Congress
Session } COMMITTEE PRINT

ASPECTS OF INTELLECTUAL FERMENT AND DISSENT IN THE SOVIET UNION

PREPARED AT THE REQUEST OF

Senator THOMAS J. DODD

FOR THE

COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE
ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY
ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY
UNITED STATES SENATE

Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
97-304 WASHINGTON : 1968

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402 - Price 30 cents

RESOLUTION

Resolved, by the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary, That a study entitled "Aspects of Intellectual Ferment and Dissent in the U.S.S.R.," prepared at the request of Senator Dodd by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress for the use of the subcommittee shall be printed together with the appendix thereto, for the use of the subcommittee.

Approved:

July 23, 1968.

LETTERS OF TRANSMITTAL

JULY 18, 1968.

Re publication of *Aspects of Intellectual Ferment and Dissent in the U.S.S.R.*

Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I wish to request that the attached study on *Aspects of Intellectual Ferment and Dissent in the U.S.S.R.*, which has been prepared at my request by the Library of Congress, be printed by the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security.

I believe that this is a most timely and valuable study which all Senators will find of assistance.

Sincerely,

THOMAS J. DODD.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., July 15, 1968.

Hon. THOMAS J. DODD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DODD: In response to your request by letter of February 29, 1968, I am pleased to transmit the report on *Aspects of Intellectual Ferment and Dissent in the Soviet Union.* This study, prepared by Dr. Sergius Yakobson, Senior Specialist for Russian Affairs, Legislative Reference Service, and Dr. Robert V. Allen, U.S.S.R. Area Specialist, Slavic and Central European Division, Library of Congress, is to a large extent based on documentation which has only recently become available in this country.

Sincerely yours,

LESTER S. JAYSON,
Director, Legislative Reference Service.

[EDITOR'S NOTE: The spelling of Russian names employed by Dr. Yakobson and Dr. Allen in their study follows the style employed in the Library of Congress. This style differs in certain minor ways from the spelling employed by the *New York Times* and most of the American press. Whereas the *New York Times* writes "Yevgeny Yevtushenko," the Library of Congress transliteration renders the same name as "Evgenii Evtushenko," while "Yuli Daniel" in the *New York Times* becomes Iulii Daniel in the spelling of the Library of Congress.]

CONTENTS

ASPECTS OF INTELLECTUAL FERMENT AND DISSENT IN THE SOVIET UNION

Prepared for the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee

by

Sergius Yakobson, Senior Specialist in Russian Affairs
Legislative Reference Service
Robert V. Allen, Area Specialist (U.S.S.R.) Slavic and Central European Division
Library of Congress

July 15, 1968

ASPECTS OF INTELLECTUAL FERMENT AND DISSENT IN THE SOVIET UNION

INTRODUCTION

By Senator Thomas J. Dodd

Roughly 2 years ago the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress prepared at my request a study entitled "Aspects of Intellectual Ferment in the Soviet Union." This study was printed as a Senate document in October 1966.*

At the time this first study appeared, the intellectual ferment which had been building up in the Soviet Union and the other Communist nations of Europe had already achieved epidemic proportions. But it was clear that the process was only in its infancy; and it was equally clear that, although there might be temporary setbacks, essentially the process was irreversible.

In my introduction to this first study I said that all the indications were that the imprisonment of Siniavskii and Daniel and the commitment of other writers to insane asylums would fare no better than previous efforts of the post-Stalin period to compel the Soviet intellectuals to toe the party line.

The developments of the past 2 years in the Soviet Union and, for that matter, throughout Communist Europe, constitute dramatic proof of the accuracy of this estimate.

In Communist Europe the ferment has already resulted in a major breakthrough in Czechoslovakia, where a more liberal Communist regime, for the first time in the history of Communist regimes, has eased up to a remarkable degree on censorship and granted freedom of expression to its subjects.

The violent reaction of the Soviet, Polish and East German press to the developments in Czechoslovakia is, in reality, a pathetic admission on the part of these regimes that they stand in mortal fear of the contagion of freedom.

The Soviet leaders, in particular, have ample reasons to fear this contagion because, even before Czechoslovakia, they had their hands full attempting to deal not only with the intellectual ferment which was the subject of our first study, but also with the massive nationalist ferment which has surfaced in recent years and with a truly amazing revival of religious attitudes.

The intellectual ferment, the nationalist unrest, and the religious revival are separate aspects of a single phenomenon: the reassertion of the passionate yearnings of the Soviet peoples for freedom of every kind, for the right of the individual to think as he wishes and to be-

* S. Doc. No. 130, 89th Cong., second sess.

97-304—68——2

lieve as he wishes, and for the right of peoples to genuine cultural autonomy and even to self-determination.

The story of what has been going on in the Soviet Union in recent years has been told in bits and pieces by our daily newspapers and our periodical press. But when the story is told whole, as it is in this remarkable study by Dr. Yakobson and Dr. Allen, the impact becomes overwhelming.

In the battle for justice and liberty which is going on in the Soviet Union today, the intellectuals of the Soviet Union have given birth to a literature of freedom that ranks among the noblest and most heroic since the American Revolution.

To write about freedom from the safety of the Western World requires little courage or commitment, for in the Western World freedom is an accomplished fact.

But to write about freedom or to take a stand for freedom under the totalitarian Soviet regime requires the most sublime kind of courage, and a degree of commitment exceeding the understanding of those who have been brought up to regard freedom as their birthright.

In the Soviet Union the price paid for political dissent runs high. While there has been some abatement in the terror since the days of Stalin, the Soviet camps still house hundreds of thousands of political prisoners; some say the figure may still exceed one million.

The penalties meted out to intellectual dissidents are still incredibly harsh. For example, in a trial which took place in March of 1967, Professor Ogurtsov, a specialist in Tibet at the University of Leningrad, was sentenced to 15 years hard labor, while Yevgeni Vagin, a prominent writer and editor, was sentenced to 13 years of hard labor.

To the Neanderthal cruelty of the Stalin period, the present Soviet regime has added an interesting refinement. Today it very frequently happens that dissident writers, instead of being sent to Siberia, are committed to insane asylums.

And for those who are not imprisoned or locked up in asylums, other punishments are available. A writer may find that his works can no longer be published in the Soviet Union.

An academician may find himself barred from his profession, with nothing but the most menial employment open to him.

A student protester may find that his ouster from the university means that he is barred from universities throughout the Soviet Union.

But despite the heavy penalties, the demand for freedom and for the right of each man to search for the truth, grows with every passing year in the Soviet Union. In this connection, it is noteworthy, as the authors of this study point out, that in the Russian language the word "pravda," or "truth," is defined not only as "that which corresponds to reality" but also as "justice; a system based on justice."

A thousand instances of heroism are recorded in this study of dissent in the Soviet Union. Let me relate only a few of them.

In September of 1967 there took place the secret, or virtually secret, trial of three young Soviet writers. All three of the defendants had been kept incommunicado for 7 months before they were brought to trial. On matters of principle the three young writers refused to concede an inch to the Soviet court. According to a transcript which

reached the West, Vladimir Bukovskii, one of the prisoners, told the court:

> Freedom of speech and the press is, first of all, freedom for criticism. Nobody has ever forbidden praise of the Government. If in the constitution there are articles about freedom of speech and of the press, then have the patience to listen to criticism.

When he was accused of discrediting the activities of the KGB (the Soviet secret police) Bukovskii replied that "the KGB has discredited itself to such a degree that we have nothing to add." He concluded his statement by saying that he was not in any way repentant for having organized a demonstration, and he told the court that "when I am free again, I shall again organize demonstrations."

This statement by Bukovskii became known to the Western World thanks to the courage of Pavel M. Litvinov, the 30-year-old grandson of Maxim Litvinov, Soviet Minister of Foreign Affairs under Stalin. Young Litvinov had been one of the demonstrators outside the court room. He was warned by the KGB that he would be held criminally responsible if he distributed the minutes of the trial. Not only did Litvinov ignore this warning, but only a few days after Bukovskii's plea had been printed abroad, he took part in a protest against another trial of three young writers accused of compiling, for transmission and publication abroad, a "white book" on the Siniavskii-Daniel trial.

On the conclusion of this second trial, Litvinov, together with Daniel's wife, Larissa Daniel, addressed a letter to world public opinion which they smuggled abroad. Describing the procedure of the trial as something which "ought to be unthinkable in the 20th century," the Litvinov-Daniel appeal went on to say:

> In this heated atmosphere nothing can be said about any objectivity of the court or about justice and legality. * * * We appeal to world public opinion, to Soviet opinion first of all. We are appealing to all in whom there lives a conscience and a grain of daring. Demand a public castigation of this shameful trial and punishment of the guilty ones. * * * Demand a second hearing, with observance of all legal norms and in the presence of international observers.
>
> Citizens of our country! This trial is a stain on the honor of our state and on the conscience of each of us. You yourselves elected this court, these judges; demand that they be deprived of the powers which they have misused. Today there is subject to danger not only the fate of the three accused—their trial is in no way better than the notorious trials of the nineteen thirties which became so shameful and so bloody for all of us that we cannot to this day regain our balance.

The Galanskov trial resulted in a torrent of petitions and letters of protest. On the eve of the trial, for example, a joint protest was made public signed by 31 prominent citizens including well-known Soviet writers, a corresponding member of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, a Lenin prize laureate, and distinguished academicians in various fields.

When, in their efforts to quell this wave of protest the Soviets sent the well-known writer-mathematician Aleksandr Sergeevich Esenin-Volpin, to a mental hospital, this time 95 scholars spoke out in his favor, including several recipients of the Lenin prize and one full member and six corresponding members of the Soviet Academy of Sciences.

The Soviet leaders have been striking out furiously, indeed, frenetically, at every manifestation of the free spirit. But like some mythological monster, the will to freedom seems to sprout nine new heads for every head the Kremlin lops off.

One of the most dramatic challenges to the regime of oppression was made by the celebrated Soviet writer, Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, the author of "One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich." In May of 1967 Solzhenitsyn addressed a letter to the Fourth National Congress of Soviet Writers protesting against the illegal censorship and suppression.

"Literature that is not the air of its contemporary society," said Solzhenitsyn, "that dares not pass on to society its pains and fears, that does not warn in time against threatening moral and social dangers, such literature does not deserve the name of literature; it is only a façade. Such literature loses the confidence of its own people, and its published works are used as waste paper instead of being read."

He proposed that the Writers Congress adopt a resolution "that would demand and insure the abolition of all censorship, overt or hidden, of all fictional writing, and release publishing houses from the obligation of obtaining authorization for the publication of every printed page."

Speaking about the ban on his writings in the Soviet Union, Solzhenitsyn said:

> My work has thus been finally smothered, gagged and slandered.
> I am, of course, confident that I will fulfill my duty as a writer under all circumstances, from the grave even more successfully and more unchallenged than in my lifetime. No one can bar the road to the truth, and to advance its cause I am prepared to accept even death. But, maybe, many lessons will finally teach us not to stop the writer's pen during his lifetime. At no time has this ennobled our history.

Needless to say, Solzhenitsyn's appeal for the lifting of censorship got nowhere at the Congress, although it was widely endorsed by writers and intellectuals. In attacking Solzhenitsyn at the Congress, the Kremlin's most talented literary prostitute, Mikhail Sholokhov, made it clear that he considered such appeals to freedom the work of "uninvited cheerleaders who include the CIA, some Senators, rabid white guards, the defector, Alliluyeva, and the notorious Kerensky who has long been a political corpse."

Sholokhov was not permitted to go unpunished for his crude attacks on the dissenters. One of the most telling indictments against him was written by the Soviet writer Lidiia Chukovskaia, author of the novel "The Empty House." In her letter she bitterly castigated Sholokhov for having broken with the honorable traditions of Russian writers. She said that Sholokhov spoke as a renegade from his position. And she concluded, in scathing terms,

> Literature will take its own vengeance, as it always takes vengeance on those who betray the duty imposed by it. It has condemned you to the worst sentence to which an artist can be condemned—to creative sterility. And neither honors nor money nor prizes, given at home or abroad (a reference to Sholokhov's Stalin Prize and Nobel Prize), can turn this shame from your head.

Hard on the heels of Solzhenitsyn's appeal to the Writers Congress, there took place another incident which attracted international attention. This incident involved Andrei Voznesenskii, one of the most renowned of the Soviet Union's younger poets. Voznesenskii had been scheduled to come to the United States to read his poetry at an art festival in New York on June 21, 1967. But Voznesenskii had made the mistake of championing Solzhenitsyn. The result was that his trip was called off and the word was put out that it had been canceled for reasons of illness.

Voznesenskii wrote a letter to Pravda assailing the dishonest cancellation of his trip by the Soviet Union of Writers.

Among other things he said:

> I have been working, taking part in functions organized by the Union of Writers, going to the theater, receiving foreign writers at the request of the Novosti agency, only to learn that for three days now the Union of Writers has been telling journalists that I am seriously ill. Of course, the leaders of the Union of Writers must know what they are talking about, but why haven't they at least informed me that I am sick?
>
> Clearly the leadership of the union does not regard writers as human beings. This lying, prevarication and knocking people's heads together, is standard practice. This is what they do to many of my comrades. Letters to us often do not reach us, and sometimes replies are sent in our name. What boors, what chameleons they are! We are surrounded by lies, lies, lies, bad manners, and lies. I am ashamed to be a member of the same union as these people. That is why I am writing to your newspaper, which is called "Truth."

The study prepared by Dr. Yakobson and Dr. Allen contains a moving summary of the ferment in the Ukraine, a ferment that is all the more profound because it springs from a double well—the desire for intellectual freedom and the desire for national freedom or cultural autonomy.

As the authors point out, the Ukrainian people numbering over 40 million possess a rich literature and cultural tradition of their own and have a long history of resistance to political control by Moscow and to Russifying influences.

Documents concerning the arrest and imprisonment of hundreds of Ukrainian intellectuals have recently reached the West. One of the most eloquent letters emerging from the Ukraine was written by Vyacheslav Chornovil, a 30-year-old literary critic and journalist, who had protested against the imprisonment of other Ukrainian intellectuals. Before he was arrested he wrote to the head of the Ukrainian Communist Party in these terms:

> You are indifferent to human tragedies, to the demoralizing action of fear which creeps like a cold serpent into many a Ukrainian home. Your only concern allegedly is to see that the law is upheld. Therefore, let us take a look at what is presently going on in the Ukraine, from the point of view of socialist legality. There is ample evidence today from which to draw proper conclusions. I submit my opinions not because I have any hope of alleviating the plight of the individuals who were sentenced and imprisoned. You have taught people not to foster such naive hopes. However, failure to express one's view about what is happening would indicate silent participation in the willful abuse of socialist legality.

Another Ukrainian intellectual, Valentyn Moroz, who was sentenced to imprisonment in January 1966, wrote a petition to the deputies of the Ukraine Supreme Soviet, bearing the title "A Report From the Beria Reserve." (Beria was the last Chief of the Soviet secret police under Stalin.) His petition said that "if we follow the paths along which the KGB came into our existence to the end, we will find ourselves in the nightmarish density of Stalinist jungles."

Moroz went on to say:

> Now a new generation came which stated: "The Constitution mentions freedom of speech and we want to abide by it." This kind of variant was unforeseen. Suddenly it looked as if the model rifle prepared for display can shoot * * * The present events in Ukraine are also a turning point: the glacier of terror which had firmly bound the spiritual life of the nation for many years is breaking up. As always they put people behind bars and as always deport them to the East. But this time these people did not sink into obscurity. To the great surprise of the KGB, for the first time in the last decade public opinion has risen: for the first time the KGB felt powerless to stifle all this.

"After 50 years of the Soviet regime," this study points out, "and in spite of the utmost efforts of the Communist Party and the government, the open and avowed allegiance of more people is given in the Soviet Union to a religious organization than is given to any of the secular bodies which those in power so zealously attempt to foster."

While the great majority of the religious believers are to be found among the peasantry, and among the aged survivors of an earlier era, the authors point out that there is a new, essentially religious ferment among the intellectuals, which forms an integral part of their dissent. Evidence of this is to be found in the writings of Boris Pasternak and of other important though less renowned Soviet authors, and among students and intellectuals.

One of the most remarkable documents they quoted in this connection was a letter which appeared in *Molodaia gvardiia*, the organ of the Young Communist League. The letter said:

> In man, in addition to the necessity for eating, drinking, sleeping and continuing the species, from the very beginning there have existed two great necessities. The first of them is communion with the soul of another person. And the second, a communion with the heavens.
>
> The letter said that this latter need arises "evidently from the fact that man as a form of temporary existence is a part, be it a millionth, be it momentary, be it insignificant, but still a part of that very endlessness and boundlessness which is represented by the heavens.

To deal with this many-faceted and virtually universal dissent, the Soviet authorities are resorting to increasingly draconian measures, which have led some of the critics to charge them with returning to the methods of Stalin. In one of the best known protests against the persecution of Soviet intellectuals, Pyotr Yakir, an historian who had spent 17 years in forced labor camps under Stalin, appealed to the intellectuals of his country in these terms:

> The process of the restoration of Stalinism is going on—slowly but remorselessly * * * raise your voices against the impending danger of new Stalins and Yezhovs * * * We remind you that people who dared to think are now languishing in harsh forced-labor camps.
>
> Everytime you are silent, another stepping-stone is added, leading to new trials of a Daniel or a Ginzburg. Little by little, with your acquiesence, a new 1937 may come upon us.

The neo-Stalinist tyranny in the Soviet Union may take many victims, but it is foredoomed to ultimate defeat.

The revolt of the Soviet intellectuals, and the economic failure of communism ** constitute the chief justification for optimism about the future. It demonstrates that the Soviet peoples, despite 50 years of Communist rule, cherish the same fundamental values as we do. In this lies the best hope for the peaceful evolution of the totalitarian Communist society into a more open society which will, by this very token, be more responsive to popular needs and the popular will, less conspiratorial and less prone to engage in subversion and aggression abroad. With such a society the free world would have no difficulty in achieving that degree of basic understanding essential for peaceful coexistence.

The heroic struggle being waged by the Soviet intellectuals at a terrible cost to themselves raises a serious question of conscience for the entire free world.

**The economic failure of communism is frankly admitted in the recent statement of Alexii Sakharov, Soviet academician and nuclear physicist, to whom a section of this study is devoted.

The free world has chronicled many of the incidents described in this study, as they have taken place. But by and large it has given voice to no protest worthy of the name.

But can we afford to remain silent and indifferent to this historic confrontation between freedom and tyranny?

When Pavel Litvinov and Larissa Daniel appealed to the conscience of the civilized world for support, the civilized world owed them a response.

And the words that Pyotr Yakir addressed to the Soviet intellectuals should have a meaning for all men who cherish freedom:

> * * * raise your voices against the impending danger * * * everytime you are silent another stepping stone is added, leading to new trials of a Daniel or a Ginzburg * * *

Here is a challenge to every intellectual and every student in every free country.

Here is a situation that calls for a worldwide movement of protest and solidarity by all those who value decency and human dignity.

The figure of a writer out of step with the existing political order is one which has been all too familiar in Russia. Under Catherine II, at the end of the 18th century, Aleksandr Radishchev, author of the famous political tract, *Journey from St. Petersburg to Moscow* (recently published in an American edition), was banished to Siberia after his death sentence was commuted by the Empress. The Decembrist poet Ryleev was hanged in 1826. Ten years later the philosopher Chaadaev was declared insane and placed under house arrest. Pushkin was exiled and, when allowed to return to St. Petersburg, placed under humiliating surveillance. When the poet Lermontov wrote a bitter lament on Pushkin's death in a duel, pointing a finger of scorn at St. Petersburg society, he was exiled to the Caucasus. Fedor Dostoevskii, for participating in a political discussion group, was in 1849 sentenced to death and was taken to the place of execution in the Semenov Square in St. Petersburg to be reprieved at the last moment by a "magnanimous" decree of the Tsar; he was sent into Siberian exile instead. Other writers suffered similar penalties, ranging from exile and imprisonment to official warnings to mend their ways.

Yet, out of all this there developed one of the world's great literatures and an astoundingly varied and spiritually free way of looking at things. The Russian writer was considered to be not only an artist but also something of a social prophet whose duty it was to examine the world in a critical fashion and to call men to a greater realization of justice and truth in life. Perhaps because the possibility of open and unveiled expression of one's conclusions about life and the evils, not only of men but of social systems, was so limited by Russia's political structure of the 19th century, the writer, who could by the use of carefully chosen and controlled language and choice of incident make his points evident but not blatant, often came to exert great influence over the minds of his fellow Russians. The intellectual tone was given to the country by this relatively small group of "critically thinking persons," which was the philosopher Lavrov's explanation of the term "intelligentsia," and it was from this background that there came the largely unheeded calls for reform and civic liberties.

Although the imperial regime was based on a theory of unlimited power and was often arbitrary, even brutal, in its exercise of this power, it was, at least in retrospect and compared with later regimes, astonishingly permissive in its attitude toward dissent. As long as writers refrained from drawing too uncomfortable conclusions from their thought, almost any set of ideas could be presented and most of the institutions of society subjected to severe comment. If the limitations on open expression within Russia seemed to be hampering, writers could send their material for publication abroad with no penalties being imposed on them at home. Leo Tolstoi, for example, had many of his later works issued in England and was not prevented from doing so. Furthermore, persons opposed to the imperial gov-

97-304—68——3

ernment found comparatively minor difficulties in obtaining permission to leave the country. Already having undergone Siberian exile and known as a firm supporter of a revolutionary form of socialism, Lenin was not only given a passport, but also no interference was made with his requests for money from his mother, whose major source of income was a pension for her husband's services in the imperial civil service.

Heresy in Literature Under Lenin and Stalin

The tradition of intellectual dissent from the polices of the government continued to affect the attitude of Russian literary figures to the Bolshevik seizure of power. The old regime, with its gradually widening range of liberty, was replaced by a newer, harsher system which threw all safeguards of liberty onto the ash heap of history. Many prominent writers left their homeland. Among them one finds such persons as the future Nobel Prize winner, Ivan Bunin, Aleksandr Kuprin, Boris Zaitsev, and Dmitrii Merezhkovskii. Some of those who stayed met harsh penalties for their opposition. The Russian poet Gumilev was executed for counterrevolutionary activities. Osip Mandel'shtam, a poet of great gifts, barely escaped dire punishment for having torn up in protest a number of blank death warrants a drunken agent of the Soviet secret police was filling in with names chosen practically at random. In fact, this and other evidences of Mandel'shtam's dissent undoubtedly helped bring about his death in a concentration camp of the 1930's in a condition of pitiable insanity.

Other writers only gradually became disenchanted, losing their faith in the regime and seeking various and often tragic ways out of a soul-wrenching impasse. In 1925, the poet Esenin, the son of a peasant and at one time married to the American dancer Isadora Duncan, who had at first acclaimed the revolution, cut his wrists and hanged himself. Vladimir Maiakovskii, for many years almost the poet laureate of the Soviet state, in 1930 put a bullet through his head after having expressed growing alienation from the regime.

On Maiakovskii's last visit to France, in 1929, he confessed his doubts to his friend, Iurii Annenkov, an émigré artist, in the following remarkable fashion: "We talked, as usual, about a little bit of everything and, of course, about the Soviet Union. Maiakovskii, among other things, asked me when I was ever going to return to Moscow. I answered that I was not thinking about that any longer, since I wanted to remain an artist. Maiakovskii slapped me on the back and, at once becoming gloomier, said in a hoarse voice, 'And I—am going back . . . since I have already ceased to be a poet.' Then there followed a truly dramatic scene. Maiakovskii sobbed and whispered, barely audibly, 'Now I am . . . a bureaucrat . . .'" [1]

In 1931, Evgenii Zamiatin, who is best remembered for his novel *We* which was published in Prague in 1924, and which foreshadowed Orwell's *1984*, petitioned Stalin to be exiled from the Soviet Union. His motive, as indicated in other writings of his, was based on his defiant assertion of "the need for heresy in literature as the very condition of its existence." [2]

---

[1] Annenkov, Iurii. *Dnevnik moikh vstrech: tsikl tragedii* [A diary of my encounters; a cycle of tragedies]. New York, Inter-Language Literary Associates, 1966, vol. 1, p. 207.

[2] Blake, Patricia, ed. *Dissonant voices in Soviet literature*. New York, Pantheon Books, 1962, p. 12.

Simultaneously, steps were taken by the Soviets not only to punish dissenters but practically to require unanimity both of opinion and of style. By 1934, after a long and complicated course of ever-rising limitations on the right of the writer or artist to choose his own styles and themes, the one official doctrine in the arts was that of "socialist realism," requiring the depiction of a highly colored Socialist world in which all is bright, happy, and clear, without any doubts or ambiguities, and which is presented in forms which are immediately understandable. The only dark patches are those of the capitalistic world, an area of gloom and misery, relieved solely by the lively reflection of color from the red banners of the working class, which is always presented as innately sympathetic with the Soviets and striving to bring about a similar revolution in its own country.

Not only was the Soviet Union shown under Socialist realism as a country of affirmative, joyous, and productive people, but the leaders, Lenin and particularly Stalin, were shown in paintings, described in semifiction and portrayed in movies as men of practically superhuman qualities, whose slightest words are inspired and inspiring and whose decisions are infallibly beneficent. As an illustration of the extent to which this adulation went, one may refer to a passage in the American correspondent Harrison Salisbury's description of a Soviet art exhibit: "The All-Union Art Exhibit of 1949 opened this week at the famous Tretyakov Galleries with 600 works by Soviet artists. Nearly 70 of the works entered in the exhibition depict some phase of Stalin's life . . ." [3] Salisbury notes that the Soviet censor removed from his dispatch to New York the words "nearly 70 of," thus leaving the impression that all were devoted to Stalin.

From 1934, and particularly after World War II to the death of Stalin in 1953, writers in the Soviet Union were, to quote Pasternak, forced "to praise what you hate most and to grovel before what makes you unhappy." [4] Some ceased to publish, others spent their time in translating foreign authors and in writing for children. Writers and others in the arts were often the targets of Stalin's wrath. The first two volumes of the *Kratkaia literaturnaia entsiklopediia* (Short Literary Encyclopedia), which cover only a small part of the Russian alphabet, now reveal that at least 36 writers were liquidated in those years, including 22 Russians, 3 Ukrainians, 3 Jews, as well as persons of 8 other nationalities.

These were the years in which writers received Stalin prizes for writing rhymes about boys who turned their own fathers over to the NKVD for disagreeing with the collectivization of agriculture, when operas were composed with choruses of happy peasants singing, "Hail to thee, Working Day," to demonstrate their pleasure with life, when all forms of art were required to show Stalin as a demigod and the Party as infallibly wise and farsighted. Many novels of those years, praised by the official critics, seem to have been built around the plot line: "Boy meets girl, girl meets lathe, both meet production quota."

