

**ANDRES TARAND**

**LITTERAE NON ERUBESCUNT**

**DIARY 1980 – ....**

**Andres Tarand** (1940) a climatologist and a public figure interested in politics all his life. In the years of Soviet occupation he could do research but had to keep his other interest a secret, so it could not be a full-time occupation. When Estonia regained independence, he became a full-time state official and public figure, doing research only in his free time.

Andres Tarand started his career at the Tallinn Botanic Gardens where he worked at different posts beginning as a junior researcher and being also director and research director (1965-1990). He was elected to the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Estonia (1990) and to the 7th, 8th, 9th and 10th Estonian National Assembly (Parliament) (1992-2003) and the European Parliament (2004). He was minister of the environment in 1992-1994 and Prime Minister in 1994-1995.

## INTRODUCTION

This book is my diary, kept during a couple of years in the 1980s. The decade was a turning-point for most of the nations who belonged to the so-called socialist camp. Some of them, though, are still struggling with immense internal difficulties.

*The Letter of 40* that was an acute irritant to the authorities at the time, was characteristic only of Estonia, where the main aim was to protect and preserve the national language. The publication was partly caused by youth's demonstrations in the autumn of 1980 but the actual reason for it was the Russification that followed the secret decree of the Communist Party in 1978. I have no wish to diminish the role of the other nations, undermining the supports of the Soviet empire, be it the revolt in East Germany or the activities of the Polish *Solidarność* up to 1980 but I would like to emphasize that the fear of losing one's native language is obviously inversely proportional to the size of the nation.

I believe it would not be fitting to offer historical judgement on the events that happened 25 years ago with a hindsight. That is why I offer only the text of my diary as I wrote it, understanding the atmosphere as it was then. Here and there this authenticity might become a little encumbering for the reader today. For example, the lengthy and detailed description of my removal from the post of research director at the Botanic Gardens in Chapter 7, might be rather onerous to read. My excuse now is that then it seemed unjust to burden my family and friends with the topic, and the diary was the only possibility to clarify my spirit and soul.

Hereby I would like to quote Max Jakobson, one of the brightest stars in the constellation of modern Nordic thinkers. He wrote about the events after a quarter of a century as follows:

"The sign of the changes that had taken place in the Estonians' thinking was the youth's demonstration in October 1980. It was caused by an insignificant event but the authorities reacted by taking severe measures. Several young people were arrested and accused of hooliganism. The authorities began to search for foreign agents. But what happened then was quite unexpected.

Forty representatives of Estonian intellectuals compiled a letter to support the youth. It was quite reasonable in its tone but in the current situation it showed great courage. The letter argued that Estonians felt uncertain about their future and there were many reasons for that. The percentage of Estonians in the population had considerably decreased, especially in Tallinn; the use of the Estonian language in everyday life, official business and science had been limited, Estonian newspapers, journals and many books were hard to get; the importance of the Russian language was realised diminishing that of the Estonian language. The letter ended with a demand that the Estonian native people must have the right to decide the future of their country and nation, every Estonian residing in the country must be able to obtain secondary and higher education as well as deal with all official, oral and written, business in their native language.

The letter was not published in newspapers but it changed hands and spread widely in all the layers of the Estonian society. The authors were not arrested or shot but no concession was made either. Still, the letter forecast that the long-prevailing atmosphere of fear in Estonia began to diffuse." (Max Jakobson, *Tilinpäätos*, 2003)

It goes without saying that a diary text that is 25 years old and was not written with publishing in mind, needs comments on earlier and later time. I have written these comments in Italics and, while quoting documents of the time, used inverted commas and Italics. Naturally, after such a long time, comments were necessary but I am still

not sure about the footnotes. I mean that quite a lot of things that were understood at the time, have been forgotten today. I have decided not to repeat the material used in the book *Letter of 40* that was written together with Rein Ruutsoo and Sirje Kiin in 1989 when our expectations of liberations were high. There are a few exceptions concerning quotes from the diary in the above publication. Changes in the text compared to the original diary are minimal and are basically linguistic not contextual. Some chapters that had only Roman numbers for titles have been given headlines.

Speaking about people, I have used their first names and surnames, sometimes the initial with a surname and sometimes a nickname as it is common among friends. That is why I have included a name register at the end of the book, where the reader can find the full name and the post of the "character". I have to admit that in several cases I could not determine the basic field of activity, as the person's jobs and activities varied. My being rather liberal with that is partly due to the fact that in the Soviet Union offices and enterprises bore long and clumsy names that were frequently changed. Had I observed all these changes, my register would have become a mini-research.

I would like to express my gratitude to the wide and largely anonymous public, whose support in the 1980s gave me unforgettable impressions.

3 October 2005  
Andres Tarand

# 1 SOMETHING IS GERMINATING

I believe that more serious hints about further action following the schoolchildren's demonstrations on 1 October<sup>1</sup> were given to me in the week that began on 13 October, when Tiia Toomet suggested that I should compose the text. I agreed that it would be better if Jaan Kaplinski stayed behind the scenes, although his text would be highly appreciated. Kaplinski arrived in Tallinn on 15 October to find Erkkä Maula in his hotel. As I could not leave the Tallinn Botanic Gardens (later the TBG in the text.) in the daytime, we met at my home in the evening. The Finnish interdisciplinarian came together with a young woman he had taken along for his entertainment on the trip. Maula monopolised the conversation and kept on talking about the attempts of mankind to orientate in the space and time, until Jaan had to leave to catch his last bus. We agreed to meet in more peaceful surroundings at the River Emajõgi on 18 October.

On Saturday then, I got there in total darkness by taxi, was introduced to the domesticated sparrow and six-month-old Lemmit and, among other things, a rather lengthy outline for the memorandum. We decided that the note should be shorter and not so detailed in facts but something easily digestible for omnivores. Meanwhile the sparrow managed to leave an indelible mark on my light trousers. I got into the Hotel Park at 1 a.m.

Kaplinski came to us with a primary copy of the letter on 20 October. Armed with that copy I met Juhan Viiding and Tõnis Rätsep at the *Kuku* on the evening of 22 October. This was the first of many meetings and discussions about the content as well as technical problems. The next evening we met again at the same place and we agreed upon the first typed copy so that the talks with the possible authors would be more concrete. In order to obtain this we met at the Ruutsoos in Kiire Street, on the late evening of 24 October. I went there straight from a party of the Meat and Dairy Combine in Kiisa, where I had been asked to talk about the Roman Club. R. Ruutsoo, T. Rätsep, J. Viiding and I participated in rewriting and putting finishing touches to the text. We took great pains with the beginning and not so much with the end of the text as we got tired in the early hours of the new day. We took taxicabs to our homes only after 3 a.m.

The next morning at the TBG, waiting for our secretary, I studied the old records of weather observations in Viidumäe and did not even glance at the copy. When she arrived, we started typing. The workday in the former President Päts' kitchen<sup>2</sup> resulted in 10 Estonian copies of the letter, 4 of which I took to Tartu on Monday 27 October. I do not remember, whether Viiding and Ruutsoo got their 4 copies at the weekend, but beginning from Monday the authors had a chance to study their creation. I showed the text to Tiia Toomet and Jaan Kaplinski in Tartu and they approved of it in principle. We compiled a provisory list of Tallinn and Tartu authors separately and determined the optimal number from 25 to 40. In Tartu only Marju Lauristin and

---

<sup>1</sup> The schoolchildren's demonstration in Tallinn in 1980 on which criminal proceedings based on the ESSR Criminal Code § 194/3 were initiated on 9 October. The investigation was prolonged four times and it was concluded on 29 May 1981. An investigation group at the ESSR Prosecutor's Office, supervised by the investigator of especially important matters R. Jaup was formed. The group included senior investigator L. Petter from the prosecutor's office, investigator A. Ots from the KGB, investigator G. Smirnova from the transport militia department and senior inspector M. Paeküla from the staff inspection.

<sup>2</sup> The Tallinn Botanical Gardens were housed on the farm of President Konstantin Päts. The farm was appropriated and nationalised after Päts' arrest by the communists.

Peeter Vihalemm had been approached and their reaction was not positive enough, as they excused their distancing from the letter with their urgent and necessary work at the university journalism department.

We left their home to take our different routes – I to catch the 6 p.m. bus to Tallinn, Jaan to hunt for signatures. We had been discussing asking Betti Alver (whom I excluded out of great personal respect)<sup>3</sup> Kersti Merilaas, Sulev Vahtre, Jaan Tooming, Lehte Hainsalu, Kaur Alttoa, Ain Kaalep and some others.

At the Tallinn bus terminal I encountered Hando Runnel, to whom I spoke about the campaign and whose wife refused to acknowledge me as a relative. Runnel promised to contact Kaplinski himself. On Tuesday nothing significant happened but I got a few telephone numbers and arranged several meetings for Wednesday morning. I had been invited to play bridge at Enn Soosaar's at 6.30 p.m. and I arrived there a little early to show him the text. Enquiring about the possibility of the clergy signing the memorandum I got the reply that I should leave them alone as they already were persecuted enough (?). I agreed as I had heard that some of the clergy were accused of agitating at the events of October 1 and seconded Enn's cautious viewpoint. We had agreed beforehand that none of the signature hunters would behave aggressively and every candidate should have the opportunity to act according to his or her principles and the current situation. As for me, I was trying to do just that and I do hope that not a single really painful situation ensued. I have to admit, though, that my interest in old friends' and more recent acquaintances' conduct was intense and I experienced really pleasant and unexpectedly unpleasant moments, discovering how much the reality differed from my prognosis.

My first move was to go to the Nature Protection Board, where the meeting with Madis Aruja took longer than I had expected, as he was kept very busy.<sup>4</sup> He gave me a positive answer but asked for a day's postponement of the act itself, as he wanted to warn his pregnant wife<sup>5</sup> about the matter. I asked Madis about the possibility of Veljo Ranniku's signature but Madis advised me not to take the matter further, as Ranniku had been arrested as a student for spreading political jokes. I quite agreed. I arranged meeting Rein Tamsalu and Priit Pärn on the morning of 29 October. As we collected the signatures on several sheets simultaneously, I do not have chronological data and, naturally, any record of the others' activity. On the evening of 28th, after bridge with Ülo Tedre and Ott Ojamaa, to whom I did not speak about the matter, as I did not know them well enough, we had a meeting with Juhan Viiding and Ülo Kaevats at the Ruutsoos. I remember we reported our first success, discussed new candidates and redacted a few sentences.

The Arujas were the first on the morning of the 29th. We discussed the possible repercussions and before Priit Pärn arrived, Madis' signature was there. It came voluntarily and with a certainty of a person who had thought about the matter thoroughly. The conduct of the cartoonist, however, was vacillating and he did not even glance at the signed sheets on the table. Although he asked for time to think it over, it smelled of abstaining. Bill<sup>6</sup>, who had arrived shortly after Pärn, signed without batting an eyelid, just as I had thought he would. As agreed before, we went with Bill to academician Alumäe, calculating that there was a 6 to 4 chance of success. On our

---

<sup>3</sup> Outstanding Estonian poetess B. Alver (1906-1989) was for me a model of ethics and morals about whose safety I was worried.

<sup>4</sup> Madis Aruja was the vice-director of the board at the time.

<sup>5</sup> Asta Aruja

<sup>6</sup> The nickname of Rein Tammsalu

way we encountered Heinz Valk at the cinema *Sõprus* and I gave him a brief outline of the action. We agreed to meet for lunch at the *Kuku* Club to discuss the matter.

We had quite a long wait behind the door of Nikolai Alumäe and when we finally were invited in, he expressed his astonishment again that Tamsalu and Tarand were together. Bill enlightened him about our common university years and I passed the academician the text without further ceremony or delay. He seemed to be engrossed and it took him a long time to read it through. When he finally put it aside, he went into a lengthy semi-allegorical story about a Ukrainian he used to know. I never caught the meaning of the story: this first Ukrainian called another who studied in Moscow a traitor to his people although the latter was an excellent scientist in cybernetics and served his people more (were they his people, indeed?). Alumäe's talk was didactic and appealed to us to stop the proceedings. It would be useless as the real strategy was to achieve something great in art or science that would enable one to get closer to the superior local vassals and give them good advice. His examples were about his brother Vladimir Alumäe, director of the Tallinn Conservatoire, who had got close to Käbin at some party and asked him money for a new building. He did not get it, as Käbin had just come from Võrumaa and seen the terrible condition of the hospitals there. And the communist party leader had confessed that there was no money for the hospitals either. This was to show us that in a small country nobody can do anything. I argued against his theory of the top with that of the pyramid and said that the top men of Estonian origin would find it difficult to retain the top if the foundation layers dissolved in alcohol or in hopeless depression. I added that the old peasants' tenacity that held the top up would not necessarily achieve the same in urban society and it would be worth a lot to encourage the foundation of the pyramid. Alumäe continued persisting about the importance of tops, giving Veljo Tormis and the great humanist Jaan Kaplinski as his examples but by and by he slowed down and stopped reforming us. Suddenly, and with a great emotion, he burst out that the worst was the total lie we lived in and gave more examples. When an hour had passed he said he considered it impossible to sign. I asked my last question about his fellow academicians' possible signatures. Why did he say that it was a good question, I have no idea, but after scratching his head Alumäe advised us to approach Gustav Naan with nobody as a witness ...

Here I evidently have to make my first insert in the diary text. Gustav Naan who for some time had published (relatively) critical articles on the Soviet system, had by that time returned to his Stalinist childhood as it had been and seemed to an offspring of Estonian resettlers in the Far East. The turning point for him, evidently, occurred at a young biologists' seminar held in the Sangaste manor, where the young men asked him a yes- or no- question about taking sides if the hour of truth came at the current moment. The academician had become furious and chosen the side against "the fascists and their hangers-on". Many years later, either in 2003 or early 2004, Peeter Tulviste gave me Naan's note written to the Central Committee of the Communist Party in connection with the *Letter of 40*. Somebody had found it in the party archives. I hope the finder would forgive me for translating and publishing it here in order to clarify Naan's choices for now and ever.

In his note to the Central Committee of the Communist Party dated 24 June 1981, Gustav Joganovich Naan (this is how he calls himself in the head that is titled "Ideas on Ideological Situation") states the following:

*"I consider it my duty as a communist to express sincere concern based on the concrete analysis of a concrete situation and personal experience gained from more than forty-year-long propagandist and ideological work.*

*1. When an extremely unpleasant situation arises there is always a temptation to think like a maiden did, discovering a growing bump: perhaps the growth will reverse.*

*IT WILL NOT! All sort of concessions and compromise with the scum would be treated as a sign of our weakness and as a signal to increase the pressure. Anyway, until the antisocialist forces in Poland have not been defeated.*

*With a precise sharpshooter's theory we have to squash the "gang of forty" and those who might support them; we have to swat them down and never let them rise again or, even worse, counterattack. At least three attempts of counterattack have been made in newspapers already. The most brazen of them is, of course, A. Valton's attack against the "sick" Soviet society and praise for J. Kaplinski.*

*War is war. Considering that the enemy would not forget to use whatever means to achieve their goal, we should establish the post of a "channeller" (like in the general headquarters), i.e. a person who would carefully follow the action of the above-mentioned group and work out plans for fast and precise counterstrokes.*

*2. This is a really unnatural situation when Naan is expected to shoot alone and the rest of the intellectuals, especially communists, writers and social scientists are genially neutral (and that to the ideological enemy!) or even worse – secretly snickering.*

*Thus, when one benefits, he asks "where is my big spoon"? But when the party has to suffer pressure from the scum he says "my cottage is far away, let's see what happens".<sup>7</sup>*

*It is not only the issue of ethics. My former brethren in arms have asked me why the writers keep quiet. Aren't they convinced that the Soviet system will prevail?*

*We must not let doubt and disorder spread. Clarity is necessary for friends and enemies both. Let the people who dream about overthrowing the Soviet order and secession from the Soviet Union clearly understand: they may dream but at the same time they have to work for us, for the benefit of Bolsheviks. Or otherwise they will really suffer!*

*We have to force five or six communists to state their position publicly. It is possible that in order to get these half a dozen about a score or more should be addressed first. Some of them might discover that they are totally unable to carry out ideological work (in social sciences at the moment there is so much scholasticism and disengagement in social sciences at the moment that one needs a big scoop to remove it). Others refuse to spoil their relationship with the kaplinskis and valtons. But this is even beneficial: we'll get to know 'who is who'<sup>8</sup>. In the ideological work (and I mean it in the whole country) is too much roughness and density. The enemy's "fine moves" have been underrated. None of them starts with "down the socialism!" The Chechoslovakian experience of 1968 and the Polish one in 1980 show that the decay starts with innocent, almost academical "discussions", "personal viewpoints" etc. Obviously the most effective method is to undermine science and reason. It is interesting to note that "ours" have quickly discovered the method: Valton comes out with an idea about the non-existence of truth and the existence of opinions only and*

---

<sup>7</sup> Naan, who got his education in the Russian language, uses only Russian metafores and sayings, that here are given in word-by-word translation (Translator.)

<sup>8</sup> In the original letter Naan uses the Russian 'kto jest hu' that has a rather obscene meaning.

*Kaplinski claims that the intellect is the servant of emotions and has been forever, since the Stone Age already.*

*Such ideas have to be unmasked in a qualified way. Some newspapers like "Sirp ja Vasar" plan to organise a circus that they call discussion on the topic who was right – Darwin and Marx or the Old Testament and Kaplinski. (Darwin and Marx will be used under the pseudonym Naan but the readers are not stupid, they will understand why it all is being done.) I am not afraid of the discussion and I will disperse a hundred Kaplinskis with ten Valtons and Andresens to boot as on my side is the whole modern science and they have nothing besides the Old Testament and their fears and hopes and petty-bourgeois demagogy.*

*Let us ask: is this circus necessary in the ideological and political aspect? Its meaning is nothing else but rehabilitate the leader (Kaplinski). As the article "Homo Mutans"(Changing man)<sup>9</sup> hit the bull's eye and took Kaplinski's rating down to zero among the big (able to think) part of intellectuals. He has always attempted to seem an erudite, a refined man, and suddenly it was revealed that the emperor was naked: instead of erudition blind ignorance, instead of intellectual refinement only vulgar common sense and declamations.*

*So, I suppose that we have to strike just at this point as the most sensitive: "national heroes" are futile, uneducated chatterboxes. These chatterboxes are no danger to us, few people will join them, to find a new "hero" will take time. And this would be a good result.*

*We have to overcome the strange respect people feel for some humanitarian authorities. It is actually easy: a good tailor or a good poet needn't be competent in thinking techniques, entropy or the Paleolithicum.*

*It would not be sensible to squash the owners of signatures totally: let them publish their little poems, pick bones with each other and praise the Soviet order... but they should never be let to arrange a counterattack or even to walk around as heroes – this is something we do not need at all.*

*We have many opportunities and we are strong. This strength has to be organised. But it is the most essential, I repeat, not to believe that the growth will reverse.*

*It would make me happy if this letter were read by all the members and candidate members of the Central Committee bureau. The time when ideology is everybody's business is here."*

Member of the CPSU /signature/ G. Naan

This letter was written half a year later than the events in my diary. So – back to October 1980.

I asked what he thought of Parmasto and Alumäe said yes and added also Raukas' name. This was the end of our visit. Bill and I both thought that we should have given Alumäe more time as his attitude was gradually changing during our conversation. At home I asked the night doorbell to be answered but the bell did not ring this time. The experience brought us to the conclusion that we won't go to Parmasto to waste time and we had not considered Raukas before and decided not to do it then either.<sup>10</sup> Thus

---

<sup>9</sup> An article written by G. Naan

<sup>10</sup> As far as A. Raukas is concerned I admit I'll never know how right I was in my assessment. Even before the events described here, Raukas offered intercession to professor Sergei Zilitinkevitch who was in a Gorki oblast prison. I would like to present here the Russian-English translation of his letter to the head of the 5th department N.V.Komshin on 18 June 1982: "Sergei Sergeyeovich Zilitinkevich, sentenced to five years imprisonment based on §170 II part 92g II and 175 Russian Soviet Federative

the academicians were out of the game, as the young philosophers considered getting Naan's signature practically non-existent. The possibility Päll occurred to be a mistake but more about it later on.

On the same Wednesday I had agreed to meet Andres Sööt, who was about twenty minutes late, came, read the letter and signed after a few hesitating questions. It had taken an hour and I had to hurry to meet H. Valk and also Bill, who had gone to talk to Rein Saluri. Bill said that Saluri had read the letter through and decided there and then, "I will not sign, my family will starve." Later A.Valton commented, "Strange that his family does not starve when he spends hundreds of roubles on drinks in the Kuku Club." When we got to the club, it turned out that it had been reserved for some party and even when we got in through the back door, we still did not find Valk there. In front of the building we encountered Jaan Klysheiko, to whom we quickly gave a survey of the matter. We entered the hall of the Artists' Union, where Klysheiko read the letter through, meanwhile replying to the greetings of passers-by. We could not trace H. Valk in his office either but obtained his telephone number and Bill was to use it. Klysheiko offered a few reductions and signed with a truly pleasant naturalness.

I do not remember whether I managed to go to work at all that day, as already after four we met again with Bill. He said that the search for Valk had ended in a fiasco and suggested we should try Rein Aun, an Olympic silver medal winner in decathlon, who would represent our athletes. I was not against the idea of extending the walks of life, and we went to Lilleküla, where I had warned the Aimlas of the pending visit and Bill had phoned to the Astoks who lived in the same house. After some generalities that actually aren't generalities when old friends meet, I took the bull by the horns and passed the text to Priit. Mari-Ann Aimla made coffee. Priit read, did not ask anything, said he would prefer a more trenchant text but agreed to sign it as it was. There was not a single forced moment either when Mari-Ann had read the letter. We talked longer than I had planned and we mentioned the other people who had signed or refused to do it. The Aimlas were sure that Juhan Saar would sign and I was inclined to agree. We also mentioned Priit Pärn, whose skunky behaviour did not surprise Mari-Ann at all, although Priit Aimla was as surprised as I had been. Surprisingly enough the *lupus in fabula* dropped in while out jogging, and I could not resist the temptation to talk about the matter again. Pärn's reasoning, although he did not yet justify his refusal, were about his expected shooting a film in Åland and the great value of his trips abroad but also about the necessity of his great deeds through his art. I did not reject his proposal to call me next morning although I was sure what the result would be. And sure enough, he said no. All in all, the result of the talks with two Priits was contrary to what I had expected. I had considered Pärn more radical and Aimla more fond of his creature comforts. I think that my cousin Priit Aimla made me happiest of all during these talks, although my initial doubts about him still mar my happiness a little.

---

Socialist Republic Criminal Code, is a subject of the Special Commandery in the town of Vyksa. S.S. Zilitinkevich is Doctor of Physics and Mathematics, professor, and a specialist of world renown in atmospheric and ocean physics. We consider his services as a specialist essential. Taking into account that in July 1982 2/3 of his sentence will be done, we apply to you to launch the procedure of his release ahead of time. In case the answer to the plea is positive we propose S.S. Zilitinkevich should start working at the Tallinn Botanical Gardens under the ESSR Academy of Sciences, where research coinciding with professor Zilitinkevich's speciality is being carried out. Academician-secretary A.V. Raukas." I would like to add that the professor was to work in the department I was supervising at the time. He did not come to work in Tallinn and at the time of Gorbachov he left the Soviet Union and has since worked at Aarhus, Hamburg, Uppsala and Helsinki Universities.

Thinking about it a bit later I believe that my mistake was partly due to Saluri's past propaganda that can be explained by the story Aimla told me later about their meeting long ago in a bus to Kohtla-Järve, where the young author Saluri gave Aimla one of his first manuscripts to peruse. Priit said at once that he found the piece no good. On the other hand, I might have been influenced by Juhan Viiding's remarks about Aimla's communal humour that I myself also considered a sort of the society's accident valve but a pseudo one at that. It is quite another matter that criticism on production should not influence the making of ethical decisions. Moreover, one also has to account for the variegated tastes of the many layers of art consumers in the society – tastes differ.

I spoke about all this in greater detail because I noticed then and later as well the somewhat strange ripples in the reflections of the authors' mutual appreciation and criticism (e.g. Runnel and Kaplinski) that is definitely not good when undertakings like ours had to be concluded. I am not ready to analyse it in a greater detail here as I do not have more ideas on the subject but I guess it might be the age-old division of labour within the guild and the concurrent pretensions to the monopoly of form. I had thought, and I would still like to think that writers should rise above such pretensions when the essential problems of the society are being deliberated. It might be some groundless idealisation of writers on my part, though.

That day, on the 29 October, I met Ita Saks who was convinced she had to sign and was not specially interested in the tone and phraseology of the letter. I mean, it was the ACT that counted with her and not the nuances in style. Having finally come home, I got a phone call from Andres Sööt, who wanted to talk. He came to my place from assembling the film about the Olympic games and seemed to be quietly sure that he wanted to take his signature back. He seemed to reason for his own sake more than for mine, and it mostly concerned his father, who had taken part in the movement of the **League of Veterans**; himself, who had been deported to Siberia for seven years; and especially the difficulties with the film mafia that was eagerly waiting for additional fuel to punish and sack him. Our talk about all this inclined to turn almost emotional that came from sympathy, I do hope – mutual. It is difficult to say why Andres Sööt's argument about fearing the disruption of his work seemed more real to me than that of Priit Pärn. I believe it is partly due to my subjective appreciation of both men's creation – I consider Sööt's work of greater significance. It is also possible that I am influenced by the Stalin-time trip to the east and the meaning of it to one and the other – who was sent there and who not, I mean. To conclude the tea and the talk I offered Sööt two volumes of W. Tooming's memoirs to help him clarify his father's activities. He grabbed them with pleasure and left to continue his work in the studio.

I left home together with him to go to the Ruutsoos to discuss the impressions and weigh the opinions expressed. By that time the night-watch at least up to 3 a.m. had become a tradition. I also remember that in two cases people smilingly thanked me for trusting them that gave me a very pleasant feeling (Ita Saks and Priit Aimla).

On the morning of 30 October I worked in my office, although before going there I had tried to catch Juhan Saar. The Puppet Theatre confirmed that Saar was at a festival in Pärnu and may return to Tallinn on Friday. I also called Fred Jüssi who said he would leave town at 4 p.m. I managed to get to their cooperative flat half an hour before. He read the text, passed it to his wife Helju and while packing, promised to think about it and tell me the next day. I proposed my home as the place and eight o'clock as the time.

I got home on time to meet Bill and heard that Villu Astok had not refused point-blank but the refusal could be sensed. In case he would have been interested, he could

contact us. As for Rein Aun, he had recently beaten up his wife's lover and the court-case was yet pending, so his signature was not welcome.

The same evening I visited Jaan Kross and Ellen Niit with whom we talked over two hours. I wanted to come to a conclusion and started to collect papers (just like with Enn Soosaar, although the reasons were different). Ellen Niit was ready to grab her pen and said, "I will sign!" Jaan Kross jokingly commented that as two from one family were not acceptable what would happen to him. I said that the repressions would evidently be confined to removal of privileges like going abroad. Ellen Niit said that she would like to go abroad and asked, "What do you think, Jaan, should we give it more thought?" So this was their decision and I said I should have their answer by Friday evening. At midnight I visited the Ruutsoos again. Rein had arrived home from Tartu and was sleepy but his news were good: Marju Lauristin, Aira Kaal and some others had signed. I told them also that Friday, 31 October should be the last day to make corrections as the weekend should be dedicated to type the letter out and this should go undisturbed.

On Friday it turned out that Juhan Saar won't be back on time and Kalju Komissarov was at the hospital. Going home I encountered H. Valk in Vana-Posti Street. He turned his left shoulder (in order to turn his back to me) but could not quite manage that due to the narrow pavement. We exchanged a greeting and again body language expressed the situation clearly, we both went our own way.

I had to deal with numerous trifles at the office where I had recently spent very little time. After a few hours we took a taxicab and, having dropped in the Engineers' House on the way to get the royalties for a lecture, we landed upstairs in the café *Tallinn* for a short relaxation. Here we agreed to work through the weekend at the TBG. Later I phoned flat no 6 and asked Ellen Niit whether I should drag my weary feet up to them. She said she considered some conversation necessary and so up I climbed. Jaan Kross told me that Juhan Viiding had visited them last night but had not asked for the signature and they had not asked Juhan anything. I admitted that Juhan's and my activities were not totally co-ordinated. Having spoken about the general situation some more, the couple announced that they considered signing wrong at the moment. Ellen Niit said that Jaan was at his best then and Jaan said he would sign were he 40 or 80. That last thing excluded, everything went smoothly and I considered it necessary to add that I did not need any justifications. In order to be polite I asked how the whole matter seemed through a lawyer's eye and before answering Kross read the text through once again. I retreated in case of Andresen whom I had thought to be ready to sign. I was evidently infected by Juhan Viiding's optimism about the minister of foreign affairs in Vares' government<sup>11</sup>. This man was the greatest disappointment to Juhan. ("I want to live for three more years and not in Siberia," he had said.)

The visit to Kross and Niit was not a disappointment to me because I had foreseen the result. Later Ita Saks and Arno Pukk said that even asking Kross had been wrong as his work alone was great and important enough. Leaving them I promised to keep them informed and they thanked me for trusting them. To tell the truth – I myself fished for it, saying that this is what nice people do. Thus the session ended on a joke.

The evening was not yet over and we gathered at the Ruutsoos for our final debate. The Ruutsoos, Rätsep, Kaevats, Viiding and I read the text sentence by sentence, keeping in mind the remarks made by M.Hint, M.Lauristin, L.Valt, J.Klysheiko, A.

---

<sup>11</sup> Nigol Andresen (1899-1985), minister of foreign affairs in Vares' cabinet, i.e. the first communist government in Estonia after the 1940 Soviet occupation.

Pukk, L.Karu and some others. We accepted some of the corrections and rejected some others. We paid much attention to the use of the acronym ESSR<sup>12</sup> that was not in the initial text at all and came up later. It occurred in the title thanks to Juhan Viiding's reasoning that no one would need to send such a letter from Estonia. When we had reworded the ending that had been rather troublesome (whether to study the national issue first and then offer a solution, how to phrase it), A. Valton arrived and made two more corrections in the emphasis that were all approved. The rest of the conversation concerned the possible repercussions and the possible action of the KGB that we actually sneered at. We had been acting within the legal framework but the Soviet citizen's sense of reality could apprehend danger even so. Eventually, Valton suggested that more signatures should be obtained next week, first – the more the better and second, half-jokingly – he will certainly have left for Australia by the time all hell broke loose. The others seemed to be unsure and that is why I argued that the longer we take, the more danger for the whole undertaking there will be. Given time, provocative (and false) letters may be created, the greater amount of signatures would make the KGB even more interested in the organisers and forty representatives mean quite a wide bearing surface. Timing is important, the text can be corrected *ad infinitum* and we have to consider the technical possibilities. Tõnis Rätsep was also against more corrections, saying that this way we might achieve a white sheet which would certainly be best for everybody. Finally we discussed posting the signatures, whether to register the letters or not and decided not to post the first copies as the adversary might simply wipe it under the carpet. We also noticed a small mishap in the Russian translation that Kaevats promised to set right with Igor Tõnurist on Saturday morning.

Several people had promised to give their final agreement at the weekend and there were many phone calls before I could go to Päts' kitchen again on 1 November. Bill was ready to tackle the Russian typewriter but we did not have the final corrections and thus we both worked on the Estonian copy. Under the text was the still open list of names. Kaevats phoned and said Tõnurist was not available and so he had to go to M. Lotman. Thus we got the corrected Russian variant only on 2 November that, as far as I remember, was a word by word translation and not especially skilled. It turned out that Bill was not so good at the Russian typewriter as he had hoped, so we erased and used correction tape on the Russian copies until it got dark. Tõnis Rätsep brought the last signatures after three (A.Üksküla and L.Peterson) and some confirmations came by phone. Eduard Päll and some others refused. As we might have guessed, Päll had no sympathy whatever, although he had always emphasised his Leninist principles in national issues. It also seems that he was the one who betrayed what was going on. I cannot prove it but on Monday afternoon I was given several hints about rumors in the street. And this gave us a signal to make haste.

Sirje Ruutsoo phoned to share some good news – Arvo Valton was to leave Tallinn for Moscow by 6 p.m. train but the Russian copies were still being worked at<sup>13</sup>. Thanks to the fact that I could take our TBG bus, I could manage on time (by the meeting of Sirje Ruutsoo and Valton), only the address of *Pravda* was missing from the envelope. The copies to the Estonian papers had to wait until the next day. Late at night, using the letterpress I had got from Finland, I printed the addresses on the envelopes and admired my handiwork sincerely. On the morning of 4 November at a quarter past eight I dropped both envelopes (to the papers *Rahva Hääl* and *Sovetskaya*

---

<sup>12</sup> The Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic

<sup>13</sup> Letters addressed to the SU government were taken to Moscow by couriers and dropped in a special box located in the Kremlin. The local censors would not have let them through.

*Estoniya*) in the right-hand-side box of the old post office in Karja Street. We had not managed to agree, whether to register the letters or not, whether to add the illegibly written sender's address (it did not seem fitting to write just one name of the forty)... So there was no sender's address at all. That this all did not matter in the least was clear the next day already but this belongs to the second chapter.

## 2 The Letter Received

The second chapter started actually before the first had come to its end. On 3 November a KGB officer appeared at the Institute of History at the Academy of Sciences and wanted to know if Lembit Valt was aware of a letter that was being compiled and demanded that if somebody came asking for his signature, he should inform the organs immediately. This was supposed to be Valt's duty. Valt had said that he did not know anything of the letter. The next day the man called and scolded Valt for trying to deceive him, as he had been informed that Valt had read the letter but not signed it. Valt had asked in his turn, "Do you want to incriminate me also for not blowing up the tower of Munamägi?" The phone had been hung up. The informant to the KGB had evidently been Päll, who had not wasted time and reported on his conversation with Ruutsoo, although he had said that he quite agreed with the content of the letter.

Around noon on Tuesday the letters were delivered at 67a Pärnu Road (The address of the so-called House of Journalism where the editorial offices of the majority of that-time newspapers were. Translator.) There are rumors that the letter sent to the paper *Rahva Hää*l was read by about 10 people and somebody also made a copy of it. This is confirmed by the 5 November statement of Heino Tedre, the minister of forestry and nature protection, to Aruja: the letter sent to *Rahva Hää*l had disappeared. The Central Committee was informed at noon on Tuesday and they got really busy. It is difficult to say whether the KGB got any additional info but they did not even try to hide their activities.

It seems to me that the first discussion about counter activities was held in Rein Ristlaan's office, when the matter had been brought to his notice. Most of the authors' workplaces were confirmed by Tuesday noon and the rest was left for Wednesday. The first to be called out was Mati Unt, who had to go straight to Olaf Utt. The conversation went round and round in the vein like "so you, Unt, have started to deal with politics now". I do not remember anything sensible from the reports on this conversation but, all in all, it was the same as most of the succeeding ones, constructed according to the following:

1. Is the signature yours or written by somebody else?
2. Did you want to take it back?
3. Fatherly advice not to do things this way.
4. What will happen if the letter is smuggled abroad? Would you still want to see your name underneath?
5. Who were the organisers (some names were offered for selection)?
6. The conversation was to be had in a friendly atmosphere.

Excepting the first matter-of-fact question every other one showed the usual arsenal: although writing the letter was legally not a criminal act, intervening in the sphere of the potentates should be treated like one anyhow. On Wednesday J. Tamm was invited to have an audience with minister Lott (that took place on Thursday morning), and M. Aruja with minister Tedre. As already said, Aruja's audience was held in a warm and friendly atmosphere.

Tamm's description of his conversation is different. He got the note on Wednesday and had been consulting the Ruutsoos on the same evening. On Thursday morning he came to me and said that he had told the minister he could not take his signature back even if he wanted to. I was thinking about the fact that the letter must have been received and did not pay attention to the hint that he would like to get one of the copies in his hand (To be able to refute his signature. Editors). Aruja wanted to give

me a résumé of his talks too and Tamm and I departed. Later it turned out (according to Ü. Kaevats) that Lott had been very thorough and threatened Tamm that unless he recanted four people from his department would not be given flats. To this Tamm had reacted by writing in his own hand that he revoked his signature. Not for himself but for the four people in the waiting list for the flat.

In case of Aruja the difference in the talks was in the names of the initiators: writers Unt and Kaplinski and a natural scientist Tarand. Aruja answered to all the questions like most of the people interrogated – nothing further was explained. When I got to the TBG a little after 11 on Wednesday, Martin told me that Kõörna had been waiting for me and Pukk in his office for an hour. As they had not spoken about the reason for it, I gave Martin a short survey and added that we had not included him to keep the institution out of it. Martin seemed to agree with everything. I could work at current duties for a couple of hours and then Martin informed me again that Kõörna still wanted to see me. I called the latter and promised to be in his office in an hour's time. The talk went according to the pattern and there was no discussion on any certain topic. When we had been talking for about ten minutes I asked Kõörna whether he had read the letter himself and the negative answer prompted me to give him one of the Russian copies. He read the names first and perused the text here and there but still considered it necessary to say the text was not good. He was more interested in Kaplinski's participation and the issues pointed out in the scheme. He did not express any opinions of his own and the whole conversation was restrained. Afterwards I thought that he might have feared the bugs in his room and had come to the TBG just to be able to talk more freely but I cannot be sure. A more lively note entered the talk when we argued whether Kõörna could keep the text or not. As foreign press had already been mentioned I argued that leaving the text with him would make me lose control over its further movements. Later I agreed to lend him the text for one day and still later that Kõörna could keep it and when They want it, will pass it to Them but if They do not, he will return the text to me. As I had just asked him who told him to talk to me and he had answered that the Central Committee, naturally, I considered that They were the top men of the latter, although it turned out later that there were others too. Who Kõörna kept in mind remained unknown to me. He never insisted that I should recant my signature but he did ask, whether I stick to my point. I answered calmly that this went without saying. Kõörna seemed most worried about the possibility of the letter getting abroad and asked what he should answer in case he is asked about Tarand's authorship. I did not deny it but said I had not authorised its getting abroad likewise all the rest of the 40. I reminded him of the existence of the VAAP (the all-Union Association of Protection of Authors) whose business it was to mediate such things. He advised that people should go to the functionaries of the Central Committee with their worries. I did not remind him that the White House<sup>14</sup> had too narrow a door for the likes of us but I said that a letter published in a paper should reach everybody interested. We talked nearly an hour and concluded with a warm handshake.

On the same day preceding the October holidays when all the institutes and offices had to increase their watchfulness and seal up all the windows<sup>15</sup> Arnold Koop called out Marju Lauristin and Peeter Tulviste, Endel Sõgel talked to L.Tavel and A. Langemets and Kõörna to R.Ruutsoo. I do not remember anything else reported after

---

<sup>14</sup> The popular name for the building of the Central Committee of the ESSR Communist Party. Translator.

<sup>15</sup> It was customary that all the empty rooms, especially those with typewriters in them, had to be diligently watched by the employees put on a roster.

these talks but A.Langemets' reaction to Sõgel's worry about the letter getting abroad: "it won't unless you send it there". (Sõgel was the only one who said he had read the letter). This worry about the letter getting abroad seemed to be somehow provocative as the letter was addressed clearly to the newspapers and it was difficult to grade it as dissidentism.

I was somewhat surprised at the activity of the KGB. An officer Raus who had been the 'curator'<sup>16</sup> of the Drama Theatre troupe on their trip to Finland, pretending to be a travel mate and friend, had called Viiding and Rätsep at the theatre and said he wanted to meet so much. They did not see any reason for refusing a friendly get together and went to some office on the corner of Hobuse and Lai Streets. This was just another round talk and the officer had been convinced beforehand that they would not tell him who gave them the text to sign and who had composed it. As there had been no official invitation the KGB took only a partial responsibility for it – official quarters were used. It might have been a mistake caused by technical reasons: a taperecorder was too cumbersome to carry along. The actors went to their ordinary coffee place the Acvarium<sup>17</sup> where they were noticed by Viiding's former classmate Rein Bergson. The latter approached them and said that things were not good – he had just seen the prosecutors' sanction to search both men's homes. This was not yet all, Kalju Orro, the long-time dressing room mate of both actors, seemed to be overexcited about 'flying shit' he did not manage to speak about in the dressing room. Tõnis was kind enough to drag him into the green room, where it turned out that Orro also knew about the prosecution sanctions but he did not betray how he knew about them. I can comment only that the last scene shows low-quality organisation or gravely underestimating the partners.

