Russian poetry and Cold War politics in the West

Emily Lygo

Summary

The reception of Soviet and Russian poetry in the West was shaped by the binary nature of Cold War politics no less than other fields of culture and sport. Indeed, the associations between poetry and authenticity meant poetry was especially significant as testimony. In the USSR itself, writers' memoirs were some of the most important texts published in this era, speaking as they did of the personal experience of the Stalin period that had not been expressed before. Konstantin Paustovsky and Il'ya Ehrenburg, for example, published many-volume memoirs during this period, both of which were translated into English and published in the West. A similar focus on individuals and testimony is reflected in the framing of works of Russian literature in English translation. In 1964, Max Hayward and Patricia Blake's selection of Russian writers was entitled 'Dissonant Voices', while George Luckyj's study of non-Russian Soviet literature in 1975 was entitled 'Discordant Voices'. Also in 1964, the translation of the anthology *Tarusskie stranitsy* was given an additional subtitle 'new voices in Russian writing'. The idea of the individual voice, which is clearly found in lyric poetry of course, was central to the preoccupation with finding an authentic expression of Russia that would be a counterpoint to the Soviet official one.

After the death of Stalin, the voices of poets writing in the USSR who had been censored by the authorities were recovered by academics and émigré Russians: Boris Pasternak's novel *Dr Zhivago* and its poems, and the poetry of Osip Mandel'shtam and Anna Akhmatova were amplified in the Western media as voices that could express authentically the suffering, injustice and inhumanity of the Stalinist system. In the case of *Dr Zhivago*, the CIA also worked clandestinely to ensure it was published and distributed in the West. The fact that

these works remained only partially published in the USSR fuelled the ongoing criticism of the Soviet government's repressive nature. At the same time, young poets such as Evgenii Evtushenko and Andrei Voznesensky , publishing some poetry that challenged Stalinist norms and criticised the past, were feted by the Western media. They were subject to political censorship, of course, and had to compromise with the authorities in order to pursue their careers.

Across the Cold War years there was a hardening of opinions in the West towards poets who compromised with the regime, and support for those such as Natalia Gorbanevskaya who fought for human rights in the USSR and were prepared to suffer imprisonment for their principles. Uncensored poetry, smuggled out to the West, was published and often accompanied by stories of arrest and imprisonment and sadistic practices in psychiatric hospitals. Poets were among the writers who began to emigrate, too, forming the third wave of Russian emigration; Joseph Brodsky arrived in the USA in 1972 already well known for his trial by the authorities and time spent in northern exile as punishment. Stories of persecution, and poetry written in the GULag or prison, were undeniably testament to the tyranny of the Soviet government, and could even play a political role themselves: Irina Ratushinskaya's release from the GULag in 1986 may have been influenced by the publication of her work and campaigns for her release in the West.

The CIA and other intelligence agencies financed cultural institutions such as the Congress for Cultural Freedom in order to promote and amplify criticism and damning evidence of Soviet illiberalism; this meant that poetry and literature which served the cause of anti-Soviet agitation was perhaps more easily accepted for publication, and more widely translated, and promoted. Such manipulation of cultural organs, for example the high-profile and high-quality magazine *Encounter* funded by the CIA, does not detract from the quality of work produced by its contributors, most of whom were unaware of the financial backdrop. Joseph

Brodsky's poetry, awarded the Nobel Prize in 1987, is no less talented for being read and discussed in the context of anti-Soviet discussion; indeed, Brodsky himself wrote against tyranny and criticised the USSR. Nonetheless, the story of Russian poetry in the Cold War cannot be told without acknowledging its interactions with politics.

Keywords

Russian Poetry, Soviet Politics, Cold War, Joseph Brodsky, GULag, Censorship, CIA, Khrushchev Thaw, Human Rights movement

Russian Poetry in the West

There is no doubt that Russian poetry achieved unprecedented prominence in the West during the Cold War period. Neither before nor since has it garnered the attention that it received in those years; the names of Russian and Soviet poets were widely known to the general public, and articles on their lives, works and latest pronouncements appeared across the media. The awarding of prizes and positions further attests to the prominence and significance of Russian poetry: Anna Akhmatova was awarded an honorary doctorate at the University of Oxford in 1966, two years later at the same institution Evgenii Evtushenko was nominated for the position of professor of Poetry; both Boris Pasternak in 1958 and Joseph Brodsky in 1987 were awarded the Nobel Prize for literature, and Brodsky went on to become American poet laureate in 1991.

Russian poetry came to the West with the first wave of emigration after the Bolshevik Revolution, represented by exceptionally talented poets such as Georgii Ivanov and Marina Tsvetaeva. The poets of that generation struggled to achieve recognition outside the émigré circles, however; not only were they in competition with the exciting new and revolutionary literature coming from post-revolutionary Russia, they also suffered from a lack of specialists

in Western universities who might have promoted them. The emigration would go on to supply specialists and translators to Western universities and publishing houses, but there was little appetite for its poetry in the inter-war years.

In the Cold War, all this changed. As poetry became a keynote of Khrushchev's Thaw in the USSR, it was greeted enthusiastically in the West as a barometer of cultural politics in the post-Stalin era; unlike earlier in the century, Russian specialists were now in positions in academia and publishing, able to translate and publish it.[1] The 1950s saw cautious rapprochement with the Soviet Union and for many intellectuals the hope that Marxism and USSR could still come good; at this time the Soviet published literature that was pushing the boundaries of what was permissible in Soviet literature was fêted in the West.

When the political limitations of the Thaw began to become apparent, especially after 1968, the West excitedly began to receive poetry that remained unpublished in the USSR, both contemporary and also recovered from the Stalinist past. Such works resonated with the growing Soviet human rights movement, which had support in the West, especially in émigré and religious circles and among academic specialists; the literary focus of Western readers passed increasingly from new Soviet poets to underground figures. In the 1970s some of these poets arrived in the West in person as well, as the third wave of emigration began around 1970. Russian poetry – and literature more widely – became divided by labels of official and unofficial, and into the two separate channels of Soviet and émigré. Each new stage of Russian poetry's arrival in the West – from published Soviet poetry through to underground and émigré poetry, was received in the highly politicised context of the Cold War, and each stage played a role in shaping the Western reading public's view of Russian literature and politics.

The Thaw – a tale of two generations

Lyric poetry during the Stalin era had all but disappeared from official publications. Apart from a brief pause during the Great Patriotic War, for most of the period 1929-1953, poetry was restricted to mainly public themes and campaigns, praise of leaders and approved heroes, the war, and communism and the revolution. For established lyric poets of the Silver Age and the 1920s who had not emigrated, this meant enforced silence: Anna Akhmatova, Boris Pasternak, and the poets of the OBERIU (The Association for Real Art) were among the most famous who disappeared from Soviet Russian literature during these years. Much has been written about the fate of this generation, perhaps most famously in Roman Jakobson's article on the death of Mayakovsky 'The Generation that Squandered its Poets'.[2] Many exercised self-censorship for years; some had retreated into children's literature and translation to preserve a professional life; some had been imprisoned in the GULag, and were released only in the amnesties that began in 1953. When those who survived the Stalin years re-emerged during the Thaw, they came to represent the culture and poetry of pre-Stalin and pre-revolutionary times. For young people whose childhood had been entirely under Stalin, the older generation were carriers of culture, uniquely placed to educate them in culture and ways that had seemed lost. The meeting of these two generations – young and old – is at the centre of poetry in the USSR in the Thaw. Friendships between poets of these generations generated energy and creativity, and went a long way to restoring the traditions of Russian lyric poetry to literature in the USSR.

