

# LOKSHIN CALUMNIATED BY KGB

(notes by the son of composer)

## A MOUSE-TRAP

(Notes on the Jewish history, 2007, №13)

<http://berkovich-zametki.com/2007/Zametki/Nomer13/ALokshin1.htm>

These notes tell about the fact that Svjatoslav Richter's moving from the Heinrich Neuhaus' apartment to the apartment of Vera Ivanovna Prokhorova, which has occurred in 1942, was (I am sure, secretly from participants of the moving) planned in NKVD (the Soviet Secret Police). These notes also tell about other events in the apartment of Vera Prokhorova, a grand daughter of the last owner of the Three-Mountain manufactory (and a daughter of its last co-director).

### Citation 1.

“On November, 4th, 1941 daddy [i.e. Heinrich Neuhaus] had been arrested <...>. For all of us and for Slava [Richter] daddy's arrest was a hard blow. One room was sealed up in our apartment. From this point on in a room with two grand pianos there lived Slava, Serezha and grandmother, and I have moved to mum.” (Neuhaus M. G. “Svjatoslav Richter in Heinrich Gustavovich Neuhaus' family” / In: “Recollecting Svjatoslav Richter. – Moscow: Constanta, 2000, p.35-36)

### Citation 2.

“In 1942 when it became dangerous to Slava [Richter] to live in our apartment, Vera [Prokhorova] and her family (her mother and her sister) have invited him to move to them. Slava lived at Vera's apartment till 1946”. (See the above-quoted article of M.G.Neuhaus, p. 34)

### Citation 3.

“During the war Svjatoslav [Richter] lived in my family though he had been registered at Neuhaus' apartment with whose family I am a relative. Heinrich Gustavovich was imprisoned at this time. [Discrepancy: H.H.Neuhaus was released from the prison on July, 19th, 1942; see the article by M.G.Neuhaus quoted above, p. 36.] Before war Svetik [Svjatoslav Richter] lived at his apartment <...>. Once Svetik had received the summons: “Lihter has to be in police station with the passport”. Svetik told: “I am not Lihter, I am Richter, therefore I will not go anywhere”. It was dangerous to stay at Neuhaus' apartment, and it has been decided that he will move to us on the Furmanov street (nowadays it is the Nashchokinsky lane). By diligence of the Secret Police IT TURNED OUT RELEASED [allocated by me - A.L.] a room in our common apartment and we turned out to be owners of three rooms (the cousin and the uncle had been arrested). And Svjatoslav began to live there. In the afternoon he often went to Neuhaus' apartment where he played the piano, but in the evening he always returned to us. By the way, there was A SHADOWING AFTER HIM [ allocated by me – A.L.] not only in the wartime, but also after the war, because his mother was abroad [ she had left on the West the occupied Odessa]. (See: Prokhorova V. I. “He was entirely in life ...” / Recollecting Svjatoslav Richter. - Moscow: Constanta, 2000, p.46-47)

Two things seem inexplicable here at the first sight:

Why the "released" room has not been sealed up;

How it turned out possible to Richter, WHO HAD BEEN WATCHED, to live FOR YEARS DURING THE WAR in Prokhorova's apartment without a residence permit.

About the extreme role that the residence permit played during the war one can read, for example, in George Efron's "Diaries" (Moscow: VAGRIUS, 2004, v. 1, p. 433):

“[July, 8th, 1941] the owner of the room where we now do live, has left to the house-committee the document that we leave on August, 1st. It means that since August, 1st we have no right to spend the night here. <...> but whereas her husband [i.e. the owner of the room] has written that we leave since August, 1st how can we live without a residence permit till September, 1st? It is impossible”.

Two following citations explain, in my opinion, both mentioned strangenesses.

#### **Citation 4.**

“Mother of Vera [Ivanovna Prokhorova], Nadezhda Nikolaevna, is nee Guchkova.

The Moscow mayor Nikolay Ivanovich Guchkov is her father. Alexander Ivanovich Guchkov is her native uncle. According to the Soviet historiography, each of his posts was a sedition: he was the founder and the leader of the Oktiabrist-party, the chairman of III State Duma, the Minister of War of Provisional government [and also – in addition to posts - one of the organizers of the Intervention, an influential figure in White emigration. Has died in Paris in 1936].

In the USSR for a person originating from such a family tree it was impossible to find a work, moreover it was impossible to live . <...>

By 1930 [!] to mum [i.e.V.I.Prohorova’s mother] all the same was allowed to work as a translator with foreign tourists, including high-ranking ones[!!!]”. (See: Grigoriev A “ Prohorovy from Three mountains ”/ Izvestia, May, 12th, 1998)

#### **Citation 5.**

<<In the evening of their life when many people start to live on recollections, Vera Aleksandrovna Guchkova-Suvchinskaja-Trail [a famous Soviet spy, daughter of A.I.Guchkov] needed a worthy interlocutor. She writes <...> [to another Soviet spy] Rodzevich:

"<...> Many years ago Ezhov [chief of the Secret Police in the USSR] adored me (certainly, in absolutely innocent sense), however, I wrote about it in my book.">> (see: Aniskovich L. “Sofia Parnok and Konstantin Rodzevich. Two sides of one moon”. Moskow: Cyrillics, 2005, p. 319)

And this is one more fragment from L.Aniskovich's book (p. 311): <<Most of all participants of dismantling of documents [belonging to Rodzevich which were found after his death] were amazed with a certain magic phrase in one of Vera Trail’s letters: “They must, at last, stop annoying me with this story [about murders] of Reiss and Trotsky’s son ; I have an absolute alibi!”>>

Two last citations, no doubt, mean that the apartment of Prokhorova was carefully listened by the Secret Police. This obviously explains the above mentioned strangenesses, accompanying Richter's moving to this apartment.As I believe, NKVD (the Secret Police) has planned this moving (certainly, secretly from Richter and Prochorova’s family): loyalty of the super-talented musician required round-the-clock check.

In 1948 my father was invited in this mouse-trap .

I have already written in detail about the consequences of this invitation in my book “Genius of Evil”, Moscow, 2005 (it is possible to get acquainted with some details which were not included into the book on [www.lokshin.org](http://www.lokshin.org)).

In brief, the essence is as follows. In 1950 Prokhorova has been arrested, and seditious conversations which occurred between my father and Prokhorova when they stayed alone, had been shown to her by the inspector: "Each our conversation with Shura [i.e. A.L.Lokshin] has been presented as my monologue, my statement or my personal opinion." (See: Prokhorova V. "Tragedy of treachery" / the Russian musical newspaper, 2002, №4). And on the basis of this Prokhorova has written the article, having accused my father of the arrest.

It is inexplicable, however, how could Prokhorova dare to hold a whole series of many anti-Soviet conversations in her listened apartment. She has counted 12 or 13 anti-Soviet conversations between her and my father....

