

2002

An Introduction to the Brotherhood of Free Culture and the Cultural Center of Pushkinskaya Ten

Joseph C. Troncale

University of Richmond, jtroncal@richmond.eduFollow this and additional works at: <http://scholarship.richmond.edu/mlc-faculty-publications>Part of the [Painting Commons](#), and the [Slavic Languages and Societies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Troncale, Joseph C. "An Introduction to the Brotherhood of Free Culture and the Cultural Center of Pushkinskaya Ten." In *The Brotherhood of Free Culture: Recent Art from St. Petersburg, Russia*. Richmond, Virginia: Joel and Lila Harnett Museum of Art, University of Richmond Museums, 2002.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Languages, Literatures, and Cultures at UR Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Languages, Literatures, and Cultures Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of UR Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact scholarshiprepository@richmond.edu.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE BROTHERHOOD OF FREE CULTURE AND THE CULTURAL CENTER OF PUSHKINSKAYA TEN

In 1863, fourteen Russian student-artists, who were about to undertake their diploma work at the Academy of Fine Arts in St. Petersburg, refused the assigned theme for their final paintings because of its rigorous and suppressive classical prescriptions. Under pressure from the liberal press and the intelligentsia of St. Petersburg as all artists were, the young students of the academy were protesting the conditions under which Russian artists of their day lived and worked.

The respect and reverence that Russian artists enjoy today became the rule only later in the nineteenth century. Until that time, within the rigid dictates of classicism, the production of all art was controlled traditionally through either imperial or ecclesial patronage. Subsequently, the young artists were expelled from the Academy and did not receive their diplomas. Instead, they formed a group known as the *Artel* and assumed the role of directing their own future as artists in direct opposition to the establishment. The action of these young artists was the initial step in the establishment of an “unofficial”¹ art in St. Petersburg that signaled the beginning of nonconformism in Russian painting. Something quite momentous had happened in that November of 1863 that would affect

the course of Russian painting forever.²

The exhibition *The Brotherhood of Free Culture: Recent Art From St. Petersburg, Russia* represents a significant moment in the history of exhibitions of Russian nonconformism in painting. Like all Russian nonconformist art, this exhibition and these artists trace their roots back directly to 1863 and to the tradition of “unofficial” art, which, one might say, began with the refusal of those fourteen artists to remain under the yoke of the academy. The bold move of those young artists in the nineteenth century precipitated the formation of a more permanent group of painters into the Brotherhood of Traveling Art Exhibitions, or the *Peredvizhniki*, often mistakenly referred to in English as the itinerant painters. This is a misnomer. In fact, the point of the exhibitions organized by the members of that brotherhood — and a very important point at that — was not that the painters themselves would travel, but that their paintings would travel around the country, giving the population greater access to art and, in particular, to contemporary art. Interestingly enough, the majority of the population, to whom these paintings were traveling, could not afford even the four-ruble admission to see them.

From 1871 to approximately 1897 in twenty-seven major exhibitions, using the salon style of exhibitions popular in France at that time, the *Peredvizhniki* gave the world a view into the conscience of Russian artists, who were realistically portraying the problematic circumstances of ordinary peoples' lives in the hope of creating a better world for them. Running out of steam and financial backing at the beginning of the 1890s, the *Peredvizhniki* ironically rejoined forces with the academy, their avowed *bête noire*, thus again becoming a part of the establishment, in the face of which the next "unofficial" group would have to insist upon its own independent aesthetic.

Although they defected from its ranks, the *Peredvizhniki*, to be sure, had never entirely distanced themselves from the academy in aesthetic terms. It was the rigorous training that artists of the nineteenth century received at the academy that was the foundation of their extraordinary technical achievements and experimentation. In a very real sense, just as it had in nineteenth-century France, the academy played an indispensable and deeply significant role in shaping the achievements of nineteenth-century Russian painting, both technically and ideologically.

One of the most important yet often ignored parts of the history of Russian painting, particularly where "unofficial" art is concerned, is the structure of the exhibition system during any given period

of history. Without some understanding of that structure, the history of Russian painting may appear more chaotic and arbitrary than it was in fact. Obviously, no form of painting can gain any measure of stature in the context of the medium as a whole, if it is not exhibited and scrutinized publicly.

