the former Church of Sts. Cyril and Methodius. From 1978-1980 he actively worked in the feminist club “Maria,” and distributed a feminist samizdat magazine. In 1980, he organized and participated in the exhibition “46” which took place in the apartment of the ballet-dancer Alla Osipenko. He was expelled from the Soviet Union in 1981 and lives in Paris. In the past 35 years he organized more than 100 exhibitions in Paris, Cologne, Munich, Amsterdam, Brussels, Berlin, Jerusalem, St. Petersburg, Moscow, Yaroslavl, and Novosibirsk.

Сергеев, Сергей
Born 1953

In 1973, Sergeev graduated from the Department of Theater Decorations of the Serov Art College. He became a nonconformist in 1975. He has worked as a costume designer in the Kirov Academic Theater of Opera and Ballet (1972-1973) and as animator and producer in Lennauchfilm (1974-1975). Together with Vika and Alena, he founded the group “Alipiy.” Since 1981, he actively took part in all the TEII (Association of Experimental Fine Arts) exhibitions and is a member of the Society of “Free Culture.” Sergeev lives and works in St. Petersburg.

His work is included in the following museum collections: The State Russian Museum, St. Petersburg, Russia; The State Museum of St. Petersburg History, St. Petersburg, The Museum of Fine Arts, Sevastopol, Ukraine; Jane Voorhees Zimmerli Art Museum, Rutgers University, New Jersey; The Museum of Nonconformist Art, St. Petersburg, and The Kolodzei Art Foundation Inc., USA.

Шагин, Дмитрий
Born 1957

In 1975, Dmitry Shagin graduated from the Art School affiliated with the Academy of the Arts of the Soviet Union. In 1984 he organized the group
"Mitki." He considers his mother, the painter Natalia Zhilina, his father, the painter Vladimir Shagin, Alexander Arefiev, and Richard Vasmi as his teachers. From 1976 he participated in the exhibitions of unofficial painters of St. Petersburg: TEV (Association of Experimental Exhibitions) and TEII (Association of Experimental Fine Arts).

Since 1988 his work has appeared in group exhibitions abroad in Paris, Cologne, Antwerp, Lausanne, Vienna, San Diego, New York, Washington, and Rio de Janeiro. His works have been purchased by numerous private collectors of the former Soviet Union and foreign countries, by the State Russian Museum, the State Museum of History of St. Petersburg, the Novosibirsk Museum, and others.

Шагин, Владимир
Shagin, Vladimir
1932-1999

In 1944, Vladimir Shagin entered the Art School affiliated with the Academy of the Arts. There he met A. Arefiev, S. Schwarz, R. Gudzenko, K. Lilbok, V. Gromov with whom he became lifelong friends. In 1948, together with most of his friends, he was expelled from the art school for formalism. He studied at the Tavrichesky College for one and a half years and was dismissed for the same reason.


In his younger days, he was influenced by A. Arefiev, R. Vasmi. Vladimir Shagin had a great impact on the development and ideology of the group "Mitki."

Шефф, Сергей
Sheff, Sergei
1936-1997

In the beginning of 1960, Sergei Sheff attended the Architectural Technical School. He started painting on his own in the middle of the 1950s and then chose painting as an optional subject at the Academy of Arts. He participated in the group exhibitions organized at the Kozitsky Factory Club (1968-1969), at the Nevsky Palace of Culture and in different apartments. In 1979-1981, he described his artistic life as a fine art critic on the pages of the samizdat magazine Chasy The Clock and he signed his articles and reviews "U. Istokov" or "U.I."

In 1982, embracing the ideas of Christian-ethical Maximalism, he renounced poetry, criticism, and paintings and gave all his works away to his friends. Only shortly before his death did he return to painting, more accurately, to iconography.

His own exhibition (posthumous) took place in 1998 at the editorial office of the magazine Neva.

