

Summer 1972

# index

on censorship

## **TV Coverage of Northern Ireland**

**Anthony Smith**

## **Cuba: Revolution & the Intellectual**

**The Strange Case of Heberto Padilla**

## **Four Years of 'Normalisation'**

**The Academic Purge in Czechoslovakia**

Solzhenitsyn

Vaculík

**index index**

documents reviews letters

50p

Editorial board: Victoria Brittain Jenefer Coates Stuart Hampshire Peter Reddaway Stephen Spender

Notebook	5	
<b>Articles</b>		
Television Coverage of Northern Ireland / <i>Anthony Smith</i>	15	
Four Years of 'Normalisation': The Academic Purge in Czechoslovakia / <i>Peter Payne</i>	33	
Press Censorship in Spain and Portugal / <i>Alberto A. de Carvalho</i> and <i>A. Monteiro Cardoso</i>	53	
Cuba: Revolution and the Intellectual – The Strange Case of Heberto Padilla	65	
<b>For the Record</b>		
Czechoslovak 'Black List' of writers	45	
Greece: Banned books	135	
Declaration of Loyalty for Civil Servants	139	
Extract from a Greek woman's letter	142	
Ukraine: Zinovia Franko's Open Letter	142	
Letter from Yugoslavia	144	
<b>INDEX Index:</b> a running chronicle of censorship and suppression of free expression around the world	89	
<b>Literature</b>		
Poems / <i>Heberto Padilla</i>	68	
'God Keep Me From Going Mad' / <i>Alexander Solzhenitsyn</i>	149	
The Guinea-pigs (extract) / <i>Ludvík Vaculík</i>	153	
Poems from Catalonia / <i>Joán Brossa</i>	161	
<b>Organizations</b>		
International PEN and the Writers in Prison Committee	167	
<b>Reviews</b>		
Robert McDonald	Inside the Colonels' Greece Greece Without Columns Greece Under Military Rule	173
Clive Jordan	Uncensored Russia Red Square at Noon Ferment in the Ukraine	176
Daniel Weissbort	Unguarded Thoughts Prison poems by Yuli Daniel Yuli Daniel, Stikhi iz Nevoli	180
Letters to the Editor		183

Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.—Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

# notebook

---

It is only natural, I suppose, for the editors of a new magazine to pay close attention to the response their efforts evoke from the press and public and to wait with some anxiety for the first letters and reviews. I am pleased to be able to report, therefore, that on the whole the response to INDEX number one was both wide and sympathetic, although not without criticisms being voiced. Perhaps the most gratifying single response came in the form of a welcoming editorial in *The Times*, whose author concluded that we had resisted the temptation to utter just 'another incoherent and indiscriminate scream of protest' and had instead produced a sober and global view of the problem of freedom of expression. *The Times'* editorial was subsequently reprinted in *The Christian Science Monitor* in the USA and evoked a number of echoes elsewhere, notably in Australia and Italy. *The Sydney Morning Herald*, for instance, while quoting *The Times* and noting that Australians in general had little first-hand experience of tyranny and the suppression of freedom of expression, also commented: 'But there are tyrannies and tyrannies, tyrants and tyrants, and before unfamiliarity breeds too great an unconcern, we are offered a course in identification that might actually be good for our national soul. We might on occasion even recognize ourselves in a small way.' As it happens, we plan to assist this process of self-identification with an article on Australia in our next issue.

In Italy the *Corriere della Sera* printed a long article on the British tradition of defending liberty of expression, beginning with a radio broadcast made by E.M. Forster at the outset of the second world war and ending with a review

of INDEX. Praising INDEX's disinterestedness, the *Corriere* wrote: 'Certainly . . . no considerations of prestige prompted this initiative and very little importance was attached to its publicity value. INDEX is only one example of the intellectual inspiration that renders England the most acute observer of the contemporary world.' Other echoes came from Sweden, with articles in Stockholm's *Expressen* and the Göteborg *Posten*.

Closer to home again, we were given a cordial welcome by *The Observer*, *The Guardian*, *The Evening Standard*, *Peace News* and the Unitarians' *The Inquirer* (no interest seems to have been shown by the 'underground' press in the problems of political censorship) and a somewhat more critical reception by the *New Statesman* and *Times Literary Supplement*, whose comments merit separate consideration.

#### Philosophy of Censorship

In the *TLS* the anonymous author of a piece in *Commentary* seemed to feel that number one of INDEX suffered from a certain confusion of aims and was unmethodical: 'What *Index* needs, and what everyone will hope it evolves, is a reasonably exact philosophy of censorship which enables it to tell what is censorship and what isn't, or failing that, which acts of censorship matter and which don't.' This demand, on the face of it not unreasonable, certainly points to a goal we are striving to achieve. But a moment's reflection would have revealed to the author that this is an extremely tall order. How do you define censorship exactly and decide which kinds matter and which don't? As I wrote in my first *Notebook*: 'This, on close inspection, turns out to be so vast a subject that it is impossible to tie oneself down to a programme in advance. Our preference is rather for feeling our way step by step. We shall explore this wide terrain slowly, striking out in each direction that seems to call for it, gathering material, examining the facts and attempting to evaluate them objectively.' And that is what we have tried to do.

Another problem concerns the use of that vexed word 'censorship'. I must confess that it was with some trepidation and after much discussion that we decided to put the words 'on censorship' on the front cover of INDEX. The difficulty is that we are concerned not only – nor even mainly – with censorship as such. As is made clear in our statement of aims and as I tried to emphasize in my first *Notebook*, our main concern is intellectual freedom and the problems presented by various attempts, in various places, to suppress it. Censorship is but one of the forms this suppression takes, albeit an important one. The slaughter of Bengali intellectuals (as described in an article favourably commented on by almost everyone) could certainly not be described as censorship in the normal sense of the term. Nor could the jailing of writers in Greece and Czechoslovakia (to name but two countries)

be described as just censorship. On the other hand we had the problem of presentation. We decided, rightly or wrongly, that something had to go on the cover of a new and unknown magazine to identify its general character. Yet phrases such as 'the preservation of intellectual freedom' and 'the suppression of freedom of expression' turned out to be not only stiff and cumbersome, but also, which was worse, to be so shopworn as to have a bemusing effect on the reader or listener. 'Censorship', therefore, seemed simpler and directer and has gradually come to represent a sort of shorthand for what we feel our subject matter to be. And if the concept is stretched to its very limit, it could even be said to include the idea of silencing independent thinkers and writers by killing or jailing them, or exiling them to distant places. For the point to remember, as *The Inquirer* pointed out in its review, is that 'censorship' in its broad sense wears many faces and it is not always easy to identify and recognize each face when it first appears.