Pasternak's Dr Zhivago and the moral survivors of Stalinism

Among writers of the older generation who re-emerged into public after decades of enforced silence, Boris Pasternak was one of the most famous and lauded writers from these ranks. His infamous novel *Dr Zhivago* was intimately connected to poetry, sinceits protagonist is a poet and it ends with a selection of his poems. It was not accepted for publication in the

USSR. Its appearance in print abroad in 1958 and Pasternak's receipt of the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1960 were signals to much of the world of the recovery from Stalinism that was occurring in Soviet politics, and helped to establish the link between literature, especially poetry, and politics. Six years after Pasternak's Nobel Prize, Anna Akhmatova travelled to Britain to collect her honorary doctorate in person. Her poem about the Terror of the 1930s, 'Requiem', remained officially unpublished in the USSR in 1989, but was known in the USSR through *samizdat* publication and in the West it was published in Russian and translated.

When the philosopher and academic Isaiah Berlin travelled to the USSR in 1945 he wanted to discover whether Boris Pasternak and Anna Akhmatova were still alive: such was the ignorance about the fate of these poets in the West at that time. On that visit, the inquiries he made led to his now famous meeting with Akhmatova, who would soon be infamously defamed in the Soviet press under Zhdanovshchina. A later trip, after the death of Stalin, was the occasion for Berlin to come into possession of the manuscript of *Dr Zhivago,* which he brought back to Oxford where Pasternak's family was settled in exile. Both these poets were very significant for Berlin, as a Russian émigré who had escaped the fate of the Russian intelligentsia in the USSR: their survival and even more their ability to bear witness to the fate of their generation was paramount.[3] For readers in the USSR and the West they represented authority, authenticity, and cultural continuity. Their works, which had been produced for the desk drawer in the Stalin years and now published in *samizdat* and in some cases officially, were testament to the survival of Russian culture even through the worst years.

The appearance of *Dr Zhivago* in the West provoked a furore in the USSR but the novel and its poems were greeted with great acclaim abroad. The central character, Yuri Zhivago, brought the experience of Pasternak's generation into the spotlight and put forward

specifically a poetic, even mystical interpretation of the Russian revolution, civil war, and more generally of the nature of Soviet power. For even though the work is a novel, it bears the stamp of a poetic vision, having less in common with realism than many novels and foregrounding the figure of the poet, his poetry and vision. After the novel was published in the UK, Harvill Press followed with editions of his poetry, broadening the UK reader's view of his work. Over the following years, others from Pasternak's generation also took a prominent role both in the USSR and abroad.

At the same time, work from poets who had not survived the Stalin years also began to emerge. Family members who had preserved works written but unpublished now brought this previously unknown literature to a readership, again through samizdat and eventually official publication. Perhaps the most famous among the dead poets were Osip Mandel'shtam, who died in the GULag system in 1938, and Marina Tsvetaeva, who emigrated to Berlin in 1922 but returned to Soviet Russia in 1939 and committed suicide in 1941. The work of both poets began to circulate in manuscript form in the post-Stalin era and was even partially published in the Library of Poets series in the 1970s, although this edition was almost immediately withdrawn for political reasons.[4] The memoirs of the poet's widow Nadezhda Mandel'shtam, which also circulated in samizdat and were published abroad, became one of the most important testimonies of the Stalinist period.

For people in the USSR and in the West, the work of poets who survived and even of those who did not was testament to the endurance of Russian literature and culture. Its significance cut both ways: for some, the survival of Pasternak, Akhmatova and others was a light at the end of the Stalinist tunnel, demonstrating that not absolutely everything and everyone in the USSR had been obliterated in the dark years of repression. On the other hand, the horrendous fates of Mandel'shtam, Tsvetaeva, poets of the OBERIU, as well as other literary and intelligentsia figures underscored how debased and illegitimate Soviet power had become

under Stalin, and led to the conclusion that the Bolshevik revolution had failed and was beyond redemption. Whether survivors or victims of Stalinism, however, all these poets belonged to the generation that came of age during the Silver age at the turn of the century. They were, by and large, members of the privileged, educated intelligentsia, who were broadly sympathetic to Western liberal values and steeped in the history and culture of classical liberalism. In the USSR, survivors of Stalinism were able, in the 1950s and 1960s, to pass on this cultural heritage of the Russian Silver Age to the younger generation.

Osip Mandel'shtam became one of the most prominent poets to have died of Stalinist state violence. His poetry and essays are imbued with the culture of Western Europe, and represent the antithesis of Stalinist nationalism and anti-cosmopolitanism. The history of Mandel'shtam's texts and reception has been documented in detail by Andrew Kahn; he shows how the piecemeal emergence of the texts, together with Cold War politics and assumptions about and associations with East European poetry, shaped the particular path and nature of his canonisation in Russia and the West.[5] This process began in the Cold War period. A review of a 1950 study by Leonid Strakhovsky reminds us how unknown Mandel'shtam and Akhmatova were at this point.[6] The reviewer was Erik De Mauny, who would go on to be the BBC's first correspondent in Moscow. De Mauny comments that Akhmatova may, at this point in 1950, have been silenced forever, and makes no comment at all in relation to Mandel'shtam, presumably because there was no information about his fate. His criticisms of Strakhovsky's study also remind us of how ill-served Russian poets were by criticism before the post-Stalin period, the third wave generation, and the growth of Soviet and Russian Studies. He describes it as having 'a patchwork and inconclusive air', and complains that:

> The writing itself is often stiff and ungainly, reading like an unrevised translation; and it is impossible to envisage readers unacquainted with Russian being fired with enthusiasm by most of the verses here freely translated […].

It was not until the 1960s that graduate students and academics from the West apparently began to be able to access information about Mandel'shtam, chiefly by making contact with his widow Nadezhda Iakovlevna. Clarence Brown eventually published translations of selected poems and a critical study in the early 1970s and at about the same time Collins Harvill published Max Hayward's translation of Nadezhda Iakovlevna's memoirs *Hope against Hope* and *Hope Abandoned*. This recovery of Mandel'shtam's life and work was hailed as greatly significant in the West. One of the earliest comments in the British press, made by Anthony Burgess in the *Guardian* in a review of Mandel'shtam's prose, set Mandel'shtam in opposition to his Soviet peers:

> All the ideologically "correct" poets, who seems to hold the pen between their hobnailed boots, shrink to mere ranters in the face of this most delicate and inspired of verbal artists, Russian inheritor of best of French symbolism, even surrealism, wonderful chronicler of an age of transition and pain.

