

# Briefing :: Human Rights Play on Magnitsky Murder

Commission on Security & Cooperation in Europe: U.S. Helsinki Commission

“One Hour Eighteen”

Director:  
Yury Urnov

The Event Was Held From 6:00 p.m. To 7:00 p.m. in 121 Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C., Kyle Parker, CSCE, Moderating

Thursday, November 17, 2011

Transcript by  
Federal News Service  
Washington, D.C.

KYLE PARKER: Well, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of Chairman Chris Smith and Co-Chair Ben Cardin, I would like to welcome you to tonight’s event hosted by the Helsinki Commission.

I’ll be very brief because we’re going to have a discussion following the play question and answer, and it will be transcribed for the record.

And I would – just a couple of housekeeping items: Because we have such small space tonight – sort of recreating that coffeehouse theater, if you will, up on here on Capitol Hill – we will try to keep the door closed, just to minimize the disturbance, as well as ask anyone with cellphones to silence them, shut them off.

One note about the clock: The clock has a habit of beeping irregularly, and that has to do with votes happening on the floor of the House of Representatives right now, so don’t mind the clock.

The play we’re going to – at the Helsinki Commission, we are mandated by Congress to focus on the human dimension OSCE participating states. States? Russia is a participating state, and the United States is a participating state. And so we focus on the human dimension, the human face.

And the play tonight, “One Hour Eighteen,” is – the story of Sergei Magnitsky is a very – it’s been called an emblematic example of the devastating human cost of corruption and the lack of rule of law. Today is the second

anniversary of the death of Sergei Magnitsky in a Moscow pre-trial detention facility. There is a lot more information on the table about the case, and I won't take the time up now to go into that, but will have opportunities. And the play we're about to see is based on documented evidence, diaries, prison diaries that Sergei Magnitsky kept and other public records.

So with that, we'll start.

(Break.)

YURY URNOV: Kyle, so we're coming back for a – we were talking, like, five, now. Are we taking a short break?

MR. PARKER: Yeah. Yeah, why don't we – you could change up and we'll – just a little bit, and we'll start in about – a couple of minutes.

MR. URNOV: Thank you.

MR. PARKER: I think we'll leave the papers around here.

By the way, for anyone, the bathrooms are just around the corner, in case they are needed.

(Break.)

MARK MILOSCH: That was, of course incredibly powerful.

My name is Mark Milosch. I'm staff director of the Helsinki Commission. In the room today. I want to, on behalf of our Helsinki Commission chairman, Congressman Chris Smith, a very big thank-you to the actors, Mr. Urnov, and Arnoult's Center for International Theater Development.

We will now have a short discussion up here. Maybe we – I'd like to begin a little bit with a statement or comments, and then we can go into questions up here and from out there, and of course include the actors. You can direct your direct questions to . It's a small room – going to be very freestyle.

I'd like to say, we've got Kyle Parker. This is the commission staffer, who has done tremendous work on the Magnitsky case for the commission, for so many people. He's been a real leader on the issue. And I'll ask Kyle to sort of monitor the speed of discussion since he knows the issue like few people.

MR. PARKER: Thank you, Mark.

You know, I thought we might begin – Yury, if you have a few words to sort of set the context and then perhaps tell us a little bit about the theater in which this comes out of. You're a Fulbright, I believe, right?

MR. URNOV: I was, yeah.

MR. PARKER: Oh, you were? OK. I believe this play – and I also know that this was performed today in London so – by Amnesty International in London and it's –

MR. URNOV: On Sputnik Theatre.

MR. PARKER: – in the Sputnik Theatre – and continues, to my knowledge, to run in Moscow, and has now for – almost a year?

MR. URNOV: More than that. I think a year, a year and a half. There are actually people from.

MR. PARKER: Oh, there are? Well, welcome to you.

MR. URNOV: Maybe beginning of June 2009, so it was probably a year old.

MR. PARKER: Somewhere in there.

MR. URNOV: Half a year – so now it's a year and half. They're not – they're not playing it every night.

But it's this very small theater, very, very small theater in very central Moscow, which became a very powerful the Russian culture and the new writing which is really an important and most importantly, to the Russian culture of the last 20 years – playwrights who were formed – most of them were fully formed after 1990. Many of them don't have professional education. Many of them are using the language which what's useful writing for a long time. Many of them are using the knowledge of .

