
FROM THE OTHER SHORE

The Fate of Olga Ivinskaya

THE PASTERNAK case has been the great moral *agon* of recent years. It is the one crisis which, though recognised everywhere as a great public event, has not involved solely political figures, states, and masses, but—on one side—a single man.

He is perhaps best seen as a man of immense moral toughness, an ability to sweat it out year after year in the face of the overwhelming pressures of a vast and insistent machinery of power. It was impossible to shake him in his feeling that he was right, and that the collective wisdom arrayed against him was absurdly wrong. Fortified by his principles he died unbroken.

What he felt for the state was not a political revulsion. He rather saw its views as inadequate and pettifogging and its life as ephemeral; he foresaw an eventual triumph of the ideas of the Russian Enlightenment. And his strength derived not only from his own "courage of genius," as Edmund Wilson put it, but also from consciousness of support from a less temporary, more genuine, larger collective—that of all concerned with real life and with true art, rather than political expediencies. Even his opponents were reluctant to make too open a breach with this powerful protective force.

But he was also personally sustained by the devotion of a few individuals, and in particular of Olga Ivinskaya, the original of Lara in *Doctor Zhivago*. In 1948 she had been arrested and, as Pasternak tells us, "tortured" in an attempt to incriminate him. After four years in a labour camp, she came back to be his secretary and literary agent. When his persecutors attempted to force upon his corpse the compromises he had refused when living, Ivinskaya, his closest collaborator, continued to stand for his authentic demands. The resentment of the authorities was at last able to vent itself without restraint.

After the violent attacks on Pasternak which culminated in the winter of 1958, the Soviet authorities had changed their approach. In the spring and summer of 1959 they said no more about him or *Doctor Zhivago*. At the same time

ROBERT CONQUEST is known as both a poet and a student of Soviet affairs. A book on the Pasternak case, *The Courage of Genius*, is to be published in the autumn by Harvill. A new book of poems, *Between Mars and Venus*, will also be out shortly, from Hutchinson. According to a report in *The Times* of 15th June, both Olga Ivinskaya and her daughter, Irina, "are seriously ill in a Russian prison hospital after being transferred from one camp in Siberia to another near Moscow. . . ."

reassuring reports that his more extreme opponents had to some extent been thwarted began to be put about. Meanwhile, Pasternak himself was extremely reserved in what he said to visitors of unknown reliability. The impression gained ground that the Soviet government had had second, and better, thoughts.

A slight appearance of *détente* affected Pasternak himself. On September 11th, 1959, he reappeared in public for the first time since the Nobel controversy, at the final concert in the New York Philharmonic's tour of the U.S.S.R. Not that he was optimistic. The *New York Times* correspondent, Max Frankel, reported (September 12th, 1959):

Mr. Pasternak disclosed later that he was working on a play about the liberation of Russian serfs in the eighteen-sixties. He hopes to complete it within six months, he said, but added, "It will not be any more happy for me personally than my novel." He was in good health and living comfortably, but he said of *Doctor Zhivago* that "he did not believe that it would be published in the foreseeable future."

The reference to the evidently unorthodox play shows that he was still stubbornly putting forward his own ideas. In conversation with Mrs. Olga Carlisle in January, 1960, he described this work as a trilogy called *The Blind Beauty*. The "blind beauty" is a peasant girl, but Pasternak noted (*Paris Review*, summer 1960) that:

The title is, of course, symbolic of Russia, oblivious for so long of its own beauty and its own destinies.

The fate of this manuscript is a matter of legitimate interest to the world literary public, and it evidently played an important part in the events which followed the poet's death. When he saw Mrs. Carlisle, he said that he had then written one-third of the trilogy, adding that, "The first and the second plays are partially written," and that the third part "is but a project yet."

When Heinz Schewe visited Pasternak in March, 1960, the poet showed him a 175-page manuscript of the plays' progress to date. (*Corriere della Sera*, August 2nd, 1960.)

Thus, though the state of completeness of the work at the time of Pasternak's death is uncertain, it is plain that there is solid and important material awaiting release. Besides this, Olga Ivinskaya is known to have been preparing an edition of his correspondence.

By the autumn Pasternak knew that his health was getting worse, but concealed the fact in order not to become an invalid controlled by doctors and sympathisers. In a letter dated November 17th, 1959, he wrote of (*New York Times*, 4 Feb. 1961):

now and then a disturbance on the left side of a breast. I am telling no one about it, as if I do mention it I shall have to give up my habitual daily routine.

He died on May 30th, 1960. His death, it will be remembered, was announced in three lines on the back pages of the literary papers only. His funeral was not announced, but was attended by

several leading writers and a crowd of fifteen hundred Russian students, workers, and others.