This high praise sets the tone for the reviews of his poetry and prose that cluster in the early 1970s, not only in terms of the superlative quality of the poetry, but also Mandel'shtam's proximity to Western European literature. John Bayley wrote of his 'divine harmony', arguing that 'though it can only be heard in Russian, its shape and weight seem to embody a whole European sense of forms, particularly architectural forms, her space of domes and temples, the stretched curve of sails and ships,'[7] and elsewhere that

> The fact of himself, a Jew with his roots in the Russian language and the Western Classical tradition is criticism enough of the regime that could not accept him. Like

> Ovid and Pushkin, Mandel'stam reveals the nature of tyranny simply by being himself and by writing the kind of poems that he did.[8]

Mandel'shtam's proximity to European models is here part of the hallmark of his genius; his Europeanness also reminds us that in Cold War politics, Soviet anti-Westernism was yoked to the brutal suppression of artistic freedom. In 1973, C. A. Johnson spelled this out in his review of Brown's volumes, stating that 'Mandel'shtam, barring a miracle, has no literary future in his own country, except possibly of a furtive *samizdat* kind. His second life as a poet, and his immortality, will be in the West.'[9] Edward Crankshaw echoed this in 1981 when he asserted that when Nadezhda Mandel'shtam's memoirs are published in Russia 'it will be the start of hope returning.'[10]

Nadezhda Iakovlevna's two volumes of memoirs are positioned by reviewers at more of a distance from Western culture, which was no doubt necessary given the particular Soviet experience that they describe. The importance of these volumes for an understanding of life in Stalin's Russia was emphasised in reviews that described this widow's important role in explaining the Soviet experience to westerners. 'Truth-telling' and bearing witness were key qualities reviewers also associated with the poetry of Akhmatova; the Mandel'shtams, Akhmatova, and Pasternak as well were discussed in terms of their decision not to emigrate but to share the fate of their nation. Clarence Brown stated that 'The Russian language is richer for her steadfastness'[11], while Henry Gifford explicitly addressed this virtue:

> [Akhmatova] and Pasternak were often dismissed as 'internal émigrés'. The apparent injustice of this term was fully apparent to Chukovskaya: 'Émigrés, whether at home or abroad, *tear themselves away* from land and people, while these *share* the fate that befalls land and people' (her italics). It pleased Akhmatova to hear from an American visitor the reported words of Isaiah Berlin: 'Akhmatova and Pasternak gave me back my motherland.'[12]

In the British press of the 1970s and 1980s, these poets were seen as aligned with Western European culture and values and standing as a bulwark against the Soviet forces that would crush them, with their poetry outlasting them and serving as testimony to their strength and resistance. This narrative is not far-fetched or indeed unrealistic, and it matches the view of many in the USSR and now Russia. Nonetheless, it plays a role in the Cold War Manichean politics, affirming the superiority of the Western cultural tradition.

Alongside these three giants of Russian poetry, Ronald Hingley included a fourth in his study *Nightingale Fever*, published in 1981. Marina Tsvetaeva emigrated from Bolshevik Russia after the Civil War, returning just before the Second World War. Her years in exile were the most productive of her poetic life and her work was published in émigré publishing houses, although escaping the oppressive Soviet literary censors brought her hardly more success as a writer than her contemporaries back in Russia. While Hingley's inclusion of her work marked her belated recognition, she received nothing like the attention of Pasternak, Akhmatova or Mandel'shtam until much later. In 1982, Robin Kemball wrote a letter to the editor of the *Times* about his dismay that the first symposium, in Geneva that year, dedicated to her work received no delegates from the Soviet bloc countries.[13] This is a rare mention of her in the media. Though a pioneering study was published by Simon Karlinsky in 1966,[14] essentially she remained unknown outside narrow academic circles until the 1980s, when more poetry and prose was translated and published, and at last she began to be recognised. Other émigré poets – Georgii Ivanov for example – shared this fate, suggesting that the focus of Western eyes and readers was primarily on Russians in the USSR, and especially those who had stood against the regime and fallen foul of it. It is an example of how first wave Russian émigré poets did not become a politically favoured topic. This would change very much, as we shall see, for the third wave emigration in the 1970s.

Young Poets of the Khrushchev Thaw

Although the very first publications heralding the Thaw after the death of Stalin were prose works, it was not long before poetry became the dominant genre for the period.[15] The names of Moscow-based poets Evgeny Evtushenko and Andrei Voznesensky in particular became famous not only in the USSR but also abroad. These young, fresh-faced poets appeared not to bear the weight of the Stalin years and not to be intimidated by its shadow; they appealed to readers in the West as the faces of a new chapter in Soviet history. At a time when communists and sympathisers in the West were trying to come to terms with the crimes of the Stalin period and more widely with the failure of the political doctrine they had supported, these poets seemed to personify the Thaw and to embody the quality of sincerity that had been obliterated in the revelations of terror and torture under Stalin. Even for those were not heavily invested in seeing the USSR salvaged from its recent degradation, Evtushenko and Voznesensky's tours of the West, interest and engagement with its intellectuals, easy self-confidence with foreign journalists, and their charm that replaced the stiff suspicion of more traditional representatives of the USSR, promised a new rapprochement between East and West, built on a mutual understanding that once again seemed possible.

As early as 1959 Penguin books published a slim volume of Evtushenko's poems; just 3 years later he would come to Britain in person, reading his poetry to enthusiastic audiences. More important than the poetry itself was Evtushenko's political stances against, for example, antisemitism in his poem 'Babiii iar' (1961) and the looming threat of a return to Stalinism in 'Nasledniki Stalina' (1962). In 1963 his *Precocious Autobiography* was published in Western Europe, without first undergoing Soviet censorship and publication, in which he argued strongly that the USSR had changed profoundly since the death of Stalin and was moving on from the mistakes of the past. Cyril Connolly's review in the *Sunday Times* acknowledged the uniqueness of the work:

> This is a remarkable book under any circumstances and fascinating as coming out of Russia. It is a book we ought all to read, and our duty is our pleasure. He writes from the quick. Every sentence is alive, conveying the essence of the author: a vigorous, poetical young idealist for whom "cynic" is the worst term of abuse and who sees Communism as the religion of the Soviet people and himself as one of a dedicated band whose task is to reassert the hopes of the Russian Revolution.[16]

Connolly goes on in his review to express the reservations common to many reviewers: that Evtushenko is not sophisticated, that his work is often simplistic and 'tinged with exhibitionism', yet these failings are not enough to discredit his work as a whole, and he remained for many an undeniably strong contemporary Soviet voice representative of a new generation and a whole new era.

The critical reception of Evtushenko in the West was highly politicised as a result of the poet's own political poetry and statements. His significance as a poet was probably magnified because of the wider context of Cold War politics, but so was the scrutiny of his conduct and integrity: critics in the West were quick to point to compromise, capitulation, or evidence of his apparent cynicism and readiness to appease his Soviet masters. In 1968, for example, Oxford students chose Yevtushenko as the students' choice for Oxford Professor of Poetry, but in the same year, after it was widely publicised abroad that he was a signatory to the letter denouncing the anti-Soviet activity of writers Andrei Siniavsky and Iulii Daniel', Kingsley Amis and Bernard Levin denounced him as a 'hack propagandist' and 'squalid pseudo-liberal, abhorred by his fellow liberals'.[17] In the following years he attracted more and more criticism for apparent compromises with the Soviet authorities: writing, for example, anti-Chinese poems at times of Sino-Soviet tension, or criticising America in Vietnam in line with the official Soviet propaganda.