#### Cummings and the IRA

This brings me to the celebrated paragraph about the Cummings cartoon in the *Scottish Daily Express*, to which both the *TLS* Commentator and Anthony Arblaster in the *New Statesman* took exception. It is true, first of all, that we take special care to look for examples of 'censorship' in the British Isles, not in order to establish some sort of superficial and spurious 'balance', but on the principle that those looking for moles in the eyes of others would do well to heed the injunction in the gospel. But there is not the slightest doubt in my mind that this was an absolutely classic case of censorship and its inclusion was not in the least 'tendentious', as the *TLS* called it. In the first place there were the classic terms in which the NUJ protest was couched, combining righteous indignation, muddled thinking and a desire to have it both ways that is absolutely characteristic of the censor's psychology. The cartoon, said the NUJ, was 'an insult to Scottish Roman Catholics' – and just in case this seemed too feeble an argument they threw in for good measure the argument that, regardless of the merits of the issue, publication of the cartoon threatened them with physical danger, since it was 'an incitement to the IRA to bomb the premises of the *Scottish Daily Express*' (the implication being, apparently, that if a bully doesn't care for your opinions it is better to shut up than get hurt – a curious line for journalists to take). 'Insult' and 'incitement' are standard formulae in the vocabulary of censorship and not even Vice-President Agnew or the Greek colonels could have put the case better.

But far more interesting than this wilful refusal on the part of the *TLS* and the *New Statesman* to recognize the face of censorship when they see it are their reasons for doing so, which turn out to be the same in both cases.

For both detect in the protest an embryonic form of 'workers' control'. 'Now it may be,' writes Arblaster, 'that cartoonists and editors *should* have the right to decide what goes into a newspaper. But the corollary of this freedom for editors is unfreedom for other journalists and printworkers. I do not myself see why the freedom of the press should be automatically equated, as it habitually is, with the freedom of editors and proprietors.' And the *TLS* writes: 'Some might think it was an overdue effort by journalists to have more say in the editorial line of the paper they work for.' Now tucked away behind these glib formulations is an issue of great seriousness: how to disperse control of the communications media in the interests of securing a maximum diversity of viewpoints and how to democratize the structure of individual media. The *New Statesman* itself took a step in this direction in its arrangements for the appointment of a new editor; and it is an issue raised in the present number of INDEX by Tony Smith in his article on television in Northern Ireland (of which more later). But these comments as applied to the Cummings cartoon are prime examples of mere cant. How, for instance, does freedom for editors and proprietors mean 'unfreedom' for the rest of the staff? Are we to suppose that there is a conspiracy to prevent journalists and linotype operators from getting their views into print? And if, say, 'workers' control' were to come into effect in the press, does this mean they would be able to do away with editors and sub-editors and editorial discretion (not to speak of doing away with reporters and linotype operators in their 'subordinate' positions)? Or would they follow the time-honoured revolutionary tradition of setting bakers to be ploughmen and ploughmen bakers?

#### Varieties of Censorship

It may seem as if I have made heavy weather of two brief comments about an equally brief paragraph in INDEX *Index* — and I hope it doesn't look like an oversensitive reaction to the least breath of criticism; on the contrary, we welcome criticism and it is only by accepting it and measuring our standards against it that we can hope to preserve the necessary detachment and objectivity. But the questions raised are serious ones and our answers to them do provide an indirect response to the *TLS*'s call for a philosophy of censorship. The *TLS* was prompted to make this demand by what it termed the 'lumping together' of 'specific acts of censorship of ludicrously unequal importance', instancing the slaughter of Bengali intellectuals in East Pakistan as being incompatible with the inclusion of events on the *Scottish Daily Express*. Now the first thing to note is that if we do have a philosophy of censorship at all, it is one that permits a concern with both sets of events. The slaughter of the Bengali intellectuals, as I have already pointed out, was

an example not of 'censorship', but of a deliberate and ghastly attempt to suppress the articulate voice of a nation, whereas the protest against the Cummings cartoon was a feeble and unsuccessful attempt to suppress the opinions of a fellow journalist. It does not take much imagination, I submit, to grasp that these actions illustrate not only the differing standards of their perpetrators, but also two extreme points on the psychological spectrum that unites them. There is, of course, a world of difference between the gravity of the two actions — and we are not suggesting that the Scottish journalists wished to hang, draw and quarter Michael Cummings for his sins; but it is precisely **that** tiny thread of intolerance and bigotry uniting the two extremes that forms the subject matter of INDEX. At the same time, the charge of 'lumping them together' is absurd. No less than 18 pages of a full-scale article, complete with footnotes and a list of names, were devoted to East Pakistan, while the incident at the *Express* was covered in a single paragraph of small type buried inside a much larger feature. And although it would be foolish to look for an exact mathematical reflection of our concern in the proportion of space devoted to various items, this seems to me to be a pretty good indication of our attitude to the relative gravity of these events. Our task, as we regard it, is to see the problem whole and to see it clearly. It is to scrutinize and grasp the significance of the horrifying events in Bangladesh, while not losing sight of more trivial happenings on the *Scottish Daily Express*, just as, in the present number, we see it as our duty to monitor the anguished strivings of British television for objectivity in its coverage of Northern Ireland, while not forgetting the far more tragic events of the intellectual purge in Czechoslovakia. The touchstone must be the scale of values we apply and our ability to measure the disparate examples of the suppression of freedom of expression firmly against that scale.

#### Television in Northern Ireland

It is time to say a word about the contents of this second number of INDEX. Doubtless the most controversial and publicized article will prove to be that by Tony Smith on Northern Ireland. It appears, judging by the reactions of some journalist friends of mine, that the mere mention of Smith's name is enough to set the corridors of the BBC buzzing. Yet the ex-editor of *Twenty-Four Hours* comes to some fairly uncontroversial conclusions about television coverage of Northern Ireland and, if anything, shows the BBC and ITA in a somewhat more flattering light than certain people would expect.

His basic conclusion, if I have understood him right, is that it is the

institutional structures of the Corporation and the Authority that have tended to obstruct reporters in the objective coverage of events, rather than some form of sinister interference by politicians. This in itself is a considerable tribute to the resilience and independence of these two bodies in the face of a domestic political crisis that is certainly the most tense, divisive and explosive since the Suez crisis, but it does also raise the whole question of the wisdom of granting monopolies, or near monopolies, in the field of television, and these are issues that go far beyond Britain's shores.

Radio and television monopolies are the rule, rather than the exception, in most parts of the world, and if it can be argued that the BBC and ITA, which without undue complacency can be said to be certainly among the half dozen best such television stations (in their news programmes, at least), are showing signs of strain and perhaps proving incapable of maintaining objectivity in the face of a serious domestic crisis, then there is a case for considering how great the difficulties have become and examining the alternatives. Tony Smith foresees the growth of control at the reportorial and editorial levels and implies the development of more editorializing on television analogous to that seen in the newspapers. But whether such developments are compatible with monopolies or not remains an open question, while even more open is the question of whether governments would ever give up their monopolies. One has only to look at the role of television in countries with authoritarian governments to see what a difficult problem this is, or to observe the contortions of the South African government as it prepares to introduce its first network. And few countries even in Western Europe can bring themselves to give up so much power. It is a subject that we would very much like to return to and on which we would welcome letters or contributions from our readers.

#### Czechoslovakia and Cuba

I hope, by the way, that publicity about television in Northern Ireland does not divert attention from the other major articles in this number, notably those on the academic purge in Czechoslovakia and the Padilla case in Cuba.