WITH HIS DEATH an attempt was made to blur and misrepresent his own attitude and to pile squalor upon the grandeur. The impression of comparative calm over 1959-1960 had been a false one. The truth was that things had become so bad that the poet, while speaking and writing frankly about it to his acquaintances, had to beg them to say nothing of his plight for fear of making it worse. Worse, too, not only for himself, but also for those not even protected as much as he was by his reputation, and whose fate after his death was to show the implacable meanness of his enemies. During this period of apparent serenity he was writing, in a letter dated August 9th, 1959 (ENCOUNTER, August 1960):

It continues in all its strictness. My situation is worse, more unbearable and endangered than I can say or you can think of. . . .

Worse than Pasternak, who had lived through the *Yezhovshchina* and the *Zhdanovshchina*, could say! And this is typical of many letters and remarks which could not be quoted at the time. But even now a good deal of what Pasternak told his friends has not been made public. As Edward Crankshaw says (*Observer*, 22 Jan. 1961):

One day his letters, sometimes almost recklessly indiscreet, to his friends outside Russia will be published. They will be read with distress and a profound sense of outrage that a good man should be made to suffer such humiliation and agony of soul. Don't believe all you hear of me, he said over and over again; they are closing in on me, and I shall come to a bad end. He was, indeed, hounded to death.

THE MAIN WEAPON the authorities had against Pasternak was the hint that reprisals would be taken against Olga Ivinskaya. During the whole period from 1958 she was often called in by the police for apparently pointless interrogation. According to Dr. Ronald Hingley (in the *Sunday Times*, 22 Jan. 1961):

Fear for her welfare became an obsession of his last years. This was precisely the intention of the authorities, for though he was shielded from direct molestation by his international fame it was possible to harass him effectively in this way. He conveyed to his friends in the West his fear that after his death she would be re-arrested.

Crankshaw quotes a letter from the poet shortly before his death:

If, God forbid, they should arrest Olga, I will send you a telegram saying that someone has caught scarlet fever. In that event, all tocsins should ring, just as would have been done in my own case, for an attack on her is in fact a blow at me. . . .

In another letter he had written, "she and her children are a kind of hostage for me."

PASTERNAK's forebodings were only too well justified.

A French student, M. Nivat, to whom Olga Ivinskaya's daughter Irina Yemelianova had become engaged, was refused a renewal of his visa, and left the U.S.S.R. on August 10th, 1960. Olga Ivinskaya was arrested the following week and her daughter in early September. They were, it was later learnt, tried on December 7th, and sentenced to terms of eight and three years respectively. They were sent to Siberia on December 12th.

Such, at least, is the course of events as unofficial Soviet sources have recounted it in the West. There is no clear official account.

When the trial and sentence became known, several Western writers, including Bertrand Russell and Graham Greene, sent unpublicised appeals in the hope that the Russians would realise the extremely bad effect such actions were bound to have even on people of whose political attitudes they themselves had spoken in a friendly way, and that they would then find themselves able to repudiate the trial without loss of face.

It speaks well for the discretion of the many in Western Europe who knew of these letters, that the first publicity came from the Soviet side.

In the middle of January a spokesman of *Goslitizdat*, the State Literary Publishing House, told a British reporter that Madame Ivinskaya had been selling verse translations to them at a profit, having had young students do the actual work—evidently a reference to her obtaining prose translations of poems from languages she did not herself know. He added:

We have broken off all connection with Ivinskaya. Our Managing Director is very angry with her. In 1959 she delivered 15,000 lines of rhymed verse earning her about 150,000 roubles. . . . no one person could translate so much poetry in one year. It is probable that legal action will be taken against her. (*Daily Herald*, 17 Jan. 1961.)

Though nothing more was ever said about this particular offence, this first public statement, with all its inadequacy, made further privacy impossible; in fact it seemed designed to do just that, and to amount to a declaration of irreconcilability on the issue. Outside the Soviet Union there was a storm of protest. A few days later Radio Moscow mounted a formal attack, carried on its foreign services only.

In a broadcast on the night of January 21st, it violently accused Ivinskaya and her daughter of currency offences in connection with the royalties on *Doctor Zhivago*. At the same time, it charged her not merely with breaking the law in this way, but also with deceiving Pasternak for reasons of personal profit. This is in accord with a whispering campaign which had been started in Moscow the previous year, representing her as an evil influence on him and responsible for the anti-Soviet attitudes of his later life. It was followed, on January 27th, 1961, by another, also confined to the foreign services. The essentials of the first broadcast are as follows:

Big sums of Soviet money began flowing in to Olga Ivinskaya not through the post or telegraph,

that is, not through legitimate channels; quite the contrary. Packets of money were handed over to her in some hotel, at her country home, or even gateway, by some Western correspondent who had brought this money in unlawfully across the border, or by some foreign post-graduate student who received Soviet money through diplomatic channels from some Western Embassy in Moscow. . . .

