

*Paper prepared for the  
8th Euroacademia Forum of Critical Studies  
Asking Big Questions Again*

*24 – 25 January 2020*

*Venice, Italy*

***This paper is a draft  
Please do not cite or circulate***

# Cultural diplomacy “of high propagandist value” – Some facts on the organization of the 1<sup>st</sup> Russian Art Exhibition in Berlin (1922)

by Viktor Kempf, Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, IGK 1956, Germany

*Abstract:*

*In the following paper I will retrace the organization process of the 1<sup>st</sup> Russian Art Exhibition. First I will in short introduce my current dissertation project and contextualize the exhibition within its conception. In the next step the theoretical implications (Cultural Transfer Theory and Network Theory) will be presented as well as their methodological implementation via a microhistorical approach. The reconstruction of the exhibition planning will be based on archive documents and it leads to new insights into its coordination and organization. Furthermore, existing interpretations regarding the political obstacles of the involved officials will be discussed. The outcomes of the document analysis allow me to question existing conclusions on the political implications behind the exhibition as well as on its relevance for the further conception of Soviet cultural diplomacy within the 1920s.*

In this paper I intend to focus on the 1<sup>st</sup> Russian Art Exhibition in Berlin (1922) as the first main event in Soviet Cultural Diplomacy towards Germany after the Bolschevik revolution in 1917. I will reconstruct some organizational facts on basis of archive documents. From there I will discuss the interpretation of its effects on Soviet cultural diplomacy. I will draw a conclusion for a reinterpretation of the exhibition in its function for the further cultural diplomatic conception.

The analysis is part of my dissertation project with the title “Guided Transfer? Soviet Cultural Diplomacy towards Germany from 1920 to 1933”. This time range is usually regarded as the most fertile period of cultural exchange between both countries. In my project I will examine the activities of selected relevant protagonists enabling cultural transfer processes. I want to identify the state organizations and individuals that were involved in cultural exchange and the paths they chose. The dissertation will be divided in two parts. First I want to give a diachronic overview of the Soviet cultural diplomacy in Germany from its beginnings in the early 1920s until its abrupt interruption in 1933. Here I will deal with the central institutions – especially VOKS, established in 1925, and its predecessor OBI, founded in 1922. I intend to identify continuities but also changes in the official guidelines and in the actors’ intentions in a longitudinal section. The second part will consist of three case studies, in which I will analyze the organization, execution and reception of events in art, music and theatre on a microhistorical level. This will enable me to retrace paths of exchange and to identify different forms of reception in regard to specific cultural artifacts. Beside the 1<sup>st</sup> Russian Art Exhibition in Berlin (1922) I will research on the International Music Fair “Musik im Leben der Völker” that took place in Frankfurt a.M. in 1927 and a guest play of the Mejerchol’d theatre in Berlin in 1930. The cases were chosen due to their representative character. They are exemplary for the “trans-genre” cultural diplomatical activities of the Soviet state in Germany. I will widen the perspective to a reciprocal approach and take into account both sides in this part of my project.

By focusing on the organization process and on the reception in Germany I aim to extract political, ideological and economic implications behind the support of certain cultural events. In my thesis I also show the development and differentiation process of Soviet cultural diplomacy by considering general policies, relevant actors and the institutional framing, which allows to analyze learning processes within Soviet cultural institutions deprived from the experience with past events. The Soviet state developed a hybrid communication strategy in its struggle to secure its stability in a changing international context. Obviously, Soviet institutions only had limited access to the German public. Hence, they promoted progress and tried to attract foreign peoples’ sympathy for the revolutionary state’s cause by showing off its cultural achievements. In that context, guest plays and exhibitions fulfilled an important function as means of bureaucratic communication: They helped to establish constructive transnational cultural relationships but were also instrumentalized for geopolitical or economic reasons.

First, I intend to clarify the terminology on the object of my work. In scientific research one can identify different terminological approaches with partly different but also overlapping implications, that have a tighter or broader focus. In the Russian language area the term „cultural diplomacy“ is usual, but one has to consider that current definitions differ from the deterministic one introduced by Frederic Barghoorn, that implied an obviously

instrumental intention.<sup>1</sup> “Cultural Propaganda” on the other hand is the usually used term by Soviet officials, but it is problematic as its meaning in the historical context that was mainly framed by Lenin is positively connoted. Whereas it was understood as a form of enlightenment and education work, it is now defined as an aggressive form of one-directed cultural promotion.<sup>2</sup> This may result in front of the national socialist and stalinist propaganda. Kurt Düwell situates propaganda as a subcategory of foreign cultural politics, which again he defines as a “systematic political organization of foreign cultural relations”.<sup>3</sup> Frank Trommler stresses the reciprocal aspect of foreign cultural politics.<sup>4</sup> These two approaches seem rather concise and convincing compared to the other concepts that aim more obviously at the instrumental character of cultural diplomacy.