The situation in Czechoslovakia is of course well known and has been regularly covered, to their credit, by the newspapers of most countries. But we believe this to be the first attempt in English to present a synoptic picture of the purge of intellectuals in Czechoslovakia since 1968 with particular reference to its impact on the universities and centres of higher learning. This purge, the most far-reaching in a European country since the communist revolutions of the forties, is particularly damaging in a country like

Czechoslovakia, whose standards of culture and learning have periodically been among the highest in Europe. It also takes place against a background of steadily widening freedom of expression in the neighbouring countries of Poland and Hungary and at least a stabilization in East Germany and Rumania. In fact the only other country in that part of the world giving concern at the moment is one which, in all other respects, has far outstripped its neighbours in the liberality of its laws and its respect for freedom of speech, namely Yugoslavia. Until last winter's events in Croatia, Yugoslavia was making gigantic strides towards complete freedom of expression and censorship was at a minimum, but the present trend, as we show on another page, is in quite the opposite direction.

As for the case of the Cuban poet, Heberto Padilla, the events surrounding his arrest and release last year, his 'confession' and the reactions to it among progressive intellectuals in Europe and Latin America, make it one of the most fascinating episodes in the intellectual history of the past few years. Does it mark a return to the methods of the Stalinist trials of the thirties and forties, as pessimists would maintain, with dark hints about torture and forced confessions? Or is it a totally new phenomenon, peculiar to Cuba or the Third World, and should the confession, as many of Cuba's friends maintain, be taken at its face value? Certainly there are strong arguments against the case representing a return to Stalinism. History rarely repeats itself, and not even in Czechoslovakia have there been trials or recantations reminiscent of the situation there in the forties. Secondly there is the fact that Padilla remains alive and well and living at liberty in Havana, which would have been inconceivable as the outcome of a Stalinist trial. Whatever else one may think about it, therefore, one must admit that it does not fit into any pre-existing pattern and must represent something new. Either, as some progressive intellectuals seem to think (including many friends of Cuba), it represents some diabolical refinement of brainwashing techniques, such as the Chinese were once thought to have invented, or else the confession must be taken as the sincere recantation of a man who truly believes that he has perceived the error of his ways.

The case is too complex and involves too many personalities and too many political problems for there to be an easy answer, which is why we have decided to print a comprehensive selection of documents, rather than a commentary or an assessment. It may be that we have gone too far in presenting this case at such length, but since so little is known about it in our country and since even specialists and friends of Cuba are divided in their judgement, we have adjudged it fairer to give the original sources and let readers decide for themselves.

### Poetry in *Index*

A word now about our literature section. The *TLS* commentator (clearly a carping sort of fellow) seemed to feel that it was pretentious of us to publish literature and that we should stick to bringing out a news sheet – perhaps he thought we might be poaching on *TLS* territory. But it is an essential part of the case against censorship that it suppresses good literature – indeed, all sorts of literature, good, bad and indifferent, as well as art of other kinds. Our aim is to bring this literature to the attention of readers, particularly when it would otherwise remain unknown and possibly even unrecognized, and to show what serious losses ensue for society when the censor or suppressor is allowed to have free rein. That is why it is pointless to complain, as the *TLS* does, that, say, Gorbanevskaya's poems are nonpolitical and have no place in *INDEX*, and that we are trying to make her into a 'political' writer by publishing her poems. On the contrary, the whole point of publishing her work was to show what excellence was being suppressed and to make it clear that the Soviet censors by no means limit themselves to suppressing only 'political' works. In our literature section it is precisely the 'nonpolitical' works that make the point about censorship best and show it in its true colours.

For the fact of the matter is that the poet's clash with the authorities is so often no mere political squabble, but stems from the very nature of his vocation. It is art itself, literature itself, that is incompatible with censorship and the absence of freedom of expression. It is Gorbanevskaya's literary vocation and her literary values that bring her into conflict with society, and whether these values find expression in publicistic works such as her book, *Red Square at Noon* (reviewed at the end of this magazine), or in 'pure' lyric poetry, they equally represent a threat to the prevailing political order and are equally subject to suppression. In this sense there is no conflict between Gorbanevskaya the activist and Gorbanevskaya the poet and it would be superficial to concentrate on the first aspect of her work at the expense of the second.

### Brossa and Vaculík

Of the items in this number's literature section, the poems of the Catalan poet, Joan Brossa are inspired by an intense local patriotism and that it is this patriotism, in the form of Catalan nationalism, that has got him into trouble with the censors. The examples of the censor's blue pencil at work that we reproduce also offer a fascinating glimpse of the censor's mind in action.

Ludvík Vaculík, on the other hand, has written a novel *The Guinea-Pigs* that is openly satirical in intent in the best tradition of Czech literature.

The chapter that we have translated is only intended to give something of its flavour, since it is impossible to convey the impact of the whole novel, but I hope it will provoke interest among our readers. Strangely enough, although it has been published in Czech and German and is currently being translated in the United States, no publisher in this country has taken it up. Should anyone be interested after reading this chapter, we would be only too pleased to supply further information.

### Solzhenitsyn

I should also say a word about the extract of Alexander Solzhenitsyn's poetry published in this issue. This is a translation of some verse quoted in a long article on Solzhenitsyn by an old friend of his, Venyamin Teush, writing under the name of Blagov. We had intended to publish it in our first issue alongside the prose poem *Means of Transport* and the elegy to Tvardovsky, but owing to a misunderstanding, the author requested us, through his Swiss lawyer, to abstain from publication. I am pleased to say that this misunderstanding has been cleared up and we are now able to go ahead and publish.

Incidentally, Solzhenitsyn, who wrote a mass of poetry in his younger days, now has an extremely low opinion of his verse and in general does not want any of it published. From what I have seen of the little that has appeared in print, he is probably correct in his assessment, but I do feel that this particular passage rises well above the level of the rest and has an intrinsic biographical interest that makes it well worth publication.

### Apologies

Finally, this is an appropriate place to make apologies. First I must apologize for the horrible gaffe over the title of Seferis's poem, which should have been *Colonus Hippius* instead of the absurdity that we actually printed on our cover and inside. Secondly, the article on Amnesty International was, of course, written by Zbynek Zeman, who was credited in a note, but not mentioned at the head of the article.

Thirdly – an unforgivable error for a translator like myself – we omitted to acknowledge translators in our first issue. These, for the record, were as follows. The Seferis poem was translated by Nikos Stangos; the poems by Solzhenitsyn and *Stone and Violets* by Milovan Djilas were translated by Michael Scammell, the translators of *The Clockwork Show*, *Letter to Europ-*

*eans* by George Mangakis and *Changing a Nation's Way of Thinking* by José Cardoso Pires are not known to us, since these articles came to us in English; and just to compound the confusion, *Homage to Solzhenitsyn* by Rodis Roufos was translated not by Geoffrey Ryan, but by the author. Our humble apologies to all concerned – and we will try to do better from now on.

M.S.

