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Introduction: Emigrating from the Soviet Union

Marilyn Rueschemeyer

Since 1970 approximately one hundred thousand citizens of the Soviet Union have emigrated to the United States. Among them are as many as a hundred painters and sculptors who came to New York with great hopes and expectations for their lives and careers as artists in American society.¹ This book is a record of their experiences. It is based on the reflections of the artists themselves as well as on the impressions of gallery owners and managers, art historians and critics who are familiar with the system of art in the Soviet Union and have known artists there or worked with them after emigration.²

Exploring the lives and the work of these artists, as they make the transition from the social and cultural world of the Soviet Union to our own very different one, can tell us much about these two societies as seen from the particular perspectives of our respondents. It also reveals important aspects of art itself—its rooting in human experience and its relation to the social, political, and cultural milieux in which it is created. The act of emigration, because of its radically disruptive character, throws a strong and peculiar light on the culture and society these artists left behind, on their new host country, and on the ways in which art is grounded in a social setting.
These are the major themes we will address in this book. They are embedded in individual stories about mundane issues such as where to live, how to exhibit, and what financial risks to take. At the same time they are often the subject of conscious reflection and discussion, for concern with the underlying questions of one's existence is the lot of the uprooted. Some experience this as a burden, others as a gift.

First, however, we need more information on who these artists are and how they fit into the over-all emigration from the Soviet Union in the 1970s.

Who Are the Emigres?

Of the roughly 300,000 people who have emigrated from the Soviet Union since 1970, most are Jewish—about 248,000. Among the others who have been allowed to leave are about 50,000 Germans and 8,000 Armenians, as well as selected members of the intelligentsia of every ethnic background. Of the artists who are the subject of this book, some call themselves "half Jewish" and some are drawn to Christian beliefs. Still, the typical pattern is that at least one member of the emigré family is identifiable as a Jew, because such identification was generally necessary for obtaining permission from the Soviet authorities to emigrate to Israel, the official destination of most Soviet emigrants and the one originally fought for by Soviet citizens who wanted to pursue and deepen their Jewish commitments.

Large-scale emigration of Jews from the Soviet Union began in the second half of 1971. By the end of 1978 more than 170,000 Jews—almost 8 percent of the Jewish population of 2,150,000 recorded in the 1970 census—had left the Soviet Union. It is difficult to determine why this emigration was permitted. Analysts have discussed the importance of the fact that internal pressure by minority ethnic groups occurred at a time when the Soviet government wished to improve relations with the West, especially the United States. Developments in the Arab-Israeli conflict may also have influenced Soviet policy, if it can be speculated that the Soviet government reconciled itself to the fact that many Jews went to the United States rather than Israel since this deflected Arab criticism. Undoubtedly Soviet authorities also saw emigration as a way to rid themselves of Jewish activists and some non-Jewish "trouble-makers" as well. A steep decrease in the number of Jews allowed to leave the Soviet Union—only 21,000 left in 1980, less than 10,000 in 1981, and less than 2,000 in 1982—has paralleled increasing tensions with the United States and complaints by the Soviets that emigrants were not in fact proceeding to Israel, their official destination. In recent years many Jews have been refused permission to leave and others have been hesitant to apply, knowing that their chances are now poor.

It is of course difficult to estimate who or how many would leave the Soviet Union if given the choice, but it seems quite likely that a majority of Jews, like others, would remain; in general, most people prefer to live within a familiar milieu, even if with great difficulty, rather than venture into the unknown. To obtain permission to emigrate, a Jewish citizen of the Soviet Union must receive an invitation in the form of an officially certified petition from relatives in Israel for the uniting of a family. These invitations are almost always requested by the relatives in the Soviet Union when they make serious plans to emigrate. The decisive step, of course, is not requesting an invitation but filing an official application to leave the country, for a person who applies for emigration is seen as rejecting the Soviet system. Taking this step creates tremendous tensions and difficulties; it is all but irrevocable, yet the outcome is uncertain.

... quite frequently (though not always) submitting an application means automatic loss of employment and therefore one's livelihood. Everything depends on just what kind of employment it is, and on the attitudes of the local authorities. Often a person will leave his work voluntarily in order to avoid many of the inevitable and unpleasant consequences... [A]nd most important, the individual takes a great risk in submitting the application. It cannot be known in advance whether permission will be granted or denied.