The title of my thesis implies a possibility to control and guide transfer processes. It refers to a tension between an intended control of impacts and effects on reception processes abroad by the Soviet bureaucracy and the de facto reception. From a theoretical point of view, the assumption of a “guided transfer” is questionable. Even if an initial “sender” may choose the means and the contents that are to be transmitted, transfer and transformation processes take place in the target context. So, in consequence it is the target group who decides about the manner of reception, e.g. by productive adoption, adaptation or denial.

## Theoretical framework and methodological operationalization

The project will be built on the theoretical approach of the Cultural Transfer Theory and the Network Theory. Microhistory shall be its methodological implementation. Network analysis will allow me to identify the central instances and actors enabling cultural transfer.

Michel Espagne and Michael Werner are regarded as the founders of the Cultural Transfer Theory. They deal with the theoretical assumptions behind the exploration of intercultural relations.<sup>5</sup> Espagne defines Cultural Transfer as “the inclusion of a cultural artifact from an initial context into a new context” with a semantic reinterpretation that is not regarded as a loss of substance by the new sense making and not as a misinterpretation but as equal in value.<sup>6</sup> In his approach he focuses on the support groups enabling transfer processes.<sup>7</sup> Hans-Jürgen Lüsebrink claims that the Cultural Transfer Research is dedicated to “the transmission of ideas, cultural artifacts, practices and institutions from one specific system of social acting, behaving, and cultural patterns into another”.<sup>8</sup> A central premise is the assumption, that every national system of memory partially consists of external memory moments that can potentially be brought to mind, meaning that the receptive context fulfills the crucial function of a “cultural import”.<sup>9</sup>

Cultural Transfer Theory aims at identity construction, transmission and reception of cultural artifacts in and between cultural spheres. Its perspective will be complimented by a network analytical approach as networks can be regarded as the precondition for cultural transfer.<sup>10</sup> Network analysis enables to reveal paths and stations of the transmission of cultural elements.<sup>11</sup> Besides in-between instances, different intensities of cultural adoption may be analyzed into different directions; a transfer can occur into one or different directions and it may be one-sided or reciprocal.<sup>12</sup>

Phenomena of cultural transfer may be analyzed in microhistorical case studies that place the individual within its environment into their center of analysis.<sup>13</sup> Within my dissertation project I intend to implement three such case studies to illustrate exemplarily how thinking patterns and categorizations from an “alien” cultural sphere are adjusted or reinterpreted into the own familiar patterns.<sup>14</sup> The micro-dimension analysis allows to grasp historical actors as acting individuals with their own perspectives and strategies within their social relations.<sup>15</sup> The implication of this observation is that social groups and institutions are created and framed by individuals in negotiation processes and conflicts and that a social order results from the interaction of various individual strategies.<sup>16</sup> Microhistory aims at reconstructing this network of a specific social order and at approximating the actors within different contexts.<sup>17</sup> By doing so, it is expected to receive deeper insights into mechanisms and functional rules of certain environments.<sup>18</sup>

On a methodological level the Cultural Transfer approach considers paths, media and linguistic conditions for the transfer of cultural artifacts and practices.<sup>19</sup> Lüsebrink divides the analytical dimensions of Cultural Transfer into “initial culture”, “cultural artifacts” and “target culture”. He also defines processes into individual and institutional selection, transfer and reception processes.<sup>20</sup> In compliance with this categorization I intend to focus on the actors and their activities. First, I want to analyze the selection, planning and organization of representative events. Second, their realization will be retraced and third, the reception of those events within the target context, especially by the public, bureaucracy and press will be considered. The document analysis should reveal means of reception of cultural artifacts and whether it came to transfer and learning processes. I have not decided yet, whose perception I will stress most. One may examine the backlash of cultural political events on the further development and conception of cultural diplomacy but also focus on the reception context. It seems more coherent to aim at the perception of the German public reactions by the Soviet institutions in order to show

potential learning processes within the organizations. I also want to consider “counter-exhibitions” in Russia in order to avoid a one-sided “influence-analysis” and to highlight the importance of reciprocity.

## 1<sup>st</sup> Russian Art Exhibition in Berlin (1922)

The 1<sup>st</sup> Russian Art Exhibition was a spectacular event in the German-Soviet cultural relationship<sup>21</sup> and one may argue, that it marked its beginning but also the highlight of the official cultural political offensive of the RSFSR.<sup>22</sup>

Now the organization of an art exhibition is a process in which it is rather probable that the final result differs from the initial intended concept. Even though there has already been much research on the exhibition that delivered deep insights into its planning and reception<sup>23</sup>, there are still some “white spaces” and irritations in the reconstruction of its initial organization. Therefore, an analysis of the archive documents allows it to draw some new conclusions on the organization.