It is very strange, because my father was EXTREMELY afraid of INTERCEPTION (see Prokhorova's article).

It is quite strange, because Richter WHO WAS WATCHED, continued to happen in this apartment (see Prokhorova's article).

It is especially strange, when having such a specific relative as a Soviet spy Vera Guchkova-Trail.

It is also strange, because Jury Nagibin regularly happened in Prokhorova's apartment. During that time Nagibin was the SON-IN-LAW of STALIN's FAVOURITE I.A.LIKHACHEV, the former People's Commissar of Mechanical Engineering (!) and a FORMER SECURITY OFFICER. ( See:Nagibin J."The Eternal Music". – Moscow: ACT, 2004, p. 346-355; see also: Nagibin J."My Golden Mother-in-Law". - Moscow: ACT, 2004, p. 228-229 where I.A.Likhachev is deduced as "V.K.Zvyagintsev")

By the way, Prokhorova writes about conversations between her and my father the following: "<...> And all the conversations began to have especially political character." But someone should begin conversations on political themes . Especially during the terror. Especially, if interlocutors are know each other no more than one year. Probably, it was the person who was not afraid of interception ...

And what did Vera Guchkova-Trail do in that 1949 in which anti-Soviet conversations in the Prokhorova's apartment took place? She also held anti-Soviet conversations, but in English.

"Already in 1949, - Alain Brossat writes, - when Victor Kravchenko during the epoch of rise of the cold war has opened eyes to the western public opinion by the sensational book " I Choose Freedom ", she accompanies the deserter on public statements as a translator. In a photo published on May, 4th, 1949 in the newspaper "Evening news ", Vera Trail stands near to Kravchenko, being nervously tightened by a cigarette ... " (see the book of L.Aniskovich quoted above, p. 314-315).

Perhaps, Prokhorova did not know about Vera Guchkova-Trail profession. But as the outstanding expert on her own family tree she could have guessed.

\* \* \*

In general, Soviet Secret Police could use taps creatively. Below I adduce a citation from Elena Bonner's memoirs. These memoirs tell about later times (1971), but the "handwriting" of the Secret Police is the same:

"We [i.e. Elena Bonner and Andrey Sakharov] have passed to his room which, for months that have passed since December, I already knew to last nail in a wall. We drank coffee, gnawed cookies and all that he has told me in these hours <...> has been then retold in a dirty-disgusting tonality in the Italian newspaper "Sette Giorni "referring to me that I ostensibly told it about him to my girlfriends. Listening

[by the Soviet Secret Police] has been adjusted well in his apartment". (See: Sakharov A., Bonner E. Diaries, v. 1. Moscow: Vremia, 2006, p. 65)

As it is known, it turned out impossible to discredit Elena Bonner in Sakharov's opinion with the help of a tap. In my father's story everything has turned out quite differently: persecution from outside the progressive public has not stopped even after his death ...

P.S. Recently I have found an incredibly surprising document placed in the book "Lubjanka in days of the fight for Moscow . Under the declassified documents of FSB of the Russian Federation" – Moscow: the Publishing House "Zvonitsa", 2002, p. 82 - 90:

<<THE INQUIRY ON THE ORGANIZATION OF SUBVERSIVE AND TERRORIST GROUPS  
WITHIN THE LIMITS OF REALIZATION OF "THE MOSCOW PLAN">>

On October, 14th, 1941 Top secret

For comrade L.P.Beria

<...> The Agent "Lekal" is a former officer of the imperial army, an old checked up agent.

He is left in back of the enemy with tasks of prospecting character. For successful performance of the task under our task he has married the daughter of the former owner of "the Prokhorov's manufactory", who has large communications among employees of German embassy in Moscow and the White emigration.

In case where the factories will be returned to his wife "Lekal" will operate them and will occupy a corresponding social standing.<...>

With all abovementioned heads of groups and agents there are established passwords for communication.

KOBULOV

Central Archives of FSB of Russia, <...>

The original. The hand-written copy is executed by N.I.Ejtingon.>>

I leave this document without comments.

## «PERHAPS I WILL SURVIVE»

Events of 1948-49th years had played an enormous role in the destiny of my father, composer Alexander Lazarevich Lokshin (1920 – 1987). So, I cannot hold back about facts which I knew from him, and from other people as well as from some remained documents.

In May of 1948 my father had a strongest attack of stomach ulcer; immediately he was put in the Sklifosovsky Institute. At that time the stomach resection was considered as risky business and the probability of a failure was great. However, anaesthetising did not help any more, therefore the operation was inevitable.

On May, 28<sup>th</sup>, 1948 a well-known surgeon S.S.Yudin operated him. My father had been extremely exhausted and, therefore, was ultimately weak after the operation; during several days he could not move at all. It also had rescued him: the postoperative seams had time to grow together. A physically much stronger military man whom had operated the same surgeon (also concerning a stomach ulcer), died on the next cot (in the face of my father) as he could not lie the necessary time motionlessly and the postoperative seams had dispersed.

On June, 15th, 1948 my father had been discharged from the hospital, and on August, 26th he was dismissed from the Moscow Conservatory during the campaign of struggle against formalism; they had reminded him again his degree work «Les Fleurs du Mal» on Baudelaire's verses because of which he had been already deducted from the Conservatory fifth year in May of 1941. Of course, a certain role played «the fifth point» (i.e., the Jewish nationality): the struggle against “cosmopolitanism” already had begun.

Now I shall pass to events of somewhat other kind.

On July, 21<sup>st</sup>, 1949 Chernovtsy Department of NKVD (that is, a department of the Soviet Secret Police) arrested A.S.Yessenin-Volpin who had been familiar with my father before the arrest, approximately, for two months.

This arrest was a direct consequence of the fact that my father had found an informer among his own nearest acquaintances, and in a confidential conversation had carelessly exposed this person, had forced this person to admit the mentioned fact of being an informer. Thus, Volpin was arrested NOT BECAUSE someone had informed the Secret Police, BUT IN ORDER to compromise my father! [1]

(The phenomenon of Volpin, who had spoken out loud that Stalin is a murderer and a fascist etc during the years of terror without any consequences for himself is described in memoirs by Olga Adamova-Sliozberg, Juri Aihewald and Naum Korzhavin.)

The informer had demanded my father to keep silence, threatening, in the case of default of the requirement, to arrest all father's family. Also, the informer has accompanied the threats by words: «I am not a person, I am a corpse». All this I have learnt from my father when I was 15 years old. Father had never told me the informer's name. Possibly, he feared for me. (I must notice that "corpse" is mentioned in my father's letter dated September, 19th, 1949.)