Until 1971, applying to leave the Soviet Union was risky indeed, and those who did so were usually motivated by intense religious or
nationalistic commitments. Later, when the number of permissions granted increased, applying to emigrate no longer seemed a hopeless endeavor and people with a variety of motivations, not only those with Zionist beliefs, began seeking permission to leave. Soviet Jews, of course, are a heterogeneous group; aside from Zionists, there are traditionally religious Jews, Jews attracted to Yiddish cultural life rather than religion as such, and Jews who feel no particular identification with a Jewish community and have no explicitly Jewish associations. Many, especially in the larger cities, have embraced Russian culture as their own. They are dedicated to their professions, but find that, as Jews, they are unable to attain the desired level of responsibility. Their Jewishness prevents their social, educational, and occupational integration into Soviet society.

Although the occupations and the class backgrounds of the emigrants vary, it is not surprising that as many as half of them are professionals, especially when one considers the high levels of education characteristic of Jews in the European republics of the USSR. Between 1974 and 1980 nearly 10,000 Soviet Jewish professionals came to the United States with training in the humanities, in the arts and entertainment, and in medicine. With the engineers and technicians, they made up half the working immigrants.

Why Emigrate?

In a report on the emigrants, Zvi Gitelman has suggested that Soviet Jews, notwithstanding their heterogeneity, share a community of fate since they are seen by Soviet society as members of a Jewish community and are identified as Jews in their internal passports. It is interesting that this perception of community should exist in spite of the absence of Jewish organizations and Jewish schools in the Soviet Union, where the few remaining religious communities are tiny. Many Soviet Jews have experienced anti-Semitism in their own lives and fear that their children will encounter discrimination, particularly when it comes to gaining admission to certain institutions of higher learning. This has been a major concern of emigrant families. The feeling of being an outsider, or simply of having to do especially well in school and at work, may exist even when one’s personal situation and one’s colleagues are not threatening and are even friendly. While many Soviet Jewish professionals say that their Jewishness made no difference at all at work, the history of Jews in the Soviet Union, and occasional incidents in the very recent past, cause lingering feelings of uneasiness.

Gitelman found that a significant minority of Soviet Jewish emigrants reported only rare experiences of anti-Semitism, and he concluded that it would be wrong to see all emigrants as refugees. Indeed, emigrants cite many other important reasons for leaving the Soviet Union.

Nearly all of the emigrants who have come to the United States had hopes that they could better themselves economically. Some were dissatisfied with the Soviet economic system and felt more disposed to the attitudes and culture of a free enterprise society. A few had at one time or another been involved in various illegal or semilegal enterprises in the Soviet Union. Yet even many who objected to the economic aspects of life in the Soviet Union still expressed warm feelings toward their former country.

Others were dissatisfied with their occupational development. They may have been unsuccessful in gaining admission to a desired institution of higher learning or in finding suitable work. (It must be said that many in this group have had great difficulties pursuing their careers in the West as well.) Still others who were well-educated and successful professionals in the Soviet Union were nevertheless frustrated by their inability to achieve what they had hoped for and by certain aspects of the system which impeded their activities, such as organizational inefficiency or the scarceness of equipment that they needed for their work. Some were irresistibly attracted to the possibility and adventure of beginning “a new life in a totally different society.” There were many who had felt oppressed, spiritually or culturally, in the Soviet Union. These frustrations were felt most keenly, perhaps, by those involved in the humanities and the arts.

The Plight of the Soviet Artist

Many of the reasons artists cite for leaving the Soviet Union echo those of other emigrants: hopes for a better standard of living,
irritation with the inconveniences of everyday life, dislike of the general political atmosphere, resentment of restrictions on foreign travel, and sometimes, the desire to escape anti-Semitism. But artists have special reasons for emigrating which are not shared by other former Soviet citizens. Artists complain that they were unable to develop freely in their work in the Soviet Union. They could not always obtain the materials and supplies they needed; they felt isolated from many developments in the contemporary art world; they could not exhibit what they thought worthy and important to share with a large audience. Their life as Soviet artists had its positive sides, of course. Nonetheless, they were inspired to believe that there was an alternative to living with the restrictions and inhibitions on their artistic development which they experienced in the Soviet Union, and that if they were able to emigrate they could anticipate satisfaction and success.