*We have been requested by Index Film and Television Library Limited to make it clear that this magazine is neither published by nor has any connection whatsoever with that company.*

*We would also like to state that we are in no way connected with Index, a commercial goods magazine, published by Maclaren Publishers Ltd. of Croydon.*

Although the main building of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences, and some other parts of its premises, were occupied by the invading forces in August 1968 in their search for 'counter-revolutionaries', and despite the barrage of verbal attacks on intellectuals in general and some academic personalities in particular, the academic year 1968/9 saw no great changes in terms of institutional arrangements or staffing. Some prominent people who had been subjected before and after the invasion to especially virulent attacks from the Soviet side found it wise to apply for leave of absence to take up temporary posts abroad (this was granted for instance, to such leading scholars as Prof. Ota Šik and Prof. Goldstücker), but there were no notable dismissals on political grounds.

The full force of the change in leadership, when Dubček was ousted and replaced by Husák in April 1969, began to be felt in September of that year. Among members dropped from the Central Committee of the Communist Party at its September meeting were Academician Sorm (President of the Academy), Academician Málek, and the Rector of Charles University, Oldřich Stary. This of course was the first step in the process leading to expulsion from the Party and dismissal or enforced resignation from their posts.

The other vital measure was the issuing of the so-called Legal Measures of 22 August 1969, providing for emergency powers 'for ensuring and protecting public order', but containing in Section 4 the following provision: 'He who by his activity disrupts the socialist order . . . may be immediately recalled from his post or dismissed from his employment . . . Under the above circumstances a student may be prohibited from continuing his studies.' And as an indication that the field of education and learning was of special concern, the Section continued: 'In the case of teachers at institutions of higher and other education, the appropriate Minister may also suspend them from their posts or order immediate dismissal if in contravention of their duties they educate the young people entrusted to them in opposition to the principles of socialist society and its construction.' Furthermore, 'the Minister of Education or the President of the Academy of Sciences or a Vice-President of the Academy of Sciences authorised for this purpose by the Government' were all given powers to over-ride the authority of University and Academy institutions in respect of dismissals and expulsions (Legal Measure of the Presidium of the Federal Assembly 99/1969.) Many of the provisions of these emergency measures were later incorporated in the amended Labour Code and in other legislation, including that on the universities and the Academy of Sciences (1970).

The stage was thereby set for a political onslaught on the seats of learning from the start of the academic year 1969/70. To this was added, early in 1970, the purge within the Communist Party which, especially among

intellectuals, was projected into non-Party circles too.

The consequences of all this lay, as we shall see below, not only in the actual 'purging' of people, the uncertainty, the pressures to conform and the petty infighting accompanying the whole procedure, but were felt in the very structure of higher education and research. Typical of the attitudes underlying the purge are the following two statements by leading spokesmen of the present regime. Speaking at a meeting of the Communist Party Central Committee in December 1970, Academician Jaroslav Kožesník, President of the Academy of Sciences, having condemned 'anti-Soviet' and 'elitist' attitudes of 1968, declared: 'Today we see the way forward in a close linkage between our science and the policy of the Party in a unified Party and Government direction of scientific and technological development . . . in the concentration of all creative capacities on key tasks of the state plan.' (*Rudé právo* 21 December 1970). In an article in *Rudé právo* of 1 July 1971, Jan Fojtík, Party Secretary for ideology, wrote about 'the duty of science [to be understood in the broad sense of scholarship-author's note] to take its place in the system of instruments with which politics operates'. And lest one might imagine that such references apply solely to the more practical, technical sciences, the same article includes a definition of 'partisan, revolutionary commitment' which 'sees the area of culture and the arts as an integral part of all Party work and the activity of the socialist state'.

One further circumstance also has to be borne in mind if we are to appreciate the full significance of this policy and that is the high degree of centralisation of academic work in a country like Czechoslovakia. All university-level institutions are state controlled, while the Academy of Sciences has, since 1969, been deprived of the measure of independence which it once enjoyed. The greater part of fundamental research in all fields, from the technical and natural sciences to the arts, is carried out in institutes of the Academy, with a smaller share falling to the universities. (According to a report in *Rudé právo*, 30 January 1970, 12 per cent of the country's research and development capacity fell, at that time, to the universities and the Academy of Sciences, the remainder belonging to the more industrial category of R & D handled by government departments and enterprises.) The operation of an academic purge, therefore, has been directed at the very heart of the country's undertaking in scholarship, research and higher education.

#### The Universities

On 16 September 1969, the then Czech Minister of Education, Dr. Hrbek, issued a circular calling for political reports and denunciations on university staff and students. The time was not ripe, however, for measures of this

AUGUST, 1968

The Ogre does what ogres can,  
 Deeds quite impossible for Man,  
 But one prize is beyond his reach,  
 The Ogre cannot master Speech:  
 About a subjugated plain,  
 Among its desperate and slain,  
 The Ogre stalks with hands on hips,  
 While drivel gushes from his lips.

W.H. Auden\*

## FOUR YEARS OF 'NORMALISATION'

### THE ACADEMIC PURGE IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Peter Payne

---

Although we have had occasional reports in the press about the fate of individuals, and some attempts to assess the scale of the political persecution to which Czechoslovak intellectuals are being subjected, there has been a little hard fact to substantiate the general impression expressed in Aragon's emotive phrase about a 'Biafra of the spirit'. Naturally, the post-invasion regime, while ready enough to boast about successes in its drive towards 'normalisation' and 'consolidation', which implies conducting a hate campaign against anything and anyone connected with the 'Prague Spring' of 1968, is not anxious to publish comprehensive figures about the results of its purge in the different walks of life. Nevertheless, by studying official Czechoslovak sources and combining the information they reveal with reliable unofficial reports, it is possible to fill in at least part of the picture. The present examination is an attempt to collate some of this available information concerning the state of affairs in the academic world with special reference to university staff and to the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences. It should be emphasised that the field of enquiry is limited to these two areas and that, for instance, the thousands of jobless writers and journalists are not mentioned here; moreover, for the universities in particular it has been found impossible to do much more than offer some examples drawn from individual faculties. All in all, the decision to use only what I believe to be verifiable facts and exclude generalisations, rumours and the like, probably means that I am understating rather than exaggerating the situation. Furthermore, it must be understood that despite recurrent official announcements to the effect that the purges are finished, we are dealing with a continuing process, and therefore any figures cited here have to be regarded as provisional.

\*

\*

\*

\* We print this poem with permission of Faber & Faber Ltd. from *City Without Walls* by W.H. Auden.

crudity and the results of this effort were negligible. In the meantime, a few days before term was due to start, the Minister announced that the teaching of Marxism-Leninism (compulsory in all faculties) was to be reorganised, which meant that the staff of the political departments attached to each faculty, almost 100 per cent Communist Party members, were the first victims of the drive against 'anti-socialist forces'. The departments were disbanded and in due course screening interviews were held to select staff worthy of appointment to Institutes of Marxism-Leninism established under Ministry control. At the close of the 1969/70 academic year Dr. Hrbek announced that of 587 former staff (in the Czech Republic), 286 had been transferred to the new Institutes (*Rudé právo*, 13 August 1970). Writing in *Tvorba*, 28 April 1971, however, the Prague Party Secretary Kapek reported that the Institutes of Marxism-Leninism were not consolidated, they had problems, and only 35 per cent of teachers from the former departments were employed.