Olga Ivinskaya began accepting money from anyone who brought it, and not only money but nylon coats and other commodities bought with the royalties from foreign sources. Much buying and selling was done. . . . And Ivinskaya's daughter, Irina Yemelianova, a student at the Gorky Literary Institute in Moscow, was drawn into these activities. Her mother involved her in all her contraband dealings.

The incoming sums kept mounting. Last August, for instance, after the writer's death, certain foreign tourists brought half-a-million Soviet roubles to Olga Ivinskaya's country home. . . . All in all, Olga Ivinskaya received more than 800,000 roubles.

She kept her meetings with these envoys from abroad a deep secret. She was even sent four halves of foreign banknotes and as she testified at the questioning, she had been instructed to match the halves brought by the visitors as a password for those who were to meet her secretly in Moscow.

Olga Ivinskaya did all these things in the name of the late Boris Pasternak, claiming to be his benefactress. The writer's anti-patriotic act had been denounced by the Soviet public. But these dark criminal dealings went on behind the writer's back during his lifetime as well. Even then this benefactress managed to deceive her patron and diverted a large part of his royalties into her own pocket. . . .

This letter taken from Ivinskaya on her arrest was addressed by Feltrinelli not to Pasternak's heirs but to Ivinskaya. It reads in part: You must however bear in mind the following: (1) The former contract with Boris Pasternak regarding publication of *Doctor Zhivago*, as well as the new contract which I request that you send me as soon as possible, must not get into the hands of the authorities or Pasternak's family. All these secret documents must never be found on your person. (2) Send me all other documents that you have which might be useful to me. Everything I receive will be regarded as coming from Pasternak directly. (3) I shall not rest until all of Pasternak's letters and manuscripts are in the West. I shall always see to it that the greater part of the profit goes to you and Irina. . . .

Ivinskaya told the court that all the evidence in the case was absolutely true, and there was nothing she could refute. She pleaded guilty to having formed criminal contacts with foreign nationals, beginning in 1959, and to having received from them Soviet currency smuggled into the country. . . .

The second broadcast took much the same line.

THEY CALL for some comment. In the first place, the broadcast quoted above (which was in English) translates the parts it gives of Feltrinelli's letter misleadingly. Copies of the letter (written in German) were circulated by the editor of *Izvestia*, Alexei Adzhubei, on his recent visit to this country. The documents are not referred to as "secret" but "*vertraulich*"—confidential. The last sentence of point 3 should read: "I shall always see to it that a substantial (*substanzzieller*) part of the profit will be left over for you or Irina." A minor point, perhaps, but an indicative one.

The reference (made in both the broadcasts) to Feltrinelli's desire to get Pasternak's manuscripts to the West, may reflect an important motive of the Soviet authorities. They have consistently shown themselves as wishing to be in a position to suppress or censor Pasternak at will. And they may regard it as important to prevent, in particular, the publication of his new, unorthodox play outside Russia. To make safe safer, to remove his fearless literary executor, and to put the whole of his MSS in the hands of a committee answerable to the government would, on this view, be a major objective. And if, as seems possible, some MSS had already reached the outside world, Ivinskaya could be penalised and, at the same time, held as a hostage against publication.

The second broadcast states that Pasternak intended to adopt Irina, though he had not yet been able to do so, showing both the relationship of trust between them, and the likelihood that he would in fact wish to give her financial help. (When the mother was in jail in 1948-53, he had looked after her daughter and her son.) It also indicates how vulnerable he must have been to threats directed at Irina, as well as at her mother, and adds sharpness to the horror of his reaction to the proposal in 1958 to expel him from the country, which would have been, apart from anything else, to leave them to their fate. When he did so leave them in another way, the result justified such fears.

When Moscow Radio goes out of its way to refer to Irina as a student at the Literary Institute, it may be hinting at her real offence. At the Constituent Congress of Writers of the R.S.F.S.R. held December 7-13th, 1958, a speech by S. U. Smirnov spoke of a cult of Pasternak at the Institute (whose students had already been under attack the previous year for admiring "decadent" poets). Pasternak's portrait had been hung in the students' hostel, the manuscript of *Doctor Zhivago* had been circulated, and two of the ringleaders, the 19- and 20-year-old poets Kharabarov and Pankratov had, as a result of secretly visiting Pasternak, been expelled from the Komsomol and the Institute and sent to Kazakhstan, but had returned to pay further clandestine visits to the poet. (*Stenographic Report of the Congress, Moscow, 1959*.) That Miss Yemelianova had not been in some way connected with this literary opposition seems unlikely.

