

March 20, 1989

Collective Memory, Architectural Monuments, and the
Crisis in Soviet Culture*

"Dwell on the past and you'll lose an eye;
forget the past and you'll lose both eyes."

Russian proverb

The present ferment generated in the USSR by perestroika (restructuring), glasnost' (openness), and demokratisatsiia (democratization) have had an astonishing impact on how the Soviets recall their past. Although perestroika, which concerns itself with a highly inefficient Soviet economy, is Secretary Gorbachev's undoubted priority; the other two have energized diverse segments of the intelligentsia.¹

Not surprisingly, much of their debate concerns history, always an important commodity for Soviet ideologues. The perestroika people hold that reform cannot occur unless there is an honest accounting of the Soviet past. Others deeply resent rehabilitation of former "enemies of the people" and condemnation

* This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association in Atlanta, August 24-28, 1988. The author acknowledges a grant from the American Philosophical Society and the assistance of the staff of the Documentation Office for East European Law of the University of Leiden, The Netherlands

of recent heroes or "necessary" undertakings such as collectivization of agriculture.²

In this context the flawed Soviet record for preserving architectural monuments--specifically, those in historic Russia--has stoked the embers of Great Russian nationalism. This spirited concern for such artifacts has been generated, it seems, by identifying them with the collective memory of a people.³ That monuments destruction has occurred and even continues makes it, like environmental abuse, a popular national cause not only for Russian but for other Soviet nationalities.

This appearance as an issue is by no means sudden: it emerged after Khrushchev's ouster nearly a quarter century ago. Since the mid-1960s the following can be documented: 1) extensive legislation on monuments preservation⁴; 2) numerous legal commentaries on the subject⁵; 3) creation of a mechanism--"Soiuzrestravratsiia"--for undertaking preservation work⁶; 4) establishment of diverse cultural organizations to promote the cause⁷; and 5) establishment as well of journals for the same purpose.⁸

The Soviet record for protection and preservation of Russia's architectural monuments may be periodized as follows: 1) 1918-1928, when protective and restoration efforts met with reasonable success despite some losses; 2) 1928-1934, when significant architectural monuments were demolished; 3) the mid- and late 1930s, when reconstruction greatly altered the historic center of Moscow with the resultant loss of many landmark

buildings; 4) 1941-45, the war years, when many great architectural monuments were destroyed in Novgorod, Pskov, the Leningrad suburbs, and elsewhere in European Russia; 5) 1959-64, the Khrushchev era, when church architecture was savaged and Moscow renovation obliterated Moscow's historic Arbat; 6) 1965 to the present, when monuments activists founded in 1966 the All-Russian Volunteer Society for the Preservation and Use of Cultural and Historic Monuments (VOOPIK) and lobbied successfully for all-union preservation legislation (1976, 1982) and inclusion of an article on the topic in the 1977 Constitution.

Restoration projects were included in the eleventh Five Year Plan. The Soviet Culture Fund (1986) has also lobbied for monuments preservation as well as for the arts generally. Recently the monuments preservation movement has been seized, in part at least, by several "informal groups", perhaps fueled by glasnost'. The most prominent, or even notorious, of these are Pamiat' (Memory) and Otechestvo (Fatherland)--some members of which have brashly reasserted the anti-semitism and anti-masonry long associated with Great Russian nationalism.⁹

In the aftermath of the Bolshevik Revolution, the prospects for preserving the best of old Russian monuments appeared reasonably good. Destruction from the uprising had been minimal in both Petrograd and Moscow: the principal abuses resulted from burning and vandalizing of manor houses in the countryside. A.V. Lunacharskii, the first Commissar of Education, played a positive role in protecting monuments and persuading Lenin to

take action. A government appeal early in 1918 calling for preservation of the nation's artistic heritage urged citizens not to "touch one stone, protect the monuments, the old buildings, articles, documents--all this is your history, your pride."¹⁰ This promising beginning in 1918 continued for the next decade.

One of the great figures in the protection of Russian monuments was Igor Emmanuelovich Grabar', painter and art historian. As a scholar and publicist for old Russian architecture Grabar' is particularly remembered for his monumental Istoriia russkogo iskusstva (1909-1915) and his even larger edition of the same work, entirely rewritten by multiple authorship, after World War II. Not only did he assume an important role in preservation matters during the 1920s, the period of the New Economic Policy (NEP), but he performed similarly after World War II.¹¹

In 1918 Grabar' organized the Collegium for Museum Affairs under Narkompros, the People's Commissariat for Enlightenment; later in the same year the organization changed its name to suit its principal orientation, the Department on Museums and Preservation of Ancient and Artistic Monuments.¹² Grabar' established in Moscow a central restoration workshop, facilitated bringing thousands of monuments under state protection, and engaged in the restoration of many others. During the 1920s Pavel Aleksandrovich Florenskii also facilitated preservationist efforts in serving on the Commission to Protect the Art Objects and Antiquities of the Trinity and St. Sergius Monastery and

through his professorship at the Higher State Arts and Crafts Workshops.¹³

This heyday of protection came to an end after the death of Lenin in 1924 and Stalin's massive push for industrialization and reconstruction, neither of which allowed for preserving old architecture.¹⁴ Frequently state protection of monuments was either withdrawn or shifted to local authorities. Grabar's State Restoration Workshop was closed in 1930. Protectionists like Grabar' and the architect Shchusev, using the journal Stroitel'stvo Moskvyy as their platform, protested to no avail.

The list of great architectural monuments destroyed in the name of progress between 1928-1934 is a long one.¹⁵ Moscow, in particular, was hard hit: it lost some 400 ancient buildings.¹⁶ The old city, silhouetted by a forest of cupolas, was shorn of many of its churches.¹⁷ Perhaps the most dramatic loss was the razing of the Cathedral of Christ the Redeemer, a monument commemorating the Russian victory over Napoleon.¹⁸ Among secular buildings destroyed were the Golitsyn Palace, the Sukharev Tower, large remaining portions of the Kitai Gorod wall, Prince Ukhtomskii's Krasnye Gates, and Osip Bove's Triumfalnye Gates before Kazan Station. As it turned out, Bove's monument of the last century was only dismantled and subsequently has been reassembled on the Kutuzovskii Prospekt.¹⁹

Apart from simply a piecemeal destruction of Moscow's architectural monuments, many were swept away during the reconstruction of the city.²⁰ The prime movers behind replanning

Moscow in the 1930s were Lazar Kaganovich and his aide Nikita Khrushchev.²¹ Their 1935 plan, intended to impose a socialist look on a city built by capitalism, altered the city's center by reverting to models of Russian classicism. Even St. Basil's in Red Square was scheduled to be blown up in order to allow for bigger and better military parades in the tradition of the 1812.²² This meant accentuating Moscow's arterial highways, concentric boulevards, and squares, often by placing imposing public buildings upon them. It also necessitated the demolition of many old structures which obstructed this grand design. The Garden Ring, Moscow's ancient boundary enclosing the Zemlianoi Gorod, lost its lovely lime trees; the once magnificent Tverskaia, now Gorkii Street, lost many of its splendid mansions.²³ After the war construction of the Kalinin Prospekt through the ancient Arbat required razing many of its classical (post-1812) edifices.