Apparently, my father's collision with the informer had also other consequences. Another letter by my father which he has written to I.L.Kuschnerova on November, 19<sup>th</sup>, 1949 testifies to it. I will quote this letter almost entirely:

«From an outer side my affairs are without visible changes. However, internally something should move a little though I have not felt it yet. Possibly on Monday I will hear the choral rehearsal for the first time. The orchestral ones are appointed to November, 27th. The first (and possibly last) execution is appointed to November, 30th. The conductor is Gauk, the soloists are Janko and Lisitsian. However soloists are

under doubt, I did not see them yet. My condition is still nasty, or even worse. *I have a presentiment that I am on the verge, and if I shall safely avoid it within the next few days I will be with you. Otherwise farewell forever. I have the so-called disintegration of nerve-knots (cells). Pray for me. Perhaps I will survive.* » (The letter original is stored in Baden-Baden (Germany), in the personal archives of I.L.Kuschnirova.)

I am sure that the lines of the letter allocated by me are written in Aesopian language and narrate not about postoperative complication, but about arrest expectation within the next few days. (At Stalin's time it would be a madness to write about it directly.) My confidence in it is based upon the fact that in his previous letter to I.L.Kuschnirova (November, 14<sup>th</sup>, 1949), as well as in the subsequent one (November, 24<sup>th</sup>, 1949) my father does not write even a word about his health. Subsequently I.L.Kuschnirova has agreed with my interpretation of the quoted letter. She has recollected that when she had received it, her first thought was that my father is afraid of arrest.

\* \* \*

Semion.S.Vilensky, the chairman of a historical-literary society "Vozvrashchenie" uniting the former prisoners of Stalin and Nazi concentration camps has made comments on this letter for me: «Probably, NKVD suggested your father to co-operate, he interested NKVD as a person round whom gathered an intellectual society. However he, a person independent and proud, has refused, so that they felt wounded, offended. The fact that they subsequently caused on a confrontation with V.I.Prokhorova his mother and his seriously ill sister is a revenge of NKVD.»

\* \* \*

Now, I must tell about the composition mentioned in the fatherly letter. This composition is «The Salutatory cantata» on verses written by poet Ostrovoi and devoted to Stalin.

The background of birth of this composition is in brief as follows. Even before collision with the informer, which happened, as I believe, in May-June, 1949 the position of my father was rather shaky. Expelled from Conservatory, he apprehended news about the arrest of Volpin as a terrible prevention. Knowing about a danger source in his own nearest environment, in September father starts to write «The Salutatory cantata» to present it on forthcoming composer plenum. At the end of September father, who had been working, as always, professionally, finishes to write the cantata score; approximately then he learns that a well-known musical ideologist Apostolov has published in the eighth number of the «Soviet music» an ominously-comical article where a rating of other fatherly composition occupies the central place.

The peripetias preceding the execution of "The Salutatory cantata», are in detail described in fatherly letters of this period. On November, 30<sup>th</sup>, 1949 «The Salutatory cantata» was executed on the Third Plenum of Soviet composers where, in total, compositions by more than 150 authors, including «the Song about Woods» by Shostakovich were executed.

(To give to the reader a representation of the atmosphere reigning on the Plenum and round it, I will quote M.Chulaki: «The greatest successes are reached by composers in the expired year in creation of oratorios and cantatas.<...> the overwhelming majority of oratorios and cantatas is turned to comrade Stalin with whose name the Soviet people do connect during all their life, their struggle, their constructive labour.» («Culture and Life», December, 31st, 1949).)

And on December, 7<sup>th</sup>, 1949 Tikhon Khrennikov who acted on the Plenum with a rather optimistic report, estimated Lokshin's cantata as follows [2]:

«However, we do not have any bases to calm down on the reached. Even in a number of the best compositions executed on the Plenum, there are many lacks and contradictions which are not giving us possibilities to recognise them as a high-grade expression of our reality. In other compositions about which I did not speak yet, these lacks and contradictions are expressed even more evidently. In some cases, as I have already noted above, we can speak about DIRECT FAILURES, THE CREATIVE FAILURES HAVING FOR US A BASIC VALUE. THE QUESTION IS PERTINENT : HOW SUCH COMPOSITIONS HAVE GOT TO THE PROGRAM OF CONCERTS OF THE PLENUM?[Here and below the text is allocated by me - A.L.]. Now, I should accept the fault on the Secretary [of the Union of Soviet composers] and on myself personally that in familiarity with the set of compositions when selecting them for the Plenum we have admitted a number of errors, without having managed a correct estimation of quality of some compositions which we have listened in preliminary performances on a piano. So, «The Salutatory cantata» by composer Lokshin , A PRODUCT WHICH IS COLD AND FALSE [it is a political charge – A.L.] ON ITS MUSICAL IMAGES, EXTREMELY CHAOTIC, NOISY AND HELPLESS has been selected for execution on the Plenum. THE AUTHOR HAS NOT CONCERNED WITH DUE RESPONSIBILITY THE THEME OF HIS COMPOSITION, HAS NOT MADE PRELIMINARY DEEP WORK ON SELECTION OF MUSICAL MEANS, ON DEFINITION OF STYLE OF THE COMPOSITION, ON THE MATERIAL ORGANISATION ».

The extensive, detailed Khrennikov's report did not contain any other political charges . My father had faced the threat of the second exception from the Union of composers ; this could be only the beginning of possible consequences...

My father was actually rescued by a noble and extremely clever person , Michael Fabianovich Gnessin, who had already heard from Maria Judina about a talented composer Lokshin. Below I adduce a fragment from Gnessin's speech during the debate on Khrennikov's report. Gnessin has begun from apart:

«<...> Now I wish to say some words about the report made by Tikhon Nikolaevich . I doubt that someone of us would wish to get to position of Tikhon Nikolaevich Khrennikov. To read such a paper containing accounting of values offered on the Plenum, it is terribly difficult. Besides, a full consent really never can be obtained here. Judgements on a composition can disperse, and it is not necessary then to carp under those characteristics which have seemed insufficiently [converging] with one's opinion.

But, all the same, I would like to concern some moments in this report. I consider it very risky such a penitential statements about the faults of the Secretary. Such statements about errors immediately lead us to a thought. If, by mistake, there have passed such not so successful things, maybe, a considerable quantity of things were not admitted to the Plenum, things which are not worse at all or maybe even better than the shown ones. And I consider that, maybe, it would be fair, that if there were on viewing in Secretary such good things which for whatever reasons it has not appeared possible to show them at the Plenum , they should be mentioned in the report. After all, it is our pride that there were still good products in which there were such advantages. But all the same, when speaking about things which have not justified themselves in concert display, by all means we should mention advantages because of which these things have been accepted and passed. IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO REPRESENT OURSELVES AS PEOPLE WITHOUT MEMORY. YOU HAVE LISTENED THESE THINGS, YOU HAVE PRAISED THEM VERY MUCH. IT IS VERY IMPORTANT. SO, YOU HAVE PRAISED THEM FOR SOMETHING!