When I heard of it, I appraised it as psychoterror – they hoped something might unravel if they subtly terrorised different people. It is hard to say how much time the Organs had for the letter during these greatest Soviet holidays. No provocation occurred in the TBG during my rota, although I had thought something might happen. They evidently had not managed to analyse the first talks sufficiently yet but some sort of preliminary decision had been made by Sunday, 9 November. Was it totally self-evident or concluded from somebody's talk is hard to say but searchers arrived at Kaplinski's door explaining it with accusations of agitating at the youth's disturbances. We heard about it the next day. The coded phonecall about "the greedy guests who took away granny's birthday cake" was a bit worrying but I could not believe that something that fatuous could happen. On 11 November I called Jaan who confirmed openly that his diary had been confiscated and he had himself offered them a copy of the letter. Naturally, the diary was not written to any of the papers, KGB or censors and that is why it became a kind of source material for them. But all the details in connection with the open letter followed October 1 and did not precede it, thus they could not agitate anybody and even the fabricating KGB officers should have grasped it. The event arouse emotions that were close to fury, but having calmed down I realised that I had overestimated the top vassalry. I had not believed them to be so quick to show the green light to the KGB. We cannot say that the *ohranka*<sup>18</sup> was acting on their own. It would question the role of the party and remind too much of Beria and his time in miniature.

---

<sup>16</sup> With every professionals' and tourists' group abroad there was a KGB officer to keep watch over the group. They were usually introduced to the group as journalists, counsellors, group-leader's assistants etc. Translator.

<sup>17</sup> Popular name of the bar on the corner of Rütli and Harju Streets.

<sup>18</sup> Local department of political police in Russia. Translator.

Monday (10 November) started for me with a visit from startled Saluri who came to tell me about the search at Kaplinski's. I took it seriously at first but then expressed my doubts about the truth of the rumour. When A. Pukk got to the TBG that day, he was told to go to Kõörna at once. As he was well prepared he expressed his surprise at Kõörna's doing the job of press editorial offices and after that explained in detail why he as a communist cannot an audience with higher party officials (like R. Ristlaan, for example) as he is usually stopped already in the regional bureau of the CP. He said that he had had the experience and also that he had imagined life to be different when he was director. Everything else went according to the scheme.

In Tartu Lauristin had talked to Koop again. Koop had expressed his sorrow that Russian Estonians<sup>19</sup> were so deeply disliked here. At a festive meeting on the occasion of Tartu anniversary even Kaarel Ird had condemned them and realised only later that Koop came from the Pihkva Province. The self-pity did not end with that – the rector had complained what a difficult post it was. The same Monday, minister of culture Lott caused undue excitement in Heino Kaljuste, whom he invited to the carpet instead of his son, either by mistake or deliberately, who knows. Curiously enough, the son Tõnu Kaljuse who was at the ministry at the same time arranging documents to go to Hungary or Vienna, was never addressed on the issue.

A little drunk Mati Unt, whom I met at the Viidings', spoke about his second meeting with Utt. The only thing I conceived of their talk was that Utt had said he understood Unt's wish to be a successful Soviet author and an honest man at the same time. This was a complicated endeavour indeed! Some of the following events (clashes in a certain family) showed clearly, however, that people created the horror of the KGB themselves when no exterior reasons even existed and this, in its turn, was Their most effective weapon of all. Otherwise there is very little that would prove the secret service's discernment in this case.

On Tuesday, 11 November, the Television and Radio Committee bosses became active. P.Aimla and later F.Jüssi were interrogated by Slutsk and Penu according to the basic scheme. Fred mentioned that Penu had been sitting hands in front of his face all the time, I am sure he could not bear Fred's innate power. As I had given Fred the text on Sunday, he made both gentlemen read it. Slutsk had perused the letter, Penu only nervously paged it through. The phone had rung three times and when Penu answered, he had only said yes, yes, we are speaking at the moment; yes, yes we are going to finish soon... Somebody was evidently eager to sum up. I had thought that Kaplinski and Jüssi would not be called to these discussions, the first because of his Christ's eyes and the second because of his personal strength that was so much above the interrogators. However, Kaplinski got a chance to look pitingly at the searches of his home who, as he admitted in our phone conversation, had felt really uneasy, and Jüssi could behold Penu's sorrowful figure and eyes hidden behind his hands.

Either on 11 or 12 November Üksküla who had been away from town had a talk with rector Viktor Guryev but I do not know what their talk was like. Ita Saks talked to party secretary Jaak Jõerüüt and it goes without saying that nothing could be expected from this. Jõerüüt, as a true-blue functionary denied having read the letter, although Ita knew that he had talked about it with Sirje Ruutsoo already. On Wednesday evening rumors spread that Aira Kaal had recanted and V.Lõugas had named Kaevats as the one who gave him the letter and insisted that he had read only the rough copy and not agreed with the final one in case it has "some stinking

---

<sup>19</sup> Russian Estonians were offspring of the peasants who emigrated to Russia in the hope of getting land there as a reward for conversion to the Russian Orthodox Church. Translator.

nationalism" (so defined by Maamägi) in it. As for A.Kaal, the truth was never revealed. Lõugas had been worried that his note could be used in the wrong way by the newspaper *Kodumaa*. Some other sources said that Lõugas had been threatened with not getting a flat he had appealed for.

13 November brought along the first repression-like phenomena.<sup>20</sup> The previous day Moidela Tõnisson had called Fred Jüssi to arrange a broadcast but already the next day she backtracked and informed Fred that his face was not to be seen on TV. It was again the local commander Penu who tried to show initiative, just like with Priit Aimla, whose name was cut out from the performance of Baskin's theatre, where it should have been together with a Russian humorist's name. Aimla himself called me on Thursday morning and reported that Laine Soe had told him to go to the vice-editor of the *Rahva Hää*. Having discussed it with some more co-authors, Priit decided not to go, saying that he was only 1/40th of the authors and not competent to speak for all 40. Juhan Viiding also refused to obey the theatre's personnel officer's (!) order to go to talk with prosecuting officer Bergson in room 10 or 20 the next day. As Viiding was to be in Pärnu, he made the personnel officer give him Bergson's phone number and said he would not go. He met Bergson later but I still do not know what the talk was like. Viiding summed it up that the prosecutor who had issued the search warrants on the names of Viiding, Rätsep and Tarand (was this thanks to Kaplinski's diary? <sup>21</sup>) was already sorry he had done it and they had been done because of the youth's disturbances. Nobody was, naturally, launching criminal proceedings due to the letter. Viiding seemed to believe his former classmate but I think it was targeted blackmail, this time better prepared and based on better information.

Martin phoned me also on Thursday and said that he, Pukk and I had been asked to go to Maamägi at 9 on Friday morning. So this was the beginning of Friday. We were kept waiting for a few minutes in the hall. I asked whether anybody knew about Maamägi's presence and were told he was in his office. We marched in. Maamägi said to Martin, " You and Pukk, let Tarand wait!" I reacted with a surprised "ohoo" and out I went, as the lords and masters wished. I waited in the hall behind the door and heard some fragments in Pukk's baritone that was explaining to Maamägi what nationalism is and that the letter had nothing to do with it. In his conversation with me Maamägi remained below average and I remembered having heard that he got his title of academician for his struggle with the bourgeois nationalists and not for his knowledge of history. He wanted to know why I was fighting against the Russian language and if I wasn't I aware, like he was, that the Estonian people had never lived as well as at present. To some of his questions I tried to give argued answers but his talk consisted mostly of curious statements that had nothing to do with the letter. (How important the Russian language is in the army and how Estonians do not know it well enough to get into technical troops?!) The vice-president was also interested what I, as a Soviet citizen, had done for the benefit of the society. I replied that my everyday job should meet the criteria. I expressed my amazement that an open letter to a newspaper caused such a waste of time among the top officials instead of meeting the authors and bring the matter to its conclusion. Maamägi also wanted to know how

---

<sup>20</sup> Actually the first repression was already on 9 November when Fred's 4 minutes of text were cut out of the programme. It was thought that it might have been sacrificed for the sake of the description about the parade in Moscow but it became clear later that it was Penu's orders.

<sup>21</sup> Footnote from the diary: Jaan's diary had nothing much to do with targeting this trio. Quite possibly the info leaked from the Kuku Club where we had some meetings. In the nervous atmosphere created by the KGB and the bosses there were hints about people who had met with stool pigeons but such meetings needn't be classified as snooping, so I do not want to make any conclusions.

long I had been working at the Academy of Sciences and how long as a research director, but why this was necessary, only God knows. To conclude the matter he asked whether I stuck to my viewpoints and I said that I was not a man to change them every week.

Something quite similar happened between Ruutsoo and Maamägi as well, whereas the question why Ruutsoo had not consulted some senior and more experienced colleague got the following answer: "I consulted Eduard Päll, who said he absolutely agreed with what the letter said but would not sign it." This was a nice draw in the score. When Pukk and I were waiting for Martin who had been asked to stay, smiling Kõörna walked by. I stopped him and asked him if anything had been heard about the commission from Moscow (that had arrived on 12 November). Kõörna said that there had been a session about the letter the day before but what was decided he did not know. Martin in his turn said that Maamägi had not threatened him in any way. He obviously did not notice that the threat was included in the sentence about the possibility of the letter getting abroad. Maamägi had said it in connection with the remark about the letter being spread among the people. I said that trying to stop the spread would mean creating an organisation that is prohibited, and that is why we cannot do anything. The most interesting conversation was probably held between Ita Saks and Nikolai Johanson. The secretary of the town party committee had behaved as if they had known each other all their life (although they met for the first time), used Ita's first name only and stated that she had been led astray by "the bearded ones". There was nothing like the national concern, it was an attempt to restore the bourgeois rule. It was led by the *kulaks* or their offspring who somehow had escaped being deported in 1949 and so on and so forth in the most orthodox vein. To the question who showed Ita the text, she had answered mischievously, "I won't tell!" Among other things it had come out that Jaan Kross is a very bad person indeed but Uno Laht a real patriot. The flirting discussion had been concluded in a different tone and been a threat: In case the letter got abroad, all the participants will be considered responsible. Johanson had been extremely well versed in Ita's personal life and biography and made only one mistake – thought that she was married and under her husband's thumb. It is worth mentioning that Johanson had been surprised that Ita had signed only once. As it turned out president Rebane was at the same time talking to guys from Lippmaa's institute and Lippmaa himself was present. This was evidently the first talk to these biophysics and cybernetics boys and it had passed in a congenial vein. Rebane had asked them to address their further letters to him personally and promised that he would grant the secrecy of correspondence. He had been sorry for the lost time he had to dedicate to the matter.

Some more news based on 14 November 1980. M.Lauristin does not believe that A. Kaal recanted. Tõnu Kaljuste had been forced to do it because the formation of his new choir was in danger and somebody had already written out a certification for him. All the participants from Tartu had had a talk with J.Kaarma and everybody was pleased that there had been no unpleasantness. Ruutsoo said that Maamägi was quite close to threatening him about his job and degree.

On Sunday morning (i.e. 16 Nov.) Piret Saluri rang the doorbell and gave me a paper from the public prosecutor's office that she said she had found on the floor near the letterboxes. She left without saying anything more and I thanked her for the trouble. I became a little nervous but, just as I had thought, the summons did not meet the accepted rules. First, the paper was not handed over to me personally, second it had not been entered the register, there was no registration number, third there was no mention why I had been summoned and the signature was illegible. The first reaction

was not to go. A little later Juhan Viiding came with similar summons and said that Tõnis Rätsep had got them as well. The appointed times were 10.30 for Juhan, 2 p.m. for Tõnis and 4 p.m. for me and all of us were to go to room 5. Juhan said that during the last talk with Bergson the latter had advised him that we three should work out a common platform. I believe it was common enough already.

M.Lauristin, P.Vihalemm and the Ruutsoos visited me in the evening. Marju said that the events in Tallinn revealed more panic than in Tartu and was sure the Moscow committee had come because of the youth's disturbances and not the letter. She had had a private talk with A. Slutsk in which the latter had especially emphasised the danger of the letter getting abroad. It turned out that the letter to *Rahva Hää* had been received only on 12 November. The KGB's long hand was suspected, as Päll's information had not included *Sovetskaya Estoniya*. In this case it is amazing that both addresses in the same fount had not attracted attention. Later the KGB had even visited printing houses to find out where the "print" came from<sup>22</sup>. If it really is so, it hints at the solo operations of the KGB and thus the disguised summons to the prosecutor's office were a part of them. The reason was not hard to guess – the main interest was in – where are the signatures. The fear of them published in the *New York Times* had already infected Lauristin as well. I hesitated but finally agreed that Lauristin would give them to R. Ristlaan. How soon it was done was another issue. It was hard to believe that somebody would deny their existence and almost impossible that they would be used under some quite different document. The order of signing would certainly be investigated and some underhand revenge should be expected. The problem was whether passing the signatures to the authorities would calm them down or not. It had no sense to keep them until the letter was published abroad and present it then in court as evidence. As court procedures were as they were, they would not be worth much as evidence. I thought our only trump card would be to keep them secret but all the others considered passing them to Ristlaan sensible before the letter got abroad and I eventually relented.

I must admit, though, that breaking up the forty has been achieved already. It was accomplished in different ways but mostly with half-hidden threats. The best means seems to be the flat that has influenced the behaviour in two cases. The cultural-political chantage that had been supported by Tormis could have been avoided if Tõnu Kaljuste had been left out<sup>23</sup>.

The psychological hooliganism applied to Viiding, Rätsep and me must be preparation for something bigger. If it calms down when Lauristin carries out her plan about Ristlaan, remains to be seen. It is an interesting thing, though, as it allows a glimpse into the relationship of the KGB and the Central Committee of the CP. The other part of the plan is to convene an extended session of the Writers' Union board with some of the authors of the letter present. The authorities could consider the whole thing formally concluded and the public fuss could end. We would pay the price for the signatures.

Something is happening in the editorial offices of the papers as well but I'll talk about it after my meeting with Madis Aruja. On the phone he only said that his meeting with the editor of *Sovetskaya Estoniya*, Turunok had lasted for 1.5 hours and had exhausted Madis. Some others had been called to the editorial offices as well. Everybody alone! 40 x 1.5 hours of Turunok's worktime.

---

<sup>22</sup> The Letterpress mentioned before was obviously as unknown to the KGB like to me before my visit to Finland in 1978. My wish to use it, however, came from an attempt to correctness not playing a game of an underground printing shop.

<sup>23</sup> Not true in Kaljuste's case as he explained it to me in 1988.

Madis came at a quarter past six p.m. on 17 November and gave a survey of his conversation. The beginning was full of polite excuses about the conversation being held in the Russian language, as ..., and a piece of information that comrade Turunok was actually Polish by nationality. His paper, according to foreign estimations (!), was one of the boldest. Some general talk followed, especially about children's vocabulary that contained phrases like "*russkaya svinya*" (a Russian swine. Editors) and "*estonskye fashisty*" (Esonian fascists. Editors) and so on, until the chief editor took the letter through point by point according to pre-prepared notes. Madis thought that he was not quite up to the mark in the issues of bilingualism but in environmental issues the editor had only listened without comments. I got an impression that Madis was intelligent in his talk and sometimes trenchant. He estimated his partner relatively highly as well. An interesting thing was that when Madis pointed out repression-like phenomena, the editor denied the possibility. But when, some time later, Madis offered him an article on nature protection he had written for publication, Turunok said that in the nearest future the publication of it was impossible.

Madis Aruja, who was the vice-director of the Nature Protection Board at the time, later gave me his notes that I publish here as they are a very good example how these talks were arranged.

Madis Aruja's text: *"On 13 November 1980 minister H. Teder calls on the interior phone and wants to see me in his office. He informs me that the editor of the newspaper "Sovetskaya Estoniya" wants to talk to me about the letter in his office at 10.30 on Monday. I promise to go.*

*I try to get some information what kind of a man Turunok is, but the journalists I am familiar with do not know him well.*

*Genrihh Franzovich Turunok – editor of the newspaper "Sovetskaya Estoniya", vice-chairman of the ESSR Journalists' Union, member of the Central Committee of the ESSR CP, Polish by nationality, phone not registered in the town's directory (I got the 440580 in the special directory of ESSR CCCP and Council of Ministers, whereas other editors' phone numbers are available).*

*On 17 November 1980 at 10.30 I arrive, dressed in my uniform, at the editor's office. G. Turunok is a short, stout, grizzled man who keeps smiling and, I dare say, behaves quite jovially with me. We exchange greetings and a handshake. I am asked to sit in the chair opposite his at the desk, although there is a corner with soft furniture in the office. The editor has a sheet of paper filled in tiny handwriting and our letter on his desk. I am amazed to see a seal with "Received on 13 Nov. 1980 A-73" Where was the letter without any registration for 8 days, I wonder.*

*Turunok (T): I am very sorry but we have to talk in Russian. I have no talent for languages.*

*Aruja (A): That is all right, we may do it in Russian. I hope my Russian is digestible to you.*

*T: Your Russian is excellent.*

*A: I guess I can consider myself fluent in the Russian language although it is not always grammatically perfect. On what principle did you select me for this conversation?*

*T: You are not the only one. I have asked other people to come and talk to me (but you asked me through the minister and you do not tell me who the others are, I think). Our editorial office got a letter that we considered anonymous as it had no signatures. (But why the does the letter bear the mark A, the initial of Aimla whose*

signature is alphabetically the first and not the regular An that would signify an anonymous letter?)

A: There is no need to doubt the authenticity of the letter as every one who signed has admitted it in the fartherly talks with their bosses already.

T: The letter is long and discussing it in detail would take too much time. I have several questions to you that we should deliberate. (Glances at his crib.) What is your attitude to the fact that during the disturbances a boy was arrested who had shouted "Heil Hitler!" While he was asked why he had not shouted "Heil Carter!" he answered that he respected Hitler more.

A: How old is this boy?

T: Sixteen.

A: This age should have some independent thinking ability already. Must be very stupid or a total idiot. But what is your attitude to the following fact: In Männiku there was graffiti on the wall – Death to Estonian fascists? Who are these fascists? The young people who came into the streets or their parents?

T: If this is really true, it is very sad. One cannot justify it, it must be condemned.

A: I still remember something really unpleasant from my childhood. I was asked to do some things in town for my granny. All through the day Russian boys were following me shouting "Fascist! Fascist!" only because I was dressed differently from them.

T: Unpleasant indeed. I have a son whose best friends are Estonians. He speaks Estonian fluently, not like me who has no talent for languages. But some Estonian children shout at my son in the yard "Russian swine!" Despite that his best friends are still Estonians. Why are you against bilingualism in your letter?

A: But this is not what we are against! We want normal balance between the two languages. There was an article about bilingualism by Eduard Päll in Nõukogude Kool /Soviet School no 8, 1980. He emphasizes that Russians in national republics do not want to learn the local language and cannot speak it. In Kazakhstan only 1% of the 5.5 million Russians can speak the local language, in Turkmenistan and Kyrgyzstan 2-3% and in Estonia more – 12%. You know as well as I do that services are one of the least developed areas in our economy as a lot of random people work in it. There are conflicts every day as most of the Russians employed in services do not know enough Estonian. It goes without saying that if one works in services one should know the local language.

T: Scientists have told me about Hungary, where children of different origin go to the same kindergartens and learn each other's languages.

A: This is one of the possibilities to arrange language studies. Children find it easiest to learn a language.

T: In the Soviet Union there is a big part of the scientists of the world. It would be impossible to spread their research in the other Soviet republics without the mediation of the Russian language.

A. It is necessary, true, but still, there should not be such exaggerated means forcing it. Why should a dissertation concerning Estonian philology be written in the Russian language? A Russian summary should suffice. My own boss is writing his dissertation in Russian according to present regulations and has had to take really great pains on it.

T: As for the philological theses I have to consult comrades from the Academy of Sciences if it is really so as you say. Your letter states that the number of Estonian lessons has been reduced on behalf of Russian lessons. Where did you get that?

A: This is not my walk of life and I cannot answer it exactly but some other authors should be able to answer the question satisfactorily.

*T: The authors of the letter express dissatisfaction that there are not enough Estonian publications. But you know that this is caused by lack of paper. In 2-3 years this problem will be solved.*

*A: This is quite impossible. I read in Pravda that we lack at least half of the needed paper. A few years won't solve anything. Some big paper mills will not meet the needs and there is no foreign currency to buy paper. It should be necessary to find out why quite a lot of books are not wanted at all and stay on the shelves in bookshops. This sort of books are a sheer waste of paper.*

*T: The need for paper is really huge. Our newspaper Sovetskaya Estoniya that even our enemies abroad consider trenchant has had to reduce its print-run from 56000 to 40000.*

*A: We feel the lack of paper in our ministry offices very much as well. We have a common journal with the Academy of Sciences – Eesti Loodus /Estonian Nature – and all the 100 employees have not been able to subscribe the magazine although they need it for their work. In general, subscribing newspapers and journals has become impossible.*

*T: Why are you against development? Only economic improvement will better people's well-being"*

*A: Any development must be planned sensibly. How can this sort of production be assessed that is taking place in the Paper and Cellulose Mill? There is no protective sanitary zone around the combine, thousands of people have been breathing polluted and poisoned air for decades. All the time it is said that the situation will be improved but absolutely nothing has been done. Or take the Maardu Chemical Combine, this giant polluter. The All-Union ministry of chemical production is handing out promises but nothing is being done. At the same time natural resources are being rapaciously used. Some top officials behave strangely indeed in the issues of nature protection. You may know the first secretary of the CP Harju District Endel Jaama. Recently nature protection officials disciplined a collective farm chairman for spreading mineral fertilizers straight on the snow. This is not only pollution of nature but it is more than shortsighted in economy, as the deficient fertilizer is wasted. The chairman immediately rushed with a complaint to Jaama, who in his turn complained to the Central Committee that the nature protectors have gone too far with their demands. Where have we got to – in the name of economic development the party functionaries are repressing the nature protectors! And, at the same time, quite many regulations have been issued that demand improvements in nature protection.*

*T: Comrade Aruja, you are an intelligent man and have to understand that we have temporary difficulties, it is not possible to improve everything at once.*

*A: Temporary difficulties are an old hat already.*

*T: Don't you feel that you are repressive in your letter?*

*A: No, I do not.*

*T: Comrade Aruja, have you read the letter at all?*

*A: Of course I have. And it is worth reading again!*

*T: I beg you to read it again when you go home and then call and tell me what is your opinion of it.*

*A: It seems to me that our talk is nearing to its end, so may I ask you a question?*

*T: I'll try to answer it.*

*A: For what are the people who signed the letter repressed? They are not given possibilities to broadcast on TV and radio, their articles are not published. Why? Only for that that they wrote about an acute issue to their newspaper?*

*T: I'll contact the Central Committee and try to find out.*

A: *Here, in the same house, a few floors down, there lies a detailed article of mine on nature protection issues. I'll bring it to you and you are going to publish it to prove we are not being repressed.*

T: *But if I did it just now, comrade Aruja, I would be misunderstood!*

*I get up and am ready to leave. We shake hands.*

T: *You know, we have got similar ties!*

A: *That is right but the colours are a bit different.*

T: *I am looking forward to your phone call.*

A: *You know, although we were speaking about matters connected to a small nation's existence I admit the historical tendency of small nations disappearing. But I am Estonian, a representative of a small nation and until I live I try to fight against this tendency.*

*Later I remembered something more from the conversation:*

A: *It would be normal if our new constitution confirmed that the Estonian language is the national and official language in Estonia. I made a proposal at the discussions of the constitution project but, naturally, it was not taken into account.*

T: *Estonian is the native language. It is natural and needn't be fixed in the constitution.*

A: *It is by no means the same thing whether the native language is confirmed by the constitution or it is considered natural.*

T: *Nobody doubts that Estonian is the native language, do they?"*

The conversation lasted for an hour and half.

Endel Nirk had had some difficulties in the publishing house, too. The total veto on appearance has not been issued, though, as only yesterday something from Viiding and Rätsep's *Creatures* had been read by Üksküla over the radio. The editor of *Sirp ja Vasar*<sup>24</sup>, Leo Laks had banned all the forty from his newspaper. This style should be estimated as battle on nerves only.

Madis Aruja revealed an interesting fact that the registration date of the letter in the editorial office of *Sovetskaya Estoniya* was 13 November 1980 and it had been registered as anonymous. The date is strange and disproves the supposition that the copy sent to *Rahva Hää* was removed and read by somebody. Why was the pause for a week necessary? What was found out during this week? Was it possible that until the copy sent to *Pravda* was clarified they deliberated to hush it up? Actually, although not in written form, the delivery of the letter was acknowledged on top level already on 5 November. Did they need to check everyone who had signed to make sure no names were added against somebody's will? The first round of talks had to clear it up and it did, otherwise the copies would have been thrown into garbage, if I may call the archive of the KGB like that. It seem the existence of the first copies and original signatures that were not found yet helped along here.

The afternoon was dedicated to dicussions about handing over the signatures and to the prosecutor's office. Most of the participants in the discussion considered yielding the signatures sensible and I had to agree, although reluctantly. I suggested in the morning that Marju Lauristin should offer the signatures to Ristlaan and ask him to put an end to the repressions. Ristlaan's word of honour would do. Although it would not change the following, it would be a slight moral achievement. The covenant in the Writers' Union was deemed to be unrealistic by Ellen Niit, Jaan Kross and Ita

---

<sup>24</sup> The paper – *Sickle and Hammer* in translation – published articles on issues of culture mostly. Translator.

Saks as well as Paul Kuusberg with whom Paul-Eerik Rummo talked today (his first talk). Besides, for the next day a plenary session of the CP Central Committee had been appointed to discuss the schoolchildren's disturbances and our letter also. Thus handing over the letter might become hurried and the saddest result of the lack of time is the unconditioned surrendering of the signatures.

At the moment I am inclined to think that speculations on the differences between the three powers (the Central Committee, the KGB and the prosecutor's office) meant that we swallowed the bait and in reality everything is going on according to plan. The worst would be that a group of the signers would be considered guilty and punished in order to tame the rest (whatever they would be called – the ones paid by Carter or sons of the kulaks – Johanson's idea). The best would be that the majority of the company would endure – this would be really important considering the people's mood and opinions – and current repressions would be applied to some of us. The really favourable solution would be the matter concluded within the Central Committee's inside fight for power – then nobody would be dragged onto the pillory in Town Hall Square and nobody's loaf would lose a too big slice off it.

I still have not decided whether to go to the prosecutor's office or not. I was almost sure I would not but now at night I have been thinking that something preceptive might come of it.

18 November 1980

## THEY THAT PLOUGH INIQUITY ...

Thus M. Lauristin handed the first copies of the letter on seven pages and with 41 signatures – one of them crossed out – over to R. Ristlaan about twenty minutes before the ECP CC plenary session started. The latter's stony mask has somewhat melted down in the ten minutes conversation and his hand had eventually found Marju's shoulder.

At the same moment Juhan Viiding should have been at the prosecutor's office talking to senior investigator Rein Jaup on an unknown topic. He chose another way, called his classmate Bergson and agreed to meet him in the Aquarium at noon. Together with Bergson there was to be Egon Oja, Juhan's neighbour, who had already read the letter before it was posted. Juhan had thought to invite me there as well but the four in a row on bar stools would not have been a convenient situation for a conversation. So I left town for Kloostrimetsa<sup>25</sup>. In the evening I heard that Juhan had indeed spent ninety minutes talking to the two investigators and treating them with brandy, paid for by the fiver borrowed from me. There was nothing useful in the conversation besides a piece of friendly advice to go to the prosecutor's office as soon as possible. The friendly conversation kept our interests but also theirs in mind. Bergson topped his role by giving Juhan four copies of Witness Interrogation Record and advising to write SOMETHING on them. There was nothing concrete but Bergson might have given a hint to write about the letter. After a friendly good-bye the three departed, Juhan with the advice to fill the sheets in our own hand by the end of the week.

Jaup could not talk to Tõnis Rätsep either as Tõnis decided to ignore the wrongly-formed summons.

At 3.15 p.m. I dialled 448 479 and had a phone conversation that I jotted down at once:

I: Is this senior investigator Jaup?

Jaup: Yes.

I: Tarand, vice-director of the Botanic Gardens speaking.

Jaup: I see.

I: I have some indirect information that you want to meet me... (I wanted to know whether it is true but Jaup interrupted me.)

Jaup: How so, indirect? Didn't you get the summons?

I: I have not received any formal summons...

Jaup: What does it mean – no formal summons. Did you get them or not?

I: I repeat, I have not got any formal summons.

Jaup (in a raised voice): What are you playing at? When you get the prosecutor's summons you must obey.

I: This is what I want to know – for what reason do you wish to speak to me? I am going to leave town for two days and I'll be back here at work from 9 to 4. You'll be able to catch me here then.

Jaup: Right. I am going to leave myself so you will come on Friday. At what time will you be able to come?

I: I said I was going to be at work on Friday from 9 to 4. If you want to speak to me, call me and we can meet here.

---

<sup>25</sup> The Tallinn Botanical Gardens are located in Kloostrimetsa, the place name meaning Monastery's Woods coming from the fact that in the 15th and 16th century the woods belonged to the Pirita Monastery. Translator.

Jaup (in considerably raised voice): I tell you once more – you have got the summons of the prosecutor's office and you will have to come. When on Friday?

I: I cannot say at what time as we are making the annual reports and I have several bosses who without warning beforehand give me various tasks to do.

Jaup: Tell you bosses that this is the prosecutor's office that summoned you and tell them the time or give them my telephone number that you know and I'll inform them myself.

I: I do not see any possibility or reason for coming to you as you can consult me here as well. We can go into a greenhouse where you certainly have not been before, and we'll have a perfect atmosphere for a peaceful conversation.

Jaup: My dear man, I do not wish any botanical consultation. I want to talk about something quite different and that is why you'll have to come here, to the prosecutor's office.

I: I see. I thought that you wished to get an expert consultation that I have given to your office before. What is the matter then?

Jaup: I told you already that you shall come here to the prosecutor's office as summoned and then we'll talk about the matter. I cannot tell you about it in a phone conversation.

I (heatedly): If it is something like that you must forward a formal subpoena so that I would know what you want to talk about and in what capacity you have subpoenaed me. Before that I do not see any reason for coming to you.

Jaup: Stop playing games, we are not children. You have been summoned and now I am so accommodating that I agree to have an appointment. If Friday is really out of the question we may meet on Monday.

I: I told you I must be at work on Friday and I cannot say anything about Monday yet. If you come here, I'll listen to what you have to say but I will not come to the prosecutor's office before I am subpoenaed properly.

Jaup: What does it mean, properly! You get the summons and you'll have to come. Tell me the time on Friday or Monday.

I: Properly means, according to the criminal code, that the summons must include information about the reason and capacity. You should know it well enough.

Jaup: In what capacity ... you will come as a witness and why, you will be told here in the prosecutor's office.

I: You know that the matter must be stated.

Jaup: My dear man, I cannot tell you over the phone. Tell me what time on Friday or Monday.

I: I have said everything I plan to say. If you want to see me in the prosecutor's office, subpoena me formally.

Jaup: All right, all right, I'll talk to my super and you will get your proper subpoena. Still, it would be better if we agreed on the time already now, Friday or Monday.

I: A formal subpoena must be issued if somebody is summoned to the prosecutor's office and the matter must be stated.

Jaup: Don't you dare tell me what I must do. I have been working longer than you and I know how things are. Your time!

I: Good-bye! (Hanging up.)

I cannot say the phone call satisfied me in any way. Jaup had been impetuous and intrusive as if I were a pickpocket, the like of which he was evidently used to deal with. The senseless dialogue upset me. Jaup had achieved nothing but neither had I, having only irritated the senior investigator. I felt dissatisfied, although not broken.

Later it turned out that the *ESSR Criminal Procedure Code, edition with commentaries* (1965) did not state in its §131 that the subject matter of the subpoena should be mentioned. Even if I made a mistake in this, the summons contained other errors.

Only an hour passed when my phone rang and the super-serious voice of Jüri Martin announced that he needed to see me at once. I said that I had to leave (he very much wanted to come to the TBG) and nothing was so important it could not be postponed to the next day. He insisted and so we agreed to meet in front of the theatre *Estonia* where our bus dropped the people. I supposed that it could be another message from some Academy of Sciences functionary or probably Jaup had already managed to take the matter further. In Martin's car I learned that it was high time to make the signatures public. It was the KGB who wanted it, no doubt, but I still asked Martin who said so. He looked ashamed and said it was not important. I made my conclusion that he had either been called to Aus' iron-grilled room of the KGB department in the Academy, or his direct contacts to the Organs had been put into use (I am not going to contemplate here how these direct contacts were created). I said that as far as I know the signatures have been in Ristlaan's drawer already since that morning and there was no reason for worry. I do not remember whether I added that the KGB had been late again or not, but later it was mentioned because it seemed to be so to me. In the evening Kaplinski called from Tartu and asked what was our reaction to the summons of the prosecutor's office. I said that I had not gone but I was not sure about the others and added that the summons had had five mistakes in the text. Jaan said he had not cared to count the errors. As the Ruutsoos planned to go to Tartu the next day and Sirje was at my place sharing the first impressions of the plenary session, I made them talk to each other, so that before Jaan had to go to the investigator at 3.30 p.m. he could get some direct and unrecorded information about our relationship with the prosecutor's office. And this was the end of 18 November.

I had promised to go to Vändra the next day to talk to the pupils of the local secondary school. I got there and back via Pärnu and had time to think about the situation in the bus. I could suppose only a couple of measures that the KGB, hiding behind the prosecutor's office, was planning to take:

1. Some sort of witch hunt for Kaplinski in the process of which Viiding-Rätsep-Tarand's reports in their own handwriting would be used as bailing buckets to heap shit on Jaan.

2. Plans to scare or punish the whole organizing committee, whereas the additional worries in Pagari Street<sup>26</sup> were Madrid and Valton in Australia and whatever other committees.

20 November, almost from dawn to dusk, was dedicated to a TV broadcast. When I dropped in house no 46 in Kloostrimetsa that morning, I grabbed along the criminal procedures code. In the evening, for the first time in my life taking it quite seriously, I opened the Bible that was on my son Kaarel's desk and I found more than I had expected from this random choice of Job, Chapter 4, 1-11<sup>27</sup>. It must, of course be

---

<sup>26</sup> Pagari (Baker) Street was the location of the KGB headquarters. Translator.

<sup>27</sup> Then Eliphaz the Temanite answered and said, 2 *If we assay to commune with thee, wilt thou be grieved?* but who can withhold himself from speaking? 3 Behold, thou hast instructed many, and thou hast strengthened the weak hands. 4 Thy words have upholden him that was falling, and thou hast strengthened the feeble knees. 5 But now it is come upon thee, and thou art troubled. 6 *Is not this* thy fear, thy confidence, thy hope, and the uprightness of thy ways? 7 Remember, I pray thee, who *ever* perished, being innocent? or where were the righteous cut off? 8 Even as I have seen, they that plow

taken into consideration that I was optimistic about our endeavours and treated the fierce lion with a certain tendentiousness.

On the morning of 21 November I went to the greenhouse as Virve Roost, ready for a trip to Hungary had asked me to drop in. Virve did not even try to hide her curiosity and tried to satisfy it. She was surprised at Arno Pukk's signature and it had never amazed me. She mentioned that Jüri Martin, obviously according to instructions, had enquired about Virve's connections with the committee. Was it a sort of warning not to take the letter to Hungary or a typical Soviet citizen's inner censor becoming attentive, I have no idea. Jüri's diligence at mediating could be explained with conscientiousness (or rather – obedience to follow orders), perhaps also with his growing ambitions to get closer to the science + commerce of the USA or some other country of decaying capitalism. I hope my slight attention to the issue is not wrong...

Part of my weekend was spent at Riina and Juhan Viiding's where we deliberated our relations with the prosecutor's office in detail. The situation had become nervous and stressful at our homes, we were given enough semi-open signs that the KGB checked our telephone conversations and thus we might have paid too much attention to the juridical aspects of the matter. A part of Sunday, 23 November was dedicated to reading the criminal procedures code, not a harmful occupation in itself. Some elements of it may come handy. The next week showed, however, that my freshly acquired juridical knowledge was not needed yet. The prosecutor's office seemed to withdraw from the public. The telephone cable in the Botanic Gardens had got broken and so the talk between Viiding and Jaup on 28 November seemed to put a stop to this young investigator's dealings with us.

The last week of November was rather eventless for me but as for the letter – this was the time when it spread extensively among the people. We got several signals that it was so and all the authors started to get especially warm handshakes, different from those after posting the letter. That means that the party had been three weeks ahead of the people. Quite a folklore started to evolve around the letter but I heard only a part of it and a lot I have forgotten. One of the first rumors was the so-called UNO letter to either Waldheim or to the conference in Madrid. This rumour might have been born when the letter was not yet circulating in big numbers. The event in the sauna of the Poultry Factory where Lind Junior treated six guests is a good example of how the letter spread. The commander of the KGB Harju District had got the letter from his driver and taken it along to the sauna. The men, most of them participants of the plenary session of the ESSR CP had been surprised that so many young men wanted to spoil their "chances" for such a low target ("They could have sent it to Madrid at least!") They had also been surprised why such an acknowledged scientist like Tamsalu had joined the company. Later, under the effect of all the served beer, they had kindly explained it to the young man that they knew very well how it all is but there is no sense to spoil one's life and admonished him to take care that he wouldn't do it in the future. This could be considered the corner stone for the morals of the so-called new man – the builder of communism.

A negative reaction was born among some intellectuals who thought the letter would greatly harm Estonian culture. I do not think that everybody who joined this camp would have agreed with Kaalep ("Do not lay your heads on the block!"). Something of their personal cowardice or incapability could be clearly noticed

---

iniquity, and sow wickedness, reap the same. 9 By the blast of God they perish, and by the breath of his nostrils are they consumed. 10 The roaring of the lion, and the voice of the fierce lion, and the teeth of the young lions, are broken. 11 The old lion perisheth for lack of prey, and the stout lion's whelps are scattered abroad.

(examples of it H. Rajandi and H. Trass). The third group of negativists were those who considered the letter too mild. Personally I got this reaction from E. Aule but I think there are also Hando Runnel and Juhan Kilik, whose letter, called public, was delivered on the evening of 1 December. I have nothing on Kilik but I do not think his message was a provocation.<sup>28</sup>

All the other reactions have been favourable and even more so. Some of the authors have been embarrassed by expressions of gratitude. My hand has been shaken in the bus and library, some men have approached me really close but have not said anything special. Generally, as my workplace is far from the town and separated, I have not had much embarrassment. As for schools, I have heard that in the history class of School 44 the letter was read aloud already on 24 November and the next day it was at School 21. Later info mentions readings at Pirita and Music Schools. This all has reached me by chance and I believe there have been more cases of public readings at schools.

It seems that the speed and width of the spread exceeded expectations and this could be proof that it was timely and necessary to address no 1.

The Russian copy started its journey at the same time but will evidently not spread as widely and quickly. Copying and re-copying may bring along mistakes and errors, although I have not heard of any up today. In Tartu, they say, there is a copy with an addition: who agrees, sign; the same was said about the Polytechnical Institute (present-day Tallinn University of Technology. Editors). They say that there is one copy with Saluri's name on it (could be an oral misunderstanding).

What is happening within the party will hopefully be recorded by these who belong to it, or are in closer contact with some members than I am. Briefly, people have told me the following:

On 13 November there was a meeting in a hall of the White House that had vacant rooms on both sides and in both of them sat a trusted watchman. The meeting was attended by two Communist party functionaries from Moscow, one of them known as comrade Morozov. These two determined the line the party had to take at the next plenary session. This was the same meeting that Kõorna said had taken place but what had taken place at the meeting he did not know. It is generally thought that Moscow advised to be forbearing. At the plenary session that took place on 14 and 15 November Vaino had been talking about economy a whole hour (I think it was published in the papers) and half an hour about ideology beginning with schoolchildren and leading up to the letter. The proportion should show how important it was considered to be, although the press passed it over with a remark, "The speaker continued with ..." Vaino's decision could be resumed as that: "Some second-rate intellectuals have composed a well-intentioned national letter that is wrong considering the time and circumstances." The only bad boy mentioned by name was "J. Kaplinski, who has written bad things before and in addition to that, has direct contacts with foreign countries, especially with the editors of the journal *Mana*". The others were all rated "second", that is definitely better than the "pseudo-scientist". Later, on 27 November the Writers' Union party organisation had a meeting, where J.Jõerüüt uttered the above statement by Vaino and quite unexpectedly asked E. Vetemaa to read the letter aloud. Vetemaa had done just that but when he got to the names, Jõerüüt had grabbed the letter and said that that was the end of the matter. It would have been if Ita Saks had not asked the floor. In this emotional speech that the speaker herself could not even remember well afterwards,

---

<sup>28</sup> However, it could be just that.

she had repeatedly asked how could they mark Kaplinski like that and the Writers' Union whose duty it was to protect its members would not even lift a finger. The bureau managed to deal with this unexpected moment as well, patting the speaker's shoulder. The bureau (Kuusberg, Gross, Vetemaa, Jõerüüt, Saluri, Prii + one more, perhaps) had been discussing the tactics of the meeting with Ristlaan the day before 26 Nov.) and as we can see, almost did it. They tried to emphasize that the letter was written because people were troubled and worried and their motives were good but we have to take Vaino's assessment to be true because he is Vaino and he does not have to prove his opinions (Jõerüüt). At the meeting with Ristlaan it was decided to cancel Klara Hallik's lecture about the relations between nations that had been scheduled long ago already and deliberated how to calm people down before the writers congress in March.