And that was important for many reasons and pretty much changed the landscape of contemporary – of playwriting – of the Russian. It's one of the – it's one of the examples. It's almost like – I believe 90 percent of it is other words that were pronounced by this people, and some of them were introduced specifically for this performance produced, so the words were from mass media. But we have, like, 90 percent all these words are real. So that's one of the – that's one of the trends. That's one of the – that's one of the new

things happening in Russia. We are very – and certainly comparing to the previous years, it's something we are very . And it really, I think we were very smart bigger stages, but –

MR. PARKER: Could you tell us just a little bit about Gremina and Ugarov?

MR. URNOV: OK.

MR. PARKER: – a husband and wife, right, who had written the play and directed it?

MR. URNOV: Well, again, when we brought in but I think they worked together very much. They are kind of – I don't know grandmother and grandfather of the – of the drama movement or modern father of the drama movement. That's a couple who basically – there were the three of them who built this theater with their hands and who created this – who brought together – I don't know – I don't know how many – how many playwrights – a whole lot of playwrights, and they're bringing more and more every year. And both of them pretty well-known playwrights. And actually, at some point it was her play after long period of time. She was very different I think that's also specific to .But I think in real life for .

MR. PARKER: Well, thank you. You know, I would also just mention, it's interesting, of course, that the play, you know, featured people who are around in Moscow, and come see themselves portrayed in it.

MR. URNOV: That's the thing. That's

MR. PARKER: In Moscow

MR. URNOV: which

We are we say that we're – we encourage people to come –

MR. PARKER: Right, right. And this, of course, is still a very dynamic story, and it's – you know, I can't think of too many murders, cases like this that remain in the news two years later. And it's certainly – I think that there is a – probably a daily story somewhere on a Russian wire. And here in the West, the Magnitsky story – depending on activity and things that are going on, but certainly every month a major story – sometimes many in the case of a week. And so it's really sort of seized the attention and become a global human rights cause.

I – you know, Judge Stachen, who was portrayed in the play, I see this morning on the Russian wire has some protesters or people who came to the courtroom this morning to make a statement. And, you know, the complaints you see are actually real complaints. Magnitsky wrote I think 450 written complaints during eleven-some months in pre-trial detention. And 20 of them were specific requests for medical care. And if anyone has any particular questions on the case itself, I certainly would think we can – we can address those as well.

This is my second time seeing the play. I happened to catch it when it premiered at the Kennedy Center. And you know, I guess my reaction initially was, first, sort of the guilty laughter – you know, things that are funny but really shouldn't be funny, and then just the powerful symbolism of the glass of water. It's sort of this – something that really is biblical and also has a tradition in Russia as well I obviously look at the New Testament. Anyone who gives a glass of water to these, my little ones, in Matthew 25. I was thirsty, and you gave me the drink. I was a prisoner and you visited me.

And then thinking – recently, some of the commissions involved in – around the commemoration of Katyn, it was interesting how the Polish prisoners of war, I would note the boiling water, the cup of water. That was a staple and a ration which was always provided. And another example, more recent, I think, of – in Russia around sort of the symbolism of the water – the Beslan terrorist attack and tragedy. Many of you, I'm sure, are familiar, but – what was it? 2004?

MR.: Four, maybe.

MR. PARKER: Yeah.

MR.: Four.

MR. PARKER: Well, in any case, these children who were taken hostage on the first day of school were held in a gymnasium for about – I think it was about three days, and were prohibited from drinking water. There were awful stories of, people with severe dehydration and in some cases having to resort to drinking urine – just incredible barbarism.

And it was really moving to see the memorial on the first anniversary of that attack. There were just a lot of water bottles sitting there at the school. So it's something to me that really seems to be, you know, a very powerful symbol in the Russian context and in the human context.

And another thing I would sort of, again, be interested in other reactions

today: As much as this play sort of – and the story of Magnitsky – has humanized a victim, in a sense, it also humanizes the so-called bad guys for lack of a better word. I think that's quite interesting to sort of really – and really very powerfully raises the question first raised by Cain in the fourth chapter of Genesis – am I my brother's keeper? You know, is this really my problem? Is it OK for me to simply turn the music up? And what is going on behind the walls of Matrosskaya Tishina or Butyrka, as the ambulance driver talks about, well, you drive by these things every day.

And pre-trial detention in Russia remains a very current issue. There have been a number of deaths following Magnitsky's case. And a number of reforms that President Medvedev appeared to put into place either don't seem to be in place or don't seem to be working. And it's interesting how corruption has very directly has exacerbated an overcrowding problem in Russian prisons. It's directly related to how many particularly white-collar criminals – or I shouldn't say “criminals” – white-collar suspects – are in juvenile detention on very dubious pretexts.

