

Pontryagin: My comments concerning the worst period of his activity

**Some friend asked me about Pontryagin and sent me a letter about his activity published in the West in the late 1970s. He asked my comments.**

*A letter about Pontryagin's antisemitic activity was published abroad in these years. It is very interesting. I have a personal story about that. One may quote me, no problem.*

In 1979 I lived in Moscow, Gubkina 9. Roald Sagdeev (a well-known plasma physicist) lived in Gubkina 7 across the yard. I had 2+2 (i.e. 2 apartments, each one had 2 living rooms, kitchen, toilet and bathroom separated), he had 2+3. He already was an academician, I was only chlen-corr.

A well-known Soviet -American workshop in Kiev has taken place in early September 1979. It was a very good influential workshop in the history of Solitons in Math and Physics, a lot of famous US and USSR scientists attended it. Few days before it started Sagdeev called me. We both were still in Moscow, did not start our trip to Kiev yet. He said: "Can you come to me: my old friend Martin Kruskal arrived, he is here now. He wants to see you."

I visited him immediately. Martin told us following: "The Editorial Board has a problem with Pontryagin. I want your consultation. We published a letter about his activity. He sent us following answer": (Martin demonstrated Pontryagin's answer to us.) "Should we publish it?"—asked Martin.

The answer was following as far as I remember now

*"There are several claims in your publication concerning my activity and my responsibility for many actions of National Committee of Soviet Mathematicians."*—claimed Pontryagin. Telling this story to people I am normally saying that the antipontryagin letter contained a collection of approximately 10 accusations. You can calculate them yourself.

*"I acknowledge a full responsibility for 3 of them. In other cases your information is wrong".*

Pontryagin explains in his answer what is wrong. I am telling to people this story saying about one accusation only. I forgot details about others: What I remember very well is his explanation concerning Grisha Margulis's nonvisit of the International Math Congress in Helsinki, 1978, where Grisha was awarded by the Fields Medal. Grisha is my friend. He hates Pontryagin for that.

*Remark. What I know is that Pontryagin privately consulted Shafarevich about Grisha's work. Shafarevich told him that this work does not correspond to the level of Fields Medal, he did such things secretly hiding them from us—even in the period when he was a dissident. Shaf also secretly dismissed Doctor Dissertation of Vinberg in early 1970s when Pont called and asked his opinion. Only after that Pont wrote a brief negative review for VAK. I know both these facts because Shaf told secretly also to me what he thinks about Vinberg and Margulis. I firmly established after investigation that he is lying deliberately. I informed him that I know truth: "Don't try to invent wrong information in my brain thinking that I do not know truth. I always check scientific information." He even could not say that the result of my investigation was wrong. Many years before that, in 1960s, Shaf told me about Doctor Dissertation of Marjanishvili in the late 1940s or early 1950s: "I asked Gelfond about it, – what Morja did in his work?– "He solved Hilbert Problem", Gelfond answered. "Do you mean the simplest Hardy-Littlewood estimate with simplest remainder?"—answered I (i.e.Shaf). "A, so you know"—said Gelfond. "He lied deliberately because he did not know that I learned quite recently an analytical number theory just for myself"—said Shafarevich. A.Gelfond and Linnik helped Vinogradov to promote this mathematically illiterate guy, Morja. Later he became academician and was used by Keldysh-Vinogradov group for the falsification of bulletins among other crooked deals (see my article "Novikov-Keldysh family..."). Looks like Shaf started to use this technic for the invention of the desirable disinformation.. It led finally to the complete break of our relations. By the way, neither Grisha nor Vinberg liked that information about the role of Shaf in their cases, they did not wanted to believe when I informed them.*

The antipontryagin letter published in the West in the late 1970s claimed that Pont pressed all members of National Committee to vote against Grisha depriving him from the right to attend Congress and to receive a Fields Medal awarded to him. There were even details in the letter how Pontryagin pressed the Members representing the National Republics of USSR. Good to ask: Who could supply such information? The answer is obvious: the source was from KGB. The KGB representative was Vinogradov. So this information was "leaked" by Vinogradov. Why it should be true? All members of National Committee especially from the National Republics knew that they should listen a Chairman. This question is political. Maybe Chairman said something like "Pontryagin knows details and will formulate our opinion?" It is very possible but actually we don't know exactly. All national repre-

sentatives from republics were much more cowardice than russians from the USSR Academy. There was no need to press them. They were ready to vote immediately as Chairman recommends. He represents Party.