There are several rumors that party organisations of various establishments have discussed the letter, quoting a part here, another there, and then condemned them in a resonant voice. This is a well-trampled path. Ita Saks said that basically she was aroused by the phoney faces of the participating functionaries. The latter in their turn evidently took Ita as a small inconvenience that came up unplanned and outside the accepted rules of the game.

It must be said that Ristlaan had meant it when he said to Lauristin who took the signatures to him that no more repressions would follow. Soon enough the names of the authors started to appear in media and the radio and TV were open to all of us again. I do not dare to classify Esko Tasa's order to write two short things for his agricultural broadcast or Rein Veskimäe's one for the journal *Horisont* or Urve Bushman's speech about the ETA as obeying instructions from above but I started to suspect something when Robert Vaidlo phoned on the evening of 9 December, wanted to talk with me on the first name basis and said he wanted to have a story in the newspaper *Kodumaa*. At first I thought that it would be a story about the Botanic Gardens and this belonged to my duties to talk to the press. But Vaidlo's idea to put my photo in the paper made me suspicious about a planned activity. On 10 December I talked for an hour with Vaidlo and his limping driver, introduced the structure and tasks of the TBG to them. When we got to the Environmental Studies Department I felt their keen interest in my work and even some prior knowledge about my field of study. Vaidlo's companion seemed much more knowledgeable to me than R.V. himself was. When they started to talk about my photo again I said that the annual outcome would not justify my photo in the paper as I have spent most time on paperwork and added that an excellent dairy-maid's photo is printed in the paper when she has milked a certain amount. Vaidlo explained that he considered the photo of the interviewee an absolute must and I asked him to take Virve Roost's who had excellent results that year and who had just come from Hungary. I had told Virve about my suspicions early in the morning and she promised to help me out. My playing hard to catch was not immediately successful as Vaidlo promised to command Trapido to the place and have me photographed next to the fern, cactus and Virve. As he had said to Virve – Tarand at his desk. He promised to drop the text in my letterbox before publishing it. The topics the gentlemen used were a bit suspicious as well. First they wanted to know about Päts' manor and I explained it in detail. Then they shifted to the Paldiski earthquake<sup>29</sup> and called it an explosion and wanted to know what I thought about it. How this was connected with the Botanic Gardens and our work, I do not

---

<sup>29</sup> A real earthquake in 1976 that people suspected to have been an explosion in the Paldiski naval and submarine base.

know but I said I considered it an earthquake and had been interested in the event as my summer cottage was quite close, but had found nothing suspicious in the earthquake theory. Today (11 Dec.) no Trapido appeared but Kersti Kreismann's photo in previous *Kodumaa*<sup>30</sup> hints at counter-propaganda.

To close the repressions topic I should mention that they showed the TV broadcast on 8 December, just as Anupõld had promised, answering my question about it on 14 November.

As for more visits – H.Kiik at Utt's, M.Unt at Ristlaan's, M.Hint at Virkus' (obviously E.Nirk also) and M.Lauristin at a long talk at Ristlaan's again. All these talks happened in November and the only interesting thing was Ristlaan's commission to Lauristin to write an article about the national issue for the journal *Eesti Kommunist*<sup>31</sup> J. Klysheiko visited Turunok in the editorial office of *Sovetskaya Estoniya*, and as far as it is known, it was only the second and the last visit to editorial offices in a month. It cannot be deemed satisfactory when we keep in mind the regulations how citizens' letters and complaints have to be treated.

I include some excerpts from the order of the USSR Supreme Soviet on "Treating the Citizens' Proposals, Applications and Complaints". It is a free translation from the Russian language as in 1980 these documents were not officially translated into Estonian any more.

*1.All the state and public organs should grant every USSR citizen their constitutional rights declared in Soviet laws to present in written or oral form proposals to improve the work of state offices as well as social organisations, to criticize their drawbacks, to appeal or to complain about the work of a state or social organization official.*

*7. Directors and other officials of the state and public organs, establishments, offices and organisations are obliged to ...systematically analyse and generalise the proposals, appeals and complaints and the critical comments in them striving to explicate and remove the reasons for the violation of the citizens' legal rights and their interests. They have to be aware of the public attitudes and opinions and improve the work of state and public organs, establishments, offices and organizations.*

*9.The appeals and complaints should be solved within a month's time from the date of their delivery.*

*11. The citizens' proposals, applications, petitions and complaints that are delivered through the editorial offices of newspapers, journals, television, radio or other means of mass information, as well as delivered speeches and materials published that are connected with complaints, applications or petitions should also be examined and checked according to the present ukase.*

*15. Violation of the order of examining the applications, petitions and complaints or bureaucratic approach to them, lingering or dragging the issue out but also keeping the citizens concerned under surveillance will bring along relevant sanctions to the person or persons responsible.*

---

<sup>30</sup> *Kodumaa*/ Native Land was a Soviet-published paper addressed to Estonian emigrants abroad.

<sup>31</sup> This promise was never kept but the journal *Eesti Kommunist* published an article "Development of National Relations in Estonia" by Viktor Maamägi in its 9th issue in 1981. The end of this article was typical of the time and the journal, when it confirmed: "Estonian people decisively push away every antagonistic attempt to break rifts in its unity and collaboration with the friendly peoples ... The duty of all our party organisations, every communist, all the soviet and social organisations is to fight against all negative phenomena in the national issue, to expand their political work, to condemn nationalism, chauvinism and provincialism in all their expressions."

*The same kind of action by persons responsible that may harm the state's or citizens' legal rights and interests will be punished according to the criminal law of the union republics concerning the official crimes.*

*In case the citizens have presented declarations containing slander, they will have to take legally established responsibility.*

P.Aimla had been at Slutsk's for the second time on 1 December and, among other matters, another letter had been mentioned. R.Ruutsoo had talked to Johanson on 3 December. What the party is planning to do is not clear. On the evening of 28 November when we had the Ruutsoos and Arujas, Kaevats and finally Juhan who came straight from Jaup's all together at our place we made a conclusion that the letter had stirred up more than we had expected. The first results were Gretchkina's declarations about the support to the Estonian language and the proclamation by Johanson at a plenary session that local Russians should learn the language. He was also heard to advise his audience to be a bit restrained in praising the Russian language. We are hopeful that matters will continue in the same vein and it will help to gain time. And who of us could have hoped for more? The most optimistic rumour is that Moscow has stopped the changes in significant posts. There had been a plan to release both Tõnspoe and Green at the session of the Supreme Soviet. Nothing about Utt is known and, on the other hand, these names have cropped up now and again throughout Vaino's rule. Thus it is obvious that the school students' disturbances stirred quite a lot up and the letter added to the chaos in the lives of the vassals who are always busy trying to pull off the seat from under another and grant it to a closer friend. It is certainly too early to say what will happen in the future. We may be sure that what is happening in Poland has a much bigger impact.<sup>32</sup> Even so, if the letter provided us with even a few years breathing spell, its composition would be justified.

Well, and now the third walk – the main activities of the KGB that is most hidden and only some bubbles from the bottom of the slough reveal that something is happening. When we finished talking about Jaup with Viiding that night of 28 November, I dared to predict that the new wave of activity would be launched when foreign press would have picked the matter up. At the moment (on 13 December), it seems I was partly mistaken. On 30 November Mati Hint visited me and he seemed to believe much more in the provocative role of the KGB in the procession of schoolboys on 1 October. Arno Pukk also said that black Volga cars were keeping close to the procession and men in them egged the boys on to shout louder and add also "*Sieg Heil!*" to their repertoire. Hint did not deny that partially the gathering was spontaneous but he believed that the provocation had somewhat backfired and spread wider than expected. As for me I still think it was spontaneous and the KGB quickly decided to make use of it. Mati Hint knew about cases how some men in Tartu were urging students to establish organizations with the aim of overthrowing the system and government. Quite soon the same sort of thing was revealed in Tallinn and closer to home than I could have foreseen.

Either on the 1st or 2nd December my son Indrek and his friend Artur Talvik had been invited to cheer at a popgroup's concert. On the ground floor of the TV house a man in his early middle age approached them and asked the boys to phone him. The man said his name was Rein Sepp and Artur who knew the building well<sup>33</sup> quickly established that the phone was that of the lighting console. When the boys did call, the

---

<sup>32</sup> *The Solidarność* movement in Poland had not yet been suppressed.

<sup>33</sup> Both his parents worked on TV.

man appeared quickly, glancing around and over his shoulder and wanted them to leave the building at once. Outside he grabbed the bull by the horns immediately and asked the boys what their political sentiments were. The whole long tirade concerned creating some threesomes the names of which were to be given to Sepp already on the 5th, some mixed up story about Arakas who had stolen a rifle at the shooting ring, the address of the latter's father that the boys could use at once if they wanted to visit, a hint that something no less than an assassination was planned on Kāo and advice to make haste and accomplish something before the 26th party congress. The boys could not at first make head or tails in the hash and thought that the man must have lost his marbles, although some things in the long obscure talk could have been considered true. Was it accidental or planned, who knows, but the letter was mentioned and Sepp said that Viiding could give it to them, only he had not met Juhan recently. When he discovered that Indrek was Tarand, he had told the boy to steal the letter from his old man. When Indrek said it might not be possible, Sepp had told him to stop talking crap and added that the boy should know that his father had signed the letter together with Ruutjärv (he must have meant Ruutsoo). He knew it all but everybody in the TV house was such a shit that they did not give him the letter. So they agreed to meet again on Friday but Indrek was suspicious and went to grandpa<sup>34</sup> to ask for advice. In the evening he spoke about it at home. We were deceived by the name Rein Sepp and thought the man was the well-known translator who really had had something to do with the mental hospital a few years back. Having thought about it I decided that the man smelled more like an instigator than a translator of classical literature and advised Indrek not to meet the man on Friday and see what his next step would be. This should reveal whether the boys were accidental victims or chosen deliberately because of the letter. The boys' mummies, however, did not let the sleeping dogs lie. Alice Talvik told in the TV house that some prop man (whom the boys so easily could take for a TV party secretary) tries to found an anti-government organization. Tiina Mägi seconded her and Mari Tarand went to Slutsk and Penu with a complaint what a suspicious man they were employing. It is not sure yet how much this mothers' campaign influenced Rein Sepp's career as a stagehand on TV but he certainly will not get a bonus from his lords and masters in the KGB. My little experiment failed but the so-called threesomes were not established either in the inner or the outer circle. (The inner circle actually does exist, they are the KGB informers within every establishment.) Obviously the KGB-planned assassination of Kāo will also be postponed.

On the same day an elderly man called Fred Jüssi and wanted to talk about matters concerning only him but not on the phone (the phobia about phones is a connecting link between the stool pigeons and every other member of the organization up to the senior investigators). Fred agreed to meet the man in front of the Radio Centre and learned that the man offered general help to the organization and special help to Fred personally if he needed to get anything out and abroad. At the same time the man reminded Fred of an encounter long ago when Fred was a child and had just arrived from South America. In addition the man had mentioned Fred's aunt who is a cleaning lady in the hotel Viru (and as such must have a specially approved CV) and showed particular knowledge of Fred's own CV, making a mistake only in his brother's name. Fred had replied that he has had many people approaching him with different problems, like, for instance the broken leg of a domesticated stork but this is the very first time he heard a story like that. He said he hoped it would also be the last time and

---

<sup>34</sup> Helmut Tarand

it was time for him to get to work at once. The man tried to keep him back but the reception and checking counter of the radio house separated them eventually. A week later another curious encounter was on Fred's way: a zoologist he only knew by face, who was a graduate of Leningrad University offered him help to get the letter spread abroad. The gentleman was politely shown a way out by Fred.

Personally I have nothing like that to boast about. If there was something – the better disguised driver of Vaidlo did actually not abase himself to provocations. If one starts suspecting, things easily become exaggerated. When Krista Kaasik asked me to give a photo for the society *Teadus* (Science) I was suspicious for a moment but reproached myself for paranoia and yielded the expected photo.

Quite a story in itself was the conversation between Saluri and a KGB officer in the editorial office of the journal *Looming* on 24 November, just before he was to go to Finland. The purpose of the meeting was to warn Saluri not to spread information about the letter on the other side of the Gulf of Finland. I am sure it was not spread. At the same time, however (early December) some copy of a film had still reached Finland. It is not possible to check these rumors but a proof that something must have penetrated to the other side is the short announcement over the Radio Liberty on 8 December.<sup>35</sup> Two days later I saw the text and heard that a new round of conversations with the investigators had already been launched. This time they hid behind the mask of the Town Prosecutor's Office. On 10 December Mati Unt and Lehte Tavel talked to the KGB officer Ots and a young investigator Promet<sup>36</sup>. Both, Tavel and Unt gave some written testimony. The same or the next day Jaan Tamm and on 11 December Peet Kask were subpoenaed. I do not know anything about what they said or did not say, but I saw what was asked at Madis Aruja's who was summoned at 11 o'clock on 12 December. Madis said that the young investigator seemed to be averse to what he had to do and almost admitted that Madis was right in his belief that the new round of investigations was released by Nikolai Johanson who wanted to save his own career by finding and accusing a group of kulaks and their sons. It may be true but it might also be possible that the KGB campaign is continuing and must be somehow concluded. It seems that this time a bigger circle is questioned and their answers would be used to squeeze the smaller circle. The official excuse is still the schoolchildren's commotions but actually the interests lie in how the letter was produced. The questions that were presented to Madis for perusal and answers at home at the weekend were as follows:

1. What do you think were the reasons for the youth's disturbances?
2. What was the reason and what the cause for writing the letter?
3. What did you expect to achieve when writing the letter?
4. How did the composing materialize and how were the signatures obtained?
5. Who of the people whose signature was asked refused to sign and why?

---

<sup>35</sup> I recorded the text a little later but it read like that: "...also these 40 Estonian scientists and writers who signed a open letter on 28 October that was addressed to the newspapers *Pravda*, *Sovetskaya Estoniya* and *Rahva Hääl*. The letter defends the thousands of young people who demanded freedom last October and criticizes the reaction of the officials whose activities caused injuries. The letter emphasized that the opposition to the Soviet power among the young people that is officially called hooliganism is based on their fear to become a minority in their own country and is a reaction to the continuing process of Russification. Obviously, as a result of the open letter, poet Jaan Kaplinski's home was searched on 6 November, some of his manuscripts and typewriter were confiscated. The search was carried out by KGB officers Viktor Kozlov and Sepper. As no paper has published the letter yet, we'll try to read it to our listeners soon.

<sup>36</sup> Turned out to be Petter.

It is clear that the first three questions were answered in the letter itself and the two last ones have no connection to propagating the disturbances. Petter had understood it well enough but proceeded dutifully to complete the given assignment.

Madis Aruja's notes read as follows:

*"On 10 December 1980 a man calls and introduces himself as investigator Petter of the Tallinn Prosecutor's Office. He must talk to me, he says. When I ask what about he replies that it cannot be explained on the phone. I would like to point out that we boast about safe phones but contain myself and we agree upon Friday.*

*Witness interrogation at investigator Petter's in the Tallinn Prosecutor's Office at 6, Kinga Street, room 14 on 12 December 1980. Beginning at 11 a.m. Lasted 40 minutes. Investigator Petter, a rather pleasant man of 25 to 30 years of age, gave me an impression that he was forced to conduct this conversation.*

*Petter: I have to explain it to you why I have to talk to you. The prosecutor's office is investigating the disturbances among the schoolchildren and as you in your open letter mention these events we hope your assistance would help to clarify the reasons for them. The youth were not able to give reasonable explanations when questioned. Did your own children participate in the events?*

*Aruja: I have four children and we live in Kivimäe, the children go to different schools and they are too young to have participated in the events. I did not see the events myself, the newspapers did not give much information and I know about what happened only due to rumors. Mentioning the events in our open letter does not signify that we should know the background and reasons you need for your criminal investigation.*

*P: We will have to conclude our investigations by 31 December and we do need your help.*

*A: The prosecutor can always prolong the conclusion date. What, actually, are the young people accused of?*

*P: The investigations would not be stretched. Obviously nobody would be convicted. (He searches for the Criminal Code among the papers on his desk and points at §194/3 – organizing group activities for violation of public order or active participation in such kind of activities. Organization of groups or active participation in such groups that brings along resistance to legal orders of government forces or that causes disturbances in transport or the work of a public or social enterprise will be punished either with imprisonment up to three years or a fine up to 900 roubles.*

*A: It means that hooliganism would not be implemented. It was rumoured that the Russian youth was planning anti Estonian activities.*

*P: It was possible to avoid that.*

*A: In case it had happened it would have brought along irreversible results. However, why was just I summoned to the Prosecutors Office? Have the others who signed been summoned as well?*

*P: Representatives from every walk of life have been summoned.*

*A: Right. As there is only one man from the nature protection field you did not have to draw lots there. But a talk in the Prosecutor's Office is different from a conversation at the café Pegasus and implies some sort of offence.*

*P: There is no offence whatever in these summons. But I have to record you as a witness.*

*A: I do not see any reason for that. Connecting us to the above events is rather contrived.*

*P: Not really! I do not like what I must do but I have to.*

*A: I think I know who forces you to do it. Do you think it a good idea that somebody from among the undersigned would go to the Central Committee and tell them that it is not sensible to harass us with the Prosecutor's Office?*

*P: It would really please me. But now I have to make you acquainted with the witness's responsibilities and rights (takes the Code of Criminal Procedures in the ESSR and offers it to me).*

*A: No need for that. I know these things thanks to my work.*

*P: I have to fill in the interrogation records (writes down what I say and I sign that I have been warned about giving false evidence). Only a few questions have to be answered (he writes them out on a separate sheet and passes it to me). Is my handwriting legible?*

*A: Absolutely.*

*P: Put the answers down at home and bring them to me. When will you be able to do it?*

*A: On Monday, the earliest.*

*P: Right. Phone me when you can come (I put down his number – 448746).*

*A. With your permission I would like to ask you a question, too. What is your personal attitude to the letter?*

*P: I consider it timely and necessary. Necessary indeed.*

*On 13 December I am busy at home, installing a work surface in our kitchen. When I make breaks, I write answers to the five questions. Eventually there are five pages. According to the criminal code, the record of examination should be done in the office by the investigator, or the examinee.*

*I call investigator Petter in the afternoon of 15 December and he asks me to come straight to room 14. When I enter there are two Russian boys and a girl. The investigator comes to the passage and I give him the record of examination and my answers. He thanks me and promises to call if there is something not quite clear. Not a squeak until today.*

The selection of the people summoned for interrogations is rather interesting – if the orders had come from Johanson, Ruutsoo should belong to the ones summoned as he, a fellow communist, was already interrogated by him, thus leaving the non-communists to prosecutors. Johanson's attempt to discuss Ruutsoo's behaviour at the Institute of History's party meeting had obviously failed, as the secretary had demanded that first the letter itself should be read. When Aruja asked the investigator on what principles the people summoned were selected, the latter said that the selection depended on the various fields of study but he cannot have believed it himself. One possibility is that they expect the intellectuals to talk more volubly – it is a common knowledge that they do. The KGB needn't have had enough information for the starters either. My prior guess that the summons followed the news that the letter has got abroad does not seem to be true, as the questionnaire had to be worked out beforehand and the spread of the letter is not included yet. But now when the Radio Liberty has read the whole text (12 December) and the *Deutsche Welle* broadcasting in Russian has commented on it, the investigation must liven up and may change directions. What would be my clue to march on the stage is yet to be seen. They say the investigation of the youth's disturbances should be completed and closed by the 31 December, thus they will have no pretext to talk to witnesses and have to invent a new criminal case in order to continue. But they would not be able to build it on the letter itself. The schoolchildren's case may be prolonged, of course. Unless

somebody answers questions 4 and 5 straightforwardly, the Baker Street boys<sup>37</sup> will be badly pressed for time in legal matters. As I read in Kaplinski's search protocol they were "looking for anti-soviet and nationally inclined documents, vital for the investigations of the criminal case". Although they confiscated 8 separate units of documents, they could not make any sensible use of the carbon paper, the copy itself and the list of people (37 candidates), all connected to the letter. It was not yet so acute either as the KGB-officers Valge, Kozlov, Palmpuu and Sepper together with the non-committed eye-witnesses Jakobson and Priimägi were searching for the original. It is much more to the point how much mentioning Kozlov and Sepper on the Radio Liberty irritates the organs at the moment. The same piece of news caused the rumour that the Kaplinskis had been searched for the second time.

As for the activities of the KGB, propaganda to compromise the authors is ripe. There is nobody among us about whom rumours of revoking were not circulating. They do not explain how this revoking process should be organized and I am not aware that anybody with the exception of J.Tamm and T.Kaljuste would have renegued in a written form. The most drastic slander about the authors came from a former classmate Tõnu Ots, who is the chief secretary of the journal *Noorus* (Youth). He said that only four people had stuck to their decision, all the others, Tarand among them, had reneged. There were more dubious issues but it was all presented with the airs of "I-know everything". I told Relve to remember me to him and advised him to consult his former classmate before the succeeding reports. The extensive spreading of the letter (one man had made 700 copies and some cabdrivers ask 5 roubles for a copy if they offer it to a single fare to read) will nullify the slander.

On the evening of 13 December we were invited to the Mades who had Jorma Pilke from Finland visiting. We went to their apartment in the building that sheltered employees of the Council of Ministers in Kapi Street and the same topic seemed to interest the host. The talk at the table was as it usually is in these cases – work and mode of life there and here, hobbies. A slight surprise was the well-printed and quite fresh issue of *Esto-80* that the host placed on the table at once. I thumbed it through and did not read the text considering it impolite in company. We did not mention the letter as everybody knew that everybody else knew about it. The host expressed his indignation about the violation of ecological balance in Toolse and the arbitrary conduct of Kão but after a couple of hours socializing he asked point blank, "Is Valton back already?" I replied that as far as I knew he wasn't and the next question was almost fired at me, "Will he come through Madrid?" I answered that I considered the rumour a frightened fantasy of the organs. I cannot say whether the question was based on curiosity or doing one's duty but it left a strange impression. More important – the host's eyes were never free and easy after that but, of course, there may be another explanation: he thinks that I think...

I would like to sum up the chapter with notes about Sunday, 14 December. I went to meet Jorma at the Valters a few minutes to one o'clock. I noticed our full letterbox, opened it and found summons no 304 that told me to appear in room 5 at the Prosecutor's Office as a witness in criminal proceedings at 2.30 p.m. on 15 December 1980. On the reverse side the word 'recurrent' was heavily underlined. So they had learned from their mistakes but they still violated the rule that these summons had to be handed over personally to the addressee who should have signed. I decided not to become stubborn for this one error and go and listen to what they had to say.

---

<sup>37</sup> Baker Street is the translation of Pagari St in Tallinn, where the headquarters of the KGB are situated.

In the evening I read what Aruja had written on the same matter to the prosecutor. I advised him to soften a caustic remark or two and some statements based on rumours the sources of which we wouldn't like to share with the KGB. Aruja had given detailed answers to questions 1 and 3 and considered others irrelevant.

The last remark is that conversation with Kall proved that he had not been summoned even once. This must be some comfort to Bill who was complaining that he was developing a complex of neglect.

## WE'LL MEET AGAIN

On 15 December at 1.50 p.m. I got to the bus-stop in Kloostrimetsa and soon the bus came<sup>38</sup>. It meant that I had half an hour to get to the Prosecutors Office and as bus 40 came when no 34 got to the terminal, I was safe. I said "good afternoon" to the militiaman and he answered "*zdravstvuite*". I asked, "*Gdje komnata pyataya?*" and he wanted to know, "*U vas povestka yest?*" When I had confirmed that I had it, the militiaman pointed his chin at the coatrack and asked me to take off my coat. "*Kuda mne idti?*" was my next question and the answer to that was "*Pryamo na levo, a tam uvidite.*"<sup>39</sup> I did see and knocked on the door. Having heard the "yes" I entered and said, "Good afternoon, my name is Tarand. Am I at the right place." Jaup answered, "Yes, you are. Take a seat, please." With a "thank you" I sat down. Jaup himself stood up and took a few steps towards the door, where he asked, "Were the summons all right this time? Without errors?" "Not quite," I answered. "What was wrong this time? You'd better tell me, so that I can continue improving," he said with forced self-irony. "Nothing important and I am here." "Well then," he agreed accommodatingly and I added, "Every occupation has its own quirks..." (Had he attacked me, I would have said that it was my responsibility to demand correctness from my colleagues, why then not from the prosecutor's office but we had avoided that.)

Jaup came and took a seat opposite me. There were two desks between us. The window opened to the Harjuoru tennis-courts. The desks were relatively empty – a lamp, a telephone and some pens only. Jaup pulled a sheaf of papers out of the drawer, shuffled the sheets for some time, placed a copy of the letter on the right side and said, "You know we are interested in several issues concerning the "Open letter" you have signed. These issues are about the compilation of the letter and the way of collecting the signatures, that is whether there is only one author and the others simply signed or was it a collective effort. We know, of course, that some people were no more involved than only signing ... Several people have been interrogated here and some of them have spoken, some not. You have total freedom not to answer but we are still going to ask."

"I think I would like to start with a question of my own," I said on my turn. "I have no juridical education but as far as I understood I was summoned as a witness in the case of schoolchildren's disturbances. Will you kindly explain it to me how is it possible to be a witness in a yet unopened criminal case on the events that took place in Town Hall Square a month ago. According to this logic these children's grandchildren can be made responsible."

"It is true that the criminal case was started only in early October. Our, it means the Prosecutor's Office's task is to get the reasons for these events in order to be able to prevent them in the future. That is why we have selected about 10 people, a fourth of all the authors, representatives of all walks of life, to find out the reasons. It is the same you wanted to achieve with your letter. It means you are sort of expert witnesses. We have to conclude the case and that is why you are here."

I think I did not express any amazement at the reasoning and said, "The selection is still rather interesting. Some have been summoned four or five times, others walk around and say they are suffering from a complex for being neglected."

---

<sup>38</sup> It should be mentioned that in soviet-time Tallinn nobody knew the public transport timetables, they were definitely not public. Translator.

<sup>39</sup> "Where is room 5?" "Have you got the summons?" "I have." "Where should I go?" "Straight to the left and there you'll see."

"We have summoned a few. I can tell you the exact number..." and he started to count on his fingers, stopped and said that there had been about five people.

"But there are also these who have been summoned to the town prosecutor's," I interrupted.

"Yes, but none of them has been summoned more than once."

"I was thinking also about all the other conversations with our own superiors."

"Mmm, yes. All together, that's right. Have you been to your superiors already?"

"Certainly. I had to talk to the vice president of the academy immediately."

"What was the idea of these talks?" Jaup wanted to know.

"As it turned out the talks were to ascertain an essential matter – namely, whether everybody had signed himself or whether there had been a swindler who just printed the names out," I answered, disavowing all the other points in Ristlaan's instructions.

"Well, this had to be done. Did you confirm that the signature was yours?"

"Of course, I have acknowledged it from the beginning."

"Not everybody has. Some people have said that they never saw the final copy and that makes the signature invalid."

"Now I have to ask for more explanations. As a jurist, could you explain it to me how to understand valid and invalid in this case. I mean, if the letter had been published, one could afterwards publish another letter disavowing the former statements..."

"Do you want to do it?"

"This is not the point. The point is that I do not understand how these few denials – one of them the result of a blackmail in material, another in cultural matters, to be more exact – promises concerning a flat and a choir – can be legally explained. I mean some sort of document stating that the signature is invalid."

"Well, you know to whom you addressed your letter and you know where it got to. It got to the Central Committee of the CP and it does not concern us how they deal with their problems," Jaup parried. I corrected him, saying that *Rahva Hääl* was the organ of the Central Committee and it was to be foreseen that the letter would get there. He agreed and asked then, "Do you know everybody who signed, I mean, do you know their names?"

"Yes, I do. I have the original copy with all the names." When saying that I felt that I might have been had – some people had evidently said that they did not know everybody but what was done was done.

"Do you know what was the procedure with them?"

"As far as I know two people have been to the editorial offices of the papers individually and this is definitely not an answer to the letter, considering the regulations of dealing with citizens' applications and complaints."

"What were these conversations like?"

"I am not well versed in details but comrade Turunok, editor of *Sovetskaya Estoniya* had used notes prepared beforehand and followed the letter paragraph by paragraph."

"Was there any discussion or resolution? Have any misunderstandings occurred?"

"I have heard that the emphasis on teaching Russian at the cost of the Estonian language in the letter might not have been totally justified. I do not know school curriculum too well and, mentioning the Russian and Estonian languages, thought about literature and language both. Actually, only the number of periods in the Estonian literature had been reduced."

Jaup thumbed the letter and commented that everything was correct. He was right as I had mixed up the letter itself and Madis Aruja's conversation. The mistake in the first copy had been eventually corrected.

This was the gist of the conversation but I certainly cannot remember the 40-minute talk word by word. I remember I touched upon the search at the Kaplinski's and Jaup, making a face, affirmed it, adding that there were other issues concerning Kaplinski and the search was unduly hurried and, unfortunately, a mistake. He said also that he had spoken to Kaplinski himself but what made matters worse was that the top eschelons had condemned him at their forum.

"What did you actually expect to achieve by writing and signing the letter?" Jaup continued. "To whom was it actually meant?"

I said again that the letter was addressed to newspapers with the purpose to clarify troublesome issues.

"What was your main concern?"

"As far as my personal motifs are concerned, I considered it another means to avoid violence. As you know, there are rumours of threats to stab and knife the adversary and you know what gang war can lead to. This was my first concern."

Thus we had come to the motifs and Jaup wanted more. I said that everybody who does research – without taking myself for a great scientist – needs facts and data. In our conditions, however, even if the data exist, next to nothing is available. It is especially true about sociological data. How can we understand what the youth strives for if we do not have any sociological background? I said that it was a dangerous situation and motif no 2 for writing the letter. Next Jaup wanted to know how we selected the people to sign. He added, "Everybody who reads papers in Estonia, knows about the majority of these people. What is the connecting link between them?"

I said that most of the authors were not known elsewhere than in Estonia and he agreed, pointing out some exceptions like Paul-Eerik Rummo. About the selection I told Jaup that it was strictly free and everybody volunteered. Jaup said he was sure nobody had been forced to sign. I added that the authors had been called second-rate intellectuals at the party plenary session and this might be the connecting link he was looking for, although it was not clear to me who appointed the ranks and rates. Jaup tried to explain Vaino's statement that people's and merited artists and writers were not among the authors. Next he wanted to know who were the people who were shown the letter but refused to sign. I was waiting for the question about the motifs of the abstainers but it would evidently have followed if I had not refused to answer the first question. I said that it was everybody's own business and not for me to comment.

"But they must have suspicions when asked and they still refused?"

"I am not absolutely sure but being summoned to the prosecutor's office is not an everyday occurrence for a person, not like going to the department store or some service centre."

This made Jaup grumble that people misunderstood things and one should explain it in papers immediately. The prosecutor's office needed witnesses to make life better for everybody as crimes were detected just thanks to witnesses. I said that older people had quite different memories of these summons and what usually followed. As for the people's and merited artists, I said, they obviously liked to keep what they had.

At that moment somebody knocked on the door and a middle-aged woman whose name sounded Russian entered. Jaup asked her to take a seat and assured her that he would be free in a minute. Then he told me to put down everything we had spoken about. I asked whether my presence was not disturbing them and they both generously

answered that it did not. I also asked whether Jaup would not like to put the questions down but he repeated that it would be all right if I wrote about what we had been talking.

He handed a form to me. He had filled in a couple of lines about himself and asked me to put down my data. I started writing without paying attention to their conversation. I asked what to write about the victim and he said it was impossible to fill in that line as there was no victim.(?) I started from the 1st of October with a couple of sentences about the militia cars and walking children and finished saying that I did not see more as I went to have my supper in the kitchen, the window of which opens to the yard.

During a short pause in writing I heard that the husband of the woman had been harassed somewhere near the Järve railway station by men in a black Volga. On the paper that the men gave the husband had been written "Down with Shishkina!" (and Jaup corrected: "Gretchkina!") and "Down with Vaino!" This was the text that had to be painted on the fence of the Tondi military barracks. I may have misunderstood but the slogans definitely sounded like recorded. I wrote on, emphasizing that the following had nothing to do with being an eyewitness, as the letter was an aftermath and not the reason for the disturbances. It was clear from the investigator's questions, the prosecutor's office was, above all, interested in the letter. I said I was ready to help them in what concerned the motifs of writing the letter. First I mentioned the threatening violence. I also said that at PTA meetings at schools parents had been declared guilty in the disturbances and parents form a big part of the public. To declare the public responsible without informing them for what is a strange way of solving the problem. Hence the second motif: the necessity of publishing sociological data and the need to have a public dialogue. I was surprised that these two motifs covered nearly two pages and reminded myself that I always advised others to be brief but became garrulous myself as soon as an opportunity was offered.

The fourth indention started with my declaration that I considered the technical issues (who brought the paper, who wrote what line and who made corrections) of secondary importance compared to the CONTENT and that is why I was not going into it. I was kind enough to ask why not take the compilation of the letter the same way as residents wrote letters to the local housing office, complaining about a broken pipe. (I was ready to write a 'sewage pipe' but understood in time that somebody would see an analogy too easily.) I summed the paragraph up by stressing that the letter met all the demands of the regulations on citizens' complaints and proposals.

When I finished writing only one line was still vacant on the third page. The woman had left by that time and Jaup was talking to a man, obviously from the same house. The man, a bit older than me, was giggling happily, when Jaup told him about the mix up of Shishkina's and Gretchkina's names. I checked my report and handed it to Jaup across the desk, saying that some sentences were a bit clumsy as I had been disturbed by the conversation in the room. Jaup reproached me for listening to other people's talk. I swallowed my own reproof about his simultaneous dealing with different matters.

The investigator started to read my text, mumbling the words audibly at first. Coming to the bottom of page one he wanted to know what I had in mind talking about violence. Stabbing and threats of stabbings, was my answer. He wanted to know whether I might consider the militia violent. I said I had not witnessed any beating myself but had heard of a concussion at the PTA meeting at school. Jaup declared it a calumny directed at the militia. Nothing physical had happened at all and everybody who said anything different was a malicious slanderer. I countered that even this little

I saw through my window – driving the cars at 40 km per hour into groups of children – was very close to violence.

When we were speaking about parents' meetings, Jaup asked, as if by chance, whether I had children of my own. I told him I had two sons, but I am sure he already knew it. He asked how old the boys were and I said jokingly that some calculations were in order. He said such precision was not necessary, it would suffice to know in which forms they were. The tenth and the eighth, I answered. "Did they participate?" "When I got home, they were both there but they had been to Town Hall Square from where militiamen drove them away." "Had they heard about the event beforehand?" "No, thanks to the location of our home they saw their peers in the street and went to see what was happening out of curiosity."

Jaup glanced at my address on the first page and remarked, "Ah, yes, you live in Harju Street in the Writers' House." I added that just opposite the monument to Eduard Vilde around which constant pub-crawlers' fights took place. Having asked and heard what school my sons attended, Jaup commented that that school had been active in the disturbances. I said that five names had been recorded and my offspring were not among them.

When Jaup was reading on, I noticed a typed sheet in Russian that had been shifted onto the line between the two desks. Although upside down I saw it was a questionnaire and bore the names Rätsep and Tarand. I remembered that the people who had been summoned to the town prosecutor's had noticed the same kind of questionnaires, so it was intentional that they should be noticed. "Has this sheet been placed here intentionally, so that I was supposed to read it upside down?" I asked and added that I would prefer to read it in the normal way.

Jaup scolded me again that I was poking my nose into matters that were not my business. I said that as the paper was just under my nose and I could see my name not much poking was necessary. The other man in the room declared that no investigator could memorize everything and such aids were essential for their work. I commented that as our conversation was in the Estonian language why should the mnemonic devices be in Russian. Neither man answered. Jaup commented that it was good I had motivated my refusals to answer some questions, otherwise he should have started asking again. He asked me to include the phrase that I had given my statement in my own hand what I did and signed.

I had been interested in the procedure before and Jaup had said that nobody has qualified the letter as anti-soviet slander, although the high forum had called us all nationalists. I said I regretted that as nationalism in soviet lexicons is a bourgeois heresy and going on interpreting it, it would be easy to get to anti-soviet slander.

"How successful have you been in catching the malicious hooligans who were declared to be the culprits in the schoolchildren's discontent?" was my final question. "You ask too many questions," Jaup said. "I just used the opportunity as I do not get to the prosecutor's office every day," I countered. "Do you think we haven't got enough hooligans already?" asked Jaup, evidently keeping in mind all these who had already been caught and were in the militia's basements. "It is quite another story how to tie them to these events." This seemed to me to be quite close to a sincere admission. We had started talking about their materials that we had used in our letter and this – a possible attack on the Prosecutor's Office – should have seemed another reason for their interest in the letter. It is also possible that the rumours about reprimands from Moscow at the address of our prosecutors were true as well.