This destruction of architectural monuments in Moscow during the late 1920s and 1930s has been taken up by the present leadership.²⁴ At the 27th Party Congress Politburo member Ie. K. Ligachev praised preservation efforts and supported "those who are raising their voices in alarm over the architectural appearance of our glorious ancient cities." Boris El'tsin, the then Moscow Party boss and Politburo candidate member, also raised the point when he noted that "the question of the loss of Moscow's architectural distinctiveness, especially in the central part of the city, has moved into the category of political

questions."²⁵

The wartime destruction in Soviet cities and countryside resulted in the loss, according to the Ministry of Culture, of some 3,000 architectural monuments, including the cathedrals of Kiev, Chernigov, and Vitebsk.²⁶ The greatest destruction in and around Leningrad were the great suburban palaces--at Peterhof (Petrodvorets), Rastrelli's Great Palace at Tsarskoe Selo (Pushkin), Charles Cameron's Catherine Palace in Pavlovsk (1782-86), and Rinaldi's Palace for the Emperor Paul in Gatchina. All of these were shattered and have required years of restoration: work on the Peterhof and Great Tsarskoe Selo Palace interiors (i.e. the personal rooms of Catherine II by Charles Cameron) has been impressive and oft noted, but the fact is that much of the Peterhof interior was irretrievably lost and the Tsarskoe Palace restoration has been largely that of facade restoration with much of the interior still untouched. In Moscow the lovely Empire-style Gagarin House (Architect O.I. Bove, 1817) on Novinskii Boulevard was destroyed by bombing. Novgorod and Pskov, largely demolished during the War, have been rather successfully restored.²⁷ In all, the Soviet record of selective restoration of monuments damaged during the War has been impressive, considering the huge losses incurred.

A Western perception of Khrushchev as "liberal" and legal reformer does not square with his policy toward organized religion. Russian Orthodox churches in Imperial Russia in 1914 (excluding chapels but including churches in Finland and Poland)

numbered 54,147; the tally reputedly was some 20,000 in 1961, when the Russian Church entered the World Council of Churches. Khrushchev's anti-religious campaign between 1959-64 may have reduced that number to 10,000 or fewer. In the process many important monuments of church architecture were either destroyed or disfigured through conversion to non-religious use.²⁸

Reaction to the destructiveness of Khrushchev's policy led directly to the establishment of VOPIK after his ouster in 1964.

Church architecture continues in a precarious state despite occasional protectionist support from those in high places. A current worry has been care for the Kolomenskoe ensemble on the banks of the Moscow River beyond the Moscow center.²⁹ El'tsin in April, 1986 joined the chorus of those lamenting the "sorry state" of Moscow's architectural monuments, criticizing in particular the USSR Ministry of Power and Electrification's use of the Church of the Ascension, between Herzen and Aleksei Tolstoi Streets, as its Moscow office.³⁰ One recent gain has been the government's return of Danilov Monastery in Moscow to the Russian Orthodox Church. The monastery and its churches have been restored in order to commemorate the millennium (1988) of Russian Christianity; moreover, the monastery will henceforth serve as the administrative center of the Moscow Patriarchate.³¹

Recently the need for new legislation to protect church property has been discussed. Blaming the clergy for necessitating changes in the law would appear to indicate dissatisfaction with the treatment of church property.³² Years

of neglect, abuse, misuse, and even "restoration" have taken a heavy toll.³³ The Ministry of Power's occupancy of a church is by no means been an aberration. Other churches and great houses have been left vacant or used as factories, warehouses, and living dwellings--to the detriment of the building itself.³⁴

The wooden and masonry architecture of the Russian North have suffered greatly from all of these as well as natural disasters.³⁵ While Novogord and Pskov have fared well in restoration, less has been accomplished in, say, Karelia, Arkhangelsk, and Vologda provinces. Nearly a decade ago the Presidium of the Central Council of VOOPIK conferred about these Northern monuments.³⁶ Although the specialists attending concurred on the need to protect the Solovetskii Monastery, Valaam, Kizhi, and the unique edifices of Solvychegodsk, Velikii Iustiug, Kargopol, Ky Island in Lake Onega and Arkhangelsk, and many lesser known--subsequent accomplishments have been meager.

Problems on the other hand have multiplied. Many of the structures, especially churches, have deteriorated. The abandonment of villages (about 1,000 in Arkhangelsk province alone) in order to consolidate the rural population has accelerated architectural ruin. Buildings--especially wooden ones--often burn down as a result of carelessness or natural causes. Vandalism and severe climate also contribute to their decay. Recently, debate has centered on the lack of lightning rods on the wooden churches.³⁷

One way devised to protect wooden architecture is that of

moving it to protected areas, for often the distances between monuments inhibits their care.³⁸ Many important works from Karelian villages have been collected at Kizhi and another museum of wooden architecture has been created in Arkhangelsk.³⁹ Better known still are the Vitoslavlitsy Museum outside Novgorod and the Museum of Wooden Architecture in restored Suzdal.⁴⁰

The creation of these open-air museums has made a virtue of necessity in that they are perceived for their tourist potential no less than for conservation. Certainly this is true of those museums in Suzdal and Novgorod. Similarly, there is a well-planned ethnographical museum outside Riga. Heavy investment, however, will have to occur before Kargopol, Mezen, or the Solovki Islands become havens of tourism.⁴¹

Soviet authorities have learned that tastefully restored ancient cities can attract both foreign and domestic visitors. Intourist, the official agency for tourism, has exploited to the fullest the architecture of Novgorod and Pskov and the cities of the Golden Ring--Zagorsk, Rostov, Iaroslavl', Vladimir, and Suzdal.⁴² Kizhi is presently included on tourist itineraries after the thaw. The potential for tourism as well as sound patriotic reasons have fostered restoration of war-ravaged Leningrad suburban palaces.

