

# RADIO FREE EUROPE

# Research

## COMMUNIST AREA

*This material was prepared for the use of the editors and policy staff of Radio Free Europe.*

1217

SOVIET UNION:  
Party

1 December 1971

### A. SNEGOV EXPELLED FROM CPSU?

Summary: According to Reuter's Moscow correspondent and several other reporters, Andrei Snegov, a major proponent of rehabilitation for victims of Stalinist terror during the Khrushchev years, is said to have been expelled from the Party. The decision was reportedly made by the Party organization of his residential rayon in Moscow. While his final expulsion has not, apparently, been approved by higher Party echelons, the rayon decision by itself would appear typical of the present political climate within the Party bureaucracy.

A. Snegov is one of the representatives of the generation of old Bolsheviks who survived Stalinist terrorism. Following 15 years of imprisonment in a concentration camp, he was rehabilitated shortly after Stalin's death and became very active politically. In the 1930's, Snegov had been active in the Soviet Ukraine. At the 11th Party Congress of the Communist Party of the Ukraine (Bolchevik) in 1930, he was elected a member of the CC, although he was dismissed from that body at the 1934 Congress. Various sources indicate that the reason for his short CC career stemmed from accusations of "Trotskyist activities."

Following his release from the concentration camp, he joined the Khrushchev group which was pushing for the rehabilitation of the victims of Stalinist terror and for the greatest possible degree of de-Stalinization. Reuter's Moscow correspondent claims that Khrushchev had appointed him director of the Rehabilitation Department in the USSR Ministry of the Interior. According to the same source, Snegov was one of Khrushchev's associates who had assisted him in formulating his famous "secret speech" at the 20th Party Congress. (1)

#### Protege of Khrushchev and Mikoyan

Snegov's efforts to effect the rehabilitation of prominent victims of Stalinist terror often involved public appearances and conflicts which received much attention both within the Soviet Union and abroad. Immediately after the 20th Party Congress, he initiated a campaign for the rehabilitation of the Soviet Ukrainian Party leader, Lykola Skrypnyk. In Voprosy istorii, he published, together with J.S. Oslikovskaya, an article directed against the Moscow historian A. Lykholat, who had characterized Skrypnyk in a Stalinist manner as a "nationalist deviationist" unworthy of rehabilitation. Snegov protested:

Individual erroneous remarks by Skrypnyk on the nationalities question several years after the first Party Congress of the CPU (B) cannot be a reason to slander the old leader of the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet Ukrainian government. (2)

Indeed, a number of Party historians in the Ukraine, including the prominent CP ideologist and former USSR representative to China, who is the present Soviet ambassador to Czechoslovakia, S.V. Chervonenko, refused to characterize Skrypnyk as a "nationalist" and enemy of the Party. (3)

Snegov's and Oslikovskaya's courage to make such statements caused a great sensation for several reasons. The whole affair became particularly dramatic when, during the 20th Party Congress (1956), A.I. Mikoyan sharply criticized Lykholat, and named additional liquidated CP leaders who had not yet been rehabilitated and had been characterized by Lykholat as questionable personalities. The two in question were Antonov-Ovsienko and Kosior. Mikoyan stated:

Such historical scribbling has nothing in common with Marxist history. It looks more like idealistic, social revolutionary interpretation of historic events. I believe that Ukrainian historians will come along who will write the history of the founding and development

of the Ukrainian Socialist State better than the Muscovites who have begun to do so even though it would be better if they would leave it alone. (4)

With Pyotr Yakir Against Restalinization

There was, of course, a large group of Soviet historians during the Khrushchev years which was very active in calling for rehabilitations. Following Khrushchev's removal from office, a systematic offensive was begun against these historians, with Leonid Brezhnev's blessings. Snegov was one of the decisive opponents of this offensive. Various documents have turned up in the West confirming this.