The attempt to portray Madame Ivinskaya as a false and mercenary friend may be tested not only against the fact that she had already suffered torture and imprisonment for his sake, but also against

the deep and sensitive picture of her as Lara in *Doctor Zhivago* which Pasternak created after years of friendship. M. Nivat commented that it was "unthinkable" that she had deceived the poet. He added (*Irish News*, January 25th, 1961),

Furthermore, knowing the relationship between Boris Pasternak and Madame Ivinskaya, I know that she would never have done anything without the initiative coming from him.

For one thing that becomes clear immediately is that, regardless of the truth or otherwise of the actual criminal accusations, Radio Moscow finds not the slightest evidence to support its charge that she had used, or intended to use, the money for her private advantage.

The trial may have been open in some technical sense, but it was not announced, and no foreigners or others interested in Madame Ivinskaya seem to have heard of it or to have been able to attend it.

As the *New Statesman* pointed out, allegations of currency and similar offences can be brought against almost anyone the authorities wish to prosecute, and several other unorthodox intellectuals have recently been sentenced on similar charges. Even if the offence was committed as stated, the interpretation Soviet spokesmen have attempted to put on it can be shown to be untenable. And this in turn speaks against the equitable handling of the trial itself.

MOREOVER, it is clear that no attempt was made to obtain foreign evidence relevant to the accusations. It is not known what these were in detail except from the accounts on Radio Moscow, which do not distinguish between general abuse and allegations of breaches of the law. But it is certain, for example, that Signor Feltrinelli's evidence about the circumstances in which the sums were supposedly sent to the U.S.S.R. would have been sought in any properly impartial investigation. It was only after the publicity on the radio that Feltrinelli issued a statement of which the following is the substance (*Avanti*, January 28th, 1961):

I myself know that the 100,000 dollars, converted entirely or in part into roubles and transmitted to Moscow, came from funds at the disposal of Boris Pasternak in the West. The amount in question was withdrawn on a written order in the author's own hand, dated December 6th, 1959. This order arrived in the West in March, 1960.

The bearer of this communication, which I saw with my own eyes, was the same person whom the author designated as the one to whom the sum should be entrusted. I know that the sum was duly withdrawn on March 10th, 1960. These are the facts. As for the delay of some months between the date of withdrawal and consignment to Moscow, I maintain this was due as much to the understandable difficulty which Pasternak's emissary experienced in finding the rouble equivalent, as to the actual transfer of the currency.

In conclusion, it is my opinion that Olga Ivin-

skaya is not responsible either for the transfer of the sum or for its eventual destination. In the first place the transfer order was given, I repeat, by Pasternak himself; secondly, it was Pasternak himself who wished that the sum converted into roubles should be sent, without distinction, either to himself or to Mme. Ivinskaya.

Nor can one rule out that the wish of the author was, in fact, to consider Olga Ivinskaya as his heiress. I trust therefore that the Soviet judicial authorities will take into account the circumstances which I have related, which are all confirmed by irrefutable documents.

Signor Sergio D'Angelo, who acted as Feltrinelli's agent in the financial dealings, has also given his equally relevant evidence. He says, "I acted entirely on Pasternak's instructions. Olga Ivinskaya had, as far as I know, nothing to do with the decision, and I doubt whether she knew at the time that he had told me to go ahead. In any case, she bore no responsibility for what followed." (*Sunday Telegraph*, May 7th, 1961.) D'Angelo adds, no doubt truly enough, that both Pasternak and Ivinskaya were being far too closely watched for any transfer to go undetected, concluding that the Soviet police knew what was going on but chose to hold their hands until after Pasternak was dead.

This is relevant to Pasternak's motives in making these arrangements in such circumstances. He had considered having money transferred through official channels, but wrote in a letter to D'Angelo,

It is being suggested to me that there should be official transfers of moneys. But I am not sure that there is not a trap concealed here to finish me off for certain (so great is the desire always to stifle me that I see nothing but this desire as far as I am concerned), moreover always with the implication that they have prepared something nice for me but just didn't manage to finish it, and that I've spoiled everything again and it's again impossible to come to terms—just think, what cheap baseness! So in reply to the proposal to make official transfers of money I have so far decided nothing. . . .

Thus his final decision to get the money direct seems to be based on the perfectly sound supposition that if the authorities were determined to arrest him and his friends they would do so anyhow, while if for reasons of political calculation they had decided to leave them free, they would turn a blind eye to breaches of their regulations. This was a realistic estimate of the circumstances, in which political calculation was the main force, with the rule of law nowhere.

In any case, we know from these statements—and, indeed, from inherent probability—that the Soviet line is entirely untrue about Pasternak's responsibility. He had made this clear to others.

Thus it is clear that Signor Feltrinelli operated under Pasternak's instructions, and if he sent money illegally to Pasternak it was under the impression that he was fulfilling these. He may indeed have misunderstood them. But in any case the primary guilt, such as it is, can lie only with the Italian operators and perhaps Pasternak himself.

