

FINAL REPORT TO
NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR SOVIET AND EAST EUROPEAN RESEARCH

TITLE: The Transformations of Babi Yar

AUTHOR: Richard Sheldon

CONTRACTOR: Research Institute of International Change,
Columbia University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Seweryn Bialer

COUNCIL CONTRACT NUMBER: 801-15

DATE:

The work leading to this report was supported by funds provided by the National Council for Soviet and East European Research.

THE NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR SOVIET AND EAST EUROPEAN RESEARCH

Leon S. Lipson
Chairman, Board of Trustees
Vladimir I. Toumanoff
Executive Director

Suite 304
1755 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 337-0168

PREFACE

This report is one of 13 separate papers by different authors which, assembled, will constitute the chapters of a Festschrift volume in honor of Professor Vera S. Dunham, to be published by Westview Press. The papers will be distributed individually to government readers by the Council in advance of editing and publication by the Press, and therefore, may not be identical to the versions ultimately published.

The Contents for the entire series appears immediately following this Preface.

As distributed by the Council, each individual report will contain this Preface, the Contents, the Editor's Introduction for the pertinent division (I, II, or III) of the volume, and the separate paper itself.

CONTENTS

Introduction

Seweryn Bialer

I. Trends in Soviet Society

Editors' Introduction

- James R. Millar - "The Little Deal: Brezhnev's Contribution to Acquisitive Socialism"
- Sheila Fitzpatrick - "'Middleclass Values' and Soviet Life in the 1930s"
- Peter H. Juviler - "Cell Mutation in Soviet Society: The Soviet Family"
- John Bushnell - "Urban Leisure Culture in Post-Stalin Russia: Stability as a Social Problem?"
- Michael Paul Sacks - "The Division of Labor in Central Asia and its Influence Upon Ethnic and Gender Conflict"

II. Literary Perspectives

Editors' Introduction

- Edward J. Brown - "Trifonov: The Historian as Artist"
- Richard Sheldon - "The Transformations of Babi Yar"
- Donald Fanger and Gordon Cohen - "Dissidence, Diffidence, and Russian Literary Tradition: The Lonely Dialogue of Abram Tertz"

III. The Language of Ideology

Editors' Introduction

- Alexander Dallin - "The Uses and Abuses of Russian History"
- Alfred Erich Senn - "Creating a Consensus: Soviet Historiography of the Russian Revolutionary Movement in the Nineteenth Century"
- Terry L. Thompson - "Developed Socialism: Brezhnev's Contribution to Soviet Ideology"

IV. Sources of Soviet Stability

Editors' Introduction

- Gertrude E. Schroeder - "The State-Run Economy: Stability or Ossification? An Essay on the Soviet Production System"
- Seweryn Bialer - "The Conditions of Stability in the Soviet Union"

(Editors' Introduction)

II. Literary Perspectives

No one surpasses Vera Dunham in the ability to suggest the complex interaction between social and personal conditions that gives rise to a poem, a short story or a novel. She is, in short, not an arid formalist, but she nevertheless scrutinizes the verbal texture and sets beside the work being examined other texts that provide startling illumination.

The materials retained by Vera Dunham's students include poems that she copied by hand during the years when she had no access to xerox machines. She said spell-binding things about the significance of those poems and that literature. She brought to life for her students the tragic struggle of Soviet writers to be true to the obligation bestowed on them by Pushkin and his illustrious successors.

Vera Dunham understands the plight of Soviet writers: their special role, so different from that of the American writer; their struggle against the shifting dictates of a realism that is socialist rather than critical. The remarkable book that grew slowly and painfully in her piano bench focused on the years of Stalinism, but she knows no less well the years of fluctuating temperature that followed Stalin's death: the determined attempts to salvage the past, to restore the memory of a society systematically subjected to amnesia.

This set of papers considers some of those attempts. Monuments had to be erected: to the millions condemned like Solzhenitsyn to the camps, to the

Jews who died at Babi Yar, to the father that Trifonov lost in the purges.

Sinyavsky claims even the right to desecrate monuments.

Vera Dunham has meditated on these figures and events not in an ivory tower, but in a sad armchair, reminding us constantly not to underestimate the lethal pressures, not to judge too quickly or too harshly. We are all her students. We remember and admire not just the quality of what was transmitted--the intellect, the intuition, the provocative formulations--but also the quality of the commitment and the deep, abiding humanity.

The Transformations of Babi Yar: By Richard Sheldon

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY*

This paper traces the tortured political and literary course of Babi Yar, from the initial efforts of the Soviet Government to obliterate it from history (and physically), through the measures to blot out the Jewish nature of the tragedy, and finally to transform it into a condemnation of Zionism as equivalent to Nazism. The monument, which was completed only in the summer of 1976, omits mention of the overwhelming number of Jewish victims; it restores the dictum of Khrushchev, who had in 1956 blocked the monument, ordering instead construction of a sports stadium and a dam on the site. Works of art devoted to the theme of Babi Yar--for example, Evgenii Evtushenko's poem "Babi Yar" (1961), Anatoly Kuznetsov's 1966 novel of the same title, and Ladies' Taylor, a 1980 play by Aleksandr Borshchagovsky--provide testimony, albeit in censored form, to the tragedy that the monument misrepresents. Ilya Ehrenberg, a war correspondent who had also written a novel and poem during the 1940s on the impact the discovery of the mass graves had on him, responded to the crime of the Nazis, whereas Evtushenko spoke in his poem of the crime committed by the Soviet government--its failure to erect a monument because of the Jewish nature of the tragedy. Ehrenberg, a Jew, admitted that he had had to restrain himself because of the antisemitism among the party elite, especially during the so-called Black Years of Soviet Jewry from 1948-53. Virulent condemnations of literary works on Babi Yar denounced the emphasis on antisemitism, the failure to mention that the Russian people had led the fight against the fascists, and the retreat from the communist struggle against nationalism for internationalism. Borshchagovsky's play evaded broad criticism--it was

*Prepared by the National Council for Soviet and East European Research

promoted by Moscow even though it offered a favorable picture of the Jews inspiring sympathy--because it possessed the shibboleth of human brotherhood. Likewise, in 1983 Evtushenko's poem was published without changes required in 1961, but it contains a footnote attacking Israel equated with Nazi Germany, signifying the final way in which the Soviets have tampered with the semantics of the term "Babi Yar."

The Transformations of Babi Yar

by Richard Sheldon

On June 22, 1941, Nazi troops invaded the Soviet Union, violating the non-aggression treaty signed by Germany and the Soviet Union in August, 1939. By September 19, the Nazis had captured Kiev.¹ On September 24, the city was rocked by the explosion of mines and delayed-action bombs--explosions that continued for another four days, destroying the whole central part of the city, including its famous main street, the Kreshchatik. Hundreds of Nazis--and innocent Ukrainians--caught completely by surprise, were killed.²

The explosions gave the Nazis a ready-made pretext for taking action against the Jews. Accompanying the Nazi armies that had invaded the Soviet Union were four sets of Einsatzgruppe, or Special Duty Troops, assigned by Hitler to exterminate the Jews. In charge of the northern Ukraine was Einsatzgruppe "C", under the command of Brigadier General Otto Rasch. Operating in Kiev was Sonderkommando (Special Commando) 4A, a group of approximately 50 men under the command of Dr. Paul Blobel.

On September 27, just three days after the bombs began to detonate, the Nazi Army's Propaganda Company printed 2,000 posters, which were distributed the following day,. These posters ordered all the Jews in Kiev to assemble by the Russian and Jewish cemeteries at 8:00 a.m. on September 29. They were told to bring with them documents, money, valuables and warm clothing; they were told that anyone who disobeyed the order would be shot.

Of the approximately 200,000 Jews who inhabited Kiev at the time of the Nazi invasion in June, only a fraction remained when the city was occupied

in September. Most of the able-bodied men had been captured during the battle for the city, had left with the retreating Red Army, had taken refuge in the countryside or had already been rounded up in accordance with a Nazi directive on September 22 to place all adult Jewish males in labor camps. Those Jews who did remain in the city, then, were mostly old men, women and children--perhaps as many as 30% being children under the age of eight, left in the care of grandparents. They had stayed in Kiev because Soviet Jews knew little if anything about Hitler's anti-Jewish policies, that information having been suppressed during the period between 1939 and 1941 when Hitler and Stalin had been allies; consequently, Jews reading the poster in Kiev speculated that the Nazis might be planning to resettle them in Germany or perhaps in Palestine.

What happened instead was very different. The Jews were herded to Babi Yar, a deep wooded ravine on the northern outskirts of Kiev. There they were divested of their possessions and ordered to strip. Through a gauntlet of police dogs and Nazi soldiers, they were driven out on a narrow ledge high above the ravine, where they were shot by machine guns stationed on the other side.

In a report that Einsatzgruppe C submitted on November 4, 1941, to Reinhard Heydrich, Chief of German Security Police, the Kiev operation was described:

Several reprisal measures on a large scale have been undertaken by this group.

The most successful among them specifically included Jews in Kiev with their entire families.

The difficulty which an action of this size always presents--the physical assembly of the Jews--was overcome in Kiev in the following manner. The Jewish population was ordered through posters in the city to

present themselves for evacuation. It was believed that not more than 5,000 or 6,000 would participate, but in fact more than 30,000 responded, believing in the famous evacuation up to the last moment, thanks to our most efficient organization.³

Contrary to the boast about "our most efficient organization," the large number of "participants" testifies eloquently to the success of the Soviet government in suppressing news about the treatment of the Jews in Germany and western Poland. The inhabitants of Kiev had also not been told about the extermination of the large Jewish communities in Bialystok and Lwow by Hitler's Einsatzgruppen in late June, 1941. Even the Nazis, with all their efficiency, underestimated the extent to which Soviet Jews were ignorant of Hitler's plan for a final solution to the Jewish problem.

Equally revealing is the following quotation, taken from Activity and Situation Report No. 6, covering the work of all the Special Duty Troops between October 6 and 13, 1941:

The embitterment of the Ukrainian population against the Jews is extremely great, because they are thought to be responsible for the explosions in Kiev. They are also regarded as informers and agents of the NKVD, who started the terror against the Ukrainian people. As a measure of retaliation for the arson in Kiev, all Jews were arrested and, all together, 33,771 Jews were executed on 29 and 30 September, 1941. Money, valuables and clothing were secured and put at the disposal of the provisional city administration for distribution to the needy.⁴

Word of what had happened at Babi Yar soon leaked out. During the first week of October, a group of journalists invited to inspect the damage inflicted on Kiev by the explosions questioned Captain Koch about Babi Yar and refused to believe his denials. On November 25, 1941, the Jewish Telegraphic Agency (JTA) reported that 52,000 men, women and children had been put to death in Kiev. This assertion was confirmed on January 6, 1942,

in a note signed by Molotov and addressed to all governments. The note refers to the 52,000 people put to death in Kiev and says, "These bloody executions were especially directed against unarmed and defenseless Jewish working people."⁵

By November 3, 1941, according to Dr. Blobel, the number of Jews shot at Babi Yar had exceeded 75,000. While there is no way of knowing the precise figures, it is estimated that ultimately 100,000 people died at Babi Yar, of whom 90,000 were Jews.⁶

When the tide turned against the Nazis after the Battle of Stalingrad, it became imperative to destroy the evidence. On August 13, 1943, the Nazis forced a group of prisoners to begin the abominable task of exhuming the bodies and burning them in pyres. When Kiev was liberated on November 6, however, much evidence remained. Some of those who perpetrated these crimes, such as Dr. Blobel, were convicted at the Nürnberg Tribunals, but Anatoly Kuznetsov alleged that no one in Sonderkommando 4A was convicted at Nürnberg. Then a year after Kuznetsov's novel appeared, eleven men were indicted in Darmstadt for their part in the massacre at Babi Yar. The trial lasted from October 1, 1967, through November, 1968. Seven of the eleven were convicted for a total of 61 years in prison. The court heard 175 witnesses from all over the world. In May, 1971, three more former Nazis went on trial in Regensburg for their crimes at Babi Yar.⁷

Between 1942 and 1948, the start of a virulent campaign against Jewish culture in the Soviet Union, there were several attempts by Jewish writers to commemorate the massacre. Itzik Kipnis published an article on September 29, 1944, the third anniversary of the massacre. He spoke obliquely of how the anguish felt by the Jews was made worse by the indifference of the

Ukrainians, but he compared the Jewish people to a nodule of mercury that reshapes itself into a whole drop even after a substantial part of it has been lost. Kipnis also published, in 1947, a story called "Bluntly Without Reckonings," in which he described a kind-hearted Ukrainian woman who saved a Jewish boy and girl from the massacre and reared them as her own. This story was published in Einikeit, the journal put out by the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee. When it was censored in various ways, Kipnis had the uncensored version published in a Jewish newspaper in Poland, for which he got into serious trouble.