The "Thaw"

The death of Stalin in 1953 at least removed from the artists of the Soviet Union the obligation to show a constant adulatory view of the

[3] Salisbury, Harrison. *Moscow Journal.* Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1961, p. 82.
[4] Blake, Patricia, ed. *Dissonant voices . . .*, p., xxvi.

leader. But it soon became clear that this was perhaps not enough to satisfy the dissenters. At the end of 1953 an article "On Sincerity in Literature" written by Vladimir Pomerantsev appeared in the literary journal *Novyi mir*. It was seemingly nothing more than a plea that Soviet writing present a somewhat less glossy and unrealistic view of people and the way they act. Many Soviet novels, wrote Pomerantsev, were full of clichés and unconvincingly filled with high flown set speeches. Boys and girls in love often spoke in these novels as if they were addressing production meetings. This characterization of a substantial part of Soviet writing would not, in itself, seem particularly to foreshadow any ideological shift, had not Pomerantsev also stated his view that "the degree of sincerity, that is, the directness of things, must be the first standard of evaluation."

Such a statement constituted an almost open attack on the theory of Socialist realism that the chief purpose of literature and art is to further the goals of the Party by presenting the world not so much as it is, but as it should be according to the Party's ideology. As a result, Pomerantsev became the object of criticism in a number of articles in early 1954 which sought to reinforce the ideological concept that a prime criterion for judging literature was its "party spirit." However, a critical attitude toward such views was implicitly reinforced by Il'ia Ehrenburg's novel *Ottepel'*, (The Thaw), serialized in the journal *Znamia* in early 1954. Ehrenburg has rightly been characterized by a number of foreign critics as an adroit timeserver, alert to catch the subtle indications of coming political and ideological change, but in this novel, which gave its name to a literary period, he expressed something of the discontent which Soviet artists and writers had felt with the Party's imposition of narrow controls over art and literature.

There followed a number of other novels and plays, often by persons with established names in Soviet literature, pointing out such features of Soviet life as bureaucratic attitudes at all levels of administration, the development of philistine, even "bourgeois," points of view in some segments of society, and the growing contrast between the older and younger generations. These works were heavily criticized by the official literary bureaucracy, as Pomerantsev and Ehrenburg had been, but this did not put an end to the clash of opinion.

It was evidently the official hope that the Second All-Union Congress of Soviet Writers, which met in December 1954, some 20 years after the first congress of that organization, would serve to mute this controversy, and the main speakers did contrive to gloss over the chief differences. There were, however, some indications in speeches by other persons discussing these main reports that there was a wide feeling of discontent with many of the rigidities of control, rigidities which had, some implied, brought about a great lowering of literary standards. Such sentiments did not, however, greatly influence the final official statement of the writers' congress which merely redefined, but did not change, the view that literature must follow the method of Socialist realism.

In 1955 the differences between the official literary organizations and many of the writers continued to bear fruit in pleas for the necessity of the writer to present his own, personal view of life, countered by adjurations to remember the duty of the writer to society, as interpreted in the light of "party spirit." The writers' union had, indeed, moved somewhat away from the rigidities of the Stalin era, but not

enough to give critically minded writers the leeway which they wanted. The resultant situation was one of an uneasy hovering between relaxation and control.

The ideological turmoil which followed the 20th Congress of the Party in early 1956, at which Khrushchev delivered his well-known "secret speech" on Stalin's crimes, had an inescapable effect on the literary situation. Writers, perhaps encouraged by revelations of the evils of the "cult of personality" (i.e., Stalin's personal control over Soviet life), began to attack most of the institutional devices by which the Party had sought to make the "party spirit" the major criterion in literature and art. Even in the official philosophical journal, *Voprosy filosofii*, voices were heard saying that "harsh controls not only over works of art but also over the creative process itself signified a loss of trust in the artistic intelligentsia." [5]

Such reactions against Party controls were, indeed, widely expressed, most significantly so among students in the higher educational institutions. From these young people came clear signs of disenchantment with the official ways of interpreting life, signs which took form in an increased interest in literature and even in the production of unofficial handwritten or typewritten newspapers, one of which was, indicatively enough, called "Heresy." For such actions, and for the general attitude of aloofness from the official view of life, there is a long tradition in Russia, for many of the students before 1917, had held quite similar opinions about the falseness and banality of the then-existing order, and their participation in the revolutionary movement did much to undermine the old regime.

Although Soviet young people cannot carry on antigovernmental activity of the kind their prerevolutionary predecessors did, and indeed they seem scarcely prepared to challenge the basic assumptions of Marxism, striving merely for a "purified socialism," it is they who have given the clearest voice to a feeling that the world cannot be interpreted only within the framework imposed upon them. In the words of Evgenii Evtushenko, writing in 1956 when he was but 23 years old:

> I know that others would give willing answers
> To all my questions—"How?" and "What?" and "Why?"
> But suddenly it turned out that I
> Must find these answers for myself.[6]

Thus, the questions raised among writers, largely over problems of the artistic truth of literature, met and were reinforced by a current of doubts and questioning among the youth, gravely disturbed by the revelations of Stalin's crimes and the division thus demonstrated to exist between the official and the actual picture of life. Many of the works of literature which appeared in 1956 contributed to such thoughts, for they included writings such as Dudintsev's *Not by Bread Alone*, a criticism of Soviet bureaucratic types as contrasted with the independent, self-reliant personality, or Aleksandr Iashin's "Levers," a short story suggesting the dehumanizing effect of the Party.

---

[5] Nazarov, B. A. and O. B. Gridneva. K. voprosu ob otstavanii dramaturgii i teatra (Concerning the lagging situation in dramaturgy and the theater). *Voprosy filosofii* [Problems of philosophy], No. 10, 1956: p. 92. *In:* Harold Swayze. *Political control of literature in the U.S.S.R., 1946–1956*. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1962, p. 146.

[6] Evtushenko, Evgenii, Stantsiia Zima (Zima Station). *Oktiabr'* [*October*], No. 10, 1956: p. 30. *In:* Harold Swayze. *Political control of literature* . . ., p. 180.

Manifestations of the Desire for Truth and Justice

The Hungarian revolution of November 1956, however, helped to bring silence to many of these expressions, as the Party, frightened by the thought that "the events in Hungary have demonstrated the consequences of disregarding Leninist adherence to principle in questions of the guidance of literature and art," [7] and the role played by the Petöfi circle of writers, sought to reimpose its controls. It was, to some degree, hindered in this by the internal struggle at the highest Party levels which brought about the expulsion of Malenkov, Molotov, and others from the Party Presidium in July 1957 and of Zhukov in October. However, by midsummer Khrushchev evidently felt himself in a position to issue a long statement combining three speeches of his delivered to writers' and artists' meetings in May and July, in which he underlined the basic Party control of the arts but indicated that a certain latitude would be allowed to those who did not either seek out "negative aspects" or "create saccharine images" of Soviet life.[8]

The fall of 1957 and much of 1958 brought then a tightening of controls and many authors who had previously written and published works which gave ideological offense to the Party were brought to recant, using words such as, "any work of a Soviet writer is political work . . . it is possible to perform it with honor only by steadfastly following the Party line and Party discipline." [9] There did not, however, seem to be a thoroughgoing effort to reimpose controls of the Stalin type and there was even some criticism from within the Party leveled at the diehards for being unwilling to give up old habits.

A period of relative calm was shattered in the fall of 1958 by the furor which developed over Boris Pasternak's novel *Dr. Zhivago* and the award to Pasternak of the Nobel Prize in literature. Yet despite the vicious nature of much which was said about Pasternak and his novel, the chronicle of a "resurrected Judas" deserving only "public contempt",[10] and despite the insistence on his rejecting the Nobel Prize, the general literary climate of late 1958 and 1959 remained one of moderation. In May 1959 the Third Congress of Soviet Writers was held in an atmosphere which might almost be called that of placidity. In his rather rambling speech, Khrushchev underlined his adherence to the principles of Party control over literature which, he suggested, could be maintained however without some of the extreme sanctions previously employed against dissident writers. The evident purpose of the regime was to find a middle way between the old-style Stalinist guidance of literature and what was considered as an anarchistic abdication of Party influence, permitting the writers to present a less "varnished" view of the world, while at the same time guiding them away from a preoccupation with "negative phenomena."

Although this pattern of "cautious liberality within the limits of ideological conformity" [11] was the prevailing line during the months after the third writers' congress, there were nontheless a number of

---

[7] Kommunist [Communist], no. 10, 1957. *In:* Harold Swayze. *Political control of literature . . .*, p. 188.

[8] Khrushchev, N. S. For close ties between literature and art and the life of the people. *Pravda,* Aug. 28, 1957 : pp. 3–4. *In: Current Digest of the Soviet Press* vol. 9, No. 35, Oct. 9, 1957 : pp. 3–10.

[9] Aliger, Margarita. Letter to editor. *Literaturnaia gazeta* [Literary gazette]. Oct. 8, 1957. *In:* Harold Swayze. *Political control of literature . . .*, p. 198.

[10] *Literaturnaia gazeta* [Literary gazette], Oct. 25, 1958 : p. 2.

[11] Swayze, Harold. *Political control of literature . . .*, p. 214.

skirmishes on the right and left, respectively narrowing or broadening the definitions of the official pronouncements.

It seems largely to have been the conformists who engaged in direct polemics against those whom they considered in danger of falling into ideological error, while the proponents of a critical approach sought to express their views not in abstract doctrinal terms but with works of literature filled with the humanistic impulse, the yearning for truth and sincerity, and the display of attitudes which constituted an implict criticism of the official point of view. Thus, by 1959, numbers of writers, particularly the younger ones, published works which plead for a renewed moral outlook on life, returning to values which had, so the suggestion was, been obscured or forgotten during Stalin's time.

No longer, said some of these writers, should the hero of a work of Soviet literature be the self-assured, positive, optimistic, larger-than-life figure of the happy worker who, beset by troubles but not by doubts, will inevitably overcome the difficulties which face him, but rather the "little man" or average person who never manages to find all his questions answered to his satisfaction and whose victories, if they come, are only partial and temporary. On this point the supporters of the official point of view spilled a great deal of ink, accusing the new writers of belittling many of the cardboard heroes of earlier Soviet novels and plays, who had hitherto been held up as such shining examples.

A few writers, indeed, seem to have gone further into a state of downright indignation with Soviet reality as a system in which even partial and temporary victories were impossible. These, of course, found publication inside the Soviet Union to be equally impossible, and only a few could gain access to foreign presses. One of them, the poet Aleksandr Sergeevich Esenin-Volpin, son of the Sergei Esenin mentioned before, writing in 1959, said:

> Actually, only a morally and mentally defective person can fail to reach a stage of extreme indignation in the Soviet Union. If this were not so, the Communists would have no reason to seal up their borders. In no other way could they have dealt with their flock while using Stalinist methods. Now the methods have changed, but not radically. The main point is that even the relative freedom which we have gained (a level of freedom which would seem to a person from another country to be the most shameful slavery) was not won by our society itself, but was granted to it by the government, or more accurately, by the Communist "church," as a sort of cat-and-mouse game with the people, rather than for the sake of more civilized rule . . .
>
> There is no freedom of the press in Russia, but who can say there is no freedom of thought?[12]

And, though the size of the group of writers who were, like Esenin-Volpin, prepared to undergo such penalties as being declared insane and sent to psychiatric hospitals may have been small indeed, something of their frame of mind influenced much Soviet writing in the time between the end of 1959 and the end of 1962.

It was at this time that there came to the attention of western observers, and evidently to the pained and startled notice of official Soviet literary circles, the phenomena of mass meetings, principally of young people, which brought together thousands to hear poets read their poetry.

---

[12] Esenin-Volpin, Aleksandr S. *A leaf of spring*. New York, Praeger 1961, pp. 5–7.

One such poets' evening has been described as including "some 14,000 people, most of them young," who "jammed into Luzhnikakh [sic!] sports stadium outside Moscow. They were noisy and excited, like fans anywhere gathered for a major event. Thousands more were milling around unhappily outside." [13]

There had been such readings since 1955, and there was even a poetry day each year, following which an anthology containing some of the works of these poets was printed. However, in 1959–62, these gatherings around the statue of Maiakovskii in Maiakovskii Square in Moscow became forums for the feelings of acute disenchantment and questioning of many young poets and for the creation of a responsive state of mind among the predominantly young audience. Similar meetings were held elsewhere throughout the country and often they offered opportunities for poets to recite poems which had not yet been published and which might, given their subject or opinions, never be published. Copies of these poems circulated privately from hand to hand, carefully written out in longhand or typed by those few fortunate enough to have typewriters, and many readers of these poems made their own copies or learned the poems by heart until, it has been reported, at many such poetry recitals the poet would be accompanied almost by a chorus of those in the audience who had come to know and love a poem which had never yet been printed.

Although it comes from a somewhat later, and different, time, Evtushenko's statement in the Yugoslav newspaper *Borba* of September 5, 1965, about the status of poets in Russia is not inapplicable to this period. He said, "In Russia, the poets always constitute an intellectual government. In contrast to a state government—here or elsewhere—this government is stable, not subject to dissolution, and invulnerable to violence and death. A chief of state can be assassinated but never this government."

One may also recall the statement of Andrew Fletcher of Saltoun, "Give me the making of the songs of a nation, and I care not who makes its laws," upon contemplating a phenomenon such as that of the poet-composer-singer Bulat Okudzhava, whose songs were copied and recopied by tape-recorder and circulated throughout the Soviet Union with many subtle darts aimed against the Soviet "Establishment" long before a carefully selected few were ever published. Okudzhava has, indeed, been called one of the most significant voices of the present day Soviet scene.[14]

The poems of the years 1959–62 included a wide variety of themes, ranging from a quiet personal lyricism, scorned by the regime as not contributing to the building of socialism, to subjects of great national importance. The most widely known of such poems outside the Soviet Union is Evgenii Evtushenko's *Babii Iar*, a slashing attack on anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union by a young poet who for a great while has combined the ability of writing sharp and bitter words about the errors of the regime (though chiefly those of the Stalin past) with that of avoiding any dire form of sanctions for his boldness. There are others, however, who may have cut a little closer to the quick in their references to other features of Soviet life and perhaps Robert Rozhdestvenskii's poem "Istoriia" (History) which appears in *Den' poezii*

---

[13] Lyons, Eugene. A specter haunts the Kremlin. *Reader's Digest*, September 1963: p. 55.
[14] Mihailov, Mihailo. "An Unperson Sings to the Russians." *New York Times Magazine*, May 15, 1966: pp. 26–27.

1962 can serve as an example, particularly since Communist ideology places such emphasis on the proper interpretation of history:

History!
And I was
a naive boy
I believed too long,
too sincerely
that you are
more exact than any math,
more unquestionable than
the most trivial truth.
But, it can't be helped—
boys
grow older.
Your winds
cut their
faces.
Seconds
present their bills
to centuries!
I am speaking
in the name of seconds . . .
History
magnificent as the dawn,
History
as damned as poverty,
Again reshaping people
and retreating
before baseness.
History
straightforward and absurd!
How often you were called—
remember!—
bad
(when you were magnificent!)
good
(when you were shamefully low!)
How you depended on the tastes of the petty-minded,
on agitated feelings,
on dullness of spirit.
How you feared the rulers,
measuring
you on their
self-invented yardsticks.
They swore by you,
be-drugging the peoples!
Hiding behind you
they plundered the earth!
They powdered you! And rouged you!
And dyed you! And stole you!
You were filled
with heart-rending cries
and made
giants
out of the undersized . . .
History!
Vagabond
history!
What use then
in all the dust
of your archives?!
Enough
lying!!. . .
Clench your dry fingers
Open your living heart
to people.

See how
masterfully there awaken
your immortal creators.
They swallow
a simple breakfast.
They hurry.
They kiss their wives.
They go away.
And the green aroma
agitatedly enfolds them.
The sun beats in their eyes.
The whistles screech.
The imperturbable smoke
swims forth from the stacks . . .
You will become
the most exact
of sciences!
You will!
You must!
We
want it
so.[15]

It is perhaps somewhat easier for poets, with their different use of image and metaphor, to suggest, as Rozhdestvenskii does here, a social or philosophical dissatisfaction than is the case with the writers of prose, particularly in the Soviet Union where the prevailing philosophy of Socialist realism has helped to deprive the writer of techniques such as the stream-of-consciousness or the blurring of time patterns which elsewhere have been used to indicate the finer shadings of his characters' outlook on life. Still, during this period many Soviet novelists, particularly among the young, succeeded in giving expression to the traditional rebellious spirit of the Russian intelligentsia and to their long quest for personal truth. In this they were joined by at least a few representatives of the older Soviet intellectuals. In 1962, the Soviet poet Aleksandr Tvardovskii, editor of the influential *Novyi mir* and a man in his fifties, paraphrasing in a way a famous Lincoln quotation, pointedly stated: "In art and literature, as in love, one can lie only for a while; sooner or later comes the time to tell the truth."[16]

Remarking upon some of the characteristics of the novels serially published in the late 1950's and early 1960's in the Soviet youth magazine *Iunost'*, the American student of Soviet affairs Alexander Gerschenkron writes: "The young personages exhibited in the novels are rebelling against authority in state, school, and family. They want to escape from the boredom of compulsory virtues to be displayed while trotting along predetermined tracks of life. Hence the novels themselves are in the nature of controlled rebellions. . . . But there is much more to this literature than exposure of the seamy side of Soviet life. The novels do deal with the thoughts, aspirations, and value systems of the young generation. When one of the youngster heroes says: 'We have no theories!,' when a young physician in another novel expresses his disgust at all those sickening 'high-falutin words,' all those 'verbal fetishisms,' and his friend declares to have thought about the matter and understood that it was all 'bluff', their views are an open challenge to a state that forces every one of its subjects into an ideological

[15] Rozhdestvenskii, Robert, Istoriia (History). *Den' poezii 1962* [Poetry day, 1962], Moscow, 1963, p. 93–94.
[16] Blake, Patricia and Max Hayward, eds. *Halfway to the moon; new writing from Russia*. New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1964, p. 10.

straight-jacket. For 'theories' and 'high-falutin words' obviously refer to the totality of official values. The young people are eager to escape from it all. Thus not only in style, but also in content they are Huckleberry Finn stories. This does not necessarily mean that the flight carries them beyond the point of no return. They may eventually make their peace with the system. But they do proclaim their right to seek and to err and to hack out their own paths. . . . Theirs is a flight from the pressure to conform. . . ." [17]

However, the most significant novel of 1962, both for its literary merits and for its implied criticism of Stalin and the misdeeds of the Communist Party, was Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn's *Odin den' Ivana Denisovicha* (One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich) published in *Novyi mir*, the influential literary review edited by Tvardovskii, but only after, as Khrushchev revealed later, the Party Central Committee itself had given its consent. This novel is a shattering account of one day in the life of a single inmate of a Stalinist concentration camp, a man driven almost below the level of human existence but still holding on. Many of the old guard clearly found this an upsetting, even subversive, work and some of the articles of comment which followed suggested that Solzhenitsyn had erred in not showing that such concentration camp prisoners were actually inspired to survive by Marxism-Leninism and the Party and thereby were able to look beyond the grim events of camp life. However, as Solzhenitsyn has abundantly made clear in this novel and in his relatively few other stories, the goal which inspired him was that traditional Russian one of truth, truth in the sense of justice as well as in the sense of correct reporting of events or facts.

This attitude toward truth on Solzhenitsyn's part quite closely corresponded to the mood which seemed to prevail among the younger writers, and it is possible to note among the works of the latter group a reinforced disenchantment with the pattern laid down for them by the Party and Komsomol. Although the guardians of the official interpretations do not seem to have given explicit expression to a fear that Solzhenitsyn's views and those of the young might combine to form an even more effective criticism of the regime, their acts of the next few months suggested this might be so. A campaign was begun against Solzhenitsyn by the more diehard supporters of the official literary policy, and at the same time the young writers of the Soviet Union were admonished to remember that their function was that of leading and inspiring people to build communism, not that of grumbling and of attempting to introduce harmful, largely foreign, innovations.

The Party Asserts Its Role

Not only were younger writers now attacked, but artists and musicians as well, for giving ear to "unhealthy tendencies" and for "the encouragement of ugliness." The first striking event of this campaign came early in December 1962, as Nikita Khrushchev, attending an art exhibit which included examples of nonconformist art, burst forth in typical unexpurgated language about the way in which these younger artists were not paying back the cost of their education by creating art the people would like.

---

[17] Gerschenkron, Alexander. The changeability of a dictatorship. *World Politics*, July 1962 : pp. 596–598.

Later, on December 26, the Party Central Committee met and L. F. Il'ichev, Secretary of the Central Committee specializing in ideological matters, spoke at length on the policy to be adopted toward young writers and artists. Perhaps the most revealing statement came in his peroration:

> The Party and its militant aide, the Leninist Young Communist League, have raised and will continue to raise the young creative intelligentsia in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism, in the spirit of communism.
>
> A true artist's talent is the property of the people. We can and must tell the young creative intelligentsia this: You no longer belong to yourselves. If your creativity has been recognized by the people, it has become the property of the people and is the people's wealth. You are at the disposal of the people and you must serve the people loyally.[18]

Still this crude statement of the official view of the artist's position did not, as might have been the case in previous years, put an end to all indications of dissent. The events of January and February 1963 indicated that some leading figures in Soviet literature were not convinced that this was a proper analysis of the situation and managed, through the use of various turns of thought and language, to indicate their disagreement. The situation after some 2 months has been summarized by an American writer in the following words:

> Briefly, the situation in early March was this. Few if any, of the artists or writers challenged communism as an ideal. Few challenged the right of the Party to direct their work. The more talented, however, hoped the Party would interpret this right more liberally than in the past. They sought to experiment with form in poetry and painting, to select themes of their own choosing and develop character in their own ways in fiction. . . . They hoped that de-Stalinization would benefit them in several ways: that it would entail the removal of Stalin's heirs from the cultural bureaucracy and so alter the tenor of Soviet life as to open up to art a whole range of subjects that had formerly been tabu. And they hoped that in reward for the aid they had rendered the Party in de-Stalinization, the slightly wider opportunity they had had for experiment since 1959 would now be granted them as a right.[19]

However, on March 7, with its usual ponderous bluntness in such matters, the party indicated clearly that it was not going to permit any such freedom to writers. A 2-day meeting of some 600 intellectuals with Party and government leaders was held in the Kremlin, with an address by Il'ichev as the opening event. He admitted that the discussion of the artist's role in society had, to all purposes, become a national debate but emphasized that there could be but one answer. The artist had the duty, and one duty only, of collaborating in building socialism, which should outweigh any individualist strivings after innovation and after forms of expression which might not be understood by the people. This point of view was repeated even more colorfully and revealingly by Nikita Khrushchev, whose speech of the next day is one of the most idiosyncratic documents in the field of Soviet cultural history.

In this speech, which runs to 40 pages of an average-sized book, Khrushchev offered not only the official guidelines which the Party wished to lay down for art, but also some unconscious revelations of the abysmal level of his own artistic knowledge and taste. He was, so he said, inspired by the works of one Dem'ian Bednyi, a Communist

---

[18] Il'ichev, L. F. Speech. *Sovetskaia kul'tura* [Soviet Culture], Jan. 10, 1963: pp. 1–3. *In: Current Digest of the Soviet Press,* vol. 15, No. 2, Feb. 6, 1963: p. 40.

[19] Johnson, Priscilla. The politics of Soviet culture, 1962–1964. *In: Khrushchev and the arts; the politics of Soviet culture, 1962–1964,* Cambridge, Mass. The MIT Press, 1965. pp. 20–21.

jingle-writer, whose verse was set to music and widely sung during the Russian Revolution recalling particularly "My Mother Saw Me Off to the War." In statuary, Khrushchev's eye was caught by the muscular, but empty, figures of the sculptor Evgenii Vuchetich, or by one of Moscow's monuments to Marx. He spoke well of Nikolai Ostrovskii's *How the Steel Was Tempered*, a novel the hero of which is almost unbelievably devoted to the Communist Party, even to the point of ruining his health. And in many ways, Khrushchev indicated his rather simple-minded level of taste.

Khrushchev's private point of view was, however, less important than his official one, which may be summed up in the following two paragraphs from his speech:

> The press, radio, literature, painting, music, the cinema, and the theatre are a sharp ideological weapon of our Party. And it sees to it that this weapon is always in fighting trim and hits the enemy without fail. The Party will not allow anyone to blunt this weapon or weaken its effect.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> On questions of creative art the Central Committee of the Party will demand of everyone—from the most distinguished and famous worker in literature or art to the budding young artist—that he abides unswervingly by the Party line.[20]

And, most important of all, Khrushchev by one paragraph of his speech seemed to have rehabilitated Stalin in such a way as to appease Stalin's heirs and to put an end to the campaign of de-Stalinization. He said that the leaders of the Party during the purges, among whom he was included, knew of the arrests of people but believed in their guilt. Even at Stalin's funeral Khrushchev and others shed "honest tears."

In short, Khrushchev's long speech, by criticizing those who wavered from the official line in art, was actually directed against those who wavered from the official line on Stalin and on the Party, which was presented as an infallible institution despite the errors of the "cult of personality."

The following weeks saw the Soviet press filled with reports of meetings of workers in literature and the arts reiterating the view that art is a servant of the regime, criticizing those, particularly among the younger workers, who had sought to introduce "false innovations," and seeking to produce statements of recantation from those under attack.

In late March 1963, S. Pavlov, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Young Communist League, in demanding that the Komsomol exercise close supervision over the works of young writers and artists, said:

> The true mentor, tutor, and inspirer of the young people is our Party. The entire life, heroic achievements and inspired creative work of Soviet young men and women are the most vivid evidence of this. Our young people warmly thank Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev, who said at the recent meeting in the Kremlin that Soviet youth has been brought up by the Party, follows the Party, and sees the Party as its tutor and leader.

He went on to demand that literary publications such as *Novyi mir* and *Iunost'* give up their preoccupation with works which "breathe such pessimism, mustiness, hopelessness that I fear they could mislead an uninformed person," and cooperate with the "absolute majority of our

---

[20] *Ibid.*, pp. 178, 179–180.

young talent" in the "struggle for the triumph of the most humane society on earth—communism." [21]

The campaign to force ideological conformity, of which the above quotation is a representative sample, continued with a series of meetings at which the older, conformist artists and writers directed anguished criticisms against the "nihilistic attitude" of the young who belittle the concept of the "positive hero" which is so central to officially sponsored art. Such "de-heroicization," said one highly placed official of the Union of Soviet Writers, "would deprive literature of its propaganda significance, its role as an active helper to the Party." [22]

It was not, however, merely the young who were under attack but all those who departed from the officially received canons of bright, inspiring art, to "elevate a petty incident to the rank almost of national tragedy," to employ "an obvious tone of doom," and to write works which arouse "such ambivalence, such contradictory responses" that they cannot "serve Soviet people, inspiring them in the struggle for communism." These were the words in which the critic for the provincial newspaper *Sovetskaia Belorussiia* expressed her view of the 13th Symphony of Shostakovich, who is certainly not of the younger generation.[23]

The Literary Zigzags and Trials of the Early Sixties

Yet, after approximately 2 months of such reports, the tension seems to have lessened somewhat and by mid-May 1963, *Pravda* was even finding space for Tvardovskii's interview with Henry Shapiro of the United Press International, which, despite its surface agreement with many of the official statements, made something of a defense of younger writers who had been under fire and indicated that Tvardovskii and the influential *Novyi mir*, which he edited, would continue many of their previous policies of favoring new writers.