I also wanted to know whether we were to meet again in the same matter and he said that I might become a witness in some murder. I stressed that I had been speaking

about the letter and he rejected the possibility. I still said "see you" and left, walking down Kaarli Avenue quite happily.

~~~

Rein Jaup's denial had been false and my "see you" was soon realized, as we will see in the following.

On 22 December 2004 I walked up the same Kaarli Avenue again, not happily but feeling all right due to the approaching Christmas. I had decided to test my own memory and get a copy of the report I had written 24 years ago in my own hand.<sup>40</sup> As I had made an appointment by phone, the access was as easy as it had been back then. There was no militiaman at the door, instead of him a rather torpid secretary of Russian nationality was sitting at the foot of the stairs. She passed me to kind Stella Ilves who is responsible for the archive files of the prosecutor's office. I do not know why but suddenly I remembered that I was in the building for the third time actually, although it was the first time I had come on my own initiative. The first time I was summoned during Khrushchshov's thaw when I was a tenth-form schoolboy. A neighbour in the village where we lived at my maternal grandmother's after the 1949 deportation, had purchased piglets in South Estonia and sold them for a bigger price in North Estonia. The difference in price was explained by something in the co-operative sector's financing system, but it was still considered to be a crime at the time. The enterprising neighbour, wanting to escape with his hide intact, had written out a lot of receipts "proving" that I had sold him a few tons of rowantree berries and other forest bounty. In reality I was not keen on the woods any more, my interests like every other teenager's, lay in quite different spheres. Thus I was boasting about my legitimate reason for not attending lessons that day to my classmates, but could not admit I had anything to do with rowanberries. This is what I told the investigator and later also in court then.

I might have remembered the story when I was summoned to Jaup's room no 5 but I did not go into it with him and neither did I bother Stella Ilves with it. I was surprised when Stella Ilves said she had never heard of Jaup, although she had found out already that my name was not included in the two big files about the schoolchildren's demonstration. After some cogitation I was sad my role in the matter had been erased but still decided to have a look as the folders had already been brought out of the basement. I left the majority of the material to be perused by the now forty-year-olds who once participated in the demonstration and might want to start writing their memoirs soon. At the first glance the children's explanations seemed to be quite similar ("...we were walking here or there, when the militia drove

---

<sup>40</sup> When I read it and copied parts of it later, I decided not to put it all in the diary but I'd like to include some passages. About the youth's demonstration I have written: "...Ten minutes later I noticed a militia car (I was watching the area around the monument to E.Vilde from my flat's window), loudspeaker at the top power, getting dangerously close to the children when speeding through it." And about the reasons for the disturbances: "As the main blame was laid on the parents at the PTA meetings at schools – it means to quite a big part of the public – it seemed to be natural that the discussions about the reasons would be carried out openly and publicly. It would be too strange if the main culprits were absolutely not aware of any generalizing sociological facts but still supposed to liquidate the cause. Thus the second essential motif to write the letter was the unavailability of facts concerning sociological issues. It is easy to accuse the youth and their parents of violations but it is much more complicated to see the real reasons for their discontent that may lead to more events like the ones that occurred on 1 October. This is what needs to be discussed by all the layers of the society and the best way to do it is through expressing opinions in newspapers."

us away or a moustached man dragged into the car"). The first file contained explanations of the radio-TV football match organizers (they were mostly sports commentators) and also reports about the PTA meetings at schools. As they were not filed in order and left out of the list of contents I did not find out whether these reports were compiled by teachers or informants. To sum up I'd like to say that I have no plan to generalize the whole procedure of the investigation but would like to include the document about closing the criminal case.

*"D e c r e e*

*on closing the procedure of the criminal case*

*Tallinn, 29 May 1981*

*Investigator of especially important cases at the ESSR Prosecutor's Office R. Jaup investigating criminal case no 003845*

*e s t a b l i s h e d:*

*criminal case based on ESSR Criminal Code §194/3 about the violations of public order by groups of youngsters on 22 September and 1 October 1980 was opened on 9 October 1980.*

*The investigation ascertained that on 22 September 1980 a football mach was held in the Tallinn Dünamo stadium between the Estonian television and radio athletes together with entertainment provided by the "Propeller" – band of Nõmme House of Culture.*

*As the TV and radio had advertised the match in the media extensively, a lot of spectators, most of them teenagers between 13 and 17 gathered at the stadium. After the match many of them surrounded the band members on the running tracks. Although it had been announced over the loudspeakers already that the band would not play after the match, the youngsters demanded more music. When the band packed up and left, the youngsters also started to leave, most of them going towards the tram terminal in Kadriorg. Some groups started shouting nationally-inclined slogans. Later these were partly replaced or alternated with other rowdy slogans. Some of the youth disturbed the trams, the rail-brakes were applied several time, a tram window was broken and the doors stopped from closing. At the same time some groups started to walk towards the centre, still shouting rowdy slogans. A few youngsters called the others to come to a meeting in the Old Town on 1 October. later the same calls spread at schools and public places and the meeting place at the icecream café in Harju Street was announced.*

*Thus, on the appointed time and place – at the Harju Street icecream café and its vicinity, on 1 October lots of youngsters gathered. Later some groups went to Toompea, some to the Schnelli pond, some to Town Hall Square from where they moved to the Hotel Viru and Tammsaare's memorial. When walking rowdy shouts were hollered. The youngsters disturbed traffic and the public order was violated.*

*The investigation ascertained the identity<sup>41</sup> of many minors who had actively violated the public order in groups, refused to obey the orders of the militia and disturbed traffic. Thus their conduct contains characteristics that can be attributed to a crime – based on the ESSR Criminal Code §194/3.*

*Taking into consideration that the minors committing the offence were all positively characterized, had never committed any prior offence or had a record at the minors' commission, it was decided to induce public and social levers.*

---

<sup>41</sup> According to the file 148 pupils were arrested but "ascertained" must mean also these whose identity was discovered at schools by the photos taken by the KGB.

*Thus material on Kalev Kukk, Andres Koppel, Veljo Haavel, Heiki Hiiesalu, Venno Zuyev, Anneli Vahtre, Meelis Ilves, Jüri Borissov, Erik Virkebau, Made Mägi, Signe Raadi and Armin Altorf were transferred to the minors' commissions of their area of residence for discussion and inducing social levers.*

*In connection with the statement above, based on the ESSR Criminal Code §8, the procedure of the criminal case is closed."*

What these 'public and social levers' were, should be explained by the concerned themselves.

My first reaction to Stella Ilves's statement that my name was not included in the files at all, was the question whether something had been removed from the files. She considered it impossible. I had known 25 years before already that the attempt to tie the letter with the youth's disturbances was farfetched and artificial but I had still thought the material will be in the same file. When in the early 1990s I dropped in at the office of some investigators in Pikk Street, I found the investigator of especially important cases Jaup extremely fettered. He said there was nothing interesting in those files and I did not press him unduly as we had become independent and the former soviet investigators might have considered M.Laar's first cabinet revengeful. About a dozen years passed and only then I thought of the removed pages in the file. The answer was not so complicated, though.

My personal file contains a copy of the search report at the Tallinn Botanical gardens on 8 June 1981 that I have described in my diary below. The reasoning for the search was explained as follows in this report: "...with the purpose of finding and confiscating anti-soviet literature and documents concerning the publication and spreading the so-called Open letter."

The capital letter in Open attracts attention. This was taken into use through the Russian (*otkrytoye*) in the establishment that used only Russian as its official language. Estonians knew the letter as the letter of 40. What is essential is that the case of youth disturbances had been closed by that time (29 May 1981) and, naturally, the file could not contain the looked for document. I thought that this was in another file in the house that at that time was called Security Committee (KGB). I discovered my mistake soon, fortunately. In connection with this search at the Botanic Gardens I wanted to have a look at the articles written about ten years before by a colleague Lembit Aasalo. Reading the journal *Eesti Aeg* I found out that Aasalo had read file no 102241 on the criminal case containing the testimony of the authors already in February 1995. I have to admit that the fact I had not noticed the article before can be explained only by my cursory reading of newspapers at the time I was prime minister. But at that time the prime minister had no press service, there was one man who mediated the cabinet and the journalists – Ain Saarna.

Thus I visited the Prosecutor's office once again and was kindly given file no 102241. The decree on opening the new case bears the title "Separating the material and opening a new criminal case" and the date 19 May 1981.

It reads as follows:

*"Investigator of especially important cases at the ESSR Prosecutor's Office R.Jaup, investigating criminal case no 003845, e s t a b l i s h e d: the criminal case was started based on the ESSR Criminal Code §194/3 in connection with youth's disturbances and violation of public order on 22 September and 1 October 1980. During the investigation it was ascertained among other facts that in November and December the so-called Open letter was spread in various districts of the Estonian SSR. The letter dealt with several problems in the national issues in a wrong and*

tendentious way and tied the latter to the public disturbances of the youth. Later on the letter was read over several foreign radio broadcasts on propagandistic and hostile purposes

Taking in account that the people's conduct who spread the letter can be qualified criminal based on the ESSR Criminal Code §§118, 90, 94 and 109, e s t a b l i s h e d:  
1) To separate the materials about spreading the so-called Open letter from those concerning criminal case 003845. 2) To open a criminal case based on the ESSR Criminal Code §194/1 and inform the Estonian SSR prosecutor about it. 3) To process the case. Investigator R. Jaup.

This investigation, too, was renewed, as it was decreed at that time in every two months. As my diary includes the search at the Botanic Gardens that is a point in the investigation, I am not going to jump ahead of the events here.

~~

Somehow it happened that already the next evening I had to think about a new meeting with Jaup. Our family, my mother-in-law included, went to a concert by the *Virtuosi di Roma*. The boys were disinclined to waste time waiting for their granny to get ready to go home and left ahead of us. Getting bored waiting as well, Mari (the author's wife) and I followed the boys in about 4 or 5 minutes. At the cinema *Sõprus* we heard somebody's whistle and saw Indrek talking to somebody. I was surprised at seeing an older man with my son and took him for a felon. When we reached them, Indrek said, "Let me introduce Rein to you." As Indrek later said, I had pulled my hands out of the pockets and asked in a threatening voice, "Sepp?" When I heard that it was so I wanted to know what they were planning to do and heard that they were just talking. I said that talking could be more convenient in our home than in front of the cinema and invited him there. Mari got into hysterics and said she would not open her door to such people. I felt frustrated that she nullified my little plan and told her to go ahead. The man grasped that we had seen through his plans and said that he was not prepared to talk about such things in flats. I was angry and not able to make the next move. I asked what sort of triangles he had kept in mind when talking to Indrek the first time and he took the role of somebody who knew very little. I asked how he was getting on at his job in TV and he said it was not good. (He had already tried to explain to Indrek that Talvik was wrong saying that he belonged to the "office". Talvik, making a broadcast in the Patarei<sup>42</sup> had seen Sepp there once and made wrong conclusions?!) I still wanted to know about the triangles and asked him whether he spoke about them to Indrek. Sepp made a meek face and said, "No, I have not!" I asked Indrek the same question and he answered in affirmative. Then I told Sepp that I had been at the prosecutor's office where they were really interested in that kind of agitators and I planned to report him if he didn't leave children alone. "I believe you would," was his answer to that. Actually, he should not have believed it if he had kept his role in mind: he knew me as one of the authors. But our meeting seemed to be as unexpected to him as it was to me. Rein Sepp had an air of a well-fed and well-shod man, he was wearing an expensive fur coat and hat. The only thing not clear is whether he was there by chance or stood on his duty watch. Watching Indrek, however farfetched it seems, cannot be debarred. Pukk had advised me to report Sepp

---

<sup>42</sup> Patarei (Battery) was the biggest prison in Tallinn, established in the former 19th-century fortress. The prison was removed into a modern building in 2002. Translator.

already on Monday and the boys' mothers had already done it to some extent. It was a temptation to do just that but I feared some revenge on Indrek. When a militiaman visited Artur Ader at how to inquire about Sepp, I decided not to inform Jaup and let Mati Talvik wrestle with the problem. Talvik had the support of the party, after all, and had had nothing to do with the letter.

On Wednesday evening I saw the protest letter written by 365 Georgian writers and scientists to defend the rights of the Georgian language. It was really a great boost that this letter existed. I thought about taking a copy of it to Parmasto and Alumäe but it would have been probably too spiteful. (The Georgian letter, it was said, had been signed by academicians.)

Later in the evening we got a visit from Pentti Mälkki and still later came Bill. Bill came straight from the emergency hospital where he had taken an SCD of physics from Sevastopol. Earlier Bill had shown the Russian copy of the letter to two of the symposium guests at the Hotel Olympia. One of them had said that had he been in Bill's shoes, he would not have signed and would have thought of science and his career instead. The other man had got terribly angry and reproached the first that he was laying a shame on their institute and their whole nation. Bill left the room and the men argued on. When he got back, the second man was already lying prone on the floor, his speech indistinct and the left eye blind. Bill overestimated the power behind the first man's fist and panicked. At the hospital, however, he was assured that there was no concussion and the eye would be all right soon. Both men were considerably drunk but it needed recording due to the fact that the letter written against violence gave rise to violence in this case.

On Thursday I encountered Valton in the Pirita shop. He was back from Australia and had been at home for five days already. He said nobody had taken any interest in him. He evidently disappointed a few people that he did not come back through Madrid at all. Later I met Priit who told me that Käbin had been cut out of the the BAM film but Käbin himself was not to hear of it. Käbin was mentioned once more on that evening in connection with Paul-Eerik Rummo, who had been summoned to him for a talk.

On Saturday, 20 December I had fresh news from Tartu. Captain Ots, who acted under the title of an investigator of the town prosecutor's office, had summoned all the authors (with the exception of Kaplinski) by phone. Marju Laurisin got the summons of a witness, as she had previously already refused. The questions were more or less the same but more skilfully spaced. R.Pöllumaa had named Kaplinski as the person who showed him the letter and admitted it later. I heard from another source that Aira Kaal had done the same and added that she called Lehte Hainsalu herself. And had been sorry. Was Ots considering Tartu a real nest of vipers or was he expecting to get as much as possible information is not clear yet and won't be clear before Christmas is over.

On the same Friday when Ots was accomplishing his duty in Tartu, some ideology workers were sitting at the Central Committee, listening to comrade Soidla telling them to get closer to the people or everything would be out of balance. The church was a virulent nest, especially dangerous because it was an organisation. Donations to the church had started growing very quickly recently. Does that mean that events in Poland and Lithuania are automatically transferred over here? The aparatchik had not mentioned the letter itself but had answered some questions about it. Soidla had mentioned a few second-rate figures anonymously, half of whom had just signed accidentally. The letter itself had been nationally inclined and quite wrong. Some sort of a shaky platform had been put up at the meeting, though: some bad 'uns and a lot of

silly-billies had accomplished something not even worth mentioning, that is why it was not read to the ideology officials.

Jaak Kaplinski would not get his *Sirp* award, although the editorial office is still discussing it. Jaak was also cut out of the film shot for Tartu anniversary. He had been sitting at his typewriter, a baby in his lap, representing a writer from Tartu. But what was he planning to write?

Let us assert, though, that both Jaaks and Ivans are being cut out and cut off... Somebody who had set up his candidature for the chief architect of Tallinn had not been taken into account due to his Russian surname, although the man is fluent in the Estonian language.

On Saturday I had a long and sinful session with Bill at the end of which we dropped in at the Vetemaas' place. The host said that he would have signed although he did not quite agree with some statements. With a little offence in his tone he admitted that nobody gave him a chance to do it.

Once again Rein Sepp appeared. He saw Indrek who was going to take an exam in German and wanted to know whether his old man was always so piggish or was it sometimes possible to talk to him. He had comforted Indrek that he was not going to beat me up and after that become quite paranoid again. He had asked Indrek to ask Yushkevich what a fine fellow he is and been offended that somebody from the Patarei had been sent to share his flat. Despite the fact that he could bring out Niklus's letters from the prison, he still had not managed to lay his hands on the Open letter. So he asked Indrek once more to get it for him. If I am going to keep my word, I really have to tell Jaup about him now. (I had quite forgotten about it due to the report I had to present to the scientific council.)

The next day, the day before Christmas Eve, Vello Lõugas's apartment issue had to be decided. This was the thing he had been blackmailed with by Maamägi. I had meanwhile seen Lõugas's letter to Maamägi, Kõörna and Siilivask in which he said that no corrections in the letter that had been made after his reading the rough copy were essential and thus he was not withdrawing his signature.

Jüri Martin informed me that at the Academy of Sciences Party bureau meeting that would begin at 3 p.m. Kõörna would talk about the letter. I talked a bit with him and his wife and it was quite clear that Martin was scared about keeping his uniform spotless. When I, keeping in mind the stool-pigeons in the streets, called the KGB personnel primitive, Martin began to defend them.

Getting home I found T.Raid there, who together with Kaarel tried to catch the Voice of America's programme from behind the *Mayak*.<sup>43</sup> According to advance notice the letter was to be read. We could listen to it only in an hour and surely the 19th wavelength was recorded by competent organs by then.

Hereby I would like to present the text of the letter that was the main source for the present book.

*To newspapers "Pravda", "Rahva Hääl" and "Sovetskaya Estoniya"*

*Open letter from the Estonian SSR*

---

<sup>43</sup> The Russian radio station Mayak was transmitted at almost the same wavelength and thus did a good job of jamming the Voice of America broadcast.

*On 14 October 1980 the following press-release of the ETA – "In the Public Prosecutor's Office of the Republic" appeared in the Soviet Estonian newspapers:*

*"The Public Procecurator's Office has instituted criminal proceedings against the authors and instigators of the serious disturbances of the peace that have taken place in Tallinn in recent days. These disturbances, which involved groups of youngsters, have invoked the justifiable indignation and dissatisfaction of the workers. Legal action will also be brought against criminal hooligans involved. The circumstances will be subjected to close scrutiny in their entirety, after which the culprits will be brought to justice as the law prescribes."*

*This forty-eight-word [48 words in Estonian] text is the only item that has appeared in the Soviet press to date concerning the political actions taken by young people in Tallinn and elsewhere in Estonia. In addition to the ETA dispatch, the occurrences have been discussed in schools and other institutions. As the events were witnessed by a fair number of visitors from our fellow republics, vaious rumours spread throughout the entire Sovie Union. All that has taken place of late compels us to write this letter.*

*The violence associated with the events in Tallinn is cause for concern. There have been subsequent calls for more of the same. The use of force is an indication that perilous splits have formed in our society, splits indicative of antagonism between the leaders and the led. The stresses are aggravated by an unwillingness to tolerate the inconsistencies between what is purported to be reality and life as it actually is.*

*We find that such a situation is dangerous and cannot prevail without bringing dire consequences to Estonia and all who live here. Aggravation of the circumstances cannot be pardoned, but by the same token it would also be unforgivable to ignore the deeply rooted causes that have given rise to the present state of affairs. Consequently, we feel compelled to direct your attention to the following matters.*

*It is not likely that demonstrations involving thousands of young people took place as a result of prompting by individuals. It seems to us that these manifestations were in fact an unexaggerated reflection of the dissatisfaction of numerous older Estonians. We are dealing with a social problem impossible without the participation of everyone in our society of the problems involved.*

*Dissatisfaction has deepened in recent years, but the factors responsible for fomenting this discontent have been taking shape for a much longer span of time. This dissatisfaction has come into existence as a result of numerous socioeconomic problems hitherto unresolved. Hardships in our way of life (waiting lines in stores, shortages of food and consumer goods, and inconsistent distribution of these goods) form the backdrop for conflicts that foster alcoholism, criminality, instability in family life, and a host of other damaging phenomena. The disarray that characterizes the state of people's rights in Estonia serves to compound the aforementioned conflicts.*

*Other problems have been given public exposure to a greater or lesser degree, but it seems to us that problems occurring in the sphere of nationality questions have only been pigeonholed under the label of hooliganism up to the present. Therefore we are focusing in this letter above all else the national aspect of social conflicts. Conflicts developing out of nationality questions are particularly grave in nature, owing to the*

*fact that their causes have not been discussed publicly with adequate candor – something illustrated by the ETA communiqué cited earlier in this letter. In our opinion, the insecurity and, in some cases, even the fear about national identity that exists in the two largest nationality groups in Estonia, the Estonians and the Russians, is the source of the conflicts and stresses between nationalities in Estonia. Fear motivates irrational, frequently overt and aggressive behaviour.*

*Insecurity and fear exist because of a number of factors, both objective and subjective in nature. These factors cannot be divorced from one another when they are being considered. They must be weighed together: events of an objective nature in the realms of economics, demographics, and culture are inevitably seen and interpreted through the prism of nationalism. The uncertainty Estonians feel about their future is caused by the following conditions:*

- *the rapid proportional decline of the Estonian segment of the population, particularly in Tallinn, where Estonians are becoming a minority nationality group;*
- *the circumscription of the use of the Estonian language in business, everyday matters, science, and elsewhere, a trend that has been characterized by the compulsory presentation of theses about Estonian language and literature in Russian, and by the exclusive use of Russian at the festive gathering marking the fortieth anniversary of the Estonian SSR;*
- *the growing scarcity of Estonian-language journals and books, especially insofar as materials pertaining to the indigenous culture are concerned, and the inhibition of research in the field of native culture;*
- *the hyperbolic and inept propaganda campaign pushing the teaching of Russian in schools and kindergartens, partiality shown in history lessons, at the expense of other peoples, to the contribution made by Russians;*
- *immoderate and overtaxed development of industry by the All-Union Council of Ministers, with a blind eye towards the accompanying damage to the ecological balance;*
- *unilateral propagation of bilingualism among Estonians, without a similar effort being made among aliens, a circumstance that deepens a feeling in the Estonian community that its mother tongue is regarded as a second-rate language, and the nonexistence of a periodical analogous to Russky yazyk v estonskoi shkole for the purpose of teaching Estonian in local schools;*
- *the appointment of persons with inadequate knowledge of Estonian culture and a lack of interest in it to responsible posts and to positions concerned with national and sociocultural problems.*

*Decisions that distress Estonian national feelings are usually rationalized as being economically necessary. Nevertheless, it seems to us that the bitterness evident in Estonians cannot but exert a detrimental effect upon the efficiency of the economy and the quality of work. It may be surmised that Russians, Ukrainians and Belorussians, along with other non-Estonian ethnic groups residing in Estonia, experience difficulty in establishing an ethnic identity. They are of diverse national, geographic, and social backgrounds. The psychological differences between Estonians and other nationalities have remained completely unexamined up to this point.*

*The extent of equality that has thus been achieved is frequently overrated. Conflicts between nationalities often develop because people do not understand the behaviour of others and as a result fall prey to false interpretations. It is of utmost importance to find out more about the social, ethnic, and cultural problems of immigrants in Estonia and to establish how these problems interrelate with similar difficulties faced by Estonians.*

*Likewise, we should without fail probe, discuss, and write about the types of attitudes and behaviours of Estonians that disturb others. Distrust is evident between the two primary nationality groups, serving as fertile ground for preconceptions, stereotypical false images, and rumors, leading us back once again to the need to establish and disseminate objective information about the situation. When truth falls in short supply, we find ourselves faced with the type of scarcity most fraught with danger.*

*Certain facets of Estonian national consciousness are easily offended, and failure to recognize this can have grave consequences. The hypersensitivity of Estonians, particularly on the subject of their language, can be explained in light of the fact that the Germans who were overlords here for centuries held the Estonian language in contempt. In past centuries the Germans attempted to convince the Estonians of the impotence, uselessness, and even the detrimental nature of a culture relying on the Estonian language as a keystone. The tsarist government that followed took the same tack. Estonians formed a culture based on their own language in spite of the pressure and gibes of the German landowners and the tsarist government, thereby giving the Estonian language a symbolic meaning of human dignity. Only a person who speaks Estonian or at least displays a discernible respect for it, stands a chance of establishing close relations with Estonians. A person who lives for years in Estonia and shows no deference to the Estonian language and culture, whether wittingly or not, insults the Estonian sense of dignity. Attitude towards the Estonian language is a key question in the development of relations between Estonians and other nationality groups in Estonia.*

*The above does not pretend to be an exhaustive analysis of the circumstances that have strained basic relations between nationality groups in the Estonian SSR. We only wish to point to some of the basic problems – above all, to the need to really resolve nationality questions. They have to be honestly and thoroughly examined, discussed at all levels, beginning with strictly academic discussions and extending to comprehensive discussions in the press, radio, and television and in schools and businesses.*

*To preclude the repetition of the events that took place in Tallinn and to relieve existing tensions between the nationalities, something should be done to alleviate the doubts of Estonians about the security of their present and future and to guarantee that the native inhabitants of Estonia will always have their final word on the destiny of their land and people. The question of Estonia's future should not be decided solely by All-Union Council of Ministers or by central boards of other offices. All significant socioeconomic undertakings, such as the establishment or expansion of large industries, should be preceded by analysis of possible social, psychological, and ecological consequences and also by public discussion.*

*Since the revolution, the Estonian language has been backed by constitutional guarantees, and it has been used throughout Estonia as the official language in all aspects of civic life. Every Estonian within the boundaries of the Estonian SSR possesses the self-evident right to an Estonian-language secondary and higher education and to use Estonian in spoken or written form in the conduct of business. We think that a legislative confirmation of this principle by the Supreme Soviet of the Estonian SSR would go a long way towards normalizing the present unhealthy situation.*

*Nationality conflicts can easily lead to distrust and escalation of hate and make the peaceful evolution of society impossible. Such evolution is only viable as the result of cooperation among every nationality group here. We wish for Estonia to become and remain a land where not a single person will suffer insults and handicaps because of his or her mother tongue or ethnic origin, where understanding prevails among nationality groups, where cultural unity reigns amidst diversity, and where no one feels any injury to his national pride or endangerment to his national culture.*

*Tallinn-Tartu, October 28, 1980*

*[The signatures of the following persons are appended to the document.]*

*Priit Aimla, Kaur Altoa, Madis Aruja, Lehte Hainsalu, Mati Hint, Fred Jüssi, Aira Kaal, Maie Kalda, Tõnu Kaljuste, Toomas Kall, Jaan Kaplinski, Peet Kask, Heino Kiik, Jaan Klõseiko, Kersti Kreismann, Alar Laats, Aare Laht, Andres Langemets, Marju Lauristin, Peeter Lorents, Vello Lõugas, Endel Nirk, Lembit Peterson, Arno Pukk, Rein Põllumaa, Paul-Erik Rummo, Rein Ruutsoo, Tõnis Rätsep, Ita Saks, Aavo Sirk, Mati Sirkel, Jaan Tamm, Rein Tamsalu, Andres Tarand, Lehte Tavel, Peeter Tulviste, Mati Unt, Arvo Valton, Juhan Viiding, Aarne Üksküla.*

## PARTY PROPHYLAXIS, CARROT AND STICK

It has been suitably peaceful since Christmas and this is the second day of the new year.<sup>44</sup> Isn't it rather curious that there is no fury about the publications abroad? Of course, most of the officials were busy purchasing turkeys and fir-trees and, on the other hand, the organs are known for rather long breaks in their activities that they use for matching up the pieces of the mosaic. These breaks make the group observed stop worrying and this, in its turn, gives more necessary information to the organs.

The party has stuck to the version they came out with before Christmas. They also emphasize that *Pravda* has never received the letter, obviously aiming at liberating their chief organ from responsibility. Generally they repeat what Vaino had said before. At the Academy party bureau session Kõörna had called the case "a new ideological attack" and repeated what Johanson had said at the party town conference: the Tallinn Botanic Gardens were an apolitical nest of wrongly chosen staff. Martin said that he had been meekly quiet, Siilivask and Sõgel had been in sackcloth and ashes. The latter had certainly been agreed upon beforehand. The Martins family flew into panic at the selection of the Botanic Gardens as the whipping boy and Mrs. Martin started to spread the news that nobody would ever get the outgoing visa abroad. I expressed my amazement to Jüri about this kind of logic and my deep sympathy for somebody who belonged to an organization where nobody ever claimed argumentation or explanations and touched their forelock instead. He seemed to share my regret. I advised him not to take any responsibility for me as I considered myself a responsible person in my own right. I estimate the special mention our institute got as an old method to make the lesser brooms sweep cleaner. The tactics was fruitful at Ado Slutsk's: the end-of-the-year broadcasts were cleansed not only of Juhan Liiv and Betti Alver but even wellknown phrases like "peeping dwarfs" and "creating a *vene*" from the *Kalevala* (some time ago the line from a popular song "the *vene* flies like a bullet" was also prohibited)<sup>45</sup>. The difference in the calibre of the radio house and the Botanic Gardens can be seen in Johanson's annual report (that, for the first time in his life he delivered in the Estonian language) that does not say a single word about the BG but includes the sentence: "The TV and radio employees, especially the ones making broadcasts for the young people, have been making essential errors." I read this annual report speech with an exceptional care. Johanson claimed that truth about our life should be said. As far as the letter was concerned he said, "The town party organization has to pay more attention to the international upbringing of the young, fighting against the nationalist limitations and the manifestations of bourgeois ideology." (The quotes have been taken from *Õhtuleht*, 26 December 1980.)

When J.Kahk and J.Rääts took the floor they had agreed about everything and emphasized the international character of science and music both.

The ideology secretary Rein Ristlaan's extremely secret information reads as follows: "*On the first days of November, immediately after the letter had been delivered into the editorial offices of the newspapers, the Estonian SSR Communist Party Central Committee officers in charge, the leaders of the establishments,*

---

<sup>44</sup> This sentence shows that I had no info again. On 30 December the bureau of the ECP Central Committee listened to a report about "Preliminary results of the perusal of the Open letter by a group of intellectuals from the ESSR". The document had been declared to be "totally secret". I am going to present the translation of the document, being aware of the fact that I might not remember in detail the bolsheviks' secret language in Estonian any more.

<sup>45</sup> *Vene* has a double meaning in the Estonian language: a boat and Russia, Russian. Translator.

organizations and creative unions met with all the people who had signed the letter. The conversations were held by comrades O.Utt, A.Aben, A.Soidla, J.Kaarma, K.Rebane, V.Maamägi, A.Köörna, R.Penu, P.Kuusberg, A.Koop, R.Virkus. Some of the undersigned were invited to the editorial offices of the newspapers "Rahva Hääl" and "Sovetskaya Estoniya" to comrades G.Turunok and U.Tulp. The communists among them were talked to by the first secretaries of the town councils N.Johanson and I.Toome. Some of the undersigned were summoned to the Estonian SSR Prosecutor's Office in order to clarify the relationship between the letter and the youth's hooliganism in Tallinn streets in the autumn of this year. Some undersigned were summoned to the Committee of National Security for prophylactic talks.<sup>46</sup>

The talks revealed that the initiator and the main author of the letter was member of the ESSR Writers' Union J. Kaplinski. Co-authors and active propagandists have also been detected: member of the ESSR Writers' Union J. Viiding, actor T. Rätsep, employees of the Tallinn Botanic Gardens A.Tarand and A.Pukk and some others. It also became clear that some of the undersigned regretted their mistake and backed down, presenting their renunciation in written form (A.Kaal, T. Kaljuste, J.Tamm). Initially R.Ruutsoo, member of the USSR Communist Party and junior researcher of the ESSR Academy of Sciences History Institute also renegued, however it was revealed later that he was but a conjecturer, actually being one of the organizers of the group.

Several of the undersigned declared that they agreed only to some of the points and disagreed with the majority of its theses.

I personally talked to the secretary of the ESSR Writers' Union M.Unt and researcher of Tartu State University M.Lauristin (on her initiative). Long conversations with both of them revealed that they considered several of the presented theses right, simultaneously stating that signing was a mistake and they would not like to have the letter sent abroad and used in antisoviet propaganda. Both claimed they were ready to publish objections in the press, if necessary. Later, indeed, M.Unt wrote an article in the newspaper "Kodumaa" but he was not able to give a proper counterstroke to the slander spread in the West and circumvented the gist of the matter.

During these conversations the undersigned were unconditionally warned not to spread the letter further.

No repressive methods (dismissal from work, punishment, prohibiting publication etc.) have yet been applied to the undersigned.

To neutralize the impact of the letter the following has been done:

- well-known social scientists of the Republic have been told to publish articles to reveal the wrong standpoints of the letter; this work is carried out according to a special plan; the first articles have already been published in newspapers and journals;
- the activities of the authors of the letter have been condemned by the ESSR Writers' Union party bureau; the information about the discussions has been forwarded to all the communist members of the union;
- the letter has also been discussed at the research institutes, culture establishments, at the meetings of the secretaries of the creative unions' party organizations and party activists of the Estonian SSR Academy of Sciences.

---

<sup>46</sup> Prophylactic talks must be read as intimidation and browbeating.

*At all the meetings (with the exception of the Writers' Union) the letter was discussed without showing it or the names of the undersigned to anybody.*

*In early December 1980 the extensive dissemination of copies of the letter became a fact. On 10 December the whole text was published by emigrant paper "Eesti Päevaleht", followed by reading it over the Voice of America and publishing in other hostile sources of information. Thus the text has become well known and it has been used by some antisocialist elements to incite nationalistic feelings.*

*Taking into consideration the indicated, I hereby present the following additional measures to the bureau of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee:*

- 1. to apply the responsibility clause (including blackballing, if necessary) in case of the undersigned communists who took part in this antisoviet activity;*
- 2. the directors and leaders of establishments and organizations are to talk to all the undersigned again and present serious pretensions about the letter's wide dissemination;*
- 3. not to allow the authors of the letter publish in the means of mass communication and propaganda;*
- 4. to reveal the nationalistic content of the letter in oral propaganda and agitation;*
- 5. to publish a series of contrapropaganda articles in republican papers and journals to oppose the antisoviet campaign ripe in the West;*
- 6. to continue summoning the most active authors to prophylactic talks in the offices of the KGB and the Estonian SSR Prosecutor's Office."*

This kind of style was alien to J. Kabin who talked to Paul-Eerik Rummo in the Presidium of the ESSR Supreme Soviet on 23 December 1980. Paul-Eerik said that when he was thinking of this conversation afterwards at home, he became very sad. First due to the fact that in all Kabin's thinking there was not a shred of democratic ideas and secondly because this man, who according to Soviet constitutiona was the top political figure in the country lowered himself to the level of a common snooper. Our expectations about Kabin being on the other side were extremely naïve. What was happening was the plain and banal fight for power on the level of persons and not ideas. I had been hoping that this struggle leads to a greater interest in the processes within the society but the new aristocracy are unable to think in these lines and their measures to reinforce their personal power split up the countries and nations even more. The relative national hero had said that there is no sense to discuss anything with the people who do not grasp anything, it would be better to apply straight to them.

During Yuletide the Radio Liberty continued to read the letter and on 27 December it was read again over the Voice of America. Their introductory comment informed the listeners that the teaching staff of Tartu University were facing a threat to be discharged. What is behind it (might it be the same as the news about the confiscation of Kaplinski's typewriter, although actually only a tryout of the font was taken), I have not yet discovered as the annual report has taken all my time. People seem to take the letter as a sin that, as we all know, is sweet. Rumours of several authors having lost their jobs already, are ripe and many. The truthful assessment is rather secret, they try to hide it from wider public. I got an idea of it in Viljandi, where I was to give a lecture to about half a hundred-strong audience about prediction and weather forecasting. The atmosphere was friendly but it was already midnight when people started to approach me one by one to shake my hand and confess they did not want to

mention the matter in a bigger group. Perhaps even clearer was the attitude that was revealed on a Christmas-card addressed to Mother. The text said: deep respect and glory to Andres, but there was no name of the sender! In the bus, on the way back from Viljandi I got talking to Helju Tauk who told me that a lot of people were dissatisfied that nobody asked them to sign. I comforted her with the same, already frequently used hint about further opportunities. She told me about her personal experiences in 1975 when she was discharged from the conservatoire and her home thoroughly searched. She also said that the person responsible for her case was major Raus. She also added a piece of fresh folklore that had named the authors of the letter "the emperor's forty madmen"<sup>47</sup>.

On the same day, at the plenary session of the "Man and Biosphere" programme I got the answers Madis Aruja had written to the five questions presented by the prosecutor's office. These are a proper addition to the original text of the letter, presenting examples of Nature protection and educating the young by means of following good examples.

Some more matters from the period.

Tiit Randla had been questioned by a hunter and KGB man Moolok (reminding me of Solzhenitsyn's series about the Gulag, where the name and profession are related in the same way, curiously enough! The problem is whether the name has made the man or have the forefathers who were given the name justified it in some way and this justification has genetically been forwarded to the the offspring.), who wanted to know who had given the letter to Fred Jüssi to sign. Randla could not know it.

Ita Saks encountered Aira Kaal in the street. In the following conversation it became clear that A.K. had never reneged. Invention of slanderer again!

Vello Lõugas, whose application to get an apartment the trade union refused to consider, estimated the result as a special taunt. Indeed, at the meeting Maamägi, Kõörna and Pullat had justified the trade union's decision by signatures to some ill-natured letters. Fighting for his rights, Lõugas said he would go to Ristlaan but it is sure the three would not acknowledge the reason and stick to the "unanimous decision of the trade union committee". Actually, the decision was very much influenced by the fact that Lõugas was wishing to get he same flat Kahk needed to improve his living conditions (i.e. move out of his home and leave it to his daughter). Maamägi and Kõörna evidently wanted to show Lõugas how things are arranged, as Lõugas was almost ready to renege his signature. L.Aasalo was planning a letter to Lõugas's support that I think is not too sensible at the moment. The trade union of the Academy of Sciences is too tiny an opponent and the big guns would wash their hands of the whole matter. Besides, the tone of the letter with its frequent reminders of Stalin-time repressions might not be quite right.

Kaplinski was indeed excluded from the annual prize-winners of *Sirp*, and *Looming* was not allowed to publish a poem by Kalju Kangur just because of its dedication to Kaplinski.

Quite a peculiar talk took place between Juhan Viiding and me in our kitchen, where he invited me for privacy. Juhan was evidently arranging a psychological experiment when he silently wrote the name Juhan Kilk on a piece of paper<sup>48</sup> and

---

<sup>47</sup> "The Emperor's Madman" (1978), a popular historical novel by Jaan Kross is about Timotheus Eberhard von Bock, the author of the draft of the first Russian constitution and one of the most outstanding precursors of the Russian Decembrists. Openly outspoken about autocracy, he was accused of high treason and spent 9 years in the dungeons of Schlüsselburg Castle. Translator.

<sup>48</sup> Some nationally-inclined (read: nationalistic) verses written under the pseudonym Juhan Kilk were passed from hand to hand but I never kept them.

asked me what it meant to me. I said that it meant nothing besides that some people (A. Pukk) had advised to read it backwards<sup>49</sup>. After that Juhan became more open and said that somebody suspected me behind the pseudonym. I was surprised indeed. This "somebody" had said that it was a pity that such letters gave an opportunity to reveal the real authors of the first letter. Juhan did not tell me the name of this scared somebody and put an end to the talk "for ever", evidently believing my words and other signs. I supposed, perhaps exaggerating the matter, that Juhan Kilik was a finely-planned provocation, aimed at Tarand. Another, and perhaps a more realistic assumption is that some mental giant (no sense to suspect more than two persons)<sup>50</sup> has gone beyond sense in his combinations and permutations. Sure, the authors do not know each other that well but my attitude to the rules of a team game has thus been seriously underestimated. The trouble is that in case of provocations exchange of information would be necessary even in details but in case of speculations the whole thing should be kept quiet. *Errare humanum est.*

We were to spend the New Year Eve at the Kreems' who had just returned home from Finland<sup>51</sup> I was considerate and even did not think of talking about the "uncomfortable" topics with a man informed abroad, who was expecting a good and responsible job here now. At the same time it was clear that this reticence would raise barriers in the conversation. The barrier was removed by the brother-in-law himself who asked, "Did you put your hand in, too?" When I admitted it he said he had read the whole story in the Stockholm-published *Eesti Päevaleht* and added that he would have signed himself. He had heard in the Central Committee, though, that I as an undersigned only, needn't worry but it would be quite different with those who compiled the text. I neither commented nor corrected the viewpoint and this conversation was over. Perhaps I should not tie the next to the former but when we were taking our leave, the following scene occurred. My two brothers-in-law were this time a bit more active with vodkas and juice in the kitchen and this might explain the different situation. When I reached my hand out to shake Kreem's he asked with a drunken surprise, "And you still want to shake hands with me?" Somehow I thought I had to comfort him and said that situations had changed here meanwhile and all Estonians should work for the same purpose. He added something about the very high position offered to him and I thought that he feared losing contact with old friends and did not even get the idea that he might have pricks of conscience. It would be wonderful but not realistic to expect to have "our man in Havanna", but this is what the Central Committee rules and regulations would not allow. The matters will become clearer further on but this was the beginning of my understanding that the letter split the social groups.

As for the dissemination of the letter, in rural localities the demand still supercedes the offer. This information came also from the Nissi district forest officer Rein Paltser, who said that the ten copies he typed needed additional ones that would be typed by his wife, the chairperson of the village soviet (for those whose IQ exceeded 100, as he said). He had heard from a friend, the chief of Rapla militia, that beating of children was blamed on the militiamen from Byelorussia.

Who can say how much truth and how much fantasy these rumours contain. What happened at the People's Court of Kalinin district (Ita Saks sometimes has to be there as a people's assessor) is definitely more realistic. A schoolboy from Perm who visited Tallinn in October within the framework of international upbringing had asked

---

<sup>49</sup> Read backwards it is an obscenity in Russian.

<sup>50</sup> Evidently R. Ruutsoo

<sup>51</sup> Enn Kreem had been working at the USSR Press Bureau TASS in Finland for four years.

a Tallinn schoolboy whether the latter participated in the demonstration and disturbances. When the Tallinn boy said yes the guest beat him badly up and the matter was taken to court. But the boy from Perm refuses to come to the court saying he has no money. Evidently he would be subjected to compelled attendance but it is a good example of international thinking and friendship between the soviet nations.

Olaf Utt was persistent defending the principles of socialist internationalism in the newspaper *Sirp ja Vasar* and condemned the arrogant encasement. Some people think that this passage was about the letter.

7 January

The horizon is getting darker. Some days ago we heard about Ristlaan's vicious speech at the Radio House, where he, among other things, had emphasized that the people who do not understand how hostile the letter is would have no place in an ideology establishment. I am not responsible for the wording but the atmosphere at the radio has been whipped to fine froth and some exaggerations are easily born in this situation. The idiocy embraced also the 1 January concert of the Ellerhein chamber choir the last song of which was announced as an English folk song *Night*. Actually, the beautifully performed song that was heard was *Silent Night*. Somebody, obviously the Central Committee employee Toomas Leito, "told the ones who needed to know" and the event and song were declared to be dirt. And that despite the fact the whole programme was made up of spiritual music of the seventeenth century. This clearly shows that not religion but cultural coherence is under attack, just like 40 years ago people who had the so-called English orientation were deported to Siberia or nothing can be heard of the "third way" in 1944<sup>52</sup>.

This is some general background. More concrete steps are summons to top men again. Fred Jüssi had been summoned to Slutsk, Ita Saks to Jõerüüt. Juhan Viiding was at Kuusberg's already yesterday. These are the first blossoms of the third round.

Late at night the phone rang. Rein Saluri sounded a bit more sober than he actually was. When I had gone up to his flat, it became clear at once what he was trying to talk about. His mixed up phrases and fragmentary sentences summed up as a lament how difficult it was for him and Jõerüüt to condemn Ita Saks at the party bureau session. This was given as a reason why both men were drinking excessively. Another worry seemed to be that the authors of the letter have carelessly given a blow to the Estonian culture in general, as now the journal *Keel ja Kirjandus* (Language and Literature) was being investigated. The pillars of culture, he said, were extremely busy saving the Estonian culture and they were irreplaceable as there were so few of them. This was about Kuusberg as the secretary of the Writers' Union among others. The emphasis laid on the differences between him as a pillar and me as a second-rate figure made me angry for a while and my reply was that Saluri's inner tensions and ambiguity between the party life and culture should not be extended to culture in general. Piret Saluri was obviously embarrassed about her husband's proclamations and the next day she tried to explain his outbursts by the undue influence Jõerüüt had on Saluri.

Evidently at the same time another conversation like that took place in Tartu between Hans Trass and another student of his – Martin.<sup>53</sup> These two men discussed the possible sad fate of the Botanic Gardens thanks to the unworthy behaviour of the vice director. It is only a supposition and Martin should be more than medium-drunk to admit it.

---

<sup>52</sup> The Otto Tief government in September 1944 attempted to restore the independence without the Germans and the Russians, they achieved it for a few days.

<sup>53</sup> Rein Saluri and Jüri Martin had both studied biology at Tartu University. Translator