Perets Markish published in 1948 a four-part epic called War, containing more than 20,000 lines of poetry. This work deals with the fate of the Jews in the Soviet Union through two protagonists, Gurary, a young Jew, and Aleksei Sadovsky, a young Russian officer. Gurary, having miraculously escaped from Babi Yar, returns there after the war with the young Russian officer to show him the place where the earth heaved for seven days over the mass grave of those buried alive.⁸

There was also a poem called "Abraham," published by a Ukrainian Jewish poet named Sava Holovanivs'kyj. He depicts Ukrainians watching passively as the old Jew Abraham is driven to his death at Babi Yar. The motif of Ukrainian complicity was taboo, especially after 1948. Holovanivs'kyj was pilloried for this poem by none other than the head of the Ukrainian Writers' Union, Dmitry Dmiterko. The severity of the attack reflects the antisemitic atmosphere that had been established by 1949:

Holovanivs'kyj is the author of a nationalist poem, "Abraham," which is openly hostile to the Soviet people. In this poem Holovanivs'kyj heaps terrible, unthinkable slander upon the Soviet nation. He lies brazenly by alleging that the Soviet people--Russians and Ukrainians--turned their backs on an old Jew, Abraham,

whom the Germans were marching through the streets of Kiev to be shot.

This is a terrible defamation of the Soviet nation, which has succeeded, after a hard and bloody struggle and by dint of great sacrifice and effort, in upholding the freedom and independence of Soviet people of all nationalities.⁹

In the same article, Dmiterko singled out for special condemnation a brilliant young drama critic named Aleksandr Borshchagovsky. Borshchagovsky had edited a journal of drama criticism call Teatr until 1940 and taught for several years at the Theater Institute, a school based on the Stanislavsky method. He also directed the literary section of the Kiev Jewish Theater. Between 1946 and 1948, he had published three books--on Franko, Buchma and Tobilevish, as well as many articles and revisions. Dmiterko accused him of being a "rootless cosmopolite" because he had dared to suggest that Franko had been influenced by Ibsen, a westerner. He had also dared to point out flaws in the work of Shevchenko and Korneichuk: the former a classic of nineteenth century Ukrainian literature, the latter a Party hack. Thirty years later, Borshchagovsky was to write a play about Babi Yar, which will be discussed at the end of this paper.

There is one other writer who dealt during the forties with the theme of Babi Yar and who is of special interest for the purposes of this paper. That is Ilya Ehrenburg. In 1947, Ehrenburg published a novel called The Storm, which contains a description of Hannah and her granddaughter being sent to their deaths at Babi Yar. Hannah's son Osip hears about their fate only much later and visits the desolate site after Kiev has been recaptured by the Red Army.¹⁰

Ehrenburg was traveling with the Red Army when Kiev was liberated. Working as a war correspondent for Izvestia, he saw with this own eyes the

terrible evidence of the atrocities committed at Babi Yar. In his novel, he assigned that experience to fictional characters, but he also wrote a poem in which he registered his response directly, as he did in his memories:

There were no relative of mine among those who lost their lives, but nowhere, I think, have I felt so wretched, so orphaned, as on the sands of Babi Yar. Here and there a pile of ashes and charred bones made a black patch (before they retreated, the Germans ordered prisoners-of-war to dig up the bodies of the victims and burn them). Somehow I had the feeling that my relatives, friends, childhood playmates had perished here, friends whom forty years earlier I had watched at their games in the murky streets of Podol and Demievka.¹¹

The poem¹² testifies to the sincerity of Ehrenburg's response by the fact that he never calls for retribution or, for that matter, even alludes to the Nazis. He was too overcome with pity for the victims to think of retribution. He identified strongly with the victims not only because he was a Jew, but because he had been born in Kiev and had, throughout his life, frequently returned to Kiev to visit friends and relatives.

Although deeply moved by the massacre at Babi Yar, Ehrenburg lacked the command of poetic diction needed to produce a first-rate poem. After expressing his horror in conventional terms--the inadequacy of words, the rock on the heart, the convict's ball and chain--he attempts to restore the victims to life in his imagination: focusing first on an individual, then on the grasp of the whole. He imagines a woman whose hands he once kissed, but whom in fact he never knew. The woman remains schematic, at least partly because neither piece of information about her really matters. Measured by what she has suffered, the information that he kissed her hands and that he never actually knew her in real life becomes irrelevant and trivial.

In the final portion of the poem, Ehrenburg imagines the collective victims rising from their mass grave and moving toward cities that smell of bread and perfume. The word "cities" has already been mentioned once earlier in the poem, when Ehrenburg said that he once lived in cities. The word "cities" does not belong in the poem at all and there is certainly no justification for its being used twice in a short poem, where every word counts. To begin with, why the plural form when the victims are from Kiev? More seriously, why does it matter whether the victims were from the city or the country? And why, in this context, would the victims be drawn primarily to the smells of bread and perfume when their children and grandchildren have been killed?

This poem ends with the image of the risen dead arriving in the cities and the exhortation to douse the lights and haul down the flags. Then comes the final line: "We have come to you. Not we--ravines." There is a serious problem with the metonymic shift that takes place here: from the part for the whole that the word "bones" represents to the container for the contained that the word "ravines" represents. The word "bones" is adequate, if not startlingly original, but the word "ravines" is inadequate, perhaps even faintly ridiculous. Thousands of dead bodies cannot be adequately described as ravines. Moreover, when one imagines that the legions of the dead marching on the cities are not skeletons but ravines, it becomes evident that the substitution is not only inadequate but wrong.

Although Ehrenburg was unable to create a poem that could do justice to the theme of Babi Yar, there can be no doubt that the discovery of these mass graves had a major impact on him. He had, for the most part, lived abroad since 1921, working for various Soviet newspapers on a series of

assignments that included the civil war in Spain during the late thirties. During the thirties, he had downplayed his Jewish original. After the Nazi-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact in 1939, he had been forced to conceal his antipathy toward Nazism; in fact, publication of his novel The Fall of Paris has been discontinued because of its negative picture of Nazism.¹³

The Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union, then, allowed Ehrenburg finally to express his true feelings about the Jews and about the Nazis. On August 24, 1941, he took part in a public meeting called to rally support for the Jews. Among those who spoke were Itzik Fefer, Solomon Mikhoels, David Bergelson, Jerome Kuznetsov and Petr Kapitsa. Ehrenburg's speech made the strongest impression. He said that he was a Russian writer and that his native tongue was Russian, but that he could also not forget that his mother's name was Hannah. He proclaimed the pride that he felt in being a Jew, a people whom the Nazis had chosen as the chief target of their persecutions, and he called upon Jews all over the world to help their Soviet brethren expel the Nazi invaders. This idea of enlisting the moral and financial help of the American Jews in particular led the Soviet government to allow the formation of the Jewish Antifascist Committee in April, 1942.¹⁴ Its task was to work among Jews in the West, especially in America, and to enlighten them about the achievements of the Soviet Union, in the hope of gaining their support against the common enemy. In 1943, Mikhoels and Fefer traveled to England and America, where they collected nearly three million dollars for the Soviet war effort.

By early 1944, however, the Soviet Union was already reluctant to admit that Jews had suffered more than other nationalities. On March 1, 1944, for example, the Extraordinary State Commission for the Investigation of Nazi

Atrocities in Kiev spoke of the "thousands of peaceful Soviet citizens" massacred in Kiev by the Nazis. Whereas Molotov's note in January, 1942, had indicated that the Jews were singled out for lethally special treatment in Kiev, this report in March, 1944 never mentioned the Jews.¹⁵

In August, 1944, the Jewish Antifascist Committee (JAC) ran into trouble. It had undertaken, in collaboration with American Jewish organizations, to publish an account of Nazi atrocities against the Jews in the Soviet Union. This account included accurate descriptions of the Jewish massacre at Babi Yar. The manuscript, entitled the "Black Book," was edited by Ehrenburg and Vaily Grossman. The JAC rejected the forward written by Albert Einstein and, in general, showed no inclination to proceed further with the project. Evidently, the committee was getting too heavily involved in domestic Soviet matters to suit Stalin's tastes, so he stopped publication of the book.¹⁵ The committee further jeopardized its position by reviving the old proposal that the Crimea depopulated by Stalin's eviction of the Crimean Tartars, be made a Jewish Soviet Republic. Stalin saw this proposal as a blatant violation of the committee's charter and as a plot by American Zionists to establish a colony within the borders of the Soviet Union.¹⁷

Throughout the war, in addition to his active role in the Jewish Antifascist Committee, Ehrenburg continued the work as a war correspondent that had taken him to the burial pits of Babi Yar. His dispatches became known for their vitriolic anti-German diatribes and for their constant reminders to the Soviet people that they shared a common heritage with the West that had to be preserved. By April, 1945, however, this combination of anti-German and pro-Western sentiments had outlived its usefulness and

Ehrenburg was rebuked by Georgy Aleksandrov, chief of the information bureau of the Central Committee.¹⁸

When the war ended, the ruling circles of the Ukraine discussed the possibility of building a monument at Babi Yar. Among those who worked hardest to promote this idea was Ehrenburg. In the end, though, the Central Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party voted not to erect a monument.¹⁹ First secretary of the CPU at this time was Nikita S. Khrushchev.²⁰

On various occasions during his regime, Khrushchev was to express the intriguing thought that Jews should not hold leadership positions, because Jews in those positions attract resentment and hostility, which in turn breed antisemitism. One can extrapolate from that attitude at least one reason why Khrushchev did not wish to build a monument at Babi Yar. Another reason can be found in the fact that Jews returning to their homes in the Ukraine after the war often met with a cool reception. Those Ukrainians who had helped the Nazis and those who had taken the jobs and apartments vacated by the Jews were not eager to see them return. Under those circumstances, the members of the Ukrainian Central Committee were reluctant to endorse a monument to the Jews.²¹

The onset of a virulent anti-Western campaign in 1946 soon had ominous consequences for the Jews. In January, 1948, a mysterious accident took the life of one of the foremost Jewish intellectuals, Solomon Michaelis, who was evidently murdered by the GPU at Stalin's behest. In April, 1948, no Soviet delegation was allowed to attend the commemoration of the fifth anniversary of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising. In August, 1948, no Soviet delegation was allowed to attend the World Jewish Congress.