"Pont is completely responsible for everything"—claimed the above mentioned letter.

"No—said Pontryagin, I am not a Chairman of that Organization, I am one of 24 members of it. The vote was 24:0, so my share of responsibility is 1/24. Yes, it was my opinion. But the vote was unanimous. "

Pontryagin insisted on publication of his answer.

"What to do?" asked Kruskal.

"He is right,."— said I, "Vinogradov is a Chairman of that Committee. It is him who is responsible for everything. Pontryagin's answer is correct."

### **They published Pontryagin's answer.**

It is obvious for me that our Math Authorities were closely connected to KGB. They decided to use KGB connections in order to present to the world that it is Pontryagin who is responsible for everything. Pontryagin was not really their man, but he did not understand that. They only used him and his stupidity. Was it really stupidity indeed?

*The weakest period of Pontryagin's mental state and selfrespect known to me happened in the January 1973 immediately after the death of Petrovski at January 17. Everybody in math department of academy knew that Pont was a terrible enemy of Petrovski, he publicly told about that. Petrovski's heart was very weak. He died in the Central Committee building not far from the Kremlin waiting for his car after some meeting of rectors of Universities or something like that. Earlier in the morning Sakharov visited him in MSU because his step-daughter was expelled from the MSU law department. The motivation was quite nonserious. It looked as something formally legitimate, but no one student before was expelled on that base. Soviet people knew about such situations very well. Petrovski could do nothing. Probably this department made it as a provocation against Petrovski, who always had support of the leading physicists in Academy. The conversation certainly was unpleasant. I don't know details.*

*After the death of Petrovski a number of people who were closed to him in MSU —including Paul Alexandrov—, started to come to his office in the 9th floor of MSU. Following phrase dominated this meeting (probably it was invented by the MSU Party Secretary Protopopov—who was indeed the enemy of Petrovski): " Sakharov killed our dear rector Petrovski". Without Petrovski Kolmogorov and Alexandrov were not covered by anybody closed to the high-*

*est Party Hierarchy. It was very bad for the future of Mech/Math. However, Breznev appointed good physicist and very clever strong man Rem Khokhlov as a new rector soon. He was recommended to him by Petrovski. So situation improved until 1977 when Khokhlov died in the mountains. But at the moment of the Petrovski death Alexandrov was terribly afraid. Rumor told us that he promised to write a letter to Sakharov "as academician to academician" expressing how he feels about Sakharov's visit to Petrovski. My friend closed to Alexandrov told me later that he really saw Sakharov's answer, so such letter was written. I suspect that such a fox as Paul Alexandrov who knew all stupidities in the soul of his talented former pupil Pontryagin, called him and expressed his deep anger orally saying that "Sakharov killed our dear Petrovski". Such call made in the presence of Protopopov directly from the 9th floor of MSU could give to Alexandrov some sort of stability when Vinogradov company from Academy terribly hunted them. Protopopov could not avoid his duty to report to the higher authorities that Paul Alexandrov is "a right person" in MSU, Mech/Math. I cannot believe that Pont produced this phrase himself. I met Khokhlov a number of times later, in particular, visited his office in the 9th floor of MSU, and heard something from his secretary. She was in fact a secretary of Petrovski before.*

Let me mention another case demonstrating how deeply Paul Alexandrov knew Pontryagin. Alexandrov sent my friend in 1978 to ask Pontryagin: "Your 70th birthday is coming. Who would you like to be the authors of the the article in Uspekhi about you?" According to my friend, Pont answered: "Only I myself can write properly about me."

No doubt, Alexandrov knew his answer in advance. As a result, Pont wrote a famous scandalous article with long title ending by the words "...written by himself". This title in fact was copied from the title of some famous XVIII Century English novel, but Pont did not know literature as good as Paul Alexandrov. So it was him who produced this title. In his article, in particular, Pont called the President of Academy Anatol Alexandrov a "zionist". He attacked many other people. Zionist was considered as a worst insulting term in the late Breznev era. The Party Central Committee censorship stopped publication of this issue of Uspekhi: One should not attack members of Central Committee. A.Alexandrov was a "personal friends of Breznev" who was a main ideologist who pushed USSR to build the atomic submarine fleet. It is more valuable business than stupid barking of people like Pontryagin. Breznev knows better whom to support. However, after some minor smoothing they allowed to publish it. Why? Probably they de-