Шварц, Шолом
Shvarts, Sholom
1929-1996

During WW II, Shvarts was evacuated from Leningrad. He attended the Restoration Industrial School. Following the advice of his teacher, G.I. Orlovsky, he entered the art school affiliated with the Academy of Arts in 1947. There he got acquainted with the painters of the future circle of Arefiev. He graduated from the school in 1951 and tried to pass the entrance exams to the Academy of Arts, but failed. He became a student of the Polygraph Institute.

exhibition of TEII (Association of Experimental Fine Arts, 1983). From 1988, S. Shvarts’ works were annually exhibited in modern art exhibitions in St. Petersburg, Moscow, USA, and Germany. The first and only individual exhibition of S. Schwarz took place posthumously at the Museum of the City Sculpture (St. Petersburg, 1996). His works can be found in the State Russian Museum, the Far Eastern Art Museum, in Kharkov, the Manez, the Museum of Nonconformist Art in St. Petersburg, and in private collections.

Сигеи, Сергеи
Sigei, (SigoV) Sergei
Born 1947

Sigei graduated from the Theater Institute in Leningrad (1979-1985). Afterwards, he was the head of the department of painting at the Eysk Museum of Local Culture. In 1998 he immigrated to Germany.

Segei was a painter, poet, performance and mail artist, publisher (Transponans, a samizdat publication), and researcher of the Russian avant-garde. He received the Andrey Bely prize in poetry. He participated in the unofficial art exhibitions of 1983 and was a member of the “5/4” Group (“The Fifth Quarter”).

Сухоруков, Владислав
Sukhorukov, Vladislav
Born 1950

In his youth, Sukhorukov joined the art study group in the Palace of Pioneers and by 1976, his first individual exhibition occurred at the Institute of Motion-picture Engineers. The same year he met the Leningrad underground.

He became a member of TEII (Association of Experimental Fine Arts) and participated in TEII exhibitions. He was also a member of the groups: “Ostrov” (“Island”), “Tir” (“Shooting Range”) and “5 Uglov” (“5 Corners”). Since 1986, Sukhorukov became a member of the Free Russian Modern Art Fund. He has had exhibitions in Russia, the Baltic States, France, and Germany. From 1990 to January 1996 he lived and worked in the USA. His paintings have been exhibited in the museums and galleries in California and Guatemala. His works are in private collections in 13 different countries around the world. The credo of his life and creative work is “Immortality begins with consciousness and consciousness begins with creative work.”

Trofimov, Виктор
Trofimov, Viktor
Born 1953

Trofimov graduated in 1974 as a painter from Leningrad’s V.I. Mukhin High School of the Arts. He was one of K. Zastensky’s students. In 1976, he began working at the film studio Lennauchfilm as a painter and was there for 14 years. Since 1975 he has been an independent painter and has taken part in official and unofficial exhibitions. He was a member of the “Alipiy” Group and in 1993 he received the golden medal of the Valon Academy of Art (Belgium). Trofimov lives and works in St. Petersburg.

Устюгов, Геннадий
Ustiugov, Gennady
Born 1937

In 1955-1958, Ustiugov studied at the B. Ioganson Secondary Art School affiliated with the Repin Institute of Art, Sculpture and Architecture. He participated in the exhibitions at Gaz (1974) and Nevsky (1975) Houses of Culture and in apartment exhibitions of from 1970 to 1980. He was a regular participant in the TEII (Association of Experimental Fine Arts) exhibitions in 1980-1990. He was a member of TEII and the Society of “Free Culture.” His works can be seen in the best museum collections of Russia, Europe and USA. Ustiugov lives and works in St. Petersburg.

Вальран, Валерий
Valran, Valery
Born 1949

Valran lived in Pechora, Komi, USSR, until the age of 17. In 1966 he passed the entrance exams to the Mathematics Department of the Teacher’s

In 1976 he began to participate in exhibitions: first, unofficially in apartment exhibitions, and, from 1979, in exhibition halls and galleries. He has participated in more than 90 group exhibitions in Russia, Germany, Switzerland and USA. Since 1979, he has organized more than 30 group exhibitions and festivals in Russia and Germany. In 1997–1999, he was the gallery curator of the “Art Collegia.”

Васми, Рихард
VASMI, RIKHARD
1929–1998
An acknowledged genius of Leningrad’s unofficial art, Vasmi belonged to the Order of Impoverished (or “unsellable”) Painters and was a participant in the first apartment exhibitions of unofficial artists. He was a member of the Society of “Free Culture.” He worked as a painter and graphic artist.