The work of that congress was strongly criticized by Itzik Fefer, who

argues that the delegates should have taken a much stronger stand in support of Israel during the War for Independence. "The state of Israel," he maintained, "is no longer a monopoly of the World Jewish Congress or, for that matter, of the Zionist organizations. It is the concern of the Jewish people as a whole."²²

The concept of a Jewish unity transcending national frontiers was anathema to the CPSU, which chose for the counterattack none other than Ilya Ehrenburg. In an article that astonished his Jewish colleagues, Ehrenburg published a denunciation of Israel which set the stage for the whole campaign against the "cosmopolities" that was to last until Stalin's death.²³ Many years later, Ehrenburg revealed that the piece had been "commissioned" by the editor of Pravda.²⁴

In this article Ehrenburg expresses dismay at the infusion of Anglo-American capital into Israel and he reminds his readers that Israel is governed not by the working class but by the bourgeoisie, which always has an excessive interest in money and war. Israel cannot be a solution to the Jewish problem until socialism triumphs over capitalism. Jews in other countries must stay where they are. French Jews should work for changes in France; American Jews should work for change in America. The war, with its bringing together of Jews and Gentiles against the Nazi invaders, has solved the Jewish problem in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. Soviet Jews look not to the Middle East but to the future, while Israeli workers look to the Soviet Union.

The principal message of this article is that there is no such thing as a Jewish nation with ties that transcend national boundaries, and that idea was the premise upon which the Jewish Antifascist Committee has been

founded. Shortly after publishing the article, Ehrenburg resigned from the committee. In November, the committee was dissolved and most of its members were arrested. By the time of Stalin's death, almost everyone connected with the committee--except Ehrenburg--had been executed.

Testimony about the fate of these Jewish intellectuals was given by Bernard Turner, Moscow correspondent for the London Daily Mail and the Tel Aviv Davar. Turner claims to have been in a Siberian labor camp with Fefer and Bergelson. His testimony is suspect, however, since it is virtually certain that the prisoners were held in Moscow until their execution in August, 1952. Though the story itself is probably apocryphal, it expresses the feeling of Ehrenburg's compatriots--and evidently his own feeling--that he had not played an admirable role in these events. Here is Turner's account:

They made the following request of me: Should you ever meet Ilya Ehrenburg, ask him in our name to place flowers on the unmarked graves of those innocents murdered, in whose martyrs' deaths he had a goodly share.

Six years later, in October 1955, I had an opportunity to fulfill this last wish of Bergelson and Fefer. It was at the Vienna airport. In the presence of the chairman of the Soviet Writers' Union, Nikolai Tikhonov, I transmitted to Ehrenburg, in their very words, the last wish of his comrades of the pen, Bergelson and Fefer. Ehrenburg turned pale as chalk. His lips began to tremble; he foamed at the mouth. A lost soul, he backed away and fled from me.

In January, 1953, it was announced that nine distinguished doctors, of whom at least six were Jewish, had confessed to murdering A. Zhdanov and to having plotted the murder of important army officers with an eye to weakening the defenses of the Soviet Union. Shortly after Stalin's death in March, it was admitted by the new collective leadership that the charges

were false and that the confessions had been obtained by torture. Stalin was apparently planning to use public execution of the doctors as the signal for a massive pogrom, after which, for their own protection, all the Jews in the Soviet Union were to be rounded up and shipped to Siberia.

Stalin's death inaugurated the period of relaxed controls which was soon known as the Thaw. The name actually came from a novel published by Ehrenburg in 1954-- a novel which has as its central message the need for more artistic freedom. With this novel, Ehrenburg assumed the role that he was to play until his death in 1967: as defender of the right of talented young writers to freedom of expression. No doubt he was trying to make amends for the article that he had written in 1948.²⁶

By the mid-fifties, monuments were being erected at the sites of Nazi crimes all over the Soviet Union and the absence of a monument at Babi Yar had become more conspicuous. There had been no question of raising such a monument during the so-called Black Years of Soviet Jewry between 1948 and 1953, but in 1957 the question was officially discussed by the Ukrainian Central Committee, now under the leadership of Nikolai Podgorny. The committee decided not to erect a monument and it also decided to efface the site altogether. Plans were made to build a sports stadium on the site and to build a dam at one end of the ravine.²⁷

These plans to efface the site drew a powerful objection from the prominent Soviet novelist Viktor Nekrasov, born and reared in Kiev. In an article published by the Literary Gazette on 10 October 1959, he spoke of the 200,000 inhabitants of Kiev who lost their lives at Babi Yar and its environs--so many that hardly a family in the city was untouched. Nekrasov mentioned the monuments being erected at such sites all over the Soviet

Union. Apparently a design for a monument at Babi Yar had been prepared by A. V. Vlasov and sketches for a painting had been completed by V. Ovchinnikov. Nekrasov wondered what had happened to those projects.

Nekrasov mentioned having just heard of the plans to flood the area and to construct a stadium:

Can that be possible? Who could have hatched such a scheme--to fill the ravine and, on the very spot where this terrible tragedy occurred, to do exercises and play soccer?

No, that cannot be allowed!

When a human being dies, he is buried and the grave is marked. Can anyone possibly believe that this tribute of respect was not deserved by the 195,000 people viciously shot at Babi Yar, at Syretsky, at Darnita, at the Kirillov Hospital, at the monastery. at the Lukianovskii Cemetery?²⁸

One notices immediately that Nekrasov does not prejudice his case by mentioning the Jews. Evens so, this is a bold and passionate appeal to commemorate the victims. It evidently attracted considerable support. In December, the Literary Gazette published a letter signed by several inhabitants of Kiev, who supported Nekrasov's position.²⁹ In March, 1960, came the official response. T. Skirda, speaking for the chairman of the executive committee of the Kiev City Council of Deputies, wrote that no monument had yet been built at Babi Yar because of the poor condition (neblagoustroennost') of the district. The letter reported that work would begin on the slopes in 1960 and that in the near future the site would be made into a park, at the center of which would be erected an obelisk with an inscription to the memory of the Soviet citizens brutalized by the Hitlerites in 1941.³⁰

Neither Nekrasov nor the official response mentioned the word "Jews,"

but there is an interesting difference in the two statements of the problem. Nekrasov clearly has in mind all the people killed at Babi Yar and its environs--some 200,000--whereas the official response speaks of a monument to those citizens killed in 1941, which means from the end of September to the end of December. During that period, the victims were overwhelmingly Jewish--33,771 by the end of September, 75,000 by November 3, according to Dr. Blobel. In other words, those who formulated the official proposal seemed specifically interested in remembering the Jews, though without mentioning them by name.

Also of interest in the official response from the executive committee is the information that the decision to build a monument was made by the Ukrainian government (Ukrainskoe pravitel'stvo) itself and that the decision was made in December, 1959--in other words, made in response to Nekrasov's article and to what must have been a much greater amount of support than the letter signed by several people indicated.

Soon after March, 1960, the decision made by the Ukrainian government was evidently overruled--undoubtedly by Khrushchev himself.³¹ He had vetoed the proposal for a monument after the war in his capacity as first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party. Now that he was first secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, the most powerful man in the country, he continued to block the construction of a monument. Work began on the dam, whose prospect was so offensive to Nekrasov. It was built at one end of Babi Yar to hold the mixture of mud and water pumped in from near-by brick quarries and it soon reached the height of a six-story building.

On March 13, 1961, after unusually heavy spring rains, the dam collapsed, sending a thirty-foot wall of mud and water into the norther

suburbs of Kiev. The New York Times correspondent estimated that 145 people had been killed and at least that many injured. Residents of Kiev spoke uneasily about the victims of Babi Yar having taken their revenge. In some odd way, what happened recalls the image at the end of Ehrenburg's poem of the victims, now existing only as ravines, returning to the city from which they had been forcibly taken.³²

News of the broken dam reached Evgeny Evtushenko, one of the most celebrated of the young "rebel" poets that the Thaw had produced. He traveled to Kiev to see for himself what had happened. He visited the site of Babi Yar with a young Russian named Anatoly Kuznetsov, whom he had met at the Kakhovka Hydroelectric Power Station project, and who was already hard at work on his own documentary novel about Babi Yar.³³ A few days after his visit, Evtushenko wrote his poem "Babi Yar." In September, 1961, he electrified an audience at the Moscow Polytechnical Institute by reading the poem.

The powerful reaction made Evtushenko feel that he should attempt to have the poem published. Even though the theme was heretical, Evtushenko had some reason to hope that he might succeed. Since the death of Stalin, many poems, short stories, plays and novels once considered heretical had been published. Khrushchev's secret speech to the Twentieth Party Congress in February, 1956, had led to a surge of such publications in that year. This development, however, had been cut short by unrest in Poland and revolution in Hungary in November, which provoked a crackdown on Soviet writers. This more difficult period had been prolonged by the controversy over Dr. Zhivago in 1957 and 1958.

By the fall of 1961, however, conditions were improving again and

Evtushenko resolved to have the poem published. In his Precocious Autobiography, he describes what happened when he took the manuscript to the Literary Gazette. The editors hesitated, then marked it for publication, but final approval had to come from the editor-in-chief, V. A. Kosolapov. He kept Evtushenko waiting for two hours, then called him to his office and said that he would approve the poem for publication.

The Literary Gazette was usually put to bed at seven p.m., but by nine o'clock, the editor-in-chief had still not given the order to start the presses. The pressroom foreman showed Evtushenko the page proof, complete except for a blank space where the poem might go. At midnight Kosolapov summoned Evtushenko again to tell him that he would in fact publish the poem. He had merely wanted to consult with his wife before starting the presses.³⁴

"Babi Yar" appeared on the last page of the Literary Gazette on September 19, 1961--in time to commemorate the twentieth anniversary of the massacre.³⁵ Every copy of that issue was sold in a matter of minutes and by that afternoon Evtushenko was receiving congratulatory telegrams. Less enthusiastic was the official reaction. On September 24, in the journal Literature and Life, aleksei Markov published a poem in refutation.³⁶ In his poem he accused Evtushenko of having forgotten the atrocities committed by the Nazis and of having defiled, "with his pygmy's spittle," the memory of millions of Russian soldiers who died defending their country. He reminds Evtushenko that it was Russia that "blocked that embrasure with her own body." His conclusion echoes and refutes Evtushenko's conclusion: "As long as graveyards are trampled by even a single cosmopolite, I say: People, I am a Russian!"

Three days later, also in Literature and Life, appeared a long article by D. Starikov, who sternly denounced Evtushenko's poem.³⁷ Starikov begins his article with a long description of Nazi atrocities and condemns Evtushenko for a woefully inadequate response to those atrocities. Starikov much prefers Ehrenburg's poem, which he quotes extensively. He says that Ehrenburg wrote the poem to inspire Russian soldiers with hatred for the enemy. He then wonders why Evtushenko wrote his poem and expresses dismay that Evtushenko could find in those events only the theme of antisemitism. He then quotes with approval from several of Ehrenburg's wartime articles, which seem to maintain that the Nazis killed indiscriminately because "they hate all peoples." He admires Ehrenburg for the sincerity and depth of his emotions, for his refusal to classify the dead by their nationality, for his internationalism and for his understanding of the nature of fascism.

Starikov takes particular umbrage at the passage in which Evtushenko imagines himself as a Hebrew wandering through ancient Egypt and as Christ on the Cross. What he resents is the connection being made between Soviet Jews and ancient Hebrews. Why, he asks, does Evtushenko refrain from discussing the tragedy of those who abandoned their Soviet motherland to choose life as a "Jew in general" in Israel?

The article concludes with an angry reminder that Evtushenko never mentions Hitler and the fascist invaders, that he never mentions that it was the Russian people who led the fight against those killers. Starikov expresses amazement that the editors of the Literary Gazette allowed Evtushenko to use their paper to "insult the triumph of Leninist national policy with such provocations," and he quotes from the new Program of the Communist Party, which urges a constant struggle against nationalism and a

constant striving for internationalism. "The intolerable falsehood that pervades Evtushenko's Babi Yar," he says, "stems from an obvious retreat from Communist ideology to a bourgeois ideology. That is indisputable."

Ehrenburg, however, refused to be used as support for Starikov's position. On October 14, 1961, the Literary Gazette published the following brief letter:

Since I am abroad, it was with some delay that I received the September 27 issue of Literature and Life, containing D. Starikov's article "On the Subject of a Poem." I feel obliged to state that D. Starikov quotes arbitrarily from my articles and poems, cutting the quotations short to make them correspond to his thoughts and contradict mine.