It is difficult to suggest what the cause for this may have been. One may note, however, that during the spring and summer of 1963, the Soviet Union, bitterly engaged in a controversy with the Chinese Party, was seeking support in the Communist Parties of western Europe, among whom voices of disapproval over the treatment of the intellectuals had already been heard. Also, it will be remembered that the 1963 crop year was not a good one in the Soviet Union and that, in fact, heavy purchases of grain had to be made abroad, and it is possible that the exigencies of the time rather served to mute this quarrel over writers.

Even though in June a plenary meeting of the Party Central Committee was held with the chief subject being that of ideology and the arts, the government and Party seem to have taken an indecisive position. The resolution which was adopted had no startling proposals to make which might strengthen Party control and, in fact, the major figures seem to have their attention drawn elsewhere.

At the end of the summer of 1963, Solzhenitsyn again became the subject of controversy as his story "For the Good of the Cause" was

---

[21] Pavlov, S. Youth's art and literature should serve great ideals. *Komsomol'skaia pravda,* Mar. 22, 1963 : p. 2. *In: Current Digest of the Soviet Press,* vol. 15, No. 12, Apr. 17, 1963 : pp. 12–13.

[22] Chakovskii, Aleksandr. Always in the forward lines. *Komsomol'skaia pravda,* Mar. 29, 1963 ; p. 2. *In: Current Digest of the Soviet Press,* vol. 15, No. 13. Apr. 24, 1963 : p. 14.

[23] Ladygina, Ariadna. Listening to the Thirteenth Symphony. *Sovetskaia Belorussiia,* Apr. 2, 1963 : p. 4. *In: Current Digest of the Soviet Press,* vol. 15, No. 13, Apr. 24, 1963 : p. 16.

attacked by some for opposing human kindness to the bureaucratic spirit and defended by others for its faith in the right of the people to judge what is in the interests of the cause and what is not. With this was involved the problem of presentation of Solzhenitsyn's *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* as one of the works to be considered for a Lenin Prize. This controversy, which continued until the prizes were announced in April of 1964, ended with the award given to another book, but it was marked by a strong defense of Solzhenitsyn and his artistic and truthful portrayal of life in the camps against the views of the literary diehards.

Throughout much of 1963 and 1964, the situation seemed in a way to be one of balance. Some writers and artists who had been powerfully attacked early in 1963 were reappearing and the nonadherents to the full official points of view seemed to be winning back at least some of their previous influence. Yet the conformists were also powerful and, looking at the literary scene in a general overview, one might say that the range within which the less devoted followers of the line might move was surprisingly limited.

Furthermore, the trial of the young Leningrad poet Iosif Brodskii, which took place early in 1964, illustrated the strength of official obscurantism on questions of literature. Brodskii, a man of uncommon talent, was charged under the laws against a "parasitic mode of life," for it was alleged that he had no regular employment and his verse was said to have a bad influence on the young people of the city. The real facts seem to have been quite different, for Brodskii was employed, although at a comparatively ill-paying job, and was by no means living on any questionable source of income, and he does not seem to have propagated openly anti-Soviet or antisocial thoughts in his poetry. The trial, which was clearly prejudiced from the beginning, was undertaken with the evident purpose of warning not only Brodskii, but also other writers, that they were expected to conform to the officially approved methods of writing and belong to the official literary organizations. In a curious dialog between Brodskii and the judge, the former was asked who had appointed him to be a poet, and where, since he had no university education, he had received his training in writing poetry; Brodskii's meaningful reply was "I think that it was . . . from God . . ." Despite strong support from a number of talented Russian writers, Brodskii was sentenced to exile as a stable hand in a remote northern collective farm. This sentence evidently met with considerable approval among a strongly philistine segment of the onlookers, who were heard to say "Writers are all parasites," "Clear them all out of Leningrad," and the like on leaving the courtroom.

From this philistine strain of dislike of the intellectuals and their inconveniently questioning attitudes it is but a step more to a feeling that the intelligentsia is somehow an unreliable, even subversive group which should be kept under particular surveillance. Many of the immediate, personal reactions of Nikita Khrushchev can be cited as proof of his support of these points of view, and he was in many ways typical of a whole category of Soviet administrators who reacted with positive shock to unfamiliar and disturbing forms of art and to the philosophical questions which are bound up with them. And although Khrushchev is now out of power, there are still many representatives

of such habits of mind in responsible positions including many jobs having to do with publishing, literature, and the arts.

The note of distrust of the intelligentsia which could be heard in the Brodskii trial was even more evident in a novel of 1964, *Tlia* (The Plant Louse) by Ivan Shevtsov, which attacked, from the position of Socialist realism, "the subtle forces of 'a dark but tightly knit, well-rehearsed handful'—'few in number but amazingly active,' 'modernists,' 'cosmopolitans,' 'incendiaries,' 'esthetes and formalists of every stripe.' They 'scoff with impunity' at honest artists, give them counsel in which 'there is something diabolically tempting, or more precisely, intriguing,' they 'carry corruption' and try to 'plant' 'their own people' everywhere and to spread 'sedition.' " And, although the literary critic Andrei Siniavskii, in a slashing review which appeared in *Novyi mir* of December 1964, showed the utter absence of literary merit in this piece of pamphleteering, the point was, as Siniavskii noted, "not to reject Shevtsov publicly or heap abuse on him. It is more important to ask whether Shevtsov is alone in preaching ignorance under the guise of realism and equating the artistic intelligentsia with filth." In a very telling, but subtle answer to his question, Siniavskii notes that two well-known adherents of all the tenets of Socialist realism had expressed their approval of Shevtsov's works.[24]

It would be too much to state that Siniavskii's later troubles resulted from this review alone, for he had had much greater importance as an associate of and commentator on the late poet Boris Pasternak, but it is correct to say that it was representative of his point of view, and perhaps that of many other people in the Soviet Union, in its questioning attitude toward the official shibboleths.

Indeed, one who has read this review and who has some knowledge of the ingrained philistine cast of mind among many Soviet so-called cultural workers could scarcely be too surprised by the campaign which was unleashed against Siniavskii in early 1966, after he had been arrested in September of 1965, and charged with having slandered the Soviet Union by sending abroad writings to be published under the pseudonym "Abram Tertz." It is quite possible that this line of attack would have been pursued had no question arisen whatsoever of publications abroad, for in 1965, there were a number of indications of official concern over the effect of literature on young people. For example, S. P. Pavlov, First Secretary of the Komsomol, writing in *Pravda* of August 29, 1965, charged that some works of literature preached "hopelessness" and criticized those elements which engendered in young people "a certain skepticism toward everything bright, advanced, and progressive that comprises the essence of our society." [25]

And, though the literary controversies continued to echo in the Soviet press during late 1965, particularly in *Novyi mir's* editorial of September in support of artistic truth as a necessary component of literature, other sources made it clear that increasing emphasis had to be given to the "civic duty" of writers to aid in the "building of Communism," with the suggestion that those who did not carry out this duty had to some degree betrayed the Soviet people.

---

[24] Siniavskii, Andrei. Tract or libel? *Novyi mir,* December 1964, pp. 228–233. *In: Current Digest of the Soviet Press,* vol. 17, No. 10, Mar. 31, 1965 : pp. 14–16.

[25] Pavlov, S. P. The ideological commitment of youth. *Pravda,* Aug. 29, 1965 : pp. 2–3. *In: Current Digest of the Soviet Press,* vol. 17, No. 35, Sept. 22, 1965 : pp. 12–14.

Although the vitriolic article which *Izvestiia* of January 13, 1966, leveled against Siniavskii and his codefendant Iulii Daniel was, on the surface, concerned only with their alleged crime of having for years sent so-called anti-Soviet manuscripts for publication abroad, it looked as if such acts served only as a pretext, that the regime wished rather to make examples of Siniavskii and Daniel as representatives of a whole group of Soviet intellectuals, usually younger and usually not in prominent positions, who were discontented with the official artistic and literary policies. But now that a partial and unofficial transcript of the trial of Siniavskii and Daniel, which began on February 10, 1966, has become available outside the Soviet Union and has been published in Russian as well as in English translation,[26] the reader of this strange document can scarcely escape the conclusion that the procedure of this trial had all the forms of a Soviet court of law but that the essential trait of justice to the defendants was lacking. They were denied sufficient opportunity to present witnesses in support of their positions, the judge showed himself clearly and willfully prejudiced against them, and the regime, by means of a highly selective admission of the "public" to the courtroom, wished to make this a "show trial" with, to use Voltaire's phrase, the two authors being condemned "in order to encourage the others."

The Aftermath of the Siniavskii-Daniel Trial

As had been expected, Daniel and Siniavskii were found guilty and were sentenced to 5 and 7 years at hard labor respectively. The verdict caused serious embarrassment to the Soviet regime. Various organs of the Communist Parties in France, Italy, Great Britain, Sweden, Denmark and even the United States criticized not so much the two writers—that could have been foreseen—but the Soviet authorities for establishing, as the French poet and novelist, Louis Aragon, a member of the Central Committee of the French Communist Party, put it, "the criminality of an opinion . . . a precedent more damaging to socialism" than anything the two men could write.[27] A more telling criticism came from John Gollan, General Secretary of the British Communist Party, a body with fewer intellectual pretensions than the French one, who said:

> The Soviet press attacks on the accused before the trial assumed their guilt. So did the Tass versions of what went on in the court. Since no full and objective version of the proceedings of the trial has appeared, outside opinion cannot form a proper judgment on the proceedings. The court has found the accused guilty, but the full evidence for the prosecution and defense which led the court to this conclusion has not been made public. *Justice should not only be done but should be seen to be done.* [Italics added.] Unfortunately this cannot be said in the case of this trial.[28]

This chilling annihilation of the official case against the two writers, repeated in various forms and with differing emphases by other groups, both Communist and non-Communist, outside the Soviet Union, was the counterpart of a marked and continuing opposition not only to this trial but to other forms of intellectual controls in

---

[26] Siniavskii, Andrei D., defendant. *Siniavskii i Daniel' na skam'e podsudimykh* [Siniavskii and Daniel on trial]. New York, Inter-Language Literary Associates, 1966. 128 pp.
———. *On trial; the Soviet state versus "Abram Tertz" and "Nikolai Arzhak."* Translated, edited and with introduction by Max Hayward. New York, Harper & Row, 1966. 183 pp.

[27] *New York Times,* Feb. 17, 1966: p. 13.

[28] *Daily Worker* (London), Feb. 15, 1966. *In:* Andrei D. Siniavskii, defendant. *On trial* . . . p. 29.

the Soviet Union. On February 15, 1966, for example, *Literaturnaia gazeta*, an official organ of the Union of Soviet Writers, published a denunciation of Siniavskii signed by 18 members of the faculty of Moscow State University. But when, on the next day, one of the signers answered a student question by stating that he had helped to draft the letter and had signed it willingly, his students rose and left the lecture hall.[29] The regime was also reported to have found difficulties in securing reputable writers to sign other condemnations of the two or to expel Siniavskii from the Moscow section of the Union of Soviet Writers.[30] On February 17, 1966, the *New York Times* reported a tightening surveillance of nonconformist intellectuals and the fact that one young Soviet writer had been ordered into a mental hospital, with others pressingly questioned by the security police.

Another sign of unrest is that at least two separate groups of writers and intellectuals have sent collective protests to the Kremlin, voicing their objections to the Siniavskii-Daniel trial. Indeed, in the eyes of many, the two writers are seen as "victims of persecution and as heroes in the battle for freedom of expression," and their conduct as "brave and honorable." Although a few felt that Siniavskii and Daniel had made tactical errors in sending their writings abroad to be published, all deplored the manner in which the regime had acted in convicting the two.[31]

In June of 1967 Larissa Daniel, wife of Iulii Daniel, addressed a letter to a broad group of Soviet organizations and publications, ranging from the Moscow Collegium of Attorneys to the Presidium of the Academy of Sciences, in which she recounted the conditions under which her husband was forced to exist in the concentration camp to which he had been sent. For example, though the camp was evidently situated in an area where mosquitoes were plentiful, Daniel was not allowed to use insect repellent and when he refused to give up his supply, "three guards threw themselves at him and began to twist his arms. This, naturally, provoked Daniel to resistance. They continued the twisting, threw him to the ground, injuring his face in so doing, put handcuffs on him—and gave him 6 months in the BUR (barak usilennogo rezhima—the special treatment barracks, the camp prison)." This, wrote Mrs. Daniel, had grave effects on Daniel, whose health was already weakened. Such treatment, she continued, is no exception in Soviet camps, where the inmates, practically cut off from society, can be subjected to various forms of brutality almost at the whim of the administration. "All of which I have said, should, in my view, call forth serious alarm for the state of socialist legality in places of confinement at the present time." Despite her appeals to a number of leading Soviet writers for assistance, however, nothing was undertaken and she was therefore concerned lest public passivity permit a continuance of arbitrary and brutal actions.[32]

It is significant to note that a number of Soviet writers, not content with signing petitions in support of Siniavskii and Daniel, also supported a petition to Brezhnev which, drawn up some time before the convening of the twenty-third Congress of the Communist Party

---

[29] Brown, Deming. Moscow : the defense does not rest. *The Reporter,* Sept. 22, 1966 : p. 44.
[30] *Idem.*
[31] *Idem.*
[32] The Russian text of this letter appeared in the newspaper *Novoye Russkoye Slovo,* Nov. 8, 1967.

of the Soviet Union, asked that that body adopt a clear and resolute stand against any rehabilitation of Stalin. One of the reasons advanced for this was a fear that it would "lead only to confusion and disarray in the broadest circles" and "that this would cause great unrest among the intelligentsia and would seriously complicate the moods of our youth." In other words, the petitioners, among whom were also to be found the famed scientists Kapitsa and Tamm, the ballerina Plisetskaia, and the Old Bolshevik and former Soviet ambassador to Great Britain, I. M. Maiskii, recognized the existence of a widely based intellectual ferment in the Soviet Union and feared lest the reimposition of rigid controls be interpreted as "a surrender to the Chinese" and bring about other "great complications." [33]

The regime was not, however, without persons to state its views and to endorse the action against Siniavskii and Daniel. The most prominent speaker was Mikhail Sholokhov, who is but the third Russian writer to have received—or at least to have been offered—the Nobel Prize in literature. Sholokhov's views, as demonstrated by his speech in Stockholm upon receipt of the prize, were strongly in opposition to any of what he called the "most fashionable experiments" of the avant-garde, and he supported the tenets of socialist realism which "expresses a world view that accepts neither contemplativeness nor evasion of reality, that calls to the struggle for the progress of mankind, that enables us to attain goals dear to millions of people, to blazon for them the path of struggle." [34] Thus it was no surprise to find him speaking to the twenty-third Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in a style which brings to mind some of the most uninhibited spur-of-the-moment efforts of N. S. Khrushchev, treating of such matters as the beauties of Lake Baikal, ichthyology, the benefits for the brain of a diet of fish, and the procurement of shingles for a cowshed, but also aiming a clear blow at Daniel and Siniavskii. "They are," he said on this occasion, "amoral. We are ashamed for those who tried and are still trying to defend them, no matter what the motivation. (*Prolonged applause.*) . . . If these thugs with the black consciences had come along in the memorable 1920's, when people were judged not according to strictly delineated articles of a criminal code but 'according to revolutionary justice' (*applause*), these renegades would have received a different measure of punishment, let me tell you! (*Applause.*) And here people are still arguing about the 'severity' of the sentence." [35]

This unashamed appeal to lynch law, which breathes a spirit in strong contrast to the call of the American Nobel Prize winner, William Faulkner, for "men and women, who will refuse always to be tricked or frightened or bribed into surrendering, not just the right but the duty too, to choose between justice and injustice, courage and cowardice, sacrifice and greed, pity and self . . .," [36] to the great credit of some persons in the Soviet Union did not go without objection.

---

[33] Text of appeal against Stalin's rehabilitation. In: *U.S.S.R.: ideology, internal affairs.* Munich, Radio Free Europe. Sept. 26, 1966. 4 pp.

[34] M. A. Sholokhov to the Swedish Royal Academy, Stockholm, Dec. 10, 1965. *Pravda,* Dec. 11, 1965: p. 4. *In: Current Digest of the Soviet Press.* vol. 17, No. 50, Jan. 5, 1966: pp. 28–29.

[35] M. A. Sholokhov to the Twenty-third Congress of the CPSU. *Pravda,* Apr. 2, 1966: p. 5. *In: Current Digest of the Soviet Press,* vol. 18, No. 16, May 11, 1966: pp. 26–27.

[36] Faulkner, William. Address to the graduating class, University High School, Oxford, Miss., May 28, 1951. *In:* William Faulkner. *Essays, speeches and public letters.* Edited by James B. Meriwether. New York, Random House, 1966, p. 123.

One American observer wrote of the Moscow scene in the summer of 1966, "largely because of this speech, Sholokhov has become probably the most hated man in Soviet letters today. One distinguished Soviet woman author was so shocked by his position that she addressed an open letter of protest to Sholokhov and sent it to eight Soviet newspapers. Her letter was never published." [37]

The letter of protest referred to here appeared, however, in the *New York Times* of November 19, 1966. Written by Lidiia K. Chukovskaia, author of the novel *Opustelyi dom* (The empty house), which recounts the experiences of one who lived through the Stalin era, and daughter of the eminent poet, critic and translator Kornei Chukovskii—incidentally, the leading Soviet student and translator of the American poet Walt Whitman—the appeal notes that "persistent attempts to return to the rule of law, to strict observance of the spirit and letter of Soviet law and the progress made in this constitute the most precious achievement of our country during the last 10 years," and it bitterly castigates Sholokhov for having broken with the honorable tradition in Russian literature for writers to call, in Pushkin's words, "for mercy on the fallen." Sholokhov spoke as a renegade from this tradition and, as Chukovskaia concludes in blindingly scathing terms, "literature will take its own vengeance, as it always takes vengeance on those who betray the duty imposed by it. It has condemned you to the worst sentence to which an artist can be condemned—to creative sterility. And neither honors nor money nor prizes, given at home or abroad [a reference to Sholokhov's Stalin Prize and Nobel Prize], can turn this shame from your head."

Still, the ultra-loyal proponents of the "hard line" in intellectual matters remained active and vocal, although their repetitious and stereotyped phraseology seemed imbued with an awareness of the vulnerability of their position. Numerous Soviet publications revealed facets of their thought, and perhaps most clearly in the monthly literary review *Oktiabr'* (October), often considered to be a right-wing counterweight to the more liberal—within the Soviet scale of such things—*Novyi mir* (New World). The chief editor of *Oktiabr'* is Vsevolod Kochetov, well known as an exponent of party-line ideology, and it is reasonable to assume that the points of view expressed by contributors to the review generally coincide with those of the more devoted literary adherents of the regime. Thus the article by the otherwise obscure critic Ivan Kuz'michev in the issue for June of 1966 may be taken as representative of an influential segment of opinion with its accusation that many new writers had neglected the "secretaries of the regional Party organization, the workers, the chairmen of the kolkhoz, and other customary heroes" of Soviet novels in order to write about ordinary life as witnessed by young authors "who never saw a living kulak," and who "entered on adult life at a time when there was going on an abrupt, wide scale and not always well-founded reconsideration of the past," that is, during the time at which Stalin's "cult of personality" was being severely criticized. These young writers, it was said, went much too far in subjecting Soviet society to their irony—a quality of mind not admired by official literary circles in the Soviet Union, for it implies a form of doubt which is not comfortable to the dogmatic minds of the supporters of the regime—thus "draining the bright colors from living reality . . . making the sea into a puddle

[37] Brown, Deming. Moscow; the defense does not rest. *The Reporter,* Sept. 22, 1966: pp. 44–45.

and turning the white and red sails which have been sung about for centuries into wet rags." [38]

Not satisfied with this attack, Kuz'michev goes on to refer to other writers who, in describing Soviet concentration camps, shunted literature away from more general themes giving it intentionally a "one-sided, tendentious character." Furthermore, some authors describe persons who have "a frank disdain for the acts of their forefathers, for their heritage and their memory. All fathers, living and dead, show up under the writer's pen as having had a bad influence on their children. None of the young people are proud of the deeds of their fathers, and it would seem that there was no revolution, no civil war, no Five-Year Plans." [39]

This point, distilled out of a long and bitter article by the, as stated above, otherwise unknown Ivan Kuz'michev, is perhaps the key to the quarrel between the dissident writers and the followers of Socialist realism. None of the young people can find it easy to be proud of the deeds of their fathers, for these deeds included the as yet unexplained, unrevealed, unfaced events of the Stalin era. At that time, the "fathers," those no longer young people who are now in the Soviet "corridors of power," were active, conscious and convinced participants under the aegis of the Party, which has taken on many of the attributes of infallibility. The dissident writers, most but not all of whom are young, are ready to examine life with clear and unwinking eyes, treating things as they are and scorning to bring into their works false notes of optimism or of awe at the deeds of their forefathers, who were, after all, mere men. The regime and its literary followers, some of whom are time servers and some of whom are convinced zealots, cry out in opposition that it is the duty of literature to act as a handmaiden of ideology, to present only that picture of a smiling reality which would help convince readers that all questions have been answered, and that the writers must give a seamless and grandiose view of past, present and future, always in such a way as to aid the Communist Party in its control over men's minds.

However, it seems from many references that the dissidents have perhaps learned their basic ideological lessons too well for, instead of reflecting the official view that the existing order is, almost in Voltaire's words, the best of all possible systems, they say that there are significant gaps between things as they are and the announced goals of freedom and justice, honor and truth, which have decorated so many speeches on May 1 and November 7. Taking, then, these factors seriously, many intellectuals were seriously disturbed by the treatment given to Siniavskii and Daniel' which clashed so markedly with the striving toward legality and the rule of law which, as Lidiia Chukovskaia remarked, was "the most precious achievement" of the Soviet regime since 1956.

It is both tempting and dangerous for an American steeped in the preconceptions of his own constitutional system to draw parallels, but one may point out, again in Lidiia Chukovskaia's letter, two themes which find their American expression in the First and Sixth Amendments to the Constitution ("Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of

[38] Kuz'michev, Ivan. Puti i pereput'ia (Roads and crossroads). *Oktiabr'*, No. 6, 1966: pp. 184–188.
[39] *Ibid.*, pp. 195–197.

grievances." "In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial . . . to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense.") as she protests that "literature does not come under the jurisdiction of the criminal court" and that Siniavskii's and Daniel's "committal to trial was in itself illegal." However, it may perhaps be sounder to note here that longstanding concern of Russian thinkers with the search for "truth" in which "truth" is defined not only as "that which corresponds to reality" but also as "justice; a system based on justice." [40] A glance at a major dictionary of the Russian language will show how deeply ingrained are the words "pravda" (truth) and others formed on the same stem, ranging from "pravitel'stvo" (government) to "pravoslavie" (orthodoxy, or, literally, "true glorification"), and "pravo" (law, in the sense of rules of justice rather than statute law for which a different word is customarily employed). It then becomes easier to understand that there is a continuum between Soviet writers' endeavors to depict their world in a manner "which corresponds to reality" and their striving toward "justice, a system based on justice."

Thus, the reaction among a significant section of the Soviet intellectuals to the treatment meted out to Siniavskii and Daniel rested on the historic tradition of Russian philosophers and thinkers and the claimed goals of the October Revolution, both of which allegedly sought *pravda* in the sense of "truth" and also of "justice." Insofar as it is possible to determine the states of mind among those who protested, it seems to have been a feeling of outrage at such a violation of truth and justice which moved numbers of persons to what is under Soviet circumstances the unusual steps of public and vocal expression.

Indeed, the earliest known instance of such protest came even before the Siniavskii-Daniel trial as, on December 5, 1965, a small rally, the participants of which were largely students of the Institute of Literature named for A. M. Gor'kii, was held in front of the Pushkin Monument in Moscow, traditional gathering place for young people and the scene in previous years of a number of impromptu poetry readings. Many arrests followed. The authorities, clearly concerned lest the ideological bases of such a protest be made too public, attempted to present the meeting as merely an act of hooliganism and the defendants as nothing more than common street brawlers and disturbers of the peace whose acts tended to interfere with law and order, affect the flow of traffic and impede the proper function of government and industry. It seems, in fact, that it was the secret police and members of the Communist youth organizations who attacked the demonstrators and provoked a disturbance. The Moscow municipal court ignored the defense and on February 16, 1967, Viktor Khaustov, a factory worker, was condemned by the court to three years imprisonment. Though little is known about the circumstances of this trial it would seem that Khaustov was kept in custody far longer than should be the case according to the Soviet law on criminal procedure. At least, such detention beyond the legally permitted term has occurred with respect to others involved in such protests.

---

[40] For a discussion of the "search for truth" among 19th century writers, *see* Ronald Hingley. *Russian writers and society, 1825–1904*. New York, World University Library, McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1967, pp. 34–38.