Yet only Ivinskaya, at most a passive and unwilling accessory after the fact, has been prosecuted.

It should be added that if Pasternak felt it necessary to rely on foreign royalties, the responsibility is the Soviet authorities'. Even before his expulsion from the Union of Writers he had been saved, he tells us, entirely by advances from Polish publishers.

NO PROOF, as against implication, seems to have been advanced that Mme. Ivinskaya was actually privy to the truly illegal part of this alleged operation. Her part, on the face of it, appears to have been only receiving roubles. The alleged secrecy of the meetings with foreigners is perfectly explicable in terms of the persecution she and the poet had already undergone for officially disapproved, though perfectly legal, contacts. The precise provenance of particular notes does not seem proved to have been known to her. It may have been; but foreigners with blocked accounts in Russia had already given Pasternak some money, and there is no obvious reason why this should not have happened again. It may be that that too can be interpreted as an evasion of some other section of the law. But no other section was raised against her. All this may be mere legalism: but without such legalism in defence of an accused, the law perishes.

Evidence against Irina Yemelianova seems non-existent and even the allegations amount to virtually nothing. It seems to be a consensus of foreign opinion in Moscow that even if her mother technically broke the law the daughter is wholly innocent. The KGB's motives for ignoring this point are obvious.

There is much hearsay evidence circulating in the West about the exact circumstances of Pasternak's monetary arrangements. These vary in detail to some extent and are also immensely complicated. In the main, Pasternak's intention was to pay out most of his earnings abroad to various scholarship and other funds, while keeping 100,000 dollars for his family and Mme. Ivinskaya and her daughter.

WHAT SEEMS agreed by all who know the circumstances is that Pasternak, in a difficult and dangerous situation and uncertain of which foreigners he could rely on, became reckless, and paid little attention to the counsels of prudence which Mme. Ivinskaya consistently gave him. There is no need to doubt anyone's good faith, but the poet was not used to the subterfuges and discretions which come as second nature to political conspirators and members of secret police organisations.

The view was put forward in letters written to certain Western newspapers such as the *London Times*,* that in the Soviet Union trial must follow automatically on any breach of the law, as is the case in some other countries. This must be rejected.

* *The Times* printed a handful of short letters, of which two were from a Communist sympathiser, and refused fuller ones from distinguished and well-informed observers, indicating a remarkable fellow-feeling for Establishments.

To take a single example, involving crimes far worse than those alleged against Madame Ivinskaya; a number of fallen politicians have been clearly and specifically accused of offences against the law, without coming to trial. Members of the present Praesidium have themselves made such allegations.

Shvernik referred to "Violations of revolutionary legality committed by Malenkov, Kaganovich, and Molotov in the period of mass repressions." (*Pravda*, July 7th, 1957.) Khrushchev called Malenkov "one of the chief organisers of the so-called Leningrad Case," which is officially described as a frame-up in which many innocent Communists lost their lives (*Pravda*, July 7th, 1957.) Kozlov referred to "crude violations of revolutionary legality committed by Kaganovich." (*Leningradskaya Pravda*, July 5th, 1957.)

Moreover, the State's chief legal officer, Rudenko, the Procurator-General, himself spoke of "... these dissidents, especially Malenkov, Kaganovich, Molotov, Bulganin, having themselves committed crude arbitrariness and criminal violations of Socialist legality." (*Pravda*, December 26th, 1958.)

Yet all those named still hold well-paid posts, and have never faced a court. Nor, alternatively, have their accusers been prosecuted for criminal libel.

Even in the Ivinskaya case itself, it will be seen that only the two Russian women, who at most received the money, were prosecuted, while foreigners who actually transferred the sums without official permission were not—not even M. Nivat, who, Moscow Radio alleges, was caught by the customs in an attempt to smuggle.

In fact trials with any political significance of any sort are proceeded with or not as the result of a political decision. With Madame Ivinskaya, as Surkov's remarks (see below) and the line taken in the broadcasts make clear, the trial is only part of a more general political-cultural decision. In view of the importance of the matter, and its international aspect, it seems unlikely that such a decision could have been reached at a level lower than the type of meeting which has taken place in such crucial political-cultural matters as the purge of the staff of *Questions of History* in 1957, involving Suslov, Pospelov, and members of the Agitation and Propaganda and the Science and Culture Departments of the Central Committee, and possibly higher still.

