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A.M. Pankratova as a Soviet historian

This paper examines the activities of Soviet historians after Stalin’s death by focusing on the life of historian A.M. Pankratova and the academic journal Voprosy Istorii (Problems of History). This examination will serve as a case study of the relationship between Soviet political authorities and intellectuals during the Khrushchev era.

Pankratova was a representative historian of the Stalin period and the early Khrushchev period. She was born in Odessa in 1897 to a family of workers. In 1917, she became a member of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party and entered the Communist Party in 1919. Two years later, she entered the Institute of Red Professors and studied history under M.N. Pokrovskii, a leading Marxist historian and a founder of early Soviet educational systems. While she continued her career as a party historian, she witnessed the arrest of her husband, who was criticized as a “Trotskyist;” she divorced him in 1927. In 1936, she was excluded from the party for her defense of politically oppressed historians and Pokrovskii, her teacher, was officially criticized for a lack of patriotism. Despite such repeated crises, her official status continued to rise. In 1952, she became a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party (TsK KPSS). After Stalin’s death, she was appointed the chief editor of the journal Voprosy Istorii, which became both an advocate for the thaw and an instrument for debating the thaw. In addition, she was elected a member of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR in 1954.1

Pankratova’s life was full of vicissitudes of fortune and has attracted the attention of several researchers. Zelnik emphasized the dual nature of her life and points out that she tried to support oppressed historians, but also had an important role in party policy on science.2 Savel’ev also notes that Pankratova’s personality had both communist and dissident features and claimed that this contradiction was the most striking feature of her character.3 Such characterizations are very interesting not only for understanding her life but also for analyzing Soviet intellectuals of that time. This paper examines

2 Zelnik, Perils of Pankratova.
aspects of Pankratova’s activities and *Voprosy Istorii* from 1953 to 1957 as a case study. This study should enrich our understanding of Soviet intellectuals from the 1930s through the 1950s.

**Pankratova and the thaw**

Stalin’s death on March 5, 1953, had a serious impact on both on academic circles and Pankratova’s career. At the end of March 1953, A.L. Sidrov, the director of the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, proposed the reorganization of the editorial department of *Voprosy Istorii* to the TsK KPSS and recommended Pankratova as the chief editor and E. N. Burdzhalov as the assistant editor. This proposal was accepted through official resolutions of the TsK KPSS and the presidium of the Academy three months later. As Markwick pointed out, Sidrov, Pankratova, and Burdzhalov all had all played an orthodox role during the Stalin era. In other words, the thaw in historical science was started by older historians who had been representatives of the Stalin period. Pankratova, a Central Committee member, was appointed to the chief editor position to lead the reinvigoration of historical science.

In the same year, Pankratova became the first female historian in Russia and the USSR to be elected a member of the Academy of Science of the USSR. V.T. Krut, a historian at Moscow State University (MSU), saw the list of candidates published in *Izvestiia* and opposed Pankratova’s election for a number of reasons: her past as a student of Pokrovskii and subsequent dismissal from the party in 1936, her relationship with politically criticized historians and those expelled from the party, her editing of *The History of the Kazah SSR*, and the fact that she already held 10 official positions. These objections clearly portray Pankratova’s image among her contemporaries.

A.M. Rumiantsev, chief of the Department of Science and Culture of the TsK KPSS, sent a report about Krut’s letter to the secretary of TsK KPSS, P.N. Pospelov, and told him that while it was clear that Pankratova sometimes spoke imprudently to protect politically problematic historians, there were no other [Remark 4] objections from
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historians to her election. Rumiantsev proposed to show Pankratova Krut’s letter and tell her to speak carefully and cut back her responsibilities.⁹

In fact, Pankratova continued her attempts to promote the rehabilitation of formerly oppressed intellectuals after Stalin’s death. Her election as a member of the Supreme Soviet in 1954 promoted such activities.¹⁰

The start of the reader conferences of Voprosy Istorii

The new editorial department of Voprosy Istorii actively reconsidered varied topics in historical science. Historian K.L. Seleznev recollected that editors had discussed every book, article, and book review enthusiastically, and the plain room of the editorial department looked like an academic circle.¹¹ In addition, the editorial department held reader conferences and gave lectures in various regions of the USSR.