At the time when "The Fourteen" made their move out of the academy in 1863, the academy and, ultimately, the imperial reach of the tsar still controlled absolutely all venues for the exhibition of painting in Russia just as it did all other aspects of Russian life. There was little, if any, possibility of "unofficial" art. This was so in a caste-like society, in which everyone fit neatly and practically irreversibly into the category either of the imperial family, of the nobility, of those who had been decorated and honored by the imperial family, of those involved in trade, or of the serfs. It was only in the liberal atmosphere created by the political and social changes decreed by the "reform tsar" Alexander II, who liberated the serfs in 1861, that it became possible to conceive of an "unofficial" art. Eventually, however, thanks to the hard-driving nationalism of the eminent publicist and art critic V. V. Stasov, the imperial support co-opted "the unofficial" realism of the *Peredvizhniki* as the official "Russian School" of painting. The realism of the nineteenth-century *Peredvizhniki* was to become the official standard of artistic form and content for a

second time in the 1930s. Under Stalin, the Communist Party's rejection of the avant-garde and formalist experimentation resulted in the official elevation of the *Peredvizhniki* school as the expression of the Soviet dream through a predominant Russian socialist art.

The great movements of Western culture, such as the Renaissance, had bypassed Russia because of illiteracy and the limited production and dissemination of books.³ This left Russia in the difficult position of having to catch up with the rest of Europe — the task that Peter the Great earnestly began in every area of Russian life at the beginning of the eighteenth century. Once Pandora's box was opened by the exhibitions of the *Peredvizhniki*, Russian painting leaped centuries ahead of itself to arrive at the point in the beginning of the twentieth century, where by 1915 it was the international leader of the avant-garde. Between 1900 and 1918, there was a blinding flurry of groups of Russian painters and exhibitions in Moscow, St. Petersburg, and abroad in Germany and France. From Sergei Diaghilev and the *Ballets Russes* and the *Miriskusniki* to the Suprematists and the Constructivists, the Russians had captured the imagination of the international art world, and, significantly, the focus of that attention was St. Petersburg, and not Moscow.

The story of nonconformism, even in such an abbreviated form as it is offered here, would be distorted without some

further reference to Peter the Great and the historic cultural momentum he initiated when he decided to build St. Petersburg, sometimes called the "Venice of the North," in the middle of a swamp. Under Peter's ubiquitous direction, and much to the chagrin of Moscow — the bastion of Russian tradition — all of Russia's energies during his reign had as their focus the building of St. Petersburg as the symbol of the new Russian empire-state. Dragging Russia kicking and screaming into the modern age, Peter hacked a window to the West in the wall of Russian isolation and tradition and invited European culture to flood the country. And the torrent of ideas that poured into Russia changed her forever.

All forms of art, particularly painting, became pawns in Peter's great, mad venture. Stripped of their ecclesiastical orientation, the arts were saddled with the secular task of contributing to the building of an empire and its reputation. And it was not until those fourteen young artists protested being denied their choice of theme for the Grand Gold Medal that the force of that momentum was broken in Russian painting. Peter the Great, and Catherine the Great, had a vision of Russia's future that was inspired and directed by the idea of the individual and the merits of individuality engendered by the Enlightenment. Thus, the seeds of the rebellion of those fourteen artists in the nineteenth century, who shared that vision, were already an inherent part of Russia's

development in the eighteenth century.

The cataclysmic changes in Russia after the Bolshevik Revolution had an equally dramatic effect on the direction of Russian art from 1917 to the present. In 1918 Lenin decided to make Moscow the center of Soviet power. After 206 years as the capital of Russia, now isolated, St. Petersburg was forced to bow out of the political and cultural limelight for which she was born and outfitted. Renamed Petrograd, St. Petersburg became known as a "great city with a provincial fate." The administrative command of all political, economic, social, and cultural power in Russia was then concentrated in Moscow. And, once again, as in the nineteenth century, there was no space for "unofficial" art in the ideological context of the established political regime.

What were the boundaries that separated "official" art from "unofficial" art? After a 1932 decree abolishing all artistic groups, the Party moved further towards imposing uniformity on artistic production. In 1934, after consultation with members of the artistic community, the Soviet cultural establishment adopted Socialist Realism as the official policy under which all forms of creative expression could best serve the building of socialism. The criteria for the creation of any work of art whether it be painting, film, poetry, prose, sculpture, theatre, et cetera, were *narodnost*, *partiinnost*, *klassovost*, and *ideinnost*. *Narodnost* (literally translated as "people-ness") is the quality of reflecting

the essential characteristics and interests of the peoples of the Soviet Union. *Partiinost* ("party-ness") is the quality of being imbued with loyalty, dedication, service, and sensitivity to the Communist 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 undying service to the struggle to eliminate individualism in favor of collectivism. *Ideinnost* ("idea-ness") demands that any work of art must be steeped in the fundamental ideology of the Communist Party as it guides the course of the Soviet Union to its revolutionary future. Thus, the line between "official" and "unofficial" art was drawn.