But my – and I don't want to monopolize the discussion, so please open it up

Q: I have a question.

MR. PARKER: Sure, OK.

Q: My name is Natali Entina. I'm a Fulbright visiting scholar here from Moscow, Russia. I work in Cana (ph) Institute for center. So I'm not in theater, but I'm political science.

I have a question to Yury. Could you please tell us about the moment when you make – when you made this decision to make this play, how you felt, and what was your message. Which effect to you expect to have on this play in Moscow – And do you believe that theater can change society? And do you some government officials who attended this play?

MR. URNOV: (Inaudible.) I mean, I can go – we'll do things – like, we – people do different things. Some people some people. So we knew – we knew what we should do.

But I think that was a very – actually it was not my idea. It was Stephen's idea – he's sitting here. He read the play before I read the play. We did translations performances of that.

And then Stephen brought this play here. And I was really afraid of this play

because this – it's not a play, basically. It doesn't have this dramatic development. And I never.

But there is something really very, very specific about this particular . There are so many questions there. Starting from there? And because the is this old, right? There is a way to find one person, or, you know, even two people.

I think investigating, is who how do we kill people and how can we – well, what is – what is the measure of guilt in each of us, in a sense? Because is very different measure of guilt as much as each of us has a measure of guilt in this right?

So I think that's what this play is trying to understand. And that was – that was finally a reason for me to say, yeah, we should – we should probably do that.

As much as just this unbelievable fact that the death of the small man, right – speaking in the terms of Russian culture, the small person – suddenly became such a huge event – I'm very glad it did become a huge event, but it's very unusual. Many, many, many people die that way. Nobody. So I think that's a small door into this – into this culture, into judicial culture that is working there now.

And this was kind of that this worked at all, you know.

Well, Never mind. That's my personal.

Q: Thank you, and thank you for being so honest.

MR. PARKER: I'm sorry. Anna Stasia (ph)?

Q: Yes.

MR. PARKER: Yes.

Q: What has been happening to – with the girl who presents to the judge – to the medical doctor? Has anyone lost their job?

MR. URNOV: On the contrary – on the contrary. They are – most of them are.

Q: That's a funny question.

Q: It's the Russian system.

MR. PARKER: It's an interesting question also because Dr. Alexander Gous ,

**Comment [d1]:** I'm not sure if this is a first and last name or whether the person's name should just be Anastasia

who was in the play, was in – this summer, President Medvedev’s special commission human rights commission presented their findings in a report to the president of Russia. And Gous was one who was really quite singled out for a lot of culpability here.

And I also would remind people that what we’re looking at in the Magnitsky case is not simply a case of prison abuse and neglect – withdrawing – you know, withholding the medical treatment. It is that indeed.

But there’s also the question of how Magnitsky ended up in that situation, and what exactly – and the role of the investigators.

And of course, this surrounds a tax fraud rebate of \$230 million. And one of the shocking things for many in the United States or wherever is the realization that it’s actually a mid-level fraud. This is really – I mean, \$230 million is significant; it needs to be investigated. But it’s – when you look at just the level of some of the frauds this is really very much at the mid-level. And of course, the people we’re talking about it are also sort of the rank and file.

And shortly after there was a great sort of uproar in the Russian press shortly after Magnitsky’s death. And then there was at least the impression that President Medvedev had relieved 20 prison officials. In reality, I think all but one or two of those officials had – couldn’t possibly have had any involvement in the case, and was part of a planned shuffle of prison officials. And so currently there are two doctors who, I believe, have been indicted on charges –

MR. URNOV: Not the ones mentioned in the play.

MR. PARKER: No, not the ones mentioned in the play. And the charges themselves are very strange, because they’re charges of failure to diagnose illnesses that by all accounts were never present. And it’s hard to wonder what strategy is going on there, if it’s not just the step up for them to walk.

MR. MILOSCH: But Yury, when the play is performed in Moscow, do the performers, the producers, the director hear from the people who call them, contact them and say, by the way, I am – these are people who are out there today, who you see on the streets. People who say, one of my relatives, one of my friends – you know, I know people who were involved in this? It’s –

MR. URNOV: I never heard about this. Did you ever hear about these kind of reactions from real people involved with this case to the departments in Moscow?



Q: No. No reaction. Just total silence, nothing.