In some ways, such reports were correctives to uncritical enthusiasm for Evtushenko, sounding notes of caution where it appeared there had been little. In retrospect, they also appear to lack understanding of the political pressures on the Soviet poet that meant he was forced to walk such a difficult path between speaking independently and maintaining freedom and access to publication and travel abroad. The British press seems to have been intent on evaluating the poet's integrity, holding him up to a standard of perfection that would have been quite impossible for someone in his position. Put simply, the negotiation of a position that satisfied the more conservative censure of the Soviet Writers' Union and the government while also embodying the liberalising tendency of the Thaw was not one that could be achieved without compromise. Yet it was precisely compromise that was criticised in the West. Perhaps because poetry has certain associations with truth-telling, sincerity and the lyrical expression of an individual's self, Evtushenko was held to account by critics and often found to be wanting. As we shall see, critics would find others who fulfilled the criterion of integrity more satisfactorily, but most of those poets did not have a position in official Soviet literature, and certainly enjoyed nothing like the privileges, prestige, and publications that Evtushenko achieved.

The poet most closely associated with Evtushenko, Andrei Voznesensky, was not such a political figure. His work also appeared in translation in the West, notably in versions by some of the most distinguished English-language poets of the time in the collection *Antiworlds*.[18] Voznesensky was perhaps more the poets' poet than Evtushenko; nonetheless their appeal was similar, and undoubtedly political as well as literary. Voznesensky too travelled abroad, visiting Paris in 1962 where he was received by Simone de Beauvoir, Marc Chagall, Jean-Paul Sartre and others. An introduction to him in the *Times* in 1962 contrasts him to Yevtushenko who is 'very much poet laureate of the Khrushchev regime', seeing Voznesensky as 'a "pure poet", or, as he prefers to say, a "high poet".[19] He is scarcely ever

political.' The article quotes Voznesensky's expression of his sense of the new, post-Stalin cultural milieu:

> Yes, we have entered a new era in Russia, an era of artistic freedom. I am no longer afraid of being called names like 'formalist'.
>
> Beauty in art is not incompatible with a social purpose: to create beautiful things is a 'social mission' in itself. Poems like mine are a symbol of our new era, just as much as is the new glass palace in the Kremlin.

Voznesensky's non-political poems are important in the context of this rapprochement: the fact that he could write apolitically was a sign of softening in the USSR, the releasing of art from the political imperative. While Evtushenko's poems and statements on political lines made the headlines, Vozesensky was discussed in terms of his 'elusive stance'. Miles Burrows wrote a long review in the *TLS*, not of the translation of *Antiworlds* that appeared in New York in 1966, but of the original Russian collection which came out in 1964.[20] He turned his attention to Voznesensky's standing and particularly addressed his politics in a lengthy section beginning with the assertion that 'the meta-poetical situation defies analysis.' Burrows is realistic about the reality of life for an official Soviet poet: that there is inevitably elements of 'copyrighting' – producing the requisite politically correct work – and also that both Western and Soviet critics will bring their own gripes and bugbears to discussion of a poet's work. For Westerners this may be the 'danger of relating Leninist sympathies to a lack of poetic integrity', while in the USSR he refers to 'abstruse intra-Soviet disagreement', in this case over whether or not Voznesensky's poem 'Song of the Negroes', about the black population in America, contained covert references to suffering and discrimination in the USSR. Burrows's comments underscore that even a non-political Soviet poet had constantly to negotiate politics in his career. Such understanding was not always evident in discussion of these young ambassadors of the new Soviet generation.

For Soviet readers, Evtushenko and Voznesensky were, naturally enough, two poets among many of their generation. They were leading names, but other poets such as Bella Akhmadulina and Vladimir Vysotsky were equally well known, popular and talented. The reputations of many such poets were not as politicised, however, and probably for this reason they were not as widely read, translated or discussed in the West. There are numerous other such poets whose reputation fell outside the Cold War dynamic, for example Arseny Tarskovky. Known in the West owing to the films of his celebrated son, the director Andrei Tarkovsky, whose autobiographical characters often quote the lyrics of Arseny, Tarkovsky was too personal, too detached, and too Russian (as opposed to Soviet) in his cultural references to be assigned a position on one side or the other of the binary.

Poetry Underground: Principle, Dissent, and the Human Rights Movement

The readiness to criticise Evtushenko and other members of the Soviet Writers' Union for their compromises with the Western authorities was related, in some cases, to a more general desire to find writers and other creative artists who rejected wholesale the Soviet system and desired to change it or circumvent it. Indeed, apparent refusal to participate in the official literary world came to be seen by many people, in both the USSR and the West, as a principled decision. The reality may have been more influenced by necessity for many writers, of course. Nevertheless, Western followers of developments in Russian poetry sought out and promoted poets who appeared more independent and critical of the Soviet literary authorities than the famous Thaw poets Evtushenko and Voznesensky. Suzanne Massie's *The Living Mirror. Five Poets from Leningrad* brought to Anglophone readers five poets who were little known in most of the USSR as well as abroad.[21] Although by the time it was published Gleb Gorbovsky, Voktor Sosnora and Aleksandr Kushner had been admitted to the Leningrad branch of the Writers' Union, having published at least their first collections, nonetheless these figures were closely associated with the independent poetry movement of

the 1960s. They were seen particularly as contrasting with the very performance-orientated *Estrada* poetry of Evtushenko, Voznesensky and others, drawing on the St Petersburg cultural tradition of 'chamber' poetry.

Poets situated further from officialdom were often closer to the networks of unofficial poets publishing their work in *samizdat*: Gleb Gorbovsky's poetry, for example, was well known and liked in unofficial circles and read regularly at the Maiakovsky monument poetry readings.[22] There were, naturally, strong associations between the battle for human rights in the USSR and the struggle for freedom of speech and of publication of literature. Poetry readings at the Maiakovsky monument which began in 1958, and were revived in 1961 and 1965, were a site where the connection between dissidents and underground writers were clearly visible and strengthened.[23] Unofficial poetry readings, such as took place at the monument, were associated with literary *samizdat* – which meant bypassing the censorship system of Soviet publishing.[24] When s*amizdat* publications in the USSR began to find a way to the West, where they were published in émigré publications and sometimes translated for Anglophone readers as well, punishments for this unofficial publishing grew harsher. One result of this was that, for Western readers, the connection between underground literature and Soviet repression was strengthened.

The first really famous case of a poet being punished for writing poetry that the State did not approve of, which had been published in *samizdat* and *tamizdat*, came in 1962 when Joseph Brodsky was put on trial in Leningrad. The 24-year-old was charged with the crime of being a parasite on Soviet society. Brodsky did not have permanent employment, which was used against him in a trial probably intended to act as a warning to other young people against leading an excessively bohemian lifestyle that ignored the demands of Soviet society for full employment and cultural conformity. Brodsky's name was already known abroad; a transcript of the trial taken by a journalist in support of Brodsky was smuggled to the West,

where its publication brought him fame. One exchange from the trial, in particular, was republished in the press around the world:

JUDGE: But in general what is your specialty?

BRODSKY: I'm a poet, a poet translator.

JUDGE: And who said that you were a poet? Who included you among the ranks of the poets?

BRODSKY: No one. (Unsolic ited) And who included me among the ranks of the human race?

JUDGE: Did you study this?

BRODSKY: What?