Respectfully yours,

Ilya Ehrenburg

October 3³⁸

There is, however, some truth to Starikov's assertion that Ehrenburg, even during the war, tended to soft pedal the fact that the Jews were being subjected to particularly cruel treatment by the Nazis. Ehrenburg admitted this in private conversations at the end of the war, saying that he had to restrain himself because of the antisemitism prevalent among the Party elite.³⁹ It is certainly true that in his poem "Babi Yar," Ehrenburg does not dwell on the fact that Jews were killed there. At the same time, he does refer to the dead as "my kinsmen infinite" in the half of the poem which Starikov is careful to omit. It is also interesting that Starikov waxes indignant over the fact that Evtushenko never mentions Hitlerism or the Fascist invaders, conveniently ignoring the fact that neither does Ehrenburg. The fact remains that Ehrenburg did assert his Jewish identity during the war and that he did respond to the massacre as a Jew. The real

import of his letter to the Literary Gazette is that he wants to take a stand on Evtushenko's side.

Evtushenko is not Jewish, as he specifically indicates at the end of his poem, but he defends the Jews as "true Russian" and therefore he is hated with "mindless malice" by all antisemites. Though he is not a Jew, Evtushenko identifies with them and this identification expresses itself in a series of parallels that become the most prominent device of the poem. The poet is, in quick succession, a Hebrew in ancient Egypt, Christ, Dreyfus, a boy in Belostok, Anne Frank and finally, at the end of the poem, every child and every old man shot at Babi Yar. Although the passage on Anne Frank is particularly successful, this extravagant, presumptuous list of parallels imparts to the poem a bombastic, egocentric quality that does not accord well with the subject matter.

Like Ehrenburg, Evtushenko has an almost uncanny ability to sense the limits to which he can go in challenging official positions, and this poem demonstrates that quality. Antisemitism is depicted as something inherently un-Russian--associated with the Union of the Russian People, a reactionary, antisemitic organization formed in 1905, supported by the tsarist government and disbanded after the February Revolution. Antisemitism is depicted as a residue of that period, running counter to the true nature of the Russian people, who are "at heart international." Moreover, the vignettes in the poem are drawn either from prerevolutionary times, like the pogrom in Belostok, or from the experience of other countries, like Anne Frank and Dreyfus. The decision to use the word Dreyfus is particularly interesting, since a name that would have fit just as well and been even more appropriate to the theme of Soviet antisemitism is Beilis, who was accused in 1913 of

having killed a Christian child to use his blood in the Passover rituals. Beilis' trial in Kiev, of all places, attracted world-wide indignation that finally led to his acquittal.

When Ehrenburg visited Babi Yar, he wrote a poem that expressed the anguish that he felt as a Jew visiting the site of a Jewish massacre in the city where he was born. The crime to which he responded was the crime committed by the Nazis. By 1961, when Evtushenko visited the site, twenty years had passed since the massacre and it was now possible to speak of a different crime: the crime committed by the Soviet government in its failure to erect a monument. Evtushenko suggests in his poem that the reason for the absence of a monument at Babi Yar was the fact that mainly Jews had been killed there, i.e., antisemitism.

Evtushenko's poem inspired Dmitry Shostakovich to write a new symphony, the Thirteenth, which is a kind of cantata opening with the text of "Babi Yar" and continuing with four other poems written by Evtushenko.

Shostakovich was undoubtedly emboldened by the diminished pressure on him since the beginning of the Thaw. After Stalin's death, he had been finally able to release his Tenth Symphony and Violin Concerto; in 1961, when the climate was improving again after the difficulties of the late fifties, he had been able to release even his long-banned Fourth Symphony.⁴⁰

The premiere of the Thirteenth Symphony was announced for December 18, 1962. It seemed the fitting climax to the remarkable gains achieved by the liberals in 1962, which included the publication of Solzhenitsyn's A Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich in the November 1962 issue of the New World. Meanwhile, though, the temperature of the literary scene had dropped suddenly in late November, owing mainly to the tensions generated by the

outcome of the Cuban Missile Crisis in October.⁴¹

On December 17, the day before the premier, Party leaders summoned some 400 of the Intelligentsia to a meeting. Among those severely attacked at the meeting was Ilya Ehrenburg, who was a target now for having provided moral support to the group of young liberal artists and writers who had emerged after the death of Stalin. Galina Serebriakov attempted to destroy Ehrenburg's prestige with this group by accusing him of having betrayed his colleagues on the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee, and accusation not without foundation, as we have already seen. Serebriakov could have produced as evidence a copy of the article that Ehrenburg had published in Pravda in September, 1948, but, ignoring this possibility, she created a sensation at the meeting when she announced that her source of information was none other than General Poskrebyshev, Stalin's private secretary, who had vanished on the day of Stalin's death and whom everyone thought to be dead.

Ehrenburg remained under constant fire during the next few months because of his memoirs, which were appearing serially in the New World. In particular, he was excoriated at meetings and in the press for his chance remark that he and others had known of Stalin's crimes during the thirties, but had been forced to live with clenched teeth and silence. Critics like the infamous Vladimir Ermilov accused him of having enjoyed Stalin's special protection.

At this same meeting, Evtushenko ended his speech by quoting the last two lines of "Babi Yar," which led Khrushchev to say that the poem had no place in the current discussion, adding that antisemitism was not a problem in the Soviet Union. Evtushenko insisted that it was a serious problem and he called for positive measures to solve it. Khrushchev persisted in his

denial of the problem, but went on to say that it was better for Jews not to hold high offices, because this stirred resentment, and he expressed the opinion that the unrest in Poland and Hungary in the fall of 1956 had been due to the large number of Jews in high places.

As the discussion continued, Vladimir Ilichev, Khrushchev's overseer of cultural affairs, warned Shostakovich to cancel the premiere of the Thirteenth Symphony scheduled for the next evening. Shostakovich and Evtushenko refused to cancel the premiere, but the chorus wanted to quit after this official warning and agreed to proceed only after a stirring speech by Evtushenko. The premiere took place on December 18, but without the customary printed texts in the program. The performance was wildly successful, but there was no review in the newspapers the next day.

The second performance of the symphony took place on December 20. A few days later, the announcement was made that the third performance had been postponed owing to the "illness of one of the soloists." In fact, Shostakovich and Evtushenko had been told that the symphony would be banned unless Evtushenko made some changes in the text. Evtushenko was apparently unwilling, but when Shostakovich expressed the thought that they should agree to the changes, Evtushenko reluctantly acquiesced.

The text of "Babi Yar" was changed by substituting two new stanzas.⁴² Lines 5-8, in which Evtushenko imagines himself a Hebrew wandering through ancient Egypt and as Christ crucified -- lines to which Starikov had strenuously objected -- are replaced by the following stanza:

I stand here as if by a well
That gives me faith in our brotherhood.
Here lie Russians and Ukrainians;
They lie with Jews in a common grave.

Lines 43-46, in which Evtushenko imagines himself as a long, soundless

cry of every old man shot and every child shot, are replaced by the following stanza:

I think of Russia's exploit
Then it barred the way to Fascism with its own body;
To the tiniest little drop
Russia is dear to me in its whole substance and fate.

With these two stanzas, Evtushenko met the most serious objections raised by Markov's poem and Starikov's article. In the first interpolated stanza, the principle of "Internationalism" is injected into the poem to counter the charge of "nationalism": the Soviet Union is a brotherhood of nations, and the Jews should not be singled out for particular attention. In those mass graves lies a random group of Jews, Russians, Ukrainians.

The second interpolated stanza responds to Starikov's angry assertion that Evtushenko never mentions fascism and never refers to the millions of Russian soldiers who led the battle against the Nazi killers. Now Evtushenko had corrected that fault and enunciated his own patriotism, as well. With the text thus altered, Shostakovich's Thirteenth Symphony was performed for the third time on February 10, 1963, at the Moscow Conservatory. The first formal review of the symphony praised the music but found the text still deficient. Shostakovich was advised to "revise the text substantially or perhaps even renounce it altogether."⁴³

When this third performance took place, Evtushenko was in Paris. Asked about reports that he had been forced to change the text of "Babi Yar," he retorted that he didn't take orders and claimed that he had made the changes after getting a letter from a woman describing how a Russian woman had saved the life of a Jewish child.⁴⁴

In early March, the pressures against the liberals were increased still further at the Fourth Plenum of the Governing Body of the Communist Party,

at which party leaders continued their assault on the new trends in art and literature. Ehrenburg continued to be attacked for his memoirs. Viktor Nekrasov was in trouble for his account of his travels in America. Evtushenko was severely berated for having published in Paris, without permission, his Precocious Autobiography. He was summoned home from Paris for the meeting, attended by some 600 writers, artists and intellectuals.

On March 8, Khrushchev delivered to this assemblage a long speech which constituted the most important policy statement on the arts that he had ever made. In this speech, he returned again to his concern over Evtushenko's poem "Babi Yar." The core of his position can be seen in the following passage:

What is this poem being criticized for? It was criticized because the author was unable truthfully to show and condemn the fascists, particularly the fascist criminals responsible for the mass slaughter at Babi Yar. The poem represents things as if only Jews were the victims of the fascist atrocities, whereas, of course, the Hitlerite butchers murdered many Russians, Ukrainians and Soviet people of other nationalities. The poem reveals that its author did not show political maturity and was ignorant of historical facts.

For whom and for what purpose has it been necessary to present things as if someone is discriminating against the Jews in our country? It is not true. Since the October Revolution, Jews have enjoyed equal rights with the other peoples of the Soviet Union in all respects. There is no Jewish question in our country, and those who invent it are slavishly repeating what other people say.⁴⁵

There was a second official response to the poem. Construction work continued, with the aim of obliterating the site. Bulldozers leveled the area, including the old Jewish cemetery nearby, which was replaced by a television center. In other parts of the area, work began on new apartment buildings.⁴⁶

In October, 1964, Khrushchev fell from power. During the next few years, there was a curious kind of Indian summer, during which the momentum generated during the Thaw continued to operate. For example, Solzhenitsyn published his short story "Zakhar the Pouch" in New World as late as January, 1966. Bulgakov's Master and Margarita appeared in the journal Moscow in December 1966 and January 1967. Even before the publication of Bulgakov's novel, however, it was clear that the days of this Indian summer were numbered. The signal had been given in February 1966 by the show trial of Daniel and Sinyavsky, found guilty of publishing anti-Soviet literature in the West. The situation changed drastically for the worse after the Six-Day War in June 1967, when the Soviet Union reacted violently against Israel. Any vestiges of the Thaw vanished after the invasion of Czechoslovakia in August 1968. In fact, those two events were linked by Soviet analysts, who blamed the imperialist plots of international Zionism for the problems of Czechoslovakia.⁴⁷ Thus two seemingly unrelated events merged into a single powerful justification for a crackdown whose effects are still being felt.

During this Indian summer, some progress had been made toward a resolution of the Babi Yar problem. Perhaps because the refusal to build a monument had been so closely associated with Khrushchev, beginning with his major role in the decision not to proceed after the war, it now became possible to consider that prospect more favorably. In fact, one gets the impression that during the last half of 1965, the new regime was at least trying to give the appearance of doing something to counter the antisemitism that had been associated with the Khrushchev regime.⁴⁸ In July, 1965, Pravda quoted from a speech made by Kosygin in Riga, where he had denounced

"nationalism, great-power chauvinism, racism and antisemitism" as "completely alien to our society and contrary to our world view.

Kosygin's speech was followed in September by a major policy statement on the front page of Pravda, which stressed the benefits that accrued to each republic from cooperation and which explicitly condemned anti-semitism as a danger to the realization of those benefits.⁴⁹ Finally, on November 20, 1965, there was a fourth performance of the Shostakovich Thirteenth Symphony, which had not been heard for more than two years.⁵⁰

Then, on November 30, 1965, the Literary Gazette announced that the Ukrainian government had decided to build two monuments: one to commemorate those who had died in the camp at Darnitza, which was adjacent to Babi Yar (68,000 people), another to commemorate those who had died at Babi Yar (100,000).⁵¹ This decision came exactly six years after the decision in December, 1959 to approve the construction of a monument--the decision that had been blocked by Moscow.