Dismissals and reorganisations gradually got under way in the first months of the 1969/70 winter term, and plans for legislation concerning the universities were put in hand. Some light on what was happening is thrown by a report delivered by Deputy-Minister of Education, Podroužek, to the Czech National Council (*Rudé právo*, 8 January 1970): 'The purpose of the amendments,' he said, 'is to increase the influence of the Minister of Education on the management of university institutions and to provide a legal basis for . . . liquidating all the negative consequences of 1968. All the administrative powers which the Minister has at his disposal, such as the possibility of disbanding and reorganising departments, the engaging and dismissing of staff, will, however, be used only as a last resort. Now, in January, we should reach a definite conclusion to the process of personnel changes at the universities. All supporters of right-wing views, and signatories of the 2000 Words Manifesto, who have not publicly recanted, must leave academic soil. It will be necessary to change the membership of some Faculty Boards. . . An important new measure is the introduction of a retirement age of 65 for teaching staff; exceptions are envisaged only in the case of professors who have shown themselves fully committed to the cause of socialism.'

Later, when speaking at the close of the 1969/70 academic year, Hrbek announced that he had used his powers to deal with 'the numerous ideologues of revisionism, anti-communism and anti-Sovietism, signatories of the 2000 Words Manifesto'. Faculty Boards had been 'reconstructed' and reliable supporters of socialism had been placed in academic functions. Of 16,000 teaching staff, according to the Minister's report, 332 had stayed abroad, 154 had been dismissed and 134 been retired. (Reported in *Rudé právo*, 13 August 1970). Closer examination of some individual faculties suggests that even at the time these were conservative figures (e.g. the Faculty of

Philosophy, Prague, with only some 400 of the 16,000 teaching staff, reported 12 retired in 1970). Moreover, although the Minister, speaking again on 30 September 1970, promised a quiet atmosphere for the year then opening, he also referred once more to the purge, which was 'being concluded'. (*Rudé právo*, 1 October 1970). This, as will emerge from reports cited below, was an optimistic view. The purge continued throughout the year 1970/71, and Hrbek's successor as Minister of Education, Havlin, ushered in the present academic year by including among the tasks in the field of higher education that of 'completing the purge in the universities'. He also remarked that 'the teaching of Marxism-Leninism is not yet up to the required standard, despite the sincere efforts of the majority of teachers at the Institutes of Marxism-Leninism'. (*Rudé právo*, 29 September 1971).

A glimpse of the sort of thing that was happening in the first year of the purge is provided by three articles in *Rudé právo* on 11, 12, 13 August 1970, entitled *Between Two Academic Years*, by Miloslav Hájek. It is notable that the author, in each case, turned to Communist Party officials for his information. At Plzeň, in answer to the question, What helped to improve the atmosphere in Plzeň colleges during 1970? he was told by an official of the Regional Party Committee that his committee had evaluated the results of elections to academic functions made by Faculty Boards and those it did not recommend were dropped (e.g. Ass. Prof. Mysliveček of the Medical Faculty). The new Institute for the teaching of Marxism-Leninism had rejected most of the staff of the previous Faculty Departments. As regards Party work, the Regional Committee had 'recommended' the resignation of branch committees; 50-60 per cent of the Party membership had been expelled, and the purge was to be completed. In Brno a CP official stated that a check had been made on the members of Faculty Boards and other academic functionaries — out of 85, 25 had passed the test and 60 replacements had been selected, elected or appointed. At the Slovak universities and colleges there were reports of unrest: for example, the District Party Presidium had decided on 7 May 1970 to disband the Party Branch at the Agriculture University in Nitra, and a new branch was formed of 'comrades who in 1968 and 1969 stood firmly on Marxist-Leninist positions'; with their help a new Rector was appointed and nominations of other academic functionaries made.

In *Universitní zprávy*, bulletin of the Rectorate of Charles University, Prague, of January 1971, we have a report by the Dean of the Medical Faculty in Hradec Králové, Dr. Pavel Navrátil, which, while it unfortunately vouchsafes no figures, indicates that the political axe knows no bounds. 'In recent years,' he writes, 'the right-wing has succeeded in influencing a substantial number of faculty staff by creating a revisionist, anti-socialist and anti-Soviet atmosphere.' To counter this the new leadership of the Faculty had (after Dr. Husák's accession to power) enunciated four principles for

'consolidation'. The prime task was to evaluate the political attitude of staff, secondly, to advance a programme for work and development, thirdly, to make changes in the organisation and leadership of departments and, finally, to implement the leading role of the Communist Party in the Faculty. In evaluating the political attitudes of individuals it was ascertained whether they had abused their pedagogical functions for anti-party ends or for propagating un-Marxist views.

The severest blows, however, have been directed all along at the arts faculties. In the case of the Faculty of Philosophy, Prague, we are in a position to make a somewhat closer examination. For an understanding of the rather complicated set-up it is necessary to start with a few words about the nature of this Faculty.

#### *Faculty of Philosophy*

Traditionally the Faculty has been a university within the University, offering a wide range of 'pure scholarship' to future teachers at *gymnasia*. In 1920 the natural sciences were separated, but to this day the Faculty includes some 60 subjects, falling into two broad groups, the philological and the philosophical-historical studies. The combination of 'pure scholarship' with preparation for teaching has continued, except for a brief post-war period in the 1950's when a separate Pedagogical School was established. Since 1959 it has included a pedagogical stream and a non-pedagogical. The conflict between the two and the knotty problem of the pragmatic and 'liberal' approach to higher education are elements in the political purge and reorganisation which the Faculty has been experiencing since the autumn of 1969.

Reorganisation and political purging of the Faculty proceeded in stages from the autumn of 1969; to tell the whole story would be too complicated. For an overall report taking us up to the beginning of 1971 we may turn to the above-quoted *Universitní zprávy* for March 1971, to which Prof. Emil Kraemer, Pro-Rector of the University contributed an article on the Faculty of Philosophy. We learn there that in 1969/70 the Faculty had 423 teaching staff and 22 research staff; in October 1970 the number of teaching staff had dropped to 399 and this figure included 12 new appointments. The situation as to dismissals was, at this time, rather fluid – the article in question states that 3 had left the Faculty, 24 were due to leave in March, 16 had remained abroad, 13 had been retired under the new legislation (with 3 over-65s allowed to remain) and 27 had been suspended from teaching. The Faculty Board was reorganised, 40 members removed from the Board, 16 retained and 24 new members appointed. Three Departments (Political Studies, History of the Working Class Movement, World Literature) which had 'shown the most negative features' were abolished and in 12 other cases heads of departments were replaced. In discussing the work of the

Faculty, Prof. Kraemer argues that the teacher training aspect has been underestimated, that specialised graduates are being turned out without regard to their future job opportunities and that this is politically harmful; courses should be pruned to exclude subjects not taught at secondary schools and more specialised studies reserved for post-graduate work.