JUDGE: To be a poet? You did not try to finish high school where they prepare . . . where they teach . .

BRODSKY: I didn't think you could get this from school.

JUDGE: How, then?

BRODSKY: I think that it . . (confused) . . . comes from God. ..[25]

Brodsky eventually became a prominent poet of the third wave emigration, but not before he endured internal exile in the far North, after being sentenced to live in the countryside and be occupied with physical labour to 'correct' his parasitic ways. His case was taken up by intellectuals and writers in the West who were acquainted with his work through *tamizdat* and also aware of his trial; Jean-Paul Sartre, among others, asked Khrushchev for clemency, and Brodsky was released early. This early experience of Soviet repression and consequently publicity in the West established the view of Brodsky as an opponent of Soviet power. Even though he tried to publish his work again after exile and find a way to be a writer in the USSR, there was always a temptation for Western commentators to see him as refusing on principle to acquiesce to the demands of censorship. He was extremely critical of Soviet tyranny, but his years before exile were not one endless battle against the system.

While Brodsky belonged to an outstanding generation of poets, many of whom were unable to publish much or any work in the USSR and some of whom joined the third wave of emigration, it is notable that quite a number of these figures remained largely outside politics. Their work and its reception serve to remind us again that not all poetry became grist to the mill of Cold War politics. Dmitry Bobyshev, a contemporary and one-time friend of Brodsky, was well known to poets of the underground circles that he moved in in the 1970s and later an important poetic voice of the emigration, yet his reputation remained virtually untouched by the kind of political framing seen in the case of Brodsky. Viktor Krivulin and Elena Shvarts were central figures in Leningrad poetry and philosophy circles and *samizdat* publishing and both were published in translation abroad, yet neither has a reputation that is intimately bound up with politics. In other words, the cultural arena of Cold War politics was circumscribed. It required actors on both sides, and inevitably there were poets who were recruited, but it was by no means an all-encompassing system that no one escaped. The publication of poetry underground, in *samizdat*, in the USSR was not primarily a political act, as the publication of political articles was; the Soviet state recognised this distinction by treating political *samizdat* far more harshly than its literary cousin. When Alexander Ginzburg's *samizdat* anthologies of poetry *Feniks* and *Sintaksis* were smuggled abroad and pubished in the émigré journal *Grani*, however, the authorities took action against him and he was pushed into a more overt political struggle with the authorities. Ginzburg is often described as a poet, but he is famous as a publisher and editor more than anything else: first of the poetry anthologies, but a later of the *White Book* about the trial of Siniavsky and Daniel', two other writers arrested for publishing their work abroad. His involvement in literature overlapped considerably with the battle for human rights in the USSR, demonstrating clearly the close interweaving of uncensored literature and politics.

A poet whose roles in literature and the human rights movement were similarly overlapping was Natalia Gorbanevskaya. Born in 1936, she belonged to the Thaw generation. She did not become an official writer, but published her poetry in *samizdat* and moved in unofficial literary circles. What brought her to the attention of the authorities, however, was not her poetry but her participation in the now-famous eight-person protest against the 1968 Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia. Although Gorbanevskaya did not stand trial after that arrest, her involvement with the human rights movement continued and she was one of the founders of the *Chronicle of Current Events* that same year. Gorbanevskaya was imprisoned in a psychiatric prison for two years following arrest in 1969. She eventually made it into exile and lived in France and then Poland. Her literary activities were what sustained her in exile, and she remained a poet, even if she was better known as a dissident.

The prominence of the dissident activities of writers Gorbanevskaya, Ginzburg and others, and the trial of Brodsky by the State, undoubtedly led to the strong association between underground or unofficial poetry and anti-Soviet politics. It should also be remembered that this was not a new association: we have already seen that from the early 20th century Mandel'shtam and Akhmatova, as victims of Soviet repression, were also seen in this light. More broadly, Pushkin's sympathy for and friendship with the Decembrists had already established Russian poetry's position as critic of an oppressive State and independent voice. What is also true is that, once in exile, Brodsky and many others wrote and spoke against tyranny and in support of writers' freedom, and criticised the Soviet regime.

The Third Wave of Emigration

Brodsky, Ginzburg and Gorbanevskaya were among the writers and human rights activists who left or were forced out of the USSR in what became known as the Third Wave of emigration, whose members settled predominantly in the USA. Poets were prominent among these émigrés, with Brodsky's award of the Nobel Prize in 1987 and later his position as US

Poet Laureate crowning the achievement of the generation. This wave's relative success in publishing and reaching readers, in contrast to the fate of the First Wave émigrés in Europe, was not down to a difference in talent, nor in the activities and energy of publishers, critics and writers. It had much to do with Cold war politics. In both Western Europe and the USA, the Cold War tension with the USSR inspired investment and interest in all things Soviet and Russian. Not only were there now larger émigré communities to make up readership – including the second-wave of emigration which had taken place at the end of the Second World War – there were also newly-funded University departments, careers as Soviet specialists, funding for émigré publications and activities, and a healthy public appetite for things Russian.

The success of émigré Russian poets and writers was not uniform, however; such was the influence of politics on the process. Sally Laird reported in 1987 from a conference of Russian émigré writers that many bemoaned their lack of appeal to Western publishers and readers, and even Russian readers, because they did not conform to the stereotype of Russian writers as politically engaged. She quoted Zinovy Zinik's complaint that,

> Nobody writes about us in the émigré press because they don't know what to say […] We have no ideological identity. When a Russian writer steps out of ideology, critics don't know what to do with him.[26]

The well-established association for Russian literature of the suffering of the individual and the fight against the oppressive state – seen already here in the cases of Mandel'shtam, Pasternak and Akhmatova, of Thaw poets and later in more extreme terms in underground writers and dissidents – meant that poets in exile, as opposed to emigration, with the biography of suffering and persecution, fitted into a tradition for which there was a readership and critical apparatus ready for their reception. This existed already, before any interference by political authorities through the funding and manipulation of culture (see below). Joseph

Brodsky, fitted naturally into this mould. Brodsky was also an outstandingly talented poet, which lies at the foundation of his success. He wrote his most important work in exile, and was served well by many translators before he moved eventually to writing in English. But politics also played a role.

The figure of persecuted writer who escaped to the West endured right to the end of the Soviet period, and held interest for Western readers to the end as well. Perhaps the last significant figure to come into exile from the USSR with this biography was Irina Ratushinskaya. A volume of her poems that had been smuggled out of the strict-regime women's labour camp in Mordovia was published by Bloodaxe in the UK in 1986, and led to awareness of her plight – arrested for the crime of writing poetry and for her agitation for human rights – and to the creation of campaign groups pressuring the Soviet government to release her. She was released after four debilitating years of her seven-year sentence on the eve of the US–USSR Reykjavik summit in 1986, due largely to political pressure on the Soviet government.