This disregard of the rights of the accused was clearly evident in the next instance of prosecution of participants in this type of demonstration which became known outside of the Soviet Union. On September 19, 1967 there took place the nearly secret trial of three young Soviet writers, Vadim Delone, Eugene Kushev and Vladimir Bukovskii. The latter's arrest was in violation of the existing Soviet rules of procedure as was the fact that all three defendants were kept incommunicado for 7 months. The most significant feature of this trial was Bukovskii's final plea in which he quoted the Soviet constitution to the effect that "the citizens of the U.S.S.R. are guaranteed by law . . . the right of street processions and demonstrations," and asked, "Why is such an article included? For May Day and October demonstrations? But it is not necessary to include such an article for demonstrations that the government organizes—it is clear that no one will disperse these demonstrations. We do not need freedom 'pro' if there is no freedom 'anti.' We know that protest demonstrations are powerful weapons in the hands of the workers; this is an inalienable right in all democratic states. Where is this right denied? In Madrid, there was a trial of the participants of a May Day demonstration. They were tried under a new law recently passed in Spain that provides imprisonment from one and a half to 3 years for participation in demonstrations. I see a disturbing identity between fascist Spanish and Soviet legislation." At this point Bukovskii was interrupted by the judge to be told "you are comparing things that cannot be compared: the actions of the rulers of Spain and those of the Soviet state. In court the comparison of Soviet policy with the politics of foreign bourgeois states is intolerable." But he went on to charge the KGB [Komitet Gosudarstvennoi Bezopasnosti—Committee of State Security, the secret police] with dragging his case out for 7 months "to trump up some means of covering the traces of this unseemly business. When stalling finally became impossible, the proceedings about us were made so secret that nobody would be able to penetrate and convince oneself of their illegality. . . . We demonstrated in the defense of legality. . . . We protested against an unconstitutional decree." Despite further interruptions by the judge Bukovskii went on to say "Freedom of speech and the press is, first of all, freedom for criticism. Nobody has ever forbidden praise of the Government. If in the constitution there are articles about freedom of speech and of the press, then have the patience to listen to criticism." Though the judge declared a 5-minute recess, with the evident intent of interrupting the defendant's speech, and resumed with the warning that a further interruption would be made if the defendant continued to "criticize the laws and the activities of the KGB," Bukovskii further pointed to "another aspect. The question of honesty and civic integrity. You are judges. You are supposed to embody these qualities. If you actually embody honesty and integrity, you will make the only possible sentence in this case—a verdict of not guilty." At this point the prosecutor intervened, calling Bukovskii's criticism of the laws and of the activities of the organs of the KGB, a "new criminal act," and called upon the accused to speak only to the substance of the indictment. Firing back at the prosecutor with the statement that "you accuse us of trying . . . to discredit the KGB, but the KGB has discredited itself to such a degree that we have nothing to add," the defendant finished his state-

ment with a disavowal of any "repentance" for organizing the demonstration and the promise that, "when I am free again, I shall again organize demonstrations." [41]

It was as the result of an act of considerable courage that this plea became known outside of the Soviet Union. Pavel M. Litvinov, the 30-year-old grandson of Maxim Litvinov, Soviet Foreign Minister 1933–39 and Ambassador to Washington, 1941–43, undertook to reproduce and distribute the minutes of the trial, despite a warning by a representative of the KGB that if Litvinov did he would be held criminally responsible. The dialogue which followed revealed much about KGB methods of exercising pressure upon dissidents. Litvinov told the KGB representative, "I know the laws well and I cannot imagine what particular law would be transgressed by the composition of such a document," but was threatened with the possible application of Article 190 of the criminal code, which deals with "slanderous fabrications which would discredit the Soviet social system and regime." "What kind of slander," said Litvinov, "could there be in recording the hearing of a case before a Soviet court?" The KGB man insisted that "*Vecherniaia Moskva* (Evening Moscow, a Soviet newspaper) has printed all that the Soviet people should know about this case." With a further admonition to Litvinov, who was asked, "Could you possibly think that now, in the 50th year of Soviet power, a Soviet court would make a wrong decision?", he was told to go home, destroy all the material he had collected and, by implication, keep quiet.[42]

But Litvinov did not keep quiet for, within a few days of the publication abroad of his letter and of Bukovskii's plea, he took part in a further protest against another trial which partly grew out of the Siniavskii-Daniel affair. This was the case of four young people, Aleksandr Ginzburg, Iurii Galanskov, Aleksei Dobrovol'skii and Vera Lashkova, accused of having participated in "subversive activities" including ties with an émigré organization, the publication of an allegedly illegal magazine *Feniks 1966*, and compiling for transmission and publication abroad a "white book" on the Siniavskii-Daniel trial. Ginzburg and Galanskov pleaded not guilty. Dobrovol'skii, who turned state's evidence, admitted his guilt and testified for 5 hours against his fellow defendants. Lashkova, whose part in the matter under indictment seems to have been limited to typing manuscripts, pleaded guilty with extenuating circumstances. As the Western newspaper accounts of this trial reported, friends and relatives of the accused were interfered with by police as they attempted to enter the court, a photographer believed to be from the security police took pictures of persons in the groups outside the court building, and witnesses for the accused were heckled and evicted from the court before they could complete their testimony. Many other violations of fair procedure also characterized this trial.

Because of this mockery of justice Pavel Litvinov, together with Larissa Daniel, addressed a letter "to world public opinion," stating that the judge and prosecutor, "with the participation of a selected kind of 'public,' turned the trial sessions into a mockery of three of the defendants (Galanskov, Ginzburg, and Lashkova) and of the witnesses which ought to be unthinkable in the 20th century." The court,

---

[41] Bukovskii's final statement may be found in *Survey*, April 1968, pp. 133–134.
[42] Litvinov's letter to the Soviet press reporting this meeting is in *Survey*, April 1968, pp. 131–133.

so Litvinov and Mrs. Daniel stated, helped Dobrovol'skii build a case against the other three and refused the attorneys permission to put questions which would uncover Dobrovol'skii's role as an agent-provocateur. When witnesses for the defense brought forth unwished for evidence, the judge would order the question and reply stricken from the record. The courtroom was filled with a group made up of workers for the KGB, members of the volunteer militia (assistants to the regular militia or police force) who were allowed to insult the witnesses and defendants without interference by the judge. "In this heated atmosphere nothing can be said about any objectivity of the court or about justice and legality. . . . We appeal to world public opinion, to Soviet opinion first of all. We are appealing to all in whom there lives a conscience and a grain of daring. Demand a public castigation of this shameful trial and punishment of the guilty ones. . . . Demand a second hearing, with observance of all legal norms and in the presence of international observers."

Under Soviet circumstances, the next to the last paragraph of this letter, with its appeal that Soviet citizens take definite political action sounded a new and unaccustomed note in a land which has hitherto been used to hear only words of praise for those currently in authority. It is worth citing in full:

> Citizens of our country! This trial is a stain on the honor of our state and on the conscience of each of us. You yourselves elected this court, these judges; demand that they be deprived of the powers which they have misused. Today there is subject to danger not only the fate of the three accused—their trial is in no way better than the notorious trials of the 1930's which became so shameful and so bloody for all of us that we cannot to this day regain our balance.[43]

An interview between Litvinov and a correspondent of United Press-International which appeared in the American press of January 16 included a further important statement by Litvinov, "My protest is against illegality and injustice, but not against the political system," a point of view which was, at least by implication, to be found in a large number of documents which came from a wide segment of the Soviet intellectual classes during the following days and weeks, all protesting against the violations of Soviet legality which had occurred in the case of Galanskov, Ginzburg, and Lashkova.

There were, in the words of one American newspaper article, dozens of these protests circulating among intellectual circles not only in Moscow but elsewhere.

For sure they did not appear in the Soviet press, although quite a few were addressed specifically to the leading Soviet newspapers. However, the texts of some of these have been published in various news media outside the Soviet Union and upon examining them one finds that not only do the signatories give their full names, but often also include their occupations, addresses and telephone numbers, professional affiliations, and also the decorations and prizes awarded to them. For everyone who knows the Soviet milieu, such practices definitely indicate high civic courage.

In substance, though there are obvious variations in the choice of arguments, in style, tenor and temper, the demands presented by these documents are remarkably similar. The sources of discontent were basically the same and the typical motives for such protests are feelings of moral obligation to speak up and to defy evil, a deep concern

[43] An English text is in *Survey*, April 1968, pp. 135–137.

for the future of the Motherland, an elementary human reaction to abuse of moral standards by the men in power, and, looming over all, anxiety over the danger of being driven back to the intolerable days of Stalin's rule. All petitioners seem united by a burning desire to secure for themselves and their fellow citizens conditions and guarantees of a decent and dignified life.

In a democratic society the changes asked in these petitions could hardly be regarded as revolutionary. However, in view of the peculiar character of the Soviet state, they would, if implemented, have had a profound effect on the basic features and operations of the Soviet regime. Taking as the point of departure such traditional values of the Russian intelligentsia as truth, justice, honor, inner freedom, moral right, human dignity, courage, faith, and civic duty, the protestors pressed for redress of their grievances within the framework of the Soviet Constitution and the existing institutional order, the validity of which they did not question. In most instances the signers limited themselves to raising such fundamental issues as the necessity of having effective machinery and political will to carry out the constitutional guarantees, observance of due process of law through open and speedy trials, impartial selection of witnesses, full public airing of court proceedings, scrupulous application of law and public control of the courts. Protection of civil rights and especially the right of dissent, and the creation of honest and independent information media belong to the same category of demands. Specific steps to undo the injustice suffered by Galanskov and Ginzburg were asked, with punishment for all those who had violated socialist legality. Many of these documents also specifically criticized the KGB (Komitet Gosudarstvennoi Bezopasnosti) for its role in these trials, within a very short time, it should be noted, after the official celebration on December 20, 1967, of the 50th anniversary of the foundation of its predecessor, the Cheka.

It is, of course, not possible to comment on all these letters and petitions, but a number deserve some particular attention. This is especially the case with one of the longest and most eloquent, the product of the collaboration of three Soviet scholars, the most noteworthy of whom is Petr Ionich Iakir, a historian by profession, son of the General Iakir who was executed at Stalin's orders in 1937, and himself the survivor of 17 years in a Stalinist camp. The other two signatories are Il'ia Gabai, identified as teacher and editor, and Iulii Kim, a teacher. Their protest, addressed to those engaged in science, culture, and art—that is, in effect, to the Soviet intelligentsia as a whole—links a concern with the violations of legality which took place in the trial of Galanskov and the others with the larger question of "ominous symptoms of a restoration of Stalinism [which] have been evident in the life of our society. This is manifest most strikingly in revival of the most terrible acts of that era—through organization of harsh tribunals to judge people who have dared to defend their dignity and inner freedom, who have had the audacity to think and to protest."

Iakir, Kim, and Gabai emphasize further that the trial, with its "reliance on the base character of specially selected persons who have a drumhead logic: a loutish indifference to the fate of others and an emptyheadedness which demands neither information nor analysis of facts," was a "logical extension of the atmosphere of public life in recent years" in which "slowly, but remorselessly, the process of restoration of Stalinism is going on." The regime, with its interference

with the impartial portrayal of history, is castigated for its acts of censorship, its prohibition of works of literature and art, and for its deceit of the people. An appeal is made to the intellectuals of Russia to "raise your voices against the impending danger of new Stalins and Ezhovs [Commissar of the secret police during the purges of the 1930's]." One of the most telling sentences is: "We ask for little—for our society to have the *moral right* to protest the 6-month imprisonment of M. Theodorakis [a Greek composer accused by the present Greek government of Communist sympathies]." In other words, while the Soviet government holds men such as Siniavskii, Daniel, Bukovskii, and Galanskov in prison, it is immoral for it to complain of the activities of foreign governments.

The last paragraph is again a moving appeal:

> We again remind you that in the harsh conditions of hard labor camps people are languishing who dared to think. Every silence of yours is a stepping-stone for a new trial of a Daniel or a Ginzburg. Little by little with your tacit acquiescence, a new 1937 may come upon us.[44]

Although others of the letters and petitions which were written as a result of the Galanskov trial if taken singly do not seem so forceful and eloquent as this, they make a deep impression as a group and particularly since they are signed not by two or three persons, but by large groups of 78, 31, 170, 95, and so on. The major theme which they have in common is that of protest against the infractions of legality which were committed by the authorities in the course of the trial of Galanskov and Ginzburg. This concern is linked not only with the fate of the defendants in this and preceding trials, but also with a fear that, unless these infractions of law are brought to a halt, there might return the evil days of the Stalin era in which millions suffered the actions of arbitrary and unjust action by so-called courts. It is particularly noteworthy that many signatories of these petitions are by no means unknown or insignificant people, for in some documents almost every person is identified by a institutional affiliation or indication of academic posts or degrees. The letter of the 78, dated January 27, 1968, though it bears no name widely known outside the U.S.S.R., is signed by a number of persons who hold the Soviet degree of "kandidat filologicheskikh nauk" (Candidate of Philological Sciences, a degree approximately intermediate between American master's and doctor's degrees), by a senior member of the staff of Moscow State University, along with others identified merely as "bibliographer," "historian," "sociologist," etc. The protest of the 31, which was drawn up on the eve of the Galanskov-Ginzburg trial, includes the well known Soviet writers V. Aksenov and Bella Akhmadulina; Doctor of Physical-Mathematical Sciences, Laureate of the Lenin Prize, Corresponding Member of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. I.R. Shafarevich; Dr. Academician P. Novikov (both eminent mathematicians); V. Ivanov, a section head in the Institute of Slavic Studies of the Academy of Sciences; and so on. Indeed, when as an outgrowth of this wave of protests the Soviet authorities sent to a mental hospital the writer-mathematician Aleksandr Sergeevich Esenin-Volpin, son of the poet Sergei Esenin, 95 scholars spoke out in his favor, including a full member of the Academy of Sciences, six corresponding members, several recipients of the Lenin Prize, over 15 full professors, and many holding positions equivalent to associate

---

[44] An extended summary of this protest was printed in the *Washington Evening Star*, Feb. 13, 1968, pp. A–1, A–6.

and assistant professorships. However, other protests were signed by people who, unlike the academicians and professors mentioned above, did not have such signs of status and accomplishment which might to some degree protect them, and who occupied such relatively low ranking jobs in the Soviet system of things as a student in a teacher's training institution, the musical director of a kindergarten, a librarian, an employee in an airport, and "a mother of six children."

Some letters and petitions relating to the trial of Galanskov and his associates were signed by but one or two persons. They resemble the larger appeals in their common concern for justice and legality and often contain interesting and well-expressed reflections of what the writer feels to be the connection between this single instance of injustice and wider social problems. Perhaps the most thoughtful of all these, raising a number of questions which bear on the whole future of Soviet society, was that of Ivan A. Iakhimovich, a collective farm chairman of the Kraslava district in Latvia, once hailed by *Komsomol'skaia Pravda* as "honest and just," and "more concerned for the welfare of his community than he is for himself." Writing from his remote post he admits that he cannot on the basis of the information available to him judge the degree of guilt of the accused, "but of one thing I am firmly convinced and one thing I know—the type of trial that took place in the Moscow City Court, January 8–12, 1968, is causing enormous damage to our party and to the cause of communism, both in our country and elsewhere. We were naked, hungry, indigent, but we won because we placed in the foreground the liberation of man from injustice, outrage, lack of rights, etc., and we can lose everything, despite our rockets and hydrogen bombs, if we forget the origins of the Great October Socialist Revolution. From the time of Radishchev, the trials of writers have always been an abomination in the eyes of progressive, thinking people. What were our home-grown leaders thinking of when they shut Solzhenitsyn's mouth, made a fool of the poet Voznesenskii, 'punished' Siniavskii and Daniel with forced labor, involved the KGB in spectacles with 'foreign enemies.' One must not subvert the confidence of masses in the party; one must not speculate with the honor of the state, even if a certain leader wants to end 'samizdat' (Russian expression based on the words 'self' and 'publishing house' used to refer to the private circulation of manuscripts of—usually—nonconformist writings)."

After appealing to the Declaration of Human Rights, to the guarantees of the Soviet constitution, and to a quotation from Lenin to the effect that "truth should not depend upon the question of whom it should serve," Iakhimovich raises a more general question of the relationship between the regime and its restless young people in a paragraph which deserves quotation in full:

> I believe that the persecution of young dissenters in a country where more than 50 percent of the population is younger than 30 years of age is an extremely dangerous line—adventurism. It is not toadies, not a public of yes-men (O Lord, how they have multiplied!), not mama's boys who will determine our future, but rather those very rebels, as the most energetic, brave, and high-principled members of our young generation. It is stupid to see in them the enemies of Soviet power, and more than stupid to let them rot in prisons and make mock of them. For the party, such a line is equivalent to self-strangulation. Too bad for us if we are not capable of reaching an understanding with these young people. They will create, inevitably they will create, a new party. Ideas cannot be murdered with bullets, prisons or exile. He who does not understand this is no politician, no Marxist.

Himself quoting extensively from Palmiro Togliatti, the late Italian Communist leader, Iakhimovich criticizes "foot-dragging" which impedes freedom of discussion and utterance on questions of culture, art and politics, a "foot-dragging" which, he charges, benefits only "overt or covert Stalinists." He urges amnesty for Siniavskii and others, and punishment of the court officials for having allowed violations of legal procedure and, "primarily for acting like idiots and abusing their power." Those who act in this fashion are harming the Soviet regime more than all the efforts of the NTS [Narodno-Trudovoi Soiuz—Populist-Labor Union, an anti-Communist organization of Russians in exile], the BBC and Radio Liberty.

If, he concludes, a person such as he living in the provinces, "in an area where in winter the buses can't get through and the mail is late by whole weeks," finds disturbing information reaching him on such a wide scale, "you can well imagine what you have done, what kind of seeds you have sown throughout the country. Have the courage to correct the mistakes that have been made, before the workers and peasants take a hand in this affair." Because of this, Iakhimovich does not want his letter passed over in silence, for it concerns the Party's very reason for being and he insists that all the members of the Party Central Committee be acquainted with the contents of this letter. For this purpose, Iakhimovich addressed his letter to Mikhail A. Suslov, a member of the Politburo of the Party, as well as a man with a reputation for ideological rigidity.[45]

More than any other protest this one by the collective farm chairman must have put the Party on guard. The letter by Iakhimovich, as has been noted, raised the very important reminder that over half the Soviet population is under 30 years of age and stated that it was more than stupid to punish the young dissenters since the country needed their daring and creativity, a creativity, Iakhimovich warned, that might extend so far as to set up a new party. This problem of what current jargon calls the generation gap is one which markedly afflicts the Soviet Union, despite a curtain of official disclaimers, particularly since that country has long been in the control of a very small inner group who are, as the ritual photographs of the leaders assembled to review the May Day or November 7 parades will show, not young themselves and who do not have any evident understanding of the problems or needs of those among the young people who do not agree with the by now worn and outmoded tenets of the party.

Protests against the frightening revival of Stalinism are obviously the most embarrassing expression of this youthful dissent, especially if one keeps in mind that the majority of those 60-year-old members of the governing bodies who now make policy had their feet firmly on the ladder upwards in Stalin's time and were evidently tireless agents of his system. Thus, these petitions beginning with a simple appeal for justice to a few gradually and most uncomfortably widen in scope to take up the larger matter of those who are responsible for injustice and, by implication, to attack those holders of power who cannot forget the lessons learned 30 years ago and cannot learn the lessons of the present.

It is but an infinitesimal part of the Soviet population which has even heard of these petitions and protests, not to mention signing

---

[45] An English translation appeared in the *New York Times*, Mar. 8, 1968.

them, but the combination of a demand for simple justice and legality made by the exponents of the intelligentsia and of similar voices of persons who are somewhere in the Soviet equivalent of a lower middle class is new and perhaps rather unsettling to the leaders of the regime who have heretofore been free of the need to take the possibility of active political expression by this group into account. What is more important, perhaps, is that the present authorities have shown what can only be termed indecision in their dealings with this mood of disagreement among a part of the intellectuals and the Soviet youth. And the hesitation between the harsh application of Stalin-type measures and the pro forma observance of proper legality has served only to exacerbate the desire of many for the rule of law and has in some eyes created only the ironic situation of a vast and powerful government dithering in irresolution in the face of a relatively small and basically quite powerless body of poets, novelists and literary critics.

This should not, however, be taken as implying that in individual cases the regime has not acted with severity against single persons; still there seems to have been no really consistent policy other than that of reiteration of the repetitive and probably outworn adjurations to Soviet citizens to beware of the subversive ideological influence of the West which have affected a "few, immature seekers after sensation."

The Grievances Among the Writers: Solzhenitsyn, Voznesenskii, and Others

The preceding wave of dissent, as noted, had its origins in the Siniavskii-Daniel trial, and concerned the broad topics of justice and respect for law as well as mercy for those whose outcry the regime sought to silence. There is, however, another line of current protest which may be termed an appeal for artistic freedom more than for other forms of liberty. In view of the official insistence that art and literature serve—in the most direct sense of that word—the Party and state, in view of the fact that Stalin's words that "writers are engineers of the human soul," though no longer quoted, still echo, the striving of an artist to express his own point of view in his own manner is in itself an act with political overtones and any dissent for whatever reason is a counterproclamation.

In spite of official restrictions, some artists and writers in the Soviet Union manage to live useful lives and to produce works of integrity if not of greatness. Yet, it often happens that writers wish to discuss topics, to use methods, to mention events which do not fall within the official calendar of the accepted and permitted. As a result they must make their compromises, fall silent, or, if the creative impulse is too strong, write, as the Russian expression has it, "for the drawer," to be filed away against the day when a possible change in circumstances may allow its publication. Both under the imperial regime as under the Soviets, especially in recent years, there has also been the method of dissemination known as "samizdat" in which manuscripts of works which could not be published in the regular channels circulate from person to person. This is, of course, a procedure which requires that someone undertake the labor of making copies, which is not easy to do in a country where the authorities require the registration of every mimeograph and duplicating machine and in which the typewriter is

rather rare. In spite of this, such manuscripts are read by relatively large numbers of people and may, indeed, become well known in that form. As mentioned before, it has been the case that poets reading their own poems in public have found, if they forget a line, a chorus of prompters in the audience who have come to know these poems through their "samizdat" distribution.[46]

In some cases "samizdat" material is by young, unknown, and unorthodox writers whose efforts are perhaps a mixture of nonconformity with some immaturity, qualities which it would seem better to leave to the public to judge than to impose on the process the intervention of the authorities and of the Union of Soviet Writers, an organization best described as a labor union with the principal duty of setting up a closed shop for writers and allowing no one to practice that craft without a membership card.

Of the young writers quoted before, Iurii Galanskov, in addition to the other items in his indictment, was brought to trial as much for his part in the production of a "samizdat" literary review *Feniks—1966* as for his protests against the violation of legality. Although the anonymous critic of the (London) *Times Literary Supplement* considered this review "disappointing and amateurish," it published, as may be seen in the excerpts which appeared in the Russian language émigré journal *Grani*, many revealing documents and articles which either directly or by inference condemned the regime's intervention in the cultural life of the country.

However, this passing of manuscripts from hand to hand obviously cannot really replace actual, printed publication of materials and writers and artists naturally want their works to reach the widest possible public which may understand and appreciate them. In many instances, then, the efforts of the regime to control, in the very narrowest senses of that word, the output of literature and art has served to generate tension between the artist and the state. It is impossible at the distance which separates the United States and the Soviet Union and through the barriers imposed on the flow of information between the two countries to become aware of all such instances, but in one case, that of a writer of major stature, a comparatively large amount of documentation has become available.

This reference is to the writer Aleksandr Isaevich Solzhenitsyn, whose novel *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich*, referred to above, was a literary sensation in 1962–63. Only relatively few of Solzhenitsyn's works have been published in the Soviet Union, evidently both because his major themes tend to involve those "crimes of the period of the cult of personality" (i.e., of Stalin's time) which the regime would prefer to forget and because he embodies so very directly that traditional search for "pravda—justice" and "pravda—truth" which is so much a part of the essential history of Russian literature. Born in 1917, Solzhenitsyn fought in the Second World War, reaching captain's rank and being awarded the Order of the Fatherland War and Order of the Red Star. In the last winter of the war, as part of a unit fighting the Nazis in East Prussia, he was arrested for having written a letter with some anti-Stalin allegations and spent the next 8 years in concentration camps. This forms the basis for his novel. In early 1953 he was sent to Kazakhstan in central Asia on as-

[46] A German-language account of the "samizdat" phenomenon may be found in the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* of Sept. 10, 1967.

signed residence and only in 1956 was he permitted to return to European Russia. In 1962 *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* appeared in the Soviet journal *Novyi mir*, which has the reputation of being the most liberal of Soviet literary publications, but only, so rumor has it, after Khrushchev himself read the manuscript and approved its publication. Although this novel won immediate recognition and great critical praise, it also generated a great deal of controversy and marked the author in the eyes of the conservative guardians of literature as a person to be watched. Since that time only four short stories by Solzhenitsyn have appeared in the Soviet press, and each has occasioned further dispute.

Perhaps the most powerful of these four stories is his *Matrena's House*, which appeared in *Novyi mir* in January of 1963. It tells of an elderly peasant woman, a childless widow, poor and uneducated, but who has a warm and loving soul and is willing, even at great personal effort, to help those around her. In one instance in which she does so, in a senseless accident caused by a drunken relative, she is killed. Those who survive her, without noting her good qualities, are interested only in dividing her tiny inheritance, but the narrator, a person based on Solzhenitsyn himself, reflects in the last moving lines of the tale:

> We all lived beside her and did not understand that she was that just person [pravednik—a word based on the concept of *pravda*, also used by the Church of Russia to denote those saints whose sanctity was manifest in ordinary, daily and family life] without whom, according to the proverb, the village could not endure.
> Nor the city.
> Nor all our land.

Solzhenitsyn was attacked by many orthodox Soviet literary critics for thus glorifying backward, unprogressive old women, for ignoring the bright and progressive aspects of village life, for turning toward a false spirit of humanism and forgiveness, for failing to demonstrate an affirmative and optimistic outlook. This wave of criticism, which merged with the reaction to *One Day* . . . , was quite clearly a factor which influenced the practical closing to Solzhenitsyn of the pages of the Soviet press, even of the journal *Novyi mir* which is significantly more willing to take risks than are other publications. One further short story appeared in 1963 and nothing else until January of 1966.

Even if these four short stories and one novel were all that Solzhenitsyn had ever written, they would continue to be noteworthy contributions to Russian literature, but he continued to write. Information from Russian intellectual circles indicated that he was busy on at least another novel and some plays, and from time to time rumors indicated that his novel *Rakovyi korpus* (Cancer ward) would appear. However, nothing happened and at last, in a letter dated May 16, 1967 addressed to the Fourth National Congress of Soviet Writers, Solzhenitsyn raised his voice not merely to complain about his personal situation but also about the hindrances imposed on many other authors by a censorship "not provided for by the Constitution and therefore illegal and nowhere publicly labeled as such," which imposes "a yoke on our literature and gives people who are unversed in literature arbitrary control over writers." Because of this, "Works that might have expressed the mature thinking of the people, that might have timely

and salutary influence on the realm of the spirit or on the development of a social conscience are prohibited or distorted by censorship on the basis of considerations that are petty, egotistic and, from the national point of view, shortsighted."

Solzhenitsyn notes that in many cases "troublesome writers" are returned to the public only after death "with an annotation 'explaining his errors.' For a long time, the name of Pasternak could not be pronounced out loud, but then he died, and his books appeared and his verses are even quoted at ceremonies.

"Pushkin's words are really coming true: 'They are capable of loving only the dead.'

"Literature that is not the air of its contemporary society, that dares not pass on to society its pains and fears, that does not warn in time against threatening moral and social dangers, such literature does not deserve the name of literature; it is only a façade. Such literature loses the confidence of its own people, and its published works are used as waste paper instead of being read."

Such a situation has, Solzhenitsyn writes, lost for Russian literature that leading position which it once held in the world, and made it appear "something infinitely poorer, flatter, and lower than it actually is, than it would appear if it were not restricted, hemmed in."

He proposed that the Writer's Congress adopt a resolution "that would demand and insure the abolition of all censorship, overt or hidden, of all fictional writing and release publishing houses from the obligation of obtaining authorization for the publication of every printed page."

At the same time he went on to criticize the record of the Union of Soviet Writers for having failed to come to the defense of persecuted Soviet writers; in fact, it "through its leadership was always first among the persecutors." "The leadership of the union cowardly abandoned to their distress those for whom persecution ended in exile, camps, and death." Here Solzhenitsyn lists a number of such persons, including Osip Mandel'shtam, Isaak Babel', and Boris Pil'niak, "and others. The list must be cut off at 'and others.' We learned after the 20th Congress of the Party that there were more than 600 writers whom the union had obediently handed over to their fate in prisons and camps."