First contacts in regards to arts were established by Russian artists already in 1918, in which they made plans for the creation of a united congress for the coordination and organization of cultural events and they were also welcomed by Adolf Behne and Walter Gropius.<sup>24</sup> Those plans were supported by the Soviet Commissar of Enlightenment, Anatoli Lunacharskij, and by several Soviet artists. Lenin gave Lunacharskij his approval for a stonger cultural diplomatic engagement that was defensively oriented in its beginning.<sup>25</sup> In March 1921, Wassily Kandinsky submitted a plan to the “*Arbeitsrat für Kunst*” for an “extensive art exhibition of new Russian art which have been appreciated in Germany.”<sup>26</sup> As Helen Adkins argues, cultural diplomacy became an important aspect of the Russian foreign politics by that time.<sup>27</sup> Therefore, within the same month the German foreign office received an official letter from Victor Kopp who was a Soviet representative in Berlin in which he introduced a plan for a extensive exhibition of Russian art.<sup>28</sup> It should give a wide insight into the art production in Russia from 1914 to 1921 with special focus on the last three years. It should contain 250 artworks of all art tendencies in Russia, including 100 pictures and plastics, 100 products of the modern Russian art industry, 50 works of reformed Russian art academies and artist publications and reproductions. The exhibition was to be shown in different German cities and an organization plan was attached, too.<sup>29</sup> The plan was also introduced personally to the German foreign office as Sievers notes on 5<sup>th</sup> April 1921. The documents mention a young sophisticated representative of the art section of the Soviet *NARKOMPROS* (Commissariat of Enlightenment), Mr. Umanskij (Konstantin Umanskij, V.K.). Sievers notes that in his impression the Soviet government would search “under all circumstances for ways and means to realize the exhibition in some kind of form.”<sup>30</sup> But for the German state the time was too early for such an event, as the foreign office was forced to react to recent inner-German developments.<sup>31</sup>

On the Soviet side Anatolij Lunačarskij played a crucial part in the realization of the exhibition at the van Diemen Galery and energetically pushed it forward.<sup>32</sup> It was him who stressed on a dinner with the German representative on 9<sup>th</sup> November, the Soviet government’s wish to organize an exhibition that should contain art and porcelain works. He assured that any political taste would be avoided, and the Germans felt that it would be inappropriate to deny his inquiry again.<sup>33</sup> On 18. November it was approved under strict preconditions that were submitted to the Soviets on 23<sup>rd</sup> Nov 1921. Shortly later, on 6<sup>th</sup> December 1921 the German foreign office received another inquiry – now from the secretary of the International Workers’ Relief, Willy Münzenberg, who also suggested the plan for a Russian art exhibition and asked for the duty-free import of two wagons of art material from Riga, that caused some irritation within the foreign office.<sup>34</sup>

Willy Münzenberg was a representative of the International Workers’ Relief. An organization founded to collect food and goods for the people affected by the hunger crisis in Russia in 1921-1922. In August 1921, the “*Auslandskomitee zur Organisierung der Arbeiterhilfe für die Hungernden in Rußland*“ was established in Berlin.<sup>35</sup> During his stay in Moscow in November 1921, Münzenberg introduced Lenin his plans to launch a Russian art exhibition in Germany and asked for his support.<sup>36</sup> His central argument was the propogandistic character of such an event. On the one hand, its organization by the „*Hungerhilfe*“ should attract sympathy within the western intelligence. On the other hand it should counterbalance and neutralize the emigrants’ influence in Berlin by presenting the recent high accomplishments of Soviet post-revolutionary arts and also show the government’s tolerance towards revolutionary art tendencies as well as towards the Russian cultural heritage.<sup>37</sup> Lenin approved Münzenberg’s plan with 70 million Rubel in order to enable him to realize the exhibition.<sup>38</sup> Kasper Braskén notes that Münzenberg also mentioned the objectives of an art exhibition during a speech at the enlarged ECCI meeting in Moscow on 1<sup>st</sup> March 1922. It was meant “to achieve moral support for Soviet Russia and on the other hand to produce financial support for the *Arbeiterhilfe*.”<sup>39</sup>

Adkins claims that the further preparation process in early 1922 cannot be clearly reconstructed on basis of the documents. She doubts that the further organization of an exhibition by Münzenberg refers to the 1<sup>st</sup> Russian Exhibition. She mentions that since early December 1921 artworks have been collected in a hurry for the

Russian art exhibition but doubts that they were meant for the „Propaganda-exhibition.“<sup>40</sup> Still, she does not provide an explanation for this curiosity. In fact, the archive documents offer a hint to the context. As Lunacharskij gave the order for the organization of such an exhibition to Sterenberg on 16. February 1922, the goods in the first wagon mentioned by Münzenberg, that remained in Moscow until January 1922<sup>41</sup> were apparently not meant for that exhibition.