Ratushinskaya's arrival in Britain was announced in the *Guardian* with the headline 'Poems as a defence against the gulag horror', and her lineage set out clearly in the body of the text:

> Stalin played his part in Mayakovsky's suicide and Mandelshtam's death in a labour camp, and Pasternak and Akhmatova were intermittently harassed and denigrated until their deaths in 1960 and 1966 respectively. Poets under Soviet rule have often died early and often by their own hand.[27]

The article described in detail the history of her arrest and imprisonment, and her determination to keep on writing even without paper, by using a matchstick on a bar of soap and committing her lines to memory before washing them away. Her biography fitted the established mould of a Soviet dissident poet perfectly. After release from prison, she obtained

permission to travel to Britain for hospital treatment, where she stayed for some years. Her memoir was published in 1988, detailing her time in the GULag, and her poetry was performed live, featured on the Radio, and set to music and performed. Although many claims were made for the high quality of Ratushinskaya's work not all critics toed this line, and there were certain moderating voices in the press. Edwin Morgan, for example, wrote in 1988,

> [I]t would be very rash to assert that Ratushinskaya is another Tsvetayeva, as some have claimed. The Russian texts of her poems are now available for inspection, partly in her own tiny handwriting at the end of this book, partly in collections published in Frankfurt and New York. They show a modest lyrical talent, but hardly match up to the greatness which has been thrust on her.[28]

Robin Milner-Gulland's comments in a review of *No I'm not Afraid* are similarly cautious about making too great claims for Ratushinskaya's work.[29] He is explicit about the political interpretation being pushed on to her poetry in a volume in which '"context" is given such weight that half the book is editorial matter.' These contextual materials were the minutiae of Ratushinskaya's arrest, trial and imprisonment, which meant, Milner-Gulland pointedly remarked, 'we are left in no doubt what we are to think.' What he does suggest, hopefully, is that the publication of the book might have helped bring about her release. Both reviewers here are certainly alive to the way that Cold War politics shaped the reception of Ratushinskaya in the West and imposed on to her readymade models and expectations from the genre of persecuted Russian poet. Milner-Gulland's hope was that these politics and expectation at least served the interests of the poet as well.

The CIA, the CCF, and culture as a political weapon

It may not be quite true that the atmosphere of the Cold War, the new Soviet and Russian Studies university departments, public interest in 'the enemy', and growing population of émigrés were enough to launch Joseph Brodsky to the heights of fame that he reached, to bring Mandel'shtam's name to the pages not just of literary magazines but of national broadsheets, and to bring the stories of Soviet dissidents to the attention of the general public. While it is certainly true that the Cold War created an atmosphere of curiosity about the USSR, the high level of engagement with literature from the USSR was also a product of manipulation by Western government agencies, led especially by the CIA, who engaged politically with the USSR at the level of culture, to achieve political ends. This took the form of funding cultural endeavours, most famously the magazine *Encounter* and its parent organization the Congress for Cultural Freedom (CCF).[30] Whether or not the CCF was successful in its aims is not so much of interest here, and in the end it is very difficult to unravel the threads of manipulation and genuine open discussion and interest. Of more interest is that among the CCF's means were the publication and promotion of voices and figures whose work and biography showed the USSR in a negative light, which included writers persecuted by the Soviet regime. This is where, undoubtedly, the influence of politics can be seen on the reception of Russian and Soviet poetry in the West.[31]

While there is no doubt that politics and culture were intricately entwined during the period, it is all too easy to assert that the enthusiasm for Soviet and Russian poetry was a result of politics, and even that it was engineered by covert political forces such as the Congress for Cultural Freedom. It is true that politics penetrated virtually all aspects of cultural life during the Cold War, but it is not necessarily the case that culture was always secondary to the politics. In discussing the Irish poet Seamus Heaney and his interest in Czesław Miłosz and Osip Mandel'shtam, Clare Cavanagh asks why writers in the West were so drawn by poets

whose governments persecuted them, who lived under political conditions so unsympathetic towards poetry.[32] The persecution of poets, the censorship of literature, the choice writers in the Eastern bloc appeared to face between a hack's comfortable life and the heroism of sticking to principles and telling truth to power, raised writers and their work to a status that was even enviable to poets in a free Western society where poetry seemed to matter little. Conditions in the East may have raised the quality of poets' work, as they rose to the challenges presented by politics. So, although Western poets and readers were perhaps prompted to think about the meaning of art because of Soviet repressive political conditions, ultimately this engagement went far beyond the East-West binary of Cold War politics.

Discussion of the Literature

The subject of poetry and politics in the Cold War intersects with many areas of study including translation studies, the history of human rights and dissidents, exile and emigration, and the history of censorship. During the Cold War, discussion in émigré circles and among Western academics was necessarily shaped by context. Contemporary Russian poetry in the USSR was the focus of anthologies of poetry; one of the earliest was George Reavey's *The New Russian Poets*,[33] and later Suzanne Massie's *The Living Mirror*[34] and Olga Carlisle's *Poets on Street Corners*[35] presented different selections. Max Hayward and Patricia Blake's *Dissonant Voices in Soviet Literature*[36] featured poetry alongside prose. Peter France and Jon Stallworthy's translations of Pasternak are an example of a single-author publication.[37] The introductions to these anthologies and collections were important areas of contemporary discussion of the developments that were observable in the politics of poetry in the USSR.

The particular predicament of dissident or *samizdat* writers, and the closely associated human rights movement, was the subject of a number of studies as well. Peter Reddaway's *Uncensored Russia*[38] brought translated excerpts from the *Chronicle of Current Events* to the

Anglophone reader; *A Question of Madness*,[39] by Zhores and Roy Medvedev was an important early account of abuse of psychiatry in the USSR, used against writers such as Natalia Gorbanevskaya as well as dissidents and human rights campaigners, hippies, and many other groups the USSR sought to repress. These studies rarely deal directly with poetry, but certainly present an important part of the political context for poetry in the USSR in the Cold War.

Russian literature in emigration was a parallel concern. Writing in exile was addressed by *The Third Wave. Russian Literature in Emigration*[40] and by Maxim Shrayer's encyclopaedic article 'Russian-American Literature'.[41] Volumes of the Dictionary of Literary Biography 'Russian Poets of the Soviet Period'[42] and 'Twentieth-Century Russian Emigre Writers'[43] are useful resources.

The recovery of poetry that had been written for the desk drawer, or by poets persecuted during the Stalin era, was an important and active area of research. Simon Karlinsky's study of Tsvetaeva,[44] Clarence Brown's *Mandelstam,*[45] Jennifer Baines *Mandelstam: The Later Poetry*, [46] and Amanda Haight's study of Akhmatova[47] were among the early milestones. This was still limited to interviews, reliance on manuscripts or only partial publication, and on accounts by émigrés.

After the fall of the Soviet Union there was mass publication of previously unpublished poetry of the Soviet era. Along with this, the study of censorship and its impact on literature became a focus, especially in Russia, and significant publications of archive materials came out, for example T. M. Goriaeva's, *Istoriia sovetskoi politicheskoi tsenzury.*[48] The politics of the time of *glasnost'* and *perestroika* led to a rather wholesale dismissal of approved poetry published in USSR and an equally indiscriminate enthusiasm for work rejected for Soviet

publication or never even submitted. Katharine Hodgson's work on anthologies of Russian poetry looked at how the canon of 20th century Russian poetry was shaping up in the first decade of the 21st century.[49] Her subsequent work on the canon also focussed on the issue of national identity in Russian poetry, tracing how the divisions between official/unofficial, Soviet/émigré were erased and replaced with once again a broader question about poetry and Russia.[50]

The politics of the Cold War were not forgotten, however; several studies have looked at the involvement of government intelligence agencies in the shaping and funding of publications and conferences promoting Western liberalism, including *Who Paid the Piper? The CIA and the Cultural Cold War* and *The Archives of Authority.*[51] My chapter in the *Routledge Handbook of Translation and Politics* looked specifically at translation, politics and the Cold War.[52] In a somewhat different vein, Paolo Mancosu has focussed specifically on the connections and networks that existed in the Cold War to uncover the history of the Zhivago manuscript, examining how it was transferred to Britain, who among émigré and Russian studies networks were involved in bringing it to publication, and at the same time considering the impact of its appearance in the West on Pasternak and those close to him.[53] This kind of archive-based research into Cold War literary history is further illuminating of the interaction of poetry, literature more broadly and politics.