The roll, he writes, is even longer, for it should also include the young writers and poets "whose talents were crushed in camps before being able to blossom, whose writings never got further than the offices of the state security service . . ."

Continuing, Solzhenitsyn asks that the congress consider the interdictions and persecutions to which he himself had been subjected. His novel *In the First Circle* was taken away from him by the security forces, thus preventing him submitting it to the publishers. However, a "closed" edition has been made for reading by "a selected unidentified circle," and he has been unable to prevent its misuse and plagiarism. His literary archives, containing many things not intended for publication, have been taken and tendentious selections are being circulated. A campaign of slander is being waged against him in relation to his wartime conduct, accusing him of having "served the Germans," and secret meetings addressed by persons in official positions are held to spread this slander. During the past year, despite his pro-

tests, the campaign has intensified and become more vicious, "making use of distorted materials from my confiscated files, and I have no way of replying."

Solzhenitsyn's novel *The Cancer Ward* cannot be published in the Soviet Union, either in full or by installments, nor have his stories been reprinted in book form in that country. He has further been prevented from holding public readings. "Even the simple act of giving a manuscript away for 'reading and copying' has now become a criminal act, and this the ancient Russian scribes were permitted to do.

"My work has thus been finally smothered, gagged, and slandered.

"I am, of course," he concludes, "confident that I will fulfill my duty as a writer under all circumstances, from the grave even more successfully and more unchallenged than in my lifetime. No one can bar the road to the truth, and to advance its cause I am prepared to accept even death. But, maybe, many lessons will finally teach us not to stop the writer's pen during his lifetime. At no time has this ennobled our history." [47]

This forthright letter, reportedly laboriously typed out in sufficient copies that one could be sent to each member of the Congress of Soviet Writers, caused a turmoil at the congress, which was intended to be "an exercise in public amicability," and not to "irritate the sores of cultural politics, but produce platitudes about the coming anniversary." On the surface, and as far as the published report went, this was true. That was, in fact, the cause for some criticism even by Mikhail A. Sholokhov, winner of the Stalin Prize, winner of the Nobel Prize, and proponent of lynch law for Siniavskii and Daniel, who in his speech of May 26 expressed "some misgivings about our literary leadership's unconcealed desire to steer the congress through without touching any sharp corners." [48]

But as if in partial answer to Solzhenitsyn, at the same time Sholokhov went on to attack those calling for freedom of the press in the Soviet Union, making it clear that he considered all such appeals to freedom the work of "uninvited cheerleaders, who include the CIA of the United States of America, some Senators, rabid White Guards, the defector Alliluyeva and the notorious Kerensky, who has long been a political corpse." Sholokhov bolstered his argument by quoting Lenin's reply to a plea for freedom of the press, "We laugh at 'pure democracy'."

Behind the scenes, however, it is reported that Solzhenitsyn's stand became a "test of principles and ideals for the literary community outweighing tactical considerations." [49]

Among the strongest expressions of support for Solzhenitsyn was a frank and challenging letter from the poet Pavel Antokol'skii addressed across the congress walls to P.N. Demichev, Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, calling Solzhenitsyn "a writer of rare talent, a man of growing promise for our realist literature, and

---

[47] Solzhenitsyn's letter appeared in the *New York Times*, June 5, 1967.

[48] A possible explanation for such a yearning for quiescence was provided later in Sholokhov's speech as he stated that at the first writers' congress [in 1934] "71 percent of the delegates were under 40; at the second [1954] only 20 percent, at the third [1959], 13.9 percent; and now, at this congress, only 12.2 percent of the total are under 40 . . . . The average age of the delegates to this congress, which is near 60, makes a rather sad impression." In other words, the average delegate would be a writer whose formative years coincided with the rise of Stalin to complete power and whose prime of life would have passed before anyone ever dared suggest that there might be more to literature than the cardboard and plaster of Paris concoctions of socialist realism. The text of Sholokhov's speech appeared in *Pravda*, May 26, 1967, p. 2, and in English in the *Current Digest of the Soviet Press*, vol. 19, No. 21 (June 14, 1967) : pp. 20–21.

[49] U.S.S.R. : *Literature, Culture* (Radio Free Europe), Aug. 11, 1967 : p. 3.

heir to the great humanistic tradition of Gogol, Tolstoi, and Gor'kii. . . . Confiscating his manuscripts, as described in detail in his letter, appears to be an incredible abuse, which is unworthy of our socialist society and our Soviet state. . . . Is this kind of seizure of our writers' manuscripts to become a legalised custom? . . .

"I have been working as a writer—continued Antokol'skii—for 50 years. I have behind me many books and my whole life, and I have been through many difficult moments. There were times when I had great fears for the fate of our literature and the fate of individual comrades: Bulgakov, Pasternak, Titian Tabidze—I recall these because they were close to me.

"Having lived such a life, I just cannot imagine that at the end of my days this kind of fear should arise again, and that it should happen on the eve of our great and famous anniversary.

"If a Soviet writer felt compelled to address to his fellows such a letter as that of Solzhenitsyn, it means that we have all to bear responsibility before him and before our readers. If he cannot say what he wants to say to the readers in our country, then I, an old writer, have no right to face the readers either." [50]

There was added to the voice of the deeply concerned 72-year-old Antokol'skii that of a man of a different generation, the 37-year-old Georgii N. Vladimov—whose first publication seems to have been his review in *Novyi mir* in 1954 of J. D. Salinger's *The Catcher in the Rye*. Vladimov sent his letter to the President of the Writer's Congress, in which he used the Solzhenitsyn case to call in general for "freedom of creativity." A "complete and unlimited freedom to express any opinion in the sphere of the social and moral life of the people—no matter what harsh words we may have to bear," he insisted, "this is a legitimate demand of any artist who is in the least an honorable, thinking person. Without it, he is a bureaucrat in the agency of elegant words who repeats the butt-ends of newspaper editorials; with it, he is a herald, a prophet in his own country, able to exercise a moral influence on his reader, to develop his social conscience, or to warn him of a danger before it is incarnate and has grown into a national tragedy."

Vladimov goes on to say "such freedom does exist. It is realized, only not in the sphere of officially recognized, censored literature, but in the activity of the so-called Samizdat about which you all, most probably, are informed. From hand to hand, from reader to reader there pass in the form of seventh or eighth carbon copies the unpublished works of Bulgakov, Tsvetaeva, Mandel'shtam, Pil'niak, Platonov, and others, who are still living—whose names I do not give for fully understandable reasons.[51]. . .

". . . This process of the liberation of art from any kind of 'guiding directives' is developing and expanding and to withstand it," he warned, "is as foolish and useless as prohibiting alcohol and tobacco.

"It is better to note this: there are clearly two forms of art coming to light. One is free and unconstrained, as it ought to be, and its distribution and influence are dependent only on its genuine artistic merits. The other is orderly and well paid but oppressed in one degree or an-

---

[50] Antokol'skii's letter appears in *Survey,* April 1968, pp. 135–137.

[51] Mikhail A. Bulgakov (1891–1940), novelist and playwright whose works were severely censored under Stalin; Marina I. Tsvetaeva (1892–1941), poet who spent years in emigration, returned to Russia and committed suicide; Osip E. Mandel'shtam (1891–1939/40), poet, died in a concentration camp; Boris Pil'niak (1894–?), novelist, died in a concentration camp; Andrei Platonov (1896–1951), novelist and short story writer, severely censored during the Stalin era.

other, hemmed in, and at times even maimed by all sorts of torturers of the children of one's thought, the first of whom on the author's path is his own 'internal editor'—indeed the most frightening one, for he kills the child while it is still in the womb. Which of these two arts will win is not difficult to foresee. And, willy-nilly, even now a choice must be made as to which side we will take, which of them we will support and defend."

After openly disclosing that he had read many samizdat publications and found them deserving of publication, as revealing true artistry, Vladimov turns to Solzhenitsyn's writings, almost all the unpublished portions of which he has read. Solzhenitsyn is there referred to as "a writer whom my Russia needs now above all, who is destined to glorify it in the world and to give answer to us concerning all those painful questions of the tragedy which we have suffered. . . . Let it not be said to this congress in insult, but probably nine-tenths of its delegates will scarcely carry their names over the threshold of our century. Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, however, the pride of Russian literature, will carry his name further." Is it not, Vladimov writes, the duty of the congress to defend and guard this writer from all the vicissitudes of his individual situation?

It is painful and shameful to read of the slander which Solzhenitsyn has been subjected to, of the searches and confiscations of his files. Especially, he said, when this is carried on in a proletarian state, on the 50th anniversary of the Revolution. "Only the courage to declare the writer 'an enemy of the people' was lacking—after all, this would be a bandit's barefaced procedure, to which we have certainly been accustomed—but no, they used the method of denunciations . . . they spread rumors in an underhand fashion in order to compromise the writer in the eyes of his readers . . . Such a paradox has not thus far been seen in the history of demagogy—official public organizations spread anonymous rumors about an honorable man! Why even Chaadaev was declared insane on the emperor's orders, and then in an open manner."

"And this is what I want to ask the plenary congress—are we a nation of scum, informers, and compilers of denunciations, or are we a great nation which has given the world an incomparable constellation of geniuses? Solzhenitsyn will fulfill his task. I believe this as firmly as he does himself." But, Vladimov asks, has Solzhenitsyn been helped to defend himself from this onslaught of censorship, searches, confiscations?

"Solzhenitsyn's letter has already become a document over which it is impossible to pass in silence, a silence unworthy of serious artists. I propose to the congress that it discuss this letter in open session, take a new and unequivocal decision on it, and present this decision to the government of the country." [52]

As far as the official proceedings of the Congress went, Solzhenitsyn's plea fell on deaf ears. However, it was reported that 82 Soviet writers, of the 6,500 members of the writers' union, including Evtushenko and Tvardovskii, petitioned the Central Committee of the Party in favor of Solzhenitsyn. The poet Andrei Voznesenskii proposed that an edition of Solzhenitsyn's published works be issued in one volume and that a committee of writers be set up to examine his

[52] A Russian text of Vladimov's letter appears in the émigré periodical *Posev,* April 1968, pp. 16–18.

unpublished and rejected manuscripts.[53] As later discussion will show, Voznesenskii suffered reprisals, of a particularly petty kind, for this boldness.

In the months which followed Solzhenitsyn himself was made the object of a wide-scale campaign of denigration by the Party establishment. In October of 1967, M. V. Zimianin, editor of *Pravda*, speaking at a meeting in Moscow, called him psychically abnormal, a schizophrenic, a man with but one theme, that of the concentration camps, and said that his works were directed against the Soviet regime, in which he saw nothing save plague and cancerous tumors. Zimianin also included the poets Evtushenko and Voznesenskii in his anger—the first because he had answered criticism in a closed session by Pavlov, secretary of the Central Committee of the Komsomol by a published poem; the second, because of his criticism of the Union of Soviet Writers, as we shall see later, over a controversy which arose from the Solzhenitsyn affair.

In November Solzhenitsyn again wrote to the secretariat of the Union of Soviet Writers asking that he be protected against this campaign of slander, that the prohibition on publication of his works be lifted, in particular that his novel *Rakovyi korpus* (Cancer ward) be published in the Soviet Union in order to blunt the effects of a publication abroad on the basis of manuscripts, possibly incomplete, which had become available there, that an end be put to the circulation of excerpts from his confiscated files which were not intended for publication, and that his files be returned. The chief result of this came when, after long delay, clearly because of a controversy on the subject, the December 1967 issue of *Novyi mir* appeared in early February 1968 without the promised first installment of *Rakovyi korpus*.

A later development in the Solzhenitsyn affair was the announcement in the *New York Times* of April 26, 1968, that an American publisher was planning to issue a translation of *Rakovyi korpus* in July. The article on this subject indicated that a number of copies of the manuscript were circulating in publishing circles in Europe. A week later the *New York Times* reported that Solzhenitsyn had protested plans for publication of this work outside the Soviet Union, stating that "our works of literature should be permitted publication in our own country, and not given for the profit of foreign publishing houses." This same dispatch reported a high degree of strain on the topic in Moscow literary circles, with the leading Soviet novelist Veniamin Kaverin accusing Konstantin Fedin, head of the writers' union, with personal responsibility for the banning of Solzhenitsyn's novel. "Is it possible," wrote Kaverin scornfully, "that you do not understand that the publication of 'The Cancer Ward' would relax the unprecedented tension in our literature, that it would dissipate undeserved suspicion toward our literature and would open the door to other books that would enrich our literature?"[54]

Subsequently in mid-May, the first American publisher announced that, in order to prevent possible harmful consequences to Solzhenitsyn by those who might seek to turn the fact of publication in the United States against him, the American edition would not appear. This did not, however, prevent the complete novel from being available to those

---

[53] Kunitz, Stanley. The other society inside Russia. *New York Times Magazine,* Aug. 20, 1967: p. 24.

[54] A Russian text of this letter appeared in the New York newspaper *Novoye Russkoye Slovo,* May 29, 1968.

reading Russian, for copies in that language, printed by an Italian publisher, bearing only "Anonim" (anonymous) in place of the author's name, were offered for sale in the United States. In addition, a long excerpt in English appeared in the (London) *Times Literary Supplement* of April 11, 1968.

During June it was announced that another American publisher was proceeding with plans to issue not only *Cancer Ward* but also another of Solzhenitsyn's novels, *In the First Circle.*

It is clear that Solzhenitsyn's vicissitudes are not finished. Late in June 1968, the Soviet official attitude toward Solzhenitsyn was further underlined by a vitriolic article in *Literaturnaia gazeta* calling him "a tool of the West," and accusing him of allegedly having praised war-time "traitors" to the Soviet cause. Further, there are rumors that he is the object of an official campaign which has even included the circulation outside the Soviet Union of manuscripts of his writings specially edited by the agencies of the Soviet security forces in order to heighten their anti-Soviet content, so that, if published in the West, it can be said in the Soviet Union, "Of course we wouldn't want to publish that. You can see for yourself from this foreign copy what a slanderous product it is."

The case of Solzhenitsyn, incidentally an ill man—*Cancer Ward* is said to reflect his own struggles with the ailment—is not an isolated phenomenon. Another Russian writer who found himself in difficulties because of his strivings for self-expression and because of his support of Solzhenitsyn's letter to the writers' congress was the poet Andrei Voznesenskii. One of the younger generation of Soviet writers, a poet of great talent, a skilled reader of his own works, and a man who had previously rather tended to avoid the more public forms of controversy in which another young poet, Evgenii Evtushenko, had so often and, fundamentally, so equivocally engaged, Voznesenskii was announced as booked to read his poems in an arts festival at Lincoln Center in New York on June 21, 1967. He was however, prevented from doing so by the Union of Soviet Writers, clearly in retaliation for his views on Solzhenitsyn, though an attempt was made to present the matter as an outgrowth of the worsening of the international situation at the time of the Arab-Israeli War of June 1967. On June 22, Voznesenskii wrote to *Pravda* a bitter attack on the writers' union for having prevented the trip and for having used the clumsy lie that he was ill at a time when, he states, "I have been working, taking part in functions organized by the Union of Writers, going to the theater, receiving foreign writers at the request of the Novosti agency, only to learn that for 3 days now the Union of Writers has been telling journalists that I am seriously ill. Of course, the leaders of the Union of Writers must know what they are talking about, but why haven't they at least informed me that I am sick?" He went on to write, "Clearly the leadership of the union does not regard writers as human beings. This lying, prevarication and knocking people's heads together, is standard practice. This is what they do to many of my comrades. Letters to us often do not reach us, and sometimes replies are sent in our name. What boors, what chameleons they are! We are surrounded by lies, lies, lies, bad manners, and lies. I am ashamed to be a member of the same union as these people. That is why I am writing to your newspaper, which is called 'Truth' (Pravda)."

Although, as may be expected, Voznesenskii's letter was not published, he did manage to bring his views to the attention of a part of the public. On July 2, 1967, at the end of a poetry reading in the Teatr na Taganke (Theater on Taganka Square) in Moscow, he read a poem which lashed out at the way in which in the Soviet Union the sense of shame had been lost, even over situations such as:

> . . . when the King of the country
> pauses before taking off a shoe
> at a public session,
> and wonders anxiously:
> "Hell, I remember washing one of my feet yesterday,
> but which: the right or the left?"

Then he went on more specifically to refer with scorn to:

> You so-called "intelligentsia",
> caught in the tissue of your lies,
> You read Herzen,[55]
> while you bare your backside for the lash.[56]

Not, as far as is now known, penalized directly for this poem or the letter, Voznesenskii was criticized by Zimianin, editor of *Pravda*, for having allegedly given a copy of his letter to Western journalists. Zimianin is quoted as saying, "I told him that he might get off with a reprimand the first time. But if he ever did it again, he would be ground to dust. I myself would see to it that not a trace of him remained."

While not a part of the Solzhenitsyn case, the situation in which Iurii Vladimirovich Mal'tsev found himself was quite similar as he petitioned N. V. Podgornyi, Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., for permission to emigrate from the Soviet Union, since he has been "deprived of the possibility of working in my chosen field in this country." His argument ran as follows: "Soviet editors refuse to publish my novelettes, stories, and articles in the form in which I write them, with those ideas, opinions, and sentiments which I express in them. They either completely reject them or tell me that if I wish to have them published I must redo them to conform with the orders of the editors, that is, in conformity with the demands of official Soviet ideology and in conformity with the Party directives. But I am not a Communist and I am not a Marxist and I do not wish to obey the orders of the Communist Party or, expressed in your language, its directing orders and its 'resolutions on questions of art.' It disgusts me to see how they wish to lower literature to the level of primitive propaganda, as if it isn't the most unnatural thing for art to be forced to serve politics and the official ideology. And, in this regard, I completely make common cause with the Italian Communists who, in regard to this question, have for a number of years been engaged in a dispute with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on the pages of *Unità*, *Contemporaneo* and *Rinascità*, defending the autonomy of art, its independence of politics and party programs, and proclaiming tolerance toward those who are differently minded." This daring quotation is taken from a letter which Mal'tsev wrote in 1966 midway in his campaign to secure permission to leave the country, a campaign beginning in 1964 and still continuing. He is

---

[55] Alexander Herzen (1812–70), Russian émigré writer, critic and revolutionary, unsparing in his criticism of the imperial regime.

[56] Voznesenskii's letter and poem may be found in the *New York Times*, Aug. 11, 1967.

by education a student of languages, specializing in Italian, and his work experience has included the publication of translations from that language on movies and the theater as well as acting as guide for Italian actors and theatrical workers visiting the U.S.S.R. Although he cited in support of his plea the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as he noted in a letter of early 1968 addressed to U Thant, Secretary General of the United Nations, the Soviets, though protesting about alleged violations, for example in Greece, do not admit that it applies also to Mal'tsev and keep him in the Soviet Union: "Therefore, in a country where the obligatory principle of the Communist Party line in the arts is proclaimed, —he sadly concludes—I am condemned to spiritual extinction." [57]

It is, of course, difficult to judge Mal'tsev's place in the world of the arts, for he is not the novelist Solzhenitsyn nor poet Voznesenskii, but he has every right to say, in the words of the poet and editor of *Novyi mir*, Aleksandr Tvardovskii, writing in the monthly *Iunost'* (Youth—a literary periodical with particular appeal to young people and with the largest circulation of any literary publication in the Soviet Union):

I myself inquire and find
All my own mistakes.
I shall remember them
Without a given libretto.
There is no sense—I am a grown man—
In laughable self-defense.
But, please, don't hang on my soul,
Don't breathe down my neck.

In spite of his year long efforts Mal'tsev failed to obtain permission to leave his country legally. On the other hand, one Soviet writer, A. Belinkov, who in the past has spent thirteen years of his life in Soviet prisons and camps, together with his wife, recently succeeded in escaping and securing freedom abroad. As a literary critic he is best known for his widely acclaimed biography of Iurii Tynianov and for his work devoted to another writer, Olesha. In his self-imposed exile, Belinkov directed a passionate "J'accuse" to the Board of the Union of Soviet Writers culminating in his resignation from the Union, which he denounced for having become an integral part of the existing police state. This made it necessary for the Writers' Union to "destroy everything born of brilliance, since brilliance cannot tolerate evil."

Belinkov's letter further contained a frontal attack on the whole Soviet establishment, which in his words is "incorrigible and incurable; it can only be what it is: vindictive, intolerant, capricious, arrogant, and clamorous." Indeed, "in such a state there can be no other kind of politician (than the present rulers)." Fear seems to permeate the actions of the government and party and it has thus become one of the chief characteristics of the regime. "The Soviet leaders are afraid. Afraid of that bright young man Khaustov, who was emboldened to tell the dragons and porcupines of the Soviet court that he had rejected the Soviet creed (Marxist-Leninism); they are afraid of the marvelous artist of Russia, Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn; they are afraid of America, afraid of China, afraid of Polish students and recalcitrant Czechoslovaks; they are afraid of Yugoslav revisionists, Albanian dogmatists, Rumanian nationalists, Cuban extremists, and East German

[57] The Russian text of Mal'tsev's letters was published in *Novyi zhurnal* (New York), No. 90, 1968, pp. 271–278.

dolts; they fear the wily foxes of North Korea, the workers of Novocherkassk who rose and were shot down, the prisoners of Vorkuta who rose and were shot down from airplanes, and the prisoners of Ekibastuz who were crushed by tanks; they fear the Crimean Tatars who were driven from their homeland, and the Jewish physicists who were driven from their laboratories; they fear the hungry peasants and the shoeless workers; they fear each other and each even fears himself, they fear themselves jointly and separately." [58]

Plight of the Ukrainians

The intellectual ferment in the Soviet Union is not limited solely to the inhabitants of the Soviet capital. In some parts of the country it is further aggravated by a search for group identity on the part of members of the many nationalities included in the population. Nowhere is this more clearly visible than among the Ukrainian people. Numbering over 40 million, having a long history of striving to avoid Russifying influences, and possessing a rich literature and cultural tradition of their own conveyed in a language related to but quite distinct from Russian, the Ukrainians reflect the double strains of attempting to preserve their heritage and of resisting arbitrary acts of authority which violate the stated provisions of the law and the constitution. There are many extensive accounts of the development of the Ukrainian nation to which one may refer for the historical background of that nation's present situation, and all that can be done here is to examine a few recent documents which show that the Ukraine is also the scene of ferment based on lines of thought very similar to those noted above as being found among Russian intellectuals, but with the added factor of a resistance to cultural assimilation.

On April 17, 1966, the *New York Times* reported the arrest of two Ukrainian literary critics, Ivan Svitlychnyi and Ivan Dzyuba, evidently for "their spirited defense of young Ukrainian poets against attempts by the Soviet literary bureaucracy to impose conformity." Information from other sources suggest that there was in addition a protest by many young people in the Ukraine against Russification and centralization, with a consequent undermining of Ukrainian culture. It also became known that since the summer of 1965, there had been arrests among Ukrainian writers, artists and students, with at least 70 persons being detained. A long manuscript by Ivan Dzyuba, who was reportedly released without being brought to trial, based on these events has become available outside the Soviet Union and is reported soon to be published in English. Bearing the title *Internationalism or Russification? A Study of the Soviet Nationality Policy* it takes up in great detail the problems which Ukrainian intellectuals have faced in attempting to preserve a national basis for their culture despite a centralizing and Russifying policy of the government in Moscow.

Although Dzyuba did not come to trial, others were less fortunate. Beginning in January 1966, in Lutsk, Ivano-Frankivsk, Ternopil', and Lviv, trials were held with violations of Soviet legality very similar to those in the Galanskov-Ginzburg case, and the defendants were charged with writing, copying, and spreading articles dealing with

[58] The Russian text of Belinkov's protest appeared in *Novoye Russkoye Slovo,* July 20, 1968.

the state of Ukrainian culture in the Soviet Union, and with disseminating books and other material unfavorable to the Soviet regime, including a speech by former President Eisenhower at the dedication of the statue of the Ukrainian poet Taras Shevchenko in Washington. It was the defendants' contention that they were not enemies of the Soviet state per se but merely were seeking equal rights for the Ukrainian population. In one trial the defendants' refusal to participate in proceedings carried on only in the Russian language, indeed, succeeded in bringing the judge and prosecuting attorney to relent on this point. Other experiences were, however, much less promising. It is reported that in Lviv the crowd outside the courthouse on the day of sentencing had to be dispersed with the use of fire hoses. Sentences ranged from 8 months to 6 years.

One of those punished was Svyatoslav Karavansky, a journalist, poet and translator from Odessa who had already been sentenced in 1944 to 25 years in the camps, but who had been released after serving half of his term. On April 10, 1966, evidently at the time of his return to the concentration camp without trial, Karavansky petitioned the President of the Council of Nationalities of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., calling for correction of "abuses resulting from the Stalinist cult of personality—abuses which even today restrict and undermine friendly relations between the nations of the U.S.S.R." He called for action to do away with various forms of discrimination which prevented the Ukrainians, Jews, Tatars, Volga Germans, Estonians, and Latvians, from enjoying a free cultural life or from living in their native homelands. Writing with detailed and thorough knowledge of Ukrainian conditions, Karavansky refers to many instances in which natives of that republic have been exiled to distant regions of the U.S.S.R. and forbidden to return, although the Soviet Union, he notes, signed in 1948 the International Convention on Human Rights which refers to the right of people to move about freely within a given country." [59]

The circumstances surrounding the arrest and trial of these Ukrainian intellectuals, and the imprisonment without trial of Karavansky, moved another Ukrainian writer to a spirited protest against the violation of Soviet legality which may be compared with those raised by Bukovskii and Ginzburg. He wrote:

> You are indifferent to human tragedies, to the demoralizing action of fear which creeps like a cold serpent into many a Ukrainian home. Your only concern allegedly is to see that the law is upheld. Therefore, let us take a look at what is presently going on in the Ukraine, from the point of view of socialist legality. There is ample evidence today from which to draw proper conclusions. I submit my opinions not because I have any hope of alleviating the plight of the individuals who were sentenced and imprisoned. You have taught people not to foster any such naive hopes. However, failure to express one's view about what is happening would indicate silent participation in the willful abuse of socialist legality.

This writer is Vyacheslav Chornovil, a 30-year-old literary critic and journalist, who thus addressed the Ukrainian court and police authorities. This protest, together with biographical data which he gathered about some 20 Ukrainian defendants in these cases and a covering letter to Petro Yu. Shelest, Secretary of the Central Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party, has become available in

---

[59] This petition appeared in the *New Leader,* Jan. 15, 1968, pp. 12–15.

the West in a Ukrainian edition and an English translation has been announced.

Chornovil describes with compassion the way in which dozens of young Ukrainian intellectuals were "deported to Mordovia in 1966 to weave shopping bags or make stools," by servants of the state, "many of whom still have dirty hands from the 'good old days under Stalin.'" All that these young people had sought to do was, he says in his petition to Shelest, to "persistently refuse to call white that which is black." Efforts to make them do so would be a revival of Stalinism and "they are—and I say this with full conviction—anti-Soviet in their essence."