On 8<sup>th</sup> December 1921 the foreign office suggested Münzenberg in a personal meeting to combine his plans with the official Soviet proposal.<sup>42</sup> But as Münzenberg stated in another visit such a combination would not come into question for the Soviet government by that time.<sup>43</sup> The toleration and support of Münzenberg's plan by the foreign office is somehow remarkable as one of its representatives visited the poster exhibition in Sophienstraße 17/18, that opened on 15<sup>th</sup> December in Berlin and found it to be an obvious propaganda event and that all preconditions to Münzenberg and to the Soviet state representatives for a Russian exhibition in Germany had been ignored. According to the report it received little public attention, therefore, the foreign office decided not to raise any potential press attention to it with a complaint to the Soviet government.<sup>44</sup>

The first wagon had arrived Berlin before 3<sup>rd</sup> February from Moscow. Münzenberg states that it contained information material whereas the second wagon in Moscow would include art works and porcelain.<sup>45</sup> According to a report by the German officials on 17<sup>th</sup> February 1922 the wagon was full of Bolshevik agitation writings, Russian belletristic literature, diagrams, paintings and photos.<sup>46</sup> It seems very probable, that the material in the first wagon, that was approved by the *Reichskommissar für Aus- und Einfuhrbewilligung*<sup>47</sup> was exhibited in the exhibition „Hungersnot und Hungerhilfe in Sowjet-Russland“, that opened in the Soviet representation on 7th July in Unter den Linden 11.<sup>48</sup> Münzenberg accounted a great success to it, whereas a German police report indicates that the visitors were mainly persons from the communist circles, that it was of no success at all and therefore had to close already on 25<sup>th</sup> July.<sup>49</sup>

In April 1922 Münzenberg reports to the foreign ministry that the previously planned exhibition could not be realized due to the difficult economic situation and hunger crisis in Soviet Russia.<sup>50</sup> Mainly due to the Treaty of Rapallo, signed between Germany and Soviet Russia in the same month, the exhibition plan was revived. The crates with the items arrived in Berlin in August and the exhibition opened in on 15<sup>th</sup> October 1922 with speeches of *Reichskunstwart* Edwin Redslob, Sterenberg and Münzenberg.<sup>51</sup> As highlighted in the catalogue the profits were meant to be transferred to the starving people of the hunger regions in Soviet Russia.

The Soviet part of the organization has already been described in parts on basis of personal documents and articles.<sup>52</sup> The art works have been collected in a hurry. As the works were meant for sale, the NARKOMPROS either did not offer the best ones – as it had its own museum plans – or the artists had little hope for financial profits. Also, due to the short planning period the organizers were not able to acquire the best works.

The responsible persons on the Soviet side were David Sterenberg, Naum Gabo and Nathan Altman.<sup>53</sup> The Exhibition included about 1.000 works from 180 artists.<sup>54</sup> Even though the works offered an overview of different art epochs and tendencies in Russia since 1905, constructivist and suprematist artists like Kasimir Malevich, El Lissitzky, Wladimir Tatlin and Alexander Rodchenko received the most public attention and provoked theoretical and aesthetical debates.<sup>55</sup> This may also result due to the fact that the organizers seem to have highlighted their own works.<sup>56</sup> In total, about 15 000 people visited the exhibition that was prolonged until December.

Besides these already researched facts about its organization, from my impression there has been little work on basis of archive materials from the NARKOMPROS. I intend to analyze the documents in March in Moscow and hope to gain new information on the implications and obstacles from the Soviet officials then.

The 1st Russian Exhibition also gave the initiation for the *Allgemeine Deutsche Kunstausstellung* – a German exhibition that was mainly organized by the International Workers' Relief, too, and that took place in Moscow and Leningrad in 1924.<sup>57</sup> On the Soviet side it was organized by a special commission under the lead of Ol'ga Kameneva, who later became the head of OBI and VOKS, the central Soviet organization for international cultural relations.<sup>58</sup> The exhibition included various art schools. It received a broad echo within the Soviet press and provoked inner-Soviet art theoretical discussions.<sup>59</sup> It seems relevant to analyze the preparation and execution of this exhibition, too.