Initially, the demand for adherence to these criteria was unequivocal. In the second half of the 1930s, the punishments for violation were draconian. The nation's creative genius was decimated; the names of an entire generation of creative artists were erased. During World War II, when the USSR was in a life and death struggle against an outside enemy, there was a reprieve for the alleged internal enemies of the state, among whom were those artists and writers who did not follow the course prescribed for them by the Communist Party. Once Hitler was defeated, however, the Communist Party began to tighten the screws once again within the country to ward off the ill effects of what it labeled "decadent bourgeois Western influences."

Many artists took great risks by simply presuming they were free to create. The Party defined this freedom as defiance, and, thus, illegal. From the artists' point of view, however, the creation of a nonconformist art was not necessarily their intention, but was, rather, a figment of the party's collective paranoid imagination. Thus, nonconformist art was, in effect, the party's own creation. One of the earliest postwar groups of nonconformists in Leningrad (as St. Petersburg had been renamed after Lenin's death in 1924) was the Association of Impoverished Painters (ONZh), or the *Arefiev* group that included Aleksandr Arefiev, Rikhard Vasmi, Valentin Gromov, Vladimir Shagin, and Sholom Shvarts. Their work often portrayed as utterly depressing the abject poverty of everyday existence in the Soviet Union.

Finally, after Stalin's death in 1953, ripples from the thaw in the Stalinist legacy of Soviet Socialist Realism began to make themselves felt in Moscow. Communist Party leaders and ideologues were criticizing the excesses of Stalinism and expressed dissatisfaction with the direction that the art of Socialist Realism had taken. It had become uninteresting. The ripples turned into waves of "unofficial" art that were fed by de-Stalinization. In a crucial series of stunning exhibitions in the 1960s and 1970s, "unofficial" art began to occupy an official "unofficial" position. Denied public

exhibition space, "unofficial" artists in Moscow and Leningrad began to exhibit their paintings in the open air. At first, the dialogue between the ideologues and the artists begun in Moscow was only dimly mirrored in Leningrad. The city was so far away from the international scrutiny and political pressure focused on Moscow that it was more of an uphill struggle for the "unofficial" artists there to find space for their work to breathe.

The few successes during the Khrushchev era were followed by Brezhnev's crackdown on "unofficial" artists, even after a rehabilitation in 1964 of the Russian avant-garde of the 1910s and 1920s. The "unofficial" art movement gained the most ground between 1974 and 1976, when the conservative wing of the Communist Party was willing to do anything to rescue its reputation and save its political program from the ash-heap of history. After brutal government reprisals, the artists moved their exhibitions into their apartments. And it was at this time in the early 1970s that the St. Petersburg spirit came into its own again.

The authorities then began to consider nonconformist, "unofficial," or "underground" art as an anti-Soviet political movement. This official opposition helped forge a more unified coalition between Moscow and Leningrad "unofficial" artists than might otherwise have emerged. A group of nonconformist artists from Leningrad exhibited side by side with their

comrades in Moscow at the *First Autumn Open-Air Exhibition* of “unofficial” art on September 15, 1974. Commonly known as “The Bulldozer Incident,” the exhibition of the work of thirteen courageous artists lasted for two hours before the authorities bulldozed it. Several paintings were destroyed in the mayhem, and, along with some of the artists, members of the foreign press were manhandled by agents of the KGB. The international outcry following the reports of what happened forced authorities to issue a permit for the *Second Autumn Open-Air Exhibition* two weeks later. Lasting from noon to 4 P.M. on September 29, the exhibition of sixty “unofficial” artists at a park in the Moscow suburb of Izmailovo was attended by more than ten thousand people.

On the heels of this victory and after several other successful indoor exhibitions, in 1976 the “Brotherhood of Experimental Exhibitions” (TEE) was formed in Leningrad to unify all nonconformist artists in their efforts to hold exhibitions of each other’s work and to organize related events promoting such activities. However, pressure from the authorities continued to mount, and the victory was short-lived. Nonetheless, exhibitions in apartments continued to attract as many as two thousand people over a four-day period despite harassment and threats of arrest. The work begun by TEE was continued in the 1980s by another organization known as the “Brotherhood of

Experimental Visual Art” (TEII). As many of Leningrad’s nonconformists emigrated, an “artist drain” was created. Given the continuing dire economic circumstances in which an artist must struggle to survive, this drain continues to plague today’s Russia.