cided to put all responsibility for antisemitic actions in mathematics on him. Keldysh already died in June 1978; so this group lost highlevel support. People like Vinogradov who really were associated with antisemitic ideological part of KGB and worked already long period organizing antisemitic activities, felt unstable after that. They wanted to accuse Pont for everything what they did. It was a good choice. Pont was bad as a politician. He probably did not realized completely what is going on. Is it possible that he understood everything, but deliberately choose antisemitic path and was not afraid as a brave person? He was not as cowardice as Vinogradov who did this job but wanted to look respectable in the eyes of Western Mathematicians? Vinogradov knew that warlock should suck human blood only in the dark. Pontryagin started to do such business openly and publicly.

*Let us return to the January 1973. In order to arrange meeting with Bogoliubov I came to the central building of the Presidium of Academy. My friend met me, he was excited. "You know, 15 minutes ago Pontryagin called to vice-president Millionshikov. He said: This scoundrel Sakharov killed our dear Petrovski. I insist on the Trial of Honor on him." Millionshikov answered scornfully: "I am a vice-president responsible for the general problems. You and Sakharov belong to the phys-math section. Your vice-president is academician Kotelnikov, call him." My meeting with head of academy math department, Bogoliubov, has taken place at the February 1 in the math room of building 5. My friend said to me: "Nikolai Nikolaevich is coming in 15 minutes, he attends important meeting in the room of Kotelnikov." Bogoliubov arrived soon and said: "We discussed proposal of Pontryagin to make a Trial of Honor against Sakharov, who killed person dear for him— Petrovski"—he smiled misteriously, his left eye blinked. "We decided to drop this case, good not to make noise." Obviously, only Breznev could say what to do, but he did not wanted any noise at the moment. My discussion with Bogoliubov is described in the article "Novikov-Keldysh Family", we started our friendship at that day. I despised Pontryagin after that. "You became a cheap KGB "donos'chic" now. Your dear Petrovski! If Pont said that Sakharov is a bad man but made a good action once—killed Petrovski—may be I would continue to respect him as a strongman and believe that he says what he thinks. But now I knw that he is a cheap liar.*

Pontryagin started to attack me in early 1970s in favor of Vinogradov company saying in some meetings behind the closed doors that my scientific activity is finished. This company was unhappy that I joined Landau Institute. Pont needed to say something against me just to please them. I

decided to make a counterattack. I started to look for weak points in his contribution—especially in the Control Theory. After collecting information how it started, I spoke to several people saying that he essentially stole his contribution from engineers, their names were not quoted by him. Even the names of people who explained him this area were dropped in his very first publication. There is some partial truth in that—only partial indeed, but everything depends how to present collection of facts, what to mention and what to drop. However, before I made it completely public, Pont changed position and supported me in the academy elections in 1981. Maybe he heard about my speeches and decided to make peace? Pont knew that it was him who started to attack me. I may became inconvenient for his interests. Vinogradov normally persecuted people who never made counterattack sitting like lambs. In my case Vinogradov had no choice because he made actions against me serving to Keldysh "for good money". Our quarrel developed so far that there was no way back. But Pont's actions against me were not deep, he really could make step back after the death of Keldysh—especially when he started to realize that Vinogradov betrayed him. Certainly, my decision to make public antipont actions was partly a corollary of disrespect which I felt to Pont after the "dear Petrovski killed by Sakharov" story. It could be that this additional feature in my behavior was essential for Pont (if something reached his ears). His sympathy to me based on our scientific past, would not be enough. Such people don't do anything without reason, and science was not the most important reason for him at that period. After the death of Keldysh his angry dogs like Yablonski lost influence completely. Clever people like Gamkrelidze reappeared near Pont. It certainly was also essential.

The letter which we discussed with Martin Kruskal, no doubt, was sent to the western journal using the KGB-dissident connections.

Few years before that Shafarevich (at that time a dissident) told me furiously about such tricks of Vinogradov. Some letter was published in the West in mid-seventies. It said that Steklov Institute is under the rule of 3 people: its director, very good mathematician and unacceptable ("nevozmojnyi" in russian) antisemite Ivan Vinogradov; Shafarevich whose dissident activity is what is needed by KGB, and by some unknown ("nekii" in russian) Lev Pont. I knew about this letter only from Shafarevich and have no idea where it was published.