## Interpretation and Thesis

There are various interpretations of the Soviet government's intentions behind the 1<sup>st</sup> Russian Exhibition in the Russian scientific debate. Even though Lunacharskij distanced himself from leftist artists, as does the – still not clearly identified - author of the catalogue, the exhibition was dominated by avantgardist artists, as mentioned above. Igor' Golomshtok argued, with the avantgarde, that has had a destructive effect on the carist order, was

now instrumentalized by the Komintern in order to throw over the social-economic order of the liberal-democratic Weimar state.<sup>60</sup> Aleksander Golubev questions this interpretation. He states that in the beginning of the 1920s exhibitions were organized by subdivisions of the NARKOMPROS and not by the Komintern or ZK WKP(b). By that time avantgardists reached the command heights of the Soviet art sector and also in the NARKOMPROS which they used with Lunacharskijs help and support. Additional to that the avantgarde may have met the aesthetic interest within the German public.<sup>61</sup> From the propagandist aspect the exhibition was a great success as it had „the effect of a exploding bomb on the revolutionary oriented German artists“. This propagandist success was also highlighted by Lunacharskij in an article in *Izvestija* from 2. December 1922.<sup>62</sup>

The description of the organization process offers the basis for a reinterpretation of the Soviet cultural political obstacles. Based on the above stated documents, Golubev's conclusion seems only partly correct. On the one hand, he is right to claim that the exhibition was organized by the NARKOMPROS on the Soviet side. On the other hand, the involvement of the International Workers' Relief, that is a suborganization of the Komintern, on the German side indicates further intentions beyond the official part. This thesis is supported by the fact, that Soviet officials did not intend to combine the "propagandist" exhibitions with the art works, that were shown at the 1<sup>st</sup> Russian Exhibition. One may argue, that both interpretations explain part of the picture.

As Christoph Mick points out, Soviet cultural diplomacy in the 1920s was divided into three sectors, targeting different political and social-economic groups in Germany.<sup>63</sup> The Workers' Relief aimed at the mobilization of the international working class in Western capitalist countries. The Komintern's underlying principle was an idealist world-revolutionary perspective. Parallel to that, the Soviet state had its own line of foreign and cultural politics that was driven by the intention to preserve and stabilize the young state after the civil war.<sup>64</sup> Within the 1920s the VOKS cooperated with – and financed – the "Gesellschaft der Freunde des Neuen Rußland", an institution, which addressed German liberal and leftist intellectuals, and the German DGSO, that was supported and financed by the German foreign office. By cooperating with the latter VOKS aimed at reaching the national-conservative groups in Germany.

## Conclusion

The reconstruction of its planning reveals that in its organization process, the 1st Russian Exhibition included both actors with their different approaches: the Komintern – represented by the International Workers' Relief and the official Soviet cultural diplomacy, represented by NARKOMPROS. Obviously, both approaches can be seen as two sides of one coin, but the different strategies, this may be the conclusion of this paper, had its beginnings with the 1<sup>st</sup> Russian Exhibition in Berlin, where Komintern politics met with state coordinated cultural diplomacy. This interpretation allows us to regard the famous exhibition as being not only initial to cultural exchange between Germany and the Soviet state but also as the foundation of an ambiguous cultural political strategy in which the Soviet government's approach that aimed at tightening the political, economic and cultural relationships between both countries was complimented by the Komintern's propagandist one that was supposed to mobilizing the international working class and to destabilize the capitalist order, leading to realize the final goal of a worldwide communist international order.

Furthermore, the 1<sup>st</sup> Russian Exhibition marks the beginning of Soviet cultural diplomacy in two aspects. It can be regarded as the initial project where it was divided into Komintern world-revolutionary politics and state-preserving governmental cultural diplomacy. Second, Olga Kameneva's leading involvement in the organization of the counter-exhibition may have been one cause of her later responsibility for cultural diplomacy within OBI and later, in 1925, VOKS, the central Soviet institution for cultural diplomacy, that was directed by Kameneva until 1928.

## References

### Archive documents

Politisches Archiv des Auswärtigen Amtes (PA AA) R 94534.

Russian State Archive of Socio-Political History (RGASPI), F. 538, Op. 2, D. 8, Sheet 29-31.