Links to Digital Materials

Project for the Study of Dissidence and Samizdat, ed. Ann Komaromi, Toronto: University of Toronto Libraries, 2015, samizdatcollections.library.utoronto.ca

Further Reading

Blake, Patricia and Hayward, Max, eds. *Dissonant voices in Soviet literature*. London: Allen and Unwin, 1964

Balina, Marina and Lipovetsky, Mark, eds. *Contemporary Russian Writers*. Dictionary of Literary Biography vol. 285. Detroit: Gale Research Inc. and Bruccoli Clark Layman Books, Thompson-Gale, 2003.

Forrester, Sibelan E.S. *A Companion to Marina Cvetaeva: Approaches to a Major Russian Poet*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2017.

Hayward, Max. *Writers in Russia 1917–1978*. Edited and with an introduction by Patricia Blake. London: Harvill/Collins, 1973

Hodgson, Katharine and Smith, Alexandra. *Poetic Canons, Cultural Memory and Russian National Identity after 1991*. Oxford, Peter Lang: 2020

Kahn, Andrew. 'Canonical Mandel'shtam' in *Twentieth-Century Russian Poetry. Reinventing the Canon*, ed. by Katharine Hodgson, Joanne Shelton and Alexandra Smith. Cambridge: Open Book Publishers, 2017, pp. 157-200

Mancosu, Paolo. *Inside the Zhivago Storm. The Editorial Adventures of Pasternak's Masterpiece*. Milan: Fondazione Giagiacomo Feltrinelli, 2013

Massie, Suzanne. *The Living Mirror. Five Poets from Leningrad*. London: Victor Gollancz, 1972

The third wave : Russian literature in emigration. Edited by Olga Matich, with Michael Heim. Ann Arbor, Ardis, 1984

Rydel, Christine, ed. *Russian Writers Since World War 2*. Dictionary of Literary Biography vol.302. Detroit: Gale Research Inc. and Bruccoli Clark Layman Books, Thompson-Gale, 2004.

Smith, Gerald Stanton. *Songs to Seven Strings: Russian guitar poetry and Soviet 'mass song'*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1984

Victoroff, Tatiana, ed. *Anna Akhmatova et la poesie europeenne*, Bruxelles, Bern, Berlin, Frankfurt am Main, New York, Oxford, Wien: Peter Lang Publishing Group, [Vol. Series: Nouvelle poetique comparatiste / New Comparative Poetics - Volume 36], 2016.

Voznesensky, Andrei. *Antiworlds.* Trans. by W.H. Auden...[et al.]; edited by Patricia Blake, Max Hayward. London: Oxford University Press, 1967

Notes

[1] The history of Slavic studies in America is detailed in David Engerman, *Know Your Enemy. The Rise and Fall of America's Soviet Experts* (Oxford, New York: OUP, 2009).

2 Jakobson, Roman, and Dale E. Peterson. "The Generation That Squandered Its Poets (Excerpts*)." Yale French Studies*, no. 39, Yale University Press, 1967, pp. 119–25, available at https://www-jstor-org.uoelibrary.idm.oclc.org/stable/2929486?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents. Accessed 21 February 2022.

[3] Michael Ignatieff writes about the significance of meeting Akhmatova for Berlin, see the chapter 'Leningrad 1945' in his *Isaiah Berlin. A Life* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1998), pp. 149—169.

[4] As Andrew Kahn says, the Khardzhiev text that was used for this publication in the Biblioteka poeta series was a very flawed text. Readers in the USSR had to rely on *samizdat* texts until *glasnost'*. Andrew Kahn, 'Canonical Mandel'shtam' in *Twentieth-Century Russian Poetry. Reinventing the Canon*, ed. by Katharine Hodgson, Joanne Shelton and Alexandra Smith (Cambridge: Open Book Publishers, 2017) pp. 157-200, p. 195.

[5]. Ibid.

[6] Erik De Mauny, 'Three Russian Poets.' *The Times Literary Supplement*, no. 2503, 20 Jan. 1950, p. 37. The Times Literary Supplement Historical Archive, link.gale.com/apps/doc/EX1200288304/GDCS?u=exeter&sid=bookmark-GDCS&xid=affc290f. Accessed 11 June 2021.

[7] John Bayley, 'Poet of Divine Harmony' *Guardian*, 8 January, 1978, p. 25, available at https://www.proquest.com/hnpguardianobserver/docview/476411879/D66947EED7344114PQ/1?accountid=10792, accessed 5 July 2021.

[8] John Bayley, 'Mandelstam and the Bitch-Pack', *The Listener*, December 6, 1973. Available at The Listener Historical Archive, 1929-1991, link.gale.com/apps/doc/GM2500148760/LSNR?u=exeter&sid=bookmark-LSNR&xid= f4659dd4. Accessed 7 June 2021.

[9] C. A. Johnson, 'Mandelstam restored', *Daily Telegraph* Thursday November 29th, 1973, p. 9. The Telegraph Historical Archive, link.gale.com/apps/doc/IO0704584439/ TGRH?u=exeter&sid=bookmark-TGRH&xid=7b5332ff. Accessed 7 June 2021.

[10] Edward Crankshaw, 'A wife's flame of hope', *Observer* 4January, 1981, p. 10, available at https://www.proquest.com/hnpguardianobserver/docview/476663385/FFCA3C0E628A4890PQ/1?accountid=10792, accessed 23 July 2021.

[11] Clarence Brown, 'Akhmatova's steel' *The Guardian,* 17 January, 1974, p. 9, available at https://www.proquest.com/hnpguardianobserver/docview/185786707/3320716358164B6FPQ/1?accountid=10792, accessed 23 July 2021.

[12] Henry Gifford, 'Terror and the Muse' *Times Literary Supplement*, 7 August 1981, p. 895. Available at The Times Literary Supplement Historical Archive, http://link.galegroup.com/apps/doc/EX1200434603/GDCS?u=exeter&sid=GDCS&xid=f2f6cf1a. Accessed 21 May 2021.

[13] Robin Kemball, 'Poland and the pipeline' *Times*, 16 July 1982, p. 13. The Times Digital Archive, link.gale.com/apps/doc/CS219122416/TTDA?u=exeter&sid=bookmark-TTDA&xid=1a523b93. Accessed 6 July 2021.

[14] Simon Karlinsky, *Marina Cvetaeva: her life and art* (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1966).