Organized in the 1990s, the “Brotherhood of Free Culture” (TSK) is the living link in St. Petersburg to the history of nonconformist art in Russia that continues the struggle to create opportunities for the free and open expression and exhibition of art unconstrained by politics or commerce. At the end of the 1990s, in order to preserve the cultural and artistic traditions of St. Petersburg and to maintain the links with the past generations of Soviet and post-Soviet artists, Evgeny Orlov and Sergei Kovalsky, veterans of the movement of “unofficial” artists and organizers of the “Brotherhood of Free Culture,” conceived and established The Museum of Nonconformist Art at “Pushkinskaya Ten” (House #10 on Pushkin Street). In the experience of Russian culture, it is a unique occurrence to witness such a success of the initiative of creative people, who, during the Soviet period, had represented “unofficial” art and, subsequently, had developed the idea of “a place of its own in the Motherland.”⁴ The museum has an archive of the history of nonconformist art and houses a collection of artistic works of the second half of the twentieth century,

and it provides St. Petersburg and the international community with a regular program of exhibitions. The University of Richmond Museums' exhibition from St. Petersburg's Museum of Nonconformist Art presents to the American public, for the first time, the most recent phase of Russian "unofficial" art from the last decade of the twentieth century and the first decade of the twenty-first century.

There is no doubt that the seven artists participating in this exhibition would each offer distinct definitions of his or her own role in the tradition of Russian nonconformist painting and would each understand the meaning of nonconformist painting differently. While the works speak for themselves, clearly and boldly embodying the artists' different attitudes, a brief consideration of just what nonconformist art may mean in the Russian context seems appropriate.

It has been said that the primary activity of human beings is the effort to exceed or transcend the dilemma of human existence.⁵ Many would argue that, instead, the primary activity of human beings is to give meaning to human existence. Entertaining both for the moment as primary activities of our species, it seems useful to consider how well we have done either in the century we have just left behind. For example, beginning with the Russian Revolution of 1905 and the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 and ending with the devolution of Marxism into the

stagnation of Soviet Socialist reality of the 1980s, history might consider Russia the greatest monument of the past century to humankind's most ambitious attempt and failure in both categories. Both the attempt and failure represent humankind's apparent collective inability to grasp the nature of conditionality or of the ephemerality of all aspects of conditional, mortal existence itself as being inherently incomplete and unsatisfactory, and indifferently so.

Nonconformism may be understood to be an inherent reaction of the human psyche to the restrictions that mortality and mortal existence place on being. "Man's suffering lies in his presumption that there is a difference between Being and Form, between Consciousness and Energy, between Moveless Being and the world of appearances."⁶ This classic imagined separation or difference puzzled Socrates as the question of the separation of body and soul. Rousseau pinpointed as a turning point in civilization man's alienation from himself in his felt need to feign appearances different from his being to win the approval of his peers. The Tao represents all of reality as only "is" to confound the "not this / not that" which represents the binary logic of man's ratiocination. Nietzsche critically explores resentment and the subsequent creation of an ascetic ideal that precludes the possibility of truly uncompromised being and life in human form. In Freud's theory of the personality, the ego is the

mediator between the self and the world, other individuals, and even one's own body — the ultimate example of the obsessive fear we have of form.

Out of their own individual cultural experiences, artists of the twentieth century defined the dilemma of human existence in terms of form — cast as the very limitations of being human. The forms themselves, in which being manifests itself, appear to be our own nemesis. The conditionality of human existence, our mortality, and the absolute lack of power to control our or anyone else's appearance or disappearance from this conditional realm have backed us into a corner revealing our impotence. Yet, Rousseau, Nietzsche, and Freud tell us how we cling to form as if that were all that we are. Yet form, or, at least, our misperception of its function and what it is, seems to have always betrayed us at every turn. One has only to visit Treblinka, Auschwitz, or Babi Yar to feel the mood of betrayal, in which the past century still smolders in our memory. The dilemma we have made, then, seems, paradoxically, to be our unwavering inclination to trust absolutely in form and in the conditional realm that we inhabit. Our activity of dilemma robs us of the vision of the unconditional or spiritual realm as the ineluctable companion to our inescapable lot as form and conditionality.