They (the ideological KGB group including Vinogradov) needed Pontryagin to use his tendency to make aggressive public speeches in order to make

him responsible for everything what they did. Keldysh himself was not visible from outside. He needed Pont for the aggressive actions. His men really were Vinogradov and Yablonski. They organized everything for him. Even Pont was invited through Yablonski. Certainly Vinogradov wanted to hide his crimes. He was more clever in these affairs.

Pontryagin's answer published in the West made antisemitic KGB ideologists furious. Such publication of answer was against their "discipline". Pont asked nobody sending answer. They removed him from all international affairs in 1979-1980. My friend Solomon Alber (at that time refusenik) told me that the President of the Boston Academy Joel Lebowitz visited Anatol Alexandrov, our President, at that period. He asked about antisemitism in Mathematics and about Margulis. Alexandrov invited a KGB general Karasov, a head of International Department in Academy and asked him. Karasov said: It is Pontryagin ONLY who is guilty for everything. After that Joel visited refuseniks seminar and told them that story.

By the way, Keldysh already died in the June 1978, the force of Vinogradov's group drastically diminished. Pontryagin became furious after 1979. He voted for me in the 1981 academy elections but in fact did not improved very much later. It was indeed extremely important for me at that time: He knew (and loved) some of my topological works and started to hate Vinogradov personally. One more vote was enough for me after the death of several people who either were against me or were closed to Vinogradov. There were people like Nikolski (Kolmogorov's pupil and friend of my late father) who realized that there is no reason to be afraid of Vinogradov anymore after the death of Keldysh. So he also voted for me in spite of Vinogradov's pressure. Pont certainly wanted to avenge Vinogradov. Maybe he hoped also that I will change my views. He remained a stable antisemite later anyway.

The history of Pontryagin's mental state was complicated: There was a case when part of Moscow math community (mostly consistent of jews, unfortunately) was pushed against him in mid 1960s by the stupid ass- Boltyanski, supported by Yaglom and some of their friends. They claimed (after the aggressive Boltyanski propahanda) that it was Boltyanski who discovered a maximum principle, not Pontryagin. People should call it a Boltyanski Principle. I tried to convince such people in 1965 that it is stupid. Our young topologists did not respected Boltyanski, we knew his level in comparison with Pontryagin and others: his understanding of topology was much below Postnikov, Rohlin and Schwarz, for example. His claims looked crazy. I said to one of his fierce supporters from the Yaglom-Boltyanski company (his

name was Girsanov): "Looks like your mathematics corresponds to such intellectual level that you cannot even see difference between cock and eagle." He was shocked and left. Very soon he died in the mountains, so I don't know his reaction. Pontryagin expelled Boltyanski from Steklov. Later in 1980s I returned to Steklov and took Boltyanski back to the Geometry/Topology Otdel in Steklov not without help of E.Mishenko. Some people are stupid but still are good mathematicians. Someone should help them.<sup>1</sup> By the way, Yaglom-probabilist was a very good scientist but as a person he cannot be characterized as clever. His book was rejected by Pont later in Nauka. Yaglom claimed that it is completely unfair. Probably he forgot his stupid and aggressive antipont attack in the mid 1960s. I acknowledge a sacred right for avenge.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>By the way, I helped to Boltyanski first time when (being expelled from Steklov) he worked in the institute whose name I forgot. The director was the prime ministers's Kosygin son-in-law Germen Gvishiani, a very clever guy, probably a KGB general. He loved to establish very good connections with best scientists. His son was taught by the Gelfand group, the Nobel Prize winner Kantorovich worked in this institute. Boltyanski started to write something against the General Relativity—much more stupid than all writings of the Logunov group, completely nonprofessional. Germen asked our director Khalatnikov to review it. "Germen asked me about the work of some mathematician. It is completely noncompetent"—said Khalat to me."We should prepare a negative review". I realized that it is about Boltyanski and asked him to wait. Somehow I convinced Bolt to take this manuscript back and saved him from the negative review with very serious consequences for his reputation in the institute.

