



## Yuri Glazov on dissent in Russia

Yuri Glazov

.....a pleasant, soft spoken, peace-loving man; and at the same time very sincere and intense. He is very fond of his country and its culture -- he feels almost like a fish, used to the high pressure and darkness of a deep ocean basin, which has been suddenly transported to a shallow sea; it is intoxicated with light and oxygen.

In January Professor Glazov spoke to the Amnesty International luncheon. One of his concerns was about the 'wester' interpretation of what he meant by "intelligentsia." In Russia the "intelligentsia" are people from **all walks of life** who think and speak freely about human rights, life and liberty.

### Interview with Prof. Glazov excerpted from Irene Kirk's Profiles in Russian Resistance

**Q.** The West admires the courage shown by the protest movement in the Soviet Union. But many of us wonder: do such people as Pyotr Grigorenko, the Medvedev brothers, Amalrik, and Litvinov risk so much **only** because they feel that there is some chance that their actions will bring about reforms or improvements in their country?

The fact that the West admires the courage of these people does not bring me any joy; what we need most is not praise or wonder but understanding. What is lacking is the understanding by the West of what is happening in the Soviet Union. As for the motives of these people, they speak out because they cannot keep silent—the atmosphere and the situation demand it. Before 1968 there was still a hope that some reforms or changes might be possible. After August, 1968, it became evident that any serious dialogue between the Soviet Government and the protest movement was impossible.

**Q.** Does the Government sometimes allow dissent in order to identify the troublemakers?

The Soviet Government is in a very peculiar position. On the one hand it is quite capable of suppressing every movement inside the country. On the other hand it has its games with the West and tries to save face. That is why it isn't right to assume that the Soviet Government is absolutely free in its actions against the members of the moral protest movement. The movement at first was a shock to the Government. Later it was thoroughly investigated, especially by the KGB which more than any other organization, understood the motives of the people in the movement. I think that the KGB wanted to see how the movement would develop. They didn't need to identify the people since the outstanding members of the movement had often been in trouble with the Government. It was kind of an experiment—to see if there would be a chain reaction. But to their great amazement they realized that the society they had created was rather stable and there was no chain reaction. The members of the moral protest movement are isolated not only from the authorities but also from the people

and the other members of the Intelligentsia.

**Q.** Do you think government agents penetrated the movement?

In the Soviet Union there is bilingualism and the Intelligentsia speaks its own language, and, of course, the officials are interested in that other language and they send their agents to interpret it. But those who are in the movement are not afraid any more and they speak openly even if they suspect that someone is an agent.

**Q.** Are women liberated in the Soviet Union?

I don't think so. We have a different tendency there: the Russian women would like to be, so to speak, enslaved. They would like to live quietly in a family circle, with a husband who has an adequate salary that would allow them to raise their children quietly at home.

**Q.** Do you see any link between yourselves and the nineteenth century Intelligentsia? Does the present Intelligentsia feel any links with the people? What are the myths of the present Intelligentsia?

The revival of the Intelligentsia in Russia is a real miracle. After all, it was exiled or wiped out during the Revolution, and wiped out again in the 1930s. And even though we don't have anyone on the level of Nicholas Berdyaev, Sergei Bulgakov, or Leo Shestov, we will. This reborn Intelligentsia is not the same as the Intelligentsia of the previous century, or that of the beginning of this century. These were very often infatuated with the people and were antireligious. The Intelligentsia now makes use of the lessons of the past and is trying a synthesized approach. Though they realize that the Russian people, in spite of everything, did not undergo any transformation and are basically very stable, there is no cult of the people to communicate with the people, because there is a gap between them and they need a lot of education to understand things. So instead of **narodnichestvo** (populism) there is now **intelligentchestvo**: an appeal to Intelligentsia as a single class that may close this gap.

**Q.** What are the prospects of the moral protest movement in the immediate future?

The movement has now come to a standstill and frankly I am not surprised. There is a lot of disillusionment even though many things had been foreseen. I think that after two or three years of silence there will be other developments. Because if the Soviet authorities will not understand that it is necessary to change course, and to stop their spiritual genocide, then they will be opposed in at least four different ways. First by the underground—in some cases we have already seen the appeal for strikes in Moscow last year. Then there is a new revival of Slavophilism.

I'm not a partisan of that, especially when it is connected with anti-Semitism or fascism, but I share their belief that the Russian people will finally gain their freedom. Another strange revival is neocommunistism. The young people who do not want to learn from the lessons of Czechoslovakia think that Stalin did corrupt Lenin's ideals and that they could revive Lenin's teachings as put forth in this **What's to Be Done?** and try to realize a new approach to communism the way Dubcek tried. Lastly, there is the Christian revival, but one connected with social activities. The religious approach now demands action in

the social sphere, as with Boris Talantov and Gleb Yakunin. That is why I am not pessimistic at all in regard to the future of Russia. We will witness all this in three or four years. I don't invite anyone to make another crusade against the Soviet Union. It is invalid to blame only the Party officials and the Government for what is going on. They are not more responsible than the people and the Intelligentsia. Finally, it is necessary to intensify everyone's feeling of responsibility for what goes on on this earth—whether it is happening in South Africa or Bangladesh or in Ireland or in the Soviet Union.