It means, that there is a high quality in them. It is impossible that there were no their qualities in them. Undoubtedly, it is so. In this case I speak about the cantata by Lokshin. It is possible to have any judgement about it. BUT IT HAD BEEN PRAISED VERY MUCH, WHEN IT WAS SHOWN AT THE

SECRETARY. We will assume that after that it would fail with a crash, has been catcalled by the public. But even then you should search for the reasons of this failure, perhaps it should be executed once again, as it has been executed absolutely unsatisfactorily and shown in adverse conditions. But it has not been catcalled at all. It was appreciated highly enough by many listeners. I do not wish to tell that it was the best product which you have underestimated. No, that is not the case, absolutely. But it possesses excellent qualities, namely good musical themes. Thematically the material is of a very good quality. The polyphonic skill also takes place. Perhaps, there are miscalculations in orchestra arranging. But, after all, you have listened when looking in the score. The Secretary had listened, saw that there are defects and could advise something.

I must tell that I have seen Lokshin only two times in my life. I have heard that he is highly talented and completely not weak in orchestra arranging. There were some lacks, but there were also big advantages. It seems to me that it would be fair to note both, lacks and advantages, instead of so rudely characterising a thing, as if, really, the composer has involved the Secretary into an unprofitable transaction. The Secretary has turned out guilty because it has passed such a thing! You have listened to a thing, you have approved it, there were merits and demerits in it, hence you should note them both. Otherwise it is unfair.

I imagine that I have written a thing; after that experience it is inconvenient for me to show it at the Secretary. If they will scold me a little, that's all right; if they will praise me, that's all right. BUT IF THEY WILL PRAISE, AND THEN WILL PUBLICLY DECLARE THAT THIS THING IS WORSE THAN BAD AND THAT IT IS A TERRIBLE ERROR THAT IT HAS BEEN PASSED, THEN, YOU MUST FORGIVE ME, IT IS NOT A COMPANIONABLE APPROACH. SOME PERSONS HAVE DECLARED TO ME THAT AFTER THAT THEY WILL NOT WANT TO SHOW THEIR THINGS.

That's all I wished to say. It has been already told that we cannot master all problems, and I do not undertake to do it ». (Applause).

In the report on the Plenum (Soviet Music, 1950, №1, p. 49-50) there is given only a short retelling of Gnessin's speech, and the editorial addition is as follows: «However the attempt [undertaken by Gnessin] to protect from criticism this unsuccessful product [«The Salutatory cantata» by Lokshin] turned out to be unpersuasive ».

In my opinion, at the contrary, it was the fearless Gnessin's speech (who did not fear to push off Khrennikov with Khrennikov), has saved my father from the nastiest consequences which could have Khrennikov's political charge.

Further, by comparing the speeches of Khrennikov and Gnessin, one necessarily comes to a conclusion that Khrennikov undertook the destruction of Lokshin against his own (Khrennikov's) will. Probably, from NKVD or the Central Committee had arrived an order and Khrennikov was compelled to carry it out. But what was at the bottom of such an order? I think that it was not the state anti-Semitism or a struggle of ambitions. I am sure that my father and NKVD's collision, which took place shortly before the Plenum, has played the pivotal role. The blow on «The Salutatory cantata» within a rather peaceful Plenum was too strong and in too an awkward situation all the Secretary was unexpectedly put.

Now, I shall tell about consequences of the Plenum. Certainly, Gnessin's protection has born fruit. Though in the Plenum Resolution «The Salutatory cantata» is condemned two more times (!), but already at the same time together with the composition of another author (Levitin), the tone of condemnation is softer and what is the most important, there are no political charges [3]. Then Marian Koval continues to finish the composition by my father, simulating a professional analysis [4]: «It is painfully difficult to sing Lokshina's cantata. The chorus is singing in an intense register, the melody is inexpressive, the text is inartistic. The composer has concentrated the thoughts to external grandiosity, without deep sensation

of the inexhaustible national feelings turned to Stalin». Political claims are smoothly transformed to professional ones. The system crawls away, considering what to do with Lokshin further ...

Now, on the got custom, Lokshin should repent. However my father did not repent [5]. In January, 1950 T.Livanova [6] has considered it necessary to curse him once again for all the same «The Salutatory cantata» ; then mentions of Lokshin in «the Soviet music» disappear for a long time .His compositions are deviated, and it even a temporary job turns out impossible to be found in Moscow, it is necessary to go to Leningrad . There my father under R.S.Bunin's recommendation managed to get a temporary editorial work. (After approximately two years the cousin of my father H.A.Lokshina and her husband E.P.Garin have acquainted him with known theater and cinema- directors of that time: Zavadsky, Kulidzhanov, Segel, Zguridi, Karmen. Composing music to their films and performances, my father could contain our family.)

\* \* \*

At last, I wish to tell one simple thing. THE FACT THAT AGAINST MY FATHER THERE WAS EXPOSED THE WHOLE COHORT : APOSTOLOV, KHRENNIKOV, KOVAL, LIVANOVA SOLVES THE "PROBLEM". AFTER ALL, THEIR ARTICLES HAVE BEEN PRINTED NOT BEFORE, BUT SOON AFTER VOLPIN'S ARREST. And on the Plenum Khrennikov has brought political accusation only to Lokshin and to anybody more. Actually, my father has been selected as the basic antihero in propaganda musical campaign of 1949th year. Are there any doubts?

Moscow, 2001-2010

---

[1] I have explained in my article “Logic against Volpin”for which reasons I am sure that this collision had occurred in May-June, 1949. See <http://berkovich-zametki.com/Forum2/viewtopic.php?f=7&t=50>

[2] See the shorthand report of the Third plenum of the Union of composers (RGALI, fund 20770.. In a short form, but with preservation of the basic charge, this fragment of Khrennikov's speech has been published in his article «For new lifting of the Soviet music» (Soviet Music, 1949, №12, p.50).

[3] Soviet Music, 1950, №1, p.55.

[4] Soviet Music, 1950,№1, p.8.

[5] I confirm it because reports on repentances were regularly published in «the Soviet music». What did it mean not to repent during Stalin times, I think, it is not necessary to explain.

[6] Soviet Music, 1950, №3, p.15.

## AN OPEN LETTER TO ALEXANDRA AIHENWALD

Recently I have read the book of memoirs by your father published by you (Aihenwald J., *The Last Pages*. - Moscow: RGGU, 2003). I will not speak about advantages of this book. I will talk about those defects which are not visible to you.

Your father (as well as you together with him) repeated the M.Ulanovsky's "*feat*" who had accused my father in being an informer by REPEATING WHAT OTHERS HAVE TOLD. (M. Ulanovsky had accused my father referring to Vera Prokhorova's opinion .) It may be surprising for you, but one must forbid oneself to do such things . Especially, if the accuser is alive and has a full possibility to express his opinion in the press.