Later reports indicate that the Party purge and the academic pruning had by 1971 created a state of considerable chaos within the Faculty, with many of the staff uncertain about their future, students faced with courses being stopped, pre-graduation theses having to be scrapped for lack of staff to read them and examinations in some cases only saved at the last moment by calling in outside help. The Communist Party purge seems to have been completed, in several stages, with less than one-quarter of the original membership retained: those expelled from the Party had to be dismissed; those given the milder treatment of being struck off the records were demoted and their dismissal was usually only a matter of time. Of 27 staff members who were banned from lecturing the majority have had to leave the Faculty or, at best, some may have found more humble posts outside their own special fields – for instance, an expert on literature found himself engaged in linguistics. The political screening of non-Party members followed the Party purge, so that the picture remained confused. But out of the confusion the following facts emerge: by spring 1971, all 25 departments of the Faculty had new heads, the reorganisation and merging of departments having continued, with the Department of Philosophy reappearing as History of Philosophy, German and English studies having combined, sociology no longer having an independent existence, and so on. Subjects not required for secondary school teaching were not included in the syllabus for 1971/72, except for post-graduate study in some cases, and the first-year intake was 80 compared with the normal figure of some 200 – in short, the Faculty has been set upon a course of teacher training, with a severely depleted staff and its foremost scholars dismissed or doing work below or outside of their qualifications.

The strictly pragmatic approach to the role of the arts faculties which has been pursued *ad absurdum* at the Faculty of Philosophy was underlined by Prof. Bedřich Švestka, Rector of Charles University, in his speech to the May 1971 Congress of the Communist Party. While in another context what he had to say about over-specialisation would be irreproachable, and questioning about the 'social mission' of universities is certainly not confined to Czechoslovakia, the references in this speech to the 'profound decline in Marxist ideological and political work' at Czechoslovak universities and to tendencies towards a 'revival of the old liberalistic system of the bourgeois Republic' can, in post-invasion Czechoslovakia, only mean a condemnation of any independent scholarship. 'The fight to purge the university,' said

Prof. Švestka, 'and for its political consolidation has to be linked with new perspectives for the faculties and the university as a whole. Work is in hand at all faculties on programmes stressing the social mission of the faculties' (*Rudé právo* 29 May 1971). Narrowly specialised training had to be kept to a minimum, he continued, but at the Faculty of Philosophy there were still some tens of students taking highly specialised courses. (And the example cited makes one feel that something is wrong not only at the university, for he complained that 212 students were preparing for work in adult education, while only 37 jobs would be available, and there is no suggestion that instead of reducing the number of students there might be an increase in posts in this important field).

Finally, we may mention here two matters which apply to staff or former staff of the Academy of Sciences as well, and to a much wider circle of scholars and intellectuals. The first is that anyone dismissed from his post is banned from publishing any work, and this even goes for translations, irrespective of subject. Secondly, there are constant complaints that people are cut off from books and periodicals of a professional and scholarly nature published abroad, so that even those still able to do some work are hampered by this isolation. To isolation resulting from restrictions on travel we shall refer later.

### The Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences

To enable the reader to appreciate the significance of what has been happening in the Academy some explanation of the standing of this body is necessary. It has been modelled since 1952 on the Soviet Academy of Sciences, being simultaneously the leading body for science (in the widest sense of scholarship) within the state system, a collection of research institutes and a professional association of the foremost scholars. Over the years the Academy acquired considerable authority thanks to its contribution to learning and to the national economy, and also to its role as a learned society; it has therefore enjoyed a measure of independence and ability to assert itself vis-à-vis the administration and the political authorities (this standing was also expressed in Law no. 54 on the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences of 9 July 1963).

At the close of 1968, the Academy had 138 research centres and employed a total of 13,436 people, of whom one-quarter were classified as research staff (not including university-trained assistant staff). There were also 40 learned societies attached to the Academy, with a membership of 18,000.

The office of President of the Academy has always carried considerable weight in public life – its holder being regularly a member of the Communist

Party's Central Committee and in government having a standing comparable with that of a Minister.

Having been dropped, as noted above, from the CP Central Committee in September 1969, Academician Šorm was obliged to resign the Presidency of the Academy at a special meeting of its Presidium on 10 October 1969. At first, however, the process of 'consolidation' proceeded rather gingerly – Academician Kožešník, appointed temporarily as Acting-Vice President, had failed in September to get the Presidium to rescind 'politically incorrect' resolutions passed by it in 1968-69 (resolutions which were in accord with the official policy of the day and supported the Dubček leadership – in November, with 3 votes against, the Presidium did rescind its resolutions passed on 21-28 August 1968, during the Soviet invasion). Šorm remained, for a time, a member of the Presidium. But soon the Government began to use the powers bestowed on it by the emergency measures of August 1969 (see above).

On 23 December 1969, the Government appointed a new Presidium, with Acad. Kožešník as Acting Vice-President enjoying full powers, and with Acad. Málek and Macek excluded from membership. This was followed on 27 May 1970, by the appointment, under new legislation of a Presidium with Kožešník as President and with the following members of the previous Presidium dropped: Acad. Šorm, Schwarz, Macek, Knapp, Filip, Průšek, Málek, Blaškovič, Corresponding Members of the Academy Pluhař, Spaldon, Svoboda. Similar changes were made in Slovakia.

The new government powers substantially reduce the authority of the Academy as a learned society. Members are now nominated by the Government, 'as a rule' in the light of elections by a General Assembly of Members; membership can be ended by Government decision according to 'its own judgement or at the proposal of a General Assembly of Academy members, in the event of a Member defaulting in relationship to scholarship, the state, the cause of peace and socialism or if he has been condemned to loss of titles and decorations or if he persistently and without due cause neglects his duties as a Member of the Academy' (e.g. by residence abroad) – Article 12, Law on the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences, 1970. Election of Members to the Presidium is, under this law, subject to Government approval. The latest General Assembly of the Academy, held in Prague in March 1972, demonstrated, however, that all pretence of election has now been dropped. The President, Academician Kožešník, merely acquainted the Assembly with a Government decision nominating new Members of the Academy and appointing new members of its Presidium. Moreover, the President of the Academy, who was previously elected by and was responsible to the body of Academicians, is now nominated by the President of the Republic and is

responsible to the Government. The present holder of the post, Academician Kožešník, was, incidentally, honoured by the award of the decoration Hero of Socialist Labour on 1 May this year. Direct management by the Communist Party has been tightened through staff of the *apparat* responsible for sectors of Academy work and by the revival of an institution existing in the 1950's – an executive committee within the Academy's Presidium which is appointed by the Party (this arrangement in the USSR was abolished in 1956).

Sweeping changes have been made in the *Collegia* of the Academy, of which there are 20, each with some 15 members; they coordinate and direct basic research in the fields covered both by the Academy and the universities. Estimates suggest that 80 per cent of the members of *Collegia* have been replaced (see below on social sciences). Some examples of the dismissals, which started in November 1969, are: economics, Acad. O. Šik; history, A. Šnejdárek; theory of state and law, Dr. Ivan Bystřina; chemistry and biochemistry, J. Rudinger, J. Sicher, L. Kováč; physics, J. Tauce; philosophy, Prof. J. Srovnal; and so on – including mathematics, astronomy, geophysics, geodesy, meteorology, for which our source, the official Bulletin of the Academy, mentions no names. These first dismissals referred to members who had taken up temporary posts abroad, but the process did not stop at this – in February 1970, for instance, all members of the *Collegia* for history, and for philosophy and sociology were withdrawn.