On 17 and 18 June 1964, shortly before Khrushchev's fall from power, a discussion took place at the Institute for the History of the Soviet Union at the Academy of Sciences in Moscow on the draft of the ninth volume of the Istoriya SSR s drevneyshikh vremen, dealing with the developments from 1933 to 1940. A. Snegov participated in this discussion. At one point, he was reported to have said:

It is not history when the truth is not told. In many works of the 1930's, praise was mixed with lies, and they called it history. In volume nine, all the artificial hindrances to progress at that time should be revealed. Kaganovich's role should be explained. 1930 was the hardest year for our agriculture. In volume nine, reference should be made to the difficulties which Stalin personally had created during collectivization, and an explanation should be made of how collectivization was able to progress in spite of these difficulties. A propos the "cult"; How much real opposition to Stalin existed? Probably none whatsoever. Was it necessary, then, to shoot Kamenev and Zinoviev as spies. (Here, Snegov is interrupted by cries of "No!") In the ninth volume, explanation should be made of who signed the false documents during the trials .... What role did the struggle against Trotsky play? Was that, too, perhaps nonsense? If there were only 12 Trotskyists in the concentration camps, does that mean perhaps that the other 80,000 were Leninists? The Soviet historians continually repeat the Stalinist formulations about "rightist" and "leftist" Trotskyists. More intelligent formulations must be found. All of this only [serves to] desecrate our flag throughout the world. Nothing has done more damage to the cause of socialism than Stalin's deeds in the 1930's. (5)



Another document from the period of the famous Nekrich discussion (early 1966) confirms that Snegov has opposed re-Stalinization tendencies with all his might. During the discussion of A. Nekrich's book 22 June 1941 at the Institute for Marxism-Leninism at the CPSU CC on 16 February 1966, Snegov supported the progressive group of historians and referred to Nekrich's book as "honest and useful." He protested against the fact that Nekrich's book, in which Stalin was attacked, was subjected so rapidly to discussion and even condemnation, "while the book by the well-known forger of Party history, I. Petrov, in which many positive acts are attributed to Stalin, [acts] which he never carried out, has been waiting for years to be discussed." Snegov recalled that Stalin had had all the Polish communists who had come to Moscow as delegates to the 17th Party Congress shot. The Russian historian Professor G.A. Deborin reacted negatively to Snegov's statements, saying that he had heard the very same words from Professor Jaconson from the Federal Republic of Germany shortly before:

It is curious that Snegov shares this opinion. Comrade Snegov should tell us which camp he really belongs to!

Snegov's rapid-fire answer was clear enough:

I come from Kolyma! (6)

Today, Snegov is 75 years old, and a class-two invalid. As far as is known, he, was relieved of all duties and posts at the end of 1968. The decision by his Party organization organization to expel him from the Party symbolizes the line which has been established within the Party bureaucracy following Khrushchev's removal and especially following the invasion of Czechoslovakia. In fact, rehabilitations of the victims of Stalinist terror have been halted completely since 1968. Occasionally, a biography of a prominent victim of the liquidation appears, but never is reference made to the manner in which he died. The younger generations are obviously not supposed to learn about the events in the 1930's and the crimes committed against Party and state functionaries, against the military cadres and the intelligentsia. All the more reason the bureaucracy should try to silence Snegov.

- (1) See also Ukrainski Visti, 31 October 1971.
- (2) Voprosy istorii, No. 3, 1956.
- (3) See Partiynaya zhizn, No. 12, June 1958, in which appeared an article by S.V. Chervonenko, "Pod znamenem Marksizma-Leninizma."
- (4) "XX.Sjezd KPSS," speech by Mikoyan, (XX. Party Congress of the CPSU), Vol. 1, p. 326.
- (5) Kultura, No. 5, 1965, p. 125.
- (6) The report on this conference first appeared in the left-socialist paper La Sinestra (1 October 1966), and later in Posev (13 January 1967) and Kultura, No. 4, 1967,