Fortunately, Vera Prokhorova has published her charges in the article "Tragedy of Treachery" (the Russian Musical Newspaper, 2002, № 4). And I have managed to answer her; see: "Tragedy of treachery as an Epoch Portrait"(the Russian Musical Newspaper, № 7/8, 2002) and "Mouse-trap" (Berkovich-zametki, №13, 2007). Both texts can also be found (in Russian) on the site [www.lokshin.org](http://www.lokshin.org)

As a result, as I believe, Prokhorova's charges addressed to my father proved to be idle ... And this is the softest thing that one can say in respect of these charges!

Now, I will speak about Volpin's charges addressed to my father.

Your father – in accordance with his rich biography - should pay attention to the following circumstance. Taking into consideration the fantastic style of life which Volpin had practiced (see, e.g., fragments of memoirs by O.Adamova-Sliozberg and N.Korzhasvin placed on [www.lokshin.org](http://www.lokshin.org)) Lubjanka (NKVD) surely was filled up with denunciations of Volpin written by frightened citizens. And the inspector, for some reason, runs business so that suspicions in informing fall upon Lokshin. What would it mean?

This meant the following. Shortly before Volpin's arrest my father has had a collision with a secret agent of NKVD. During finding-out of relations the agent had revealed himself, and NKVD needed to cover the agent. The way of covering chosen by Lubjanka was to discredit of Lokshin. On the same site [www.lokshin.org](http://www.lokshin.org) one can find a lot of acknowledgement to my words.

During the hunting for my father VOLPIN HAS BEEN USED AS THE DISCREDIT TOOL. It was necessary to overhear "the phrases told when Lokshin and Volpin stayed alone" and then to reproduce them to Volpin!

By the way, already by the end of the thirtieth the technique of interception was at a rather high level. I quote YOUR FATHER'S WORDS from the book published by you (p. 280):

*<< Gorb [ YOUR GRANDFATHER, A SOVIET SPY] has employed him [Djushen] at once IN A LABORATORY OF OVERHEARING where different devices were thought out. My mother-in-law has told me before her death: " Jurochka, never speak anything in the hotel "Nazional": still Djushen sounded it. " Poor Djushen! He had been engaged in installing overhearing devices in different lodgings. In 1936 he was arrested.>>*

Moscow, 2008

APPENDIX 1. Jury Ajhenwald, «The Last Pages» (Moscow: RGGU, 2003, p. 288-289).The episode described took place in Karaganda, 1950.

*<<He [Volpin] told that he had suddenly felt in himself forces to hypnotize. Well it is fine, he had felt, that's all right. We will look, what will he do? "And now, - he had told, - I will show it to you." I do not remember, whether it was at my presence or already after my arrest. We had approached to the tavern.*

“Here, - he said, - people are sitting. Now, I will make so that they will rise and leave.” He had approached to a table at which two persons were sitting and drinking their tea. <...>He had approached to them and had told: “DEATH TO GANGSTER STALIN AND THE FASCIST POLITICAL BUREAU” [allocated by me – A.L.]. We did not know it, we saw only: he had approached to them and had told something, they rose and left.>>

APPENDIX 2. Olga Lvovna Adamova-Sliozberg. A WAY. (Moscow:Vozvrashchenie, 1993, p. 188-9)

<<On August, 1st, 1951 I have been forty nine years old. Emka Mandel , Alik Volpin (Yessenin), Valia Gerlin [the wife of J.Aihenwald and the daughter of “Gorb”– A.L.] and Jura Aihenwald came on a visit to me. They brought a small bottle of port as a gift. I have absolutely forgotten that Alik cannot drink. We poured a half of the small bottle and drank to my health. Then Alik wanted to make a second toast.

It was summer time, one window had been broken, and always when four or five persons of exiled gathered the «vertuhai» (agents of the Secret Police) darted about under the windows .

So, the toast was lifted by Alik.

- I drink, - he told loudly creaking , - I drink for that Stalin has died!

My visitors disappeared in a moment as if a wind has blown them off. Only Alik and I remained.

— Shut up! You are ruining me as well as yourself ! Shut up!

— I am a free person, — answered Alik gravely, — and I say that I want. I drink for that Stalin has died!

I wished to clamp his mouth and had somehow knocked him on lips. Therefore he ,very plibly, fell down to the floor and grew a bit more silent, but, as before, accurately and separately repeated:

— I drink for that Stalin has died. I am a free person, you do not dare to clamp my mouth.

I have knocked him on his lips again, and he continued to repeat the toast, but more and more silently.

In panic horror I had started to simply beat him on lips, on cheeks, anywhere, and he continued to mutter the same.

At last he rose and told me:

— I despise you as the Secret Police, — and had left.

Then immediately returned Mandel, Valia and Jura. It appears, they had ran under the windows and guarded, whether “vertuhai” will appear or not, but those had not appeared. They had seen how Alik went out. They watched where he went, and, having been convinced that he goes home, ran to me.

On the next day Valia came to me and had told that Alik was not at work and when she had visited him she saw that he was laying beaten, with such black eyes and lips that it is impossible for him to go to work.

— Vavka, — I said, — go to him, carry to him, from me, the yesterday's pie which he has not eaten, and ask him to forgive me.

Valia had executed the commission and returned with a small volume of verses by Lermontov which was sent by Alik to me as a gift with an inscription: «to dear Tigra Lvovna [a joke – Tigress , daughter of Lion – A.L.] who beats the cap fits». But, unfortunately, the incident had not been settled yet.

In about five days after that he had recovered and went back to work. His school [Volpin taught mathematics] was located close to a sewing studio, where I had been the chief of shop. Quite often he used to come to me after the work hours, and we used to go home together. Having seen that he is safe and sound, I shouted to him from apart:

— Hi! You have come! Well, you are not angry about me?

A loud answer through all shop had followed:

— Really, do you think, that this rascal Stalin could set us at variance ?

One can imagine my reaction.

For a long time I did not sleep at night and waited for reaction of the Secret Police to Alik's words. No reaction followed.

Somehow I shared the fear with one of the co-workers. She told me:

— All of us have heard his words, but we have agreed to be silent, as though we did not hear anything.