## Andrei Sakharov - the focal point

### Sakharov: The Chained Titan

To the Editor:

On Dec. 10 in Oslo, Elena Sakharov received a gold medal and diploma which her husband, Andrei Sakharov, winner of the Nobel Peace Prize, was unable to accept in person. The event took place almost exactly ten years after the Russian intelligentsia, revived from ashes of executions and imprisonment, conducted its first demonstration to defend human rights. Sakharov seems to be the only mighty voice that has survived the movement's persecution by the Brezhnev regime. The list of victims is long—too long.

Sakharov posed quite a problem for the Soviet authorities. He is too influential to get rid of without much fuss. The possibilities of silencing him are limited.

He might be expelled from the prestigious Soviet Academy of Sciences. He might be put on trial and sent to a remote place in Siberia. He might be deported like Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, but unlike Solzhenitsyn he could use his knowledge of the theory of relativity to discover rather peculiar laws dominating in our two artificially separated hemispheres, and by so doing he might advance the day when pro-socialist and non-religious intellectuals of the West will embrace their counterparts—pro-religious and non-socialist Russians.

The Soviet authorities could keep on playing their favorite game: Leave the lamp untouched while

catching all birds and flies rushing to the light—that is, isolate Sakharov from his friends and associates.

Since the middle of last October, a new offensive against Sakharov has been under way. One blow followed another. On Nov. 22, Yuri Zhukov, and editor of Pravda, informed millions of Soviet TV listeners of the "indignant letters" about Sakharov he had received. (On Nov. 23, a worthy Soviet recipient for a peace prize—from the Moscow-supported World Peace Council—was at last found; Leonid Brezhnev.)

On Dec. 10, Sakharov was forbidden even to be present at an "open trial" of his friend Sergei Kovalev in Vilnius.

After ten years of non-violent struggle, Sakharov received the Nobel Peace Prize abroad while at home, or rather far from Moscow, the native city of both Sakharov and Kovalev, his close friend was sentenced to ten years in a strict prison camp and internal exile.

Like Prometheus, Sakharov is being chained to a Soviet rock, and an eagle of slander daily approaches him to eat his immortal liver. Will Heracles show up, in whatever shape, to release the titan?

(Prof.) Yuri Glazov  
Halifax, N.S., Dec. 16, 1975  
The writer is chairman of the Russian Department at Dalhousie University.

Reprinted from  
The New York Times

### Sakharov: World Symbol of Redemption

To the Editor:

I am writing this letter to a Western newspaper because I am not allowed to express my opinions in the U.S.S.R. My subject is the great Soviet physicist and Nobel Prize winner Andrei Sakharov.

Except for party- or government-inspired press attacks on him, in my country the silence over Sakharov is complete. But the West should know that there are many people here—and I am one of them—who strongly disapprove of the dirty campaign waged against the man who is perhaps the only absolutely honest person among our eminent scientists.

The almost absolute lack of overt support for Sakharov among highly placed Soviet scientists and scholars clearly demonstrates that **there is no such thing as the Russian intelligentsia any more.** If Sakharov's colleagues and former friends, such as Khariton and Zel'dovic (not to speak of the sixty other academicians and professors) signed the "letter" denouncing Sakharov, it can mean only that moral considerations are fully excluded from the mentality of those who should base the whole of their activities and lives on moral principles.

It is difficult to compare different ordeals, but last month a tribunal in Vilnius sentenced to seven years imprisonment plus three years of exile the biophysicist Sergei Kova-

lev, a members of Sakharov's Committee for Human Rights. For a scientist of more than forty years of age, this means death—spiritually and mentally, if not literally. Not one Soviet scientist protested. **The members of the Soviet Academy of Sciences have become soulless puppets, devoid of convictions and conscience.**

As for the West, I cannot understand the attitude of your scientists and scholars. Perhaps they do not fully realize that a powerful nation of 250 million, guided by the unscrupulous and **having at its disposal first-class brains with no hearts and souls**, may prove highly dangerous.

The examples of Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, and Angola show the impotence of the West in the face of the Communist machine. And real freedom and human rights in the Soviet Union are as important (if not more important) to the world as they are to us.

Please do not forget that there are many here kept in jails, labor camps and prison psychiatric hospitals who are suffering also for your freedom. Sakharov is for us—and should be for the world—a **symbol of redemption.**

I.A. Mel'cuk  
Moscow, Jan. 4, 1976.  
The writer is a senior scientist on the staff of the Soviet Academy of Sciences' Institute of Linguistics.

Reprinted from  
The New York Times