Although the rebuilding of Soviet cities has often had disastrous consequences for historic monuments, the reverse has occasionally been true. Planners recently have gone to unusual lengths to preserve the appearance of old cities, and in so doing

have utilized monuments for aesthetic and recreational as well as for tourist purposes.⁴³ Parks of Culture and Rest have been planned with both natural setting and monuments in mind.⁴⁴ The great palace of Ostankino in Moscow with its lovely gardens has served such a purpose. The repaired palaces and gardens outside Leningrad and Kuskovo and Arkhangelskoe outside Moscow are favorites for holiday outings. Beautifully restored buildings such as the Il'ia Propok Church in Iaroslavl' or ancient kremlins and monasteries have remained focal points in Soviet as they had been in Imperial town planning. The pedestrian mall in the Moscow's Arbat, popularized by the strolling Reagans during their Summit visit, has repaired some of the damage done to the area two decades ago.⁴⁵

The impetus of collective memory has gone beyond protecting architectural artifacts. The matter respecting cemeteries has been raised by the preservationist Mikhail Talalai.⁴⁶ An effort appears underway to restore historic names of cities and streets in various parts of the USSR.⁴⁷

This narrative of destruction and deterioration of Russian architectural monuments and preservationist reaction should not be limited to bricks and mortar and certainly not the anti-semitic rantings of Pamiat'. The worry over monuments really embodies a perceived spiritual crisis--a reaction to sterile and souless socialism on one hand and youthful fascination with frivolous and materialistic Western culture on the other. Those artifacts of old Russia--the architecture and

village along with the natural environment--symbolize the ethos of the Great Russian people. Destruction of both these environments by callous apparachniki threatens, as the conservative writer Iurii Bondarev has observed, Russia's collective memory:

If we do not stop the destruction of architectural monuments, if we do not stop doing violence to the land and the rivers, if a moral explosion does not take place in science and criticism, then one fine morning, which will be our last--our funeral--morning, we with our inexhaustible optimism will wake up and realize that the national culture of vast Russia, its spirit, its love for its native land, its beauty, its great literature, painting and philosophy have been wiped out, destroyed, and are gone forever; and that we, naked and destitute, are sitting on the ashes trying to remember the native alphabet that is dear to our heart, but are unable to remember it, for our thought and feeling, joy and historical memory have all vanished.⁴⁸

Another prominent Soviet writer, Valentin Grigorievich Rasputin⁴⁹, speaking before the Fifth Congress of VOPIK in Gorky (July, 1987) also focused on the linkage of memory and monuments:

Memory is in itself a concept that strengthens and preserves. There is no greater fertilizing force for the opening and blossoming of a people's potential, there is no more fertile soil than the national memory, a perceptible, unbroken link between the living generations and the generations of the past and future.

Rasputin could but lament the years of "memory failure" and that monuments destruction continues: "The law, when confronted with our native barbarians wearing the mantle of leadership, continues to give in--moreover, the law is weak in the first place--and the wagon of restoration continues to crawl along slowly."⁵⁰

While Soviet disregard of the Russian past unquestionably has fueled Great Russian nationalism, it is important to consider why Russian monuments foster remembrance. Veneration of old

buildings, especially if they are perceived as an essential to the national heritage, often leads to organized means to protect them. Such protection frequently accompanies re-created villages, towns, or parts of cities as with Leningrad. This "veneration of the old, " Edward Shils has noted

turns the reception of a physical thing into an appreciative tradition; the traditum is not just received, it is also appreciated for its association with the past. Association with past greatness is added to the appreciation of pastness as such. Pastness even generates greatness. The attribute of pastness makes the thing of the past worthy of preservation, of becoming a tradition to be maintained and passed on. Both the object itself and the belief about it become traditions.⁵¹

Preservation efforts in the USSR have been both systematic and populist. The populist endeavors are enhanced by the prevalence of old buildings. They are everywhere: they do not require the same scholarly filtering as do history and literature. The censor is not likely to hack away at every creative notion. As David Lowenthal has observed:

Intentional preservation accounts for only a small fraction of what survives. In resurrecting the way of life of the millions who have left no archival trace, artifacts partly redress the bias of written sources, and hence make historical knowledge more populist, pluralistic, and public.⁵²

Their accessibility and disarming character make monuments a powerful ideological tool when encoded to serve nationalist or culturally regenerative purposes. To the extent that the monuments issue in the USSR is not manipulated by ultra-nationalist groups, it appears compatible with glasnost'. The Gorbachev regime will undoubtedly be alert lest restive Soviet nationalities besides the Russians appropriate monuments and its baggage of collective memory for their own devices.⁵³

Albert J. Schmidt

Arnold Bernhard Professor Emeritus of
History

Professor Emeritus of Law
University of Bridgeport

1. The usual Western assumption is that reputed tension between Gorbachev and Party conservatives like Ye. Ligachev stems from their differing views on the limits of glasnost', not perestroika.

2. See Julia Wishnevsky, "Soviet and Emigre Academics and Writers Meet in Denmark," Radio Liberty Research RL 102/88 (Mar. 9, 1988); Vera Tolz, "'Blank Spots' in Soviet History," Ibid RL 119/88 (Mar. 21, 1988); and Vera Tolz, "A New Stage in Restructuring Soviet Historiography," Ibid RL 170/88 (Apr. 18, 1988).

Current Digest of the Soviet Press has had articles on the rehabilitation of Bukharin (40, no. 5), Khrushchev (40, no. 9), and the Orthodox Church (40, no. 15), and "debunked" the Stalinist 'Golden Age' (40, no. 16). Much tension has developed in an effort to commemorate the victims of Stalin. See Julia Wishnevsky, "Conflict between State and 'Memorial' Society," Report on the USSR, 1, no. 3 (Jan. 20, 1989), pp. 8-9. A memorial has been unveiled in Ashkhabad, the Turkmen Republic, to commemorate a victim of the Stalinist purges. Radio Liberty RL 186/88, (Apr. 29, 1988).

Another problem--one which has generated much criticism--in recapitulating Russia's past is that of simple record-keeping. Libraries in the USSR, poorly managed and frequently inhospitable to researchers, have in several instances been beset by destructive fires resulting in catastrophic losses. See Vera

Tolz, "Poor Storage of Books and Inaccessibility of Archives Discussed in Soviet Press," Ibid. RL 180/88 (Apr. 28, 1988) and "Archive Directors Resist Historians' Efforts to Expand Access," CDSP 40 (1988), no. 22, 22-23.

3. See a delightful vignette by Martin Walker, "The Old Storey," Manchester Guardian Weekly (Jan. 24, 1988), p. 24.

4. The statute "On the Protection and Use of Monuments of History and Culture," which served as a basis for incorporating monuments protection (art. 68) in the USSR Constitution of 1977, produced a spate of union republic laws. By 1982 new federal legislation enlarged on that of 1976. For these two statutes see USSR Supreme Soviet, 29 Oct. 1976. Vedomosti (Ved.) SSSR (1976), no. 44, item 628. For English translations see William Butler, ed., The Soviet Legal System: Selected Legislation and Documents (Dobbs Ferry, N.Y.: Oceana, 1978) and CDSP 28 (1976), no. 45, 15-19. The 1982 legislation is found in Sobranie Postanovlenii (SP SSSR) 1982 no. 26, item 133; Min. Kul'tury SSSR, 1982, no. 604.