~~~~~

My assessment of people here does not pretend to give a general estimation of their character, only their reactions in connection with the *Letter of Forty*. Hans Trass wrote in his book *Alone and Together* (2002):

*"The people who belonged to the Communist Party – I mean these who joined it without sharing the communist ideas – will always be characterised by one feature that I would like to call quasi-quislingism or becoming a raddish, becoming pink. I know from experience how difficult it is to admit it. But I think it must be admitted.*

*I personally find these excommunists the most disgusting who once sang praises to the red ideology in their speeches and remarks and who now have not said a single analytical or critical word about their deliveries before and now. It seems that the change from what they spoke and wrote about in the seventies and early eighties and what they did after the "singing revolution" was as easy to them as changing a shirt. I detect a real and continuing ideological flightiness in them.*

*Analyzing my own party membership, its background and reasons, I notice again and anew how cunning the red ideologists were, how hypocritical and, alas, how effective. They never expected that the one hundred thousand who joined the party would become "convinced builders of communism", they sneered and scoffed at the very idea. Their main aim was to isolate these people from possible adversary activities, to tie them up within the net of the collaborators, complying with stupidities and nonsense. Double morals ruled – in confidential private talks they criticized, condemned, ridiculed the party and the soviet power but openly the same people either tried to avoid criticism or spoke in such a naïve way that every listener was to interpret their words as something the speaker did not actually believe in but was forced to say."*