The article referred to the victims as "Soviet citizens, prisoners-of-war and officers of the Soviet army." The decision to build two monuments would have seemed to offer a reasonable solution to the problem: the monument at Babi Yar could commemorate the Jews. No mention was made of this possibility, however. The article announced a contest in which several groups of architects would submit plans for the monuments. The contest was to close on December 10, at which time the various plans would be put on display to elicit the comments and suggestions of the public.

In the latter part of 1966, during the final months of the Thaw, appeared yet another work of art devoted to Babi Yar--the documentary novel by that name written by Anatoly Kuznetsov and published in the journal

Youth.⁵² On the editorial board of that journal was Evtushenko, who must have pressed for publication of the novel.

The editor of Youth was Boris Polevoi, who had replaced Valentin Kataev in 1962. Polevoi had increased the circulation of the journal from 640,000 to 2,000,000--mainly by publishing with some regularity the young liberals who had come to the fore during the Thaw. Polevoi would not have been described as a liberal, and the pictures of his editorial work provided by Kuznetsov and by Anatoly Gladilin are not flattering, but there is some evidence that he developed during the sixties an increasing concern about their plight.⁵³

Kuznetsov, like his friend Evtushenko, was not Jewish. Like Ehrenburg, he had been born in Kiev; but, unlike Ehrenburg, he had grown up there in a suburb not far from Babi Yar, where he and his friends had played as children. Kuznetsov was twelve years old when the Nazis occupied Kiev in September, 1941, and he continued living in Kiev throughout the period of the Nazi occupation. From his house, he could hear the machine-gun fire at Babi Yar. When he was fourteen, he began keeping a notebook about Babi Yar, recording everything that he saw or heard about these events. He wrote his book during the summer of 1965, as bulldozers continued to level the site and to prepare the ground for a new stadium and an amusement park.

By this time, Kuznetsov had already published two novels: The Continuation of a Legend, 1957, and In Your Own Home, 1964; both novels, to the author's despair, had been heavily censored, but both of them had been extremely successful. The subject of Babi Yar required delicate treatment. The attitude of the new regime was still ambivalent, and conflicting signals had been given in the fall of 1965. On the one hand, Daniel and Sinyavsky

had been arrested; on the other hand, the decision to build a monument at Babi Yar had been announced. In any case, Kuznetsov never even submitted the full text to the editors of Youth--mainly because of the theme that, to Kuznetsov's own surprise, had emerged: that there is no real difference between Nazi fascism and Soviet fascism.

Even in the "lightened" form in which Kuznetsov submitted the manuscript, however, it proved heretical. When he was told that he would have to make extreme cuts, he refused and demanded the manuscript back. When Polevoi refused to return it, Kuznetsov grabbed the manuscript, ran down the street with it and tore it to shreds. Unfortunately, the editors of Youth had another copy, which they censored and published. Kuznetsov finally agreed to let them proceed, since he was heavily in debt at the time and was in no position to return the advance.⁵⁴

Babi Yar, like Kuznetsov's other two novels, was highly acclaimed. The Literary Gazette made the following comment:

It combines the honest, morally incorruptible thought of an artist, the powerful force of a document and important historical information. Caught up in the documentary nature of the novel, some readers may not immediately appreciate its artistic power, may not perceive what a marvel of art is behind the realistic facts. With the passage of time, it will become clear that Soviet literature has gained a passionate and talented work.⁵⁵

Kuznetsov had originally intended to write this novel in a more fictionalized form, with a third-person narration, but the pressure of the facts made that approach impossible. The decision to use as a first-person narrator an ordinary twelve-year-old boy trying to make sense of events intrinsically irrational gives the novel its power. Its weakest moments occur at those junctures where Kuznetsov interrupts the narrative with his

adult exhortations.

Occasionally, Kuznetsov abandons his child's viewpoint to provide information or to report someone else's experience. One of the most powerful sections of the book is the story told by Dina Pronicheva, one of the few survivors of Babi Yar. Portions of this set piece served as the apocalyptic climax of D. M. Thomas' novel The White Hotel.⁵⁶ One work of art on Babi Yar led into another. Thomas drew inspiration from Kuznetsov, just as Shostakovich had drawn inspiration from Evtushenko.

In August, 1969, Kuznetsov gained permission for a trip to England by filing a fabricated report with the KGB that accused Evtushenko and other liberal writers of plotting to start a dangerous new underground journal. Once in London, Kuznetsov defected. He had brought with him on microfilm the manuscript of Babi Yar as he had originally written it, and he told the whole story of how the novel had been mutilated by the censors. The consensus at Youth was that publication of the novel, even in its truncated form, was a fluke and that had negotiations over the novel delayed its publication by even one month, it would surely never have been published at all.⁵⁷

It is certainly true that Kuznetsov's novel could not have been published after the Six-Day War in June, 1967, but the idea that October 1966 was the last possible moment is probably not true. In January, 1967, Izvestia found some fault with the novel's rapidly shifting narrative line, but all the same described it as a powerful novel, one of the best published in 1966. In February, the Literary Gazette published a letter from Dina Pronicheva, who described in detail how she and her husband had barely managed to save their children from execution.⁵⁸

In any case, the data made public in Kuznetsov's novel, even in its censored form, established that the victims of the massacre were overwhelmingly Jewish. The novel thereby tacitly refuted the policy that Khrushchev had enunciated.⁵⁹

During the same fall in which Kuznetsov's novel began to appear, and just as the site seemed to have been stripped of all its distinctive features, thousands of people gathered to mark the twenty-fifth anniversary of the massacre--on September 29, 1966. The first two installments of Kuznetsov's novel had just appeared; they must have encouraged the idea of holding such a ceremony. In a weak moment, the Kiev chief of police gave his permission for the occasion. Several people gave speeches which no one had cleared--including Viktor Nekrasov and Ivan Dzyuba, the dissident critic. The police arrived and began to disperse the crowd. Cameramen from the Kiev Newsfilm Studio had their film confiscated; the director of the studio lost his job. Nekrasov was summoned for the first of many interrogations about what had happened on that day at Babi Yar.⁶⁰ Two weeks later, however, people visiting the site discovered a granite stone whose inscription said that a monument would be erected at Babi Yar to the memory of the victims of fascism.⁶¹

This stone seemed to be a hopeful sign, but the Six-Day War in June, 1967, drastically hardened hostility toward the Jews. Even so, people continued to gather at Babi Yar every year on September 29, though they were invariably harassed by the police. In 1968, after the official ceremony, which included the usual speech about the evil deeds of the Zionists, an engineer named Boris Kochubievsky called attention to the fact that the dead had been victims not only of fascism but also of genocide. "Here lies a

part of the Jewish people," he said. Tried in the same courthouse where Mendal Beilis had been tried in 1913, Kochubievsky was convicted of fomenting bourgeois Zionist propaganda against the regime. His application for emigration was denied at the last minute and he was sentenced to three years in a prison camp.⁶²

In December, 1970, a group of Jews was tried for having plotted to hijack an airplane at the Leningrad airport. The draconian sentences imposed drew protests from all over the world and undoubtedly helped persuade the Soviets to begin allowing the Jews to emigrate in 1971. Since then, more than 250,000 Jews have left. This hopeful development, however, did not lessen the regime's nervousness about Babi Yar. In 1972, twenty-seven Jews were arrested for putting flowers on the ground at Babi Yar. In 1973, nearly a thousand Jews gathered on the anniversary, but the police forbade a religious service, dispersed the gathering and arrested five people for unlawful assembly.⁶³

Finally, in October, 1975, the New York Times reported that the monument, long promised and long deferred, was finally being built.⁶⁴ A government spokesman explained that the monument would be not to the Jews, but to all the people who had died at Babi Yar. Bulldozers once used to efface all signs of the executions now worked to shape the battered land into the setting for a monument. It was completed in the summer of 1976--a cluster of writhing people some thirty feet high, standing at the end of a slowly rising wide stairway. The inscription repudiates the message of Kuznetsov's book and restores the Khrushchev dictum: "Here in 1941-43, German Fascist invaders executed more than 100,000 citizens of the city of Kiev and prisoners-of-war."

In October, 1980, yet another work of art devoted to the theme of Babi Yar appeared--this time, a play called Ladies' Tailor, written by Aleksandr Borshchagovsky and performed at the Sovetskaya Hotel in Moscow by the Jewish Drama Ensemble.⁶⁵ The play, sold out well before opening night, was allowed to run for only one week.

All three acts of the play take place in an apartment on the outskirts of Kiev, not far from Babi Yar. It is the night of September 28, 1941. Kiev has been taken by the Nazis. The heart of the city has been destroyed by bombs planted by a special Soviet unit before the Soviet army abandoned the city. The Nazis have blamed the Jews for the explosions; the posters ordering all Jews to assemble on the morning of September 29 have been distributed.

The play focuses on a Jewish family making their preparations to report the next morning. There is an old ladies' tailor, Isaak; his daughter-in-law Irina, with the cherished baby that she bore after twelve years of marriage; his daughter Sonya and his granddaughter Masha, who is thirteen. Coming in and out of the apartment is Anton, the building superintendant, who, though anti-semitic cannot restrain a certain amount of sympathy for the family's plight. His wife Nastya occasionally appears to beg Irina to leave the baby with her and not subject it to what may be a difficult journey. Toward the end of Act I, another family is introduced into the action--a woman doctor named Evdokiya, accompanied by her pregnant daughter Polina and her grandson Alyosha, who is thirteen. They are one of the families whose apartments were destroyed by the explosions on Kreshchatik and they have been assigned to take over the apartment of the Jewish family when they leave the next morning. The Jewish family, being too kindhearted

to let the doctor's family stand outside the building all night, invites them into the apartment. Much of the play then shows the process by which the gentile family gradually overcomes its suspicions of the Jewish family and develops sympathy for their plight.

Both Act II and Act III open with flash forwards. Act II opens with Evdokiya hearing moans from outside the house and finding Masha covered with blood. Masha briefly tells what actually happened at Babi Yar and asks Evdokiya to hide her. Evdokiya agrees. At the beginning of Act III, Evdokiya, Masha and Anton are being taken away by a Nazi patrol. It turns out that Anton, the building superintendant, has betrayed Masha to the Nazis. He protests that he should not now be arrested. Evdokiya tells him to accept his chance to redeem himself for what he has done. He tries to escape and is shot by the Nazis. The play ends as Nastya makes one more appeal to Irina to let her keep the baby, but Irina cannot bear to leave it behind. Polina tells the departing Jewish family that she will not sweep the floor for two days in order to give them luck on their journey.

Like Ehrenburg, Borshchagovsky returned to Kiev with the Red Army in November, 1943. His Russian wife and his daughter had spent the war years there, under the Nazi occupation. Borshchagovsky immediately resumed his career in the theater and published three books in quick succession, but then, as already mentioned, he became a primary target of the anti-cosmopolite campaign in 1949. Subjected to a series of vicious attacks, he disappeared from view.

After the death of Stalin, Borshchagovsky reappeared in print with a series of plays and historical novels, which according to the Concise Literary Encyclopedia, show the "moral fortitude of Soviet man." In 1958,

Borshchagovsky touched upon the theme of Babi Yar in a story called "Apprehensive Clouds," which gives a fictionalized account of the legendary soccer match between a Ukrainian team and a Nazi team in occupied Kiev. After playing too well during the first half, the Ukrainian team was ordered by the Nazis to lose the game. When they continued winning during the second half, the match was cut short and they were marched straight to Babi Yar for execution. This aspect of the Babi Yar theme, also discussed by Kuznetsov, was less controversial, since it lent credence to Khrushchev's position that people of all nationalities were killed at Babi Yar.