<sup>2</sup>Pont sent Yaglom's book to Rozanov. His review was typical for his reviews on jewish dissertations in VAK which I saw later when I entered VAK in 1984. He wrote that he does not like Yaglom's book but it deserves a lowest positive mark and can be published. He always wrote such reviews on the jewish dissertations in VAK. His enemies like Shiryaev distributed information that he wrote bad words against good mathematician in his review. So people hated him. But dissertations were confirmed by VAK, this evaluation was enough. Students did not liked him as well. People did not liked him but he did not made really serious harm to anybody. They hated him for the demonstration of disrespect. His father was an important government official, he was included in the Lenin Prize, people thought that he does not deserve it. Dobrushin told me that he can prove lemmas, so he was competent enough. Pont took his review on Yaglom and came to Vinogradov. "Look what this zionist wrote" said Pont."Invite him please". Rozanov came and was frightened by the aggressive pressure of Pontryagin. Vinogradov kept silence. Rozanov rewrote his review under the pressure of Pontryagin, made it negative. A lot of people in Moscow discussed how bad Rozanov is. But in fact Rozanov was raped. Indeed, he made an important mistake. All prospects of his career were broken. One should not rewrite his review after it is signed and sent. Vinogradov did not respected such behavior. The raped girl already used for prostitution is not a proper bride anymore.



His brother was geometer he was less aggressive and more clever but weaker as a scientist. I knew him very well. He did not play any significant role in the anti-pont campaign. However, Pont persecuted also a number of completely innocent jews. It is certainly a crime. There are many people who are saying: "Jews made something against me, I am going to avenge"—and start to make harm to some completely innocent people. I doubt however, that Pontryagin belonged to this category of people. There were completely different reasons for his behavior. He badly wanted to become a ruling mathematician, supported by the State.

### Appendix

Gamkrelidze told me many years ago the following tale: Solomon Lefschetz is known to people as a famous topologist. He gave an important research program to P. Alexandrov, Pontryagin's official teacher. Lefschetz had serious connection with our school in the late 1920s and early 1930s. He thought that Pontryagin is an extremely talented jewish boy and helped him a lot." It is possible that Pontryagin's father was a jew. However, it is unimportant. Lefschetz certainly was highly impressed by the unusual math gift of a blind boy who became a unique person in the history of mathematics as we know now. Pont used jews a lot. He really helped to some jews and dissidents (Rohlin, Efremovich and Boltyanski, for example.) The cases of Rohlin and Efremovich were dangerous in 1946, but Pont was not a coward like Vinogradov who never helped anybody except himself if there was a possibility that some higher officials might not like it. Shafarevich told me about that many years ago.

His best collaborators were jews, his friends were jews since 1930 till mid 1950s. At the same time Rohlin and Boltyanski paid him back very well doing important work for his research program. Their contribution to his scientific activity is much higher than contribution of "natz-men" or in russian terminology (and reasonably good mathematicians, especially in the case of Gam). They were good people, who helped him in the scientific and personal life till 1960s until he made choice in favor of Yablonski,– Mishenko (ukrainian) and Gamkrelidze (georgian); Anosov and Postnikov—his best russian pupils—refused to help him in his research, they proved to be completely useless for him even when they lost their own scientific momentum. His jewish pupils really helped him scientifically in topology and control theory. He defended Rohlin against Vinogradov. There was an ugly persecution of Rohlin in 1951 made by Vinogradov. In early 1960s Pont refused to receive Lenin Prize

without his collaborators and pupils including Boltyanski. At the same time it is true that Boltyanski became crazy in mid 1960s and organized stupid and unfair attack against Pontryagin using Yaglom among others. Mostly jewish mathematicians participated in this campaign, unfortunately. I always thought that Petrovski was unfair to Pontryagin in the late 1950s and early 1960s.<sup>3</sup> He had several jewish advisers. People like Vinogradov immediately told Pontryagin that Petrovski's actions were done under the influence of these advisers. Pontryagin was right scientifically in his collisions with Petrovski in the late 1950s-early 1960s: his course (and corresponding textbook) in ODE was better than Petrovski's. I think that it is also better than the Arnold's textbook written later, but Arnold certainly used some Pont's ideas; However, Petrovski was completely right as administrator not giving to Pont half of his chair. The Petrovski-Landis famous work collapsed later, in 1967. It was Pont who had some doubts about it and stopped its promotion to Lenin Prize in 1960-61. I believe, it was the second reason except my work on the topological invariance of the rational Pontryagin classes, why Pont loved me: It was I who finally convinced Petrovski and Landis that they have no proof of their claim. Petrovski indeed also loved me—he was a great man!