On January 25, 27, and 28, 1956, Voprosy Istorii held a reader conference in Moscow. The editorial department announced the conference publicly in Pravda to call for participation, which was attended by over 650 historians, teachers, librarians, and archivists.¹²

The conference attracted much attention from citizens and party organizations. On February 7, V. Kirillin and K. Kuznetsova, the director and vice director of the Department of Science and the Higher Educational Establishment of the TsK KPSS, respectively, sent a report on the reader conference to the TsK KPSS, criticizing Burdzhalov’s speech for attempting to reevaluate Menshevik’s activities in the Petersburg Soviet. Burdzhalov had also criticized Soviet historical science for portraying the Russian Empire as a “fort” of friendship of nations, while ignoring the obligation to reveal the historical facts that united the nations in the Russian Empire. A non-party historian working at the State library, Engel’gardt, called on attendees not to await party instructions because “people working at TsK are not geniuses” and “they could adopt wrong decisions like the forced deportation of Chechens.” Reporting that many academic staff, teachers, and propagandists expressed bewilderment and resentment about the conference to the department, Kirillin and Kuznetsova proposed
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holding a meeting at the department in order to deliberate the activities of Voprosy Istorii and its errors in 1955.13

P. V. Borobuev, a staffer in the Department of Science and Culture of the TsK KPSS in 1953–1955, also recollected that many historians at the Institute of Marxism-Leninism and the academy of Social Science of the TsK KPSS came to the department and criticized Voprosy Istorii.14 However, such criticisms had little effect on the journal’s activities. Against such criticisms, Pankratova appealed to party authorities, including Khrushchev, about the significance and correctness of their activities and criticized the Department of Science and Culture’s lack of understanding.15

When Rumiantsev, the department chief, told Pankratova that Borobuev and A.S. Cherniaev had proposed holding meetings about the journal in the department, Pankratova got angry and told him that “such meetings are not necessary. If it is necessary for you, please call me to the TsK. I will tell you and your instructors what we do, if you do not know!”16 Rumiantsev was wary of Pankratova’s high level of influence and often asked younger staff members, “Do you know what sort of person Pankratova is? She is a member of the TsK KPSS and the delegate of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet. You are not dealing with someone unimportant like Kammari, this is Pankratova we are talking about here!” 17

Pankratova’s high position enabled her to act as a shield for Voprosy Istorii in the early years of the thaw. However, as the journal’s activities attracted more attention, the editorial department came under increasingly heavy pressure.

The 20th Party Congress and “perestroika” of historical science

The 20th Party Congress and official criticism of Stalin had a serious impact on Soviet society, including the academic world. Pankratova’s speech at the congress reflected political authorities’ interest in historical science. According to Seleznev, Pankratova was very anxious about her speech because it was the first case of an academic journal’s editor speaking at a party congress.18
Because of the growing general interest in Soviet history, “The Society of Knowledge,” a nationwide group of intellectuals for disseminating political and academic knowledge, invited Pankratova to give lectures on the present political situation and historical science. Similar lectures were also conducted at Leningrad, which about 6,000 party activists, writers, teachers, archivists, and students attended.19

At one meeting with history teachers in Leningrad on March 20, Pankratova admitted frankly that she found it difficult to adopt herself to the repeated changes in official policies.

We have to primarily do serious self-criticism and drastically change our way of thinking. I don't know how it is for comrades sitting here, for I myself and many others—it is not easy. All that I speak, all that I think—it's not so easily achieved. People sitting here are younger; for them, it may be easier. For me, for example, for people who are not young and who have experienced many changes, it seems that it is the hardest change. /Noise in the hall/ I’m not sure why you comrades are laughing at my statements. I don’t know, maybe, for laughing comrades, it is all easy. I do not think that it is not so…20

It seemed very difficult for Pankratova, who had been a famous historian and an editor of many textbooks of history since the Stalin era, to understand citizens about her criticisms to historical science during Stalin era and the changes in her evaluation of Soviet history. S.S. Dmitriev, a historian at MSU wrote in his diary that he heard that Panratova’s speech had been unsuccessful, and she had left expressing much irritation. After she made her remarks about changes in her way of thinking, he wrote, ironic laughter went off in the hall.21

In fact, correspondence addressed to Pankratova after her speech included relentless questions. One attendee wrote, “you talked a lot and marvelously about the idealization of personalities in history. However, questions emerged—where were our historians? And why did they not correct it?”22 Other attendees asked her why she did not mention the problem of the cult of personality in Stalin’s lifetime, and wrote that

Did not you have the power and courage to speak against widely accepted authority? It seems like that. This almost cannot be a reason to protect Marxist historians… You say that you cannot endure such “idealization” anymore. It was not an accident that laughter spread in the hall. I think you had

19 Селезнев. Страстый борец. С. 42 – 43.
20 Архив РАН. Ф. 697. Оп. 1. Д. 180а. Л. 52.
22 Архив РАН. Ф. 697. Оп. 1. Д.181. Л. 98.
better not try to rationalize your misunderstandings and errors because it is meaningless attempt now.  