The fate of the Jews at Babi Yar had haunted Borshchagovsky since his return to Kiev at the end of the war, but he must have been reluctant to write on this topic after his difficulties during the late forties. He finally wrote his play Ladies' Tailor thirty-three years later at the Czech resort of Karlovy Vary and it was produced in 1980, when he was in his late sixties.⁶⁶

When the play closed after its brief run in the fall of 1980, it looked as though it might have been just a gesture of appeasement, an application of the safety valve, as was the brief production of The Diary of Ann Frank many years ago. That which inspires sympathy for the Jews tends to be avoided. In the fall of 1981, however, the Jewish journal Sovetish Heymland published a Yiddish translation of the play, giving as its primary title The Night before Babi Yar. In the fall of 1982, there were more performances of the play--this time at the Stanislavsky Dramatic Theater in Moscow.⁶⁷

There is further evidence of Moscow's desire to promote the play. Soon after its opening in Moscow, VAAP, the Soviet copyright agency, tried to persuade Joseph Papp, director of the New York Public Theater, to undertake

an American production of Borshchagovsky's play--even though American requests to produce Soviet plays were being routinely denied after the Soviet-American exchange agreement was not renewed in the wake of Afghanistan. Papp agreed to produce Borshchagovsky's play if the Soviets would let him also produce Viktor Rozov's controversial play News to of the Wood Grouse. The Soviets refused and the American rights to Ladies' Tailor eventually went to Rick Hobard.⁶⁸

Anthony Austin, who wrote about the play for the New York Times, expressed his bewilderment that such a favorable picture of the Jews had been presented at a time when Jews were being subjected to such intense discrimination. The play does inspire sympathy for the Jews, but it has in abundance one element that must have overcome the taboo: the shibboleth of human brotherhood. The element had been conspicuously absent from Evtushenko's poem, as the critics were quick to point out, until he corrected this fault by adding a stanza about his faith in brotherhood, about how Russians and Ukrainians lie with Jews in a common grave. Borshchagovsky's play hinges on the process by which the Russian family, originally antagonistic, comes to feel sympathy for the plight of the Jewish family. The Russian woman doctor who agrees to hide Masha after her escape from Babi Yar will clearly lie with the Jewish girl in a common grave.

Still, the question remains: what is the significance of the decision not only to allow but to promote Borshchagovsky's play? The answer to the question must take into account the fact that the play seems to be part of a developing pattern. In 1978, the authorities allowed the publication of the novel Heavy Sand, by Anatoly Rybakov, which depicts the brutal destruction of a Ukrainian Jewish family during the war. Only the narrator and his

niece survive. The other members of the family are killed during the occupation and the uprising of the ghetto. The novel concludes with the narrator standing before a monument whose inscription pays tribute "to the victims of the German fascist invaders," but the inscription is at least repeated in Hebrew.

In 1982, Mikail Lev published a novel call Trial after Verdict, which describes an uprising of the Jewish prisoners in the concentration camp of Sobibor.⁶⁹ Like Rybabov's novel and Borshchagovksy's play, it gives a sympathetic picture of the Jews and their terrible fate at the hands of the Nazis. All three works remain within a time frame that does not extend beyond 1945. The questions raised by the fate of the Jews in the Soviet Union during the late forties and early fifties would be too difficult to answer.

In 1983, there was another event of considerable importance in the development of this pattern of sympathy for the Jews. This was the first publication of Evtushenko's Babi Yar since its original appearance in September, 1961--with no changes whatsoever in the text. The stanzas that Evtushenko and Shostakovich had been forced to add have not been retained. There is, however, one important addition--a footnote, which goes as follows:

Babi Yar - a ravine on the outskirts of Kiev, where the Hitlerites annihilated several tens of thousands of Soviet people, including Jews, Ukrainians, Russians and other inhabitants of Kiev. When this poem was written, there was as yet no monument at Babi Yar. Now there is a monument to the victims of fascism.

Fascism inflicted on the Jewish people a policy of genocide. Now, through a tragic paradox of history, the Israeli government has inflicted a policy of genocide on the Palestinians, who have been forcibly deprived of their own land (author's footnote).⁷⁰

This footnote supplies the shibboleth of brotherhood originally missing from the poem and temporarily supplied by the added stanzas. It also permits Evtushenko to qualify his poem, originally written in unqualified support of the Jews, so that it can serve as an attack on Israel, which Evtushenko equates with Nazi Germany.

Is there in fact a strategy here, a change of policy? We can assume that this set of works sympathetic to the tragedy that befell the Jews during the war is no accident. The explanation may lie in the fact that the regime had become increasingly strident in its attacks on Zionism, culminating in the establishment of an Anti-Zionist Committee in May, 1983. It remained difficult to articulate these attacks in a way that precluded the charge of anti-semitism. By allowing the publication of these works, the regime provided some comfort to Soviet Jews and, at the same time, it showed the West that it harbors no ill will toward Jews as a race. The appearance of these works helped the regime to make the claim that it differentiates between Jews and Zionists.

Borshchagovsky's play, Kuznetsov's novel and Evtushenko's poem all testify to the tragedy that the inscription on the monument misrepresents. Before the monument was built, the officials at Intourist and Sputnik did everything in their power to conceal the site from foreigners. Kiev was closed altogether to foreigners for several years after the war. Then Edward Crankshaw was permitted to visit the city in 1955, he asked the local director of Intourist to take him to the site:

At first he pretended he had never heard of Babi Yar. But when I insisted, he said: "Why do you want to go look at a bunch of dead Jews? If you're so interested in Jews, you'll see more than enough live ones on the streets."⁷¹

When Joseph Schechtman was refused all assistance in 1959, he got to Babi Yar by bus.⁷² Then Elie Wiesel was refused all assistance in 1965, he got to Babi Yar by taxi. The place was so desolate that he finally concluded that the surly taxi driver had taken him deliberately to the wrong place, but his description makes it almost certain that he was indeed at Babi Yar:

We traversed the city, continued until we reached a broad and open area. In the distance were new housing developments, groceries and little repair shops on the ground floor of five-story apartment buildings. On my right a new highway, on my left a construction site. "Babi Yar," the driver shrugged, as if to explain, You can see with your own eyes there's nothing here. He was right. Nothing. Blue skies, a long smooth road, the movement of traffic. And the driver's smile. I stayed there for an hour searching for a sign, a memorial of some kind. Nothing. There is nothing to see at Babi Yar.⁷³

One year after Elie Wiesel's visit, there was something to see: the promissory stone installed in October, 1966. And ten more years after that, there was the monument. Since then, all the impediments to a foreigner's visit have been removed. Babi Yar has become part of the official tour of Kiev, just as the Piskarevsky Cemetery is part of the official tour of Leningrad. Those who know nothing about the history of that monument will return from the visit with two fundamental pieces of information: 1) that this is a place where terrible crimes were committed by the Nazis, 2) that the crimes were committed against many thousands of "Soviet citizens." The Soviets hope that the memorial stone will erase the memory of what happened to the Jews at Babi Yar.

Elie Wiesel returned to Babi Yar in August, 1979, as part of a presidential commission charged with planning an American monument to the victims of the Holocaust. He expressed his dismay at the inscription:

When I stood here fifteen years ago, there was no monument at Babi Yar. But we all knew what Babi Yar meant. Now there is a monument at Babi Yar. But what kind of monument is it? We all had hoped to find a memorial for all the Jews who died as Jews, as well as for all the others who died here. But the Jews are not being remembered.⁷⁴

There is another significant way in which the Soviets have tampered with the semantics of the term Babi Yar. This is perhaps the final and most terrible desecration of the site. Since the Six-Day War in June 1967--and, to some extent, even before--Soviet propaganda has attempted to equate Zionism with Nazism. This effort is reflected in the following statement quoted in Pravda in 1971: "The tragedy of Babi Yar will forever embody not only the cannibalism of the Hitlerites, but also the indelible shame of their accomplices and followers--the Zionists!"⁷⁵

Just how for this attempt to reshape the term Babi Yar has gone is evident from the previously discussed footnote that Evtushenko added to the 1983 edition of his poem. It is also evident from an astonishing headline that recently appeared in the Literary Gazette: "Babi Yar , Lidice, Khatyn--Now Sabra and Chatila."⁷⁶ Khatyn, a village in Belo-Russia where every inhabitant was burned alive by the Nazis, has been heavily promoted by the Soviets in an effort to supplant the phonologically similar Katyn, a name which the Soviets would like the world to forget. In the case of Babi Yar, the name and location are retained, but drained of vital semantic elements. The truth is engraved not on the monument, but in the play, the novel, the poem.

Postscript

In early June, 1985, Evtushenko visited the United States to read his poetry at the United Nations in honor of World Environment Day. An article

in the New York Times, inspired by this visit, included the following observation:

Evtushenko has also been a strong opponent of Soviet anti-Semitism (although he has read different versions abroad and at home of his famous "Babi Yar," a poem that commemorates the mass execution of Ukrainian Jews by the Nazis during World War II; in the Soviet version he includes non-Jews also massacred at Babi Yar, as Moscow has always denied the specifically anti-Semitic nature of the event).⁷⁷

In response to this comment, Evtushenko wrote a letter to the editor, in which he said:

Mr. Grenier says I recite "Babi Yar" in two different versions, abroad and at home. I recite absolutely the same identical text. In the second volume of my collected works, published last year in the Soviet Union, "Babi Yar" corresponds completely to all foreign editions. In 1964, at the request of Dmitri Shostakovich, for his 13th Symphony, I inserted four lines about Russians and Ukrainians who perished along with Jews, which is historical reality. But this insertion relates only to the symphony and has never been published or recited by me.⁷⁸

The first and last assertions made by Evtushenko appear to be true: that he always recites the same version of the poem and that he never published a version of the poem containing the stanzas added for the symphony, but all the other assertions are questionable. To begin with the most trivial errors, this recent appearance of the poem occurred in the first volume of Evtushenko's collected works and was published not in 1984, but in 1983. In addition to the four lines, or one stanza, that Evtushenko mentions, he added another four lines, which describe how the Soviet people heroically turned back the Nazi invaders.

It is not perfectly clear who took the initiative in modifying the poem for the symphony, but there is evidence that it was not Shostakovich. This evidence was cited in a letter to the editor signed by Mstislav

Rostrapovich, Galina Vishnevskaya and Maxim Shostakovich, who added their own personal testimony that Shostakovich never asked Evtushenko to change the poem.⁷⁹

The most serious misrepresentation, though, is the statement that this recent edition of "Babi Yar" "corresponds completely to all foreign editions." The foreign editions do not include the footnote, which alters the import of the poem drastically as already indicated: 1) the footnote assumes the burden previously borne by the interpolated stanzas: that various nationalities suffered more or less equally at Babi Yar; 2) the original poem calls for a monument to the Jews, but the footnote accepts the monument built in 1976 as a satisfactory response to that demand, though the monument makes no mention of the Jews; 3) the original poem was written as a protest against ant-Semitism, but the footnote uses the poem as a platform for an attack on the Israeli government, resorting to the unacceptable analogy between Nazi treatment of the Jews and Israeli treatment of the Palestinians. In short, the footnote undermines and perverts the poem. It is wrong to say that this new edition "corresponds completely" to all foreign editions.