THE next public move made in Moscow in connection with the case was an interview given by Surkov to various local correspondents of the Western Communist press. He is reported as saying:

It is simply a question of illegal dealing in foreign exchange and this had nothing to do with Pasternak. I have seen the Public Prosecutor and the judges. They sentenced Olga Ivinskaya to eight years' imprisonment and her daughter Irina to three years: they had illegally received sums of 300,000 and 500,000 roubles. I have received letters and telegrams on this subject,

from Graham Greene in particular... I replied giving the true facts and expressing surprise: What, you intervene and demand the liberation of rogues of whom you know nothing! Now this is really a question of an illegal currency deal and is not connected with Pasternak who was a great poet. His family, it must be said, has nothing to do with this sordid story. All these rumours offended the writer's memory. If people abroad wish to respect his memory then they should not stir up mud around him, just because among his friends there was an adventuress. We do not want to interfere in this affair because it has nothing to do with politics or with literature. (*Humanité*, January 24th, 1961.)

This evidently reflects a decision of which Surkov was simply the spokesman—a selection which seems to imply that writers with less strong stomachs were not prepared to associate themselves publicly with the action now being taken. (A year earlier Surkov had referred to Pasternak as a “renegade litterateur,” but his opinions have always been readily adjustable.)

THE NEW ATTITUDE TO PASTERNAK, coupled with the trial of Ivinskaya, made up a general proposition: that Pasternak had written reputably until he had, in his dotage, fallen into the hands of an adventuress who had provoked or lured him into excesses not representative of his normal talent and opinions. The advantage of such a line is that it would make it possible to write off the works of his last years or perhaps even produce a vastly bowdlerised edition of *Doctor Zhivago*—and thus retreat from the awkward position of total hostility to a writer whose books are stubbornly regarded by the great majority in Soviet literary circles as among the best Russian works of the epoch. If such a plan is taken as being afoot, the removal of Madame Ivinskaya becomes particularly necessary, as it is impossible to imagine her becoming a party to a literary manoeuvre of the sort, while at the same time it was impossible to deny her closeness to and influence with Pasternak. The solution, to blame her for the aberrations, to transfer to her the writer's literary and monetary guilts, ties things up nicely. That two women, one a young girl, should be inequitably condemned to years of misery is not perhaps a point that would appear as more than incidental to Surkov and those who think like him.

As to Surkov's remark about Graham Greene “knowing nothing” about the Ivinskaya case, one is reminded of Khrushchev's remark (at the XXth Party Congress) about Stalin's handling of the “Doctor's Plot:”

The case was so presented that no one could verify the facts on which the investigation was based. There was no possibility of trying to verify the facts by contacting those who had made the confessions of guilt.

This did not mean that those without access to the facts were wrong, and those with access right; on the contrary! (Khrushchev adds that his doubts

were aroused, in spite of the legalities and confessions, by his knowledge of the doctors' characters. And ours by our knowledge of Ivinskaya's, among other things!)

The Surkov line had little success outside the U.S.S.R. Even in the U.S.S.R., no support seems to have come from any reputable writer. But the more liberal-minded made the best of the concession—a great change from the talk of “pig” and “literary weed” in 1958—by which it became permissible to praise the poet. Ehrenburg gives him the warmest possible acclaim in a section of his memoirs published in *Novy Mir* of February 1961, and even praises much of *Doctor Zhivago*. Moreover, even his criticism of it is inoffensive. He adds that Pasternak had no intention of harming the U.S.S.R.; his error was just “being Pasternak.” But Ehrenburg, however mildly, makes him responsible for his own actions, and simply ignores the shoddy melodrama of the influence of the evil adventuress.

Here, as in so many other cases, it becomes plain that civilisation and decency are not matters of political belief or attachment to one or other idea of the correct organisation of society. The division is not between Communist and non-Communist, but between humanist and *apparatchik*. What colloquy is possible there? What appeal can bridge that gap?

One was soon attempted.

IN FEBRUARY 1961, Mr. Alexei Adzhubei, editor of *Izvestia*, and son-in-law of Khrushchev, came to Britain (together with Surkov, Mr. Georgi Zhukov, and others) on a delegation to a conference on “peaceful co-existence” organised by the Great Britain-U.S.S.R. Association. He brought a set of documents supposedly proving Madame Ivinskaya's guilt, and attempted to get a number of leading British newspapers to publish these. He wanted them published “without any comment whatsoever” (*Daily Telegraph*, 24 Feb. 1961) and complained of censorship when this was not found acceptable—though, as British journalists pointed out to him, the documents had not been published, nor the case referred to, in the papers of the U.S.S.R. itself! The documents consisted of:

- (a) Photographs of bundles of Russian banknotes;
- (b) Photographs of Italian banknotes cut in two;
- (c) A photostat of a letter in German said to have been sent to Madame Ivinskaya by Signor Feltrinelli;
- (d) A confession said to have been written by Madame Ivinskaya in the Investigation Section of the Committee of State Security.