Many of the artists had been criticized for “advancing the bourgeois course” because their paintings were “decadent,” or simply not in the style of socialist realism; one had experienced difficulties because he did lithographs dealing with Jewish themes. Often such criticisms had real consequences, including nonacceptance for membership in the Union of Soviet Artists, or expulsion from it. The recent history of cultural development in the Soviet Union includes many instances of artists having difficulty exhibiting work that deviated from the accepted styles. Some who managed to obtain permission for an exhibit had it closed within a few days or even a few hours. Consider these excerpts from painter Mikhail Chemiakin’s exhibit biography:

1962 First exhibition at the Star Club. Duration: two weeks—great success.
1964 Exhibition at the Hermitage Museum. Exhibition forbidden after three days: Museum Director loses his job.
1965 Exhibition at the Star Club. Graphic exhibition and illustration of Dostoevsky and Hoffmann. Exhibition forbidden after two days.
1966 Exhibition at the Rimsky-Korsakov Conservatory. Exhibition of paintings and engravings. Forbidden after a week.

1967 Large exhibition at the Science Academy of Novosibirsk where were held some very famous exhibits: Filonov, Lissitzky, Falk. . . . Duration of Mikhail Chemiakin exhibit, a month and a half. Since then the Novosibirsk Gallery has been turned into a billiards academy and a cafe. 15

The best-known story about this sort of problem concerns the sculptor Ernst Neizvestny’s confrontation with Nikita Khrushchev at an exhibition at the Manège in 1962, marking the thirtieth anniversary of the Moscow section of the Artists’ Union. The two had a heated argument about the quality and legitimacy of the modern works on exhibit. 16 In March 1969 Oscar Rabin, Boris Sveshnikov, Vladimir Nemukhin, Dmitri Plavensky, and Lev Kropivnitsky planned an exhibit at the Institute of World Economics and International Relations. It was closed forty-five minutes after the opening: the secretary of the local party organization announced that the hall was needed for a meeting and ordered the artists to take their paintings away. Oleg Tselkov’s one-man show at the Architects’ Center in 1971 was closed after fifteen minutes. 17 People viewing paintings by Vitaly Komar and Alexander Melamid in Melamid’s apartment were taken to police headquarters for interrogation.

In September 1974 the destruction of an exhibition of “unofficial” art set up on a vacant lot in Moscow attracted international attention. Several Western journalists witnessed the event and sent an open protest letter to the Soviet government which gives a clear description of what happened:

The artists and numerous spectators were met at the exhibition site by police in civilian clothes with dump trucks and bulldozers. The artists’ pictures were taken away and their arms twisted and dislocated. The bulldozer drivers literally chased artists and spectators. One bulldozer driver, after running over pictures by Oscar Rabin, knocked the painter off his feet, and another ploughed into a confused group of people. Water cannons scattered artists and spectators with powerful jets of water. Eighteen pictures were mutilated and burned by uncontrolled young thugs. . . . 18

In the wake of an international protest, the situation improved somewhat. A large open exhibit was eventually held in a park, lasting
several hours and attracting thousands of spectators, many of whom remained afterwards discussing what they had seen. Several artists showed their works in cafes and apartments, and some did succeed in getting authorization for exhibits.

Some of the artists who are now in the United States were never involved in “unofficial” exhibits and so were not directly affected by the dramatic incidents described here; their difficulties manifested themselves in a more subtle manner, which will be discussed later. But there is one problem that was shared by all the artists, whether “unofficial” or “official,” who created modern art considered unconventional in style: the difficulty of becoming known to others, of getting publicity. Even those who succeeded in obtaining permission for an exhibit, or who were not harassed for showing their work more informally, had few opportunities to publicize their art. They had to depend on friends and small circles of interested people for their audience. Typically, the artists were not mentioned in the newspapers, their shows went unannounced and were not discussed by the art critics. A few of the unofficial artists received mention, but mainly in critical satirical articles; yet even this recognition, however negative, at least gave them some sense of being professional artists and the hope of eventually reaching a larger audience. The following anecdote told by the collector Alexander Glezer suggests what efforts are required to have success under these conditions.