[15] Earliest works included novels – Dudintsev's *Not by Bread Alone*, Ehrenburg's *The Thaw*, Abramov's *Vokrug da okolo*, and literary critical articles by Pomerantsev. Dudintsev's and Ehrenburg's novels were translated into English and discussed widely in the Western press.

[16] Cyril Connolly, 'The matter of Yevtushenko' *Sunday Times*, 4 August, 1963, p. 20. Available at The Sunday Times Digital Archive, http://link.galegroup.com/apps/doc/FP1800686725/GDCS?u=exeter&sid=GDCS&xid=c712f9f4. Accessed 8 July 2019.

[17] See, for example, 'The Yevtushenko Battle: Ed Stevens in Moscow says the poet's defeat for the chair of poetry at Oxford has saved the Kremlin from a dilemma' *Sunday Times*, 1 December, 1968, p. 8. Available at The Sunday Times Digital Archive, http://link.galegroup.com/apps/doc/FP1801039623/GDCS?u=exeter&sid=GDCS&xid=5d2b0aff. Accessed 8 July 2019.

[18] Antiworlds*, ed. by*

[19] 'Russian Poet who Can Pack A Stadium' *Times*, 31 December, 1962, p. 9. Available atThe Times Digital Archive, http://link.galegroup.com/apps/doc/CS151741343/GDCS?u=exeter&sid=GDCS&xid=fdf096ec. Accessed 9 July 2019.

[20] Miles Burrows, 'Russian in Retreat', *Times Literary Supplement*, 24 December 1964, p. 1164. Available at The Times Literary Supplement Historical Archive, http://link.galegroup.com/apps/doc/EX1200335597/GDCS?u=exeter&sid=GDCS&xid=7a5698b1. Accessed 9 July 2019.
[21] Suzanne Massie, *The Living Mirror. Five Poets from Leningrad* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1972).
[22] His poem 'Fonariki' in particular became famous in the USSR, though less so abroad. Emily Lygo. *Leningrad Poetry 1953–75. The Thaw Generation* (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2010), p. 70.
[23] An account of the history of the 'Mayak' readings can be found in Liudmila Polikovskaia, *My predchuvstvie, predtecha… Ploshchad' Maiakovskogo 1958–1965*, originally published by Zvenia, 1965, now available online at: http://old.memo.ru/history/diss/books/mayak/ (accessed 9 July 2021).
[24] Philip Boobbyer, 'Vladimir Bukovskii and Soviet Communism', *Slavonic and East European Review*, Vol. 87 (3), July 2009, pp. 452–487.

[25] The English translation of the stenograph of the trial appeared in the *New Leader*, 31 August 1964, pp. 16-17, among other places.
[26] Sally Laird, 'The Double Bind. Sally Laird on émigré writers' dilemma', *Guardian*, 27February 1987, p. 12. Available at https://www.proquest.com/hnpguardianobserver/docview/186723329/2FBFE40B27864C72PQ/1?accountid=10792, accessed 23 July 2021.
[27] Michael Simmons, 'Poems as a defence against the gulag horror', *Guardian*, 19 December 1986, p. 19. Available at https://www.proquest.com/hnpguardianobserver/docview/186658424/AAD7703ADF3E4AF4PQ/1?accountid=10792, accessed 23 July 2021.
[28] Edwin Morgan, 'From the personal outwards', *Times Literary Supplement*, no. 4456, 26 August 1988, p. 940. Available at The Times Literary Supplement Historical Archive, link.gale.com/apps/doc/EX1200173993/TLSH?u=exeter&sid=bookmark-TLSH&xid=3945662c. Accessed 12 July 2021.
[29] Milner-Gulland, R. "From one poet to another." The Times Literary Supplement, no. 4361, 31 Oct. 1986, p. 1222.
The Times Literary Supplement Historical Archive, link.gale.com/apps/doc/EX1200451122/TLSH?u=exeter&sid=bookmark-TLSH&xid=bf6718ab. Accessed 12 July 2021.
[30] For information on *Encounter* see Francis Stonor Saunders, *Who Paid the Piper? The CIA and the Cultural Cold War* (London: Granta, 1999).
[31] Andrew Rubin discusses translation in *Encounter* and other publications by the CCF in *The Archives of Authority* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012).
[32] Clare Cavanagh**,** 'From the Republic of Conscience: Seamus Heaney and Eastern European Poetry**',** *Harvard Review* 6 (Spring, 1994), pp. 105-112.
[33] George Reavey, *The New Russian Poets, 1953–68: an anthology* (London: Marion Boyars, 1968).
[34] Suzanne Massie, *The Living Mirror. Five Poets from Leningrad* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1972).
[35] Olga Carlisle, *Poets on Street Corners: portraits of fifteen Russian poets* (New York: Random House, 1968).
[36] Patricia Blake and Max Hayward, eds*., Dissonant voices in Soviet literature* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1964).
[37] Boris Pasternak, *Selected Poems* translated from the Russian by Jon Stallworthy and Peter France (Harmondsworth: Viking Books, 1983).
[38] Peter Reddaway, ed., *Uncensored Russia : the human rights movement in the Soviet Union* (London: Cape, 1972).
[39] Zhores A. Medvedev and and Roy A. Medvedev, *A Question of Madness* (London: Macmillan, 1971).
[40] Olga Matich with Michael Heim, eds., *The third wave : Russian literature in emigration* (Ann Arbor, Ardis, 1984).
[41] Maxim Shrayer, 'Russian American Literature', in *The Greenwood Encyclopedia of Multiethnic American Literature*, edited by Emmanuel S. Nelson, 5 vols. (Westport CT: Greenwood Publishing Group, 2005), IV, 1940–1951.
[42] Karen Rosneck, ed., *Dictionary of Literary Biography 'Russian Poets of the Soviet Period'* (Detroit: Gale, 2011).
[43] Maria Rubins, ed., *Dictionary of Literary Biography 'Twentieth-Century Russian Émigré Writers'* (Detroit: Thomson Gale, 2005).
[44] Simon Karlinsky, *Marina Cvetaeva: her life and art* (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1966).
[45] Clarence Brown, *Mandelstam* (Cambridge University Press, 1973).

[46] Jennifer Baines *Mandelstam: The Later Poetry* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1977).
[47] Amanda Haight, *Anna Akhmatova: A Poetic Pilgimage* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976).
[48] T. M. Goriaeva, *Istoriia sovetskoi politicheskoi tsenzury. Dokumenty i kommentarii* (Moscow: Rosspen: 1997).
[49] Katharine Hodgson, 'Two Post-Soviet Anthologies of the 1990s and the Russian 20th-Century Canon', *Slavonic and East European Journal*, 90 (2012), 642–70.
[50] Katharine Hodgson and Alexandra Smith, *Poetic Canons, Cultural Memory and Russian National Identity after 1991* (Oxford, Peter Lang: 2020).
[51] See Frances Stonor Saunders, *Who Paid the Piper? The CIA and the Cultural Cold War* (London: Granta, 1999) and Andrew Rubin, *The Archives of Authority* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2012).
[52] Emily Lygo, 'Translation and the Cold War' in *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Politics* (Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2018), pp. 442–454.
[53] Paolo Mancosu, *Inside the Zhivago Storm. The Editorial Adventures of Pasternak's Masterpiece* (Milan: Fondazione Giagiacomo Feltrinelli, 2013).