Q: Ignored.

Q: Ignored.

Q: Let me just say one?

(Cross talk.)

Q: My name is Gregory Petai . I'm a film director for Moscow –  
. I was invited also so make a stage play in the.  
I'm not attached to the theater, probably not very well, but.  
And I just wanted to say that, of course, the case is that for the American  
audience, you should understand that it's just the of many  
cases of that kind, not so well known, because the Magnitsky case – it just so  
happened that it started to be – it happened to be very well known all over in  
Russia and in the world.

But sticking that pole over Russia, you have to remember that it's not the –  
all the people of Russia – just those people who are going on the Internet or  
to the radio station, station, or the station,  
because you actually can find nothing about this case in the official – in the  
official press, just except the news that it's for some just two – one or two or, in this case,  
nothing. Not a word  
about this on the official TV channels – nothing, just ignored it – silence.

So for many people who saw this show in Moscow and here, it  
just is our way to understand. And it's the of  
many, many cases which we don't even know about, but we heard about them, and  
the people who are in charge of and engaged in this situation, and the  
journalist and their relatives who are so we should quickly  
know of many cases with this kind of threatening in Russia. That they – the they charge for  
water, for anything. So this is not the case,  
and I just about.

I want to congratulate you as a director. I want to thank you for this excellent, spectacular play.  
I like it very  
much. The actors are wonderful, thank you so much, and the director's – the  
gesture that you made into this this meeting of  
these people. That's, I think – that's the most important thing. That brought  
– I didn't have enough, though I liked it very much and they are my friends but I didn't get this  
much for this in Theater  
Gluck in Moscow.

They wanted it to be more like a social gesture, not like a theater spectacle. But of course, it's a theater. And the only way to get to the heart of the spectators is like the needle that does inside the heart, to be very, very – oh, I'm sorry for my English – to be very confident and profound in the characters that you show. Then the – you – the demands you make – then all the explanations of these people, only in this case, they start being very obvious, that each of them has the explanation why he didn't do this or that.

So only when you show the character so brightly is – so artistically, and so – and so – and so truthfully, then I understand the awfulness of the situation, because it's not even the question of Putin or the Russian regime. It's the question about internal – the spiritual, psychological –

Q: Connection.

Q: -- understanding of the – of the comprehension of those people – the judge, the medic – paramedic, the doctor, the girl in – right, exactly – in. It's – for me as a director, very crucial that I saw in Europe – in your spectacular – when you understand the reason you understand the character. And then and he talking and of course he will sit and. So –

Q: Thank you very much.

MR. URNOV: But I think this is – this is very important to say that this be part of – that this area here are being. So when you think about me coming to the Moscow – doing the performance in Moscow where we already did. We hope that not just for but also some kind of recognition of the types who are like this – all the architects of the when Russians say investigate –

MR. URNOV: I think there is an awful lot of associations in the. That's not right, that's not exactly that, I hope.

MR. MILOSCH: Well, I don't know.

Q: On the correct, that you take as a director to represent.

MR. URNOV: Different. You know – sorry, I hate to as we're going just overseas. Sorry, we're going to – we're trying to understand these people from, I think from a very.

MR. MILOSCH: Picking up on some of the things they were saying and their efforts to I came here really not knowing about I intended to sort of tell the story and Slavic Theater and modern art.

And, you know true story a play true story and – so that you're – you're asked to play a role unlike Shakespeare or Beckett or whoever else you're playing. And this probably feeds into a lot of training, a lot of things Washington theater, right at method acting – built into the character.

So anybody different or interesting or challenging you want to share about playing in a real story? And please introduce yourselves.

MR. URNOV: We can.

MR. PARKER: Oh, sorry, sure

STEPHEN NUNNS: Stephen Nunns programs out there.

I can't speak anybody else, but I don't think that it's much different from doing anything else. I think it's just a question of you – I mean, I'm a little connected to this because I worked with Yury on the script, so it – so I'm in a sort of different position than they are. But – and I was a little deeper into it as a result of that, because literal translation, and then I basically turned it into American language.

And so I think – I think it's – I probably think from a very different place, but I don't think it's much different. I think it's just a character and you just sort of make decisions about who the person is. And I didn't do any investigation about these people, and I don't – I mean, I don't think Temple did either. I mean, we just – we just – we took some cues from the director, and we went with that, basically, you know.