I am not well versed what else may have been published meanwhile but I must say that this kind of talk is honest, I have not met it elsewhere in the Estonian language. As soon as I had read it it let the author know what I thought.

~~~~~

We discussed the "Estonian matter" as I jokingly called it once with Martin on the 9th of January. he told me that he had been commanded to have a talk with me. I asked him to whom I was summoned that time and heard that he was the person. I became much happier and commented that talks with writers were taking place already. I asked him if I had to answer the questions about my feelings when I heard about the letter having got abroad in written form and he said that that kind of belletristics was not necessary. This time there was no demand for a written explanation at all. I said that if the letter had been published the rest could safely be left in the hands of the copyright to solve but this idea would hardly satisfy the potentates. Jüri Martin agreed. We thought it was enough of an explanation to stress that addressing the letter to three newspapers should show for whom the letter was meant. Nobody had asked permission to publish it abroad. We also contemplated the reasons for Johanson's declaring the letter apolitical. I reminded us both of the words of Kõörna at our first meeting: so you have gone into politics now. And I had thought that it was politics at least to some extent. Now the politics has snowballed but finally

the whole institute is declared to be apolitical! Concluding our talks I asked again who had commanded him to talk with me and his smile showed that nobody else than the KGB.

Later in January the party channels let us hear only echoes of footfall and shuffle. A. Pukk, who already had disobeyed his summons to Johanson, went to the Nõmme hospital. He had talked on the phone with Jüri Martin about the feelings concerning the publication abroad and Jüri had promised that he would write out the answer himself. Ruutsoo became ill too as the institute was preparing to condemn him at a party meeting. At least five people had been prepared to support him but, naturally, his illness postponed all that. The senior party comrades had namely advised him to gain time as the mudwrestling among them might lead to a much lighter punitive action.<sup>54</sup>

I also heard that Captain or Major Ots had been busy in Viljandi, trying to find out how widely the letter had spread there. He had investigated Priit Pedajas as an author. It was evidently an attempt to find out whether Pedajas had been one who reneged. A lawyer from Võru had been discharged for copying and multiplying the letter. Some women in Keila had not been given the quarterly bonus because they had made copies of the letter, but their colleagues had organized a voluntary collection that eventually became bigger than the premium would have been. Tiia Toomet, who visited us on 17 January said that they were getting exhausted of all the fuss about the letter. Jaan Kaplinski's lecture in Lithuania had been cancelled, Henn Käämbre's invitation to talk at the Institute of Physics withdrawn. As a compensation for the cancelling Jaan had got a book with a dedication.

At birthday parties I heard that Aimla's name had been erased from under a Russian–Estonian translation in the newspaper *Sirp ja Vasar* and Aruja's article was considered unsuitable for the *Noorte Hää*. On the evening of the 14th Astok called and mumbled something about Öpik having deemed the North-East Estonian prognosis tendentious as Tarand had compiled it. It was ridiculous, I had not made a single stroke of the pen in the project made at our office. I informed Martin about it to remove the suspicion from the real authors. On 21 January at the department bureau meeting I mentioned it also to Erast Parmasto. The latter wanted to talk after the meeting and asked me to accompany him up to the Council of Ministers (Toompea Palace). At the gate of the Presidium he asked me quietly what kind of repressions have been applied in my case. I replied in a loud voice that I would not call these activities repressions and Parmasto, looking around, told me to speak in a low voice. I mentioned the summons to the prosecutor's office and to Kõörna and Maamägi. Parmasto had heard about the latter from Martin and took greater interest in my talk with Kõörna. I mentioned that I had got an impression that Kõörna was afraid of our talk being bugged. Parmasto corrected me saying that it was not a mere fear but a fact that the talk had been bugged and added that he would not, otherwise, have asked me to accompany him. The short walk was short indeed and I asked him whether he had read the same kind of letter written in Georgia. When he said he had not, I mentioned that academicians had signed it, we both made a grinning grimace and parted.

The next day, i.e. today, Parmasto still took a risk and talked to me on the phone "about the matters we talked about yesterday". He said that it was my duty to inform him about all the conclusions as it was not allowed to pass the academy's secretary by in such matters. I interpreted the order equivocally: first, he has heard something about

---

<sup>54</sup> The CP rituals foresaw that the only excuse for being absent at some important meeting or talk was the medical certificate confirming some disease. The "prophylactic means" or scaring people, actually brought along symptoms that could truly be considered an illness.

what lies in wait for me, second, he is sympathetic and wishes to be my guardian angel. It will do no harm, surely, but I doubt how much anybody could benefit of it.

What sort of traps are being set at the moment is difficult to foresee. Indrek and his friend Artur were summoned to the prosecutor's office (this time captain Ots received them in the republican, not town office). Indrek called me from school and at half past three I talked to the boys for half an hour in Päts' kitchen, my telephone disconnected. Listening to Indrek's summary later, I saw the boys had been quick learners if they needed my advice at all. The matter concerned Rein Sepp, naturally, and Indrek had to write his witness's report down and Artur was interrogated orally. A hint from Ots, whether the boys had not thought Sepp a madman shows how they would get him off the hook. When the open letter was mentioned, Ots had been looking at Indrek for a long time. Artur had demanded about five times that Sepp must be arraigned. This demand made Indrek laugh afterwards. Ots had calmed Artur and said they knew very well themselves what to do and besides, they were investigating the school students' demonstrations together with other matters. What to make of it – first, Ots as one of the main investigators wants to map a whole scheme out and tested Indrek; second – a farther-reaching trap may be in making. The organs might get a freer hand in the near future as people are going to deal with other matters and the letter would be forgotten.

It would be interesting to see the commentary of *Frankfurter Allgemeine* and Daily Mail if it is true that the letter was indeed published in both.

The punishment meted out for communists was spoken about for some time before it started to happen. Marju Lauristin was reprimanded and called to account in written form at the party meeting of the university. This is said to be the last but one punishment in its weight and consequences.

Nobody defended her. Marju had made a speech, the text of which in writing exists. The motivation of the punishment was that she had been politically shortsighted not to foresee how the letter would be used. The other party members are still waiting. The necessity to punish Pukk was mentioned by Martin at the party meeting of the Botanic Gardens on 27 January. There are rumours that he would be expelled from the party. Evidently the party secretary Piirisild heard more at the district committee than he told me. This conclusion is supported by the fact that he left immediately to recuperate. Martin hinted at Pukk's badly working department as if it had become clear to him only now, and expressed an opinion that Pukk would not escape a punishment. Our organisation has some oppositionists but evidently somebody from the district committee would be appointed to retain law and order. But it will all be in the future as the examinations and test for asthma and then the treatment will take at least a few weeks.

The functionaries of the Writers' Union have become well again but Ita Saks' case has evidently been brushed under the carpet. Her last writing must have caused a pretty big confusion and they might want to gain some more time. Rein Ruutsoo is well too but has been recommended to stay on the sickleave until the congress of the Estonian CP. Some people still hope that time will tell.

We were at the Kaplinskis' in Tartu the whole day on Jaan's birthday. We did not discuss details, we mostly deliberated about Naan and his very bad article that up to now is still in a drawer in the editorial office of *Sirp*... I supposed that it had been commissioned, timing it with the rage of the academician. When it is published it must be succeeded by "social opinion" about Jaan's incompetence that would lead to his essays being deemed unprintable. In this respect it is a serious matter and the

worry of the younger biologists (K.Kull, T.Tiivel) well grounded. However, I do not see any possibility of a public reply to Naan, as the younger men suggested. I am not able to produce anything multilayered enough, so that neither Jaan nor Naan were mentioned and the reader still figured out what it is all about. Feelings of indignation that Naan has caused are ripe only among the literati. I believe that the wider public, especially the younger generation of intellectuals, needs to be educated a lot more.

More about Jaan – today Martin considered it necessary to prohibit his appearance at the winter seminar. Before that he had advised Siiri Liiv to drop the drunken jokes and the latter directed Martin to me. I got angry and said I did not see any reason for reacting to rumours and he should say why Jaan was not suitable. If one gives anonymous information it often is slander. My anger might have had some impact but not on Jaan's appearance at our seminar. Jüri Martin resumed his veto with our being in the centre of attention and his reluctance to irritate some people more.

On the last Sunday of January the reunion of the Modern Secondary School alumni took place. I had been invited to be present at the establishing the alumni association in the daytime already (actually it was the re-establishment after a 44-year-long interval). The opening speech was made by the oldest alumnus Georg Meri, who said that he had graduated 64 years ago. The talk was rather bold: plans to found the school museum and writing the history of the school. Finally a pointlessly large presidium was elected and, despite my secret protest, T. Ots was one of the members. In the evening I went back to the school and spent horribly much time in the cloakroom queue – talk about the centenary of the school had brought out real crowds. I left my coat with Kristi Kattai-Pärkma and went to reconnoitre. I found about a dozen classmates standing in a circle on the second floor and asked about their plans. At that time teacher L.Virkhaus passed our group. She did not say anything but grabbed my hand and shook it several times before continuing on her way. Saller commented: well, well, others are not even worth a hello... The gist is that at the end of my schoolyears I was in teacher Virkhaus's black books for my argumentative interjections. This had made her angry and she predicted a poor future and not getting to the university for the likes of me. When I, as a first-year student full of pride, attended a reunion, Virkhaus did not even respond to my greeting. *Tempora mutantur* ! I had done nothing else that still violated the rules – although on a different scale this time.

It was not possible to reminiscence or even talk at the restaurant Viru, where the band played really loud. During one of the intermissions Reet Shvaiko-Talivee started to talk about the letter, seemingly only to demonstrate her competence. She spoke about the discharge of Mati Unt and the pending dismissal of all the authors from the radio. I did not care to correct her and the band came back anyhow and took over again. K.Kallaste seemed to be somewhat interested as well. When Villomann arrived the party had got into real swing already and at 1 a.m. the bad habits of the class surfaced and it was decided to go to Pihlak's place. Only two merry widows (read divorcees) declined and stayed with Dr Haug's class. When we had established ourselves to the horror and umbrage of Pihlak's wife Kai and revelled for about an hour, Villomann quietly left and was away for about an hour. Then he came back together with a wizened man, introducing the latter as a graduate of the class two years behind us. As I had a girlfriend just in that class I knew the boys also and was sure this one had never been at our school. I did not believe either that Villomann had just encountered the man he called Juhkum by chance. It is quite dubious that one leaves a party between 2 and 3 for a little walk and encounters a stranger to all of us whom he drags to our party in another person's home. Well, it may happen to a drunk but hardly

on a reunion day. My train of thought might sound like spyomania but I remember very well Villomann's provocation at the probably 1966 reunion, when I heard that the KGB so much wanted to bring a case of a former forest brother to its end... Well, I would have tried to endure the wizened stranger unless he was too familiar with me. I interpreted it as a forced introduction and told him quite seriously that if I were him I would not agree to do that kind of a job. Juhkum pulled a long face and did not utter a syllable more. I soon left for home.

A few days later, on 28 January, our Botanic Gardens' bus brought me back from work to the theatre Estonia. As usual I went along Suur-Karja Street towards home. At the cinema Sõprus I noticed somebody at my heels but he pulled back almost at once. His hesitation attracted my attention and so I was not surprised when Rein Sepp came up to me and said he wanted to talk to me. When I wanted to know what about, he proposed to go to some park and talk there. I replied I had only half an hour at my disposal to drop in at home and if he wanted to talk he had to do it there and then. Without further delay he asked why I had told on him in the prosecutor's office. I said I did not have the honour and he countered that I had promised to do just that. I said that I had done it to free my son Indrek from the attention of his kind. Sepp wanted to know who could have told on him and I said I did not deal with cases that were the responsibility of investigating organs. At the same time I tried to push on homewards. Sepp continued talking in a hurried manner (this forced and hurried manner of speaking was characteristic of him). He wanted to know whether the boys had not given evidence against him as if he did not know that it had been so. I replied that they certainly had, as they had been summoned to the prosecutor's office just for this purpose. The next question what the boys had said about him remained unanswered. Sepp tried to return to the question but before that gave me a hazy story about the Patarei prison, Talvik and harassment. I only shook my shoulders. Perhaps his plan was to make me ask why he had been in prison and heard a legend about a bravehearted freedom fighter. He expressed a badly hidden threat that whatever the boys might have said about him was easy to confute and write another report about what Indrek had told him. He hinted that Indrek had no witness as Artur had been behind them. I did not react and then he showed that he knew very well what Indrek had written (– naturally, Indrek had been asked to make a carbon copy). Then Sepp leaped to another topic and said that harassment by so many people (fathers and sons Talvik and Tarand) was a shame, although he was able to protect himself. I made another step homewards and he followed me fast, plunging into the prosecutor's topic again. I said that everything had been said and there was no need for more talk. He deviated quickly and expressed his delight that he finally had had the chance to meet one of the forty. He wanted to get to the source and know whether indeed two men had renounced. I said I did not know what he was speaking about. Sepp agreed and said that such men were shite but I was sure to know who they were. I repeated that I did not deal with cases under investigation and was not interested.. Sepp remarked that it showed I did not trust him. As this was absolutely true, I left him standing. Now he called after me that in our house a man was listening to everybody's calls and I should be careful not to mention any names. I repeated that I was not interested in matters that violated the constitution and, besides, I had no idea why anybody's phone calls should be bugged. Sepp thought that this was not sensible and that he had thought about his own name when we agreed to meet. I said that as we had no common interests, I would hardly make any move to meet him. When we had started our talk, Juhan Saar was passing by, shook my hand and asked what I was doing

there. His countenance told me that he knew the TV informer. Why has the little square in front of the cinema been appointed just to this man to snoop, I wonder.

During my short breathing space at home I informed Indrek about Sepp and suddenly felt again that I was sick to my teeth of all these snoops and informers. Although I, as the temporary director was delegated to attend the concert for the party congress deputies in the city hall and had planned to go in order to observe the audience, I decided not to go. I was mad because they were trying to involve Indrek in their games and feared that something might be made of his report on Sepp. Still, half an hour was sufficient to recover, and so I went to see the city hall itself and the *crème* of the society in it. Walking around there I met several acquaintances (the Ladvas, Kaasiks, Mades, Tamms from secondary school) who seemed to be surprised to see me there. As I was walking around with Ülo Mandre, I had no chance to ask them whether they were indeed surprised and in case they were, why. Later it turned out that the reason might have been Vaino's speech that remembered the Botanical Gardens with such "an amiable charm". I myself heard the passage about the BG only the next day when Aruja phoned and read it aloud and with great relish to me. I asked Kalju Auner to get me the special issue of *Rahva Hää*. I immediately understood that declaring our ideological work unsuitable and ignoring all the facts must be a cover for something bigger to come. The direct result will be punishing Pukk within the party but several knight's moves later, it will be my turn. There will be some time before my role as a weak link in the general research of the academy becomes verified. Weak ideology resulting in weak research had been mentioned in the speech of Rebane.

I left the city hall at the end of the intermission as the variety show from Leningrad was not alluring. I had seen the audience and the hall, besides I wanted to avoid the long queue in the cloakroom after the concert. I went through empty passages towards the exit doors that were all locked. Approaching the woman at the reception I asked whether it was possible to get out of there and she kindly pointed to the end door in front of which a group of security grenadiers and militiamen with walkie-talkies all turned to stare at me. I exited without thinking that they took a special interest in my person, they must have been amazed at my untimely and unsuitable departure.

At the beginning of February I had a fierce cold but on Wednesday, 4th of February, I had to present the annual report at the department bureau. Martin was there as well, his nose running even more than mine. Veiderma, whom I had met on my way up Lühike jalg and who had mentioned the passage of Vaino's speech, asked what the slander actually meant. Martin answered straightforwardly and said that Vaino's criticism had nothing to do with our research and seminars and the reason for it, as everybody knew, was a certain letter. The academicians seemed to agree but started to deliberate what to do next. Parmasto made a scheming politician's proposal to condemn our ideology at the bureau. I do not know whether he proposed it due to the bugging system or according to the procedure that "the invective has to descend from the top downwards". Parmasto was criticised by Trass who said that it was necessary to learn something about the previous seminars. Raukas thought that it would be sensible to check the department first, to criticise too but it should certainly be shown that the financial means were not sufficient for achieving a high ideological level. He was rather happy himself that it turned out so nicely Marxist (social standing determines the social consciousness). Listening to them, a small hope was born in my heart that the ideology might bring us some means, for example to build at least half of the needed fence for the Botanic Gardens. Eventually it was decided that the so-called reply to Vaino would be composed by the trio Parmasto-Raukas-Martin.

Priit called at the end of the week and said that *Helsingin Sanomat* (5 February) have published the letter, although in an abbreviated form only. I expressed a hope that as royalties some *sukkahousut*<sup>55</sup> will soon appear.

On 9 February Bill called and said that Vellner was reluctant to employ him, hoping that it would be easier in three or four months time. Bill had stressed the regulations of transferring employees from one institute to another and promised to seek for a court solution if these regulations were violated. Vellner had refused to tell Bill where his unsuitability had been declared. M.Unt had been left out from the almanac *Jaosmaa* that is just being edited and also lost permission to go to Finland. Viiding and Valton had been erased from the list of candidates for the Smuul prize .

By 12 February the party has livened up again. Ita Saks had been approached by Villem Gross who had asked her to rewrite her too direct letter. Ita had agreed to produce a shorter and less emotional one. We went with her to Ruutsoo to consult him on party matters. Ruutsoo had been sacked from his job as a lecturer at the Marxist evening classes and had also had a longer talk with the director Valkonen. I talked to Mari Saar about the same problems concerning Pukk, trying to ascertain that somebody would present a defence speech. The women seem to be ready to do it; H.Tamm may tip the scales.

Mati Unt had been commissioned by the newspaper *Kodumaa* to write up some sort of contrition. He had produced *January Contemplations*, stating that although information was somebody's property, other peopl's letters should not be opened and used in one's own interest. This had been considered too weak and meek and Utt had returned the article to Unt.

I had a chance to see the article in *Helsingin Sanomat* on 6 February. The next day the same paper published an article by the Moscow correspondent. *Neue Züricher Zeitung* had also published the letter, I heard. I saw a quotation on human dignity in the paper of Estonian Agricultural Academy and hope to squeeze it into my materials later<sup>56</sup>.

When time goes by the intervals in my making notes are getting longer. Today is 21 February and the notes I had had to hide<sup>57</sup> meanwhile ended with our visit to the Ruutsoos on the 12th, I think. The next day Ruutsoo was informed of his dismissal from Tartu University as well, where he had read some lectures as a part-time job. Some days later there was to be the History Institute's party meeting but it did not take place as on the evening of the 14th Rein had a serious stomach-ache and was taken to the emergency hospital. The first diagnosis was burst stomach but injections helped a bit and prolonged the need for operation. The later diagnosis was malfunction of liver or pancreas that the stomach had misinterpreted and prepared to burst. What was the role of nerves in all this may be debated but they might have played a part in the hormones of these organs indeed. The party meeting did eventually take place and Maamägi had tried to persuade the others that it was necessary to expel Ruutsoo from the party and declare his research out of date. He had also threatened that there would

---

<sup>55</sup> *Sukkahousut* – tights in Finnish. Many people depended on good friends from Finland who brought them coffee and tights and other commodities the shortage of which was chronic in the occupation years. Translator

<sup>56</sup> It was the article by Harda Arimäe *Sentiments after the Friendship Days* that was published in the paper *Academy of Agriculture* on 27 January 1981 in which the author quoted *The Letter of Forty*: "Estonian culture was created despite the oppression and derision of German nobles and tsarist officials and that makes the Estonian language a symbol of HUMAN DIGNITY."

<sup>57</sup> As there were too many names included in this first chapter I hid the notes in L.Aasalo's rural cottage.

be layoffs at the institute. Some of the employees beginning with Ea Janssen and ending with Ülo Kaevats had presented defensive speeches and the matter was not concluded yet. Medical examinations at the hospital are going on.

The same is true about Arno Pukk, who thought that he would stay at the hospital for a week or two more. I hoped that by the time the party meeting of the Botanic Gardens would take place all the other party members would have been punished already as none of them would have been expelled, the defence of Pukk would be more reinforced. So it should still be useful to gain more time. The disciplinarians themselves do not like the distention at all. Martin has already several times expressed his disapproval of Pukk's sickleave and not going to Johanson. As far as the other bannerbearers of the era's conscience are concerned, Jaan Tamm had been reprimanded at the meeting and in written form as well, although the latter has not yet been approved by the district committee. Ita Saks had been copped up at the bureau of the Writers' Union, attended only by three comrades. Her arch-enemy was Ahto Vellamaa from the district committee who had been especially angry as Ita would not say she was sorry.

My suspicions that had become almost a mania and included also T. Koppelman's attempt to borrow some money from me only increased, when I got a card today. Some unemployed Grebentshuk promised to return everything he got from me, did not mark my name on the address. The card had been delivered by hand and I should send him a parcel or money poste restante. Curiously enough the "unemployed" Grebentshuk had bought a card with a view of Harju Street for three kopecks but saved another three not buying the stamp. Why did he not slip such cards into other postboxes if he had to walk up to mine anyhow? Is it simply sort of throwing out a net or is it a part of some systematic activities? My conversation with Martin on the evening of the 14th helps to make me susceptible. I was invited to go to his place on Friday evening in a style that let me guess the topic beforehand. We talked quite long although the main topic was exhausted already within an hour. Martin was not sincere and I see several reasons for it. As he later said himself, firstly he had been embarrassed to start this kind of talk at all and secondly, as he repeatedly emphasized later, he was not exactly aware of the plans concerning me. Thirdly, as it also became clear later, he still knew much more than he let out then. He based his talk on information from the KGB and the party both that somebody from the top eschelon of the Academy of Sciences would be punished for weak ideological work and the domino effect would soon touch upon the Botanic Gardens as well. Whether this fury of the gods would split the Gardens and if it does when, Martin had no idea. I agreed that the possibilities were there and admitted that I did not have to be research director if it was possible to avoid the calamity. I sketched up some plans of withdrawing either totally or partly but insisted that I had to have some certainty of a new job before resigning from the old. He quite agreed to that and said he did not want my total resignation at all. We conceded that he would clarify the possibilities with the top men as I do not have any reason for doing it myself as my work as research director had not found fault with anybody. We also discussed possible candidates for the job and parted company with mutual compliments. The gist that they wanted to get rid of me was entirely clear. Martin even remembered to remind me of our talks in the previous summer when I had grumbled that I did not like the bureaucracy included. I still thought this way but said that we had to treat it as a punishment to satisfy the punishers who might not stop at that otherwise. Martin stressed that "we would not be forgotten".

Our later discussion became a rather heated debate on national issues and the host's drinks made of spirits were enjoyed also by his neighbour Mati Punning. I was alone against two practical doers but they could not reform me. Their arguments about a vigorous and powerful Soviet Union consisting of Russians, about research within the permitted limits and no diversity in the society were nothing new and they were more often than not used to promote one's own career, or as Martin and me used to call it – as footholds in climbing a mountain. The slogan *Macht und Wille* has done enough harm already.

On 22 February my father Helmut dropped in and told me about summons to the militia in Lubja Street. They had asked questions about some Finnish journals sold to the second-hand bookshop. Dad had indeed sold some *Seura* magazines that belonged to the hospital where he worked. He had been told that all the Tarands living in Tallinn are being checked. It may be a separate case but I mentioned it in case it is not. (Dad's relationship with Kangro had also been hinted.)

On Sunday evening I was visited by Kaur Altoa, whom I had not met before. He got the Russian text he wanted and hurried to catch his train, before what we both expressed a wish to meet again.

Today, on Tuesday, Mati Hint and his wife dropped in. They had just returned from Czechoslovakia that they finally, after 14 attempts to get permission for a trip abroad, had visited. He was convinced that the permission this time was just due to the letter.

The party meeting at the Writers' Union was written down in shorthand and that is available. V.Gross and L.Remmelgas had done their very best as wholegrain imposters.

Jaan Tamm called and said his reprimand had been replaced with expelling that is against the statute, though.

8 March

The previous week at the winter seminar in Neeruti was fine in every respect. It was also a respite from all the matters concerning the letter. Nothing else was mentioned than Gustav Naan's article battering Jaan Kaplinski that was just published. Fortunately the article brought about a total condemnation of its author. Besides, this article reminded several people suddenly what role Naan had played at Stalin's time.

The tale "Rein Sepp" is approaching its end. As I heard from my sons Indrek and Kaarel another meeting had taken place when the boys went to take some bottles and jars to the recycling point. Indrek had kindly allowed Sepp to carry their suitcase with empty bottles. Sepp had again praised his own skills and steadfastness that helped him to get out of the mess and then he had shown great approval of the KGB man Ots who was thinking just like all of us. On the other hand, he had threatened to find assassins to murder the man who had told on him and added that Indrek would never get to the university now. Enn Kreem told me that the prosecutor's office had informed Talvik that there was no case on Sepp at all. So it all can be evaluated as a demonstration of power. It does not mean, certainly, that Sepp is smelling like roses after his failure as a provocator. What it means, hopefully, is that there is no sense to let him orbit around us. But why then, if he won't bother us any longer, did he pull wads of money out of his pockets to show Indrek?

When I got home on the 9th of March, I found Ita Saks here, depressed and out of sorts. Her party retributions had not developed further than the order to fill in one more form titled "What else I have got to say" that seems rather similar to an investigation record. Ita's first reaction was not to write anything and she still stuck to it when she was sitting here. This would certainly lead to automatic expelling. I

repeated my former prediction that she would not be expelled if she could bear about two more rounds.

So she finally came to the conclusion that she would fill the form up. Her depression and disgust were evidently caused more by a handful of writers who passed her by barely nodding in greeting or greeted her in an angry manner. I do not remember who they were except Rimmelgas. According to Andresen's specification Rimmelgas is a born ferret and his conduct should not have caused depression but there may have been more, and hasn't this sort of thing been happening to "witches" throughout centuries?

She also told me about rumours circulating about the Botanic Gardens. They had come for Pukk and me from the KGB and I had managed to leave very quickly towards the hothouses or the forest. The skeleton of the story actually corresponds to a real event, only the interpretation is folklore. It was a Monday meeting after the night talks with Martin. The meeting was not quite over yet when the secretary came to tell Martin that somebody from the KGB was waiting for him. Martin left the room and when he came back he asked me whether he could use my office. He did not say what for and I did not ask but gave him my permission, saying that I would first take a paper from my desk that I had to take to another office. Martin could not use his office as the department heads were still there arguing. So Martin and the freshly appointed curator of our establishment entered Päts' kitchen before me. I entered my office, greeted the front line peace fighter whose mien and bearing clearly betrayed his profession, grabbed the paper I needed and left in a hurried way as usual. Who told the story and gave his or her interpretation to the trivial event, I have no idea and no wish to pursue it further.

On the 12th of March I can report that last night Tiia Toomet came and said that just before she had left home to catch her bus, Kozlov from KGB had appeared at their place. As Jaan Kaplinski was not yet at home and Tiia had to leave not to miss her bus, the KGB men remained to circle around their house by their car. Tiia tried to call home several times, direct and through the long distance operator, but in vain. As it was late we could not ask our neighbour to help. I tried the direct line today from work but after five calls the line turned to be busy. It might have been some technical problem but Tiia remembered that when their home was searched last autumn, they had been told not to take the phone off the hook when someone called. Tiia was naturally nervous.

My attempts to call Jaan were caused by the information I got from Virve Roost. There had been some kind of meeting in the Central Committee the day before and the expression concerning us had been garish, so we'd better be careful. Moscow had scolded our Prosecutor's Office due to the partly solved case, the excuses and the searches. Moscow was demanding clear lines. If it is true, it might again lead to the interior fights for power within the party that splits the reds into the black and the white. The black are combining a case that would show at least a part of the undersigned as tools for emigrants, the white try to get a milder solution, simultaneously using the outcome in their fight against the black. During the last months the black seem to have been on top but it is not sure for how long. In case the black win, the whole colossus would crumble sooner but the end may be too black, or blood red.

## **THE FIRST RETROSPECT**

The history only a year old is too fresh to compile an epic of heroic exploits – all the heroes with their odd anguishes and meagre bodies still walk around and are inclined to explain everything in their own way. At the same time, half a year is long enough a break in these notes to be sure the paint is not sticky fresh any longer. The subsurface currents in the society are difficult to detect as there is still the same lack of information. Besides, there is always a danger that friends and acquaintances see things from the same viewpoint and do not know what is happening in different social groups. But there must be these currents and the organs are evidently kept busy with bigger, and certainly criminal cases, so that the letter as a single case should not be in the focus of their attention any more.<sup>58</sup>

I would like to record a few more facts here, just recording and not explaining like the ancient chroniclers did in case of interesting phenomena in the nature.

In spring the punishments of party members continued, although there were some breaks in the activities. This buffoonery took longer than anybody had foreseen, perhaps due to the fact that the first hurriedly made errors had to be smoothed down as they had not followed the bufoons' regulations to the dot. There was to be a fixed number of meetings in a fixed order, for example. By summer, though, everybody had been duly whipped and the number of whacks seems to have been the same (a reprimand in written form on the personal card). Aira Kaal might have been an exception.

I was most concerned about the whipping in Päts' estate's stable<sup>59</sup> that was prepared for Arno Pukk and finally I almost participated in the procedure. Namely, I eavesdropped, standing behind the door of the room, where the meeting was held. There is actually nothing much to write about it, the records exist and the whipped one has a copy of them as well. By that time the darkest clouds had withdrawn to the horizon and the two instructors sent from the district committee – Malysheva and Soo by name – were responsible for meting out the punishment according to the statute. Further protests seemed to be senseless although Pukk was reluctant to leave things as they were. About the same time Ita Saks' case was brought to its conclusion in the district committee and evidently Rein Ruutsoo's as well. Every one of them was declared to be politically shortsighted and got the opportunity to improve their sight within the trial period of one year.

On the 8th of June something happened in the Botanic Gardens that I eyewitnessed. I still do not know how much it was connected with the letter, i.e. the connection has been openly admitted but its deeper meanings have not been disclosed. I came to work from our summer cottage by the morning bus and so could not get there before 11 a.m. In my office, Päts' kitchen, I found hordes of dead and injured bees. One swarm had settled in the chimney already earlier and now they had evidently come into the room through the flue. The weekend in the cool room and hunger had played havoc with them. I opened the window and started to collect the bees on a punchcard and placed them in the small patch of sun that reaches the windowsill only in June. Being busy with the bees I noticed three men approaching from the direction of the barn. Their gait was so characteristic of their profession that I said to myself: again some KGBeshniks, let them walk, I am busy with more important things. I did not see

---

<sup>58</sup> The preliminary investigation was stayed on 1 September 1981. It means that it could have been continued at any time. The rather stupid term "stay" became known also in the Republic of Estonia especially in connection with stopping one's party membership for the time one had a job that according to the constitution should be neutral.

<sup>59</sup> Estonian peasants were whipped for smaller or bigger violations on the Baltic-German noblemen's estates until 1903. Translator.

them any more and did not pay attention either. (They evidently went to make a phonecall at the secretary's.) It took me about an hour to save the bees and do some current jobs before I could go to the clayhouse<sup>60</sup>. I had not been there long when I noticed Rein Ratas going into Taimi's room. I would not have paid much attention to it had he not had a very peculiar look on his face. About ten minutes later another man appeared in the same corridor, asking for me. Approaching him I recognized the senior investigator Jaup. I greeted him and commented on our former acquaintance. He asked me to come out for a private talk. We had our private talk in front of the clayhouse. Jaup asked whether Aasalo was our employee and I answered in the affirmative. Jaup said he had a search warrant for Aasalo's workplace and home both and passed it to me. I made clear that the warrant was indeed sanctioned by the prosecutor and could not think of anything to gain time. It might be possible that this is what the brigade was waiting for, some underground activity perhaps. (Why else did they not do anything before, although they had been at the Botanic Gardens already since morning?) As Martin was on a business trip in Tartu, I was the highest official present and could not protest. Jaup asked me whether I knew anything of the key to Aasalo's safe. I said that I had not worked in that house for some time and did not know even the safe for sure. On our way towards the 46th house, Jaup deliberated about how we (the forty authors) had wanted to do good but the letter had got abroad and now they had to investigate again how it could happen. I might have asked what sort of crime was spreading a not anti-soviet material but the warrant stated "also anti-soviet material". I was afraid that there might be something like that in the safe and in this case I must be strictly official. I was still hoping to gain time with looking for the key but it became clear how naïve I was at once. Two more KGB men who joined us in front of the greenhouse did not introduce themselves. When we reached no 46, the taller, spectacled one, stood on watch about ten metres from the door (does this mean that they hoped to discover some organized activities?). Together with the others we entered the passage where three safes stand one upon another. We asked which of them could be Aasalo's. L. Saaver did not know but Sander who was coming downstairs suggested that we should try the upper one as the middle one was mine. The last hint was quite unnecessary and I did not like it at all, as my safe was full of maps, among them copies of the presently "secret" ones<sup>6162</sup>. The investigators were very happy about Sander's directions and they were ready to open the upper box. For that they needed the tall man who was keeping watch in the yard who stepped in, pulled a key from his pocket and opened the safe at once. A preceptive moment on the background of our thoughts at the moment when we put our valuables in a safe...

---

<sup>60</sup> This is how the labourers' house was called on Päts' farm.

<sup>62</sup> What makes the matter piquant was the fact that when I visited Finland in 1976, my friend whose hobby was flying provided me with a topographic map of Estonia and vicinity that had been made for British Royal Airforce. If they had discovered that my fate would have turned as coordinates on maps were rigorously prohibited by the party and government. But for my work I needed just the coordinates. I came back from Finland by boat and the map was in a plastic bag together with all sorts of odds and ends. A couple among the friends who had come to see us off in the morning had given us a tin of smoked reindeer meat that was in another plastic bag. At the Tallinn port the customs officers at that time had a long counter behind which there were a man and a woman that day. Sex did not matter as they both had eyes only for the tin as soon as they had got it out of the bag. Paying no attention to our explanations they requisitioned it. During our talk I was pushing my other plastic bag with the map of espionage towards the door and managed to take it through without being detected. I admit that the *poronliha* (reindeer meat) played a much bigger role than my skills in my success.

Later I understood that a totalitarian state could not afford to make complicated locks for safes: men in its own service would have more trouble only. I risked offering the skilled safeopeners an opportunity to open the other safes as well but they were not interested. So I just stood there and watched how the shorter KGBeshnik was taking one folder of detailed plans of land use after another out of the safe and laid them aside after having given each a cursory glance. I even started to hope that the safe was clean but then I glimpsed something pinkish red and the hope died<sup>63</sup>. The searcher said hurriedly, too quickly actually, "Here it is!" and it really was there. My immediate impression that the searchers knew exactly what they wanted and the searcher was too quick, not even pretending to have a better look at everything in the safe. They were not interested in the other safes and Jaup had indeed asked only about Aasalo's one. Before opening the safe we had had a quick look at Aasalo's desk and shelf. There was a bundle of letters in the drawer, all addressed to Aasalo. The men seemed to take some interest in these but Jaup did not make the decision to confiscate them immediately. Standing at the shelf I tried to find out what method they used when deciding whether the material was antisoviet. It was my own fault that I did not even get an idea what it was, as I had clumsily pointed at the *Estonian Statistics. Agriculture* that was lying on the shelf. I had wanted to get closer to the limits but my question was answered by a haughty sweep of a hand and a patronizing comment that this was nothing.

However, I got to know concrete examples, a whole dozen of them, of antisoviet materials on the same day already. Jaup sat at the desk and started making a list of material confiscated. I took a seat opposite him, at Saaver's place. Jaup had not been writing much, when he looked critically at the carbon copy paper he had taken from his briefcase. It was really quite worn out. Our helpful employees seeing the mishap offered another carbon paper. Jaup asked to test our typewriters with Latin alphabet simultaneously. Two of the KGBeshniks went to grant the wish with the help of Annuka and Veering. Loopmann who had entered the room a little later was sure that all the performance was actually to get fingerprints. It might have been true but I was not aware of it when it all was happening. There were no other people in the room besides Jaup and me for a while. Jaup's manner of speaking became milder and he said it was a pity somebody had to keep such rubbish.

This should be the right time to publish the record that I could copy at once as the representative of the institute. As said before, it was according to the instructions of the Central Committee but according to a legal procedure it is arbitrary like everything soviet is.

*"Search Record"*<sup>64</sup>

*Tallinn 8 June 81*

*Investigator Jaup of the Estonian SSR Prosecutor's Office, at the presence of impartial witnesses Erna Eduard's daughter Annuka – Tallinn, Ehitajate tee 42-45 and Luule Aleksander's daughter Veering, Tallinn, Mustamäe tee 147-62, and the vice director of the Botanical Gardens Andres Tarand, according to the requirements of the ESSR Cr. §§ 140-142 and 147-148 carried out a search at the workplace of Lembit*

---

<sup>63</sup> This was the manuscript of "The Gulag Archipelago" by A. Solzhenitsyn that I had borrowed from Aasalo to read with difficulties (very poor quality paper and the worse printing tape).

<sup>64</sup> The lists of the material are included in the file of criminal case no 102241.

Aasalo in order to find and confiscate antisoviet literature and documents that concern the so-called Open letter and its distribution<sup>65</sup>.

The persons mentioned afore have been explained their right to be present at everything the investigator does, to express their statements that will be recorded.

The search began at 13.30  
ended at 14.00

Before the search began the investigator presented an order of 8 June 81 and after that asked vice-director Tarand to open Aasalo's safe ( not knowing the key<sup>66</sup> the safe was opened by the employees of the prosecutor's office).

In connection of that the search was conducted in Lembit Aasalo's workplace (safe and desk drawers).

During the search were found and confiscated 1) letter to academician Karl Rebane (begins with the words "We have been informed" and concludes with the words "case in the work of the Academy of Sciences on the 3rd page". 2) two-page Estonian language printed matter titled "Let's Live Without Lies" which concludes with the words "Alexander Solzhenitsyn" Moscow 1974". 3) 40 pages bound in a folder titled "Additional remarks to the free distribution of ideas and news in Estonia" VIII collection starts with the words "The blue, black and white national flag" and concludes with the word "Observer" and the contents. 4) letter to vice-president Kõörna (starts with the words Better late..." and concludes with the words "to comrade Siilivask – on 1 page). 5) Letter on 1 page (starts with the word "V.M. Molotov" and concludes with the words "In Scandinavia". 6) six-page printed matter "To whom language belongs" Hando Runnel ends with the words "without agreement". 7) Five-page printed matter "How to behave when interrogated". Concludes with the date 1977. 8) Seven-page typed letter to Lord Killanin. Ends with the date 9 March 1980. 9) Two-page typed letter "Violation of the constitutional rights of the Georgian people. Concludes with the word "academicians" – in two copies. 10) Open letter from the Estonian SSR – on five pages – ends with the name Aarne Üksküla – in four copies. 11) "Otkrytoe pismo ob Estonskoi SSR – on six pages – ends with the name Aarne Yukskyla – in three copies. 12) Eight-page typed matter bound – A.Kadak "Russian axe-culture". Concludes with the words "marked off". 13) six-page printed matter "Authentic material on recent history" Heino Susi. Concludes with the words "Journal Mana" 40 pp 95-99.

14) Seven-page printed matter bound – A.Kadak "Gymnastic exercises on monuments" Concludes with the words "The Russian bear would go". 15) Printed sheet When will the Russian Empire disintegrate? 16) Typed and bound Russian-language manuscript of A. Solzhenitsyn's "The Gulag Archipelago" on 401 pages. 17) Green notebook that begins with the words "B-333". The second page starts with the word "arrests". 18) Thirty seven letters addressed to Aasalo.

The impartial witnesses and the person present did not make any statements. The recors was read to them aloud, correctly written.

Impartial witnesses /signatures/  
Person present /signature/  
Investigator /signature/

---

<sup>65</sup> In what way "The Gulag Archioelago" by Solzhenitsyn corresponded to the distribution of the Open letter has been answered by history. But it is still topical how the jurists produced in soviet time understand it.

<sup>66</sup> I do hope he did not mean that I was not aware what is a key. But it is true that I did not know where Aasalo's safe key was kept.

I asked who were his unIntroduced companions and he answered that I should not be interested, he was the one responsible anyhow. I also asked whether I was any kind of a processual person and he replied that I was only the person present and thus had no obligations whatever. The impartial witnesses, however, had obligations. I also wanted to know whether the prosecutor's office had already found the instigators of the youth demonstrations and he answered with a face of a person who wants to get rid of an unpleasant topic that the whole idea about instigators was wrong and not the prosecutor's office doing at all.

Testing the typewriters did not take long and the whole company was soon together again. The least-experienced man, the shorter one and an Estonian by nationality, sat next to Jaup and started reading (it seemed that with unpretended interest) the "Additions". Having been reading for a while he suddenly asked me whether I knew what it was. I said I did not. He offered the journal to me saying, "Here! Look!" It seemed to be a provocation but I accepted the journal and thumbed through it thinking whether the scene had been arranged to see my reaction and concluded that if this thought had already come to my head, it might change my reaction<sup>67</sup>. I passed the journal back and commented that it seemed rather alike the Russians' journal *Hronika tekushchih sobytii*. Giving a lively jerk, the shorter man cried out, "But what do you know of THAT?" "Why play games?" I answered drily. "You know it as well." The topic was changed. I felt that Jaup was a little tense during the episode but I do not know if he considered the KGB-man's provocation too coarse or indeed expected me to swallow such a plain bait. On our way back I sauntered together with them past the greenhouse and up to the barn. One of the men asked whether some employee of the Botanic garden couldn't write a good gardening handbook and the other commented on our peaceful milieu. So, jokingly, we parted company.

By that time everybody had already heard what was happening. It turned out that the brigade had been present since early morning, having dropped in the greenhouse with a question or two, introducing themselves as Aasalo's friends at another place. They must also have kept in contact with their main office as at the same time another brigade appeared at the working place of Aasalo's wife with a search warrant to their home. There they had confiscated the history of the War for Independence, some photos of Estonian military men and some other odds and ends. This I heard the next day already when we walked with Aasalo in the gardens and I summed the previous day up for him. I also gave him the list of confiscated items (the one the copy of which was given above). Aasalo thought that he would say that most of the things had belonged to a late friend, an elderly man. I pointed out that there were a few things published later than the friend's death and that they needed to be explained specially. This just what he did on 11 June, telling Jaup that he had found the letter on his desk, the Georgian letter in his mailbox. He had also expressed a wish to get he confiscated things back and Jaup had almost agreed. The fact that the material was in the safe was explained by Aasalo with a wish it would not spread. But as far as his friend's inheritance was concerned, he had barely had time to look at it.

The female staff at work quickly made their conclusion that it was a plain case of snitching. I assumed that this might be the idea of such searches: to create an

---

<sup>67</sup> I had sent through Eve Pärnaste some general abstracts under the pseudonym Observer to this journal and that is why I suspected a provocation. At that time I did not know that A.Kadak was my father's pseudonym that he signed feuilletons smuggled abroad with.

atmosphere of suspicions and later quarrels, and so I put a rather abrupt end to these speculations. But this way I also put an end to the opportunity to hear what other people were thinking. I myself thought that there might have been a secret search at night, in the course of which the antisoviet bundle was discovered by chance and then it was easy to come and get it legally in the daytime. Another possibility was that there was something quite unknown to all of us, as Aasalo had close connections with former prisoners. Later, though, I was inclined to think that our ladies were right in their first guess and this is what I still think. I cannot believe that the trouble and rowing among the three senior researchers<sup>68</sup> in the previous year would have led to that. And a successful application to get abroad cannot matter that much either. The funny miene at the lunchtime of 8 June would count for more but might mean several things. Well, it cannot be proved anyhow.

Quite a characteristic detail is that J.Martin, whom I informed about the search on 9 June, immediately told A.Raukas. The latter, like the other academicians, arrived at the quarter session of the bureau. L.Martin told me about it and could not resist adding a grain of salt: you see how these things develop and hopefully you will have learned your lesson by now. I advised her not to overdramatise and reminded her of their fear that his trips abroad would be vetoed yet he would soon go. Some days later J.Martin told me that the incident was already known in the presidium (he was naturally hiding his own role spreading the info), new unpleasantness would await the Gardens and we should quickly get rid of Aasalo.

Nothing concrete happened in this matter, as the expedition on the *Academician Vernadski* began and, not unexpectedly, H.Tamm was appointed director for the time of Martin's absence. According to rules the job should have automatically been mine. The juridical finesse that this made Tamm his own subject on even two levels did not seem to matter in this case.

I could not escape blaming myself for carelessness. I should have taken H.Sander's visit more seriously. The man had been characteristically panicky and told me about the case with Vellner's photographer who was caught at photocopying the letter and a threelink chain led to Sander. As far as I know he has never been interrogated about the matter. Furthermore, also in May, Mosolainen told me about the search in our photo lab that was then in Sakala Street. There had been no search warrant and she had been warned to keep quiet about it. That is why she had not spoken about it before. Bugs in the lab and a search at her home seemed to be a fantasy but evidently something did happen in the lab. However, it should have been enough for me to tell the colleagues to be careful and hide the papers. June showed that.

Aasalo's case that had no developments due to summer holidays did not come up before the end of August when Jaup summoned Saaver. Later (30 Sept.) also Loopmann, Rauk, Sander and Annuka were given the summons that did not state the reason or in what capacity they were wanted. About the same time Ratas also visited the prosecutor's office. Aasalo tried to get the confiscated material back once again but Jaup had been much more precipitous in his refusal than in summer.

Another summer story unravelled around Jaan Kaplinski's article in the newspaper *Kodumaa*. It arose repercussions in various groups and layers and several responses were published in Estonian papers abroad. As some sentences in it were so atypical of Jaan and the fact of publication itself made me suspicious, I used the opportunity and went to the Kaplinskis' summer residence on 27 August by the radioe car. We found the host at work in the saw-mill. He had seriously injured himself in one eye while

---

<sup>68</sup> What L.Aasalo, A.Loopmann and R.Ratas were rowing about I do not remember indeed.

chopping firewood in the morning and that is why I did not immediately start speaking about political shortsightedness. Jaan said half-jokingly that he was surprised that somebody would come visiting such a sycophant at all. His house was full of children, some of them babies, and other people, we did not have much time and that is why we did not talk much about the *Kodumaa*. Still, it could not be passed over totally. Jaan hinted at the possible role of Tinn and Kaarma who had been at his place recently. However, neither then nor later, Jaan attempted to make these men responsible. Kaplinski was the author as the signature in the paper showed. This means that Jaan evidently passed his original text over, agreeing to corrections and additions already beforehand and never saw the unpublished text again. As there was no more time and no newspaper with the text at our disposal, a more exact analysis was not carried out. Jaan hoped that quoting Galilei ("But it does move!") at the end of his text that several readers had also noticed, would be some saving grace.

Having talked about it several times with Jaan later, I resumed the whole thing as eternal relations between preaching the truth and the size of the loaf. If one has five children, feeding them is all the basis for ethics one needs. I do not know how much Jaan believed in Tinn's and Kaarma's mission in national issues – he tried to elaborate on it in the summer. Several poets have a broad amplitude that sometimes causes slopping over the edges. Perhaps he simply tried to pacify his conscience. Like several other undersigned colleagues we stated that the act was symbolic (Jaan himself said that he had not wanted the role of the symbol but people began to look at him just like that) and as such rather deplorable.<sup>69</sup> I personally was not offended, it means I did not consider Jaan my personal representative.

Mati Hint, Andres Langemets and Mati Unt with whom I also talked about the article were of a different opinion. Tõnis Rätsep was worried that Kaplinski might lose his balance totally and do something really stupid. Quite a lot of different opinions were bandied around, some of them against those who had condemned Kaplinski. An essential question remains: how much could Jaan secure his financial situation – a little, nothing...

Other rehabilitations have not materialised. On 16 October Kaplinski came to our place together with a Swedish radio reporter who was collecting material for his broadcast about the Baltic states. We talked about the present situation for several hours. Jaan was absolutely unequivocal stressing that taking care of one's children was the main and highest duty in this country. It seemed to me that it was partly addressed to me. Probably it was easier to talk like that in English. The fact that the final solution had not yet been reached became clear when Tiia Toomet informed us on 25 November that Jaan had again met Tartu KGB-men and they had showed him some Estonian papers pulished abroad (articles against Jaan's opinions), obviously expecting one more public reaction from him. That autumn Tiia and Jaan had many visitors, several of whom were critical of Jaan's action. When I visited them on 19 October, Jaan showed me his answer to G.Naan, a brief and to-the-point piece about Naan as a pseudo dialectician. It has, naturally, not been published in *Sirp*.

Naan decorated himself with more glitter soon (3 October), whipping Valton's report at the congress of the Writers' Union that was published in the summer issue of *Looming*. This caused new whispers in the society that did not leave me untouched either. As it turned out later, at a students' meeting in Tartu, Naan instigated a lot of interest among the younger people who wanted to know what he had been doing in

---

<sup>69</sup> At that time none of us knew anything about G.Naan's letter that released the campaign to soil Kaplinski's halo.

Stalin's times . Many people responded to him, most in an indirect way, though. In the paper *Noorte Hääli* a parody to Naan's text was published, causing trouble at the editorial office later.

I would also like to mention that Finnish press has started to talk much more about Estonia this autumn. Juhani Talve has quoted the letter itself and also Lenin's ideas on national policy, criticising the present Soviet Union's national policy in *Kanava*. About the same time (25 and 26 October) *Hesari* (*Helsingin Sanomat*) published Seppo Heikinheimo's "*Viron kulttuuri puristuksessa*" (Estonian culture under pressure) that had been written in the Tallinn Viru Hotel and based on good local information. From there he managed to send it straight to the editorial office (it is thought that as a zipped up signal). The circumstance needn't have been mentioned but the Organs understood it in their own way and charged the radio centre teletype that in their opinion was the only means to get the text abroad. The next day S.H. published a remark in the same paper, saying that due to a fault in the monitor four passages were left out of the printed text and were published in that issue. The article came to Estonia via various channels and was spread in the original and in a limited copies of translation.

The brains trust of our special committee decided to respond on behalf of a collective of several public figures. The text, the real author of which has remained a secret, was offered for signatures to people who were known in Finland. P.Ariste, V.Tormis, M.Palm, K.Ird and M.Unt signed. Some of them have been heard to state that they never saw the text. Who else were asked, I have no idea but Lennart Meri managed to escape somehow. It will soon be seen whether this signature rehabilitated Mati Unt enough. The text announced that there have never been so many Estonians than at present, that a huge amount of literature is being published in Estonia, that the Institute of Language and Literature employs over 200 people, that our creative unions have 1100, 460 and 160 members<sup>70</sup> Nothing else was important but no undersigned revealed the secret in which bookstall they obtained their issue of *Hesari*<sup>71</sup>. The end of the article includes Heikinheimo's commentaries about being sorry that the authors have not cared to say a single word about the Russification that was a topic in his article. He includes some more facts like the impossibility to defend the doctoral thesis on Estonian literature in 1920-40, that Tartu University has five Russian and two Estonian language professors etc. Rumours have it that *Hesari* and some other papers have published articles about the economic situation in Estonia and some other topics have been aired as well.

*Kansan Uutiset*, whose brigade visited Tallinn immediately, hastened to counterattack. They talked to several top figures, as they emphasised. Did they do it inadvertently or deliberately but they certainly nullified their good intentions themselves. Eva Lille thought that every response from our side was good as it kept the topic in the centre of attention and advised everyone to give their signatures to every critical article. Well, it seems that it is always easier to advise others to do it than venture the same oneself.

---

<sup>70</sup> Artists', Writers' and Composers' unions respectively.

<sup>71</sup> *Hesari* is the nickname of *Helsingin sanomat* and it was not sold in Tallinn. The communists' paper *Tietonantaja* that was sponsored from Moscow and very limited issues of *Kansan Uutiset* were the only Finnish papers that could be bought in Tallinn.

## LET US MOVE NOW, MEN

Our leaderless establishment started to function normally again at the beginning of December. We were busy with preparations for the 20th anniversary and also the report and so Jüri Martin who arrived in Tallinn on the evening of 2 December could not take everything over at once. At the conference of the 20th anniversary he was in his leader's role already.

On 10 December I had a chance to go to the Hydrometeorological funds where I had been invited already in early spring. H.Kadai offered our establishment some books that they did not want to keep any more but they were no use to us either. I made that clear to her but she kept on talking and started asking questions about the events the year before, being especially interested how Villu Astok had reacted when he was offered the letter for signing. I gave her rather vague answers, keeping in mind that Kadai had been mentioned as an informer in spring, and saying that a whole year had already passed since. It was not difficult, considering her unending urge to blabber. On the same, or perhaps the next day Martin came to my room for some reason and asked whether anything had happened meanwhile. I did not grasp the background to his question but understood what "happened" meant and replied that everything was quiet in what I was concerned. Then we started to speak about Poland, I do not remember why, and that was the end of that.

I forgot about it almost immediately and was busy with the-end-of-the-year matters that brought along some conflicts. They arose in connection with the dispensing of the annual bonus. I considered it totally democratic but annoyed Mandre and Jürgens came to me and wanted to know the details. It does not actually matter more than a background to the talk between Martin and me on the evening of the 17th. Already in the morning Martin had asked whether I had cigarettes. I forgot to be surprised although I happened to know that he had given up again when out at the sea. I was obviously still thinking about the clash with Jürgens that had consisted of peaceful explanations, repeated three times over, and a lie I recognised as one, after which, for the first time in my life I opened the door of my room. Showing him the door did not satisfy me at all. Thus I was thinking about it and did not pay heed either to Martin's need of a smoke or his curiously egg-like behaviour that several other people had already noticed.

An hour later Martin again asked for a cigarette and I said that I had some in my room. We started to walk towards the smokes together. On the way Martin suddenly said that things were really bad. Now I understood the meaning of his stunted manner but as I was in a really bad mood I said that I was fed up to the back teeth with the matter and did not want to hear about it any more. Martin almost agreed and said that everybody was bored with it. I asked whether I was supposed to do something concrete and, although presented in an incoherent way, Jüri's message was that it would be best if I left. I said I was not surprised as Aruja had been having the same sort of problems for some time already. He said he knew about that. The relationship between Aruja and Luik started to deteriorate already in mid-October. Martin and I exchanged only a few sentences about Aruja.

By that time we had reached Päts' kitchen, where I got my cigarettes out and offered Martin one. I noticed his hand was shaking when he took it. I sat down on my own chair and Martin remained standing sidewise opposite me. As we have never offered each other seats at the workplace I did not do it then either and only afterwards thought that it might have increased his feeling of awkwardness that was so clearly seen in his body language. I asked whether a new man to replace me had