Вик (Вячеслав Забелин)
VIK (VYACHESLAV ZABELIN)
BORN 1953
Zabelin is a painter and graphic artist. Since 1957 he has lived in Leningrad. He attended the Serov Art School and has worked as a restorer, theater painter, designer, furnace stoker and others. At the beginning of 1970s, he actively began to take part in exhibitions of nonconformist artists. The art group “Alipiy” was formed in his studio. He was a member of TEII (Association of Experimental Fine Arts) from its inception. Since 1980, he has participated in many group exhibitions. Vik’s works have been sold at the most famous auctions of England and France. His works are in the collections of many museums and galleries as well as in many private collections of the world.

Воинов, Вадим
VOINOV, VADIM
BORN 1940
In 1959, Voinov graduated from a correspondence school and after that sailed on fishing boats to America and Africa. In 1976 he graduated from the Leningrad State University (Department of History of Arts). From 1972 to 1993 he worked as a member of the Museum of Leningrad History. In 1979 he began working as an artist. Since 1983 he has regularly participated in exhibitions of unofficial artists. Voinov organized and took part in many apartment exhibitions. He was a member of TEII (Association of Experimental Fine Arts) and the Society of “Free Culture.” He was also a member of the artistic group “5/4” (“The Fifth Quarter”), one of the founders of the Group “7.” In 1994, he founded the gallery “The Bridge over Styx” at Pushkin 10. His works can be found in the largest museum collections of Russia, Europe and the USA. He lives and works in St. Petersburg.

Жилина, Наталья
ZHILINA, NATALYA
1933–2005
In 1955, Zhilina graduated from the “Tauride” Art School. A particular influence on the formation of her worldview at the school were her teachers, N.N. Punina and G.D. Glagoleva. Thereafter, she became acquainted with A. Arefiev, R. Vasmi, V. Shagin, S. Shvarts, B. Gromov, and other artists who had a significant influence on her work. The year she graduated she married Vladimir Shagin. Her son is now well known as the leader of the group “Mitki.” She was a participant in the exhibition at the Nevsky Palace of Culture (1975), in the apartment exhibitions (1970s) and other artistic efforts of TEII as well as in post-perestroika exhibits in the USSR, Russia and abroad. In 1993 she had a one person exhibition at the gallery “Borei.” She was a significant influence on many of the members of “Mitki.”
CHECKLIST OF THE EXHIBITION

Dimensions are given inches, height precedes width. All the paintings are from the collection of the Museum of Nonconformist Art, Pushkinskaya-10 Art Centre, St. Petersburg, Russia.

1. Vyacheslav Afonichev / Vyacheslav Afonichev (Russian, born 1946)
   Бык / A Bull
   1976, oil on cardboard,
   25 1/2 x 34 1/4

2. Viktor Andreev / Viktor Andreev (Russian, born 1955)
   Композиция №33 / Composition No. 33
   1980, oil on canvas,
   23 5/8 x 27 5/8

3. Aleksandr Arefiev / Aleksandr Arefiev (Russian, 1931-1978)
   Хрущев с Булганиным / Khruushchev with Bulganin
   circa 1960s, graphite and mixed media on paper,
   15 x 9 1/4

4. Leonid Bolmat / Leonid Bolmat (Russian, born 1931)
   Импровизация №35 / Improvisation No. 35
   1977, oil on cardboard,
   23 3/8 x 23

5. Leonid Borisov / Leonid Borisov (Russian, born 1943)
   Композиция / Composition
   1977, mixed media on fiberboard,
   16 3/8 x 23 5/8

6. Sergei Dobrotvorsky / Sergei Dobrotvorsky (Russian, born 1952)
   Идея №4 +Ленинград+Лесник / Idea No. 4 + Leningrad + Lumberjack
   n.d., mixed media on paper,
   11 3/8 x 16

7. Henrik Elinson / Henrik Elinson (Russian, born 1935)
   Композиция 03 / Composition 03
   1982, mixed media on paper
   24 1/2 x 32 3/8