FOOTNOTES

1. Among the most useful and detailed accounts of what happened in Kiev during the war are the following: Lucy S. Dawidowicz, "Babi Yar's Legacy," The New York Times Magazine, 27 September 1981, pp. 49-67; George St. George, The Road to Babi Yar (London, 1967); and A. Anatoli (Kuznetsov), Babi Yar: A Document in the Form of a Novel, trans. David Lloyd (New York, 1970). This edition of Babi Yar, by the use of different typefaces, permits the reader to distinguish between the original manuscript, the censored version published in Youth (*Iunost'*) and the final version, as restored and augmented by Kuznetsov after his defection.
2. On November 3, another set of explosions destroyed one of the most priceless architectural ensembles in the Ukraine--the Cave Monastery, founded in the eleventh century. As with the explosions on the Kreshchatik, the Soviets blamed the Nazis, the Nazis the Soviets. K. Dubina, for example, alleges that the Nazis blew up the monastery to conceal the evidence of their looting and to arouse hostility toward the partisans. See K. Dubina, V gody tiazhelykh ispytani (Kiev, 1962), pp. 90-95. Kuznetsov alleges that the Soviets blew it up to destroy Nazi gun emplacements there and to prevent the monastery from being reopened. See Kuznetov, Babi Yar, pp. 76-88 and pp. 194-202. Kuznetsov demonstrates convincingly that it was in fact the Soviets who were responsible for both sets of explosions.
3. St. George, p. 100.
4. Ibid., p. 98.

5. See Walter Laqueur, The Terrible Secret (London, 1980), pp. 68-69. In 1943, Swiss newspapers reprinted from the British press some reports about the massacre at Babi Yar two years earlier and were reprimanded by the Swiss government, which had no desire to provoke Nazi Germany after its seizure of northern Italy (Laqueur, p. 45). Molotov's note was reprinted on the first two pages of Pravda, 7 January 1942. Molotov may have been especially sympathetic to the Jews since his wife, Polina Zhemchuzhina, was Jewish. In fact, she was arrested and exiled during the anti-Jewish campaign of the late forties. After Stalin's death, Khrushchev was astonished to discover that she was still alive. He permitted her to rejoin her husband. See Khrushchev Remembers, with introduction, commentary and notes by Edward Crankshaw; trans. and ed. Strobe Talbott (Boston, Toronto, 1970), pp. 259-261.
6. Dawidowicz, pp. 54 and 59.
7. See the New York Times (hereafter as NYT), 3 October 1967, p. 15; 14 February 1968, p. 11; 30 November 1968, p. 17; 4 May 1971, p. 16.
8. Yehoshua Gilboa, The Black Years of Soviet Jewry, 1939-1953 (Boston, 1971), pp. 126-128. Joseph Schechtman includes in his book an English translation of a poem about Babi Yar by Olga N. Anstei, who lived in Kiev during the war. He also mentions a song about Babi Yar recorded by Nekhama Lifshitz. See his book Star in Eclipse: Russian Jewry Revisited (New York, 1961), pp. 94-98. The song was written by Moscow composer Revekka Boyarskaya. Lifshitz is now in Israel. See David Garber, "Choir and Drama in Riga," Soviet Jewish Affairs (Henceforth SJA) 1 (1974) p. 42.
9. Literaturnaia gazeta (Henceforth as LG), 9 March 1949, p. 2. See also

- Solomon Schwarz, The Jews in the Soviet Union (Syracuse, 1951), p. 357. I have not yet been able to find a copy of the poem, but it was published in 1943 outside the Ukraine in Holovanivs'kyj's collection knyha vojnyv. I want to thank Assya Humesky and Mary Miller for help with Lolovanivs'kyj.
10. The Storm appeared in New World (Novyi mir), Nos. 4-8, in 1947. It was translated by E. Hartley and T. Shebunina (London, 1949). The Babi Yar episodes occur in Part III, Chap. 8, and in Part V, Chap. 17.
 11. Ilya Ehrenburg, People and Life, 1891-1921, trans. Anna Bostock and Yvonne Kapp (New York, 1962), p. 307. The original installment was published in Novyi mir (January, 1961).
 12. The poem in the original may be found in the Biblioteka sovetskoj poezii edition of Ehrenburg's poetry (Moscow, 1972), p. 129, as well as in his Collected Works. The poem first appeared in Novyi mir (January, 1945), p. 16.
 13. See Maurice Friedberg's excellent entry on Ehrenburg in Soviet Leaders, ed. George W. Simmonds (New York, 1967), pp. 272-281.
 14. For a detailed account, see Salo W. Baron, The Russian Jew under the Tsars and Soviets (2d Ed. rev., New York, 1976). See also Shimon Redlichy "The Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee in the USSR," Jewish Social Studies, XXXI (1960), pp. 25-36, as well as Redlich's book Propaganda and Nationalism in Wartime Russia: The Jewish Antifascist Committee (1941-1948), 1982. From an English translation of Ehrenburg's speech, see Ilya Ehrenburg, "The Jews," Russia at War, trans. G. Shelley (London, 1943).
 15. Baron, p. 417.

16. An English version of The Black Book, as adjusted by Soviet censors, was published in New York in 1946, but it was never published in the Soviet Union. A Russian-language edition of the book was published in Jerusalem in 1980, based on a manuscript sent to Eretz-Israel in 1946 when it looked as though the book might still be published in the USSR. Missing from this manuscript was the section on Lithuania, which has still not been found. The editors did a magnificent job of restoring missing pages and blurred sentences and one wishes that they had included Albert Einstein's original introduction. This book was translated by John Glad and James S. Levine for the Holocaust Library (New York, 1981).
17. Khrushchev Remembers, pp. 258-269, in the chapter called "Stalin's Antisemitism," where Khrushchev attempts to put all the blame on Stalin. For an interesting look at the background of the Crimean episode, see Gilboa, pp. 226-243. Stalin was evidently also terribly upset by the huge cheering crowds of Jews that greeted Golda Meyerson (later Meir) when she arrived in Moscow during the summer of 1948 to take up her position as the first Israeli ambassador to the Soviet Union. See L. Schroeter, The Last exodus (New York, 1974), pp. 22-23.
18. Gleb Struve, Russian Literature under Lenin and Stalin, 1917-1953 (Norman, 1971), p. 337.
19. Kuznetsov, p. 470. Apparently Ehrenburg wrote Khrushchev begging him to keep the city authorities from building a modern market on the site of Babi Yar. Khrushchev supposedly told him to mind his own business and stick to his novels. See Gilboa, p. 36.
20. Khrushchev had become first secretary of the CPU in January, 1938, with

- the task of intensifying and completing the purges in the Ukraine. After the Soviet occupation of eastern Poland in September, 1939, as provided by the Nazi-Soviet pact, he had played a major role in the process of incorporating most of that territory into the Ukraine--a process that included exiling hundreds of thousands of Jews to Siberia. See Edward Crankshaw, Khrushchev--the Road to Power (London, 1960), which is probably too harsh, and Roy Medvedev, Khrushchev (Oxford, 1982), which is probably too lenient.
21. See Yaroslav Bilinsky, The Second Soviet Republic: The Ukraine after World War II (New Brunswick, 1964), pp. 405-406. See also Schwarz, p. 196. Bilinsky also cites testimony rejecting the charge of Ukrainian complicity. Dokiya Humenna, a Ukrainian woman living in Kiev during the war, says, "There was not a person in Kiev who did not abhor, who inwardly did not shudder at Hitler's butchery of the Jews." See her book Kreshchaty Yar (Cross-Shaped Ravine) (New York, 1956), p. 203, as cited by Bilinsky, p. 407.
 22. Jacob Sontag, "Yiddish Writers and Jewish Culture in the USSR: Twenty Years After," SJA (February, 1972), pp. 37-38.
 23. Ilia Erenburg, "Po Povodu Odnogo Pis'ma," Pravda, 21 September 1948, p. 3. See also Bernard D. Weinryb, "Antisemitism in Soviet Russia," The Jews in Soviet Russia since 1917, ed. L. Kochan (3rd ed, Oxford, London, New York, 1978), p. 322.
 24. Ilya Ehrenburg, Post-War Years: 1945-1954 (London 1966), p. 125.
 25. Bernard Turner, Di Goldene Keyt, No. 25 (1956), as reported by Irving Howe, "Predicaments of Soviet Writing - II," The New Republic, 18 May 1963, pp. 21-22. Rumors of Ehrenburg's complicity in the arrest of

prominent Jewish intellectuals in 1949 led him to assert his innocence in a letter to Le Monde (26 August 1957), but Le Monde continued to question his integrity (see T. R. Fyvel, "The Stormy Life of Ilya Ehrenburg," Encounter [December, 1961], pp. 82-90).

26. Actually, Ehrenburg seems to have taken his stand with the liberals even before Stalin's death. V. Svirsky mentions a meeting at the Pravda Conference Hall in 1952, called by Stalin to approve the expulsion of the Jews from their homes. Ehrenburg was evidently the only person there who rose to his feet and stalked out of the meeting. See V. Svirsky, Hostages, trans. G. Clough (London, 1976), p. 196.
27. Kuzentsov, p. 471.
28. Viktor Nekrasov, "Pochemu eto ne sdelano?" LG, 10 October 1959, p. 9. In the memoirs that he published after his emigration in 1974, Nekrasov speaks at some length about Babi Yar. He reproduces the ending of a piece on Babi Yar that he submitted to New World in the late sixties. See Viktor Nekrasov, Zapiski zevaki (Frankfurt, 1976), pp. 68-77. I want to thank Charles Allen for providing me with a tape of the talk that Nekrasov gave on Babi Yar for Radio Free Europe-Radio Liberty.
29. LG, 22 December 1959, p. 2. The workers who signed the letter differed with Nekrasov on just one point: they recognized the need for the new housing being built in the area and they saw nothing wrong with filling in the ravine for that purpose.
30. LG, 3 March 1960, p. 2.
31. There is some evidence that this proposal by the Ukrainian government was vetoed on the ground that the long-range plans for the city called for the area to become a refuse dump. See Schechtman, p. 97. There

- are some indications that Moscow encourages Ukrainian-Jewish antagonism in order to discredit the Ukrainian national movement and to keep the Ukrainians and Jews from making common cause. See Israel Klejner, "The Present-Day Ukrainian National Movement in the USSR and the Jewish Question," SJA, Vol. 11, No. 3 (1981), pp. 3-14.
32. Dawidowicz. p. 60. See also Kuznetsov, pp. 471-474.
33. Anatoly Kuznetsov, "The Memories," The New York Times Book Review, 9 April 1967, p. 5.
34. Yevgeny Evtushenko, A Precocious Autobiography, trans. Andrew R. MacAndrew (New York, 1963), pp. 116-122. The editor, V. A. Kosolapov, weathered the storm created by the publication of "Babi Yar," but when the Party tightened controls on writers at the end of 1962, he was fired for having published the poem more than a year before. See Khrushchev and the Arts: the Politics of Russian Culture, ed. Priscilla Johnson and Leopold Labedz (Cambridge, Mass., 1965), p. 15.
35. LG, 19 September 1961, p. 4. For more than two decades, this poem was never reprinted in any of Evtushenko's many volumes of poetry, nor was its existence acknowledged in the entry on Evtushenko in Kratkaia literaturnaia entsiklopediia, Vol. 2 (Moscow, 1964), pp. 866-867. This volume was actually subjected to considerable delay because of Evtushenko. His entry, complete with photograph, was originally prepared in 1962 when he was riding high after publication of "Stalin's Heirs" and "Cuba." Before Volume Two went to press, he was in trouble over his Precocious Autobiography, which he was publishing in France without permission from the authorities. The editors of the encyclopedia were instructed to make his entry more critical and to

omit the photograph. Then he redeemed himself in 1964 with his poem "Bratskaia GES," so a third, more positive entry was prepared and his photograph was reinstated. See Barry Lewis and Michael Ulman, "The Soviet Concise Literary Encyclopedia: Its Evolution and Achievement," Slavic Review, Vol. 39, No. 1 (March, 1980), p. 107.