I made the acquaintance of the Lianozovites and other unofficial painters in December 1966, felt impelled to help them, and offered to arrange an exhibition in the Druzhba Workers’ Club on the street called Chaussee Entuziastov, whose manager was an acquaintance of mine. This exhibition by twelve nonconformists . . . opened on 22 January 1967 and caused a sensation. For this was the first occasion on which it had been possible to get tickets printed and thus give the show wide publicity . . . the printers accept only texts that have been approved in writing by the censorship. . . . Subterfuge was the only way. The censorship—known officially in Moscow as Glavlit—was submitted invitations to the opening without any mention of the names of the artists involved. The censors overlooked the omission. . . . In two hours the pictures were seen by two thousand people, including Moscow writers, poets and art historians, and foreign diplomats and correspondents.  

The lack of official recognition of unconventional art continues in the Soviet Union, despite the absorption of more artists than ever before into the “official” art world. Artists who hold small exhibits in their apartments will boast that as many as two hundred people come to see their work. Sometimes an artist’s work is taken out of the country by foreigners and shown abroad, confirming once more that there is an audience for it somewhere, even if the work remains virtually unknown in the Soviet Union. This interest can reinforce an artist’s hope in the possibilities of finding success and recognition outside the country.

Where to Go?

After succeeding in their long struggle to leave the Soviet Union, many emigrants settle not in Israel but in other countries, especially Canada and the United States. Their reasons are many. Some felt little sense of Jewish cultural or religious identity; they were more strongly motivated by their dislike of the Soviet system than by a desire to live an intensely Jewish life in a state they considered basically religious. In North America they expected to be able to live comfortably as Jews, with neither the commitment to become traditionally religious nor the pressure to assimilate. Soviet emigrants who chose not to go to Israel may nevertheless view it “positively,” for example as “a peaceful-loving, fairly developed country, basically capitalist, not socialist and fundamentally Jewish.”  

(It is, of course, possible that this attitude develops after emigration, in contact with an American Jewish community strongly supportive of Israel.) Others who decide against settling in Israel are more critical of the Jewish homeland. They see it as a Middle-Eastern rather than European country, a country surrounded by enemies and involved in dangerous wars, a country with intolerable weather—too hot for comfortable living.

After 1973 there was a considerable increase in the numbers of
Jewish emigrants who changed their destination from Israel to the United States once they had left the Soviet Union. The great majority of the emigrants from the major cities of Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, and Odessa settled in the United States rather than Israel. By 1976, half of the emigrants passing through Vienna decided to go to the United States. Since the peak year of 1979, nearly 70 percent of the 83,000 Soviet Jews who have left the USSR did not go to Israel. Of the Soviet emigrants who have settled in Israel, one-quarter are from Georgia and one-third from the Baltic republics, although only about 6 percent of the Soviet Jewish population resides in these republics. Central Asian and Moldavian Jews are also overrepresented in the Israeli immigration; those from the Russian Federation are underrepresented. Although many of the Soviet emigrants who go to Israel are culturally and geographically European (about 35 percent, compared to 87 percent among those who come to the United States), the proportion of more traditional Jews from Central Asia and Georgia is far greater.

Through correspondence with their relatives and friends, Jews in the Soviet Union become well aware of the difficulties of emigrants who have settled in Israel. They know that the economic situation there is difficult and that the job market is tight. Soviet professionals in Israel complain about the new positions they receive, which may not match their earlier achievements, as they see them. They resent their comparatively low status and they dislike being perceived as people who need help, rather than as contributors to Israeli society. Women have complained about Israeli attitudes toward the working woman. In the Soviet Union women are expected to work and generally are equals on the job, despite some remaining differences in choice of occupation and level within the occupation itself. In Israel they are frustrated when absorption authorities treat them as “second bread-winners” and when men receive preferential treatment in hiring over more highly qualified women. Of course, immigrants have economic difficulties in the United States as well and, as we shall see, Soviet artists in particular have many complaints about their lives in American society.