For more on monuments and Soviet law see F.J.M. Feldbrugge, "Monuments in Soviet Law," delivered at an international conference on Soviet law and administration, University of Trento, Italy, 17-19 December 1986 and to be published in the Law in Eastern Europe series (U of Leiden, The Netherlands); Albert J. Schmidt, "Soviet Legislation for Protection of Architectural

Monuments: Background," hereafter cited as "Soviet Legislation," delivered at an international symposium on "Soviet Law and Perestroika" 12-15 Nov. 1987, University of Bridgeport (Connecticut) School of Law and to be published in the Law in Eastern Europe series, U of Leiden. See also Schmidt, "Monuments," Encyclopedia of Soviet Law 2nd ed., F.J.M. Feldbrugge, et al. eds. (Dordrecht, The Netherlands, 1985) and G.G. Anisimov, ed., Okhrana pamiatnikov istorii i kul'tury sbornik dokumentov (Moscow, 1973). There is widespread feeling in the USSR that this legislation has not been effective. See "In Safekeeping but Unprotected," CDSP 40 (1988), no. 8, 27-28.

5. A select bibliography of Soviet legal commentaries may be found in Schmidt, "Soviet Legislation".

6. The All-Union Specialized Restorative Production Combine ("Soiuzrestavratsiia"), with its main offices and workshops in the Novospasskii Monastery in Moscow, is the key establishment in the Soviet preservation and restoration enterprise. For more on this, see V.I. Sherebega, A.G. Grigor'eva, et al., Pamiatniki istorii i kul'tury-narodu: diatel'nost vsesoiuznogo proizvodstvennogo ob'edineniia "Soiuzrestavratsiia" Ministerstva Kul'tury SSSR, Moscow, 1986. The substance of this work is recapitulated in Schmidt, "Soviet Legislation."

7. The best known, all discussed below, are the All-Russian Volunteer Society for the Preservation and Use of Cultural and Historic Monuments, known by its acronym VOOPIK (VOOPIiK), established 23 July 1965 (SP RSFSR 1965, no. 17, item 101; Anisimov, p. 144); the Soviet Cultural Fund, established in 1986 (The draft statute as approved appeared in Sovetskaia kul'tura, 4 Sept. 1986) and Vera Tolz, "Cultural Foundation Holds Inaugural Conference," Radio Liberty Research RL 442/86, Nov. 24, 1986); and such "informal groups" as Pamiat' and Otechestvo.

For more on the organization Pamiat', see note 9 below and Vladislav Krasnov, "Pamyat: A Force for Change?" Paper read at the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies meeting, Honolulu, Nov. 19, 1988.

8. The most prominent is Pamiatniki otechestva which first appeared in 1980. A journal of the same name was published irregularly in the 1970s. Vestnik soveta ekologii kul'tury (edited by Mikhail Talalai), devoted to preservation of historical monuments, is a product of the glasnost' era. See Vera Tolz, "Independent Journals Proliferate in USSR," Radio Liberty Research RL 35/88 (Jan. 27, 1988). The Cultural Foundation journal, Nashe nasledie, which has just appeared, will undoubtedly feature articles on preservation. See Vera Tolz, "Nashe nasledie--The Journal of the Soviet Cultural Foundation," Report on the USSR (formerly Radio Liberty Research), 1, no. 3 (Jan. 20, 1989), 11-13.

9. See Vera Tolz, "'Informal Groups' in the USSR," Radio Liberty Research RL 220/87 (June 11, 1987); Julia Wishnevsky, "Glasnost' on Anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union," Ibid., RL 254/87 (July 6, 1987); Julia Wishnevsky, "The Emergence of 'Pamyat' and 'Otechestvo'" Ibid., RL 342/87 (Aug. 26, 1987); Vera Tolz, "'Informal Groups' Hold First Officially Sanctioned Conference," Ibid., RL 380/87 (Sept. 23, 1987); Julia Wishnevsky, "Theater Attacked by 'Otechestvo' Receives State Prize," Ibid., RL 457/87 (Nov. 12, 1987); Julia Wishnevsky, "A Second 'Pamyat' Emerges," Ibid., RL 463/87 (Nov. 16, 1987); "Pamyat Draws Defense, New Attacks," CDSP, 40 (1988), no. 12; and "Crackdown on 'Pamyat' Nationalists Urged," CDSP 40 (1988), no. 33, 7-8. See also Vladislav Krasnov, "Pamyat: A Force for Change?" cited above in note 7.

Of the numerous works on Great Russian nationalism, the best, although already dated, is John B. Dunlop, The Faces of Contemporary Russian Nationalism (Princeton: Princeton U Press, 1983). It contains more on monuments and nationalism than Radio Liberty Research Bulletin (Dec. 19, 1988), which includes the following: John B. Dunlop, "The Contemporary Russian Nationalist Spectrum;" Darrell P. Hammer, "Glasnost' and 'The Russian Idea';" Adnrei Sinyavsky, "Russian Nationalism;" Ronald Grigor Suny, "Russian Nationalism in the Era of Glasnost' and Perestroika;" and Alexander Yanov, "Russian Nationalism as the Ideology of Counterreform." See also Bill Keller, "New

Moscow: More Hymns to Old Russia," New York Times, Feb. 22, 1989; and Esther B. Fein, "Soviet Conservatives Try to Turn Back the Clock on Gorbachev's Policies," ibid., Feb. 27, 1989. For expressions of nationalism elsewhere in the USSR, see note 52 below.

See also Vera Tolz, "The 'Russian Theme' in the Soviet Media," Radio Liberty Research RL 33/87 (Jan. 26, 1987); Roman Solchanyk, "Russian History, Russian Nationalism, and Soviet Politics," Ibid. RL 327/86 (Aug. 25, 1986).

10. As quoted in S.T. Palmer, "The Restoration of Ancient Monuments in the USSR," Survey (1970), nos. 74/75, 166 and Kathleen Berton, Moscow: An Architectural History, (New York, 1977), p. 199. This early legislation is reproduced in G.G. Anisimov, Okhrana pamiatnikov istorii i kul'tury.

11. Cf. Grabar', Voprosy restavratsii. Sbornik tsentralnykh Gosudarstvennykh restavratsionnykh masterskikh. 2 vols. (Moscow, 1926 and 1928). After World War II he wrote Pamiatniki iskusstva razrushennye nemetskimi zakhvatchikami v SSSR, (Moscow & Leningrad, 1948). Cf. also Grabar' V.E. Lazarev, and V.V. Kostochkin, Pamiatniki kul'tury: issledovanie i restavratsii, (Moscow, 1959-1963).