36. Aleksei Markov, untitled poem in Literatura i zhizn', 24 September 1961, p. 4, as translated and reproduced in Current Digest of the Soviet Press (hereafter as CDSP), Vol. XIII, No. 37, p. 16.
37. D. Starikov, "Concerning a Poem," Literatura i zhizn', 27 September 1961, p. 3, as translated and reproduced in CDSP, Vol. XIII, No. 27, PP. 14-17. Max Hayward reports that the editor of Literatura i zhizn' was fired soon after publication of these denunciations. See Introduction to Dissonant Voices in Soviet Literature, eds. Patricia Blake and Max Hayward (London, 1964), XII. Apparently the editor had gone too far in permitting these attacks on Evtushenko. Displeased as Khrushchev certainly was by the poem, he was determined to continue the process of de-Stalinization and, in fact, just a few weeks after the publication of Evtushenko's poem, Khrushchev promised to continue the process--a promise sealed by the removal of Stalin's body from the bier in Red Square, where it had lain next to Lenin's body.
38. Il'ia Erenburg, letter in LG, 14 October 1961, p. 4. Evtushenko wrote a poem in response to the acclaim that he received after publishing the poem. His poem, entitled "A Talk," was published only in the Kiev edition of the Literary Gazette, in December, 1961. In it, he modestly says that he was not especially courageous, just less cowardly than his fellows. He concludes the poem by suggesting that posterity will "burn

with shame" when it recalls "those strange times when common honesty was called courage." See NYT, 17 December 1961, p. 21.

39. Baron, p. 267.

40. Shostakovich had been brought up by his parents to despise anti-semitism, and he had for a long time demonstrated his concern for the plight of the Jews in his music. His piano trio, Opus 67, containing Jewish motifs as an expression of his concern for the Jews in Nazi-occupied Europe, was banned after its first performance in 1944 (The London Times, 24 January 1984, p. 8). In 1948, an inauspicious time for such work, he completed his cycle of songs called "From Jewish Folk Poetry, which could not be performed until 1955. See Testimony: the Memoirs of Dmitri Shostakovich, as related to and edited by Solomon Volkov, trans. A. W. Bouis (London, Boston, 1981), pp. 156-159.

Shostakovich was drawn at once to Evtushenko's poem, which he initially set to music as a vocal and symphonic poem; then he decided to extend the work by adding other poems by Evtushenko. See Dmitri and Lucilla Sollertinsky, Pages from the Life of Dmitri Shostakovich (London, 1981), p. 157.

The Shostakovich symphony was evidently not the first on the theme of Babi Yar. A man named D. Klebanov was under attack for his symphony on this theme in March, 1949. See B. Pinkus, "Soviet Campaigns against Jewish Nationalism and Cosmopolitanism," SJA, No. 2 (1974), pp. 53-72

41. From a superb analysis of the last two years of Khrushchev's regime, see the previously cited Khrushchev and the Arts: the Politics of Russian Culture, 1962-1964, edited by Priscilla Johnson and Leopold Labedz, which I have used extensively in this section.

42. These new stanzas were obtained from the Everest recording of the 1965 performance.
43. The symphony had been denounced previously, but not by name, in an editorial published in Sovetskaia Kul'tura, newspaper of the Ministry of Culture, on December 5, 1962. This first formal review, published on April 2, 1963, in Sovetskaia Belorussia, was a response to a performance in Minsk. See Johnson, Khrushchev and the Arts, p. 13.
44. Le Monde, 14 February 1963, as reported by Johnson, p. 41.
45. Johnson, pp. 181-182.
46. Kuznetsov, pp. 474-475.
47. See William Korey, "The Origins and Development of Soviet Antisemitism: An Analysis," Slavic Review, 1 (March, 1972), pp. 130-132.
48. It is true that Khrushchev permitted a partial revival of Jewish culture. The first books in Yiddish (3) appeared in 1959 after a ban that had lasted 11 years. He allowed the journal Sovetish Heymland and the theater group the Jewish Drama Ensemble to appear in 1961. On the whole, however, despite the thaw that took place in many areas, religion was persecuted. During Khrushchev's regime, the number of synagogues shrank from 450 to 62. See William Orbach, "Periodization of Soviet Policy Toward the Jews," SJA 3 (November, 1982), p. 52.
49. See Pravda, 19 July 1965, p. 1 and 5 September 1965, p. 1.
50. To the best of my knowledge, the Thirteenth Symphony was not performed again until the spring of 1981, when it was apparently played in Leningrad by the Leningrad Philharmonic as part of a subscription series marking the seventy-fifth anniversary of Shostakovich's birth.
51. K. Grigor'ev, "Pamiatnik na meste Bab'ego Iara i v Darnitse," LG, 30

- November 1965, p. 1. Mekrasov published an illustrated article about the models that various sculptors had submitted. He expressed a preference for those that were more abstract. See Viktor Nekrasov, "Novye pamiatniki," *Dekorativnoe iskusstvo USSR*. 11 (1966). pp. 23-27.
52. Babi Yar appeared in Nos. 8, 9 and 10 of Iunost'. According to articles that Kuznetsov wrote soon after his defection, publication in book form was never allowed. See Anatorly Kuznetsov, "My Diary in the Other World," NYT, Part I, 10 August 1969, p. 24; Part II, 17 August 1969, p. 26. Yet he subsequently described his attempts to have some passages restored when Babi Yar was published as a book by Molodaia Gvardiia Press in Moscow, 1967. See Martin Dewhirst and Robert Farrell (eds.). The Soviet Censorship (Metuchen, N. J., 1973), p. 30. The book did, in fact, appear and it contains a fuller account of these events than the journal version.
53. Gladilin described his experiences at Youth in the book that he published after his defection: The Making and Unmaking of a Soviet Writer, trans. David Lapeza (Ann Arbor, 1977). As for Polevoi, he was attacked, along with Aleksandr Tvardovsky, by Vladimir Ermilov for being one of those in the older generation who protected young rebels and helped them publish their work. Polevoi was in particular trouble for publishing some of Voznesensky's poems, but he refused to make a public recantation (Johnson, pp. 19-20). A letter by Polevoi described the pressure being brought to bear on the authorities to force them to permit Jewish cultural activities (See Politicheskii Dnevnik, 1964-1970 (Amsterdam, 1972), pp. 102-105). At the Twenty-Third Party Congress in the spring of 1966, both Polevoi and Tvardovsky were missing, having

been passed over in the Party elections to the Congress (Soviet Leaders, p. 17). Polevoi was, however, sufficiently well entrenched to weather the scandal associated with Babi Yar and Kuznetsov's defection. He remained editor of Iunost' until his death in 1981.

54. Kuznetsov, "My Diary," NYT, 10 August 1969, pp. 1, 24; 17 August 1969, p. 26.
55. Quoted in the NYT Book Review, 5 March 1967, p. 19.
56. D. M. Thomas, The White Hotel (New York, 1981). This transposition of Dina Pronichev's story to the climax of The White Hotel created a controversy about the proper use of other writers' books. See TLS, 26 March 1982, p. 355; 2 April 1982, p. 383; 9 April 1982, pp. 413-415.
57. Kuznetsov, "My Diary," NTY, 10 August 1969, p. 24. Evtushenko expressed his anger in a speech to the Fifth Congress of Writers of the USSR, held in the spring of 1971: "Our generation has had its share of bohemians and do-nothings, but those individuals are no more representative of our generation than is that pathetic, fawning, clinging Dickensian Uriah Heep who goes by the name of Monsieur Anatoly" (LG, 7 July 1971, p. 11).
58. P. Troitsky, "A Diversity of Quests," Izvestia, 22 January 1967, as translated and reproduced in CDSP, Vol. IX, No. 4, p. 32; LG, 22 February 1967, p. 8.
59. This point was made by an editorial in the NYT News of the Week in Review, 4 September 1966, p. 10, which described the publication of the novel as a triumph of truth over "doctrinaire bigotry."
60. Kuznetsov, p. 475. A transcript of Dzyuba's speech may be found in The Chornovil Papers, comp. Vyacheslav Chornovil (New York, Toronto,

- London, etc., 1968), pp. 222-226. Dzyuba was sentenced in March, 1973, to five years' imprisonment, but released early when he recanted in November, 1973 (A. J. Motyl, "Roy Medvedev: Dissident or conformist?" Survey [Summer, 1980], p. 85). See Nekrasov Zapiski zevaki, pp. 70-71.
61. The entry for Babi Yar in the Bol'shaia Sovetskaia Entsiklopediia admits that the 50,000 to 70,000 people shot at the end of September, 1941, were mainly Jews and reports that a granite obelisk was installed to mark the site in October, 1966. See Vol. II, 3rd ed., (Moscow, 1970), p. 501.
62. See NYT June 1969. There is a detailed account of Kochubievsky's case in Peter Reddaway, ed., Uncensored Russia (London, 1972), pp. 301-306. Kochubievsky and his family were allowed to emigrate after his release.
63. Dawidowicz, p. 63.
64. NYT, 5 October 1975, p. 11.
65. See Anthony Austin, "New Play Exposes the Antisemitism of Babi Yar," NYT, 16 October 1980, p. 21. My colleagues Lev Loseff and Dennis Whelan were commissioned to translate the play for a possible Broadway production under the title Before the Dawn, which opened in March, 1985. I am grateful to them for permission to use their translation. I want to thank Lev Loseff for all his help.
66. For information on Borshchagovsky, see the entry in Kratkaia Literaturnaia Entsiklopediia, Vol. I (Moscow, 1962), p. 701. See also Lukasz Hirszwicz, "On the Eve of Babi Yar," SJA (May, 1982), pp. 67-72. For the story about the soccer game "Trevozhnye oblaka," see A. Borshchagovskii, Sedaia chaika (Moscow, 1965), pp. 215-372.
67. The Yiddish version of Ladies' Tailor, translated by Note Lurye,

appeared in Sovetish Heymland, No. 9, 1981, along with an introduction by Borshchagovsky. The performances in November, 1982, were mentioned in the Chronicle of Events, SJA (May, 1983).

68. Newsweek, 18 June 1984, p. 53.
69. Anatolii Rybakov, Tiazhelyi pesok (Moscow, 1979), the novel first appeared in the journal Oktiabr', Nos. 7, 8 and 9 (1978). An English translation by Harold Shukman was published by Penguin in 1981. The other novel is: Mikhail Lev, Sud posle prigovora (Moscow, 1982). For comments on the former, see Harold Shukman, SJA, 1 (1979), pp. 66-71. For comments on the latter see SJA, 3 (1983), pp. 73-76.
70. Evgenii Evtushenko, Sobranie sochinenii v trex tomax (Moscow, 1983-84), Vol. I, p. 316.
71. Crankshaw, p. 155.
72. Schechtman, in his chapter called "The Babi Yar Story," pp. 86-104.
73. Elie Wiesel, The Jews of Silence (New York, Chicago, San Francisco, 1966), pp. 41-42.
74. NYT, 4 August 1979, p. 2. The inscription on the Auschwitz monument in Poland also fails to mention the Jews, though it is estimated that three of the four million people killed there were Jewish. When the monument was dedicated in 1967, the authorities denied permission to have Kaddish recited. See NYT, 17 April 1967, pp. 1 and 3; see also NYT, 14 April 1985, pp. 1 and 29.
75. Pravda, 16 March 1971. The attempt to equate Zionism with Nazism subsequently intensified. A recent article claims that Zionist leaders collaborated with the Gestapo and purports to describe the points that the two doctrines have in common. Both doctrines supposedly stress the

importance of racial purity; both the Nazis and the Zionists have supposedly committed genocide against races that are regarded as inferior. Just as Hitler passed laws preventing the Jews from owning property, so the Zionists in 1980 passed laws preventing non-Jews from owning property. The article alleges that both Nazism and Zionism were instruments of the imperialist powers. See V. Bol'shakov, "Fashizm i sionizm: korni rodstva,": Pravda, 17 January 1984, p. 4.

76. LG, 29 September 1982, p. 9. The same analogy was drawn in Pravda, 20 September 1982, p. 1.
77. NYT, 9 June 1985, E7.
78. NYT, 16 June 1985, E20.
79. NYT, 21 July 1985, E20. See also NYT, 25 August 1985, E22.