already been picked out as was the case with Aruja. Jüri dropped his eyes and said that he had not heard of anybody. My reply came in one breath and was that I was not going to write a letter of resignation myself as there was no guarantee that I would get the job of the department head. I repeated in another connection that the same board of the Academy of Sciences who elected me, would also be responsible for appointing me a department head and as the situation had changed from spring when the new job had been guaranteed, I did not plan to be humble and present my letter of resignation, having to think of earning a salary. Besides it would seem that I admitted being guilty of something but nobody has proved what I was actually accused of. Martin tried to argue that nobody had yet denied that the department head's post would be mine. As soon as the order to have a competition for the post is made, I would gracefully depart. Martin only smiled in an embarrassed way. I comforted him and said I understood how unpleasant it was for him to talk to me like that, besides, he did not have to play the role of a bolster as I was quite capable of talking to the top men myself. I said that Maamägi was ill and, quite unsuitably due to my frustration, would soon die<sup>72</sup>. Martin said Maamägi had nothing to do with the whole thing. I asked whether it was the KGB directly then who ordered him to talk to me but he denied any connection with them. Whose orders was he following then, I wanted to know and he was rather vague when he mentioned that Kõörna was responsible for staff matters. I said I was ready to talk to Kõörna myself and did not need any middleman. He replied that this was not the matter at all but did not say what was. The atmosphere was getting from bad to worse as he was on edge, unable to give a straight answer to the key questions and terribly vague. I offered a possibility that they may discharge me when I would have been vice-director for four years next spring as at the time when I was appointed the five-year term was not in force yet. He seemed to be very sorry that the five years must be considered the time as otherwise all the other vice-directors' posts would be revoked. I said that when the great move, little boys have been squeezed flat before, but if it is going to happen to me, I wish the explanation handed over to me in written form: what I was found lacking and why I was considered unsuitable for my post. Martin said that he had to talk it over with Raukas and Kõörna and already approaching the door, added with a crooked smile, "In this case the matter has to be solved in a different way." I sensed a sort of threat in it and this spoilt my mood most of all. I answered, "Yes, all right, you won't escape without it all in black and white."

Naturally I started to ponder over possible ways and means for the future. I had known it before that there was a need to do it but it had been comfortable to postpone the deliberations. I considered it unjust to start talking about the incident although rumours about my dismissal had been circulating already for some time. I hoped that it would be easier to find out the possibilities for a new job if the matter was not tolled too loud yet. In the Botanic Gardens the rumours spread, evidently thanks to Lyuda Martin who through Eva Nilson offered the bait that if I leave voluntarily, the post of the department head would be granted. Nice, but too thin a worm for a bait that showed that Jüri Martin had not thought it properly through. My older female colleagues who dropped in to find out what the situation was and to express their sympathy, threatening to leave as well, learned that I completely disagreed with Martin's wishes, especially so considering our long years of work together and the former agreement. I am not sure how much of it got back to Jüri or was he able to

---

<sup>72</sup> It was not a prognosis and even if it had been, it would have been wrong as Maamägi is alive at 88 when these lines are being prepared for publishing.

think it over himself but out talk a week later was quite different. But the events before that continued along their well-trodden path.

On Tuesday, 22 December Arno Pukk had been told that his department would be liquidated. When I heard of that I understood that the gist of the matter was liquidation of Pukk himself. As the redundancy planned for January would be legal, the only escape could be hidden in some paragraph of the labour code on children, health or qualification.

My next talk with Martin started at the same place but instead of asking for a cigarette in a much more direct and clearer sentence. "Look, if you are not busy with something important, come and let us talk!"

We went to Martin's office but already before we got there I asked whether there was any news. In the shelter of the office I heard that everything was all right with me. Martin had just come from the Central Committee, where they had agreed that I could go on working. He stressed it even twice in this short announcement that it was so for the time being. This may mean a couple of months or a bit longer. Obviously Raukas had played a decisive role in the turn of things but I did not ask for details. There was an air of relief in his talk but there was also enough to mull over. Jüri told me about the coming readjustments: Pukk's department would be liquidated but not the general number of departments. A new department for Virve Roost would be created. Nobody can be against that but it emphasises the feeling that they want to get rid of Pukk. I asked what he was planning to do with Pukk, to keep him or sack him. He confirmed the latter. Aasalo's post was also to be made redundant. I asked whether such posts that had been filled with elected people would not be difficult to handle that way but Jüri thought that they would not. I have not studied the labour code myself yet, but Aasalo said that the liability of offering a lower-quality post is included. We'll soon see. A strange manoeuvre the meaning of which escapes me is not to propose Karis for department head for the next period on the pretext that in the future only PhDs would be proposed for that post. To some extent it is connected with Mandre's ambitions for whom something seems to be planned. Up to now there has always been some breathing space in these rules, especially in the doctor-free Botanic Gardens.

My impressions of this talk were rather contrary. To some extent I was infected by Martin's relief but, on the other hand, I felt a bit like Judas for not being solidary with Aasalo and Pukk. I do know, of course, that Martin had been planning to get rid of Pukk already since 1978 but then I had more of a say-so and we rather quickly agreed to create a new department and a special salary for Pukk. At that time there was no letter issue and the main reason might have been the fear of interruptions from the old director (I even remember what Trass and Martin said in a conversation on that matter). The issue became acute again at the beginning of the year and that time it was solved as described before. Aasalo with his pending or not-pending criminal case is seemingly separated from us. He may be connected with us in the documents of the organs and he is certainly a blot in Martin's notebook in the party line. Solidarity would be the only real power but, unfortunately, we are living through the time when solidarity is being strangled. This is what I said to the women who threatened to leave together with me: the solidarity is a power only when it is general.

Nevertheless, the shadow remains in my heart that I am unable to do something for these two men. The problem is also that it is difficult to defend Pukk as an employee: he is lazy by nature and became more work-shy when he was director, besides his age does not allow him to change cardinally. This was evidently the main reason for keeping him three years ago, had he been sacked then, several people would have

reacted differently. As for Aasalo's antisovietism, it has been proved according to our social system and to attempt to protect him would equal to nil or become a boomerang. However, it goes without saying that as soon as the bubbles of these men's discharge break and the waters are still again, my turn will come. Tactically they try to avoid attention and perhaps even Martin has thought of too much ado. That is why I feel at present that it would be sensible to leave voluntarily when the truce still lasts. It is all rather uncertain, other bosses may not be willing to give me professional work either. I will meet Villu Astok on the 21 December and ask him to try and find out if there are any possibilities in Vellner's establishment. The senior researcher's post there would be maximum but the net would be drawn tight by Tihhonov in the foreign affairs department. A radical change of post might be my only chance, except continuing in the sick working relations but healthy natural milieu of the Botanic Gardens.

To encourage my own optimism I state that I am still worth something. The possibility of making the research director's post redundant and creating the post of research secretary was, in Martin's opinion, a simple way of getting rid of me. The reason he could not realize it comes from the difficulties to find a successor to me. But the possibility remains. It remains to be seen what he will do next.

On the Innocents' day, the 28th of December, the TBG had its usual Monday morning meeting at the end of which Martin presented three invitations to a talk to Karis Rumberg and Pukk. Karis heard that he was unsuitable for the place of a department head, Rumberg heard the opposite – he was suitable and was advised to apply and finally Pukk was told what I managed to tell him just before the meeting: the threat of a total discharge. Coming back from the talk Pukk confirmed that he had been told just that. The event has been painted in gentler colours than the events after Herod's command in the far past, the forcefulness is still clear, though.

The next day jurist Varbola who is on the payroll of the Gardens although he earns less than half of it, appeared at work and on 31 December a new department was formed, the old one could not be liquidated before that. The redundancy was evidently not as easy as Martin had expected. Some members of the Academy of Sciences, inspired by Pukk's talk with Raukas, might have intervened. Pukk said that his impression was that the idea of the discharge was Martin's alone. Raukas had said that there had been no new instructions from the Central Committee. Pukk became quite optimistic and his optimism was justified when nothing followed the talk. On 7 January Martin invited the leaders of the party and trade union to a meeting and announced that Aasalo would be made redundant as a criminal case has been opened against him at the prosecutor's office. They also heard about Pukk's unproductive department and about a third man whose removal had been temporarily stopped. The next day Martin sketched up conditions of the contest for two department heads and one junior researcher. I did not ask anything although I might have done it. He evidently wanted to inform me about making his wife a researcher that Ratas had tried to achieve through me already in the autumn. I sent the conditions for the contest to *Rahva Hääl* on 12 January.

Pukk said Raukas had promised to call me. He did on the morning of the 3rd January and we made a date to meet at the Geology Institute on 7 January. The gist of the talk was that I should have no reason to worry about the post of a department head. My condition about the competition for the department head's job had evidently been agreed upon and Raukas said it will be held in January. The news that Martin was planning to go to Svalbard next summer threw some light on his behaviour.

When he handed in his documents in December, my position was revised and the KGB would surely use the opportunity to tell Martin, what he should do if he really wanted to go. The directives of this organisation always take the form of hints to top men through other top men who then want something done. What actually and who should is never clear. Something like that had just happened between Kõörna and Raukas – according to that Rebane had been reproached that the problems of staff at the Tallinn Botanic Gardens have remained unsolved. Raukas had asked Rebane straight and got an answer that after the incident a year ago nobody from the Central Committee had said anything about it to Rebane. As the people responsible for the personnel problems always have a direct connection to the KGB, it is not difficult to guess where Kõörna's instructions came from. It is difficult to say how it was served to Martin but he was evidently made to feel that my job and his travel plans were closely related. Thus the explanation that the top men of the Academy are rebuked at the Central Committee and make Martin act in their turn, might explain the thing to a wider circle and perhaps even bring some calm to me. Nevertheless it is naïve to expect that I would believe I am guilty if it has not even been proved and that my guilt puts the jobs of the general secretary of the Academy and the director of the Botanic Gardens in jeopardy. Even more naïve, however, would be to expect these two top men to acknowledge candidly that they must get rid of me for the sake of their own career.

Raukas tried to put my successor's selection on my conscience. I did not deny that such a person was needed but the suggestion that I should convince Ratas to join the party seemed ridiculously strange to me. I told Raukas that I had picked Ratas myself already four years ago when they proposed me for the job. And I had clearly seen Ratas's wish to get the job when I mentioned to him at the beginning of the letter-concerning saga that I would evidently be made to leave anyhow. I made a little experiment one evening when going home we happened to get on the same bus. I said, repeating Martin's statement in spring, that the new candidate must be a party member. There was no doubt that this interested Ratas very much indeed. In our talk with Raukas I said that in addition to skills and abilities, Ratas had a very strong power complex the expression of which I could not prognosticate. I felt I had to say it not to feel responsible for the candidate that did not have too big a support among the colleagues.

It was rather stupid that Villu Astok had made an appointment with Raukas on the same day in order to discuss me. We had not discussed it but Raukas might have thought otherwise. Raukas had promised to concert the issue with either Tihhonov or Vellner. On the other hand, A.Lääne had expressed positive interest in my transfer. All the cards have been dealt by now. For me it seems to foretell two jobs and two contests. As there is no job in Vellner's laboratory at the moment and it is dubious whether any would be created, the first contest should be for the department head of the TBG, my post should be confirmed and I should present my vice-director's application for holidays and after that my letter of resignation. Simultaneously with that I should participate in the contest for the post of the senior researcher at the Institute of Geophysics and give myself some time to decide. On 14 January Raukas asked me by phone, whether I seriously considered the Vellner variant. I said I did but had not decided yet. I added that I have been quiet about it not to leave an impression that I was building my value up. The choices are not easy ones and I have an inkling that I am adding to them myself that is why everything is so vague.

On 12 January I got a call at work from Riina Kaljo who introduced herself as an employee of the Estonian Radio and wished something for the broadcast "The World

Today". As she had been transferred from the Narva Road establishment<sup>73</sup> I suspect that it is not straightforward. Dmitri Kaljo's daughter has hardly a bigger role to play as a mere mediator but there must be something that the broadcast for farmers prohibited in December should be replaced by something in the APN-supervised series. I may, of course, be fantasizing but if I am not, the psychology of all that is beyond me. The prerecorded talk was normally performed in the broadcast.<sup>74</sup>

The next contact with the Estonian Radio was even more curious. On 27 January a Peeter Maimik called and said he was speaking for the department Swedish Radio. He had a wish to make a broadcast for Swedes about the Botanic Gardens. As I should not have anything against my duties as a vice director, I gave him an appointment to meet in Päts' kitchen on 3 February. He arrived at the appointed time and introduced himself as a sociologist in the computer centre who was sometimes asked to make broadcasts of his own. He did not have the usual Reporter-type taperecorder with him but some unknown minirecorder that he said he had got from his aunt in Sweden. He said that I could talk freely as the translation would be read on my talk. He was not supposed to make the translation himself. So I talked about half an hour, not concentrating very much and offering words and ideas as they came to my head, and noticed it only when the cassette was full. Maimik did not ask anything but when the cassette had been filled, he pulled out a questionnaire and started asking questions about my relations with Swedish and Finnish scientists, whether I had visited Sweden and on and on in the same vein. I was rather short-spoken and commented that such dull facts could not interest a Swedish radio listener. I also said I was sorry for the talk that would not be easy for the technician to tape. He did not seem to care and this shows that he was either a real greenhorn as a reporter, or the questionnaire had been compiled for quite another purpose. This might mean that Maimik had to mediate the information how the letter could get abroad. The KGB did not want to ask me directly as I could again start harping on the criminal case and whatever. The clumsy work with taping was evidently staged and made me think of snooping but what's the big idea of the game is a question that, as usually, remains unanswered.

For a moment I was inclined to connect that incident with an excerpt from the Martin-Pukk conversation and thought it heralded the new stage in dismissals but there are not enough hints for that. When Pukk came back from his January holidays, he heard that he would be a senior engineer in Mari Saar's sector. This shows that Martin's endeavour to sweep the place clean at the end of the year was inappropriate. The same seems to be true about Aasalo whom I advised to ask Jaup straight, whether any criminal case about him had already been opened or if it was still to come. This is a simple thing, when the criminal case has been started, a punishment follows and retaining or losing one's job follows that. If no criminal case exists, there is no reason to make a qualified employee redundant. This logic is not, naturally, valid in our metalogical society. Aasalo did ask Jaup and heard that he might be treated as a witness in the "Open Letter" case and no case concerning him personally would be opened. He also got back some of the materials that had been confiscated in summer. This was a welcome solution that shows that the KGB is not eager to have court procedures in any case. They only applied them to get rid of the most bothersome adversaries. It is paradoxical, of course, that the letter that is not secret or criminal becomes an object of tracing as soon as it gets abroad. It seems the order to find out

---

<sup>73</sup> APN – the Russian acronym for the Agency of Press News, subjected to the KGB. The department in Tallinn was in Narva Road.

<sup>74</sup> Later a curious fact turned out: the old acquaintance Rein Sepp had mentioned just that broadcast to Indrek.

the channels of the letter getting abroad has been issued but to open a criminal case on that matter is still considered inept and irrelevant – thus nothing else can be done than to proceed in the above-described vague way.

The excerpt from Martin-Pukk conversation mentioned above was that when having announced Pukk's new post, Martin had mentioned that other men had it worse than Pukk. Was it meant as sort of consolation (you are not the worst off) or did it mean that Martin would soon come and ask me for a cigarette again, is difficult to say. Why others had it worse was explained as follows: high-up posts will be filled in the Academy at the end of the year and the intrigues are ripe. Maamägi would want to leave due to his ill health but before retiring he would like to improve the weak ideological work of the Academy, so the Botanic Garden is to burn in the purgatory. Pukk seemed to like the explanation, I do not. First, the new elections were not the reason for getting rid of the vices idea, this had been presented already in February 1981 and again in December the same year. In the latter case Maamägi was in hospital and his ideological puritanism could not release Martin's eagerness when he returned from the Indian Ocean. Second, Martin himself denied Maamägi's role already in December, when he said that the personnel was Kõörna's responsibility. Third, even in Maamägi's case it would be difficult to believe the new broom mentality before retirement. I presented these three arguments also to Pukk who seemed to agree. Whatever the case, I will be waiting the year-old promise of the contest for the job to be kept. Martin must have the initiative in that. If this announcement won't be issued in May, I have to continue the buereaucrat's bothersome but paid work over the summer and longer, resisting all the hints as, by the way, several experienced people have advised me to do. Among them, through my mother-in-law, was the old fighter Olga Lauristin.

Aasalo's story came to its end. In early March he was made redundant and although he was thinking about suing, he left peacefully, sending only one complaint to Rebane. The solution was helped along by a consultation with lawyer B.Jakobson who at first agreed to sue but having heard more about the background, refused. After that Aasalo thought it better not to stir things and find a new job. The people at the Botanic Gardens took it in their stride – when the KGB is openly acting, people consider themselves incapable to change anything.

About the same time, in late March, Lyuda Martin performed at the young scientists' contest "Ecotechnique-82". It is not important otherwise than some more background to Martin's role in the whole thing. I do not care to describe the scandalous incident in detail but only point out that the immigrant woman from Sverdlovsk does not grasp the situation here at all but is nevertheless eager to think she has rights to judge others, me among them. It seems that she is not averse to publish these judgements in order to forward her own career. One of these steps higher up on her own career ladder was the absolutely distorted information to her husband about how the things were during his absence. It may be, of course, that she has an innate urge for intrigue or is simply idling and has nothing else to do. Whatever the cause, such performances make it impossible to restore the relations but they are not enough to make me decide whether to stay or leave.

On St George's day the direct action followed. I do not think that Jüri Martin had deliberatelt waited until that day to make his proposal for me to move<sup>75</sup>. When he a

---

<sup>75</sup> On St George's day the Baltic-German nobles shifted their serfs around at will, until serfdom was abolished in 1816 and 1819. Translator

few days earlier had told me to publish the contest for the immunology department head, he seemed to want to add something but stopped himself saying only, "well, let it be." I prepared the announcement to *Rahva Hää* as I had been told and did not even think of adding the vacancy to the environment studies department for myself. The advert was on the secretary's table for some days and just before St George's day she finally posted it. On that day Jüri chose a suitable moment in the yard and introduced our conversation with expressing deep surprise that Maamägi would come to the Gardens, letting it seem that the reason for the visit was to sack me. I said only that if I am needed for a talk I'd be upstairs in the balcony room. Jüri said that he did not know why Maamägi was coming and according to his scenario I should have started to ask about the situation but the essential seemed to be clear and I did not say anything more. Jüri said that the post of the research director would be liquidated and that it was all crap. This was no news either and thus we talked no more.

Maamägi was indeed seen visiting the greenhouse with somebody but he had no interest whatever in me. I dedicated the next day that happened also to be the *subbotnik*<sup>76</sup> in the Gardens to moving my things from Päts' kitchen to the upper house.

On 29 April I had had it with all the lingering. Martin again tried to find a suitable moment to catch me in the yard and wanted to know whether the advertisement had been sent. I said that after a few days delay it indeed had. Then I heard that my post as a department head should have been put in the same advert. I said that it was not suitable for me to do it but he could drop in the editorial office himself and include the necessary item. I said that, as I had promised Raukas, I was prepared to leave on 24 May but it would evidently take longer now as the council could meet only a month after the advert was published. I said that we should not violate the law in such a case as that one. It was the first time I mentioned my talk with Raukas and I did not grasp whether Martin had known about it or not. He started again about Maamägi's and Rebane's great anxiety concerning me and about the liquidation of the research director's post but I said that if the last March arrangement would be done in the agreed order: first the contest, then the confirmation of the department head's post and then the letter of resignation, I would not obstruct the process. I remarked that my promise to Raukas was given in connection with Martin's trip to Spitzbergen (Svalbard). Martin could not totally hide his reaction, as it was the first time we talked about his well-hidden plan. Thus I showed that I knew more than I had said and he understood. I also said that owing to the differences in salary I would like to take my holiday as the research director and he agreed immediately. So I went to the book-keepers and made my calculations and wished to be on holiday beginning from May 24 for 61 days (as I had not had the whole holiday in 1981). The administrative order came quickly. I moved my books into the upper house and did not make a secret of my coming long holidays. Naturally it caused talks about my successor. Most often the name of a Vello Kask was mentioned and together with that rumours about the man being a snitch. I could not enlighten the people asking me about his being an informer but I told everybody that the successor had to be a man and a party member.

I called Raukas on 10 May wanting to know about the pursuit for senior researcher's post. He himself started to talk about my position and stressed the correct order of the administrative procedure. I asked what he knew about my successor and his answer was, "Martin still wants Ratas." So the picture became clearer and

---

<sup>76</sup> *Subbotniks* were Saturdays when people had to do unpaid work where necessary, introduced by Lenin. At the time of these events most of the work was spring-cleaning at the workplaces. Translator.

especially when I heard next week that R.Ratas became a candidate for the membership of the bolshevik party at the 25 May party meeting.

The first week of my holidays I spent on Vilsandi and when I next came to town on 31 May, I did not ask about my bid. I did think of the fact that throughout my holidays up to the 3rd of August they would not be able to replace me unless the Presidium of the Academy would find additional finances. The advert in *Rahva Hääl* had not been published either by 31 May yet. Indrek who came to the cottage after his second final exam on 2 June told me about running into the Kahks in town and the better half of the couple had asked Indrek to tell his father that the presidium had elected him a senior researcher. The session had taken place on 1 June. When all this started in early spring I had obviously had no doubt that it would happen but as Kahk considered it worth mentioning at a street encounter shows that I should have had them.

It might be a suitable moment to publish some correspondence that started over five years later when more sensitive noses could smell fresher air moving under the skies.

On September 10, 1987 I wrote the following letter to the Presidium of the Estonian SSR Academy of Sciences:

*"To the best of my recollection I was dismissed from the post of TBG research director at the Presidium of the Academy on August 31 1982, i.e. about a year before my time expired. As I did not apply for the dismissal, the event was staged as confirming my new post as a department head. Actually the procedure was punishment for the letter of forty that we attempted to publish legally in the late 1980 and that remained legally unanswered. As we know today, the standpoints taken in the issue were hasty and precipitated.*

*In May, the same year, I pursued the profession of senior researcher and applied to the Presidium of the Academy. My application was discussed on 1 June 1982. The respective documents were left in the drawer of the personnel officer R. Erme and thus, naturally, the certification committee could not confirm it.*

*I am not going to evaluate what I lost but I still have to point out that even a crime is not punished twice. As the situation of 1982 has been cleared up, some compensation might be expected, but I would also like to get a written statement from the Presidium whether I may expect some additional punishments or what sort of reaction would follow in case I decide to run for the post of TBG director or vice director, choose the career of a university lecturer or apply for an outgoing visa etc..*

*I hope that in the present situation the Presidium of the Academy of Sciences responds to my sincerity likewise."*

The reply to this letter bears the date 26 January 1988 and it was signed by the general research secretary R.Hagelberg:

*"Years have passed from the events you refer to in your letter and you have not enquired about them or had pretensions before. It is not possible to restore the past situation but it does not have any influence on what we consider necessary to state.*

*For the sake of contextual and terminological clarity we have to note that you have not been meted out any documented or official punishment or apportioned any negative evaluation by the Presidium of the Academy of Sciences. On the contrary, in 1986 you were awarded with the certificate of honour by the Presidium of the Estonian SSR Academy of Science and the Republican Committee of the Trade Unions that should clearly show the respective attitude to your work at the Tallinn Botanic Gardens.*

*The unjust opinion about you as one of the authors of the so-called letter of forty was the reason why the presidium did not second the endeavour of the Botanic Gardens to give you the profession of senior researcher. There is no personal culprit*

*for this injustice among the members of the presidium or, even less, among the employees subjected to them. It was a collective mistake and we are sorry for it.*

*We do hope that this official apology will help you to offload the emotional stress. You should agree that the transfer from one top post to another must not be compared to a punishment for a crime. Besides, your transfer to the post of a department head was well grounded by substantial calculations. According to the secretary of the Academy, A.Raukas, you agreed to the transfer yourself.*

*The Presidium's attitude to support your application for the profession of senior researcher is known to you. Our sincere hope to achieve justice should exclude any fear or expectation of a further punishment."*

The application for the profession of senior researcher has not been processed yet. I have not understood either who made the "collective error". I do not remember even that why I hinted at the personnel officer at that time, perhaps it was some kind of grapevine inside the presidium. But why did Juhan Kahk have to lie in bright daylight and at the presence of his wife, Vilma Kahk, who was Indrek's much respected history teacher? I spent some time to find the minutes of the meetings of the academy presidium in the archives. I learned that the presidium had had a meeting indeed on this day of the child welfare and managed to solve a lot of problems. Two of them concerned the Botanic Gardens: one was to give a quarter of a senior researcher's post to professor H.Trass and the other about granting Jüri Martin the profession of senior researcher. However, it remains unknown what actually happens: did they decide to give the profession to me at the meeting and some competent person came later and said what was the right decision and they rewrote the minutes. Or did they have to get confirmation beforehand and my documents were not even discussed. Hagelberg's assurance about their support was evidently sincere but even in 1987 the times were not yet ripe for naming the "collective persons responsible" .

Where and if I go anywhere is still unanswered – it is not easier to find the answer in the peace and quiet of the rural cottage than in the noisy town. The basic line seems to have come to its end although I have contemplated a few times whether not to drag the matter a little further and not present any letter of resignation yet. Just to test some characters. But I won't be able to do it longer than to late October as the annual bureaucracy would have to get its due<sup>77</sup> .

---

<sup>77</sup> I kept in mind the writing of the annual report.

## CONCLUSION

Only a few more incidents have to be added to bring the story to its end. When I went to town, it might have been on 9 July, I heard that the the scientific council would sit and vote for filling the post of the department head on 27 July. On that day I got there from the country five minutes late and without talking to anybody had to start reading some documents. Everything seemed to go smoothly and out of the 12 present I got 11 for and one undecided vote. When it was over, R.Ratas approached me and said that he did not know how to say it but he was not the one undecided. I said that I believed him as I had voted undecided myself. It was true. The second vote that was to make M.Mandre a department head, yielded 7 to 5 to the disadvantage of the candidate. Must have been quite an extraordinary event in the history of the Academy of Sciences.

I went back to the country to enjoy the last days of my vacation. August seemed to get by on an even keel and I could visit the cottage quite often. I also managed to pack everything up in Päts' kitchen and move it into the upper house. At 9.30 according to Russian time, on the morning of 31 August, Martin called me at home and told me to be at the Presidium at 11 o'clock. I thought I knew the reason for the summons although Martin did not say anything about it. I ascended along Short Leg steps and when I entered saw R.Ratas. I must admit a certain surprise as I thought that after my confirmation and letter of resignation some time would pass before the successor is appointed. I felt somewhat cramped in the corner of the landing, where the academicians gathered, shaking one another's hands after summer holidays as was the custom of the establishment. So I was also given an opportunity to a friendly handshake from Öpik, Alumäe, Raukas, Parmasto, Maamägi and also Kõorna. Some pseudo academicians like Tihhonov followed suit. Only Rebane hurried past, boyishly saluting with two fingers. As the landing was crowded indeed, Alumäe stepped quite under my nose and shouted jovially, "Well, will you be dismissed now?" I smiled in answer; "On the contrary, I'll be given another post." The feeble joke made only Raukas and Martin who were the closest, curl their lips. I exchanged a few words about mushrooms with Parmasto and then the academicians went to fashion science policy and we started waiting. We remained standing on the landing, where Martin and Koolmeister discussed environment protection organization, Ratas went behind the corner and pretended a deep interest in the newer publications of the Academy. Our wait was not long this time, only 35 minutes and Tarand was ordered to step in. I entered (and greeted the numerous apparatchiks whom I had not greeted before) and Rebane said that we had to wait for Martin to join us. He soon slipped noiselessly in through the door where I was standing and found a seat on the right. Rebane said that the issue was the confirmation of Tarand at the post of the head of environment studies and asked whether anybody had any questions. I was studying the seated whom I did not see very well against the light. I may have been mistaken but it seemed to me that several of them sat huddled or even cowering and did not look up. I interpreted it as their "still existing conscience". Lippmaa and Tamm were studying me with open curiosity – we had not met before. There were some curious looks also from the left, from among the aparatchiks. Kõorna was the first to ask and managed a rather stupid,

"Have you headed the department before?"

"Yes, I guess since 1976."

Kahk was next. "Are the ecologists, I mean the real ones in Tartu and Tallinn, going to join forces now? Where will their centre be?"

"At the moment the division of work is not quite clear, there is some overlapping," I answered. "But the differences come from the territory, I keep in mind the former border between Estonia and Livonia. Where the future centre will be, I do not know."

Next Kõörna wanted to know whether we dealt with prognoses as well.

I said that the activities up to now could be defined as intuiting the tendencies and our capacity to give but a few prognoses as the mathematical capabilities are weak. I am ready to swear that Martin did not like it but he managed to be silent.

Now they evidently decided that the time for the staging was up and Rebane asked, "Any more questions?" There were none. Only Raukas uttered a feeble "confirm". Rebane stood up and announced: "We consider the decision of the department bureau confirmed."

The next words came haltingly, perhaps he was thinking of the next issues already. "We ...wish you.... success and... energy... in supervising... the environment protection department."

I said thank you and when I said good bye I was surprised myself at my very low voice. When I turned to go, Rebane said, "And the other matter of the same issue..." Going through the lobby I told Ratas to prepare himself and went out into the street. I think I have seldom, if at all, felt a real bad taste in my mouth (this might be what they mean when they say "tasted shite") like the one that was there before I said good bye. I was surprised but the taste remained when I descended the steps. I had known what would happen, there were no surprises, why had it all been so depressing? I did not find an answer then and I cannot do it now either. The boat of ethics was scratching the bottom with its keel and brought up mud. I did not know any other way to get rid of the taste than buy a small souvenir bottle of brandy that I drank at home.

I continued going to work in a belief that they will ask me for a letter of resignation. Päts' kitchen was empty and I went there every morning to unlock the door in order not to be a hindrance to other people's work. I understood that research went to Ratas now who obviously needed to ask me several things but I still wanted Martin to talk to me once again about my dismissal. People were wondering and asking me who was the second on the ladder and I answered that it must be a period of twofold power – the February revolution over and the October one not come yet.

On 15 September the bookkeeper told me that Martin had demanded a change in the salaries. The accountants claimed to have a base document but that did not exist yet. I was surprised that I was not addressed to but kept my stubborn line. Finally, on 22 September an ordinance of the Presidium arrived and its final lines were again able to amaze me. I had still been sure that I had to write a letter of resignation and I wanted to enjoy the séance of begging for it. I expressed my doubt about the legality of such arrangement but did not know what else I could do.

A week later, on 30 September, the bookkeeper passed me a folder for signatures that I had signed up to the moment. This time I found only one document that needed my signature – director's order no 19K. I got really upset and refused to sign. I went and gained some information in the code of labour and then wrote a letter to Rebane. The next morning I went to consult a lawyer in the legal consultation office and an older man explained it to me that I should not treat the order as dismissal. I kept my different opinion but understood that the Presidium would never admit any guilt or blame and it would not pay to sue them. I was also advised not to post the letter as not worthy of me and I did not. But I include the sentence here<sup>78</sup>. The jurist also told me

---

<sup>78</sup> I protest against the term "resigned from the post" as this must follow the employee's letter of resignation. It was naturally splittin the hair and today I am glad that I did not post the letter.

that the office had no right to claim repayment of the salary I had already been paid and if they do it, it will be a court case that the office will lose.

Armed with the article from the code I went to work and signed the order with an additional clause: "Read on 1 October 1982. Do not agree to return the salary as nobody has informed me about the date of my dismissal as research director./ Signature. At the same time I decided to show my hand to Martin that I finally managed to do on 4 October. I took him aside and we sauntered to the door of Päts' balcony as the weather was warm and sunny. I said that this would obviously be the last time I intend to talk about the issue but the gist is that I won't return the salary. If somebody had informed me about the date of my dismissal, I would not have protested. But I had been waiting for the request to write the letter of resignation. Even the academicians shrank off and nobody said that from this moment you have been dismissed. Then I turned to face Martin and said that if he wanted to continue as director he should keep in mind that people are not old bikes to be silently counted off. He quietly protested that it was not quite so, that he had not known how to do it and Raukas had told him that no letter of resignation from me was necessary. About the salary he said that there should not be any harassment and it remained unclear to me who was more evasive, the director or the bookkeeper. Martin marched straight into the accountants' office and the next day I was paid the higher salary of the research director until the date of the order. I boasted around that I had never before written a text where two roubles were paid for a word, keeping in mind the additional commentary to the order. Thus the very last episode of the saga of idea was only material!

What to say to sum up? It is clear that the notes made within two years reflect chance evaluations due to the lack of information. Let them be a barometer and not the later calculated average air pressure based on its readings.

The project itself is not dead. Some people still remember. I recently saw the late-September issue of Finnish *Suomen Kuvalehti* where they remembered the letter. The day will get darker only a few more months. The darkening might be as short in history. But this period in the history of the USSR is surely dead, where somebody tries to legally correct the ominous activities of a quarter of a million potentates.

Everything was legal and according to rules but the reaction to it was a show of power.

And to close the summing up, a "syllogism":

A. Caution is the mother of wisdom. (Proverb)

B. Wisdom is the daughter of experience. (Leonardo da Vinci)

AB. Experience is the father of wisdom.

And something else: when I was summing up, St Nicholas' Church started to burn. I noticed it an hour later, at half past 1 when the spire was all in flames under the night skies and soon toppled over. It was a horrible sight.

## EPILOGUE IN TWO PARTS

### ABOUT FATHER AND SON AND THE EVIL GHOST

It often happens that one has to return to old stories. When we, Sirje Kiin, Rein Ruutsoo and I in 1989 decided to make a small book about the story of the letter of forty, nobody knew what the future will bring and there were also difficulties to make the authors' different attitudes and way of thinking fit. The book was published in the spring of 1990 almost simultaneously by the Tallinn publishers *Olion* and with the help of Finnish friends (basically Anja Salokannel) by the Helsinki *Otava* publishers. Some years later a letter sent by the *Olion* publishers was delivered to my home address at 1, Harju Street.

*Dear S.Kiin, R.Ruutsoo, A.Tarand,*

*due to your thoughtlessness the publishers were forced to publicise the following rectification. It cost us 413 kroons. We do not see any reason why we should bear the cost. It would obviously be gentlemanly if you agreed upon who and how to cover our direct expenses. H.Kään. Director.*

The enclosed rectification read as follows:

*"The Tallinn Municipal Court has put the Olion publishers under an obligation to publicise the following rectification: in the book published by Olion in 1990 – The Story of the Letter of Forty – by authors Sirje Kiin, Rein Ruutsoo and Andres Tarand, the allegation on page 115 about Jaan Rebane, corresponding member of the Estonian Academy of Sciences, was elected academician in philosophy in 1987 due to protection and that is why Jüri Lotman was not elected is not true.*

*The court checked the data and according to that the elections on 24 November 1987 were carried out according to the regulations of procedure and by ballot. Jüri Lotman was a candidate of corresponding member in philology but did not get the necessary number of votes. The publishers apologize and are sorry for the error.*

*All the rights belong to the authors of The Story of the Letter of Forty according to the contract. Unfortunately the Estonian law does not determine the responsibilities of the authors. That is why the publishers have to do the apologizing."*

My reply to H.Kään read:

*Wishing you a Happy New Year I have to go back to the old year and the times past. Your letter from the 19th November together with the decision of the Tallinn Municipal Court does belong to the relatively past times. As you seem to grasp the juridical stupidity of the matter yourself, the saddest part is the breath from the past in your letter and the very tonality of it. In my opinion the gist of the matter is found in the introduction of the book (pp.9-10) where we write about the possibilities of documentation clearly enough. Or do you really have at your disposal materials proving that the election of academicians was carried out without the influence of the central committee?*

*Thus it is difficult to define your endeavour anything else than a farce (and if there is a wish you might, perhaps, sue me for the last line?).*

*Despite all this I am ready to cover the sum of my responsibility: 413:3=137.67 kroons. The workday at the Ministry of Environment where I work at present is from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. but it would be sensible to call first."*

*3 January 1993*

I am not going to rewrite the clumsily formulated text of the court decision that stresses the absolute correctness of the election by ballot, like it is apparent in H.Kään's letter as well. I do not have any reason to doubt this correctness. It is quite another matter: just like in the case of the senior researcher's profession the necessary

filters were applied much earlier. A lot of documents were written but they were never available to any court or persons uninvolved. When I became research director, the confirmation in the Central Committee was essential. It is true, I did not have to appear face to face at the presence of some functionary there. The personal appearance did become necessary in case of the director's post. Naturally I do not have any concrete information who talked to whom about the careers of Jaan Rebane or Jüri Lotman and how "collective" was the responsibility of the "yes" or "no". On the other hand, I never met Jaan Rebane or knew his work as I deliberately avoided reading articles by Soviet sociologists. I remember that society talk touched upon the academicians' elections and the fact that J.Lotman was not elected made people indignant. Of course, it all was a natural part of the totalitarian regime, and like tensions within the Earth cause earthquakes and tsunamis, the election system resulted in unpleasantness. I do not mean I was going around spoiling for a fight with anybody, Jaan Rebane included. My co-author Rein Ruutsoo, who had numerous conflicts with Rebane with whom he worked at the same institute, must have felt differently. Nevertheless, Rebane decided to punish just me, although he knew the situation with Ruutsoo well enough. When trying to clarify that, however, I have to go back as far as to the times before the Second World War.

Although my first memories date from the period at the end of the war, I cannot take the four-or-five-year-old myself as a centrepiece in the events I am going to render. Neither was my father Helmut Tarand a centrepiece, although, as a member of the Self-Defence, he participated in the war within the borders of Estonia. He escaped the mobilization into the Red Army as a summertime "forest brother"<sup>79</sup> in Harjumaa. When I was not a minister any more and managed to start satisfying my interest in the family history, I found the "Orders of the Estonian Self-Defence Commander" among the archive documents that had been closed to me before. There was a copy of the following:

*No 85, 29.08.1944. Ensigns, junior sergeants and sergeants who have volunteered to join the Self-Defence and are paid for it, have the right to wear the uniform of a junior lieutenant since 25 August 1944 and present themselves as full-right junior lieutenants in the present war.*

Point 5 of the same order gives this right to aspirant, junior sergeant Helmut Tarand (Harju Malev<sup>80</sup>). Order no 88 dated 9 September makes Helmut Tarand company commander on 1 September. Whether this was due to the approaching front, I do not know. By the end of September the Red Army had occupied the whole continental Estonia and "the Red Army's sister" – the NKVD according to Stalin's name to it – began their occupation of the territory in the way typical of them.

I do not know when exactly but rather soon father started to work at the History Museum that was still housed in the Provincial Museum rooms, i.e. the present house of the Academy of Sciences at 6, Kohtu Street. I remember going to father's office sometimes, and I have not forgotten the model of a sailing boat in the corner of the same hall where, 36 years later, I waited to be received by Maamägi. A bridge over the times, with the KGB as the backdrop.

Father was summoned to the first interrogation about his having belonged to the Self-Defence on 16 November by a man whose name was Salmolainen. The later dossier on the court case of the History Museum (no 5417) does not contain either minutes of this interrogation or any other of about the 80 following ones that

---

<sup>79</sup> Estonian patriotic partisan in 1941 and 1944. Translator.

<sup>80</sup> A subdivision in the Estonian Defence League; the word comes from ancient Estonian and means "host", "army". Translator.

evidently did not contain the necessary results. There are, however, two documents that did – (the espousal of the accusation). Here I give the floor to Helmut Tarand himself, although the following has once already been published in a collection of his poems *Epitaph*:

*"I was arrested on 25 April 1945<sup>81</sup>. The inquest lasted the whole summer. Two short pauses excluded when I was taken to the Patarei, I was in the basement of Pagari Street up to 13 December 1945. About a thousand men went through the cells where I was. We often sat naked in the heat of 40° C, later were freezing even in fur vests. I counted the times I was summoned to interrogations. They were over 80 and they lasted from half an hour up to 16 hours. The accusations were bizarre. But as I was grilled with various physical and pshychical methods, my nerves achieved a situation where I was ready to admit that I was the emperor of China if somebody had been prepared to ask me that.*

*The investigators were trying to convince me that I was the leader of a rebellious group that with the historical arms kept in the History Museum planned to overthrow Soviet power in Estonia. I was also accused of anti-Soviet propaganda – for the literature that belonged to the same museum, for the photos that I was collecting for the museum at the order of the Soviet authorities, for caricatures about Stalin in the collection of the same museum. My colleagues had delivered lectures that were deemed anti-government and inspired by me, as a department head I determined the topics for research. I was accused of disinforming the State Security organs deliberately. I was even accused of trying to escape from the Soviet Union. I was accused of spying. My only factual crime against the Soviet power – being an officer and company commander in the territory of Estonia occupied by Germans at that time – was said to be mere nothing compared to everything else that I had already done or was planning to do.*

*As a young man, whose ambitions during a short career had evidently not been met, I was flattered by all the suggested self-importance attributed to me, and signed to everything. The main witness against me was my direct boss and director Leida Loone, the woman with whom I had been a month and a half in Moscow and whose certain wishes I could not grant due to some strange repugnance – a feeling that did not depend on my mind but that became fatal to me beyond the mind.*

*I was never tried. On the morning of 2 April I was called out of the cell to the corridor of the patarei prison and an unknown to me soldier read some document to me in the Russian language. It stated that I had been sentenced to 10 years in the Gulag. My psychical condition can be best characterized by the fact that when I heard about the ten years, I was disappointed indeed – they had promised to give me twenty years of hard labour. The "mild" sentence seemed to be downright offensive. To some extent the psychical trauma was alleviated by time.*

*After a few months in several prisons of my home town and in the camp close by at Mustamäe, I arrived after a 12-day-long trip in a town that was announced to be Vorkuta. It was 22 July and it was snowing. In a few days I became a miner. At the depth of 630 meters I felt like a Cain in Dante's Inferno, although I could not remember when I had slain Abel. After 15 hours of work, going there, being there and coming from the mine, all of it accompanied by unaccustomed abuse, beating, dirt, obscenities and filth, we returned to our plank beds, where instead of the mattresses the boards were covered with big and fat bedbugs in such numbers that no one who*

---

<sup>81</sup> It is interesting to note that the order of arrest was issued only on 28 April. This is a characteristic detail of Soviet juridical practice.

*has not fed them himself would believe. I considered myself a dead man and this kind of an existence the one in the netherworld, true, without the fire and rain of tar, but teethgrinding was present and breaking the bones in various forms as well."*

Let us now return to Jaan Rebane's complaint. As said before, I considered this case a farce at the beginning of the nineties: the most essential factor of the background – the invisible control of the Central Committee and the KGB when titles were assigned. The judges, most of whom were former Soviet-time jurists, seemed to be unable to take this into consideration in 1992. Of course, the people who were responsible for these secret concerts, were frightened of the *perestroika* and attempted to defend themselves. The last public attempt of such defence was arranged against Mart Laar in 1989. The announcement on 7 March with its standard headline resembled the ones at the time of the pupils' demonstrations and the letter of 40: "In the Estonian SSR Prosecutor's Office". The text read as follows:

*"In the present period of reforms the Estonian SSR juridical organs are busy with rehabilitation of the unjustly repressed citizens, victims of the Stalinist regime as well as finding out who were the persons responsible for the repressions. The republic's public has been informed that the Estonian SSR Prosecutor's Office investigates the mass murders committed in Kuressaare, Tartu and elsewhere in the Estonian SSR territory. The prosecutor's office has widely used the public's help to ascertain the victims and the scale of the mass murders. Some information has come from the media of the republic.*

*Next to the real information about the Stalinist-time crimes, some invented stories that distort the reality have also been published. So the editorial office of the journal Vikerkaar published Time of Horrors by Mart Laar, in which the author states that the fighters of the Red Army or the destroyer battalion destroyed three villages in Estonia killing the inhabitants and nailing children to the trees. Actually, the Red Army and the destroyer battalion's soldiers did not commit such hateful acts in 1941. M.Laar's statements are untrue fabrications, the spreading of which is punishable in criminal procedure. The Estonian SSR Prosecutor's Office has started criminal proceedings."*

The criminal case was soon quietly closed due to the pressure of the public. Linguistically the expression "untrue fabrications" catches one's attention. What do you think, might it be the beloved by bolsheviks expression (and in Orwell's term – *newspeak*) emphasizing that the adversary's fabrications are always untrue but OURS are true? Or is it merely that stamp phrases are thrown about regardless to their real meaning? And in this case the incoherent language leads to unclear conclusions. Fabrication should be something that actually does not exist anywhere else than in somebody's head. Up today we still hear about "untrue facts" in the complaints of Soviet-time jurists. The expression "untrue truth" can drive you crazy when you start thinking about it. It is possible to give insufficient facts, (i.e. not everything you know). Or then – you do not present facts but only fabrications.

I encountered the phenomenon once again when the investigation of Stalin's repressions brought along certificates of rehabilitation. According to the 1999 Estonian Dictionary rehabilitation means reinstating, restoring former privileges, rights, ranks, etc. The Estonian Encyclopedia gives the same explanation and my student-time (1961) Lexicon of Foreign Words is more-or-less of the same opinion. The certificate I got from the ER Police Department on 2 April 1992 (naturally, the department was ordered to issue it) reads:

*"Issued to citizen Tarand Andres Helmut's son, born in 1940, concerning the fact that he was listed to be deported from Tallinn, Estonian SSR in March 1949 but the*

*decision was not realized. On the basis of the bill from 7 December 1988 "About the Extra-Judicial Mass Repressions in Soviet Estonia in 1940-1950" citizen Tarand Andres Helmut's son has been entirely rehabilitated and regains all the juridical rights."*

The text makes me wonder what is the meaning of it. I have expressed my amazement at least twice on the podium in the parliament hall, simultaneously watching the countenance of jurists who got their education in Soviet times: they express total misapprehension at my amazement. Ain Seppik, though, gave a rather quick answer, "I do not know what you did in 1949 and I am not able to assess the issues concerning your personality. But rehabilitation concerns on principle only these who have committed an act. Ask and peruse your certificate."

The only conclusion that I can make is that the 1992 rehabilitation came for my escaping the deportation in 1949. So that I should not worry in the Republic of Estonia that I might still be deported to Siberia. Well, it is something, although the NKVD fixed my going to Raasiku instead of Siberia on 19 March 1949 already in April of the same year, together with my sister (who is by some crooked idea of the NKVD called "son Kristi") and mother. My deported paternal granny had, namely, informed the deporters about it already before the train left for Siberia. She refused to give a more exact address. And evidently they never made a decision to deport these people who had escaped in March. (They say that the cattlecars from Stolypin's times<sup>82</sup> that transported the deported remained in Siberia and it would have been impossible to repeat such an extensive enterprise so soon.) I got used to it that I still lived in Estonia and beginning from Khrushchov's times we were not afraid of deportation any longer, if a boy of 10 to 15 thinks of such things at all. And actually, I got to Raasiku to my maternal grandmother's due to my mother's decision and not my own. As for the rehabilitation and reinstating my honour, I have to admit that I did not notice the lack of it during these long years. Even in the Soviet Army into which I was conscripted after the graduation from Tartu University, I quite often heard: *tovarishtsh Tarand, vy takoi dobrosovestnyi tshelovek*<sup>83</sup>. The reason for such an assessment was, of course, that I was five years older than the conscripted youngsters and had no wish to join in all their pranks. It means I had all my honour and even to such extent that for some period a sergeant stalked me everywhere and tried to convince me that I should join the Communist Party as I was such a *dobrosovestnyi* man. Eventually I got rid of the sergeant, paraphrasing Lenin's *net takoi partii*<sup>84</sup>. After that private first class Tarand was for some time known as a *shutnik*<sup>85</sup> in the company.

Thus in my case the certificate is worthless if not to take it as a curiosity for a dinner topic. Deportation of children belongs to the genocide and is a crime that does not lapse. As a child has never committed a crime in the meaning of court punishment, rehabilitation of a child is impossible. If these juridical rights are necessary for restitution, to get back a house or land, let us say it straight. I am afraid that in this 1992 restitution the rehabilitation was more necessary for these who had once helped to carry out the genocide – they tried to find a way that they would not be accused of anything.

As far as the genocide is concerned (I mean killing my personal genes), it was almost successful. I was having serious otitis in the early 1949 and at the end of

---

<sup>82</sup> Stolypin – (1862-1911) Russian statesman, governor and minister of internal affairs, who suppressed peasants' revolts and sentenced many a revolutionary to death. Translator.

<sup>83</sup> Comrade Tarand, you are such a conscientious (fair) man.

<sup>84</sup> There is no party like that.

<sup>85</sup> a joker.

February when I was finally getting over the feebleness I learned to walk again and got my very first personal bottle of genuine Portuguese portwine that was supposed to help restore my energy. A few weeks earlier Colonel Kauler's widow (we lived in the so-called Generals' House at 31 (now17), Gonsiori Street then) had been standing next to my sickbed and predicted to my mother in a voice that was quite audible to me, "This child of yours will certainly not survive." Actually I was saved by American penicillin that my anguished mother went to ask from Dr. Saks, a NKVD doctor who by that time had moved to live in the same Generals' House<sup>86</sup>. And mum got it, evidently it came from the war-time American aid stock.

In February 1996 when I combed Estonian archives for documents concerning our family's repressions, I got a letter from the long-time president of the Academy of Sciences Karl Rebane:

*"Some time ago I looked through the papers of my late brother, academician Jaan Rebane (Jaan Rebane died in 1993). Among them was the book "The Letter of Forty" written by you, Sirje Kiin and Rein Ruutsoo, and together with it several documents and papers collected or written by my brother. Among the rest was the order of the Tallinn Municipal Court from 19 October 1992 that granted Jaan Rebane's claim of protection of his honour and dignity. It means it also protected me as the president of that time Academy of Sciences and the Academy itself. I had never read the book before but about the court case I had been informed...(followed by the text of the verdict). At least in one Estonian paper the correction was published.*

*2. I would like to ask you whether the correction was also published in Finland by the publishers of your book or somebody else. If it has not been done I find that it should, to mitigate the slander against Jaan Rebane, the Academy of Sciences, and, to some extent, myself. The verdict says that the correction should be published "in a publication of the same extent". In addition to the matters mentioned in the claim, there were other slandering expressions in the book.*

*3. I have no plan to write a critical article about the book, but a few sentences I have to put down. Among the right ideas and standpoints there are subjective, uncontrolled and uncontrollable statements as well as lies (the object of J.Rebane's claim). Subjectiveness is revealed throughout. The book has been made to serve the subjective opinions of several people's political standing, they have been divided into sheep and goats, and one cannot help getting an impression that the basis for evaluations is the subjective sympathy or antipathy of the authors (Rein Ruutsoo?). The more objective treatment would have been to the book's advantage.*

*4. Not concerning the matters of the "Letter of Forty" I met you on Toompea 3-4 years ago. You were minister of environment then. I spoke about your article in 1989 in which you express an unfounded opinion about my resistance as the president of the Academy of Sciences to set the time zones right. Actually I criticized the project presented to the Presidium of the Academy of Sciences, the wording of which was declarative and contained no new facts that the Academy needed for scientific analysis (in order to support it!).*

*I have reason for considering the articles and speeches against myself the handiwork of not only populist-creerists in the science but powers hidden much deeper who did not like me because of my attempt to defend prof. Ain Aitsam, help along his release from prison and rehabilitation. Let us recall that these were the years 1988-89 and*

---

<sup>86</sup> The 1930s building got its name because it was erected as a co-operative for Estonian officers. As most of them were shot by communists and their families escaped West, the building became a home of many trusted communists. The author's grandparents lived in the smallest flat of the building and were the only ones to be deported in 1949. Translator.

*the Central Committee of the ESSR CP and the power structures above and behind it very strong.*

*These connections correlate with the need to talk to Mr Rein Ruutsoo about an echo of the letter of 40 fifteen years ago that seemed really weird to me. He, unfortunately, ignored my proposal to meet then or later.*

*I would like to make this matter clear as well. It is not only seeking for the truth posteriorly but is vitally important to me as even now everything that was written about me then is still used against me, to denigrate me and to fix the reputation assigned to me in these waves of populism.*

*5. I consider it essential to meet you, and it would be best to do it privately. I am not going to write to your co-authors. The reason is given in point 4, I have got an impression that it might cause an unbalanced reaction. Thus, I have a proposal to meet with you at the time and place of your convenience."*

*Yours truly K. Rebane*

On 3 March 1996 I replied as follows:

*"Dear Professor Karl Rebane, your letter to me (13.02.96) touched upon the dilemma of writing history: at first the events are too fresh to give their objective description (no distance) and later the memory starts distorting them. The events of the letter of 40, however, took place in the time when it was customary not even to try to describe them objectively in the press or the minutes of the respective meetings.*

*Naturally we did and could not use the USCP – KGB – Prosecutor's Office possibly existing documents. Telephone calls were hardly documented and we say it in the introduction. In such a situation subjectivity is natural, but let us also remember what time we had just come out from in 1990.*

*Page 115 that you indicate is included in the chapter at the beginning of which R.Hagelberg's letter to me has been quoted. Doesn't it remind us of the jolly good "collective irresponsibility" of all the innocents all over the Soviet Union?*

*The court case you inquire about was unnoticed by me due to a busy period in the government and I have never spoken about it with anybody later either. I checked the Finnish translation and your brother's case of becoming an academician is included there indeed. As the claim was against Olion publishers and the Finnish translation by publishers Otava appeared earlier than the Estonian publication, I do not see any formal connection. I have no wish to publish corrections or have court proceedings in cases that cannot be objectively proved – symbolically the whole story began when the bolsheviks that were actually a minority called themselves the majority. I would be really glad if somebody among that-time academicians would describe the true organisation of party leadership, including the Russification forced by the SU Communist Party that was the incentive of the letter in question.*