12. For more on Narkompros see F.I. Sharonov & M.D. Pecherskii, "Obzor dokumentov tsentral'nogo gosudarstvennogo

arkhiva RSFSR po istorii okhrany pamiatnikov istorii i kul'tury v RSFSR" Pamiatniki otechestva, (1983), no. 1 (7), 148-152.

13. See "Russian Leonardo," CDSP 41 (1989), no. 4, 22-23.

Florenskii was recently acclaimed by the Soviet Culture Fund in its program for "Bringing Back Forgotten Names." Florenskii, a priest, was arrested in 1933, sent to Solovetskii, and disappeared in 1937; he was rehabilitated in 1958.

14. Even before Lenin's death one of the great architectural monuments of the Russian North, the Solovetskii Monastery, became the main concentration camp of the GPU. A significant portion of the prisoners in this camp were Orthodox clergy, according to David J. Dallin and Boris I. Nicolaevsky, Forced Labor in Soviet Russia, (New Haven, CT., 1947), pp. 173-75. See also the Soviet version of Solovetskii in "Film Recalls White Sea Island Prison Camp," CDSP 40 (1988), no. 46, 10, 24.

15. The following sources are important for identifying destroyed monuments: M. Iu. Braichevskii, "Sokhranit' pamiatniki istorii," Istoriia SSSR, 1966, no. 2. 205-226; S.T. Palmer, "The Restoration of Ancient Monuments in the USSR"; and Kathleen Berton, Moscow. Les eglises de Moscou/Moskva zlatoglavaia, Paris, 1979); Architecture of Russia from Old to Modern 2 vols., Russian and English (New York, 1973); and Razrushennye i oskvernennye khramy (Frankfurt/Main, 1980) focus extensively on

destruction of ecclesiastical buildings.

For description of Moscow in 1914 the reader is referred to Baedeker's Handbook for Travellers: Russia (New York, 1970). See also James Crafcraft, The Petrine Revolution in Russian Architecture (Chicago: U. of Chicago, 1988) and Albert J. Schmidt, The Architecture and Planning of Classical Moscow (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1989).

16. Vladimir Soloukhin, after enumerating some of Moscow's greatest architectural losses, eloquently reveals the tragedy of these years:

It would be very tiresome for the reader if I started detailed enumeration of complete destruction. It is also a pity that the Sukharev Tower, built in the seventeenth century, was destroyed. It was blocking the automobile traffic....What a pity that the Red Gates and the Triumphal Gates were also demolished....And would you know that Pushkin Square was adorned with the old Passion [Strastnoi] Monastery? They pulled it down and now a black-gray dismal courtyard is facing the street. Is this supposed to be the imposing appearance, the sights of Moscow we should be proud of?....Nobody would be admiring either the square or the cinema "Rossiia" that replaced the Passion Monastery.

It took forty years to build the Cathedral of the Redeemer. This immense architectural structure was financed entirely by a popular subscription in commemoration of the famous Moscow

conflagration and the unconquerable Muscovites defeating Napoleon....A famous Russian artist, Vasilii Surikov, painted the walls and arches of the Cathedral, which was the tallest and most magnificent building in Moscow. One could see it from any side of the city. It was not an ancient building, but it constituted with the Kremlin ensemble the architectural center of our capital. They pulled it down... A swimming pool was installed there instead....They were blowing up Simonov Monastery. At the Monastery was the family burial place of Aksakovs....The sacred memorial to the wonderful Russian people and especially to the writer Aksakov had not stopped the detonaters....A sad fate overtook the magnificent Sadovyi [Garden] Ring....

In place of a unique even a little bit archaic, typically Russian, unmatched city of Moscow, they have built an average European city not notable for anything special. It is just a city. One can even say it is a nice city but not more than that.

(Pis'ma iz russkogo muzeia, [Moscow, 1967], pp. 14-19).

17. Academician Dmitrii Likhachev, present head of the Culture Fund, has related how as a young man he arrived in Moscow for the first time and came upon the Church of the Assumption (1696-99) on the Pokrovka and was astounded by its beauty. "But," he notes, "the church was torn down. This was in the early 1930s." Pravda, 10 Nov. 1979, p. 6; Engl. transl. in CDSP 31 (1979), no. 45, 9-10.

18. Palmer, "The Restoration of Ancient Monuments," p. 162 lists among the most prominent losses Kazan Cathedral (1630s) opposite GUM on 25 October Street (Nikol'skaia), the Church of the Nativity in Stoleshnikakh behind the Bolshoi Theater, the Vozdvizhenka Church (1709-28) on the Kalinin Prospekt, and one from the sixteenth century near the site of the Arbat Metro entrance. Berton, Moscow, pp. 201-201 records the Church of Spas na Boru (Savior in the Wood), dating from 1330, the Chudov (Miracle) Monastery, and the Voznesenskii Convent within the Kremlin, the Simonov Monastery (from the fifteenth century), and the Assumption Church on the Pokrovka (1690s), noted above.

19. Since 1980 or so there has been increased pressure to rebuild the Sukharev Tower. In 1983 the architects P.M. Ragulin and P.M. Miagkov suggested that it could be done opposite the Sklifosovskii Institute, the former Sheremetev Hospital and Poor House in Kolkhoznaia Square, where it had formerly stood. Nothing has been done in the interim as Oleg Volkov has noted in "Eshche raz o sud'be Sukharevoi bashni" Literaturnaia gazeta, 4 Feb. 1987.

20. The American architect Frank Lloyd Wright was an honored guest in Moscow in 1937, but he voiced little concern or awareness of monuments destruction; rather he was concerned with a new Soviet architecture. Said Wright:

The Kremlin, when relieved of its later decorations, represents one of the greatest treasures of all times and nations. Soviet Russia must honor its great architectural monuments, but not imitate them. Genuine architecture retains its significance eternally. But new principles of freedom, embodied in the Soviet Union itself, will generate other great art treasures.

(Donald Leslie Johnson, "Frank Lloyd Wright in Moscow: June 1937.")
(Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians 46 [1987], 71)

21. That Kaganovich is Jewish has resulted in his villification by such groups as Pamiat'. A recent biography of Kaganovich, Stuart Kahan, The Wolf of the Kremlin (New York: Wm. Morrow, 1987) says little about his destruction of monuments: "He practically reconstructed Moscow itself, but cared little about trying to preserve valuable monuments. The great Church of Christ the Savior was demolished for a new Palace of Soviets, the Holy Week monastery was turned into a theater for use by party members, and the Iversk Gates and clocktower at Red Square were torn down notwithstanding protests from leading architects."
(p. 176)

22. Only when the defiant protectionist Petr Baranovsky chained himself to the edifice did Stalin withdraw the order. See Ruth Daniloff, "Restoring a Russian heritage turns out to be a Byzantine task," Smithsonian, (Mar. 1983), p. 66.