What good there were my girls!>>

## WHO UNDERSTANDS INFORMERS BETTER?

A.A.Lokshin

In 2003, already after I have answered Prokhorova all her charges addressed to my father, in publishing house INAPRESS there was edited a book by N. and M.Ulanovsky «History of a family». In this book Prokhorova's friend Maja Ulanovsky, WHO HAS SEEN MY FATHER ONLY ONCE IN HER LIFE AT A CONCERT, names him «the supernatural villain» and «not-a-human-being». When reading the text by Ulanovsky, I have first believed in sincerity of her hatred to my father. I will adduce, as an example, one excellent passage (p. 244):

<<Some years ago Jerusalem was visited by R.Barshai who has invited me to his concert to talk about Lokshin. Being afraid that from me through Russian magazine where these memoirs for the first time have been printed, hearings discrediting the musician will go, he had reminded me behind side scenes that “the genius and villainy – two things not joint”, and Lokshin is a genius and consequently could not be an informant. “I understand something in musical geniuses”. – “And I understand in informants”.>>

However, when it concerns herself in a similar situation, madam Ulanovsky writes as follows (see “The Soil and Destiny” by A.Jakobson; Vilnius; Moscow, 1992, p. 342):

<<In the first letter to me from Chernyakhovsk special psychiatric clinic (on 4.8.1970) Grigorenko has expressed full understanding of my flash <...> [the Reader, I hope, understands that, being in a mental hospital associated with KGB, it was impossible to express any doubts and suspicions. – A.L.]. However, in the book “In an underground it is possible to meet only rats ...” (N.-Y., Detinets, 1981, p. 674-675) when recollecting the meeting in his house, he has given to this trifling episode the extremely ominous sense, hinting at my communications with KGB. All attempts to have a talk about it with Grigorenko personally or through the press have not resulted.>>

It would be desirable to learn, did Grigorenko understand something in informants?

Moscow, 2003

## AN EXTRAORDINARY PREDICTION

A.A.Lokshin, son of the composer

Tatiana Apraksina has written about opposition Richter – Lokshin in her essay “Another Side of the Requiem”; a fragment from this essay is placed on lokshin.org. However, Apraksina does not name the participants. I wish to place, whenever possible, points over it.

In 2000 the book “Recollecting Svjatoslav Richter” had been published; soon after that I was asked: “For what reason Svjatoslav Teofilovich hated your father so much?”

It seems that now I can give an irrefragable answer to this question. But before so doing I’ll quote M.G.Neuhaus's article from the abovementioned book “Recollecting Svjatoslav Richter” (p.34):

<<In August, 1950 Vera [Prokhorova] was arrested. Slava [Richter] had warned Vera that her close friend is a dangerous person who can inform [Secret Police] about her [anti-Soviet talks]. She did not trust and spoke with this person about everything with full frankness. In prison Vera became convinced of Slava’s being right. After six years, having returned to Moscow, she asked Slava, from whence had he got to know that this person is an informer. Slava has answered that he knew nothing, but so it seemed to him.>>

There is not a slightest doubt that Prokhorova’s apartment was carefully listened and, by means of taps, NKVD (the Secret Police) managed to inspire Prochorova of what she "became convinced" (see my article "A Mouse-trap").

I am sure that Richter understood the specificity of Prokhorova’s apartment .

Richter, who had lived in this apartment since 1942 till 1946 (and then regularly happened there).

Richter , who knew that after him an external supervision followed not only during the war, but also after it.

Richter , whose father has been shot by NKVD as a “German spy” in 1941.

Richter, whose mother has left on the West with the Germans in 1944.

Richter, who was already in 1950 allowed to give concerts outside USSR (in the socialist countries).

Richter, who played at Stalin's funeral.

Richter, who in 1960 was allowed to give concerts on the West [1].

But how , in consideration of this, should one interpret his PREDICTION WHICH “CAME TRUE” (“he will inform the Secret Police about you ”)?

For the answer to this painful question it makes sense to read Arthur Shtilman's article about Boris Goldstein <http://berkovich-zametki.com/2006/Starina/Nomer7/Shtilman1.htm>

<<Somewhat in 1976, a former classmate of the artist [i.e. of Boris Goldsrein ] <... > violinist M.Stys has got to the “salon” of Nina Lvovna Dorliak (the wife of pianist S.T.Rihter). According to Stys, among many themes of the present situation the conversation suddenly turned on Goldstein. Unexpectedly Nina Lvovna has told: "While we (that is, her husband Richter – A. Sh.) visit Germany, Busja Goldstein will not make a career there ..." Naturally, soon her words became widely known , and, probably, have been addressed to many potential emigrants thinking of moving to the West.

It is possible to trust and not to trust in coincidence, but the fact remains: soon after that the impresario of Goldstein ( who had begun the performances in Europe very successfully, had been meeting everywhere a great interest of public and full halls), has sent to the artist a letter with the notice on impossibility to continue the contract with him "for the economical reasons , causing reduction of work and obligations in relation to the "old" clients which cannot be deleted because of long-term cooperation". How could this letter appear at the period of genuine interest to Goldstein's art, full halls and enthusiastic reviews?! Undoubtedly, it was a result of pressure from the outside . Approximately the same case has occurred with my friend singer Misha Rajtsin and approximately at the same time, but in America.

It is clear that this episode has not affected the further development of concert work of the remarkable artist, but this story has made it absolutely clear that he was not forgotten in Moscow ... <...>

<...> I [i.e. A.Shtilman] told him [Boris Goldstein] about N.L.Dorliak's ominous prediction. It seemed to me that he knew about it. "Well , what do you want? They, after all, are DEPENDENT PERSONS" [allocated by me – A.L.], - he has answered easily.>>

But a "CAME TRUE PREDICTION" made by a DEPENDENT PERSON presents a full exoneration for my father. Isn't it?

Moscow, 2008-2010

[1] All listed facts are taken from the abovementioned book "Recollecting Svjatoslav Richter" and the well-known book by B. Monsaingeon "Richter. Diaries. Dialogues" (Moscow: Klassika-XXI, 2007).

## THE BITTERNESS OF LUSTRATION

On June, 6th, 2006 Irina Korsunskaja, having read mine "the Genius of Evil" and, in particular, the letter by I.L.Kushnerova dated 7/28/2003, has spoken [in an interview given to Elena Schwartz] about the reasons of arrest of her relative Vera Maksimova-Limcher (a pianist, pupil of Heinrich Neuhaus), having accused of this arrest my father. Irina Korsunskaja's interview is placed on the site

[www.igrunov.ru](http://www.igrunov.ru)

My answer is as follows.

It suffices to compare two dates:

1944, Vera Maksimova's arrest on charge in plot against Beria (the chief of Stalin's Secret Police) and in act of terrorism (see the text by I.Korsunskaja);

1948, Vera Maksimova's study continuation in Moscow Conservatory (see below I.L.Kushnerova's letter),

to understand the following. In Vera Maksimova's destiny the HIGHER FORCES (which seldom do something for nothing) have interfered. (As is known, at that time they did not condemn to less than five years for "policy"; and for terror they condemned to 10 years or more; after having gone out of prison a person had no right to live in Moscow as well as in other big towns for a long period of time.)

I consider that the tragical choice (the suicide) of Vera Maksimova-Limcher is a negation of what she had been forced to tell about my father.

January 2007

As an appendix I adduce the abovementioned letter by I.L.Kushnerova

I.L.Kushnerova to A.A.Lokshin

7/28/2003

Dear Sasha!

I have learnt from you about new charges to your father.