As the London press pointed out, these documents did nothing in themselves to substantiate the charges against Madame Ivinskaya, and “would not be accepted as evidence in support of charges in any Western court of law” (*Daily Telegraph*). The letter from Feltrinelli had already been more or less reproduced in its main points by Radio Moscow. The confession, however, was new. It ran as follows:

In the Investigating Department KGB

STATEMENT of the accused

IVINSKAYA, O. V.

Everything in the accusation is the essential truth. For my part I dispute none of it. (Perhaps with the exception of details about which I myself may have become confused owing to my nervous condition.) On the other hand, I wish to thank the investigator for his tact and correctness, not only in connection with me, but also with my archives, which have been carefully sorted, part of them returned to me, part delivered to the literat. archive, and nothing which I wanted to preserve destroyed.

4/xi 1960

O. Ivinskaya

Though there is no formal reason for regarding this as proven to be genuine, the content is so inept for the purposes of an official propaganda operation, and so strongly implies other views inadequately compromised under pressure, that we may take it as authentic, at least tentatively.

The first thing to remember, in this case, is that it represents a draft acceptable, if only barely, to the Security Police. But although it is so in form, it is remarkable how little is actually conceded. The reservation about "details" shows, even after two months of pressure, refusal to confirm some of the particulars alleged against her or her friends. The reference to her nervous condition adequately implies the awful circumstances in which she found herself. Even if the reference to KGB correctness is less of a formality than similar statements have been in the past, we may feel that two months of interrogation incommunicado is likely to build up tensions capable of producing the nervous state she speaks of.

If the document does not go far to substantiate later Soviet allegations, it is still a general admission of guilt, presumably for the currency offences proper. And, on the other issues, it is not a declaration of the Ivinskaya-Pasternak position, but only a hint at it. We may feel it to be a brave and intelligent compromise on Ivinskaya's part. It is not difficult to imagine what were the pressures on her. In the first place, her young daughter's fate, as well as her own, depended to some extent on her attitude; and there remained the other members of her family.

Yet it is clear that there was another and at least equally important consideration in Ivinskaya's lonely struggle with the KGB—her responsibility for Pasternak's unpublished manuscripts. It is difficult to interpret what she writes about her "archives" with any certainty (and the hint that at least some documents may have been destroyed is disturbing), but at any rate it shows the unquenchable concern with which she regarded the irreplaceable literature which had been her charge. It can perhaps be read as a formal registering of

assurances she had obtained from the authorities in return for her "confession." If it is argued that such assurances can hardly be thought of as reliably binding, still it was the very best she could do.

But as to the general Soviet charges, whether the description of Olga Ivinskaya's actions is as false as that of her character, we can at any rate say that there is at present no reason to attach any particular credence to it, in the absence of her side of the story. As another Nobel Prize winner, W. B. Yeats, said on a comparable occasion:

*But who is there to argue that
Now Pearse is deaf and dumb?*

Pearse was dead and Olga Ivinskaya is only imprisoned, but—except for this brief cry, selected by her persecutors—she is just as unable to communicate. Nor is the prognosis of survival in the case of an eight-year term in a labour camp, particularly for those against whom the state has shown special malice, very reassuring—and Madame Ivinskaya is no longer a young woman. Many people, reading of the sentence, have told us how they were reminded of the fate of the fictional Lara:

One day Lara went out and did not come back. She must have been arrested in the street, as so often happened in those days, and she died or vanished somewhere, forgotten as a nameless number on a list which was afterwards mislaid, in one of the innumerable mixed or women's concentration camps in the north.

But Olga Ivinskaya was victimised in a Russia which has supposedly abandoned the Stalinist inhumanities. If we are to draw a general conclusion, it must be that the ruling bureaucracy has no true objection, apart from an occasional feeling of inexpediency, against this sort of thing. We recall the revealing statement of one of them, the Assistant Procurator-General of the U.S.S.R., Kudryavtsev, in 1957:

If it becomes necessary we will restore the old methods. But I think it will not be necessary.*

Such attitudes, far from indicating moral revulsion, explicitly put the interests of the authorities above good and evil. The fate of Madame Ivinskaya shows how these views work out in practice. And yet, we can hope that protest may touch, if not any humanitarian feeling, at least a sense of the balance of political advantage, and that the ruling party may feel that it has produced a thoroughly unprofitable wave of resentment. This was seen at the time of the initial outburst against the Nobel award, and it is bound to be even more strongly aroused by what commentators everywhere have described as the cruel and contemptible persecution of a great writer to—and now beyond—the grave.

Meanwhile we may feel that, even in death and disgrace, the moral victory is with Pasternak and Olga Ivinskaya, and that in the long run such victories are usually the more effective. Pasternak's own life and work were based on such a view.

Robert Conquest

* "Soviet Law Reform," by Professor Harold Berman, in the *Yale Law Journal*, Vol. 66, No. 8.