23. Destructive "reconstruction" was limited almost wholly to Moscow in the 1930s. Leningrad kept its city-center intact.

Work in Novgorod and Pskov at this time did not alter their historic look.

24. Yet only a few years ago the writers O. Volkov, S. Zalygin, and V. Rasputin, Professor A. Losev, and Academician D. Likhachev voiced concern for the structure of Pashkov House because of construction in the nearby Borovitskaia Metro Station. CDSP 35 (1983), no. 21, 23 from Pravda, (22 May 1983), p. 3.

25. CDSP 39 (1987), no. 13, 3-7 from Moskva, no. 11, Nov. 1986, pp. 183-198. The same article retells I.E. Grabar's anecdote of Lenin's voicing anger upon seeing a broken window in the Church of Constantine and Helena (1470) on the Kremlin grounds. After Lenin's death it and others near it, some that had been restored between 1918-1920, were razed.

26. R. Daniloff, "Russian heritage" p. 66. See also M.M. Boguslavskii, Mezhdunarodnaia okhrana kul'turnykh tsennostei, pp. 93-95 and R.M. Kopomtseva, "Pamiatniki otechestvennoi istorii," Istoriia SSSR (1978), no. 3, 206-219.

27. The twelfth century Church of the Savior on the Nereditza River in Novgorod was destroyed but has been restored. Because much post-war restoration has been external only, many of the buildings are mere shells.

28. Jane Ellis, The Russian Orthodox Church: A Contemporary History, p. 14. Cf. the discussion on church statistics on pp. 14 ff. Ellis notes that the restoration of the twelfth century Cathedral of the Dormition in Vladimir as recently in 1974 prompted speculation and fears on the part of the congregation that it would be converted into a museum, "an architectural monument belonging to the country as a whole, not just to the believers." (p. 20) When the Cathedral did, indeed, revert to the Church, the Church paid the 500,000 ruble cost of restoration. (p. 20) For a recent appraisal of Soviet policy toward religious communities, see Oxana Antic, "Increase in Number of Orthodox Parishes," Report on the USSR, 1, no. 1 (Jan. 13, 1989), 8-9.

On the matter of using church buildings for purposes other than worship in order to preserve the best architectural monuments, see Iu. Gerasimov and V. Rabinovich, "New Life for Ancient Churches," in Nauka i religia, no. 11, November 1984; Engl. trans. CDSP 37 (1985), no. 6, 11-12.

On the closing of churches and the destruction of church art and architecture or conversion of church buildings to other uses during the period 1959-64 see Michael Bourdeaux, Patriarch and Prophets: Persecution of the Russian Orthodox Church Today, (New York, 1970), pp. 124-140.

For graphic accounts on destruction of monuments of church architecture, as noted above, see V.Z. Sorokin, "Obezglavlennaia

Moskva" Russkoe vozrozhdenie, 1981 (II), no. 14, pp. 155-176; and, as noted above, Razrushennye i oskvernennye khramy.; Architecture of Russia from Old to Modern, Volume I: Churches and Monasteries; vol. II: Palaces, Manors, and Churches; and Moskva Zlatoglavaaia/Les eglises de Moscou See especially Marshall Winokur's judicious review of these last three in 26 St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly, (1982), no. 1, 49-59.

29. See CDSP 30 (1978), no. 33, 13 and 19 from Literaturnaia Rossia, (11 Aug. 1978), no. 32, p. 14.

Similar concerns have been expressed for the neglect of Optina Pustyn Monastery, which has had an important role in Russian literature. Neglect and World War II left the place in shambles. Despite much talk over the years and some small appropriations, the monastery is still largely unrestored, although now returned to the custody of the Church. See CDSP 30 (1978), no. 3, 14-15 from Literaturnaia Rossia, (20 Jan. 1978), pp. 8-9.

30. He noted the loss of more than 2,000 major monuments in Moscow since 1935. As cited from Le Monde, 16 July 1986 by Andrew Pospelovsky "The Destruction of Ancient Churches Continues," Radio Liberty Research RL 308/86, (19 Aug. 1986).

31. Oxana Antic, "The Activities of the Russian Orthodox Church, 1983-85", Radio Liberty Research RL 71/86, (13 Feb.

1986), p. 3; Oxana Antic, "The Fate of Some Orthodox Monasteries after the Revolution," Radio Liberty Research RL 481/84, (20 Dec. 1984); and Izvestiia, (28 Dec. 1986), p. 6 with Engl. transl. in CDSP 38 (1986), no. 52, 18-19. Besides the restoration of the Monastery, a five-story hotel with a conference hall for 400 will be erected --all to be financed by the Moscow Patriarchate. Ibid. p. 19.

Under Gorbachev state religious policy appears to have softened. In part this has been influenced by the celebration of the millenium of the Russian Orthodox Church in 1988. Besides returning Danilov to the Patriarchate, the state returned Optina Pustyn' Monastery in Kaluga Oblast and the Tolgtskoi Bozhiei Materi Monastery in Iaroslavl'. See "The Architecture of our Forebears Calls for Joint Efforts," CDSP 40 (1988), no. 1, 22. Now there is talk of an open-air museum of Old Believer culture near Moscow (Oxana Antic, "Government Policy towards the Official Churches in the USSR in 1987," Radio Liberty Research, RL 54/88.

32. See Vera Tolz, "New legislation on the Protection of Church Property in the Offing?" Radio Liberty Research 62/86, (4 Feb. 1986) and "Draft Law on Freedom of Conscience Prepared," Report on the USSR (24 Feb. 1989), I, no. 8, 60-61.

33. See CDSP 30 (1978), no. 30, 13, 19. See also "Kriticheskie zametki o faktakh bezotvestvennogo otnosheniia k

delu okhrany pamiatnikov," Pamiatniki otechestva (1980), no. 1 (1), 162-65.

Wm. Brumfield, "Russia's Glorious Churches, Historic Preservation" (Feb. 1985), pp. 44-46 discusses this "fundamental contradiction" of Soviet preservation policy, that of restoring "palaces and churches, the relics of two groups dispossessed by the Revolution." (p. 44)

34. In 1962 one of Matvei Kazakov's best churches, that of Philip the Metropolitan (1777-78), was used as a carpentry shop; now it is simply padlocked. As recently as 1982 A. A. Menelas' (Menelaw's) Rasumovskii House (1801-1803), later the Institute of Physical Culture, lay in shambles. See CDSP 30 (1978), no. 45, 15 and 20 from Literaturnaia gazeta, (13 Sept. 1978), p. 12. There are times, no doubt, when churches used for storing grain are treated with more care than were they merely classified as a monument. See Brumfield, "Russia's Glorious Churches," p. 46.