### Literature

- Adkins, Helen. 1989. "Erste Russische Kunstausstellung." In *Stationen der Moderne die bedeutenden Kunstausstellungen des 20. Jahrhunderts in Deutschland; [25. September 1988 - 8. Januar 1989; eine Ausstellung der Berlinischen Galerie, Museum für Moderne Kunst, Photographie und Architektur im Martin-Gropius-Bau, Berlin]*, edited by Michael Bollé. 4. Aufl., 185–96. Berlin: Nicolaische Verl.-Buchh. Beuermann [u.a.].
- Berlin Moskau 1900 - 1950 : [anlässlich der Ausstellung "Berlin - Moskau / Moskau - Berlin 1900 - 1950"; (3. September 1995 - 7. Januar 1996 im Martin-Gropius-Bau, Berlin; 1. März 1996 - 1. Juli 1996 im Staatlichen Puschkin-Museum, Moskau)] = Moskva Berlin 1900 1950.* 1995. Buchhandelsausg. Edited by Irina A. Antonova and Jörn Merkert. München [u.a.]: Prestel.
- Braskén, Kasper. 2015. *The International Workers' Relief, Communism, and Transnational Solidarity Willi Münzenberg in Weimar Germany.* Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Calov, Gudrun. 2007. "Deutsche Beiträge zur bildenden Kunst und Architektur Rußlands und der Sowjetunion von 1914 bis 1941." In *Deutsche in Rußland und in der Sowjetunion : 1914 - 1941*, edited by Alfred Eisfeld, 336–71. Geschichte - Forschung und Wissenschaft 25. Berlin, Münster: LIT.
- Düwell, Kurt. 1976. *Deutschlands auswaertige Kulturpolitik : 1918 - 1932; Grundlinien und Dokumente.* Köln [u.a.]: Boehlau.
- Düwell, Kurt. 2009. *Zwischen Propaganda und Friedensarbeit : 100 Jahre Geschichte der deutschen Auswaertigen Kulturpolitik.*
- Espagne, Michel. 2009. "Kulturtransfer Im Slavischen Sprachraum." In *Die Ost-West-Problematik in Den Europäischen Kulturen Und Literaturen Ausgewählte Aspekte ; Kollektive Monographie = Problematika Východ - Západ V Evropských Kulturách a Literaturách*, edited by Siegfried Ulbrecht, 77–88. Práce Slovanského Ústavu AV ČR / Slovanský Ústav N.R. 25. Praha: Slovanský Ústav AV ČR.
- Espagne, Michel, and Michael Werner. 1988. *Deutsch-französischer Kulturtransfer als Forschungsgegenstand : eine Problemskizze.*
- Finkeldey, Bernd. 1995. "Im Zeichen des Quadrates: Konstruktivisten in Berlin." In *Berlin Moskau 1900 - 1950 : [anlässlich der Ausstellung "Berlin - Moskau / Moskau - Berlin 1900 - 1950"; (3. September 1995 - 7. Januar 1996 im Martin-Gropius-Bau, Berlin; 1. März 1996 - 1. Juli 1996 im Staatlichen Puschkin-Museum, Moskau)] = Moskva Berlin 1900 1950*, edited by Irina A. Antonova and Jörn Merkert. Buchhandelsausg, 157–61. München [u.a.]: Prestel.
- Golubev, Aleksandr Vladimirovič, and Vladimir Aleksandrovič Nevežin. 2016. *Formirovanie obraza Sovetskoj Rossii v okružajuščem mire sredstvami kul'turnoj diplomatii: 1920-e - pervaja polovina 1940-ch gg* [[*Formierung des sowjetrussischen Standpunktes in seiner Umgebung durch Mittel der Kulturdiplomatie*]. Historia Russica. Moskva, Sankt-Peterburg: Centr gumanitarnych iniciativ.
- Korowin, Elena. 2015. "Der Russen-Boom: Sowjetische Ausstellungen als Mittel der Diplomatie in der BRD." Dissertation, HfG Karlsruhe.
- Kosmatsch, W. A. 2004. "Obmen wystawkami mezdu SSSR i Germaniej w 1922-1932 gody. Iz istorii sowetskogermanskich kul'turnych swjazej w gody Rapallo. [Der Ausstellungsaustausch zwischen der UdSSR und Deutschland in den Jahren 1922-1932: Aus der Geschichte der sowjet-deutschen Kulturbeziehungen in der Rapallo-Zeit]." In *Rossija i Germanija = Rußland und Deutschland*, edited by Boris M. Tupolev, 248–59 3. Moskva: "Nauka".
- Kusber, Jan. 2010. *Kulturtransfer als Beobachtungsfeld historischer Kulturwissenschaft : das Beispiel des neuzeitlichen Russland.*
- Lersch, Edgar. 1979. *Die auswaertige Kulturpolitik der Sowjetunion in ihren Auswirkungen auf Deutschland: 1921 - 1929.* Europäische Hochschulschriften Reihe 3, Geschichte und ihre Hilfswissenschaften 114. Frankfurt am Main: Lang. Zugl. Tübingen, Univ., Diss., 1977-1978.
- Lüsebrink, Hans-Jürgen. 2012. *Interkulturelle Kommunikation : Interaktion, Fremdwahrnehmung, Kulturtransfer.* 3., aktualisierte und erw. Aufl. Stuttgart, Weimar: Metzler.