However, Chornovil, like Bukovskii and Ginzburg, was punished for raising his voice in favor of human rights and against arbitrary acts veiled under a pretense of preserving socialist legality, for it is reported that in November of 1967 he was sentenced to 3 years forced labor, with a reduction of 18 months in that term as representing the time he had spent in confinement prior to trial. This would indicate that Chornovil also had been deprived of his right to a speedy trial and subjected to a further violation of Soviet legality, for the Ukrainian criminal code specifies that the accused must be brought to trial within 3 months (Articles 120, 156, Code of Criminal Procedure, Ukrainian S.S.R.).

The fate of those Ukrainians who, like Chornovil, were consigned to the camps in the Mordovian A.S.S.R., one of the autonomous republics of the R.S.F.S.R. located to the east of Moscow and approximately 350 miles from any point in the Ukraine, is described with bitter knowledge by one of these Ukrainian intellectuals, Valentyn Moroz, sentenced in a trial in Lutsk in January 1966. His petition to the deputies of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet bears the title of "A Report from the Beria Reserve," and conveys his conviction that "if we follow the paths along which the KGB came into our existence to the end, we will find ourselves in the nightmarish density of Stalinist jungles." Members of the KGB apparatus "proudly consider themselves descendants of Stalin. Captain Krut, who is the representative of the Ukrainian KGB in the Mordovian camps, said to me: 'What have you got against Stalin? Of course, there were certain shortcomings, but on the whole, he deserves high praise.'" [60]

Moroz goes on to provide additional instances of the continuation of a Stalinist mentality among the KGB, but notes that it does not end there, for the "empire of cogs" which Stalin erected still remains in being so long as the "programmed man" exists and individualism is so nearly extinct that, as Moroz quotes the German poet Bertolt Brecht,

> **The sheep quickly step into line**
> **Beating drums.**
> **Hides are given them**
> **By sheep themselves.**

However, he confidently states that a new generation is entering into life and it poses "a completely new problem for the defenders of Stalinist order. 'Order' was maintained on the basis that the people themselves rejected all rights and reconciled themselves to lawlessness. As a result it was possible to promise everything, knowing in advance

---

[60] An English translation appeared in *Voices of Human Courage* (New York, Association for a Free Ukraine, 1968), pp. 37–57.

that it would not be necessary to deliver. Now a new generation came which stated: 'The Constitution mentions freedom of speech and we want to abide by it.' This kind of variant was unforeseen. Suddenly it looked as if the model rifle prepared for display can shoot. . . . The present events in Ukraine are also a turning point: the glacier of terror which had firmly bound the spiritual life of the nation for many years is breaking up. As always they put people behind bars and as always deport them to the East. But this time these people did not sink into obscurity. To the great surprise of the KGB, for the first time in the last decade public opinion has risen: for the first time the KGB felt powerless to stifle all this."

But, Moroz continues, the KGB still wishes revenge, revenge on those already in its hands, and so the concentration camp "is the only place where the KGB can dispense absolutely with all laws and norms. This is the place where it continues to forge terror. Its main efforts are directed at destroying the human element in man: only then does he become putty which can be shaped into whatever form is desired. A prisoner may not break the laws of the regime in any way, but if the KGB feels that he has not submitted, that he has not yet accepted evil as his normal state, and that he has preserved his dignity, it will put pressure on him in various ways. Only when it is convinced that a man has fallen to the level of a consumer of food will it find peace."

Comparing the regime in the camps to that system for which the Nazis were tried at Nuremberg or to that of Mao Tse-tung, Moroz asks, "After all this, can one seriously say that the KGB defends Soviet order? On the contrary, all its acts undermine and compromise it: it pushes people into opposing it." In his meaningful final sentences, he notes, "A crime is a crime and it is inevitably followed by retribution. For those who were shot and those who were killed by hunger, responsibility will have to be taken according to the Constitution which will someday become the law of the land." In other words, Moroz, despite all which he has suffered, yet is forced to look to the proclaimed basis of "socialist legality," the constitution of the U.S.S.R., as a protection for the rights of the citizen, and, as was noted before with regard to the situation of 1966 among Russian intellectuals, is apparently in a state in which he feels disaffection but does not seek divorce.

As in clear from both Chornovil and Moroz, there is among the Ukrainian intelligentsia a distinct discontent fed by a resentment at intellectual controls, human degradation and violations of legality like that among those in Moscow, as well as by impediments which the regime imposes on the full and open realization of the Ukrainian national tradition.

This double ferment among the Ukrainians is also understood to be felt by other national groupings in the U.S.S.R., but there is much less information available about the reactions of, for example, the Georgians, the Crimean Tatars,[61] or the Latvians, than is the case with this largest of the non-Russian nationalities of the country.

---

[61] A document has recently become available describing the arrest of over 300 Crimean Tatars, living in exile in Chirchik in Central Asia, as the aftermath of a demonstration on Lenin's birthday in 1968 in honor of his initiation of the formation of the Crimean Tatar Autonomous Republic, which was abolished during the Second World War on Stalin's orders.

The Religious Element in Intellectual Dissent

There is an ever-growing body of evidence showing that the Soviet system is in a state of great ideological disarray. The "establishment" continues its proclamations to the effect that the construction of socialism has been completed and all Soviet people are united in the great effort to build communism on that foundation. A lengthy example of such statements is the speech delivered on the 50th anniversary of the October Revolution by L. I. Brezhnev, which filled four pages of both *Pravda* and *Izvestiia* of November 4, 1967. But at the same time, as we have seen, there are protests such as that by V. Chornovil, a Communist and at one time secretary of a unit of the Komsomol, that Soviet society lacks even the elementary forms of socialist legality, or that of the collective farm chairman Iakhimovich which speaks of the danger the Party faces of censure by the workers and peasants, with a possible rise of a new party to challenge the one now functioning in the name of Marx, Engels, and Lenin. There are even greater deviations than these, however, providing such phenomena as pamphlets openly speculating about the immortality of the human soul, in terms much closer to affirmation than one might expect in an officially atheistic society.

After 50 years of the Soviet regime, and in spite of the utmost efforts of the Communist Party and the government, the open and avowed allegiance of more people is given in the Soviet Union to a religious organization than is given to any of the secular bodies which those in power so zealously attempt to foster. It is, however, true that the great majority of the religious believers of the country are to be found in those sections of the population which are either geographically or socially remote from the centers of power, among the peasantry scattered in small villages at the ends of muddy and almost impassable roads, in the lonely and disadvantaged of the cities, or among the aged survivors of an earlier era. This apartness is one of the most striking features visible as one surveys the congregation at the Cathedral of the Old Believers in Moscow, numbering perhaps 4,000, 80 percent of whom are women, wrapped in the kerchiefs and shoddy coats of the poor, or as one notes a small group of worshippers in rubber boots and quilted jackets picking their way over the mud of a sideroad toward one of the village churches which still remains open. It can be heard in the high, cracked voices of the aged in the congregational singing of the 200-odd persons gathered for Friday vespers in the great 12th century Cathedral of the Assumption in Vladimir.

Thus, the believing groups in the population are to a great degree peripheral to the major currents of Soviet life and are usually presented in the propaganda efforts of the regime as backward, even reactionary, elements who only serve as a brake on progress. And the religion to which they are so firmly attached is, in the eyes of the official spokesmen, quite truly the "opium of the people" against which, almost literally, measures should be taken as against any other addictive drug.

However, there is more in the philosophies of the great faiths which are represented in the Soviet Union than is dreamed of by the prevailing variety of Marxism, and there are questions of life and death,

truth and justice for which answers cannot be found in the party handbooks. Thus, some people among the intelligentsia look outside the dicta of the Central Committee, toward a view of life which will contain more satisfying answers and a greater portion of human truth.

It is, of course, true that this group is relatively limited, for the schism in Russia between the educated classes and religion is one which antedates the October Revolution, and the additional barriers which have been set up in the past 50 years further hinder a search for understanding. Yet one may sense in many of the works of Soviet writers something of at least an effort to reach a comprehension of the externals of religious tradition. It is easiest for the outside observer to see this in relation to those writers in the Russian language who reflect the culture and traditions of the Russian Orthodox sections of the Soviet populace and the following remarks will therefore largely concern themselves with this group, but they should not be taken to mean that there are not similar phenomena to be observed among the other groups, from the Lutheran Estonians to the Moslem Uzbeks or Buddhist Buryats.

One of the ways in which the influence of the religious tradition may be noted is by an examination of what can rather awkwardly be called the neonationalist cultural revival which has taken place in recent years. Many of the intelligentsia have been engaged in a search for roots in a soil somewhat deeper than that of the *Pravda-Izvestiia-Kommunist* line of encapsulated dogma and have in this process rediscovered something of the role of religion in at least the artistic history of the country. There has resulted a rise in interest in Russia's traditional ikons, many of which have been saved from the "ash heap of history," and in the churches which, in Solzhenitsyn's words, may be seen "running up the knolls, ascending the hills, princesses in red and white, coming out to the wide rivers, with well-proportioned bell towers, tapered and carved, rising above the commonplace thatch and plank buildings, and reaching upward to the heavens." And, although one who drives from Moscow north to Yaroslavl' may see churches converted into tractor repair shops, find potatoes stored in one of the chapels of the Kremlin at Rostov-Velikii, or see that the city streetcar depot at Yaroslavl' is a sadly damaged 17th century church, they are indeed still there like princesses over the small, grey Russian log cabins of countless villages.

One of the results of this interest has been the frequent appearance of protests against the razing or mutilation of buildings which, though they may be churches, are also works of art. If one could cite but a single writer who reflects this point of view it would be the essayist and poet Vladimir Soloukhin whose touching accounts of his native region of Vladimir province show his appreciation at least of the esthetics of the combination of church and village, but whose "Letters from the Russian Museum," which appeared in 1966 in the monthly organ of the Komsomol, *Molodaia gvardiia*, reach more deeply toward things of the spirit. There is a note which can only be called spiritual as he writes, "In man, in addition to the necessity for eating, drinking, sleeping, and continuing the species. from the very beginning there have existed two great necessities. The first of them is communion with the soul of another person. And the second, a communion with the sky (nebo—which also means heaven)." This latter need arises,

"Evidently from the fact that man as a form of temporary existence is a part, be it a millionth, be it momentary, be it insignificant, but still a part of that very endlessness and boundlessness" which is represented by the sky (or heaven—the word is the same).

Soloukhin goes on to remark that "Russia, not long before the cataclysm was multifaceted and varied." There was, it is true, Russia of the bureaucrats, such as Anna Karenina's husband or the Mayor in Gogol's *Inspector General.* Moreover, one finds the warriors, the revolutionaries, the explorers, the scientists. "But Russia was also a praying country. The hermitages in Kerzhen, in the forests beyond the Volga, the Old Believers, the self-immolators, the female fanatics who in early life went into the convents, the pilgrims, male and female, wandering from the Solovki Islands to Kiev, and from Kiev to the Solovki Islands. And it was this pious, praying Russia which the artist Nesterov put down on his canvases."

One of the inheritors of this effort to depict the old "pious, praying Russia' " of whom Soloukhin speaks, was also the artist Pavel D. Korin who, stemming from the ikon-painting village of Palekh, spent years in the 1930's working on an enormous painting, titled "Ukhodiashchaia Rus'," (The Russia which is passing away), as a sort of great group portrait of the servitors of the church and their followers, painted perhaps in a style of academic realism which is not in the Western mode, but done with great fidelity to at least the outer truth of the situation. Korin, however, was more than the mere recorder of events for, as a recent catalog of his collection shows, he assembled a major group of Old Russian ikons, and evidently did much to help bring a revival of pride in and understanding of this part of Russia's past.

And in commenting on a number of the paintings of mid-19th century Russian artists who sought to depict events in the life of Christ in the terms of the then fashionable almost photographic realism, Soloukhin writes, with reference to Christ and the woman taken in adultery, "So, according to the old laws, this young woman should be killed by stoning. Christ was—a revisionist. He came in order to revise the ancient laws. He was against cruelty. He considered that evil gave birth to and multiplied evil. And that the path of mankind in this direction would lead only to a dead end. . . . And thus He believed that it was possible to save mankind in only one way: by limitless, boundless, all-encompassing love." And in reference to another painting, Soloukhin states that, though nailed to the cross, Christ was "a symbol of love, forgiveness, and self-sacrifice."

These are indeed strange words to be found in the Soviet press of the mid-1960's, and particularly in a magazine which is an organ of the Central Committee of the Komsomol. Yet, something at least of the spirit of search for the Russian national past, including some recognition of the historical role of religion, may be observed in other pages of this periodical, with its frequent articles under the general heading of "preserve our relics!" These tell of activity to save old buildings, chiefly churches, in danger of gradual decay or of the sudden onslaughts of city-planners eager to substitute housing developments of box-like monotony and dubious taste for old but good buildings. These articles, and others of like nature which appeared in a variety of publications, seem to have played their role in the formation in 1966 of the All-Russian Society for the Preservation of Monuments

of History and Culture and of similar bodies in other republics in the U.S.S.R. And one may see the physical results of this movement in little tablets such as that attached to the Church of Elijah the Prophet in Yaroslavl', restored as a museum, noting that restoration was carried out with the cooperation of the Yaroslavl' branch of the society.

This movement has been significantly accompanied by a relatively large number of publications on neonationalist themes, publications which treat seriously, and one might say even with love, the whole religious-esthetic side of Russian culture. One need only refer to Ol'ga Chaikovskaia's recent account of Old Russian religious art in her *Protiv neba na zemle* (From earth against heaven), principally intended for adolescent readers but still a profoundly serious book, to see how the author is searching for a historical and esthetic understanding of the role of religion in terms which do not easily combine with the standard clichés of Marxism.

However, it may be said that esthetic and historical comprehension of a movement do not necessarily mean sharing the values of that movement, and so it is possible for a present-day citizen of the Soviet Union to appreciate the glories of the churches at Kizhi with their multitude of cupolas or of Andrei Rublev's majestic miniature "Spas v silakh" (The Savior in a mandala), without necessarily being affected by the philosophy which lies behind these works of art. Still perhaps one may see a deeper influence when one turns from the things of wood and stone and paint to the world of words, to take note of the many reflections in current Russian literature of the Christian and Orthodox tradition.

In addition to Solzhenitsyn and Soloukhin who have already been mentioned, one need only turn to the first poem in Andrei Voznesenskii's volume *Akhillesovo serdtse* (An Achilles heart), published in 1966, "Plach po dvum nerozhdennym poemam" (A lament for two unborn poems). This brings to the theme of thwarted creativity both the thought and language of the Church of Russia in repeated use of the theme of resurrection, resurrection of such persons as "Boris Leonidovich" (i.e., Boris Leonidovich Pasternak) who would have loved these poems, and of the words of the Orthodox requiem "Vechnaia pamiat' " (Eternal memory). Whatever Voznesenskii's precise intent may have been in this poem, the Christian influence is strong and unmistakable, one which no Russian with any knowledge of his cultural heritage could fail to perceive. Indeed, Voznesenskii is quite conscious of this, as he is quoted by the French writer Simone de Beauvoir as having said, "Those who do not understand that the religious feelings of the Russian people are oriented towards poetry understand neither Russia nor Soviet poetry." [62]

There are many similar parallels to be noted in other Russian writers, too numerous, indeed, for extended analysis here, and one may refer to the article by Zinaida Shakhovskaia from which the foregoing quotation was taken for a further discussion of the still-existing ties between Russian literature and religion.

Significantly, the intellectual ferment in the field of religion has gone deeper than a mere preoccupation with preservation of old churches and ikons and than the use now and then of strands of

---

[62] As cited by Zinaida Shakhovskaia in her "The Significance of Religious Themes in Soviet Literature" in: *Religion and the search for new ideals in the U.S.S.R.* Edited by William C. Fletcher and Anthony J. Strover. New York, published for the Institute for the Study of the U.S.S.R., by Frederick A. Praeger, 1967. p. 119.

thought or bits of wording from Russia's religious heritage. Indeed, some are venturing now, in a manner parallel to those who protested against the violation of legal procedures in the prosecution of Siniavskii, Daniel, Bukovskii, Galanskov, and others, to claim the protection of the Soviet Constitution and of its article 124 which, after decreeing the separation of the church and state provides that "Freedom of religious worship and freedom of anti-religious propaganda is recognized for all citizens."

These protestors say that, in view of the close controls kept over religious functions by the official supervisory body, the Council on Religious Affairs attached to the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers, and in view of the extremely detailed laws and regulations which govern the formation of parishes and maintenance of places of worship, even this minimal freedom of religious worship is impaired. Some indeed go so far as to proclaim that many religious leaders, including important clergymen of the Russian Orthodox Church, have failed in their duty to protest against the infringement of the rights of worshippers and have thereby permitted the Council on Religious Affairs to interfere illegally in the internal life of the church.

The most extensive exposition of this view is to be found in a lengthy and outspoken letter, addressed to Patriarch Aleksii, and supplemented by an appeal to N. V. Podgornyi, Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., which was sent in December of 1965 by two priests, Nikolai Eshliman and Gleb Iakunin, of the Moscow Diocese. These documents recount, in a wealth of detail, the way in which the highly circumscribed liberty of religious worship in the Soviet State is even more limited by all sorts of what the authors term illegal and unpublished rulings by the Council, the effects of which are furthered, they say, by "a whole group of bishops and clergymen . . . who under the cover of piety knowingly and actively distort the spirit of Russian Orthodoxy." Something of the trials to which the church has been subjected lately may be gathered from reading this remarkable letter, while many further instances of single cases of persecution, throwing light on the general observations of Frs. Eshliman and Iakunin, are to be found in the recent work by Nikita Struve.[63]

Now, there is, as Archpriest Dimitrii Konstantinov notes in his recent *Gonimaia tserkov'* (The persecuted church), (New York, Vseslavianskoe izdatel'stvo, 1967, 383 p.) an undoubted connection between this appeal by the two Russian clergymen, and by others the texts of which are not available, and "those general tendencies which are more and more strongly evident in the country. Although there is no direct external tie between the trial of A. D. Siniavskii and Iu. M. Daniel or with the exile of the writer V. Ia. Tarsis, and this Open Letter, still a spiritual tie does exist between the two phenomena" (p. 339).

It is noteworthy that Father Konstantinov wrote the above before the appearance of one of the letters protesting the action against Galanskov and Ginzburg and signed by A. E. Levitin-Krasnov who identified himself by the words, unusual in a text originating

---

[63] The two priests' appeal appeared in English as *A Cry of Despair from Moscow Churchmen.* New York, Synod of Bishops of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia, 1966. 65 p. Struve's book is *Christians in Contemporary Russia.* Translated by Lancelot Sheppard and A. Manson. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1967, 464 p. *See particularly:* pp. 290–335.

in the Soviet Union, "religious writer." Levitin, whose pen name is Krasnov, has been described both as a teacher and as a deacon of the Orthodox Church, who in 1966, according to the official atheistic journal *Nauka i religiia* (Science and religion) of October of that year, circulated a document with the title "The Ailing Church." In this, it is alleged, Levitin criticized the way in which the hierarchy of the Orthodox Church has cooperated with the state authorities to the detriment of the essential interests of church life, and *Nauka i religiia* claims that this was done with a view toward encouraging opposition to the Soviet regime.

To make things worse for Moscow, as an account of Levitin's interview in May of 1966 with a representative of the KGB and with several persons from publishing houses and atheistic groups will show, he is concerned with the problem of freedom not only for believers but also for atheists, because both are—he thinks—in a form of bondage. Just as religion is hampered by the action of the state, so atheism is "under compulsion, obligatory and not subject to questioning. . . . Thus, the insistence on atheism, the use of compulsion (direct or indirect) are compromising atheism, leave it without ideological meaning and without spiritual fascination.

"Therefore: Long live free religion and free atheism!" [64]

In short, Levitin, though clearly a believer, is opposed to the forced inculcation of any idea and, as his remarks show, is deeply aware of the harm which can come to any point of view if it is made obligatory. Levitin's position seems to have puzzled the Soviet authorities. No report has come to light of any punishment to which Levitin has been subjected, although the introductory paragraph of the *Nauka i religiia* October 1966 article would suggest that he has written articles or appeals on religious matters in such number that he has a substantial "underground" reputation in the field.

However, the two priests, Frs. Eshliman and Iakunin, mentioned earlier, were punished, although not by the secular authorities. Aleksii, Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia, in a letter of July 1966 to the bishops of the Russian church condemned the two for endeavoring "to spread distrust in our Supreme Church Authority among the clergy and laity of our Church, and thereby to bring temptation into the quiet stream of Church life." And, almost as if intent upon proving the allegations raised by Eshliman and Iakunin as to overzealous cooperation between the hierarchy and the state, this letter goes on to speak of "an endeavor to cast slander on State organs. The endeavors of individual persons to step forth in the role of unappointed judges of higher Church Authority, and their desire to cast slander on State organs, do not serve the interests of the Church, and have the effect of destroying the well-intended relationships between State organs and our Church." It is noteworthy that the "State organs" of so powerful a state would need the protection provided by the words of the 90-year-old Patriarch, or by his action to suspend the priests from performance of their sacramental functions as a result of criticism of the State.[65]

---

[64] The text of this conversation between Levitin and the agents of the regime may be found in *Religion in Communist Dominated Areas,* Jan. 15, 1967, pp. 1–7. A survey of Levitin's views may be found in Michael Bourdeaux, *Religious Ferment in Russia; Protestant Opposition to Soviet Religious Policy* (London, Macmillan; New York, St. Martin's Press, 1968, pp. 187–189).

[65] The text of the Patriarch's letter and of reports as to the suspension of Frs. Eshliman and Iakunin may be found in *Religion in Communist Dominated Areas,* Aug. 15–31, 1966, pp. 126–129.

Another revealing group of protests against the interference of the state in religious matters was made public quite recently in a *New York Times* dispatch on July 4, 1968, reporting the receipt in London of a series of letters, the principal author of which is stated to be Boris V. Talantov, son of a priest, a layman in his sixties, living in the city of Kirov, some 530 miles north of Moscow. Talantov and 11 other laymen, according to this dispatch, in August of 1966 had written to the Patriarch of Moscow complaining of governmental interference in church affairs. This letter was later published in the West and in February of 1967, evidently for the single purpose of counteracting it, the Metropolitan Nikodim, head of the foreign affairs department of the Patriarchate, had visited London where at a news conference he told newsmen to ignore such an anonymous letter and denied its allegations about the Kirov diocese. Talantov, having learned of these statements through a BBC broadcast, again wrote the Patriarch in March of 1967 declaring: "Metropolitan Nikodim's assertion that the letter was anonymous and unworthy of belief is a shameless lie, calculated to prevent those who signed the letter from having the opportunity of exposing this lie abroad.

"Metropolitan Nikodim, like all atheists, disregards the words of the Saviour: 'For there is nothing hid which shall not be manifested.' Therefore, no lie of Metropolitan Nikodim can conceal for long the truth about the mass closure of churches and the persecution of believers in 1960 to 1964 that was set out in that letter, and with even greater detail and thoroughness in a letter to *Izvestiia*."

"While Metropolitan Nikodim was assuring credulous people abroad that the open letter from the Kirov Diocese was anonymous and that the people who signed it did not exist, the Kirov region KGB office was summoning me on February 14 about the same letter and that written to *Izvestiia*. . . . There I gave written confirmation that I was the author of both, and consequently I am answerable before society and the state for the truth of their contents."

Such a similarity between the case of Levitin-Krasnov and Talantov in respect to the questioning by the KGB is made even broader by the *New York Times* statement that "From the documents Mr. Talantov emerges as deeply concerned about the condition of his church and its relation with the state. He calls for an open, frank and friendly dialogue with Communism to clear up the many conflicts that have arisen and to plan cooperation for the country's good." Furthermore, it is stated that another of the documents is a letter by Talantov of April 1968 significantly calling on the Procurator General of the U.S.S.R. (who combines the function of chief prosecutor with that of final examiner of judicial matters) for an open trial for imprisoned writers and intellectuals, including Siniavskii, Daniel, and those who took up their cause.[66]

Talantov's letters are thus another clear confirmation of that tie, postulated by Fr. Konstantinov as quoted above, between the situation in the Church and a broader and more general intellectual dissent among varied elements in the Soviet Union. It is, indeed, quite possible

[66] The Russian text of Talantov's letter of June 1966 and extensive excerpts of that of Nov. 10, 1966, are available in Russkoe Studencheskoe Khristianskoe Dvizhenie. *Vestnik* (Paris), No. 82 (1966) : pp. 3–20 ; No. 83 (1967) : pp. 29–64. In the first letter, the Bishop of Kirov, Ioann, when laymen complained of his cooperation with state authorities (*Vestnik*, No. 82, p. 8), was criticized as "conducting himself as if he were an investigator for the NKVD making an arrest during the Ezhovshchina" [the period when Ezhov was head of the NKVD during the Stalin purges].

that there are other instances of the same type and, as the *Times* notes, that ties are beginning to be formed across denominational lines as complaints on similar themes rise from among the Baptists.

Further light on the religious side of intellectual ferment in the U.S.S.R. may be gleaned from a perhaps unexpected source, the words of Svetlana Iosifovna Allilueva-Stalina, daughter of Joseph Stalin, used by her in a news conference in New York on April 26, 1966. As in the 15 years just past both the youngest generation and her generation "became more critical because we perhaps were more free to think and to discuss and to judge about things and events," she became convinced—she disclosed—that "God is just the power of life and justice" (here is another reflection of the Russian concern with truth as justice), and it may be surmised that, while speaking in English, she may have had in mind the Russian version of John 14:6—"Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, the truth, and the life." As an outgrowth of her feeling, Svetlana Allilueva further stated that she was baptized into the Russian Orthodox Church, and it is noteworthy that she believed that there were many others in Russia who felt as she did that belief in God was important in meeting life's challenges. The response to the position taken by Stalin's daughter was additional indication of the extent of repeatedly criticized parallel action on the part of the hierarchy of the Orthodox Church and of the Soviet state. Pimen, Metropolitan of Krutitsy and Kolomna, in an interview published in *Izvestiia* of June 2, 1967, called Allilueva a "more than morally fallen and spiritually impoverished woman," while Prime Minister Kosygin's answer in a news conference in New York on June 25, 1967, termed her "a morally unstable person."