35. As early as 1975 legislation designated monuments in Arkhangel'sk oblast for restoration. Cf SP RSFSR, 1975, no. 1, Item 1; see also legislation for Valaam SP RSFSR, 1979, no. 21, item 155.

For more on the architectural richness of the North see B. Fedorov, Architecture of the Russian North 12th-19th Centuries/ Zodchestvo russkogo severa XII - XIX vv., Leningrad,

1976. For a view that questions the aesthetic merit of Russian wooden architecture see James Cracraft, The Petrine Revolution in Russian Architecture, pp. 39-44.

36. CDSP 30 (1978), no. 39, 14 and 20 from Sovetskaia Rossia, 15 Sept. 1978, p. 3; CDSP, 33 (1981), no. 43, 15-16 from Sovetskaia Rossia, 29 Aug. 1981, p. 3; CDSP 29 (1977), no. 45, 18-19 from Pravda, 11 Nov. 1977, p. 3; CDSP 38 (1986), no. 24, 25-26 from Pravda, 14 June 1986, p. 3.

37. See CDSP 29 (1977), no. 7, 17 from Literaturnaia gazeta, 2 Feb. 1977, p. 12; CDSP 29 (1977), no. 17, 19 from Literaturnaia gazeta, 30 Mar. 1977, p. 13; and CDSP 29 (1977), no. 30, 14 from Literaturnaia gazeta, 29 June 1977, p. 13.

38. These open-air museums also protect isolated structures against vandalism. On the other hand, major works like those on the Valaam Archipelago in northern Lake Ladoga have suffered such abuse and neglect. See CDSP 24 (1972), no. 13, 14-15 from Ogonek, no. 8, Feb. 1972, pp. 23-24. For a criticism of these outdoor museums see CDSP 32 (1980), no. 11, 19 from Pravda, 15 Mar. 1980, p. 3.

39. See CDSP 29 (1977), no. 1, 19 from Pravda, 6 Jan. 1977 p. 6 notes the establishment of an architectural and ethnographic museum of wooden architecture near the Novoiyerusalimskii

Monastery; however, this author has heard nothing more of it. Pravda reported in 1977 that Solovetskii Monastery had been formally established as a historical, architectural and nature museum-preserve in 1974 (CDSP 29 [1977], no. 45, 18-19).

40. For more on the Vitoslavlitsy Museum see Liudmila Filipova, Vitoslavlitsy: Muzey dereviannogo zodchestva, Leningrad, 1979.

See also William Brumfield, Gold in Azure: One Thousand Years of Russian Architecture, Boston, 1983 for excellent photographs of wooden architecture from the Vitoslavlitsy Museum and the Museum of Wooden Architecture, Suzdal and Cracraft, The Petrine Revolution in Russian Architecture, pp. 40, 306, 309.

41. Although it is possible to arrange a trip to Kizhi, some 250 miles from Leningrad--the nearest Intourist hotel is in Petrozavodsk--it is not possible to arrange Intourist tours from Petrozavodsk to the Solovetskii Monastery Preserve. There may be good reason for this: Pravda (11 Nov. 1977) quotes one V. Rastopchin from Moscow who wrote that "I recently visited the Solovetskii Islands. I was delighted with the remarkable architectural ensemble and the monuments built several centuries ago. But not everything delighted me. Both the territory and the structures are totally uncared for, as though the place has no proprietor." As reprinted in CDSP 29 (1977), no. 45, 18-19.

While tourism offers some prospect for rehabilitating this impoverished and remote region, the costs for facilities would

be high. See CDSP 34 (1982), no. 52, 13 from Trud, 7 Dec. 1982, p. 3; CDSP 30 (1978), no. 36, 6 from Pravda, 10 Sept. 1978, p. 3; and CDSP 34 (1982), no. 52, 13 from Ogonek, no. 46, 13 Nov. 1982, p. 25. Cf. also Ogonek, no. 8, 1982 with Engl. transl. in CDSP 34 (1982), no. 13, 14-15.

42. Tourism, of course, is written into the monuments legislation and has from the very beginning been a factor in funding preservation work. See CDSP 18 (1966), no. 29, 10 from Literaturnaia gazeta, 9 July 1966, p. 2; CDSP 30 (1978), no. 36, 6-7 from Pravda, 10 Sept. 1978, p. 3; CDSP 21 (1969), no. 24, 29 from Izvestiia, 12 June 1969; CDSP 21 (1969), no. 26, 14-15 from Pravda, 26 June 1969, p. 1; CDSP 27 (1975), no. 47, 4 & 14 from Literaturnaia gazeta, 10 Sept. 1975. Tourism has had its negative aspects as well. See CDSP 33 (1981), no. 45, 13 from Literaturnaia gazeta, 23 Sept. 1981, p. 13.

43. Meshing the old and new is the theme in CDSP 32 (1980), no. 11, 19 from Pravda, 15 Mar. 1980, p. 3.

See Jack A. Underhill, "Reflections of the Planning of Old and New Cities in the USSR," Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies, Occasional paper, no. 80, (19 Dec. 1979) and Underhill, Soviet New Towns, (Washington, D.C., 1976), pp. 63-64.

Preserving the appearance of old or parts of old cities is a recurring theme in preservation articles, i.e. CDSP 29 (1977), no. 14, 23 from Izvestiia, 8 Apr. 1977, p. 2; CDSP 31 (1979),

no. 13, 15-16; CDSP 28 (1976), no. 42, 26; CDSP 34 (1982), no. 12, 21-22; CDSP 19 (1967), no. 33, 21-22; CDSP 31 (1979), no. 27, 22-23; CDSP 32 (1980), no. 32, 17-18; CDSP 32 (1981), no. 49, 22-23.

44. See Denis J.B. Shaw, "Recreation and the Soviet City," in R.A. French and F.E. Ian Hamilton, The Socialist City, (New York, 1979), pp. 119-43.

45. The Arbat as a protected zone and pedestrian mall is discussed in CDSP 31 (1979), no. 24, 22 from Pravda, 15 June 1979, p. 6.

That city planning and monuments' preservation are not necessarily incompatible is evidenced in several recent works on Soviet cities. See R.A. French and F.E. Ian Hamilton, eds., The Socialist City and James H. Bater, The Soviet City: Ideal and Reality, (London, 1980). See also Jack A. Underhill, "Reflections of the Planning of Old and New Cities in the USSR," Kennan Institute occasional Paper #80.