8. Elena Figurina / Elena Figurina (Russian, born 1955)
   Прогулка / A Stroll
   1982, oil on canvas,
   19 5/8 x 23 5/8

9. Valentin Gerasimenko / Valentin Gerasimenko (Russian, born 1935)
   Оттиск / A Print
   1984, etching on paper,
   11 x 9 3/4

10. Evgeny Gindper / Evgeny Gindper (Russian, born 1949)
    Дохай-Кресты / Dachau-Crosses
    1970, oil on canvas,
    18 x 24 1/4

11. Vladimir Gromov / Vladimir Gromov (Russian, born 1930)
    Театр / Theatre
    1972, oil on cardboard,
    19 x 14 3/4

12. Aleksandr Gurevich / Aleksandr Gurevich (Russian, born 1944)
    Портрет Юлия Рыбакова / A Portrait of Yuly Rybakov
    1986, oil on prepared plywood,
    25 3/4 x 21 5/8

13. Igor Ivanov / Igor Ivanov (Russian, born 1934)
    Кукла Юли / Doll Yulia
    1982, levkas (a base of chalk and glue) and oil on canvas,
    15 1/8 x 18 5/8

14. Rostislav Ivanov / Rostislav Ivanov (Russian, born 1941)
    Весенний взгляд из окна / Glancing from a Window in Spring
    1983, oil on fiberboard,
    31 1/2 x 24

15. Boris Koshelokhov / Boris Koshelokhov (Russian, born 1942)
    Ночь, окна / Night, Security
    1978, oil on canvas and plywood,
    29 3/4 x 29 3/4
16. Сергей Ковалский / Sergei Kovalsky
  (Russian, born 1948)
  "Бойкот 8". Олимпийские игры в Москве,
  Композиция в цвете музыки: "Революция №9"
  Битва, 1979-80 / Boycott '8'. The Olympic Games in
  Moscow, Composition in the Color of Music: "Revolution
  No. 9" The Beatles
  1979-1980, collage and oil on canvas
  29 3/8 x 19 7/8

17. Кирилл Лильбок / Kirill Libbok
  (Russian, 1931-2003)
  Без названия / Untitled
  1978, oil on canvas,
  26 x 23 1/4

18. Александар Лоцман / Aleksandr Lotsman
  (Russian, born 1947)
  Лялечи / Lyalichi, a Village
  1981, oil on canvas,
  22 1/4 x 34 3/8

19. Александар Манусов / Aleksandr Manusov
  (Russian, 1947-1991)
  Лялечи / A Light
  circa 1970s, watercolor and monotype on paper,
  mounted on cardboard,
  11 1/8 x 7 3/4

20. Анатолий Маслов / Anatoly Maslov
  (Russian, born 1938)
  Дерево и куст / A Tree and a Bush
  1979, oil on canvas,
  21 5/8 x 29 1/2

21. Юрий Медведев / Yury Medvedev
  (Russian, born 1939)
  Фигуры / Figures
  1983, oil on canvas, mounted on board,
  31 1/2 x 23 1/2

22. Владимир Михайлов / Vladimir Mikhailov
  (Russian, 1939-1991)
  Софийский собор / St. Sophia's Cathedral
  circa 1970s, oil on canvas,
  15 3/4 x 9 1/4

23. Евгений Михов-Войтенко / Evgeny Mikhnov-
  Voitenko
  (Russian, 1932-1998)
  Инквизиторы / The Inquisitors
  1973, sauce/gravy on paper,
  22 5/8 x 15 3/4

24. Кирилл Миллер / Kirill Miller
  (Russian, born 1959)
  Ленин на броневике / Lenin on an Armored Car
  1984, oil on canvas,
  39 3/8 x 31 3/8

25. Борис Митавский / Boris Mitavsky
  (Russian, born 1948)
  Апофеоз / Apotheosis
  1978, oil on canvas,
  26 3/4 x 33 5/8

26. Ленена Никитина / Lenina Nikitina
  (Russian, born 1931)
  Любовь Блокадная / Blockade Love
  1982, oil on fiberboard,
  24 3/4 x 18 3/4