TEMPLE CROCKER: I think, also, in some ways, we didn't want to say we know who these people are and that we wanted to be clear that this is – this could be who they are representing their thinking and their hearts and minds, but we don't really know.

And especially as – I know one of the challenges that we talked about a lot with Yury was, to Yury, some of these characters seemed like Russian archetypes in some way – like, you see people like this; you are in contact with people like this on a regular basis. And I didn't feel like I was in my own life in the States. And so that was also very challenging because these characters

have so many veils or so many masks and you're kind of trying to portray all those different masks. And there's a lot of fear there as well that's driving them. And so that's challenging as well, you know. So it's like the characters have these veils; we have these veils in us too that we're trying to move away – move out of the way to understand something about these people.

MR. URNOV: Yeah, I think fear, actually, is kind of a key word – key word to understand different kinds of fear. Each of these characters are afraid of but they some kind of very specific fear. So I think that fear is very much the reason for what they are doing. So fear.

Q: Mmm hmm. (Affirmative.) Actually –

MR. URNOV: I think there was –

Q: Ah.

MR. PARKER: Someone on this side?

Q: One of the things that struck me performance was wonderful. The really came along so well. And as you're saying, true that exactly what those particular people are feeling or thinking or if they were at the time.

But what really I have been thinking about in the last few minutes is how universal the situation really is. I mean, I thought the whole to some extent, and are they – are these people not? It's really quite fascinating. And it's much more universal – we've been talking about it in particular horrible case representative of many other cases that are unknown. And yeah, I think it's a lot more universal.

MR. PARKER: Sure. It's really again striking at something very human. And I think, again, that's something at once, sort of Magnitsky is a symbol, and at the same time, he's also a real person. And it's interesting because –

And it's also – in this case in particular, it sort of seems so accidental, right? I mean, who would have thought that a 36-year-old sort of – I mean, what could be a more sort of a banal profession than a tax attorney, right?

A tax attorney comes to the cubicle in the morning and with a cup of coffee, and then ends up being the person who's unbroken by the Russian penal system.

I mean – and just the name – and I think you should read the documents – I'm always struck by the repression, yes, and brutal honesty of the name of the

Russian Federal Service for the Execution of Punishment. Who would have thought and how many will documented that way.

And, I remember watching Mrs. Magnitsky talk about her son and how sort of this was really his way to withdrawing himself and documenting this, and in a sense, there's a sort of homeless the word is a nerd, but there's a certain bookish quality. Where you're throwing at – what the hell does he think this is, right? You know, you're in a Russia pre-trial detention cell, and you expect there'd be window panes on your cell wall? And you expect this? And, of course, those are all conditions that, probably together, faced by many. In Magnitsky's case, there were certain very specific pressure applied to break him in this case.

Just sort of offhand my views, and when we talk about the Russian press, here's a document. I don't know how well you see it, but there's November 2009, there's May of 2011, and it's more than 3,500 articles written by the Russia media repeating this story.

So – and it's also an interesting story because again, you know, to me – I cover Russia for the commission, and I sort of work on some other countries inherently, but Russia, by comparison, in many senses, is a society and . And yes of course, the national TV is highly controlled. But the things that are being said and done and going into Moscow is, it's interesting to see it happening in an authoritarian state, to be sure, but not a totalitarian state, and a very sort of mixed set of issues.

And also, in this case, this is something that, as much as it outrages many of us, outrages many Russians, and probably many Russian officials. I say for some time.

And it's also a case, that sort of really has, at least for me personally, changed my sort of approach in looking at how we sort of – at least how I do my job and getting my coffee and sitting in my cubicle and covering Russia human rights.

I knew about this case when Magnitsky was alive, and I was, of course, shocked by it, but I'm shocked by so many. I mean, so many people come office United States. I'll never forget Natalia Estemoriva who meets with us and then, shortly after, I see it in a headline that her body sat on a roadside in the North Caucasus. It's sort of, you almost want to pinch yourself – is this real? Is this really because of the one hand, for me, I ride on the metro to work, I live in suburban Maryland and, wow.

And on case, I go, well, this is really outrageous, we should do something. And so we featured it at a hearing. And then, after that, I

thought we had served our duty, right? I mean, there's a lot of cases, and you can't deal with everything. You can't. And then, the next thing I know, I walk in, November 16th, 2009, turn my computer on. What? This guy's dead?

And, you can only do what you can do; you can't do everything about everything. But sort of, like, an interesting way of approaching this – and I've often thought, you know, you see the poor on the street. And, you know, if you had \$100 to feed the poor, how do you do the best good? Do you – do you give a dollar to a hundred beggars? Or do you give \$100 to one beggar?