LETTERS

“Cuba and the Intellectuals”

It is BIGOTED to be anti-American; America is a capitalist country; therefore, opposition to capitalism is a form of bigotry. This syllogism, which underlies so many contributions to your pages, is implicit in Anthony Hartley's recent article on Cuba.

Provoked by Dr. Castro's nationalisation of American business interests in Cuba (or was there some other act of provocation that I missed?), the U.S. government financed, armed and planned an invasion. We who protested against this action are now accused by Mr. Hartley of “gleeful emotionalism,” “chauvinism and *schadenfreude*.” We are told, in fact, not that we were wrong, but that we ought to be ashamed of ourselves. As in *The Caine Mutiny*, the thesis is that intellectuals ought never to rock the boat, no matter how strangely the captain is behaving, because boat-rocking is a sign of arrogance and immaturity.

Towards the end of his piece, Mr. Hartley appears to be arguing that the only honest critics of America are those who come right out and declare their preference for the Soviet way of life. In other words, he excludes the possibility of a third course. So (you should pardon the emotive expression) did McCarthy.

In his reference to my letter to *The Times* on the Cuban adventure, Mr. Hartley is guilty of a subtle inaccuracy that I feel bound to correct. He says:

I have some sympathy with those signatories of the *Times* letter who insisted on the addition of the words “though not always in ways that all of us would approve” to the eulogy of Dr. Castro's economic activity.

Nobody insisted on any such thing; the phrase Mr. Hartley quotes was in the original draft. By suggesting, however, that it was added under pressure, Mr. Hartley is able to convey the idea that I, unlike some of my gentler co-signatories, am a ruthless believer that the end justifies the means. If this were the case, I would have to admit that Mr. Hartley had beaten me at my own game.

KENNETH TYNAN

London

1. Mr. Tynan should not attribute to me or to ENCOUNTER his own inadequate analysis of the nature of American society. Anti-Americanism and anti-capitalism are both capable of producing forms of bigotry, and, when they are combined by means of propositions as superficial and misleading as “America is a capitalist country,” the result is a particularly narrow brand of intolerance. Anyone is free to think (or to fail to think) in this way, but I would rather not have his errors in logic foisted on to me.

2. I should have thought it to be obvious that there were many other reasons apart from “business

interests” for American attitudes to events in Cuba, and I suspect that Mr. Tynan has missed a good deal. For instance, it apparently escaped his notice that half my article was devoted to a protest against the Cuban expedition. The difference between us is that I regard the Cuban expedition as a bad lapse on the part of a friendly country which shares many of the same democratic beliefs and traditions as ourselves, whereas Mr. Tynan seems to detect some more fundamental turpitude arising out of the “capitalist” nature of American society—the “monopoly trusts” and “merchants of death” riding again, a little long in the tooth, but recognisably their old hackneyed selves. I might add that I do not wish to deprive intellectuals of their boat-rocking fun, but that I reserve the right to protest when they look like swamping any craft that I myself happen to be in.

3. Naturally in terms of political and cultural theory there are many “third courses” which differ from both the American and the Russian way of life. However, at the end of my article I was talking about British foreign policy, and there we are in the position of having to make a choice, since the whole of post-war history has proved our inability to “go it alone.” Neutralists in this country are protected in their illusions by the realities of an American alliance at which they sneer. I do not find this position particularly courageous or commendable: it seems to me to combine priggishness and lack of generosity in equal proportions. As for Mr. Tynan's introduction of the late junior Senator for Wisconsin, it is the easier to pardon him the “emotive expression” in that I should have been disappointed had this particular cliché not appeared in his reply.

4. As for his final paragraph, I must say that I took the phrase “though not always in ways that all of us would approve” as indicating disagreement among the signatories of the *Times* letter. I still do not see what purpose the words “all of us” (as distinct from “we”) could fulfil other than that of demonstrating such real differences of opinion. And, if some approved and others disapproved of Dr. Castro's “ways,” then it seemed reasonable to suppose that the phrase had been inserted at the latter's request. However, I naturally accept Mr. Tynan's assurance that the words were in the original draft, though I feel that this is more an occasion for congratulations on the draftsman's dexterity than a refutation of my deduction that there were differences among the signatories. It might throw some light on the matter were Mr. Tynan to tell us which of Dr. Castro's “ways” he himself disapproves: Is it the abolition of elections? the imprisonment of Labour leaders such as David Salvador and the suspension of the right to strike? the dismissal of some two-thirds of the teachers of Havana university? the government control of the press? the seizure of *Dr. Zhivago* as counter-revolutionary literature? It would be interesting to know, for I am not aware that he has ever gone on record as a critic of any of the “ways” of the Castro régime.

ANTHONY HARTLEY

London