Similar criticism was heard from other historians as well. At the party meeting of the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR in March 1956, A.P. Kuchkin said that all citizens whispered in each other’s ears, “where were the members of the TsK?...I frankly speak, Anna Mikhailovna (Pankratova), I would like to tell my words to members of the presidium of the TsK. Where were the members of the TsK?”

It was likely very painful for Pankratova, who had become a member of the TsK during the Stalin period, to answer these criticisms. On the other hand, there were also audience members who sympathized with Pankratova.

I worry that you wrongly understood the reason of laughter in the hall. We never laughed at you or your serious attitude to serious problems. We laughed because we share your feelings about the numerous changes, which we are also familiar with.

The noise in the hall seemed to reflect the varied sentiments of the audience: bewilderment at the fundamental change in the official interpretations of Stalin’s role and Soviet history as a whole; surprise upon hearing such a frank confession from Pankratova; criticism and distrust of Pankratova for changing her views according to the political situation; and sympathy for taking on the role of explaining the official changes in views to the society.

**Historians’ criticisms of Voprosy Istorii**

During this period of drastic change in politics and social turmoil, Voprosy Istorii’s activities attracted more and more praise and criticism from historians. Attending the journal’s reader conference held in Kiev on June 28 and 29, Berous, the chief of the department of Marxism-Leninism of the Kiev State Conservatory, and Korostarenko, a lecturer in the department of modern history and history of international relations at Kiev State University, sent a report to Khrushchev criticizing Burdzhalov for
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rehabilitating Zinov’ev, Kamenev, and other “enemies of the revolution.” When the secretary of the Obkom of Ukraine, Tron’ko, asked Burdzhalov, “in whose name do you speak?,” Burdzhalov answered “in the name of the editorial department of Voprosy Istorii.” In their view, Burdzhalov used his position to mobilize academic circles to the advantage of the enemies of socialism. According to Berous and Korostarenko, many researchers and teachers in Kiev shared their concern.26

On June 19–20, a reader conference was held in Leningrad, and Burdzhalov’s speech again triggered severe criticism.27 On June 28, the Leningrad Institute of history of the Communist Party held a meeting to discuss Burdzhalov’s reader conference speech. In his concluding remarks, Kniazev, the director of the Institute, said that Burdzhalov should be punished strictly because he advocated “bourgeois objectivism” and disturbed historians by giving wrong instructions.28

After the meeting, Kniazev addressed a report to the TsK KPSS on July 2. Kniazev insisted that Burdzhalov denied the necessity for collective leadership of ideology and called on Soviet historians for “100% of truth,” insisting that they had to reveal the positive role of Trotsky and Zinov’ev. Kniazev told Burdzhalov that since capitalist countries surrounded the USSR, historians should not write 100% of truth about Soviet society because enemies could use it. Upon hearing this, Burdzhalov insisted that the dangers of encroaching capitalism were strongly exaggerated. Kniazev criticized Burdzhalov for analyzing many problems using “Bourgeois objectivism” and for damaging the “partisanship of the science.” Moreover, some staff of the Institute had requested perestroika in research activities in the spirit of Burdzhalov’s instructions.29

On August 18, 1956, a historian at the Institute, A.N. Dal’skii sent a letter to Pankratova and Burdzhalov asking them for protection from the leadership of the Institute.30 At the meeting of the Institute, Dal’skii opposed the criticism against Burdzharov and refused to sign the protocol of the meeting because it did not record criticism of Burdzhalov by Kniazev and other members. About two months later, the protocol was remade, and it was signed by all the presidium members in the meeting.31

On August 17, P. Mikhrin, another historian of the Institute who also criticized

26 РГАНИ. Ф. 5. Оп. 35. Д. 39. Л.73.
27 Burdzhalov’s speech was published on Voprosy Istorii in 1989. Доклад Э.Н. Бурджарова о состоянии советской исторической науки и работе журнала «Вопросы истории» (на встрече с читателями 19-20 июня 1956 г. в ленинградском отделении института истории АН СССР.) // Вопросы истории. №9, 11.
28 РГАНИ. Ф. 5. Оп. 35. Д. 39. Л.121.
29 РГАНИ. Ф. 5. Оп. 35. Д. 39. ЛЛ. 57-59
30 РГАНИ. Ф. 5. Оп. 35. Д. 39. Л.121.
Kniazev at the meeting, wrote to Burdzhalov that “retaliation” against them continued. According to Mikhrin, Dal’tskii had been told that day by Kniazev that he would be dismissed on October 1 because he would be 60 years old. Furthermore, Leningrad Obkom also supported Kniazev, so the party bureau of the Institute could not protect Dal’skii.  