And this case really having some interesting lessons in it about the dangers of proportionalism, about the notion that it's one case and it's not just one case, but it is one case. And that one case is enough and that one case is important – and the value, infinite value of one person, and, again, the sort of danger of collapsing something into an issue.

And then what? You hear about the statistics about awful corruption and awful human rights situation and you sort of walk away and say, well, it sucks to be you. I'm glad it's not my problem. But, again, the human face just so powerful, and never being a distraction from the issue the issue itself.

And, again, it's sort of so magnificent that it comes across in this play and in such a beautiful as it does also for those in the other side, for those who caused the suffering, who are human as well.

And of course, on the prison right? You know, it's not just those who are, you know, wrongly imprisoned. I mean, it's. In some sense, in Russia, it's almost a rite a passage, right, to have been imprisoned. It conveys a certain literary coolness, right, you know.

MR. URNOV:

MR. PARKER: But, of course, for those who are rightly imprisoned, that their rights and their sort of purchase on our humanity is just as strong, maybe stronger. And I think this is something that really is very rich.

MR. URNOV: Let's take a couple more.

MR. PARKER: OK, yeah. We should wind up please.

Q:

MR. PARKER:

Q: I have one quick question. I was just wondering, right now since is seeking membership in the WTO, whether or not you think this will be a factor in that and if this could affect how they're dealing with the situation?

MR. PARKER: Well these things are covered quite widely in the press and in – you know, on the one hand, I would say that they're sort of unrelated, and on the other hand, I would assume you're looking at perhaps some of the U.S. sort of say about it. At this point, it looks like Russia is going to join the WTO, at least as far as the news I've read, in December.

And what that will mean in the broader context and why that should have any human rights meaning, I think one of the reasons that it does is, of course, the historic and successful Jackson-Vanik amendment to the Trade Act of 1974, which was sort of, in a sense, to paraphrase it, it was, no free movement of goods without the free movement of people. It was linking two seemingly unrelated issues. And, of course, of the big issues of the day was Jewish emigration and Jewish.

So I do expect that it will all be talked about. What it all means and where this all ends is a very good question. I certainly don't know. It's still a very dynamic story.

Q: Can I ask the people who are here from Russia, who are Russians – because when we hear about dissent within Russia, about this kind of case, we hear about journalists. We might hear about some opposition political person. This play strikes me very much in the line – and I don't want to over-intellectualize it because I was really touched, but in the line of avant-garde or Russian theater from early in the 20th century, and is – you know, the – and it was the intellectuals who were encouraging opposition to injustice. Is that going on among are there intellectuals in Russia who are attending this play, who are thinking about these things? I was struck that you said that people who are in this theater have not had training or, you know –

MR. URNOV: Yeah .

Q: So is there a current going on that we should know about?

Q:

You know, in my view, the real problem, the real described by this play is that these are quite hundred percent ordinary people behaving

according everyday culture. They a code of culture and by their position, they help to go against one ordinary person, preferring to violate this prescription of everyday culture, because of some moral code.

So what we see here, just the matrix of the matrix of Russian everyday culture poisoned by. And this is undermining any efforts to modernize the country, just to renew it the moral basis. This is it's not an exception. It's not a Shakespearian . Ordinary ordinary person.

And of course, when you explain why they do so, why you paint them as the criminals, no. We. This is. They're not just devils. but I that the majority of the people at their position who replicate such behavior this devil. This is my. This is my. And this – that's why I thank you so much to propose at this stage this inner part of everyday life – maybe one of the most important elements.

This is the international

MR. MILOSCH:

Q: Just want to agree with Mark I can feel that society is infected by national character, that's how the system hurts people, and they have to cope, they have to adapt. And self-defense mechanisms, they work, and they try to protect themselves just not to be bothered. This is irrational for them going on. That's how they can survive in today's society.

MR. URNOV: That's if I could one more thing, that's something that I think we this play, that Magnitsky is the only person who is – who, in this story, behaves against this logic. Everybody else follows one logic and he's following it. And then again, you bring. From the point of view not just of most characters but I'm afraid, from the point of view of very many that he's weird. So that's – and that's, again, exactly to the beginning of that was for me what – you don't do that. You don't do that. He did. Go figure.

MR. MILOSCH: Seems to be the moment that. Thank you, Yury. Thank you.

(END)