27. Тимур Новиков / Timur Novikov
  (Russian, 1958-2002)
  Портрет мавританского художника Муля / Portrait of the Mauritanian Artist Mulya
  1981-82, oil on fiberboard,
  17 1/4 x 11 1/8

28. Евгений Орлов / Evgeny Orlov
  (Russian, born 1952)
  Мальчик и зеленый шкаф / A Boy and a Green Cupboard
  1977, oil on fiberboard,
  26 1/2 x 19 1/8

29. Владимир Овчинников / Vladimir Ovchinnikov
  (Russian, born 1941)
  Летающие тарелки / Flying Saucers
  1981, oil on canvas,
  19 1/2 x 16 7/8

30. Юрий Петроchenkov / Yury Petrochenkov
  (Russian, born 1942)
  Бешеная скакка / A Demonic Gallop
  1978, watercolor, india ink, and pen on paper,
  16 1/8 x 24

31. Юлий Рыбаков / Yuly Rybakov
  (Russian, born 1946)
  Сегодня...завтра...никогда / Today...Tomorrow...Never
  1984, oil on cardboard, mounted on plywood with
  steel frame,
  27 x 19 1/2
32. Тиль Мария Валентин Самарин / Valentin Samarin
   (Til Maria)
   (Russian, born 1928)
   Мы в 1980 / We Are in 1980
   1980, photograph/collage on paper,
   11 1/8 x 16 3/8

33. Сергей Сергеев / Sergei Sergeev
   (Russian, born 1939)
   Танцювщица / The Dancer
   1984, oil on canvas,
   35 7/8 x 29

34. Дмитрий Шагин / Dmitry Shagin
   (Russian, born 1957)
   Чаша / A Drinking Bowl
   1981, tempera on cardboard
   14 3/4 x 12 1/4

35. Владимир Шагин / Vladimir Shagin
   (Russian, 1932-1999)
   Двое в комнате / Two in a Room
   circa 1960s, oil on canvas,
   9 x 12

36. Сергей Шефф / Sergei Sheff
   (Russian, 1936-1997)
   Расстрел / Death by Firing Squad
   1970, oil on fiberboard,
   31 3/8 x 27

37. Шолом Шварц / Sholom Shvarts
   (Russian, 1929-1996)
   Фигура / A Figure
   circa 1970s, oil on cardboard,
   23 x 13 1/4

38. Сергей Сигей / Sergei Sigei
   (Russian, born 1947)
   Униф-сфои портрет / Unif-sfor Portrait
   1977, oil on canvas,
   39 1/4 x 28 1/2

39. Владислав Сухоруков / Vladislav Sukhorukov
   (Russian, born 1950)
   Постижение Хаоса / An Understanding of Chaos
   1983, oil on canvas,
   39 3/8 x 39 3/8

40. Виктор Трофимов / Viktor Trofimov
    (Russian, born 1953)
    Без названия / Untitled
    1979, mixed media on paper,
    10 3/8 x 14 1/4

41. Геннадий Устюгов / Gennady Ustjugov
    (Russian, born 1937)
    Не понятный объект / An Incomprehensible Object
    1976, oil on canvas,
    35 1/8 x 39 1/8

42. Валерий Вальран / Valery Valran
    (Russian, born 1949)
    Рыба на бронзовом блюде / Fish on a Bronze Plate
    1979, oil on canvas,
    19 1/4 x 23 1/4

43. Рихард Васми / Rikhard Vasmi
    (Russian, 1929-1998)
    Натюрморт с тюльпанами / Still Life with Tulips
    1980, tempera on fiberboard,
    19 1/2 x 15 1/8

44. Вик (Вячеслав Забелин) / Vik (Vyacheslav Zabelin)
    (Russian, born 1953)
    Натюрморт с яблоком / Still Life with an Apple
    1982, oil on canvas,
    15 3/4 x 23 3/4

45. Вадим Войнов / Vadim Voinov
    (Russian, born 1940)
    Шпиономания / Spymania
    1980, mixed media on plywood,
    25 1/2 x 17 1/2

46. Наталья Жилина / Natalya Zhilina
    (Russian, 1933-2005)
    Скорбящая Мария/ Mater Dolorosa
    1985, oil on canvas,
    23 3/4 x 17 1/2