On August 5, Kniazev published an article in Leningradskaiia Pravda under the pseudonym A. Aleksandrov that criticized the reader conference and Burdzhalov’s speech. Pankratova sent Kniazev’s article, along with a stenographic record of Burdzhalov’s speech at the reader conference, to M.A. Suslov, the secretary of the TsK KPSS, complaining that Voprosy Istorii’s efforts to speak out against the errors and deficiencies in historical science faced resistance. Burdzhalov also protested to Leningradskaiia Pravda and to the Leningrad Obkom KPSS.

The publication of Kniazev’s article provoked historians in Leningrad to speak against it and to jointly support the journal. On September 1, 17 historians, including the chief of the Leningrad branch of the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, M.P. Viatkin, sent letters jointly to Kirillin; Bogdanov, chief of the department of Science of Leningrad Obkom KPSS; and Kurtynin, chief editor of Leningradskaiia Pravda, protesting to the publication of Aleksandrov’s article. The letter refuted Aleksandrov’s article by quoting the stenographic record of Burdzhalov’s speech and insisting that the article distorted the stenographic record and was not consistent with the spirit of the 20th party congress. In addition, they asked that their letter be published in Leningradskaiia Pravda.

Another group consisting of eight Leningrad historians also protested the Leningradskaiia Pravda article. On September 5, they sent Khrushchev a letter and an article that they had also sent to both Pravda and Voprosy Istorii. The letter said that Aleksandrov’s article had triggered dissent and protest among historians and asked Khrushchev to promote the publication of their article, saying that historians who attended the reader conference understood well that the spirit of the 20th party congress reflected in Burdzhalov’s speech, and that if Aleksandrov’s article stood without the publication of the necessary rebuttal, it would interfere with historians’ struggle to fully
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realize the resolution of the 20th party congress.\textsuperscript{37}

On December 11, 1956, Burdzhalov also complained to the secretary of the TSK, Shepilov, saying that \textit{Leningradskaiia Pravda} had declined to publish his protest to Areksandrov’s article as he had requested.\textsuperscript{38} In this way, historians who protested the \textit{Leningradskaiia Pravda} article, including Burdzhalov himself, asked to publish their letters or articles in journals or newspapers. This shows that they thought the issue should be resolved through open discussion among historians, and their opinions would be accepted by both the party authorities and society if their dispute was opened to the public.

\textbf{Official criticism of Voprosy Istorii and death of Pankratova}

Despite intensifying criticism, \textit{Voprosy Istorii} seemed to have kept the support of political authorities until October, 1956. Historian N. L. Rubinshtein told Dmitriev that some authoritative organizations planned to adopt decisions on supporting the journal at that time.\textsuperscript{39} However, the situation surrounding \textit{Voprosy Istorii} changed in the late 1956. On December 19, 1956, the TSK sent a closed letter entitled “Strengthening the work of the party organization in cutting off the attacks of anti-Soviet, enemy elements” to party organizations. The closed letter cautioned against misinterpreting Khrushchev’s secret speech at the 20th Party Congress and demanded that party members not promote arguments opposing Soviet political systems. In addition, the letter criticized \textit{Voprosy Istorii} as one of the organizations weakening people’s wariness and critical attitude toward countries hostile to the USSR.\textsuperscript{40}

On January 10, the party organization of the Faculty of History of MSU held a closed meeting to discuss the TSK KPSS letter. S. K. Bushuev criticized Pankratova and Burdzhalov, insisting that journals in Britain and the United States welcomed discussions by Soviet historians about the national movements in the North Caucasus or Poland because these movements had always weakened Russian authority, and Burdzhalov’s views were similar to those in these journals.\textsuperscript{41} As this remark shows, the upheavals in Poland and Hungary and the spread of radical criticism of the political
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system in the USSR were very likely the reason for the change in official attitudes toward the journal.

On February 8, 1957, Burdzhalov sent a letter to Pospelov, the secretary of the TsK KPSS; Konstantinov, chief of the department of Propaganda and Agitation of the TsK KPSS; and Kirillin, criticizing the meeting at the MSU faculty of history. Acknowledging the ideological errors cited in the closed TsK letter, Burdzhalov asked whether it was possible to declare Voprosy Istorii as antiparty, Trotskyist, or harmful.42 Pankratova also protested the MSU faculty of history resolution to the secretary of the TsK and MK KPSS, E.A. Furtseva, and insisted that “there were weak or wrong papers in the journal; however, no such papers or positions that can be characterized as antiparty, perverse, or Trotskyist.”43 These editors’ letters showed that they believed that the most serious error for Soviet historians was to be “antiparty,” and they did not believe the journal encouraged such “antiparty” activities.