The artists I interviewed who had settled in Israel before coming to the United States had very positive experiences there. They spoke with enthusiasm about the support given to them and the interest shown in their work. Artists arriving in Israel are allowed a paid year to settle, learn the language, paint, and look for work. Two of the artists said they had never worked in such large studios. Their art was exhibited in museums and galleries and reviewed in Israeli newspapers and journals. Aside from such support, Soviet immigrants carry on a rich cultural life in Israel; they can attend concerts and readings in Russian as well as the exhibits of other immigrant artists. Still, after a while, some of the immigrants grow eager to move on. Their restlessness may have been kindled by other Israeli artists, many of whom leave Israel for long periods of time to partake of the “international” art scene in Paris and New York. They complain that Israel is too small, too provincial, and that they have to leave, at least for a time, if they are to do their art. Rejecting Israel may also have something to do with having a certain conception of oneself as a member of the Russian intelligentsia. One Soviet emigrant describes this identity:

We are not like the others, we are better, we know more; but they do not value us, they don’t want to help . . . we are aristocrats of the mind, we live our own internal lives, we are intellectuals, we are members of the Russian intelligentsia, we are the third wave of the Russian emigration. We are in Israel by chance, just as we could be in Canada or in France, by chance.

Two of the interviewed artists had been urged to move from Israel to the United States in order to further their careers and did so, though they remain Israeli citizens. Another had concluded that in some ways being in Israel was like being in the Soviet Union; he wanted to be a “professional” artist rather than an integrated member of a community.

“Despite many good experiences in Israel, I was tired of the pressures. In the Soviet Union, I was pressured to produce a certain kind of art. In Israel, I was pressured to serve in the army, again and again. I wanted to be left alone. In America, no one wants you, neither the government nor the army—and that’s positive! I was sure that would be the case in America.”
Of our respondents, four of the artists and one of the gallery owners had spent some years in Israel before coming to New York; two artists and an art collector had spent long periods of time in Paris, a home to many emigré artists. All of the others had come directly to the United States and headed for New York, which is not at all surprising. They knew that New York was one of the most important centers of artistic life in the world—whether they gleaned this from the foreigners who showed interest in their work or from international art journals they had been able to get hold of in the Soviet Union—and they were eager to be part of that milieu. They thought of New York as a newer, more modern and less traditional city than Paris and therefore more appropriate for starting a new life. They knew that New York had numerous galleries and many customers for modern art, and they dreamed of having large studios and earning huge sums of money for their work. They were excited by the prospect of unlimited opportunity—and they anticipated recognition and an immediate understanding and acceptance of their art. In part, the artists were encouraged in these beliefs by contacts with American visitors to the Soviet Union who knew their work and wanted to buy it. A few of them had even had their work exhibited and written up in journals and newspapers before they arrived in the United States, and this fueled their conviction that America was eagerly awaiting them. One dealer from California did six broadcasts on the Voice of America promising Soviet artists that a gallery was waiting for them, and for a while he did handle the work of several of the emigrés.\(^3\)

\* \* \*

Why a particular person decides to emigrate and what it is he or she seeks to attain in a new world is difficult to know. Such issues are so complex that often an individual does not even understand his or her own strivings and motivations. From analyzing a set of interviews and studying the results of interviews with other Soviet emigrants, we have gained a sense of some general patterns, based on what each emigrant has been able and willing to articulate. These patterns set the stage for understanding the issues that concern us in this book: the efforts of Soviet emigré artists to establish themselves in New York, their views on the role of art in society, their former and present relationships to colleagues, and their changing conceptions of themselves as artists, as related to the contrasts in the role and organization of art in the two societies.

We turn first to a discussion by Igor Golomshtok of the role of art in the Soviet Union, its historical development and present organization. Next, I trace the experiences of artists who leave that environment and attempt to establish their lives and careers anew in the United States. Finally, Janet Kennedy examines the creative development of Soviet emigré artists who have settled in New York.

Notes

1. This approximate figure represents the number of artists considered truly professional by members of the art community in New York. Dodge and Hilton estimate that the number of emigré professional artists trying to support themselves through their art or working full-time as artists is two to three hundred. They estimate that about fifty artists are in Israel and thirty-five in Paris, and that others are scattered over Western Europe—in Vienna, Berlin, London, and other cultural centers. See Norton Dodge and Alison Hilton, “Emigré Artists in the West (USA),” Second World Congress on Soviet and East European Studies, Garmisch, 1980.