All his life Pontryagin belonged to the same academy group with Kolmogorov and Alexandrov, he waited until Alexandrov became an academician being hundred times stronger in the eyes of math community. This group was closed to Petrovski, but Petrovski was against him. Kolmogorov and Alexandrov betrayed Pontryagin in 1958 as he thought: they traveled abroad during the academy elections. Vinogradov took business in his hands and saved his elections. At least it was presented to him in that way. Pont became crazy wanting to rule mathematics, he made public and stupid speeches about that in early 1960s, people laughed.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup>Godunov told us recently that it was Pont who started this quarrel. He pressed to take from Petrovski's chair of Differential Equations the ODE part and became a head of it. Petrovski rejected any discussion of that.

<sup>4</sup>There was a meeting of the newly created Otdeleniye Matematiki of Academy in 1964/65. A series of talks were given by the leaders of different areas of mathematics. Shafarevich made talk about new achievements in Algebra. Pont did not liked his talk. He said that Shaf overestimated the role of Golod who was not the leading person in the series of works discussed in the talk. Shafarevich sacrificed himself, said Pont, but his modesty is bad for us because we need to know exact truth in order to rule mathematics properly. A.A.Markov-junior (Chlen-Corr) said slowly like making public announcement: "Academicians rule over Corresponding Members, Corresponding Members rule over Doc-

However, his final transfer to the new crazy antihuman activity happened only in 1968: It was Keldysh, not personal quarrels and feelings, who attracted him through Yablonski and promised "a rule over mathematics". My well-informed friend with high-level connections told me that after attracting Pont Keldysh said to people in Central Committee following "basnya": "we need Pontryagin to make rockets", so he paid to Pontryagin. Keldysh needed him to produce public scandals, to destroy increasing unity between soviet and western mathematics.

*In the past times an open nasty job was not international, it was concentrated within Steklov and remained unknown to the international math community. It was done by Vinogradov, he was a Keldysh man. But Vinogradov now wanted Pont, not himself, to look responsible for all sins especially in the eyes of the World Math Community: In the postwar period of 1940s Keldysh (closed to Beria) used Vinogradov to make destabilization of jewish positions in Steklov. At the same time Keldysh invited people to work with him "behind the iron door". Some best jewish mathematicians (like Gelfand) joined his secret activity under Beria. Probably it was exactly his goal at that period. But the goal was completely different now. A nasty business today was needed to Keldysh for antisemitic ideology itself, not for any important state research programs as many years ago. This goal became a leading reason for Keldysh now. He died in 1978, and his company lost the most of its force. Bogoliubov became stronger than others, and our position seriously improved.*

President Alexandrov knew everything of course, don't be naive. He presented to Lebowitz that he is not informed, asked KGB general Karasin to present official information of KGB. Alexandrov did not wanted any association with antisemitic math activity in the western eyes. It was not his game in the Breznev' circle: he was an ideologist of atomic nuclear fleet, not ideologist of the antijewish activity. Leave this dirty job to mathematicians, for the nasty institute like Steklov the nasty job would be exactly what they deserve. Later in 1984-85, after the death of Vinogradov, he allowed to start a criminal investigation against Steklov: following to the belief of the 1/2 of Steklov institute, Vinogradov's money were stolen. KGB investigators believed to people. They found nothing and became very angry. I am aware that this money never existed. Vinogradov was crazy and distributed rumors how much money he had. These rumors (known to me from several witnesses

---

tors, Doctors rule over Candidates and so on...."

who attended Vinogradov's dacha –see my article "Novikov-Keldysh family") were completely false.

The main point is that Pont was a blind man, extremely talented but without any human feelings: Other peoples sufferings were nothing to him. He was like crocodile—not good, not bad. Jewish collaborators were useful for him until he did mathematics, so he supported them, defended them as a brave man. The anti-semitism became useful for his administrative career after Keldysh invited him in 1968, and he choose this path. He was crazy wanting to "rule mathematics". Vinogradov who certainly belonged to NKVD/MVD/KGB from 1940s always took care about his image. He distributed for example false rumors in the dissident and jewish community that he does not like jews because they made an October revolution. And this propahanda worked well. He was respected. Pont never played false games like Vinogradov. He was much higher as a mathematician. He became an antisemite and openly demonstrated it.