*The first possibility to meet you would be at 4 p.m. on 7 March. We may agree upon the meeting on phones 631 6650 or 631 6603.*

*With best wishes,  
A.Tarand.*

We did not meet at half past six after the war like in "Shvejki" but at six o'clock on the evening of March 7. I think we achieved some mutual understanding. By that time I had sorted out the papers of the late dear ones and I think I understand the feelings

one experiences in cases like that. I would not have quite understood the figurative speech about the snitches in prison camps, had I just not read, three days before, a document that surprised me considerably. It had been included in the History Museum file. And this document takes us back again to the company commander Helmut Tarand.

In File no 17, on page 184, is the following document:

*"Replying to our question no 9/2663 from 26 November 1957 the head of the KGB Accounting and Archive Department Kotelnikov told us:*

*Tarand, Helmut son of Hans, born in 1911 was indeed a secret collaborator of the Estonian SSR NKGB from 26 November 1944. There is no data about his release from the network. Tarand's personal file no 1463 has been given to the archive on 16 July 1945 and destroyed on 28 February 1955 due to the five-year term of passing and as it did not offer any operative interest." /Glushkov/.*

Why the year 1957? Because in 1956 Helmut Tarand who had been diagnosed to have stomach cancer had decided to leave Vorkuta for Estonia secretly before he went on to Gorki hospital to confirm the diagnosis. He arrived in Tallinn just for Christmas in 1955 and for me it was great Christmas Eve. I had not seen him for eleven years and the five-year-old was almost 16. Right, this is another story. What I wanted to say was that I do not know and cannot guess why father in 1957 took up the case of having been a KGB collaborator. As he had escaped from Vorkuta, not from the Gulag but from the town where he had been ordered to live, he had no passport up to the autumn of 1957 and to get the document might have been his target. But this does not cast any light on November 1944. What happened in the second half of November when Salmolainen interrogated Helmut Tarand? I have not got anything on it from the horse's mouth, neither have I found any documents. During these thirty years that followed his Gulag-period he never even mentioned it. I might make a conclusion that he had ill luck in any case, whatever he planned to do himself. What concerns the KGB text, though, the following cannot escape attention: if the file was given to the archives and from there as an uninteresting one passed on to be shredded in 1955, how could they destroy it during the agent's lifetime? Before the man (or the woman, of course) passes away? He/she might have been a double agent, mightn't he?

To believe the document one has to be a real ignoramus in secret service matters. Let us recall that the files of the agents walking around among us were taken to Moscow already in 1989 and Rein Sillari was proud of his achievement even in 1991 yet (I do not think he was personally responsible for the operation, he was but a cardboard cover for it). But to betray the agents or not to check them is an error even a greenhorn in secret service cannot make. Now, in 2004-2005, the Lithuanians have discovered the reservists of the KGB force, who are sitting at surprisingly many state posts. The Lithuanians took over quite a lot of KGB documents, not like Savisaar's government and the Aasmäe commission that his government appointed in Estonia and who staged a messy farce<sup>87</sup>. We with our own knowledge would not know anything of the KGB reservists in Estonia and would still point at each other when the relevant political order is given before the elections. This might get too current a topic, so let us better recall what happened in Estonia in the autumn of 1944. The war, a big and horrible one, had not yet ended. The Estonian people, who had just tried to escape to the West and who were still telling each other that very soon the British would come to liberate us and the Russians would return home, as the Atlantic charter

---

<sup>87</sup> The person(s) interested might read the "Final Account of the Parliament Investigation Commission formed to clarify the facts in connection with closing the activities of the Estonian SSR State Security Committee" from 28 March 2002.

did not allow to occupy small countries just like that, lived in a dream "I wish". They had nothing else – when things are really bad nothing else helps to live on. On the other hand, as became known only decades after the Second World War, the years-long fight between the British and Russian secret services was indeed going on in Estonia and Latvia. It ended with the NKVD's temporary (said with a hindsight) victory. Why do I speak about it? Because my father's interrogator Samolainen shot himself when one of his own employers accused him of being a British spy. This happened even before my father started his long journey to Vorkuta in Stolypin's cattlecar. It means the same June when father's file was transferred to the KGB archives. I do not know whether the file of agent Salmolainen exists in some Moscow archive. And, actually, even Lavrenti Beria himself was accused of being a British agent. This is but a speculation of mine. It is one thing to be forced to agree with listing as an agent standing in front of the KGB guns and quite another matter to do it in a peaceful situation just to further one's career.

This is about what I answered to Karl Rebane's allegorical hints on this March evening in 1996: one thing is to promise something when a gun is pointed at you, quite another to be weak all the time. We did not discuss concrete situations at all, but I guessed that his hints were based on the fact that he had recently read his brother's notes. I had read the files of the History Archives that had been read before me only by Jaan Rebane in 1992. *De mortuis nil nisi bene*<sup>88</sup> is a principle to be respected but analysing people's roles in history, it cannot be totally applied. I feel that Karl Rebane was inspired by his late brother's unfinished scenario, according to which the (wrong) author of the *Letter of Forty* had to be punished for his parents' sins although the responsibility of co-authors is shared. I cannot help feeling that the principle – the children will be punished for their parents' sins – is not acceptable, it has been unacceptable to me all my life (as far as the judging is done by man and not by gods), as it is connected with stalinism experienced in my childhood. Even if my father had been a sinner that I do not believe as I showed above, the transformation of his responsibility to a minor has no place in my way of thinking.

Everybody knows that children have been scourged in genocides organised by Turks and by Russians and in several other places all over the world, in our times especially in Africa. The NKVD certificate issued before the March deportation in 1949 declares that the family members of "the convicted nationalist Tarand H.H." must be deported. It is curious that the collection of deportation documents under the name of Tarand begins already with a small sheet dated 1941 and concerning the interrogation of Juta Rebane, daughter of Aleksander on 17 March 1941.

*Question: What sort of political atmosphere is dominating at your school?*

*Answer: At our 11th secondary school the teachers are pleased with the Soviet order but one group is not and they have influence on some other teachers. The opposing teachers are MÜÜR Erna, TARAND Leida and KÄPPA Erna. The worst is TARAND. She spreads rumours about a dairy farm in Viimsi that had provided Tallinn children with milk having been nationalised. She also spoke about an accident at the Raasiku railway station after which the station master of Aruküla was interrogated by the OGPU and went mad. She also says that the difficulties with meat come from the regulation that domestic animals must not be slaughtered. I have known teacher Müür as a colleague already for seven years. She is more secretive*

---

<sup>88</sup> Only good about the dead (should be said).

*and cunning in the staff room conversations. But in her case planned attacks against the young communists' league should be pointed out...*

*Confirmed as true by the undersigned junior lieutenant Shamshurin.*

I admit that 30 years ago I was eagerly searching for materials about Juta Rebane in the archives but in a totally different matter. She was a good teacher of biology and evidently the first in Tallinn who took her pupils to observe birds in Kadriorg in spring. I was organising a wider urban ecology study at the Botanic Gardens and the observations made a third of a century before interested me. My search failed to give results despite my mother's instructions about Juta Rebane's life. I think the failure might have been caused just by this life story. Mother had no idea of her colleague's informing on her (the content of it seems ridiculous today but at that time it was quite enough for the predecessors of the KGB to open a file for deportation just with the above extract as its first page) but she knew the person. In her memoirs (written before the *perestroika* – mother died in 1984) my mother wrote:

*"The majority of the pedagogical council voted that the former members of the Young Communist League should be allowed to continue their studies (during the German occupation). Not a single teacher had voluntarily evacuated to Russia but we did not have Juta Rebane with us any longer. I do not know whether anybody among our teachers was interrogated or what she was accused of. I saw her on the day when she was obviously going to an interrogation as she had a rolled up blanket under her arm. She must have been thinking that she would be arrested and imprisoned for some time. It was a depressing encounter for me. I still remember this sunny early-autumn afternoon. I came from Vanaturu kael and turned round the Scheel Pank corner when I saw Juta Rebane on the opposite pavement, bareheaded and the blanket roll under her arm. Seeing me she greeted me with a low, pupil-like and humble bow. The whole 1940/41 she had treated me with certain haughtiness or ignored me and now such humility! I got a feeling that she expected me to help her in some way or at least not to have a revenge on her. I would have never done the latter and I could not help her in any way as I was never interrogated on her case. May be the witnesses could help when they managed to suppress their urge to avenge."*

I do not know what mother would have written in the train taking her and us to Siberia but I know my mother and I think she still would not have ground her teeth revengefully. The generalisation can also be found in my mother's memoirs.

*"In 1940/41 my student-time friend Linda Kuusler-Vihalemm was appointed director of Secondary School no 3. Her husband Paul Vihalemm had become a communist. His post-war research "Estonian Bourgeoisie in the Service of Foreign Imperialists" and others characterize him clear and loud. So Linda Vihalemm – a hardworking woman of average abilities, politically a total tabula rasa<sup>89</sup>, - was appointed director and started making Estonian pupils communists, as she said once to me during a break of a lecture. I told her that she would not manage to do it any better than trying to make them Gipsies! And I never spoke to her more in 1940/41. In summer Paul Vihalemm escaped to Russia and left his wife and five children to their own fate. Linda Vihalemm had made her pupils so angry that numerous complaints about her were presented. And suddenly Salme Kõök-Kimask and I were summoned to*

---

<sup>89</sup> A clean sheet /board (Latin)

*the SS to testify about Linda Vihalemm, who had named us as character witnesses. I was asked whether Linda Vihalemm was a communist. I answered what I believed to be true – only her husband could be blamed for her career, only on his influence did she do what she did. She herself is an absolute ignoramus in politics etc.,etc.. Salme Kimask had said about the same things. And the farmer of the neighbouring farm had defended her as well (she took her children to her childhood home in a village). Linda Vihalemm was not arrested.*

*In 1945 when the master of the neighbouring farm was arrested, his wife had asked Linda Vihalemm to do something for her husband and had been told, "For class enemies I will not do anything!"*

I do hope that the moral of the story is clear. I did not continue studying the family tree of Leida Loone's (néé Rebane) sister. Neither was I interested in the possible informer (although it would be technically easy now), nor in the roots of the family tree. I mean whether there was the first Brother Fox<sup>90</sup> anywhere. Like Karu (Bear) and Hunt (Wolf), Fox is a fairytale character and had his characteristic features already fixed in folklore before Estonians were finally given surnames.

I have to make another ascent in time. This is connected to the search in the Tallinn Botanic Gardens on 8 June 1981 that I have described before and a newspaper article written by Lembit Aasalo about ten years later. There was a total mess in all the publications of the time and that is why I cannot cite exactly: there are no registers from the time and I have not got the clipping in my home archive either). As far as I remember it did not even hint but listed me directly as a KGB snitch. Aasalo's initiative did not catch and would not be worth mentioning, but it was connected with a rather tense period in my life already before the letter of 40. It characterises the atmosphere around the KGB, difficult to prove but always present in the Soviet times.

As it can be seen from my diary in between 1980-81, I never contemplated Aasalo's role but trusted him totally. I mean his role in this respect that, as some people hinted, he was connected with the KGB. I thought that people made this conclusion on the basis of his rather bold criticism on the powers that I had got used to among my father's friends, former political prisoners but that still frightened the "free" (meaning those who had not been arrested) people who had been suitably mollified.

A good psychological generalisation about the times: the prisoners were free and the free people imprisoned. For a short period in the winter months of 1981 when searching our home seemed possible after what had happened at the Kaplinskis', I gave the first chapter of my diary that could betray some people to Lembit Aasalo who hid it on his North-Pärnumaa farm. Before the winter ended I went there myself and got the manuscript from the loft of the byre. I thought about the search now and then but could not answer a few questions that arose. Here they are:

Why did the *troika* appear at the Botanic Gardens on the day when the director was away on business and the "culprit" not present either? The owner should be present when his cupboards are being searched. Why did the *troika* spend such a lot of time in the morning doing nothing and started their activities only when I got there? Why did Aasalo's safe contain a barely readable manuscript of Solzhenitsyn's Gulag and only one issue of *Lisandused* (no 8), just the one where one of my rare articles was? Aasalo had hinted at his contacts with the "boys from *Lisandused*" several times but I had never contacted them. Was I imagining the interest one of the searchers (the nameless one) seemed to have just in this issue or was it really there?

---

<sup>90</sup> Rebane in the Estonian language means fox. Translator.

It is easy to say that fear has big eyes, but at that time when we had only channelled information, some questions appeared and did not leave you alone. The main suspicious affair belonged to the pre-letter period and I do not remember when I dropped it as a problem without an answer. It had to be after Lembitu Aasalo had left the Botanic Gardens, as he came to visit his old colleagues from his new job. We started talking about the events described here. I asked rather openly whether his early release from prison, bold talk and other circumstances were not connected with certain duties as a linkman between some people and the security organs. It was impossible to get a true answer to this sort of question at that time, would probably be now as well but one can hope to watch for some reaction and make conclusions (perhaps false again). On the other hand, it is risky, you could make somebody furious with your ungrounded accusations. I must say that I had not planned to ask it, I asked because I had been thinking about it too often. Aasalo's answer was a plain and repeated "no", but evidently my sudden question started to fester in his soul. Well, who wouldn't be upset, and in both cases – when you have snitched a little or never have at all?

For more explanations I have to digress some more. By the year 1975 I had realised the prerogatives that were necessary to retain some personal freedom in the rather strait although pleasant atmosphere of the Tallinn Botanic Gardens. I had, namely, defended my thesis and found a suitable niche for myself in a totally idiotic system. I could do rather interesting work and did not have to sell myself politically. It was possible thanks to grasping the idea in the polar night of the Antarctica: I could work in natural sciences in the Soviet Union but not in humanities and social sciences that I would have loved to research.

Thus I had understood the limits of my possibilities but it did not mean setting myself limits in my profession. As a new department head I wanted to bring in a lot of girls who were basically busy with Soviet-time mode-of-life. I invented a lot of additional topics<sup>91</sup> for them but was evidently too idealistic and reached too far. In concrete situation it meant that a big army of botanists were appointed to work in urban ecology. The tradition of natural scientists at that time demanded that everybody left town in spring on whatever pretext. At the same time urbanization had reached the 7 to 3 relation for the town. Personally I had a pretentious idea to put Tallinn in the world map reconstructing its historical climatology. (I could realize this plan partly in 2002.) But it still seems too much as a hindsight. In 1975 I was, above all, interested in getting the best results in the Soviet conditions and I have to admit I even believed I could influence Tallinn town planning. So I started to work earnestly and had to overcome difficulties that were so characteristic of the times. It is strange that people today cannot grasp what the Soviet time meant in concrete matters. When Estonians go somewhere to the countryside to a wedding, confirmation party or some other festivity, the hosts tell the guests that they would mark the branch-off from the main road with a plastic bag, a slip or some rag on a tree-branch. Having served their purpose these things will remain where they were put. Estonian taxidriviers do not use the excellent Regio road atlases or other maps to find their way in towns as the customary conduct dictates that they would ask over the radiophone where a place is. I am not blaming them for this stupidity because this is one of these things that the Soviet power took from us. Many people do not even know that a map is the best way

---

<sup>91</sup> The system of planned economy: within the framework of the five-year plan. Moscow had to be applied to for finances and if they were granted, one had to invent research topics that these finances would cover.

for orienteering, as maps, true and detailed, were classified and even the officers of the Soviet army saw a real map perhaps once a year only at their field training.

Well, we will certainly recuperate. But in 1975 it was a personal and quite risky business to get a town plan. To get Moscow's permission for obtaining one, would have taken at least a year and the job (now we say 'project') had to be done in a year and a half. So I used my schoolmate for obtaining a violet-colour photocopy of the plan of Tallinn, where at least most of the streets were at the right place. One of the nice girls of the BG named Täpi went to copy this plan – at my insistence that every fieldworker should have a plan of her own – in a municipal bureau in Lai Street. And was caught redhanded as neither she nor I had any official permit to do it. In a few hours I understood what I had done and I was summoned to the town council to account. I was youthfully optimistic and, having armed myself with the greatest rarity of the Botanic Gardens – an orchid called *Cymbidium* – went where I had been ordered to go. I was received by a woman with the name of Tamme (the wife or sister-in-law of the later Popular Front figure Rein Tamme) who turned beetroot red when I gave her the flower but the deed had been done. The woman had already reported my crime to the KGB and the orchid was totally wasted as means for my rescue.

I do not remember how many days had passed when I was summoned to the secret department that was located in the top floor of the Academy of Sciences (it was the first or the second department but in vernacular known as "at madam Aus" ). Madam Aus was the authorized representative of the KGB). I discovered that behind the first room that I had frequently visited was another, where Eduard Nikolayevich Meshkov was waiting for me. I have always thought of him as a KGB captain and his phone number was 663 474. Captain or not, the man was a relatively polite Russian. I told him in a lengthy and detailed way how, on the one hand, Moscow has ordered me to make the ecological plan of Tallinn in a year and a half but at the same time permission to obtain basic sources (maps) would take a year at least. I think I convinced the captain that it was an impossible order and in order to part in a friendly way, he shook my hand as said, "*Yesli shto, pozvonite!*"<sup>92</sup> (That is why I have his telephone number). I was not punished in any way – it was but a scheme and not a detailed large-scale map – and I believe I fulfilled my additional research topic as required.

Not much time passed when along the usual bureaucratic channels a letter from the research director of the BG was dropped on my desk:

*"In connection with planning contacts with foreign capitalist countries you are asked to propose the names of scientists who would participate at conferences and symposiums (on personal invitations or based on official information) or go to work abroad on personal invitations or as exchange researchers. Please make your suggestions by 1 April 1976."*

In the same 1976 I managed to go to Finland for a fortnight on the invitation of Finnish friends, where I also visited some people of my own profession. It was certainly quite natural to wish to participate in some international research. That is why I decided to pass the not so easy road to apply for a foreign visa and permission to work abroad. And this also seemed logical to try to get first to Finland that had special relations with the Soviet Union. That, of course, meant applying to the Moscow Academy of Sciences for permission to go on a business trip.

---

<sup>92</sup> If necessary, phone me (Russian).

I am not aware if somebody has ever tried to describe all the penpushing one had to cope with while applying to go to a capitalist country. The documents had to be signed by the director, party secretary and trade union leader of the institute, but nobody of them wrote anything, this was the task of the applicant himself. I remember that in 1967 I applied for a permit to go to a conference in Poland. It was my very first trip abroad of all. I passed my self-composed character reference to the research secretary of the Botanic Gardens, Malev Margus. He made a disdainful face, declared my effort senseless and added some obligatory stamp phrases that sounded sumptuous indeed. My character remained positive for many years, the compulsory phrases were the following: "Tarand is morally unfaltering, politically educated and well-versed in international issues." Once I added, just for fun, that my ideology was correct and it passed, although I have no idea today either, what is a correct ideology. The gist of the matter was naturally to frighten the people who had to sign the reference, so that they would not do it offhandedly, not that anybody would have been really interested in the applicant's true character. One also had to write the programme for the research abroad, list all the offices and the names of their heads one planned to visit. There was a questionnaire one had to fill in at every trip, one's biography and scientific analysis of one's programme had to be included. I filled these questionnaires and wrote the references several times after December 1976 that was the first occasion to do it. The most noteworthy of all the documents was the one requested only for such a trip and called "Directive instructions". This one read as follows:

*"Tarand Andres Helmut's son who will go to Finland to work at Finnish research institutes*

- 1. is authorised to gain information on urban ecology and to lecture.*
- 2. is permitted to read the following lectures authorised by the Glavlit to be taken abroad on "Comparisons of Tallinn and Helsinki urban climates"; "Progress of environment protection in the Soviet Union and especially in the Estonian SSR"; "The Tallinn Botanic Gardens – the centre of ecological research".*
- 3. has to inform the Embassy of the USSR in Helsinki of his arrival and departure.*
- 4. may, if an opportunity opens, visit Finnish research institutes and gain information about research in climatology, urban ecology and environment protection.*
- 5. should extensively propagate the achievements of Soviet science and the progress of building up socialism in the Soviet Union.*
- 6. is allowed to use only this information that has been published in his lectures and conversations with foreign scientists.*
- 7. must coordinate every proposal to perform in the press, over the radio or on TV with the Embassy of the USSR in Helsinki.*
- 8. returning from the trip abroad must present a detailed report that should contain proposals of realising the experience of foreign scientists."*

The document was issued on 27 December 1976. After that a long period of silence followed. I was not surprised as I had experienced such kind of treatment already when I had applied to participate in the Antarctic expedition in 1968. At that time my mother-in-law<sup>93</sup> helped me out. She had once lived in the same house with Jüri Nuut, the science department head of the Central Committee and knew his telephone number by heart. I called and was asked to call again next week. And the next week I heard: "As far as I know, the matter has been resolved. As far as I know it has been

---

<sup>93</sup> Linda Viiding.

resolved positively." The festive tone of voice allowed me to make the conclusion that the batch of documents had been pushed through. Several knowing people had informed me that it was quite common that documents like that were kept on desks and soon be covered with the new ones, so that they would never be perused. Who knows.

This time the dance around the documents seemed to become longer. My notes show that I had been patiently waiting until late April in 1977 when I tried to engage director Pukk to inquire about my fate. I got my hope up when I received a note from the foreign department of the Academy of Sciences that informed me about my inclusion in the 1977 plan of the USSR Academy of Sciences. When the whole summer had flown by and no squeak was heard I suddenly remembered my interrogator Meshkov, whom I called and explained that I was using his offer of help as my application to go abroad would not give any results. The captain promised to talk to somebody and in about a week later I was summoned by phone to appear at a house in Lai Street (one of the Three Brothers). The first I saw there was a horrible looking checkpoint. It was no better than at a militia station, army barracks or borderguard gates. I was not passed much farther than a reception room that was separated from some room by a temporary plywood wall, where I was told to wait. I must admit that the whole undertaking was fuelled by my youth (a man under 40) and the sporting interest in what might come of it all. But I had not thought out any concrete plan. When Meshkov appeared together with a somewhat older comrade (whom I, God knows why, took for a major), I told them eagerly about my extensive plan to develop urban ecology and climatology. I spoke for about half an hour. The major, who asked to be called Anatoli Mikhailovich, asked some questions and the séance ended without any visible result. The operatives promised to phone when there was a need for that. The two next meetings with Anatoli Mikhailovich took place not behind the plywood wall but in the booked rooms on the third floor of the hotel Palace in late October 1977. (I have noted down the number of the room – 468.) The first meeting there passed in a friendly conversation again but there was a little and innocent-looking bid: couldn't I bring him the least classified (meant only for official use) publication of the Botanic Gardens the title of which I do not remember but that dealt with the environment situation in Estonia. Among the other articles was one written by me that concerned the air pollution in Tallinn. I did not refuse, neither did I promise to take out the classified material and pass it to a surveillance officer, violating the fixed rules. I was thinking about it for some days and I smelled a provocation: the publication that was registered would get lost in the KGB and I would have been told that I was in a rotten mess, perhaps a hopeless one. If I behave they may not bring out the mess unless I refused the next little service – to bring out the next publication or voluntarily agree to fulfill some other bid at home or abroad. Anatoli Mikhailovich did not give me any additional hints about the possibility of such a scheme. I conceived that with my wishes to research urban ecology I was overstepping the limits that would not be easy to return to at all. And I prepared to turn the proposal down, politely but decisively, already at our next meeting that took place already on 21 October 1977, still at the same Palace Hotel. I perceived that the major had expected a different outcome and he did not rejoice at my refusal. I had recently met the man with a pseudonym Anatoli in the street, where his slate grey eyes did not show any recognition, but now I saw disapproval in these eyes. It was clearly brought home to me by the threesome who sat at the next table from me on the first floor of the Café Tallinn and who had evidently been told to watch my leaving the hotel, follow me and with their unfaltering stares confirm me of the presence of

the Big Brother. I did not doubt the presence but my nerves were strong enough to face the provocation and finish my cup of coffee in peace.

I believe weeks passed before the new wave to present all the requested documents before. It was already February in 1978. The purpose for such rewriting of documents served perhaps the convenience of the top men not to go through the previous ones again. This time it was different, most papers had to be sent to Moscow to Aleksei Yakovlevitch Korsakov.

I may be slightly in error interpreting my old notes but the calendar page that marks 20 April bears a note: peculiar happenings. I think it marks my last meeting with Anatoli Mikhailovich in the Palace Hotel. I remember that it was a fine sunny spring day. The appointment was at 2 p.m. but curiously enough I got a call from the foreign department already at 11 a.m. and I was told that everything was in order with my trip to Finland finally. Actually, in Soviet times we could say it was more or less in order only when one's foot touched land in a foreign country, but the phone message of such a department was no mere trifle either. I remember that the security organs had coaxed me again to get them the classified material of Botanic Gardens, although I had stated that they should go through the legal channels to obtain it. At the same time it was difficult for me to figure out how they could act in such an uncoordinated way: if they wanted to squeeze me some more, the foreign department should not have forwarded their message earlier. I am not aware of the circumstances even now, it might have been shoddy work or some recruiting official's unwillingness to admit his failure in enrolling me.

Be it as it is, but I went to Kloostrimetsa bus stop in a suitably vernal mood. The intervals between buses were long at that time and it was usual to meet some colleague also waiting for the bus. That day I met Lembitu Aasalo. As usual we talked about this and that until the bus took us to its final stop in Jõe Street. Usually Aasalo continued his way home by bus 40 that started somewhere close-by. I had decided to go on foot to Independence Square that at that time was called Victory Square and was not especially surprised when Aasalo started to walk with me along Pärnu Road. I had certainly not told him why I was going to the Hotel Palace but I did not consider conspiracy so important that I would have started darting about. We parted at the crossing of Pärnu Road and Estonia Avenue, so that I had the honour of being seen almost to my destination by Aasalo. This detail, together with all the unanswered questions about the search in the Botanic Gardens, started to vex me afterwards as we had never walked together in town before. Why did Aasalo walk with me that day? Now I take it calmly – it might certainly have been a happenstance. I have no proof and now no wish either to suspect him. But at that time, in the stuffy atmosphere, amidst all sort of schemes, one could easily start overdosing the suspicions. On the other hand, of course, the meeting at the Palace Hotel gave me enough reason to have these overheated feelings.

That time the major had employed two absolutely dumb but essential helpers. Naturally, we were not introduced but they must have been professional starers whose assignment was to leave an impression that I would be beaten up pretty soon. I do not know what they call this method of psychoterror in the secret service but several years later I encountered it once more.

In 1995 I went to a criminal-prevention conference in Napoli that had been meant for Mart Laar already<sup>94</sup>. When there, my young and bright helpers got an idea that I should meet Russian minister of internal affairs Yerin. The meeting was arranged and

---

<sup>94</sup> Mart Laar was the PM before the author. Translator.

as the conference took place in some former noble's spacious palace, our meeting was to take place in a roomy columned hall. First, Yerin was 20 minutes late, deliberately of course, and when he arrived he placed a professional starrer at both walls. This time it felt comically absurd, much more so than the first experiment in the Palace Hotel, but I managed to curb my undiplomatic amusement.

Thus my trip to Finland was cancelled once again in this spring of 1978, on technical reasons, although I was dealing with Moscow myself that time. On 14 August, though, there were no more obstacles. The central offices of the Soviet Union in Moscow could not imagine that Tallinn was much closer to Helsinki straight than via Moscow. But even if one was aware of the fact, one could not miss Moscow due to an unavoidable and totally secret operation that could be carried out only in the capital city of the great homeland.

When I was hunting for a cab in the centre of Victory Square on the early morning of 14 August, the situation differed very much from the present one that concerned getting a cab, but it did not concerning the consequences if you were late for the plane. All my longlasting and adventurous efforts to get to Finland were of no avail, as there was no cab to take me to the Tallinn airport to catch the plane to Moscow. At that time – in the centre of the square in my great need – the closest help was militia. Despite the early hour, jumping and waving in the centre of the square together with my wife, I, or my suit, must have given them a trustworthy impression... The passing patrol car stopped and agreed to take me to the airport. I had even no chance to ask their names, but for their good deed I am still grateful.

The day in Moscow had a tight schedule. Having queued for some time, I was given my foreign passport, certificate for changing roubles for Finnish currency and train ticket and then had to get to the Hotel Rossiya behind the Kremlin, where I had an appointment with an official of the SUCP Central Committee, whose name was trusted to me in secrecy only in the foreign department. I cannot find the name in my notes, unless it is Plotinski that has been scribbled on a page. I remember that he was a jovial Russian who asked how well I knew Finnish. I said that about as well as I knew Russian and he almost applauded. He did not waste time, though, and started to explain how I should find the room, the name of which he still kept secret. It was a two-room suite, the first had a reception counter and the other resembled a reading room. You had to sign at the counter and got a score of printed pages. On the first page was the stamp SEKRETNO<sup>95</sup>. One was advised to read everything properly. It was an impossible task for me that day, as the Moscow-Helsinki express would have left by the time I finished. Thumbing the material through hastily, I divined that it was extremely interesting: it explained point by point how a Soviet citizen was to behave in capitalist surroundings and what he was not allowed to do. I was really sorry that I had no means of copying anything and blamed my friends who had passed through the room before and had not warned me about it. The last page made it clear why they had not: it was said that the material that one had just finished reading did not exist at all. You had signed for the classified material, it did not exist, you were not allowed to breathe a word about it to anybody. If you did, you could not prove it did. Juridically it means a vicious circle. The punishment would immediately have been meted out by competent organs, as they were deemed with pride.

As I am already talking about my first and last (for Soviet roubles) foreign trip, I should also speak about its exciting end. I left Helsinki for Moscow on 15 October and have to admit that I had not thought about Moscow in the past two months.

---

<sup>95</sup> Classified.

Naturally I visited the SU consulate when I had arrived and again before my departure but I avoided the films that were shown on the premises every day and did not buy the cheap alcohol that was sold there. The last fact arose lots of amazement among my hostel mates from all over the great homeland. They say that there were about 3000 Soviet officials and their family members in Helsinki, so my avoidance of the cinema and alcohol shop that were obviously frequently used by the others did not cause them any losses in money. Time passed fulfilling the plan I had set myself and meeting friends of whom I had quite a few in Finland. So it happened that I forgot some rules of behaviour dictated by Moscow and when I returned it took a few hours to get rid of a free man's feelings. Only a few hours, though. Circulating from one official's desk to another's I finally got to one, where the woman cautiously asked me for a certain sum in Finnmarks that I was supposed to return. At first I was taken aback, as I had spent all the exchanged money to the last penny. The last stivers evidently went the way of all flesh in my that-time favourite bar near the Helsinki Town Theatre. A little later the stupefaction was replaced by deep consternation as the fine on the overdraft was more than my family's annual income. I was reminded that I had confirmed the returning of the money with my signature. I was evidently rather pale as I did not see how I could contribute to the support of my family the next year. My consternation did not remain unnoticed by several charming female officials. I do not know whether they took me for an impractical *pribalt*<sup>96</sup> or what, but they definitely did not consider me a crook who would invent all sort of stories to get off the hook. In a little while I started to get low-voiced instructions and advice into which room I should go and what I should say there. The voices had to be low as they could not have openly favoured a violator. The day's labour was concluded by an agreement that I would confirm with my signature and the official seal the list of items I had bought for the Botanic Gardens, not for myself – and according to that list my fine would be reduced. When I got to the Moscow-Tallinn train in the evening I had got a little of my vitality back. And already the next day the following letter was addressed to the general secretary of the Academy of Sciences, correspondent member of the academy G.K. Skryabin.

*"On 14 August 1978 I went to Finland on governments-level exchange agreement for a two-month period to research human impact on continental ecosystems. Out of the 3660 Finnish marks I was allowed to spend 2504.33 marks.<sup>97</sup> I overspent 1155.67 marks. On the one hand, the overdraft was caused by two conferences that I attended. On 24-25 August there was a conference in Hyttiala on the programme "Man and Biosphere" and on 4-6 September the conference "Bioindication and Modelling the Air Pollution" in Oulanga.*

*I was not aware of these conferences earlier and decided to participate when my Finnish colleagues advised me to do it. The total expenditure on the conferences was 638 Finnmarks. On the other hand, I purchased several goods necessary for our institute's work for 678.35 Finnmarks.*

*When I returned to Moscow I comprehended that I had violated the rules established by the ruling organisations in what concerned the use of foreign currency.*

---

<sup>96</sup> *Pribaltika* was the common name for Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, *pribalt* would be an inhabitant of these countries in Russian. Translator.

<sup>97</sup> This kind of operations in the Academy of Sciences meant another *pokazuha* (show). The foreign countries, where this money was to be spent were given an idea that Soviet citizens were nicely taken care of: the stipend was nominally close to what scientists got in that country. Moscow bosses, however, thought it was still too much and the secret duty of returning a part of the money was explained as supporting the Academy. I have absolutely no idea how this money was used.

*I can explain it with the circumstance that I was on a longer-time business-trip abroad for the first time and had not grasped these regulations clearly. The overdraft was caused by pursuing the interests of the Tallinn Botanic Gardens (a list of these essential tasks is enclosed) and that is why I ask to fine me according to the minimum rate, if possible."*

I also made a list of things I had considered necessary for our work, beginning from a pocket calculator TI-57 and ending with several kinds of pencils (Stabilobos, Penol and others, as well as brushes for retouching) that I really had bought. To make the figures fit, I added some books I had got free from some institutes. Some weeks passed, the request for a minimal fine was delivered and I paid up with a minimal effort. My notebooks of the time contain reminders of buying fat for the titmice of the Botanic Gardens and the cold record  $-32^{\circ}$  C on the last day of the year, but not the sum I was fined with. That is why I cannot be more precise now.

For summing up I could say that all is well that ends well. My further ambitions concerning foreign countries were restrained by myself, having made necessary conclusions of the events described above. The first attempt for a new trip I made only in the spring of 1988, applying for a three-day tourist visa to Finland. The organs that had transformed suitably in the spirits of the *perestroika* by that time, did not block it. All the next journeys were in completely different conditions and should be described in another book. Finland, however, emerged again a year later, in the spring of 1989 when, obviously with the help of Eva Lille's invisible hand, I was the first in Estonia to get the Tuglas-Seura scholarship. It was not long when the *Letter of Forty* was also published in Finland and if I had any intentions of annoying my readers I would refer them back to the beginning of the book. I won't do that and will instead talk about 1996 when I became interested in my exit permits file.

I wanted to know what such files were like and whether Anatoli Mikhailovich had reflected anything of what I have described here. He might have had, but somebody had decided this file worthy of transferring to the heart of his homeland among the other 60% of such Estonian exit files. (I have no idea whether special files were transferred or if they simply picked about half of them out.) I only saw file no 7910 under the general name Tarand. The first Russian-language entry is Mari Pavlovna who had kindly been allowed to go to Finland as a tourist in 1967. The next is Andres Helmutovich who wanted to go to Antarctica in 1968. Kristi Helmutovna has been entered on St George's day in 1976 in connection with her wish to visit Finland and Indrek Andresovich ends the list with his business trip to Finland in March 1989. It is evident that the last entry is one of the last of its kind if, indeed, the deportation of these files took place in 1989. And of course the file shows only the first attempt to get the exit visa. There must be another file with other trips somewhere.

I must admit here that despite the adventurousness of many events and exercising one's mind in extrapolating scarce information in order to make vitally essential conclusions, I still cannot get rid of the feeling that the system that oppressed us defeated us in some aspects. The main aspect was creating the mania of suspicions and fears. Next to the heaps of the dead bodies, this was perhaps the greatest achievement of Lenin and Stalin. I am not able to forward my excuses to Lembitu Aasalo in the Other World. I am not able to excuse myself to these people either who are still with us and may feel somehow offended by what I have written. As I said at the beginning of the book, my aim was not to publish a censored diary with the hindsight of 25 years later. I have been interested in the generalisations one can make. These are more important to me than individual errors. I have observed the long-time inertia that has dominated when the society has passed from one social system into

another. Let us agree that our main target should be to warn the successors not to be nostalgic about or mythologise the totalitarian systems that, based on plain fear of death, build negative relationships all over the society.

## TWENTY-FIVE YEARS LATER

At 6 p.m. on 11 April 2005 the European Parliament stood up for a minute's silence in Strasbourg to commemorate Carol Woityla, the pope from Poland – John Paul II. There were not many MPs present – many of them were just approaching the session hall from all parts of Europe. But it turned out that some were unable to stand in silence because of their principles... In the Mediterranean countries the fight between the ecclesiastical and secular power was going on. To me, a long-time although not militant atheist from the other side of Europe, it was very strange to hear – I felt that some brains had stopped functioning. Certainly, we must not mourn a bloodthirsty dictator, some other murderer and creatures of the same ilk, but a person who has done perhaps more than anybody else to overthrow a dictatorship that has played such an essential role in European history (it is an evaluation, not a ranking) should be commemorated by every member of the European parliament without protest.

The text in the book dates back to the time twenty-five years ago when the delighted enthusiasm of the Polish people had grown into people's (trade unions) resistance under the name of *Solidarnosc*. We all felt that this was a new quality, compared to the events in Czechoslovakia. The Czechs' resistance in 1967 reminds of a palace coup that was suppressed by the Kremlin when they arrested a score of people traitorously in Dierna nad Tiszu. But the regime that said it spoke for the people did not have any plan to suppress the people's own discontent in Poland, and especially in Gdansk on the Baltic that was so much more open than inland Russia. It soon became clear that Moscow was eventually able to hatch out only the old show of strength again: a military coup d'état. Still, there were only a few minutes left, in the historical plan, to the final curtain of the empire. We were not yet able to count these minutes, even if we should have noticed the annual succumbing of the senile old top men that was confirmation in itself.

It is not only the death of the pope that makes us remember the role and time of the Solidarity. The last year's orange revolution in the Ukraine and the roses' revolution the year before that in Georgia, are not so far removed from our own singing revolution not to notice the connecting links between them and the pope-induced violence-free solidarity movement. The role of Estonia in pushing off the movement that started the final act in the empire was not our own invention, although it still deserves mentioning and introducing to the world as an example of the intelligence and equipoise of the people.

It is certainly too early to say that the situation has stabilised in Ukraine. We know from our own experience that working hard can produce a constitution rather quickly, more hard work enables to organise more or less regular elections and observing only the surface – to live almost democratically. But actually no revolution is able to empty people like vessels of all the old to make room for the new. Old habits are pertinacious and it hurts to admit it about Estonia after fifteen years. It hurts more than it did five years after the declaration of independence. The certain developmental delay in Estonian society in the second decade of independence has been brought about by different factors but basically it is the fault of the political parties who follow the rules of bigger groups: align according to lower moral level.

When I was the chairman of the coalition council, one of the partners of our group of three started to harp ominously every week, "If they do it, we have to do the same." This was a slogan for descending the down staircase. By now everybody who has cared to observe and study them has got a clear idea about the parties.

1. According to their own information all the parties win all the time. According to the same estimation, all the other parties lose all the time.

2. Before the elections and during government 's crises every party has an endlessly long bench, meaning that every party can appoint ministers for 2-3 cabinets. Actually, every party scratches the bottom of the barrel already after nominating the fifth minister, unless they start considering good municipality heads and give up the idea of a Euro-qualified minister.

3. When all the parties fight firm-handedly against corruption, crime, AIDS and other evils, after the elections the permanent fight goes on only between the parties themselves and they struggle in such a self-forgetting manner that there is no more steam for any other battles.

All this is not an unavoidable political competition that occurs inside every party and between the parties anyhow. It is a criminal waste of the resources of a small nation and a small state, a waste that devours the society on both ends. When the cabinet does not work as a whole but consists of gangs instead, it is not able to make essential reforms needed by the society. At the time when belonging to the "right" party is enough to get appointed at whatever post, the quality of ministers, municipality heads and other state officials suffers much more than it would if the party belonging principle were ignored, as actually the party bench is short. Unfortunately for Estonia, the bolshevist intolerance principle is included and according to that every person that has not knuckled under the party, is taunted as much as possible on his post. The latter is the real reason for wide political corruption: the posts that require neutrality have been filled with party favourites and the illusory suspension of party membership in some cases has absolutely no meaning. More and more the governing has been replaced by business ventures and projects that according to political slang are called interests.

What kind of interests are they? More often than not, they are politicians' personal economic interests that are easier to appease working in a clan. The Res Publica's march to the stage was, not considering their initial misleading slogans, an almost undisguised business project. Before them business interests were generally screened by confusing talk.

The phenomenon has a wider base than only one party, though. When after a lengthy resistance, I was removed from the post of the chairman of the foreign committee, several of the members told me outside the session room, "You know very well what the reason is." When I wanted to know what it actually was, nobody answered. It means that some things have to be done but it is not nice to speak about them. (The reason that I was rather slow to grasp was money that had to be obtained for one's party by hook or by crook. A little later it turned out that even slave market was not excluded, if we remember what happened in case of Faktulin.) The main thing was not to talk about how it was done. How can one deal with matters in the parliament without talking, though?

I tried to criticise such business ventures in the Parliament but, unfortunately, with no visible results.

Estonia is not big like the USA that can exchange half of the top officials after presidential elections. Estonia has but one Veerpalu and one Mae and it is not easy to make the relay team up. This means, among other things, that talents have to be nurtured and not destroyed because of party-political calculations. I have been thinking for some time now that the reason for such corruption is the domination of the traditions of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union within our parties. All the other traditions are still being studied and it is a reason for deep concern.

Forced party membership, threatening and frightening targeted at state officials are phenomena absolutely alien to democracy. I have heard straight from the horse's mouth how people were blackmailed with rented rooms and jobs already during the previous elections. I have asked whether these citizens are ready to be witnesses in court and they have refused. One has, perhaps, to understand this rigid clinging to one's chances, but in this case we cannot speak about mature citizenship or mature institutions in Estonia. That is why the parties' intensifying trampling on the barely sprouting lawn is so worrying. The people's reaction to this is the muttered "they are all of the same ilk" while distancing themselves from politics, this way trusting their future to the possible scoundrel-like figures.

But the people have to be protected, too, as in Estonia and in the other post-socialist countries there are lots of politicians who speak the language that G.Orwell called "newspeak". This means using words in their opposite or distorted meaning. How should the citizen know whether a politician is speaking the real or the didtorted newspeak? Actually, now I should use the word "oldspeak" as the bolsheviks who were new at Orwell's times are not that any more.

The old persists. If I invited people to my place for a prophylactic talk, the older ones, especially those who belonged to the SUCP or the KGB would think that I want to admonish and frighten them, the young would think about drugs or HIV.

Another significant drawback in our development is the relationship of the coalition and the opposition, caused by the fact that all parties behave like plundering gangs. As the opposition has often been seen by the government as something that has been squeezed flat, there is not much wish for cooperation. This abnormality is transferred even to the new coalition partners. I would like to quote Marju Lauristin in one of her interviews to the newspaper *Eesti Päevaleht* (in early March 2005).

*"Deep down in the heart of the society people feel that there are common things that need our united effort. This, however, requires a certain culture of taking other people into consideration, not the situation where everyone is playing against everybody else. We are having a rather primitive everyman's war against everybody: Tallinn against Tartu, village against town, party against party, employees against employers. At least a part of the main values should be common. One has to be ready to discuss and to find a way to agreements, so that nobody would get hurt.*

*We need purpose that would be above party interests. One party rules about four years – we have not seen any cabinet yet that would rule over three years. But the results of big reforms are not achieved in two years. People need to be confident that in two years time things would not be turned upside down again."*

I would also like to point out that the distance between the real situation and the concourse society is one of the problems of our democracy and its development. The secret agreement of merging the Kallas' – Parts' parties and then breaking this agreement in 2004, might be excusable as secret agreements are generally not the business of the society. But Ansip's announcement in the early February 2005 that "a signature is but a formality" (concerning the minister of foreign affairs) did not bring any reaction in Estonia, neither in the political opposition nor in the press. It is an appellation to all the loan takers: fuck the banks. What else than the signature requires us to pay the loan back? And just in the same way the minister's signature requires his responsibility for everything in the ministry beginning from the moment he signed the respective document – this is what Ansip's unnoticed-by-the- press sentence was all about, actually.

All this has little to do with ideology. The "hot pros" acknowledge it freely, admitting that they are PRAGMATISTS. I have never heard that this term should

comprise the evils and sins mentioned above. Another deplorable feature. As we know, the bolsheviks were fond of the deep underground and not open discussions. Several of our parties spend the taxpayer's money on salaries for anonymous vituperators in portals (while this text was being written the newspaper Eesti Päevaleht made a radical step to destroy the anonymity). These are models to a lot of other, psychopathically inclined vituperators and obscenity-lovers. Even if this kind of abuse may be therapeutically necessary for some non-party members of the society, helping them to work off their pressures and tension, it is impossible to find justifications for obscenity-full political anonymity coming from a party headquarters. Can these people who do not dare to sign when they have aired their viewpoints be organisers of free citizens? And the society digests such things peacefully, being perhaps even prepared to go underground as well.

Being well aware that evils and sins are common to all the mankind despite geographical or national conditions, I have still lost many a night's sleep over the question if our present muddle in value judgements would be less noticeable had there not been the half-a-century break in the cultural continuity. I think it would, although I cannot prove it, as it is impossible to make lab-experiments with the people. The impression that the previous system continues inside us became stronger during the discussions in the parliament about declaring communism a crime and motion of no confidence on Ain Seppik due to a past court case.

The stenograms of these discussions are public. I only refer to my own taking the floor according to my notes of that time.

*"This year Estonia has been independent again for 10 years. Is this long enough to forget things that happened sixty years ago and not to search the past? This opinion that sleeping dogs should be let to lie exists indeed. Where does it come from? Definitely not from Juhan Liiv who admonished us to remember the past...*

*When we take the years between 1918-1956 only the historical sequence is in force. First the mass repressions, the Khrushchov's thaw that did not change the basic mechanisms of the society, then the stagnation until the collapse of the empire. The two last stages would not have been possible without the first. So let us acknowledge that the totalitarian regime of the Soviet Union type that was called communist murdered, depending on the criteria, 20 or 50 million people. This is far more than the number of victims of fascism. The last-mentioned regime was condemned in Nuremberg and the politicians of democratic Germany consider it necessary to go on saying they are sorry. About the crimes committed in the Soviet Union, however, the West has refused to face the truth or offers embarrassed and demagogical arguments. The difference between the Soviet and nazi crimes is the same as the difference between a burning tree and a rotting tree. The process is the same but the time it takes differs. The tree dies in both cases. I know that such immense figures that I mentioned do not have a proper impact – it is much more effective to tell a bloodcurdling story of an individual. The members of parliament, though, should let themselves be influenced by big figures too."*

I would not repeat the list I presented in the same speech that concerned the experiments made with humans and radioactivity about which academician Yablokov, B.Yeltsin's adviser, made a documentary film in the mid-90s.

*"One Estonian party (The Reform) recommended that their young members who never had had the opportunity to join the communist party should vote the process a witchhunt. Despite the clear standpoint of the coalition council two days earlier that the declaration should not even hint at the collective responsibility of the members of the communist party for the crimes the politbureau directed and approved of.*

*Another party (People's Union), that was supported by several well-known journalists, borrowed the term "witchhunt" and declared that "the crimes of the communist regime have been condemned in Estonia".*

*Among the documents in my archive there are relics – rehabilitation certificates issued to me in April 1992, confirming that my grandfather and grandmother deported to Siberia in 1949 and the nine-year-old me who was hidden and not deported, have been rehabilitated. Who, without the bolshevik training would invent reinstating the innocents? And a little more about the witchhunt. Witchhunts, group convictions without court procedures, are impossible in the Republic of Estonia but were common in the Soviet Union. The propaganda that called these discussions a witchhunt aims at mudding the water around the main issues and is another bolshevist shadow in the way of thinking, present in Estonia today. It is also characteristic that just these people have named names of the former members of the CPSU, that is – have become concrete.*

*Yes, the Estonian society of today has other bolshevist shadows and very much insincerity that is the result of those shadows.*

*We have several days to achieve the inner clarity and not to try to defend something that cannot be defended. I have never rubbed it in with the former communists. I have even tried to acknowledge the certain positive role of nationally-minded communists for their resistance to smaller repressions and stupidities. With our statement we do not mention anybody personally. Our estimation concerns one totalitarian period in Estonian history that is significant. Let us say good bye to it!"*

*I also enclose another or appending discussion from about a year later period.*

*"Some time ago Russian politician Boriss Nemtsov said that fortunately Russian communists were 100% conformists. This was said when Selezhnyov was expelled but the percentage is evidently a professional, that is naturalistic truth. It is not true about Estonia. First, nobody has declared openly that he is a communist. Full stop. Secondly, they did not exist in Soviet time either. Don't you remember that when the election participation percentage in Russia was 99.99, it was 99.98 in Estonia. I mean neither figure has any meaning or connection with the reality as there were no elections in the true sense of the word. If we take the numbers figuratively, what Nemtsov said was true about the ECP also after the 1968 events in Czechoslovakia..."*

*The temptation to speak about the soon-starting witchhunt dates from the previous regime where people were tailed due to their convictions. To believe that it is also possible in the Republic of Estonia shows that the previous regime is still alive in the people. If we add the forced party membership, falsifications, imputations or the heroic stage sets to hide the real estate business the Tallinn Municipality is dealing with (and this enterprise is sure to supplement the party coffers), we have to admit that it is still a long way to get rid of the totalitarian regime habits that are prevailing in party leaderships.*

*My rather scarce but memorable experience of an institute's (the Tallinn Botanic Gardens) open party meeting is how people who had behaved like normal human beings behind the door, entered the room and straightened up as if they had swallowed a sword and then, in total unanimity, began to utter idiocies. It is just this behaviour, not personal but in groups, that has worried me in the parliament session hall that I have been observing for years now. Just for this reason I undertook a small research to estimate the role of the communist party members in our parliament*

*factions. The result has been summed up and published.<sup>98</sup> It goes without saying that people had to be accounted personally but as you can notice I have not tried to make witches of them. This might also be an issue of world outlook, ideology."*

These excerpts of speeches are three or four years old, the commemoration of Pope John Paul was months ago. On my way from Frankfurt to Strasbourg and back I have tried to estimate the current situation in Estonia and significant events anew. The first of them is directly connected with the events 25 years ago that I have described here – that is the last attempt at Russification organised through an attack to the Estonian language.

Some time ago the fate of some Mari Eli public figures became known: for actions that they organised to protect the existence of their language, the governor with a Russian mentality instigated that they were beaten up and some of them disappeared. At the same time, due to the agitation of Russian activists, the topic of Russian minority in Latvia dominated in the European Parliament group that was created to protect the traditional minorities. The fate of the Maris was an opportunity to draw attention to the real aims of Russia's present policies, attacks on Latvia and Estonia included. This single issue was successful thanks to the commemoration of the victims of the Second World War. The European parliament was hesitating between a resolution and commemoration of all the victims, due to current policies it ended in a resolution. This, however, was fine in its balance, as the world press had been discussing the topics for some time. The latter became the best information about Estonia (Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Moldova) in the Second World War up to date. President Putin's efforts to reanimate the Russian Empire, creating the figure of the enemy – Estonia and Latvia – and designing the 60th anniversary celebrations as a Byzantine triumphal march together with the rehabilitation of Stalinism, failed. This time thanks must go to Vaira Vike Freiberga, president of Latvia, whose initiative to go to Moscow and tell the historic truth, gave rise to a debate that was surprisingly thorough and advanced our interests in many countries' media. On this backdrop the resolution about the relations between Europe and Russia was a victory of the first stage at least, if not more. The speeches delivered on the occasion emphasized that Russia should appreciate and respect the main values of Europe: democracy, human rights and the rights of minorities above all. This gave birth to the optimism of the spring in 2005. In order to survive the next winter this optimism needs to be nourished also in the Nordic summertime. That is why I made the critical remarks about Estonia today that has not been able to be superior in a dignified way when reacting to the undignified steps taken by Russia.

Let us close the circle. What is the situation of the Estonian language, so important for our independence, today?. I have admitted being deeply moved, when I experienced last summer that the Estonian language is one of the 21 official languages in the European Union and nothing is threatening to eliminate it from among them. True, at smaller and unofficial (according to the standing orders) meetings one cannot get by in Estonian, but we should keep in mind that many a bigger nation in Europe has not got the privilege. This should admonish us to be attentive to all the traditional minorities in Europe and everywhere else. And we should comprehend that at present, after long centuries, the external dangers to the Estonian language are the smallest ever. Let us hope and wish that we would overcome the internal dangers that

---

<sup>98</sup> Up to the 10th parliament, where the part of the people who could have belonged the CP was big (due to their young age 12 could not have had the opportunity), the percentage of former communists was as follows: People's Union 93, Coalition Party 84, Central Party 65, Reform Party 60, all the others 35, Moderates 32 and Pro Patria 22.

we have created ourselves, due to inattentiveness or copy-cattig. I would like to insert the full stop now. Or three dots.