- Mick, Christoph. 1995. *Sowjetische Propaganda, Fünfjahrplan und deutsche Rußlandpolitik: 1928 - 1932*. Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte des östlichen Europa 42. Stuttgart: Steiner. Zugl. Tübingen, Univ., Diss., 1992.
- Mitterbauer, Helga. 2005. "Dynamik - Netzwerk - Macht: Kulturelle Transfers 'am besonderen Beispiel' der Wiener Moderne." In *Ent-grenzte Räume kulturelle Transfers um 1900 und in der Gegenwart*, edited by Helga Mitterbauer. Dt. Erstausg., 109–30. Studien zur Moderne 2200. Wien: Passagen-Verl.
- Nagornaja, Oksana et al. 2018. *Sovetskaja Kul'turnaja Diplomacija V Uslovijach Cholodnoj Vojny (1945-1989)*. Moskau.
- Nakov, Andrej B. (Hrsg.), ed. 1983. *The 1st Russian Show: A Commemoration of the Van Diemen Exhibition, Berlin 1922 ; London, Annely Juda Fine Art, 15.9.-3.12.1983* 175 S.,Ill. London: Annely Juda Fine Art.
- Nisbet, Peter. 1983. "Some Facts on the Organization History of the Van Diemen Exhibition." In *The 1st Russian Show: A Commemoration of the Van Diemen Exhibition, Berlin 1922 ; London, Annely Juda Fine Art, 15.9.-3.12.1983*, edited by Andrej B. (H.) Nakov, 67–72 175 S.,Ill. London: Annely Juda Fine Art.
- Plachov, Katja. 2017. "Biografie als Medium von Vermittlung: René Fülöp-Miller (1891 – 1963)." In *Transfer und Transformation : Theorie und Praxis deutsch-russischer Kulturtransferforschung*, edited by Sonja Erhardt, Jennifer Grünewald, and Natalija Kopča, 155–73. Kulturtransfer und "kulturelle Identität" Band 1: Wilhelm Fink.
- Pyschnowskaja, Sinaida. 1995. "Deutsche Kunstausstellungen in Moskau und ihre Organisatoren." In *Berlin Moskau 1900 - 1950 : [anlässlich der Ausstellung "Berlin - Moskau / Moskau - Berlin 1900 - 1950"; (3. September 1995 - 7. Januar 1996 im Martin-Gropius-Bau, Berlin; 1. März 1996 - 1. Juli 1996 im Staatlichen Puschkin-Museum, Moskau)] = Moskva Berlin 1900 1950*, edited by Irina A. Antonova and Jörn Merkert. Buchhandelsausg., 187–91. München [u.a.]: Prestel.
- Schlumbohm, Jürgen, ed. 1998a. *Mikrogeschichte - Makrogeschichte Komplementär Oder Inkommensurabel? Göttinger Gespräche zur Geschichtswissenschaft / Göttinger Gespräch zur Geschichtswissenschaft 700*. Göttingen: Wallstein-Verl.
- Schlumbohm, Jürgen. 1998b. "Mikrogeschichte-Makrogeschichte. Zur Eröffnung Einer Debatte." In *Mikrogeschichte - Makrogeschichte Komplementär Oder Inkommensurabel?* edited by Jürgen Schlumbohm, 7–32. Göttinger Gespräche zur Geschichtswissenschaft / Göttinger Gespräch zur Geschichtswissenschaft 700. Göttingen: Wallstein-Verl.
- Tafel, Verena. 1987. "Der Kunsthandel in Berlin Vor 1945." *Kunst konzentriert*.
- Trommler, Frank. 2014. *Kulturmacht ohne Kompass deutsche auswärtige Kulturbeziehungen im 20. Jahrhundert*. Köln Weimar Wien: Böhlau.
- Ulbricht, Otto. 2009. *Mikrogeschichte Menschen und Konflikte in der Frühen Neuzeit*. Frankfurt am Main [u.a.]: Campus-Verl.

<sup>1</sup> For a discussion of the terminology see (Nagornaja 2018, 8–20)

<sup>2</sup> (Düwell 2009, 70–71).

<sup>3</sup> (Düwell 1976)

<sup>4</sup> (Trommler 2014, 34).

<sup>5</sup> (Espagne and Werner 1988, 12).

<sup>6</sup> (Espagne 2009, 77) (own translation, VK).

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>8</sup> (Lüsebrink 2012, 145) (own translation, VK).

<sup>9</sup> (Espagne 2009, 77) (own translation, VK); see also (Kusber 2010, 269).

<sup>10</sup> (Plachov 2017, 159).

<sup>11</sup> (*Ibid.*, 160); (Mitterbauer 2005, 113) (own translation, VK).

<sup>12</sup> (Mitterbauer 2005, 113).

<sup>13</sup> (Kusber 2010, 264).

<sup>14</sup> (Espagne 2009, 85–87).