Here is what I remember about Vera Maksimova. Once Alexander Lazarevich has told me that he had a girlfriend, the student of Conservatory, pianist Vera Maksimova. She knew German language well and, apparently, worked as the translator. The friendship proceeded absolutely not for long as Vera has suddenly disappeared. A.L. went to her home and he was told that Vera had been arrested. In the beginning of 1947 or in the beginning of 1948 (anyway, before the operation which your father has transferred in summer [1948]) Vera was again in Conservatory. Having learnt about it, A.L. has gone to her. He did not find her in her house. But her relatives confirmed that she had returned. Soon he has fallen ill in a hospital with a stomach ulcer aggravation. I had gone to visit him, and he told me that Vera has already visited him and that she has changed very much, so that he could not recognize her at once. He has told me: «The

chamber entered an unfamiliar woman who has rushed to me with embraces». He needed a certain time to understand what has happened.

Vera was restored in Conservatory at once under a surname of Limcher. Thus, it means that she was already married.

At that time I had been studying symphonic conducting in the class of prof. N. P. Anosov (father G. N. Rozhdestwensky). Then there has arrived, for training, a conductor from Bulgaria Vesselin Pavlov. In Anosov's class there were only men ( post-graduate students and students) and I was the unique woman. Therefore I remember well, how there appeared one more woman in the class. It was Vera Maksimova-Limcher. The studies occurred in the following way: everybody came in the morning, everyone conducted by turn, and the others sat, attentively looked and then discussed the lesson.

Vera behaved very strangely. She tried to sit down near to Vesselin, opened the book and read. She NEVER conducted, but every week came regularly on studies and read, without looking at those who conducted. Once, because of my curiosity, I have sat down more close to her and have glanced in her book. It was in German. Then she has ceased to visit the studies.

In 1949 I have graduated Conservatory and never saw Vera any more . And soon I have learnt that Vera has committed suicide.

Your Inna Lvovna

## “ ONLY A FEW PEOPLE KNOW ABOUT IT ”

There is a small group of people who know that dated on February, 28th, 1961 Maria Judina's letter addressed to her old friend, an historian of the book V.S.Ljublinsky had enigmatically disappeared on half a year, and then was surprisingly found .

In this letter which has been written by Judina just after a meeting with my father (my father showed his Requiem to her), there are such lines about him [1]:

«Now I will tell you something majestic, tragical, joyful and to a certain extent secret. Listen: I have written to Lokshin a very little “professional” quasi-letter on one question in connection with Mahler, because Lokshin knows Mahler better than anybody. He has written an answer to me where he intensely asks me to see him. I have agreed. Yesterday he has played to me his “Requiem” which he had been writing many years, or, to be more precise, “tried to begin writing” and threw it away and, at last, "all at once" has written it 2 1/2 years ago. On the full text of Requiem, fuller than Mozart has used . What have I told him when has finished playing? – «I have always known that you are a genius».

Yes, it is so , and it is stronger than many because of whom I «break spears» and equals now only to Shostakovich (**not** to the last one) and Stravinsky. This composition cannot be performed neither at us nor abroad, which is clear ... It is as Bach, Mozart, Mahler, and the two abovementioned. He is absolutely quiet knowing that so it is and that it won't be executed. SHOSTAKOVICH NOW REALLY IDOLIZES HIM. ONLY A FEW PEOPLE KNOW ABOUT IT [ allocated by me – A.L.]. <...> I am glad that this man has carried out his problem, knowingly lives on Earth, that I wasn't mistaken, HAVING FAITH IN HIM, and wasn't mistaken, WHEN HELPING HIM WITHIN USUAL LIFE, and was A FRIEND FOR HIM IN UNLUCKY DAYS AND HOURS [allocated by me – A.L.]. That's what I wished to say. Don't become angry.»

The mentioned meeting has occurred after five years after rupture of relations between my father and Maria Judina. The rupture has happened because of hearings about my father dismissed with the aid of KGB . It is clear from the Judina's letter that she finally believed in my father's innocence. Of course, the apologizing tone of Judina attracts attention when reading her cited above letter: she has written a “quasi-letter” instead of a letter, besides the “quasi-letter” is not private, but "professional". It is absolutely clear that Yudina , as well as her correspondent Ljublinsky were well informed about the rumours about my father.

It is of interest that there was one more letter by Judina addressed to Ljublinsky where the speech about Lokshin and his Requiem continued. The letter it is lost [2].

As to reaction of Ljublinsky it was as follows (the letter dated 12.03.1961) [3]:

«You wrote about the Requiem [by Lokshin].It is very unexpected also for me , and, moreover, isn't clear.»

Ljublinsky's reaction seems to me quite a predictable reaction of an intellectual: Lokshin had been accused by three persons who passed GULAG . There is no subject to discuss!

But after all Yudina herself had believed in my father's guilt, their relations were broken off in 1956 . What has forced her to write to my father her " professional quasi-letter" and hence create an occasion to a meeting?

I think that it was not Mahler, but Shostakovich who really caused her to write the “quasi-letter”. In fact:

1)Being the first secretary of the Union of soviet composers he knew all informers acting in the mentioned Union and, consequently, knew that Lokshin did not belong to this sort of public;

2)Unlike other intellectuals Shostakovich understood that music and its author make a single whole.

Namely Shostakovich, as I believe, had convinced Yudina of innocence of my father.

Moscow, May 2010

[1] This letter was first published by A.M.Kuznetsov (“Zvezda”, №9,1999, p.175-176.

[2] Judina M.V. Letters (1959-1961). Moscow, ROSSPEN, 2009, p.490.

[3] Ibid.

## LETTER EXCHANGE WITH ELENA BONNER

Below I adduce the translation of my letter addressed to E.G.Bonner and her answer to me.

<< Dear Elena Georgievna!

As far as I know, some time ago you have read the 1-st edition of my “Genius of Evil” (Moscow, 2001), the book where I defend my father, composer A.L.Lokshin (1920-1987) who was calumniated as a sneaker. As I see now, my book was rather naive. However, since 2001 I have published (in particular, on the site of Eugene Berkovich) a number of articles which are sufficient for the absolute rehabilitation of my father from the suspicions of being a sneaker. The most important article is “The Mouse-Trap”(Berkovich-Zametki, №13, 2007); the following texts on the Forums are also of importance:

[http://berkovich-zametki.com/Forum2/vie ... ?f=7&t=319](http://berkovich-zametki.com/Forum2/vie...?f=7&t=319)

[http://berkovich-zametki.com/Forum2/vie ... p?f=7&t=50](http://berkovich-zametki.com/Forum2/vie...p?f=7&t=50)

[http://berkovich-zametki.com/Forum2/vie ... p?f=7&t=63](http://berkovich-zametki.com/Forum2/vie...p?f=7&t=63)

However, in spite of my cries and moans addressed to the director of the Sakharov’s Center, the evident calumny in my father’s address contained in the book of N. and M.Ulanovsky still remains on the Sakharov’s Center site:

[http://sakharov-center.ru/asfcd/auth/au ... 5&page=229](http://sakharov-center.ru/asfcd/auth/au...5&page=229)

Even a minimal decorum is not kept: there are no references to my articles! It is quite astonishing because the people close to the principal accuser of my father, V.I.Prokhorova, HAVE IN FACT EXPRESSED ME THEIR APOLOGIES

<http://musica.4bb.ru/viewtopic.php?id=363>

I ask you for help.