It is finally of interest that early in 1968, at about the same time as the turmoil over the Ginzburg-Galanskov case took place, a report in the *New York Times* of April 18 told of a trial in Leningrad of a group of Russian intellectuals, who were quite clearly motivated in part by religious thought. Based on a dispatch from Moscow, telling of information which reached that city from Leningrad, this case involved the trial of 17 persons, including university lecturers, students, and engineers, who were said to have planned a form of democracy guided by the Russian Orthodox Church and to have existed as a group since 1964. Rumors that this group had also sought to assemble caches of weapons were called "highly exaggerated." This dispatch provided some further light on a number of somewhat obscure references to the existence in Leningrad of a group of persons, evidently centered around the philosophy faculty of Leningrad State University, who had concentrated on the study of the Russian religious philosophers of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, including N. A. Berdiaev [1874–1948] whose writings in Russia and in exile have had great influence on Western thought. Although little is known about the trial in Leningrad, one significant statement is reported to have been made by the chief defendant, who "said he had sat in the same prison cell, and been prosecuted on the same charge, as Lenin nearly seventy years ago. He wanted to point out only that this court had given him twice as long a sentence as the Tsarist court had given Lenin— he had nothing else to say. . . ." [67] Little more can be stated

[67] Anatole Shub, One Hundred Days From Moscow to the Moldau; A Reporter's Notebook. *Encounter,* July 1968, p. 78.

about this trial than to note the existence of such a body of dissenters and to emphasize its significance as a demonstration of a continuing interaction of religious and social thought reflecting a major Russian intellectual current of the decade or so immediately prior to World War I.

There is, in addition to the ferment among the Russian intellectuals which has religious overtones and which is based on the Russian Orthodox tradition, evidently much discontent in other religious groupings in the Soviet Union. Information about such sentiments is rather spotty, although it has provided a number of interesting documents, such as the statement of June 5, 1967, from a Council of Relatives of Prisoners, Members of the Church of the Evangelical Christians-Baptists, Condemned for the Word of God in the U.S.S.R. Also one may find a very knowledgeable account of the situation among the Baptists in Michael Bourdeaux's *Religious Ferment in Russia; Protestant Opposition to Soviet Religious Policy* (London, Macmillan; New York, St. Martin's Press, 1968. 255 p.).

The comparative paucity of information does not make it possible to discuss other areas of possible dissent from official policy in as much detail as has been the case with the representatives of the Russian Orthodox tradition, but one should not overlook the likelihood of strain between the Party line and the religious heritage of numerous groups in the Soviet Union. Perhaps in the course of time enough documentation will become available to permit, for example, a closer examination of the way in which the intellectuals of the Uzbek people still reflect, despite all efforts at indoctrination in Marxism, the influence of Islam. Until then, one can only conjecture as to the extent to which several centuries of the Koran have resisted fifty years of *Das Kapital*.

And, although there is copious information illustrating the highly restrictive official attitude toward Judaism and toward the two and a quarter million Jews of the Soviet Union, ranging from *The Jews of Silence* by the Israeli traveler Eliezer Wiesel to *Iudaizm bez prykras* (Judaism without embellishment) by T. K. Kichko, issued in 1963 by the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, with its unpleasant parallels to Nazi anti-Semitic propaganda, there seems to be at present little which can really serve as the basis for a conclusive judgment about any possible currents of thought within the Jewish community.

Questioning Among Historians

In the world of scholarship we have selected for comments one field of learning which is considered by the Communist Party as its special province, to be guided into correct verdicts and guarded against harmful influences. This is the field of history. Since Communist doctrine places such emphasis on the view that history moves in a series of vast stages from primitive society, through slaveholding and feudal eras into capitalism and on to the culminating epoch of communism, particular care is taken to see to it that all analyses of the past are in accord with this philosophical structure. Even more zealously a watch is kept over all writings which deal with the more recent past, for there has been built up a set of interpretations holding that the present Soviet regime is a natural culmination of all of Russian history, im-

plying that it is the embodiment of both Russian tradition and Communist thought, and that the Communist Party, though isolated, single errors may have been made, has always taken correct decisions in both strategic and tactical matters. It is upon this latter point of assumed infallibility that the guardians of doctrinal purity seem to be most sensitive.

A careful, even minute, reading of the Soviet professional journals in the field of history will reveal to the informed reader many indications of a certain amount of discontent with the limitations placed upon the presentation of historical events, but this exercise, besides being at times a tedious one, falls very largely within the limits of that much discussed art called "Kremlinology," or the practice of drawing large returns of conjecture from rather small investments of fact. However, some recent documents have provided less nebulous evidence as to a ferment among historians, and it is upon these that the following discussion is based.

The first to be considered here is an account of a discussion of a draft of the third volume of the official history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union which took place at a closed meeting at the Institute of Marxism-Leninism in Moscow in 1965. Participants included some Old Bolsheviks (i.e., persons who were members of the Party before 1917), a number of historians known as faithful adherents of the official line and, as what stage directions in the drama call "noises off," some young historians who sought, but were denied, admission to this closed meeting. Among the last group was Pavel I. Iakir, a historian, a signatory of a number of documents protesting the recent Galanskov-Ginzburg case, and son of Iona Iakir, Soviet military leader purged by Stalin in 1937. As may be gathered from the severely shortened account which appeared in *Survey* of April 1967,[68] the Old Bolsheviks and the young historians were united by a common desire to prevent this volume from reflecting in any way an attempt at the rehabilitation of Stalin. Notoriously the presentation of Party history during the Stalin era had been such as to suggest that, apart from Stalin, all the leaders after the death of Lenin were "traitors" or "enemies" of Lenin, while Stalin was the all-wise, even infallible leader.

Now in 1965, one Old Bolshevik, Snegov, known as a previous outspoken critic of the official historical line, after attacking this draft volume which allegedly continued a number of Stalinist interpretations, stated that "History will not forgive the torture of revolutionaries, of Leninists, which took place in Stalin's prisons. . . There is no return to Stalin's times."

Although a defender of Stalin was also heard, in the person of one unshakably Stalinist Old Bolshevik, Shagaev, for whom "Stalin was a remarkable genius," the most significant was the role played by Anton V. Antonov-Ovseenko, son of Vladimir Antonov-Ovseenko, one of the most prominent leaders of the Bolshevik coup d'état of October 1917 and a victim of Stalin's purges. The younger Antonov-Ovseenko, who did not actually participate in the regular sessions of this discussion but who met with some of the members during a break, occasioned a lively debate by his suggestion that the third volume, which dealt with the October Revolution, was biased and should be replaced by a new edition of John Reed's *Ten Days That Shook the*

[68] A longer account in Russian appeared in *Grani,* No. 65 [1967]; pp. 129–156.

World, which is an American sympathizer's eyewitness account of those events, much praised by Lenin on its original publication. In the course of this debate it was further revealed that no young historians, including P. I. Iakir, were admitted to the meeting, being kept out by sentries. Indignantly one old Bolshevik said, "From whom do they want to hide the truth? From the children of those who gave their lives for the happiness of the people, who went into battle under Lenin's banner."

Evidently as a result of this turmoil, and in order to prevent its growing, a decision was taken to finish the conference that very day by, among other steps, reducing the time allowed speakers from 20 to 10 minutes. However, in spite of this attempt to rush the meeting to a conclusion, there was one young historian, Petrovskii, who managed to get in and to address the assembly. His principal point was that young historians had been kept out by being sent home, almost like children, and that he had been subjected to threats of possible consequences for insisting on admission.

Still, views of the Old Bolsheviks and of the young historians did not prevail, as the representatives of the Party leadership, including P. N. Pospelov, Director of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism and a member of the Central Committee of the Party since 1939, spoke in defense of the positions taken by the proposed history and also in defense of Stalin. "Fundamentally," Pospelov insisted, "Stalin defended Leninist positions during the October period."

Although the account of this meeting which is available does not directly indicate such to be the case, it would seem from the tone of remarks by Pospelov and his supporters that it was hoped to stage manage the meeting to a smooth end, with a bland statement which would satisfy both the friends and the opponents of Stalin. However, Shagaev spoke again bringing forth an audience reaction which clearly illustrates the depths of the intellectual differences among those who seek to investigate and comment on party history. His last speech is worth citing in full:

SHAGAEV (3 minutes on a point of information). I have been accused of speaking against the decisions of the 20th and 22d congresses (Noise in the hall. Shouts: "Quiet," "Stop babbling.") All of you who speak against Stalin are in the same company as Trotskyites. I have been in the party for 60 years and I have defended Stalin and will continue to defend him. (Indignation in the hall. Shouts: "Get down.")

CHAIRMAN. Comrade Shagaev, this is not a point of information. You are out of order.

SHAGAEV. I maintain that they are all Trotskyites. Whoever is against Stalin is a Trotskyite. (Noise throughout the hall.) I will finish reading my letter to Khrushchev against attacks on Stalin. (Shouts of indignation. Shagaev is not allowed to speak. The chairman asks him to leave the platform. Raising his fists Shagaev leaves the platform.)

The meeting then came to a close with the chairman refusing a proposal by an Old Bolshevik that a commission be formed to assist in writing Party history.

Another illustration of disagreement among historians with what some take to be a distinct tendency toward the rehabilitation of Stalin is to be found in the account of a meeting to discuss Prof. A. M. Nekrich's *22 June 1941*, a book which appeared 2 years earlier and sought to provide an explanation for the Soviet reverses in the early period of the Second World War.[69] One of the participants, G. A. Deborin, a

[69] An account of this meeting also appeared in *Survey*, April 1967.

prominent Soviet historian of the war, sought to defend Stalin by pointing out that other people made mistakes too, but in doing so he aroused strong objections from the participants in the meeting, including shouts of "Cowards and swine" when Stalin's servitors Voroshilov and Budennyi were mentioned. One speaker, Dachichev, evidently on the Soviet General Staff, complained about the fact that documents which might clarify matters were kept hidden in Soviet archives, noted that Iona Iakir and Marshal Tukhachevskii were condemned on the basis of forged documents, and stated that, despite all defenses, Stalin was chiefly responsible for the tragedy of 1941.

The most significant statement, however, was that by someone identified only as "Kulish," most probably Vasilii M. Kulish, a Soviet historian who has written on the planning of the second front in Western Europe. In his statement he touched on the central, but still unresolved problems of Soviet historiography:

> To ask whether Stalin's guilt was total or limited is still a typical attitude of the personality cult. One is still concentrating on Stalin. We should look into the problem more deeply. We should ask how such a situation was able to come about. How did the government, under Stalin's direction govern the country? How did it defend our people against the danger? Was it equal to its responsibilities? The answer is: "No." We must analyse the process which allowed Stalin, who was not equal to his task, to become head of the party and the state, with unlimited powers.

Such an analysis would, of course, be the equivalent of an investigation of the whole system, of its inmost secrets, and of the fundamental presuppositions on which rest not only the Stalin system but the post-Stalin era. It is, indeed, possible that it would bring into question so much of the ideological basis on which the present regime rests that its continuation, at least in its present form and with its present claims to hegemony, would be put in danger. And it is therefore not surprising that this plan for thorough investigation was not repeated, at least in this form, by the speakers who followed.

It is true that others attacked specific features of Stalin's management of affairs in the period before Hitler's war on the Soviet Union and, when added together, these make a severe indictment. Evidently the organizers of this meeting realized this, for as was the case with the discussion of the Party history, steps were taken to bring the consideration of Nekrich's book to an end, complete with a somewhat equivocal final statement. But again a speaker provided a lightning flash of illumination of what the basic question was, and would continue to be, despite official efforts to smooth it over. This man, Snegov, evidently the same Snegov mentioned above, was not, as was the case with Shagaev, an unrepentant Stalinist, but rather the exact opposite. For him:

> Nekrich's book is honest and useful. If a unit is disorganized on the eve of combat . . . then that unit suffers a defeat. The head of such a unit is generally shot by order of the high command, and there's no more to say. Stalin was both the supreme commander and the head of the unit; and that unit, in a state of disorganisation was our whole country. Stalin ought to have been shot. Instead of which, people are now trying to whitewash him.
>
> . . . Why has Deborin [Professor of history and chief exponent of the official point of view at this conference] tried to justify Stalin? When Hitler was preparing to attack Poland, Stalin helped him. . . . How can one be a communist and speak smoothly about Stalin—who betrayed and sold Communists, who eliminated nearly all the delegates of the 18th congress and nearly all the Central Committee members elected by it, and who betrayed the Spanish Republic, Poland, and all communists in all countries?

As the meeting proceeded, Deborin retorted:

> As for Snegov's contribution, we have heard more than once what he told us about Poland; but we heard it from the opposite camp. It is the thesis of the West German professor, Jacobson [sic! i.e., Jacobsen], among others. It is strange that Snegov should hold the same point of view. Comrade Snegov, you ought to tell us which camp you belong to!

Most tellingly, Snegov answered with, "The Kolyma camp." This was one of Stalin's most notorious concentration camps in the Far North. Evidently trapped by his own flow of words, Deborin went on to say, "Such things need to be gone into." At this, a voice from the hall asked, "D'you want the telephone number too? Like in the good old days?" What followed is noted in parentheses, "Uproar. Deborin is shouted down."

The last word, save for a facile and equivocal summing up, was with Snegov, who said:

> I thought this was to be a scientific discussion; but instead of scientific demonstration Deborin has produced 1937-type arguments. But it's not easy to frighten us with concentration camps. We won't let ourselves be intimidated. Times have changed, and the past won't come back.

This note of resolve that the past is past and that Stalin and Stalinism are dead echoes through many of the appeals which have appeared recently not only in the field of history but also, as may be seen from the protests over the treatment given to Galanskov and Ginzburg, in literature. It is, indeed, interesting and significant that Pavel I. Iakir, historian and son of a victim of Stalin's purges, has participated in both literary and historical cases, but it is not Iakir alone who has been the carrier of such discontent from one camp to another. Rather it is indicative of a point of view widely held by members of the Soviet intelligentsia who are now raising their voices in support of both pravda-truth, in the sense of fidelity to historical fact, and of pravda-justice, in the sense of a proper observation of the officially proclaimed laws and practices of the Soviet state, which so often has claimed to be the freest and most just regime on earth. And this injection of the intelligentsia as an independent, outside element, stating its right to examine and pass upon the activities of the state, is bound to have disturbing, if not revolutionary consequences in the long run.

However, in the short term power remains in the hands of the state and of the expositors of its point of view. Nekrich did not go unpunished. The September 1967 issue of *Voprosy istorii KPSS* contained a violent attack on him, written by G. A. Deborin and B. S. Tel'pukhovskii, in which he was accused of having fallen prey to the "bourgeois falsifiers of history"; the attack was couched in terms which remind readers with long memories of the tirades of Stalin's time, either of 1937–39 or of the postwar era of 1946–53. The expulsion of Nekrich from the Party, if not from the History Institute of the Academy of Sciences, followed suit. However, the questions asked by his book, and the sentiments voiced by his supporters at the conference remained unanswered, filled with latent possibilities for the future critical development not only of Russian historiography but also of a whole current of intellectual questioning of the sedulously fostered official myths about the Soviet state.

A Soviet Scientist's View of the World

In the *Who's Who in the USSR, 1965–1966*, published in New York by the Scarecrow Press in 1966, one finds the following biographical entry:

Sakharov, Andrey Dmitrievich, Physicist; Dr. of Physico-Mathematical Sci.; full member, U.S.S.R. Acad. of Sci., s. 1953; associate, Physics Inst., U.S.S.R. Acad. of Sci., s. 1945; *b.* 1921; *Educ:* 1942 grad. Moscow Univ.; *Career:* 1950 together with I. Ye. Tamm proposed use of electr. discharge in plasma located in a magnetic field to obtain controlled thermonuclear reactions; 1958 attended 2nd Internat. Atomic Conference, Geneva; *Publ.:* "Generatsiya zhestkoy komponenty kosmicheskikh luchey" (The Generation of the Hard Component of Cosmic Rays (1947); "Vzaimodeystvie elektrona i pozitrona pri rozhdenii par" (Electron-Positron Interaction During Pair Production) (1948); "Temperatura vozbuzhdeniya v plazme gazovogo razryada" (The Excitation Temperature in Gas Discharge) (1948); *Awards:* O. of Lenin; Stalin Prize; *A.* U.S.S.R., Moskva, Leninsky prosp. 53, Institut fiziki AN S.S.S.R.

A man with such a background of accomplishments and awards, who at the age of 32 became a member of the Academy and in addition is reported to have contributed significantly to the Soviet development of thermonuclear weapons, is quite clearly one of the Soviet elite, with, it might seem, a stake in society which would not incline him to express open and extensive dissatisfaction. However, Academician Sakharov is the author of *Thoughts Concerning Progress, Peaceful Coexistence and Intellectual Freedom*, a remarkably outspoken political and philosophical tract, which covers some fifty pages in typescript and which, according to Sakharov's conclusion, was directed in June 1968 to the leadership of the Soviet Union, to all its citizens and to all people of good will throughout the world. In this very wide-ranging unpublished pamphlet in the preparation of which he sought and received advice from a number of friends, not only does Sakharov take up the problems of justice for Galanskov, Ginzburg and others, of socialist legality and adherence to the constitution and laws, and of the abolition of censorship, but he goes into broader topics of nuclear disarmament, world economic development, and the lessening of tension between the Soviet Union and the United States.[70]

As his opening paragraph indicates, Sakharov's views were formed in the milieu of the scientific-technical intelligentsia, "which is showing a very great concern with questions both of practice and of principle in the field of [Soviet] domestic and foreign policy." As a representative of that intelligentsia, Sakharov calls emphatically for measures to end the estrangement of nation from nation, to bring about international cooperation under circumstances of intellectual freedom, and to remove dogmatism and the covert pressures of ruling cliques. This, as Sakharov phrases it, would require a truly "scientific method" of coping with world affairs, a method based on a thorough study of facts, theories and opinions in an atmosphere of unprejudiced, open discussion. Indeed, great emphasis is given by him to the problem of intellectual freedom, which he defines as "the freedom to receive and disseminate information, the freedom of unprejudiced and untrammeled discussion, the freedom from the pressure of authority and bias."

Such freedom would, Sakharov says, be the only guarantee against the infection of the peoples of the world by mass myths which could,

---

[70] An English text of Sakharov's essay, in a translation differing from that used here, was published in the *New York Times*, July 22, 1968, pp. 14–16.

in the hands of predatory hypocrites and demagogues, be turned into a bloody dictatorship. As one of such myths he specifically identifies "the myth of increased class struggle and proletarian infallibility."

However, there are dangers along the course toward attaining this perfect goal of the unification of the world for free cooperation. First among them he lists the threat of thermonuclear war, with the development of material for nuclear weapons reaching such proportions that, as he says, "There have now been built up sufficient quantities of warheads for the repeated destruction of all humanity." Application of these weapons would bring about the "annihilation of the material and informational bases of civilization, and that is the size of the danger with which the world is confronted by the estrangement of the two world superpowers."

There are in the world, he states, a number of situations which serve as dangers to the peaceful coexistence of the powers, including the war in Vietnam, for which he sharply criticizes what he considers to be American mistakes, and the Arab-Israeli conflict, blame for which is apportioned among the U.S., the U.S.S.R., and England, although he affirms that the Six Day War of 1967 represented a justifiable step by Israel in the face of the threat of annihilation by the Arab coalition. The later measures of harshness against refugees and prisoners of war, as well as the attempts to solve territorial questions by force cannot be approved. But despite this, it was a mistake for the Soviet Union to break relations with Israel, for that hindered a peaceful settlement in the Near East, including the setting up of diplomatic ties between Israel and the Arab states.

As Sakharov goes on to remark, such dangers bring a necessity for an "*active prevention* of the aggravation of the world situation." To this end he proposes that "the international policy of the two leading world superpowers (the U.S.A. and the US.S.R.) should be based on joint application of uniform, general principles," including the free self-determination of nations, the cessation of export of military and military-economic forms of counterrevolution and revolution, an increase of international economic, cultural, and organizational aid, and abstinence from attempts to extend spheres of influence or to create difficulties for another country.

Another of the dangers foreseen by Sakharov is the threat of famine in the less-developed countries. Although he recognizes a certain usefulness in forms of population control, this alone would be insufficient as long as the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. stand face to face as competitors and even opponents. They and the other developed countries should cooperate to aid in the solution of this food problem, to avoid a tragedy which he predicts for 1975–80 and he proposes a form of "tax" on the developed countries to the extent of 20 percent of their national income for a period of approximately 15 years. This would lead automatically to a decrease in arms expenditures and also contribute to the "stabilization and improvement of the situation in the most underdeveloped countries and to the limitation of the influence of extremists of all types."

A third danger considered by Sakharov is that of the harmful influence on man's environment of air and water pollution, the improper use of insecticides, erosion, and the extermination of useful animals and plants. The whole problem of what he calls "geohygiene" requires, he says, solution on an international scale.

Fourth in Sakharov's lists of threats to mankind is the development of racism, nationalism and militarism, particularly in the growth of police dictatorships, such as those of Stalin, Hitler and Mao Tse-tung. While criticising the Hitlerian regime in clear and unmistakable terms, Sakharov is merciless in his attitude toward Stalin, whose era was "a much more refined form of hypocrisy and demagogy," and whose "heaviest blow was directed against the Soviet people." No fewer than 10 to 15 million people died as a result in the hands of the NKVD, in the camps, and in exile. The Soviet camps were, he states, the antecedents of and models for the fascist camps. A footnote on this subject reports that in 1936–39 there were arrested more than 1.2 million Party members, a half of those on the rolls, and that only 50,000 returned to freedom. Of the missing, 600,000 were shot outright, while the rest died in the camps or as a result of questioning.

Others of Stalin's measures brought the nation close to military and economic ruin, and doomed many to repression and deprivation of rights. However, the unveiling of all the harmful consequences of the Stalin era is far from an end in the U.S.S.R. and Sakharov calls for measures to complete this, including the barring of neo-Stalinists from posts of influence. He is bitter about recent statements opposing "rubbing salt into the wounds" by the investigation of the crimes of the Stalin era, since only in this way, by a careful analysis of the past and its consequences can the stain be removed. As a partial explanation of the causes of Stalinism, Sakharov writes that he sees at least some truth in its definition as a "superstructure" on the economic basis of an anti-Leninist "pseudo-socialism," which brought about the formation of a separate class, a bureaucratic elite which usurped the fruits of social labor and claimed various open and hidden privileges.

As an evident reflection of pressures from within the scientific community Sakharov calls for the removal of one such neo-Stalinist, S. P. Trapeznikov, who is the head of the sciences division of the Central Committee of the Party. Trapeznikov remains, it is said, in his views and principles basically a Stalinist and is a representative not of science and learning but of the bureaucratic elite.

As one of the facets of the danger from extremism, Sakharov devotes much attention to the situation in China where the "idiocy of the cult of personality has taken on monstrous, grotesque and tragicomic forms, carrying to aburdity many traits of Stalinism and Hitlerism." However, as he goes on to state, it would be incorrect to blame the split in the international communist government as the chief harm done by Maoism. Retention of a surface unity would be only a hypocritical compromise and the Chinese people need more a unity of world democratic forces to defend their rights than they do a unity of Communist forces, in the Maoist sense of the word, to struggle against so-called imperialist dangers in Africa, Latin America or the Near East.

The longest single section of Sakharov's document is that which he devotes to the threat to intellectual freedom. He sees first the baneful influence of mass culture which brings a lowering of the intellectual level with an emphasis on the entertainment aspects of communication and a consequent type of "preventive censorship." Another

factor is the subjection of education to state control for, although free, universal and obligatory education is a great accomplishment, there is often an excessive unification of curriculum and methods of presentation. A further danger lies in a misuse of technical and biochemical methods, including mass psychology, for the control of man. "Man should not be turned into a chicken or a rat as in the well-known experiments which experiences 'electronic pleasure' from electrodes inserted in the brain." There is also a need to beware of too great reliance on the computer, which could develop in the future into a trap for humanity.

But the chief concern is with the dangers of the present day, and Sakharov takes up the problem of protecting mankind against the effects of a system of decision making in which only a select few have the power to decide, plus the power to keep their actions from public view. And it is here that he takes up the problem of censorship in the U.S.S.R. which is central to the ideological struggle of recent years. Speaking of appeals such as those by Solzhenitsyn and Vladimov, he says that "they have shown how incompetent censorship kills in the embryo the living soul of Soviet literature, and indeed the same applies also to all other aspects of social thought, giving rise to stagnation, monotony, and a complete absence of any fresh or deep thoughts. Indeed, deep thoughts can appear only in discussion, with the presence of opposition, only with the potentiality for expression not only of true but also of doubtful ideas. This was already clear to the philosophers of Ancient Greece, and almost no one doubts this now. But after 50 years of uncontested rule over the minds of a whole country, our leadership seemingly fears even a reference to such a discussion."

Sakharov goes on to criticize the Soviet actions against Siniavskii and Daniel, Ginzburg and Galanskov, Khaustov, and Bukovskii, or the various forms of persecution of those who spoke out in their behalf. "A party with such methods of convincing people and of education can hardly claim the role of the spiritual leader of mankind." Furthermore, is it not shameful, he asks, that there are still in the Soviet Union such phenomena as a barely concealed anti-Semitism, a limitation on the rights of national minorities, and attempts at the open or covert rehabilitation of Stalin.

In one of his most significant paragraphs Sakharov states:

> Today the key to the progressive reformation of the state system in the interests of humanity lies in intellectual freedom. This was understood particularly in Czechoslovakia and we, undoubtedly, should support their initiative, which is bold and very valuable for the fate of socialism and of all mankind (both politically and also, in the beginning, by increased economic aid).

Returning to the topic of censorship, Sakharov considers that no real improvement can come by a "liberalization" of the instructions issued to Glavlit (the censorship organization), but rather that there is needed a new law on the subject, together with a greatly increased international exchange of information. In addition, Sakharov proposes, since it is "very important to know ourselves better," that considerations of money do not stand in the way of sociological, political and economic studies, which should not be carried out solely by governmental agencies, which might avoid "unpleasant" questions.

After such a discussion of the problems of the nuclear confrontation and dangers to the freedom of thought,[71] Sakharov takes up certain "moral factors" which, he thinks, could contribute to making socialism "a moral attraction" in comparison with capitalism provided that people would not be influenced by memories of the restrictions on intellectual freedom under socialism or, even worse, of the fascist-like regimes of the cult of personality. He makes it clear that it is only on the moral basis that this attraction could be exerted, for he devotes several pages to an examination of the relative economic positions of the two systems. One of his conclusions deserves quotation in full:

> 2. There is no basis for affirming (as this is often done in the dogmatic tradition) that the capitalist form of production is leading productive forces into a dead-end street, that it is incontestably worse from the point of view of the productivity of social labor than is socialism, and it is also impossible to claim that capitalism always leads to the absolute impoverishment of the working class.

A number of Sakharov's statements reveal a belief in a certain "convergence" of socialism and capitalism, as the two industrial systems grow more like one another, and this he considers to be a factor supporting a strengthened peaceful coexistence.

In the process of comparing personal income and consumption in the U.S.S.R. and U.S.A., he attacks Soviet propaganda materials which claim that the Soviet distribution of income is just and that in America unjust. He goes on to state:

> Although I do not intend to minimize the tragedy of the poverty, lack of rights, and oppression of 22 million American Negroes, it is necessary to understand clearly that this problem is not essentially a class one, but connected with racism, including the racism and egoism of the white workers, and that the ruling group in the U.S. is interested in the solution of this problem (although it has not yet shown sufficient activity, being involved in a number of considerations of an electoral nature, as well as by the fear of upsetting the uncertain equilibrium in the country and stimulating the activity of the extreme leftwing and particularly of the extreme rightwing parties. I think that we in the socialist camp are interested in seeing that the ruling group in the U.S. can solve the Negro problem without an aggravation of the situation in the country).