#### Research Institutes

These have suffered, a) from reorganisation, including the destruction of entire institutes, b) dismissal of directors, c) purging of staff, especially in the course of the CP purge starting in the first months of 1970.

Under a), in 1969 the Institute of the History of Eastern Europe reorganised as the Czechoslovak-Soviet Institute, with Dr. V. Král as its new director; Institute of Political Studies was disbanded and its director designate, Dr. Jiří Hájek, Corresponding Member of the Academy and former Minister of Foreign Affairs, was transferred to the research staff of the Institute of State and Law; January 1970 saw the disbanding of the Institute of History (under fire for publishing *Seven Days of Prague*, also known as 'The Black Book') and the dismissal of its director, Acad. Macek – a new Institute of Czechoslovak and World History having been set up with an 'external director', Dr. Ríha; the Institute of Sociology and Department for the Theory and Methodology of Science having been wound up, (directors Prof. Kaláb and Prof. Tondl thereby dismissed), the Institute of Philosophy also underwent reorganisation to emerge as the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology. In the field of literature there have been drastic cuts, with at least three former institutions merged in a single Institute of Literature

under Prof. Brett, a particularly zealous proponent of the purge. And although not belonging to the Academy, it may be mentioned here that the Institute for International Politics and Economics (Ministry of Foreign Affairs), headed by Dr. Šnejdárek, has been dissolved, as has the Communist Party's History Institute which had, in recent years, been doing some very promising work.

Under b) we may note that in addition to the directors mentioned above, many others have lost their posts, e.g. Dr. Urbanec of the Institute of Nuclear Research. Acadm. Šorm of the Biological Institute, Acad. Wichterle of the Institute of Macromolecular Chemistry, Acad. Průšek of the Oriental Institute, Acad. Knapp of the Institute of State and Law. Estimates put the number of new directors at 80 per cent (see social sciences below).

c) Here figures are hard to come by, nor is it possible to gauge how many of the Communist Party members expelled in the political purge have also lost their jobs. In some cases even prominent men found guilty of political deviations have been allowed to continue working in more humble capacities – Academician Šorm, for instance, is a research worker in the institute he formerly headed. Moreover, the full fury of the purge having passed, there are signs that some of the victims have been quietly re-employed. The disbanding and reorganisation of the politically 'difficult' institutes made it possible to dismiss entire staffs and re-appoint only those who found favour.

The atmosphere of uncertainty regarding employment is heightened by the new legislation on the Academy (Article 20, clause 4). Research staff are now appointed on contracts for a maximum of four years and new contracts have to be made with existing employees; where agreement on a new contract of employment is not reached within a period set by the Academy Presidium, the Presidium terminates the employment, if this has not been done on other grounds already. The number of young researchers accepted to work for higher degrees (so-called 'scientific aspirants') is also restricted.

As can be seen from the above, the most hard hit fields of learning are history, philosophy, sociology, but in the natural sciences, too, the toll is large, starting with Acad. Šorm himself, a life-long communist. Even in such a seemingly innocent subject as macromolecular chemistry (Acad. Wichterle) the purge has been ruthless – of 200 CP members at the Institute, only 30 are reported to have escaped expulsion. And some 30 dismissals were reported from the Institute of Nuclear Physics at Řež near Prague, including Ass. Prof. František Janouch, graduate of the Institute of Nuclear Physics in Moscow and Sverdlovsk, who was chairman of the Communist Party branch at his institute in 1968. Having been expelled from the Party and dismissed from his job, he sued his employers for unfair dismissal. He lost his case on the grounds that he had 'associated with representatives of the

Right wing' and had threatened the very basis of the socialist order by 'calling for the abolition of censorship of scientific publications'.

One source of information on the state of affairs in the social sciences is provided by an article in *Rudé právo* of 5 May 1971, by Academician Filkorn, of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, Corresponding Members of the Czechoslovak Academy J. Poulik and R. Richta. This is no place to dwell on the lengthy consideration which these eminent scholars (Dr. Richta was and is Director of the Institute of Philosophy and contributed in no small measure to the Dubček leadership's Action Programme of 1968, now condemned) give to the question why the social sciences ('that is, primarily Marxism-Leninism' they note) became infected with revisionism; they come to the conclusion that to overcome 'the destruction of socialist values to which they [the social sciences] contributed' it is necessary to restore genuine Party direction of their work. There is now, they tell us, a single plan for basic research centred on 'research into socialist society in the era of the scientific and technological revolution and in the conditions of class division of the world. From this concept organisational measures have followed, representing the most extensive restructuring of basic research in the social sciences since their initiation.' First, they continue, the ranks of the Party had to be cleansed; of senior and assistant research staff in the social sciences, only about one-third received new Party cards, and in some institutes the number was far lower. There followed reorganisation of institutes, their purging of people whose records 'politically and scientifically' were not satisfactory. Five Academy institutes were dissolved (see above) and a number of others radically overhauled, new institutes were set up in the fields of history, philosophy and sociology, aesthetics and literary studies, and their programmes geared to the state plan for research. The majority of members of *Collegia* and the majority of Institute Directors were replaced. Some institutes 'strongly infected by right-wing elements' had more than one-third of their staff changed (the former historical and literary institutes),

*The list opposite is a 'black list' of Czech and Slovak writers published by the Czechoslovak Ministry of Culture in February 1971. It came as the culmination of a campaign to force Czechoslovak writers to toe the party line and immediately after the formation of a new 'Writers' Association' to replace the old pro-Dubček Writers' Union. The overwhelming majority of Union members have refused to join the Association. According to new regulations introduced at the same time, no book may be offered for translation abroad that has not first been published in Czechoslovakia - and all translations must be arranged through the state literary agency Dilia. No person on the black list may communicate with abroad and an absolute ban has been placed on foreign travel.*

## CZECHOSLOVAK 'BLACK LIST'

NAMES OF AUTHORS THAT SHOULD NOT BE MENTIONED IN CONNECTION WITH THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDATION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY.