46. Vera Tolz, "Independent Journals Proliferate in the USSR," Radio Liberty RL 35/88 (Jan. 27, 1988).

47. See "Historical Names are also Cultural Monuments," CDSP 40 (1988), no. 32, 21. A group of scholars has launched a campaign to preserve historic street names and is presently creating a

"red book" listing the names of streets which should never be changed. (Radio Liberty Research RL 63/88, (Feb. 12, 1988). The Vilnius City Soviet Executive Committee recently resolved to restore historic street names in the city center. The Soviet Observer (Feb. 1-15, 1988), p. 3. Gorkii residents have requested that the name of their city be restored to Nizhi-Novgorod, its pre-Revolutionary name. That Brezhnev's name has been stricken from a city and various locales within cities suggests that the practice of honoring political leaders with place names will be exercised with greater care in the future. See ibid. (Jan. 15, 1988), p. 4 and Report on the USSR, 1, no. 1 ((Jan. 6, 1989), p. 32. The Culture Fund has recently taken up the cause of restoring old names to Soviet cities. The reaction against Russian place names in non-Russian areas has been explored in James Critchlow, "Uzbeks Demand Elimination of Non-Native Place Names," Report on the USSR, 1, no. 3 (Jan. 20, 1989), pp. 19-20.

48. Current Digest of the Soviet Press 38 (1986), no. 32, 9.

Vladimir Soloukhin expressed similar sentiments when he observed "that by destroying antiquity one always tears the roots. A tree is provided with roots and every little piece of root counts, but especially important are those rhizomes that penetrate deep water-bearing layers. Who knows, perhaps at the time of some great drought those seemingly moribund rhizomes would supply the leaves on top with the life-giving

moisture." (Pis'ma iz russkogo museia, p. 17).

Soloukhin noted further that "when the church was closed they took all the icons away." "Where to, do you remember...?" They turned them into horse-troughs" (Searching for Icons in Russia [New York: 1971], p. 155).

The venerable Academician Dmitrii Likhachev, a specialist in old Russian culture, urged in an interview with Ogonek that architectural monuments be preserved for essentially their ethical and moral value, apart from any political significance. Separating himself still farther from nationalists who have adopted the theme, he urged that monuments in the non-Russian republics be similarly preserved. (Ogonek, no. 36, 1985).

Conservative writers like Bondarev, Rasputin, and Soloukhin have always linked monuments and environment. This connection has been especially evident as Soviets ponder their ecological debacles. One suggested remedy to the urgent need for water in Central OAsia is a great river diversion project, vehemently opposed by both the USSR Writers' Union and VOPIK. See Sergei Voronityn, "Renewed Debate over Canceled River Diversion Project," Radio Liberty Research RL 205/87 (May 27, 1987); Aaron Trehub, "The USSR State Committee for Environmental Protection," Ibid., RL 27/88 (Jan. 21, 1988); and David Tolmazin, "Trends in Soviet Policies for Developing Water Resources," Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies Occasional Paper #226 (Washington, 1987).

Solzhenitsyn has written that "We have dirtied and

disfigured the heart of Russia, our beloved Moscow....We have squandered our resources foolishly without so much as a backward glance, sapped our soil, mutilated our vast expanses with idiotic 'inland seas' and contaminated belts of wasteland around our industrial centers" (Letter to the Soviet Leaders [New York, 1974], pp. 25-26).

49. Rasputin, like Bondarev, is a part of the Village Prose School, which laments decline of the village no less than architectural monuments. See Kathleen Parthe, "Time, Backward! Memory and the Past in Soviet Russian Village Prose," Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies Occasional Paper #224 (Washington, D.C., 1987); David C. Gillespie, Valentin Rasputin and Soviet Russian Village Prose (London: 1986); and Geoffrey A. Hosking, "The Russian Peasant Rediscovered: 'Village Prose' of the 1960s" Slavic Review, 32, no. 4 (1973), 705-724.

Bondarev and other conservatives gained control (spring of 1988) of the USSR Writers' Union where praise for "Pamiat'" has been lavish. See Julia Wishnevsky, "Reactionaries Tighten Their Hold on the Writers' Union," Radio Liberty Research RL 148/88 (Mar. 28, 1988).

See also Matt F. Oja, "Shalamov, Solzhenitsyn, and the Mission of Memory," Survey 29 (1985), no. 2 (125), 62-69.

50. "Pamyat Draws Defense, New Attacks," CDSP 40 (1988), no. 12, 12-15, 31. Rasputin concluded by condemning "mass

culture" and such "diseases" from the West as heavy rock, break dancing, and hippies.

51. Tradition (Chicago: U of Chicago, 1981), p. 69.

52. The Past is a Foreign Country (Cambridge: Cambridge U Press, 1985) p. 244.

53. This has already occurred. Armenian protest, which began with evocation of environment and monuments, soon cast aside these subtleties. The Baltic Republics have long been in the vanguard in promulgating legislation for protection of monuments--a mask for the nationalism that has been more overt in the glasnost' era. When the Tajiks recently challenged the Uzbek cultural claim to Bukhara and Samarkand and their monuments, the Uzbek poet Muhammad Ali denounced the proposition in a two-part article in the Uzbek-language Komsomol newspaper Yash leninchi. See Ann Sheehy, "Tajik Part First Secretary Addresses Concerns of Local Intelligentsia," Report on the USSR 1, no. 3 (Jan. 20, 1989), p. 21.

Even more serious for the Soviet authorities are nationalist rumblings in White Russian and the Ukraine. See Roman Solchanyk, "Ukrainians and Belorussians Focus on Language and Ecology," Radio Liberty Research RL 140/88 (Mar. 17, 1988); Bohdan Nahaylo, "'Informal' Belorussian Patriotic Groups Hold First Conference," Ibid., 47/88 (Jan. 31, 1988); Nahaylo, "Vitalii Korotych Provokes

Attack from Unexpected Quarter -- Ukrainian Writers," Ibid., RL 44/88 (Jan. 28, 1988); Nahaylo, "Informal Ukrainian Culturological Club Helps to Break New Ground for Glasnost," Ibid., RL 57/88 (Feb. 8, 1988); Bill Keller, "Ukraine Intellectuals Lead Challenge to Communists," New York Times, Mar. 9, 1989; David Marples, "Ukraine in 1988: Economic and Ecological Issues," Report on the USSR, 1, no. 5 ((Feb. 3, 1989).

Uzbek restoration of architectural monuments in Samarkand has been a theme in the highly-publicized public television series "Comrades"; fascination by Muslims with new monuments is noted in Alexandre Bennigsen, "New Islamic Funeral Monuments Being Built in Kazakhstan," Radio Liberty Research RL 11/88 (Jan. 11, 1988).