2. I interviewed twenty-five of the most prominent Soviet artists in New York and Boston, two owners of galleries specializing in Soviet art, one manager of a gallery specializing in Soviet art, one curator of Soviet art, three owners of galleries who had exhibited the work of a Soviet emigrant, three Soviet art historians, and a number of collectors of Soviet art. The interviews lasted from one to four hours and were conducted over a period of five years—1979-1984. In the summer of 1983 I accompanied Janet Kennedy on her visits to a number of emigré artists to explore the changes in their art since emigration. These talks were further supplemented by a two-week trip I made with students from the Rhode Island School of Design to Moscow and Leningrad. During our visit we met “official” as well as “unofficial” artists, spent time at the Union House of Artists in Moscow, the Academy of Arts in Leningrad, a special school for children especially gifted in art, and two art salons.


5. HIAS figures.

my, London, in February 1985, Harry Shukman of St Antony's College, Oxford, independent cultural institutions had been destroyed. For a contemporary account
Rueschemeyer, John Berger, Revolution as a liberation from oppression. Such hopes were fast disappointed. In
described the despair many Jewish artists experienced only a few years after the nationalism and chauvinism. Within a generation, virtually all Jewish and other revolution, as the new regime increasingly sought support through appeals to personal relations between Jewish and non-Jewish professionals, see Marilyn
This experience has to be seen against the background of what once seemed to be great promise. Many Jewish artists and intellectuals embraced the Russian Revolution as a liberation from oppression. Such hopes were fast disappointed. In a lecture on Marc Chagall and the Russian Revolution, given at the Royal Academy, London, in February 1985, Harry Shukman of St Antony’s College, Oxford, described the despair many Jewish artists experienced only a few years after the revolution, as the new regime increasingly sought support through appeals to nationalism and chauvinism. Within a generation, virtually all Jewish and other independent cultural institutions had been destroyed. For a contemporary account of personal relations between Jewish and non-Jewish professionals, see Marilyn Rueschemeyer, Professional Work and Marriage: An East-West Comparison (London: Macmillan and New York: St. Martin’s, 1981), pp. 141-42.
This experience has to be seen against the background of what once seemed to be great promise. Many Jewish artists and intellectuals embraced the Russian Revolution as a liberation from oppression. Such hopes were fast disappointed. In a lecture on Marc Chagall and the Russian Revolution, given at the Royal Academy, London, in February 1985, Harry Shukman of St Antony’s College, Oxford, described the despair many Jewish artists experienced only a few years after the revolution, as the new regime increasingly sought support through appeals to nationalism and chauvinism. Within a generation, virtually all Jewish and other independent cultural institutions had been destroyed. For a contemporary account of personal relations between Jewish and non-Jewish professionals, see Marilyn Rueschemeyer, Professional Work and Marriage: An East-West Comparison (London: Macmillan and New York: St. Martin’s, 1981), pp. 141-42.
10. This experience has to be seen against the background of what once seemed to be great promise. Many Jewish artists and intellectuals embraced the Russian Revolution as a liberation from oppression. Such hopes were fast disappointed. In a lecture on Marc Chagall and the Russian Revolution, given at the Royal Academy, London, in February 1985, Harry Shukman of St Antony’s College, Oxford, described the despair many Jewish artists experienced only a few years after the revolution, as the new regime increasingly sought support through appeals to nationalism and chauvinism. Within a generation, virtually all Jewish and other independent cultural institutions had been destroyed. For a contemporary account of personal relations between Jewish and non-Jewish professionals, see Marilyn Rueschemeyer, Professional Work and Marriage: An East-West Comparison (London: Macmillan and New York: St. Martin’s, 1981), pp. 141-42.
13. Ibid.
16. Those interested in the details of this event should read John Berger’s Art and Revolution.
18. Ibid., p. 114.
20. If an emigrant first settles in Israel, and only later decides to move from Israel to Western Europe, Canada, or the United States, the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society (HIAS) will no longer accept responsibility for the emigrant’s welfare, since Israel is not considered a country of stress nor the emigrant a refugee.

The Soviet emigrant who has attempted to live in Israel but then moves to another country must depend on friends, relatives, and other social welfare agencies for initial aid. See Betsy Gidwitz, “Problems of Adjustment of Soviet Emigrés,” Soviet Jewish Affairs, Vol. 6, No. 1, 1976, p. 27.
28. Conversation with an Israeli woman who works with emigrant artists.
30. Press cuttings of Chemiakin refer to Gene Basin, La Jolla, California.