With great respect,

A.A.Lokshin, son of the composer

Moscow, January, 5th, 2009>>

I have received the answer from Mrs Elena Bonner on January, 8th, 2009.

.

She wrote:

**<<From a certain point I have no more relation to the museum [i.e. the Sakharov’s Center] <...> since I did not find Alexander Lokshin’s address [I ask] to let him know that I asked a member of the Public Commission to ask the director of the museum to take away from the site the material mentioned by Alexander Lokshin. And more than that – I am always on my guard when I consider all the supposedly unmasking materials . And in the most part of the cases I do not trust them.>>**

This part of the letter of Elena Bonner has been placed on the Internet with her consent.

## EXTRAORDINARY DANCES IN THE MOUSE-TRAP

In 2004 the publishing house “VZOI” has edited a volume of compositions by Yury Nagibin under a general title « The Eternal Music». On page 355 of this volume one can read the following. A certain composer, highly talented but enlisted by the Secret Police, was the cause of Vera Prokhorova being arrested. And then the prevention follows:

«I wouldn't like to name this person; he isn't alive already. He bore the punishment in himself. But now there are people who would like by all means to rehabilitate him in the most inadmissible way: by means of slander on those who was his victim. It would be better for them to keep silence. Let music wash away his guilt; his music which so long was under a ban, and has now started to sound. Otherwise I do repeat Pushkin's prevention:“ But if ... ”» (the fact that my father is not named in the Nagibin's text doesn't change the essence of matter: in December, 2002 in a telecast at the First Channel of the Russian State Television (!) Vera Prokhorova has accused my father and named his name. )

However, it is of interest, how could it happen that music by an informer has turned out to be under a ban in the Soviet Union (since Nagibin died in 1994, the Soviet time is obviously meant). It is also amazing that Nagibin who died in 1994, could expect the scandals which have burst more recently. Seemingly, the classic hasn't told yet the last word ...

But whether it is necessary to choose Nagibin as a guide to the past?

Below I adduce a citation from Solzhenitsyn's article " Yury Nagibin's twinkling" (“Novy Mir”, 2003, №4, p.16):

«The second marriage has resolutely turned the course of Nagibin's life during the war <...> He is taken in the Komsomol Central Committee, in a secret staff (though in his youth “I have managed to avoid Komsomol”). There he wrote a great number of secret reports *upward* and appeals to the occupied population –“ about what there was this literary trash, kill god I do not remember”– whether it is possible? <...> but further he tells even more improbable things - soon our hero is taken *without being checked* (!) in the department of counter-propaganda of the Main Political department of Red Army - “I wasn't even asked to show documents ”(?)»

Now, I adduce one more eloquent fragment from Solzhenitsyn's article:

«Here [i.e. Nagibin's “Diary” –A.L.] he writes directly about cinema: “ I do at cinema such things which work on our system, and these things are spoiled, tormented, deprived of sense and positive force of influence. And nobody wants to intercede ”; and, moreover, he was “deleted from set of persons going to the summer Olympic Games ... And after all I have traveled twenty five countries ... and behaved irreproachably on all trips”, I “ have deserved at the authorities”. *Irreproachably behaved, positive influence!* – according to measures of the Secret Police and the Central Committee – what self-portrait of a succeeded Soviet writer-male pig and how many hundreds of them it explains !»

In summary I adduce an amazing scene from «The Eternal Music» by Nagibin (p. 348 – 352):

«But soon there [i.e. in the room *released* [1] after the arrest of Prokhorova's relatives . - A.L.] there appeared a new tenant [Svjatoslav Richter. - A.L.] <...>. From three adjacent rooms a space which has contained a whole crowd of visitors which did not feel cramped has been created. There was a bar with little tables and a stage made from the cover of a grand piano which Slava [Richter] had hired <...> and on the cover there appeared by turn two student-songstresses executing dashing couplets under Slava's accompaniment. When one of them has therein raised her skirt over harmonious feet, visitors of the bar have amicably cried:« Above! Above! »»

The "Master and Margarita" by Bulgakov is for some reason thought of, isn't it?

Moscow, 2005-2010

[1] Terminology by V.I. Prokhorova . See her article " He was entirely in life..." / Recollecting Svjatoslav Richter.- Moscow, "Constanta", 2000, p.47.

## A LETTER BY BORIS TISHCHENKO

B.I.Tishchenko to A.A.Lokshin, son of the composer

Dear Sasha!

Recently I have received your book «Genius of Evil» [the first edition of the book is meant]. <...>

I have always loved Alexander Lazarevich, his music and never trusted any hearings about him. I want to recall once again how Dmitry Dmitrievich Shostakovich and I have come to an execution of the "Requiem" by A[lexander] L[azarevich] in the Tchaikovsky-hall (Latin words have been replaced with the words hastily written by <...> and devoted to victims of war) and D.D. looked around the thin hall and has told: «Really to eight-million Moscow there were no eight hundred persons to hear the great music by Lokshin?» Then I have happened upon Natasha Gutman in the bus and have told her about this episode, and she has told: «Public is right when ignoring this music. » - «Why!?» - «Because ...» Then she became somewhat confused and I do not remember in what words has retold me one of the hearings. I have sharply objected and at once have felt, whence the wind blows [откуда ветер дует], and immediately an alienation arose between me and Natasha. And Dmitry Dmitrievich was a man of principle and a very sensitive person in questions of this sort. Somehow I have told him that sometimes I come to a very grounded in the history and the theory of music person to fill up the store of my knowledge. D.D. grew somewhat restive and, after having thought, has told: «On your place I wouldn't associate with the person who serves in the secret police.» I won't name this person, as he has gone abroad long ago and has died there. But in such affairs D.D., as I think, was never mistaken.

<...> Yesterday (14.V) I have given, in Conservatory, one more lesson on Alexander Lazarevich Lokshin and have shown to students «Margaret's Songs». The impression was tremendous. In the morning when I had been preparing for this lesson, I heard once more the old gramophone record, presented by you, and nearly haven't burst into tears. At the lesson I showed a CD [with music by Lokshin], with which I had been presented by Rudolf Borisovich Barshai. At the same lesson I have shown the 7th symphony by Alexander Lazarevich, recorded on the mentioned CD, with the score presented by the author with a donative inscription. Music by Lokshin will sound at us henceforth. <...>

Your Boris Tishchenko

On May, 15th 2001

P.S. Warm greetings to Tatyana Borisovna!