Russian painters of the twentieth century have made their own unique investigation into the dilemma of human existence and how to come to terms with it.

Some have fragmented form, breaking it down and reconstituting it in ways that present an often disconcerting vision of the conditionality of existence. Others have tried to go “beyond” form, attempting in the very creation of new forms to somehow trick form into denying itself. None, however, have gone so far as to renounce the possibility of embodying their vision of meaning — a non-conditional reality.

Thinkers after Plato have focused on the suffering that results when human beings subjugate themselves to illusory forms of mortal existence. Deeply rooted in the neoplatonic spiritual tradition of Eastern Orthodoxy, Russian artists have tended to view aesthetic activity as an involvement in the struggle to move beyond an illusory world of appearances and to unite with unchanging non-material being. Perhaps nonconformist art in Russia, like all expressions of nonconformism, does indeed express first and foremost the reaction of the human psyche to the restrictions that mortal existence apparently places on being.

Although it is true in some cases, it would be a mistake to assume that all nonconformist art in Russia, or in the former Soviet Union, is or was a political statement in the narrowest sense of the word. To reduce it to a political statement would be to deny its virtues as art. Ironically, it may be true that Russian nonconformist artists merely accepted the role that the party assigned to them. Russian “nonconformist art,” the description that

“unofficial” Russian artists applied to their work from the mid-1970s on, is an expression of inherent human freedom that is indifferent to politics. Rikhard Vasmi, one of the leading nonconformist artists after World War II, said: “The fact that I was never allowed to call myself officially an artist had a very positive influence on my development. The less official one’s life is, the more personal freedom one has.”⁷ Russian nonconformist artists assume a position that transcends the arena of petty political maneuvering. Traditionally this is the position held by all truly great Russian artists. Pushkin (1799-1836), Dostoevsky (1821-1881), Tolstoy (1828-1910), Mandelshstam (1891-1938), Pasternak (1890-1960), and Solzhenitsyn (born 1918), to name but a few, did not equivocate or compromise their vision by turning it into a challenge to political structures or ideologies. Their role was simply to articulate the truth; that was challenge enough. They did not calculate the consequences that are essentially political. Russian artists consider it their mission to serve as the conscience of their people. They are compelled to create without assessing the cost.

Today in Russia, nonconformist art still represents the moral imperative of artists to teach or lead the way and to maintain the integrity of the aesthetic process against pollution or dilution by any outside influences. This does not mean, however, that Russian nonconformist art is

purely art for the sake of art. The didactic tendentiousness of Russian art is part of the nature of the beast. However, the Russian nonconformist artist tirelessly insists on his or her unequivocal right to hold fast to an individual point of view, no matter how far it diverges from all other views and stances, and even because it diverges from them. As Russian artists bask in a newly found and still tenuous freedom, where the market rather than the state determines who survives, nonconformist art, now no longer underground, has taken flight in remarkable ways. Now unfettered, the artists have been trying their wings beyond what was even imaginable to them a decade or so ago.

The five men and two women, represented in *The Brotherhood of Free Culture: Recent Art from St. Petersburg, Russia*, constitute a widely diverse group, whose common experience includes years of working under the constraints of the Soviet system. Some even served prison sentences for various expressions of their nonconformism that have not always been artistic. The constraints they face today are different, and different, too, is the impact made by their work in today’s context.

As is evident in the paintings in this exhibition, nonconformist art is not necessarily synonymous with abstract art. Created in the last decade of the twentieth century, the works range from futurist acrylic patterns and studies in texture and color to paper and cloth collages and non-

unlimited imagination and spiritual depth, enters the space of Andreev's tolerance. The tactile and visual luster of his canvases tantalize one to slip away into one's imagination and yield to the lure of their sensuality. He immerses us in the extremes of his palette, chilling us with his icy blues and whites, and warming us with fiery golds, oranges, and pinks as we visually cut a path, feeling securely home already, through the jagged edges of the shapes on the surface of his canvases.