In February 1957, Kirillin reported Pankratova and Burdzhalov’s complaints to the TsK KPSS, reporting that Aleksandrov’s article in Leningradskaia Pravda had, in fact, a brutal tone and distorted parts of the truth. In Kirillin’s opinion, the party meeting at the MSU faculty of history had interpreted the closed letter of the TsK mostly correctly; even though there were some brutal personal assaults, especially against Burdzhalov. In his view, the criticism against Voprosy Istorii as revisionist and antiparty was groundless and Bushuev’s remark sounded like agitation.

However, on March 6, the TsK KPSS called Pankratova and Burdzhalov to a meeting about the journal. The TsK secretaries, D. K. Shepilov and P. N. Pospelov, harshly criticized the journal’s “mistake in the direction” and decided to remove Burdzhalov from his position.44 Pankratova admitted her “error,” saying that “to be honest and sincerely, at first, when I unexpectedly heard about indications of errors in Voprosy Istorii through the letter” it seemed for me never to be worthy for us at first glance. However, after the first feelings of bitterness subsided, I honestly and sincerely understood the resolution of the TsK to be quite reasonable, especially now when ideological and political struggles with the bourgeois world, which is hostile to us, are getting tense.” Pankratova acknowledged errors in the journals, admitting that its writings were not sufficient to defend USSR interests in the Cold War situation. Historical science had been an arena of strained ideological struggles, she said, therefore, “there is no and cannot be
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44 ИЗ дневника С. С. Дмиториева. // Кукушкин. (отв. ред.) Историк и время. С. 175–176.
nonpartisan sciences.”

After the meeting, Pankratova’s condition deteriorated drastically, and she was admitted to a hospital the next day. Three days later, the TsK KPSS officially adopted a resolution to criticize the journal for undermining the struggles of Soviet historians against bourgeois historical science.

She wrote to her friend A.L. Solntseva on April 18 from a sanatorium, requesting help with her research. She wrote that “I firmly decided to unload all superfluous administrative, organizing, and editorial work and return to academic work. Only this will heal me again.” According to her, “crazy vanity and timeserving in academic work and all other – it has nothing to do with me.”

As the letter showed, Pankratova came to consider her social and political activities were “timeserving.” One can imagine Pankratova’s disappointment upon learning that party authorities considered her journal’s activities antiparty. It is also likely that criticisms addressed to her by citizens after the 20th party congress contributed to her loss of energy in social and political activities.

Pankratova never resumed her work. She died on the night of May 25. A visitor who met her that afternoon left a note about the meeting. According to the note’s author, Pankratova seemed to have felt overwhelmed with incomprehension and woe and could not avoid wondering about what the political authorities wanted her to do.

**Conclusion**

The trajectory of Pankratova and Voprosy Istorii after Stalin’s death reflected both hope and enthusiasm for a better future and bewilderment or despair over the drastic changes in political values. Both criticisms of Voprosy Istorii and their counterarguments showed that the debate began as a dispute among historians, rather than as official criticism to intellectuals. Pankratova’s protection of the journal enabled the editorial department to radically re-examine Soviet history despite severe criticism from historians, party organizations, and society. However, it did not occur to Pankratova that she could be seen as fighting party intervention into historical science.
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Indeed, she believed the journal promoted party policy. Hearing about Pankratova’s death, Dmitriev wrote on 26 May that “Now no one can represent historical science ‘at the top’ by taking on the role of a good protector.”

Pankratova’s suffering resulted from her position in the generation of intellectuals that lived through both the Stalin and Khrushchev eras. Had she not been a representative historian of the Stalin era, she would have not been appointed chief editor of *Voprosy Istorii* and would not have had such an important role in the thaw. However, Pankratova’s status made it difficult for her to gain the confidence of other historians and citizens. In addition, her support of formerly stigmatized historians could have given the impression that her own political views were problematic.

Though the lives of historians of those days need further examination, Pankratova’s complex character and personal difficulty were shared by other historians, including Burdzhalov. At the same time, we also need to ascertain the changes and continuity in historical science during the period of political reform after Stalin’s death. It seems that differences between orthodox party historians and dissidents grew more distinct among younger generations of historians who started their careers in the late 1950s and later. Therefore, we could say that Pankratova was part of the last generation of Soviet historians with dual characteristics as both loyal party historians and dissidents. In other words, the end Pankratova’s tenure at the editorial department of *Voprosy Istorii* marked the birth of the dissident in Soviet historical science.
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