And it is made clear that revolution would be no answer to the problems of capitalist countries, including the U.S., for it might lead to serious losses both economically and in the "blood of the people," as well as being fraught with a possible ironic consequence of the type which brought Stalinism into being in the Soviet Union. In fact, as Sakharov admits, the situation in the Soviet Union cannot really be compared to that in the United States and he reaches a con-

---

[71] Sakharov's statements on this point include the powerful outcry: Is it not a shame to condemn (to 3 years in the camps) Khaustov and Bukovskii for participation in a meeting in defense of their comrades? Is it not a shame to pursue in the best witch-hunting style tens of representatives of the Soviet intelligentsia who have spoken out against the arbitrary acts of judicial and psychiatric organs and to see an attempt to force honorable people to sign false, hypocritical "refutations", and to see people fired and put on the black list, and to see young writers, editors and other members of the intelligentsia deprived of all means of existence?

* * * * * * *

Is it not a shame that the president of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. spoke at the Moscow Party conference and was evidently either so frightened or so dogmatic in his views? Is it not a shame to see a revival of anti-Semitism in employment policy (moreover, in the higher bureaucratic elite of our state the spirit of philistine anti-Semitism has never completely been driven away since the thirties)? Is it not a shame to see the continuing limitation of the rights of the Crimean Tatar people, who lost from Stalinist repressions about 46 percent of their population (basically children and old people)? Is it not the greatest shame and danger to see ever more frequent attempts at a public rehabilitation, whether open or covert (and with the help of passing things over in silence), of Stalin, his comrades in arms, and his policy, of his pseudo-socialism of a terroristic bureaucracy, a socialism of hypocrisy and a pretence of growth, in the best of conditions of but a quantitative and one-sided growth, with a loss of many qualitative characteristics?

clusion that the first country is significantly in a better position as regards many problems. One noteworthy statement indicates that about 40 percent of the Soviet population is in "a very difficult economic position. (In the U.S. the poverty line includes approximately 25 percent of the population)." Indeed, at the other end of the economic scale, Sakharov is harsher with regard to the Soviet upper level groups, who have benefited, he states, from all sorts of covert privileges, than he is against American "millionaires."

In calling for a wide-scale economic reform, Sakharov attacks a number of features of Communist management of economic affairs and, by his suggestions for freeing prices, materials allotment, investment, and labor distribution by the acceptance of market factors, proposes what would amount to the abandonment of much in prevailing economic dogma. This he sees as a necessary step toward furthering the continued convergence of the two systems. But the following paragraph may better serve to define Sakharov's views on this point:

> The capitalist world could not escape giving birth to the socialist one. But the socialist world must not destroy the soil which gave it birth by means of armed force. This would be the suicide of humanity under the present concrete conditions. Socialism must fertilize this soil by its example and by other indirect forms of pressure and merge with it. A drawing near to the capitalist world must not be an unprincipled, antipopular "plot" of the ruling groups (which is in principle possible, as is seen by the "extreme" example of the events of 1939–40 [a reference to the Nazi-Soviet pact]) and it must be undertaken not only on a socialist, but also on a popular and democratic basis, under the control of public opinion, through all the democratic institutions of publicity, elections, etc.

Such a gradual, peaceful transition, Sakharov feels, is much preferable to thermonuclear war, which would be suicidal to humanity, and this transition, if carried on in conditions of intellectual freedom, would provide liberty and security for mankind.

In a concise and, as he admits, "schematic" set of concluding proposals, Sakharov sets forth proposed stages for the overcoming of international differences and for the formation, by approximately the year 2000, of a system, economically, technically and intellectually so developed that mankind could be assured of freedom and justice. This would involve, among other factors, the setting up of a multi-party system in the U.S.S.R., an attack on racism and militarism throughout the world, and a wide program of assistance to the poorer areas of the world, supplied jointly by the U.S. and the U.S.S.R., together with other developed countries and on the basis of the 20 percent "tax" on national income mentioned above, culminating in the erection of a world government.

Sakharov turns to the leadership of the Soviet Union with a number of concrete proposals, calling upon it to strengthen ties of peaceful coexistence, to develop a wide program for the fight against hunger, to draw up a new press law which would abolish irresponsible censorship and further free study and discussion in search of truth, to annul all unconstitutional laws and directives which violate the rights of man, to liberate political prisoners and review cases such as those of Siniavskii, Daniel, Galanskov, and Ginzburg, to free public life from neo-Stalinist influences, to carry out a wide economic reform, and to adopt measures against pollution of the environment, in cooperation with world efforts in this sphere. He then states that he is appealing, not only to the Soviet leadership, but also to all citizens of the country, to all people of good will throughout the earth, and that, though he

recognizes the controversial nature of many of his proposals, he hopes for a frank and open discussion of them.

An afterword indicates that earlier variants of Sakharov's tract have been circulated to friends and colleagues and that this text includes changes as the result of suggestions made by readers. Although it is of course impossible to determine how widely this document may have been read in the Soviet Union, it is a noteworthy example of the breadth of critical appraisal and of intellectual interests of a major scholar and, when considered in connection with such petitions as that signed by 95 mathematicians in protest against official acts hindering human rights, it indicates a possible latent dissent of considerable proportions among the scientific community.

The Official Reaction

There are, of course, other problems which face the Soviet government in addition to the current of discontent among the intellectuals. The necessity for increasing agricultural production, for investing large sums in new forms of industry, for providing more services to the increasingly exigent consumers, for training and allocating a more skilled labor force, for finding some sort of accommodation with the recalcitrant Chinese Communists all are to be met with on the agendas of the Soviet leaders, and together they may seem to overshadow this single phenomenon which is to be observed only among a relatively narrow segment of the population. However, this small group of people include many of those who shape the "climate of opinion" in the Soviet Union and whose dissent might do much to wear away the ideological bases of the regime.

In Stalin's time such a problem would have been handled in the very direct and uncomplicated fashion of liquidating or exiling those who grumbled. The present Soviet leadership is presented with a delicate and terrifying dilemma. As numbers of the protests will show, and as may be seen in such statements in the foregoing text as that of the historian Snegov, the return to these methods is widely and openly opposed among all sorts of Soviet people. On the other hand, it is, despite this, difficult for the regime to relinquish its claim to direct the intellectual life of the country and to permit even relatively free expression of thought. As a result, one finds such phenomenon as the allegedly "open" trial of Ginzburg and Galanskov in which the course of justice is so strongly influenced by the agents of the state as to generate a further series of protest from those who cannot accept such open and brutal mockery of the proclaimed goals of the Soviet system.

The situation is further complicated by the fact that even the time-honored methods of using the security agencies to warn the recalcitrant of possible consequences do not seem today to be so effective as in former times. One may see this in such confrontations as that between Pavel Litvinov and the KGB representative, or between Krasnov-Levitin and a whole group of members of the official atheist organizations. Both men held quite firmly to their positions and continued to express their disagreements with the existing state of affairs. Of course, there are undoubtedly instances in which officialdom has found this method rather useful, but as more and more persons in the Soviet Union come to feel that they have *rights* as citizens, that the consti-

tutional provisions for the freedom of speech are valid, that the government should honor the pledge implicit in the laws that the accused should receive open and fair trial, the effectiveness of such attempted coercion will most probably decline.

The principal tool left to the regime, then, is that of attempted persuasion of the general public that it is only a small group of unstable, self-important, ineffectual sensation seekers who have raised these protests. Added to this is the affirmation that it comes very largely as the result of agitation from outside, from forces of capitalist ideological subversion who attempt by all sorts of insidious means to foster unrest in the Soviet Union.

In some cases, Soviet organs have sought to add a touch of satire or irony to this, as, for example, M. Semenov, editor of the allegedly humorous Soviet magazine *Krokodil*, wrote in *Literaturnaia gazeta* of March 13, 1968, that he had leafed through all 644 pages of the list of members of the Union of Soviet Writers and had not found Ginzburg, Galanskov, or Dobrovol'skii listed, that he had never met them in literary circles, nor had his inquiries among other editors shown them as contributors to any publication. Semenov thanked the Voice of America and the BBC for their touching concern with literature in the Soviet Union. All in all, to an outside reader, this irony would rather seem to backfire, as Semenov's heavy-handedness about the subject tends more to bolster the view that the Soviet official lords of literature are unfriendly to new, young talent than otherwise.

Somewhat heavier artillery was employed in the next attempt at persuading the Soviet intelligentsia that these protests were the work only of a few malcontents. On March 27, 1968, the chief editor of *Literaturnaia gazeta*, A. Chakovskii, filled four columns with his answer to a reader who wrote asking why this journal, "falling silent now about the campaign which has been undertaken by the world press in relation to the trial of the group of young writers, has committed a mistake, principally by passing over the interest of readers in knowing the true situation, even if only for purposes of counterpropaganda.'

In replying, Chakovskii also used the argument of Semenov that these people had "never and nowhere (if one speaks of our own country) published a single line" and asked if the reader called them "writers" only "because the Voice of America, BBC, and the Deutsche Welle had called them that?" He went on to emphasize an alleged connection between Galanskov and his fellow defendants and the Russian anti-Soviet émigré organization NTS (Narodno-Trudovoi Soiuz—Populist-Labor Union), in which the four had received anti-Soviet items for illegal distribution in the U.S.S.R. and had provided slanderous material to the West. In fact, he said, the publications received by the young Soviet writers had included recommendations about methods of fighting the Soviet regime, including appeals for terroristic activities and other steps looking toward "abolition of the Communist dictatorship."

In view of these circumstances Chakovskii sees "no grounds for not trusting the court or the information in the Soviet press, and therefore for doubting that these people were condemned in accordance with the laws of the Soviet Union." He also defends the court's procedures, stating that there is no need to speak of "secret" or "closed"

sessions of the court merely because foreign correspondents were not admitted. "If they had been invited, then there would be set in motion the testimony of 'impartial eyewitnesses' to the effect that the accused were innocent lambs and that their guilt was absolutely unproved." This last argument seems rather strange, for one may ask if, as Chakovskii states, the four were truly guilty, why this could not be proven for foreign correspondents as well as for the rank and file Soviet citizen.

What is perhaps worse, he thinks, is that some Soviet writers "who weren't at the trial" have attempted to cast doubt on the court in a letter addressed to the Voice of America. Chakovskii cites a number of counterdocuments, the first from, of all signatories, teachers of the First Moscow Medical Institute who state that they did attend the trial. A second in the same vein is signed by teachers of the Moscow Automobile and Highway Institute, and a third by workers from the All-Union Scientific-Research Institute of Mineral Raw Materials, and a fourth, by 30 workers of the First State Ballbearing Plant. Since it is clearly indicated that all these signatories did attend the trial, it would seem that Chakovskii has disproved his own argument that the audience was not specially selected, if for no other reason than that thirty workers of the First State Ballbearing Plant would hardly take time from work in such an important branch of industry to attend the trial of four allegedly obscure and unknown young people without some degree of preconcerted planning.

The trial of the four accused in Moscow, Chakovskii states, was certainly more just and fair than actions allegedly taken against American writers fighting for civil rights, and he questions the right of those who organize such cases to teach the Soviets proper court procedures and democracy.

Since the letter on which Chakovskii based his long answer had also raised questions as to the problem of "creative daring" and "freedom of opinion," the reader is asked by the editor of the Literary Gazette the rhetorical question as to whether he believes that "the freedom of opinion in our country should include the freedom for an appeal for the overthrow of the socialist system, freedom for connections with foreign counterrevolution, and freedom for dissemination of its propagandistic materials." Although the dependants, according to bourgeois propaganda, were striving for the "improvement of Soviet life," Chakovskii asks if it is not true that any man never undertakes an inimical act against his own country without "crying out about love for his people, thus trying by this to find moral justification for his treason."

As for the foreign writers, "among whom are several quite respected ones," who have appealed against the verdict, they have no immunity to the lies which are spread by all forms of propaganda. Some, Chakovskii states, operate on the principle "fifty-fifty" [he uses the English words], and feel that, having protested against alleged evils in a capitalist country, they must also protest against Soviet acts, in order to escape suspicion as sympathizers with communism. And others, who have no reputation because of their literary output, "are athirst for an easy popularity and are ready to join their names to any sensation." This seems a rather cavalier relegation of even "several quite

respected" foreign writers to the category of dupes, fence-sitters, or talentless self-advertisers.[72]

But, Chakovskii goes on to ask the next question, what about the Soviet people, including a number of professional writers, who have protested on the subject? "Are you interested in my opinion about the Soviet literary figures who are authors of these letters? . . . Evidently there are some among them who are convinced that they are fighting for the restoration of truth, although the surprising readiness of anti-Soviet radio stations to transmit their letters should have caused these comrades to beware. I think that there are also among them others, those who, unlike de Maupassant's Boule de Suif, are unable to resist the temptation of flirting with enemies. Particularly if this flirting gives their names a certain fame for the attainment of which by means of literary works it is necessary to spend long years."

In summation, Chakovskii says that the Galanskov-Ginzburg trial and the events accompanying it was not "an episode in 'the world of writers.' It is an episode in the ideological struggle. In that very struggle which does not cease for a minute. In which, for our opponents, all methods are good and the end justifies the means." [73]

It is important that this point of view was given even weightier official support as, on March 29, 1968, Leonid I. Brezhnev, the powerful Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, spoke to the 19th conference of the Moscow City Party Organization, and his speech was given the larger part of two pages of the next day's *Pravda*. "Our enemies in the camp of imperialism," he said, "seize with extraordinary speed on any signs of ideological immaturity and wavering on the part of individual representatives of the intelligentsia. The imperialists are trying to make use of these phenomena in their own interests in the ideological struggle against the world of socialism.

"But let everyone know that the representatives of Soviet culture and art, as all the intelligentsia of our country always were, are and will be on the side of their people, the side of the Party of Lenin." Brezhnev's further remarks, on the subjects of indoctrination of the youth, the need for a Party spirit in literature, and the commemoration of the centenary of the birth of the writer Maksim Gor'kii, served to reinforce this point of view that the intelligentsia and the Party shoud be inseparable and that only the tentacles of imperialism sought to sever this unity.

Shortly afterwards, on April 11, 1968, *Pravda*, *Izvestiia*, and many other Soviet newspapers printed a communique and resolutions of the Central Committee of the Party which, among other points, called on Party organizations "to wage an offensive struggle against bourgeois ideology and to oppose actively any attempts to sneak views alien to Soviet society's socialist ideology into individual works of literature, art, or other works. Party organizations must direct all available means of ideological upbringing at strengthening, in every Communist and every Soviet citizen, Communist conviction, and a sense of Soviet patriotism and proletarian internationalism, as well as ideo-

---

[72] An example of a letter of protest by American writers, arising out of the Galanskov-Ginzburg case, may be found in *The New York Review of Books*, Mar. 14, 1968, pp. 36–37. Among the signatories are Lawrence Ferlinghetti, Allen Ginsberg, Michael Harrington, Dwight Macdonald, Norman Mailer, Conor Cruise O'Brien and Susan Sontag.

[73] The English text of Chakovskii's article is to be found in *The Current Digest of the Soviet Press*, vol. 20, No. 12 (Apr. 10, 1968) pp. 7–9, 36.

logical fortitude and the ability to resist all forms of bourgeois influence."

In support of this, the newspaper *Sovetskaia Rossiia* on April 13 thundered against "instances of ideological immaturity and vacillation in some representatives of the intelligentsia. Such people often fall for the bait of bourgeois propagandists, behave antipatriotically and slide into the morass of philistinism and apolitical attitudes. Other 'members of the creative intelligentsia' who never burdened themselves with a knowledge of Marxism, claim the role of teachers of the people, although they are mostly concerned with talking loudly about themselves in the hope that the bourgeois ideologists will notice them. It is the Party organizations' obligation to react sharply to such manifestations and to deal a resolute rebuff to those who hold bourgeois views, to various renegades and to their defenders and yesmen." [74]

One day later, on April 14, *Literaturnaia gazeta* provided the text of another speech, this time by the First Secretary of the Moscow Writers' Organization and Secretary of the Board of the Union of Soviet Writers, S. Mikhalkov, delivered at the 19th conference of the Moscow City Party Organization, saying that, "if one does not count three or four famous writers' names, most of the signers of these letters have not added luster to our literature, have not enriched it with anything substantial, and it is not they who determine the true image of the writers' community. But among them are Party members, and we have the right to ask them: Is this your political stand or political immaturity? Whom are you defending? In any event, the behavior of these Communists has nothing in common with the concept of the class consciousness of likeminded Party members, of responsibility to Party and society. Especially since many have no idea of the essence of the case or the people on whose behalf they appealed."

Mikhalkov went on to state that "some time ago we adopted a decision by the secretariat of our union's board, sharply condemning the writers who signed the above-mentioned letters. We talked with them in the union's Party committee and hoped then that they would realize their mistakes. Of course, there are some who 'bark first and scratch their heads afterward.' But there are also those who to this day remain stubborn and fail to draw the appropriate conclusions for themselves . . . I do not conceal that in our everyday literary work there are still regrettable, painful questions and unresolved problems of a professional and organizational nature. We naturally devote great attention to these questions, but in settling them we shall manage somehow to do without the services of dubious defenders scribbling appeals to reactionary circles in the West. We shall manage! We know where to turn. We have the Central Committee of the Communist Party! (Stormy applause)" [75]

To one who bears in mind Cardinal Newman's phrase, "Living movements do not come of committees," this last statement might in itself seem to foreshadow a continuing sterility of official Russian literary life. Indeed, such a feeling is not contradicted by the report in *Literaturnaia gazeta* of May 1, of a session of the Moscow writers' organization held on April 17 to discuss the question of the writers who signed appeals in defense of Ginzburg and Galanskov. This in-

---

[74] The English text of this editorial may be found in *The Current Digest of the Soviet Press*, vol. 20, No. 15 (May 1, 1968) pp. 4–5.

[75] The English text of Mikhalkov's speech may be found in the *Current Digest of the Soviet Press*, vol. 20, No. 14 (May 1, 1968), pp. 5–6.

tent of the official guardians of literature to retain control is made so clear that it is worth quoting here at some length:

The course of the discussion disclosed the unsavory role of a number of Moscow writers who displayed inadmissible political dereliction and lack of principle and lent their names to arm our ideological adversaries. The antisocial actions of these writers were aggravated by the fact that their letters appeared in various bourgeois newspapers and foreign radio broadcasts to the U.S.S.R. Such actions on the part of several members of the Moscow Writers' Organization evoked the unanimous and severe condemnation of the members of the secretariat [the committee in charge of the Moscow unit of the Writers' Union]. They noted in their speeches that such actions do not represent the opinions of the Moscow literary public and, moreover, arouse legitimate protest and indignation not only among our writers, but also among the Moscow workers and representatives of the scientific and technical intelligentsia who sent letters of protest to the U.S.S.R. Writers' Union.

The secretariat noted that the voluntary defenders of the renegades fed the ideological propaganda launched by the most vicious enemies of the Soviet state, for these letters, after being clandestinely sent abroad through the traitorous actions of their direct organizers and printed there in various bourgeois publications, are being disseminated by foreign radio stations and special broadcasts to our country with the aim of discrediting the Soviet way of life and the intention of provoking certain unstable and politically immature representatives of the Soviet intelligentsia, and of prompting them to some sort of anti-Soviet action.

* * * * * * *

The secretariat placed special emphasis on the fact that the organizers of the collection of signatures in defense of Ginzburg, Galanskov, et al., who had been convicted by a Soviet court, had used unworthy methods and approaches to obtain the signatures of members of the Writers' Union; evidence of this was provided by Yu. Ye. Pilyar's letter to the secretary of the Moscow writers' organization.

After officially withdrawing his signature from the collective "statement" and condemning his action, Yu. Pilyar wrote:

"Now that I have become acquainted with the full text of the document, I cannot refrain from expressing my condemnation of the organizers of this whole letter business who so abused the confidence of a number of writers . . . I am outraged that this document, which was addressed to official Soviet bodies, was sent abroad by puny dishonest souls without the permission of the writers."

* * * * * * *

The secretariat resolved to demand explanations from the members of the Writers' Union who, by signing all sorts of statements, had become involved in the case of Ginzburg, Galanskov, et al. The secretariat will again take up this question in the form of individual cases.

Until the time of this writing (Mid-June 1968) no one other than Piliar (Pilyar) has among the writers announced the retraction of his signature. It might also be noted that, although *Literaturnaia gazeta* does not give the names of the members of the secretariat, it does append those of the persons who discussed this decision and only the most generous of critics could include these writers among the leading figures of Soviet literature. The most widely known name is probably that of S. Mikhalkov, identified above as playing a prominent role in both the Moscow and the national writers' groups, and whose earlier assiduity in officially blessed literary endeavors won him a total of three Stalin Prizes.

The speeches, articles and statements cited above are indicative of the anxiety and even alarm caused to Soviet officialdom and its servants by the protestors. Definite and oppressive measures were finally taken to redress the situation and it is easy to guess that recent developments in Czechoslovakia must have strengthened the KGB's hand and prompted the Party and government not to delay further their countermeasures. It was reported, for instance, that persons in differ-

ent fields who had signed the appeals were subjected to penalties. A dispatch to the *New York Times* of April 24, 1968, spoke of the expulsion from the Party of Izaak Gelfand, "a pioneer in the use of mathematical methods in biology," Sergei Fomin, "head of Moscow University's cybernetics department," Iurii Manin, and I. R. Shafarevich, "both winners of the Lenin Prize, . . . both mathematicians." These men, and others of prominence in science, especially in the field of mathematics, had protested the forced detention in a mental hospital of the author and mathematician Aleksandr S. Esenin-Volpin, son of the prominent Russian poet of the 1920's, Sergei Esenin. As the dispatch states, "Usually the consequence of expulsion from the party is dismissal from responsible positions and exclusion from access to secret information."

On April 28, the *Washington Post* reported that Soviet scientists had been warned against ideological deviation by a meeting of Party activists in the Academy of Sciences and were urged to "rebuff any attempt by our enemies to . . . subvert society from inside." Permissions for some of these scientists to travel abroad were also withdrawn.

In May Mikhalkov was heard from again, as a long article by him appeared in *Pravda* of the 11th, containing his criticism of "some sadly notorious epistles" written by "several 'initiators' wishing to compensate for their creative poverty by a political scandal," who gathered signatures only because of the "serious illness or softheartedness of one or another prominent writer," or because of the lack of awareness of others, or of "political thoughtlessness and a diffuse understanding of 'humanism in general' " in yet a third group. Such letters, Mikhalkov states, only served the cause of bourgeois propaganda, which allegedly is not interested in the real achievements of Soviet literature.[76]

Possibly to his surprise Mikhalkov found a few days later an ally in a somewhat more prominent figure in Soviet artistic life, Dimitrii D. Shostakovich. Speaking on May 14 at the opening of the Congress of Russian Composers, the latter also took up the theme of "an acute, irreconcilable struggle against the ideology of imperialism. We must not lose sight of this ever. The ideology of the enemy must not penetrate our works. Every Soviet artist must always feel himself a fighter for communism."

Other changes were rung on this theme. *Pravda* of May 25 contained a long article on the role of the intelligentsia in a socialist society, emphasizing that the Soviet intelligentsia is still in need of the guiding influence of the working class and its party (i.e., the Communist Party). It is, the article stated, proper to view unfavorably the fact that "some creative workers under the influence of the struggle against bureaucratic methods have tried to deny the significance of the ideological ascendancy of the party in the sphere of creative activity." Strivings in this field should not be like those of "individual renegades in the direction of anti-communism," for they will always find, on the part of the Party, the people and the intelligentsia, the most determined resistance. Nowhere can any thinking member of the intelligentsia escape the necessity for a choice between the only two alternatives, capitalism and socialism. Any attempt to stand "above the

---

[76] The Soviet bibliography of translations of Soviet literature into foreign languages lists, for the years 1945–64, only one story by S. Mikhalkov which was translated into English, being published as a pamphlet of 28 pages in the 1940's. The listing omits the translations of the text of the Soviet national anthem, of which Mikhalkov was coauthor. One verse, as it read in 1950, began "And Stalin, our leader . . ."

battle" will be unsuccessful, and it is only the weak-kneed elements in the Soviet Union who yield to such views, which are propagated by outside, subversive influences. On the contrary, asserts the official Party organ, "the Soviet intelligentsia, together with the whole nation has a boundless trust in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, recognizes its moral and political and scientific authority, and completely shares its internal and foreign policy."

Despite this and other high-sounding statements, as may be seen by examining the protests, made in 1968, which the Soviet sources call only "letters," it is not true that *all* inhabitants of the Soviet Union have so limitless a devotion to the Party and its ideology. Indeed, as these documents would indicate, there are many who are beginning to ask that the Party and the regime keep to their pledged word, that the provisions of the Soviet Constitution and of the code of laws be observed, and who insist that the words "truth," "justice," "freedom" have an unvarying meaning which does not change from day to day as the men in power seek to attain their goals by means which were adopted in Stalin's time.

It is also clear that the bitter experiences of the past have brought many thinking Soviet citizens to the point of resolving that that past must not, can not return, that any tendencies to go back to the simple, direct and cruel methods of J. V. Stalin must be resisted, and that it is the first duty of the leaders of the state to make this clear, a duty which can best be fulfilled by proper observance of the stated provisions of laws and of the constitution. To many of the Soviet leadership such simple demands for "pravda-justice" are tainted with subversion and only the hobgoblin of foreign influence can explain why they are made at all. However, as has been noted above, the Soviet leadership itself is uncertain of the policy to pursue. The young, the unprotected, the unimportant, such as Galanskov and Ginzburg, can be dealt with, but only clumsily, applying neither the crudities of the Stalin era, in which many of the present administrators got their training, nor the rule of law, with the result that they fall into positions which can only create further protests. It is, however, impossible to proceed in this way against "the public" and, for the first time in decades there seems to be forming in the Soviet Union a "public," the inheritors of that group of 19th century people, literate and informed, whose disagreement with the Tsarist government, whose nonacceptance of its political myths, did so much to bring it eventually down. This, of course, is not intended as a prediction of the downfall of the Soviet government—predictions on such points or on any points about Russia are games for fools—but rather as a pointing out of the existence now in the Soviet Union of a body of educated, public-spirited and informed people who can no longer be dragooned into the endless hymns of praise to the "leader of all progressive humanity" but who must be persuaded by real facts into a rational and honorable support of a state, one which can be depended on to uphold freely and unreservedly its constitutional and legal commitments.

The final word on this subject must still be, as it was when this study was first undertaken 2 years ago, that the Soviet intelligentsia does not seek the revolutionary step of divorce but that it is ready to admit a considerable degree of marital strain.

○