The work of Igor Orlov plays in the nether world between articulation and thought. The artist focuses not on the depiction of finality in images, but on the process of their evolution where the primal energies of creativity brood and boil before exploding into form and convention. Extracting essence from the primeval bilge of human confusion, he choreographs powerful canvases of ambiance and ambivalence. We see raw emotion before it becomes channeled into fear, anger, hate, or love. In *Composition with Two Figures* (cat. no. 34) and *Untitled* (cat. no. 36, illustrated p. 59), we see the darkness of that untapped world as it ignites and fires the imagination. As the shadows of form begin to emerge, they are frozen in place forever. Orlov's paintings are unspoken passion longing for finality. In *We Drank Spanish Wine All Night* (cat. no. 33, illustrated p. 55) and *Untitled* (cat. no. 32), we have two canvases of pure white background with figures banded with belts

of roughly applied black. It is as if the figure in each painting is sealed up by the heavy bands of paint, held back from the next step of its materialization as it strides forward to emerge from the light of conceptualization.

The unique dynamic quality of Svetlana Tsvirkunova's pieces lies in her ability to evoke a profound strength of attachment to tradition while exploring its boundaries. No less serious, her investigation of those boundaries is not a slap in the face of taste. She cajoles her viewer to participate in her vision. Akin to Evgeny Orlov's paintings, Tsvirkunova's work abstracts her images from their bondage to conventionality and dimensionality. They are larger than life, pushing against the edges of her canvas. Tsvirkunova gently blends warm browns, soft beiges, and a rather neutral rust with muted whites to stay the hand of accent or insistence. To achieve harmony, she weaves the investigation of abstraction with, as she says, "just the right touch of feeling."

The world through the eyes of Aleksandr Lotsman is a tranquil abode of nature where the furies of human chaos are held at bay. Lotsman flattens the space in his paintings to create a harmony between the objects in his compositions. Nothing dominates anything else. Lotsman seems to be depicting "Being, Itself" — a natural world in which there is no depth, no complication beyond the pure satisfaction of existence. There is no primacy in being but "Being, Itself." In *Birds* (cat. no. 16, illustrated p. 43),

the birds are the field and path in which they stand and the water that flows in and out of them. In *A House under a Tree* (cat. no. 19, illustrated p. 47), the tree and the pile of fruit on the table are mirror images of each other's bounty and fullness. Space for Lotsman is merely where the world of color plays off, around, in, and through different shapes.

Alexsei Chistyakov's paintings are charged with the primal energy that conducts meaning between humankind and the universe, of which we are but a particle. The very condition that man finds himself in is the discovery, not the object, of art. Chistyakov sees the role of the artist as the conduit, the medium, between humankind and the cosmic force that is at the same time the source and the condition of being. His work is an investigation of the form that eludes all form where intuition alone can be our guide. He paints a window for us on cosmic ultimacy.

Struggle has always forged a common bond between artists in Russia. They know and respect each other, and they often celebrate and commiserate together. Collectively, the artists participating in this exhibition have struggled for years against a reluctant city government to acquire and restore the space their cultural center now occupies. A metaphor for the path of those who preceded them, theirs is the story of nonconformism in Russian art. Their work represents a strength and commitment that is a way of life — a way of Russian life. They

welcome this rare opportunity to share their work with us. It is exciting to imagine the form that nonconformist art of future Russian artists will take, when their experience of their motherland will be entirely different from that of the artists whose works are in this current exhibition. In this exhibition we make a significant step in knowing that Russia of the future.

JOSEPH C. TRONCALE

ENDNOTES

1. The use of the word "unofficial" within the Russian and Soviet contexts has connotations with significant historical and political nuances that go far beyond the simple use of the word in relationship to art.
2. For an excellent study of the Association of Traveling Art Exhibitions see Elizabeth Valkenier, *Russian Realist Art, The State and Society: The Peredvizhniki and their Tradition* (Ann Arbor: Ardis Press, 1977).
3. For a full discussion of this topic see the introduction in James Cracraft, *The Petrine Revolution in Russian Imagery* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997).
4. Quoted from a conversation with Sergei Kovalsky and Evgeny Orlov in June 2001.
5. From the published talk "The Primary Function of Human Existence Is the Effort to Exceed the Dilemma of Human Existence" given by Adi Da Samraj on March 10, 1998, at Da Love-Ananda Mahal, Hawaii.
6. Carolyn Lee, *The Promised God-Man is Here* (California: The Dawn Horse Press, 1999) p. 693.
7. Quoted in Alla Rosenfield and Norton T. Dodge, gen.ed., *From Gulag to Glasnost: Nonconformist Art from the Soviet Union* (New York: Thames and Hudson, 1995), p. 103.
8. Quoted from a conversation with the artist in May 1997.