- 
- <sup>15</sup> (Espagne and Werner 1988, 13); (Schlumbohm 1998b).
- <sup>16</sup> (Schlumbohm 1998b, 22).
- <sup>17</sup> (Ibid., 22–23); (Ulbricht 2009, 12).
- <sup>18</sup> (Ibid., 25–27).
- <sup>19</sup> (Lüsebrink 2012, 145).
- <sup>20</sup> (Ibid., 148–50).
- <sup>21</sup> (Korowin 2015, 21–22; Calov 2007, 345–46; Trommler 2014, 346–47)
- <sup>22</sup> (Tafel 1987, 215), cited in: (Korowin 2015, 22)
- <sup>23</sup> (Adkins 1989); (Nakov 1983); (Kosmatsch 2004); (Finkeldey 1995); (Braskén 2015, 74–76); (Trommler 2014, 346–47).
- <sup>24</sup> (Nisbet 1983, 67–68); (Adkins 1989, 185); (Trommler 2014, 345–46).
- <sup>25</sup> (Trommler 2014, 345); (Lersch 1979, 40–49).
- <sup>26</sup> (Adkins 1989, 185).
- <sup>27</sup> Viktor Kopp to Auswärtiges Amt 31.3.1921, PA AA, R 94534; see also (Adkins 1989, 185); (Nisbet 1983, 68–69).
- <sup>28</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>29</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>30</sup> Note Sievers, 7. April 1921, PA AA, R 94534.
- <sup>31</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>32</sup> (Tafel 1987, 215), cited in: (Korowin 2015, 22)
- <sup>33</sup> Report 9.11.2921, PA AA, R 94534.
- <sup>34</sup> Münzenberg to von Malzan (sic), 6.12.1921, PA AA, R 94534.
- <sup>35</sup> (Adkins 1989, 185); on the International Workers' Relief in general see (Braskén 2015).
- <sup>36</sup> Lenin W. I., Poln. sobr. soch. T. 54, 37, cited in: (Golubev and Nevežin 2016, 68); (Adkins 1989, 185); (Braskén 2015, 257) cites a letter from Münzenberg to Lenin from 22.12.1921 RGASPI 5/3/202.
- <sup>37</sup> Golomshtok, 66, cited in: (Golubev and Nevežin 2016, 68); (Adkins 1989, 185); (Nisbet 1983, 69–71).
- <sup>38</sup> (Adkins 1989, 186), S. 186; (Nisbet 1983, 69).
- <sup>39</sup> (Braskén 2015, 74).
- <sup>40</sup> (Adkins 1989, 186).
- <sup>41</sup> Münzenberg to AA, 14. January 1922, PA AA, R 94534.
- <sup>42</sup> Hauschild to Münzenberg, 8.12.1921, PA AA, R 94534.
- <sup>43</sup> Note Sievers, 13. December 1921, PA AA, 94534.
- <sup>44</sup> Note Sievers, 17. December 1921, PA AA, R 94534. The catalogue of this poster exhibition “Das neue Russland im Spiegel des Plakats“ is available in PA AA, R 94534.
- <sup>45</sup> Münzenberg to Sievers, 2. February 1922, PA AA, R 94534.
- <sup>46</sup> RKO to AA, 17.2.1922, PA AA, R 94534.
- <sup>47</sup> Reichskommissar für Aus- und Einfuhrbewilligung to AA, 25. March 1922, PA AA, R 94534.
- <sup>48</sup> Vgl. report from 20. July 1922, RGASPI, F. 538, Op. 2, D. 8, sheet 29-31, PA AA, R 94534.
- <sup>49</sup> Polizeipräsident to Staatskommissar für öffentliche Ordnung, 5. August 1922, PA AA R 94534.
- <sup>50</sup> Münzenberg to Hauschild, 20. April 1922, PA AA R 94534.
- <sup>51</sup> (Adkins 1989, 187); (Nisbet 1983, 70–71).
- <sup>52</sup> (Nisbet 1983, 71).
- <sup>53</sup> (Adkins 1989, 186–87).
- <sup>54</sup> (Golubev and Nevežin 2016, 68).
- <sup>55</sup> (Finkeldey 1995, 157–61).
- <sup>56</sup> (Adkins 1989, 187).
- <sup>57</sup> (Trommler 2014, 346–47).
- <sup>58</sup> (Pyschnowskaja 1995, 187–88)
- <sup>59</sup> (Ibid.)
- <sup>60</sup> (Golubev and Nevežin 2016, 68).
- <sup>61</sup> (Ibid.)
- <sup>62</sup> Golomshtok, S. 67, cited in: (Golubev and Nevežin 2016, 69).
- <sup>63</sup> (Mick 1995).
- <sup>64</sup> (Ibid., 68-69, 113).

### **Author's biographical note:**

Viktor Kempf is a PhD candidate at the International Graduate School “Kulturtransfer und ‘kulturelle Identität’” (IGK 1956) at the Albert-Ludwigs-University in Freiburg, Germany. His dissertation project is dedicated to the Soviet cultural diplomacy towards Germany between 1920 and 1933. He holds a state examination degree in History, Political Science and Economy.