### Those who have emigrated:

Josef Škvorecký	Vrat. Blažek	A.J. Liehm
Arnošt Lustig	Lad. Mňačko	Ota Šik
Lad. Grossmann	Ludvík Aškenázy	Luděk Šnepp
Ivan Diviš	Milan Schulz	Ed. Goldstücker
Ant. Brousek		

### Those who have organized opposition against the party:

Jan Procházka	Pavel Kohout	Ivan Klíma
Jan Drda	Lud Vaculík	Milan Kundera
Václav Havel		

### Those who have taken up anti-party positions and have been struck out or expelled from the party and have not yet changed their point of view:

Jan Otčenášek	Josef Láník	Jan Stuchl
Jiří Šotola	Vlad. Pzourek	Stanislav Vejvoda
Karel Šiktanc	Lad. Ptáčník	Vlad. Vávra
Lad. Bublík	Jiří Žák	Gustav Bare
Alena Bernášková	Mojmír Klánský	Adolf Branald
Mirosl. Červenka	Ivan Kříž	Jan Drda
Arnošt Lustig	Jiří Kupka	Eduard Hončík
Jan Šigut	Václav Lacina	Jarmila Otradovicová
Oldřich Sulěř	Jan Martinec	Jos. Pros
Anna Třesohlavová	Fr. Neužil	Karel Ptáčník
Arnošt Vaněček	Fr. Rachlík	Lenka Hašková
Lucien Wichs	Lenka Reinerová	Jan Kopecký
Hana Bělohradská	Vlad. Remeš	Ivan Kubiček
Oldřich Daněk	Anna Sedlmayerová	Milan Kyselý
Mojmír Grygar	Fr. Směja	

### Poets:

Ilya Bart	Ivo Fleischmann	Karel Šiktanc
Miroslav Červenka	Boris Jachnin	Jiří Šotola
Lumír Čivrný	Zdeněk Kriebel	Jan Štern
Miroslav Fikrle	Jaroslav Seifert	

### SLOVAK AUTHORS:

#### Those who have emigrated or have been expelled:

L. Mňačko  
E. Štefan  
R. Kukálek  
T. Fiš  
D. Monoszly

#### Those who have been criticized:

L. Tážký  
D. Tatarka  
A. Hykiš  
M. Ferko  
P. Karvaš - (resigned his function in the Writer's Union)

or even one half (former sociological and philosophical). That this was not the end is indicated by a sentence referring to 'those places where the task of purging has on the whole been completed'. The article concludes by stressing the importance of cooperation with the Soviet Academy of Sciences and the integration of research programmes.

The single plan for basic research referred to above applies in all fields. *Rudé právo* for 29 July 1970, tells us: 'Fundamental research is, in the next five-year plan, to be part of a unified national plan for research and is to include only the socially most significant tasks of basic research. . . planned research during the five-year plan period is to be concentrated on a few selected programmes, each concerned with a definite theme to be handled on the basis of a unified working hypothesis or coordinated from the standpoint of a concrete goal.' There are eight such programmes, ranging from the natural to the 'social' sciences. In an interview published in *Rudé právo*, 4 May 1972, the President of the Academy of Sciences stated that 78 per cent of the Academy's research capacity was devoted to work linked with the state plan for technological development. The importance of cooperation and integration with the Comecon countries, especially the Soviet Union, is repeatedly stressed in press articles on all aspects of the research plan, but what effect this is having in practice on the overall direction and the day-to-day work of Czechoslovak scholars would require a special study. That the element of planning, undoubtedly essential in the modern industrial society, is being carried to extraordinary lengths is suggested by the following passage from the speech made by Academician Kožešník to the 29th General Assembly of the Academy of Sciences on 9 March 1972: 'The socialist scholar does not waste time or means on developing theories which are not socially useful, nor on writing works which solve nothing and do not occupy a top place in the list of social requirements.' Under these circumstances it would appear that Czechoslovak scholars have little freedom to pursue their own lines of research.

An indication that during the period of 'consolidation' at least (say, 1969-1971) there was an actual reduction in research activity can be found in the figures for expenditure by the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences (unfortunately incomplete). The budget for 1968 (including Slovakia) was 1,021,235,000 crowns; in 1969 reduced by 3.2 per cent to 829,562,000 crowns; in 1970 the figure (excluding Slovakia) was 110,000,000 crowns – and if we take this as representing two-thirds, with another third for Slovakia, still an enormous drop.

Restriction is also evident in the figures for international contacts published by the Academy in its Bulletin:

	Visits to and from Cz.	Socialist camp	The West
1967	14,221 persons	of which: 7,336	6,701
1968	11,136	4,921	6,042
1969	7,619	2,716	4,619
1970	8,014	4,758	3,256

The picture is even clearer from the following: in 1969 the number of Czechoslovak scholars sent to what is called 'the capitalist area' (excluding developing countries) was 2,173, but in 1970 only 865 (the remaining 2,391 from the 1970 figure in the table above being visitors to conferences etc. in Czechoslovakia). Before 1969 the number of visitors in and out was about equal, but now there is a steady decline in visitors from the Soviet bloc to Czechoslovakia (1,177 in 1969) and the number of Czechs and Slovaks sent to those countries is rising – 852 to the USSR, and 445 to the GDR in 1970.

The trend of university contacts with other countries can be illustrated, at least in part, by a report on expenditure in the February 1971 number of *Universitní zprávy*. Whereas in 1968 Prague University spent 391,000 crowns on financing visits to congresses, to foreign universities etc., in 1969 the figure rose to 590,000, but slumped in 1970 to 276,000.

Unfortunately, at the time of writing no more recent figures are available to us; it may be noted that the Academy, for instance, has become less communicative in publishing statistics referring to its activities. The present paper is, however, mainly concerned with the two years when academic life was most severely disturbed and it does not pretend to provide an exact picture of the state of affairs obtaining today.

\* \* \*

To summarise, we may conclude from the above account, drawn mainly from official sources, that the features of academic life in post-invasion Czechoslovakia are:

- 1) Strict government control;
- 2) Political control based on the most dogmatic interpretation of Marxism-Leninism and unquestioning acquiescence in the Soviet occupation;
- 3) A highly pragmatic approach to higher education and research – 'science the instrument of politics' – cutting back, especially in the liberal arts, accompanied by isolation from the West and close integration with the Soviet bloc;
- 4) Persecution of individuals and entire groups of scholars, even at the expense of scrapping institutions doing valuable work.

It is not our purpose here to list the many individual cases of unemployment or mis-employment, the personal hardships resulting from present policies which are matched only by the terrible damage to the whole country. Cases have been cited from time to time in the press and we have also had a statement from one well qualified to speak; in an interview with the Italian paper *Vie Nuove* Josef Smrkovský said (*The Times*, 17 September 1971): 'My collaborators, they were all communists. They were erudite people,

specialists, political scientists, economists, historians, party officials, trade unionists, etc. None of them holds a job today in which he can use his specialised knowledge. They all work as unskilled workers, mostly on digging jobs in the country. . . Professors work as stokers or as warehouse attendants, former ambassadors work as porters, a doctor is now a delivery man, a journalist works as a driver.'

Two months after that interview, some of the men of whom Josef Smrkovský was speaking found themselves in prison. Further arrests followed in the early months of 1972. Insofar as the names of the victims are known abroad, it would appear that many are intellectuals, scholars, writers and journalists, many communists by conviction although expelled from the post-invasion party for their refusal to conform to the official policy now imposed upon their country. It is also noteworthy that members of the ideologically suspect world of the liberal arts are prominent in the list of names of those known to have been arrested or subjected to police harassment; for instance, Jaroslav Sabata, a sociologist and political scientist and formerly the head of the Communist Party Political School, Karel Kaplan, an historian, who in 1968 led the team investigating the notorious political trials of the 1950's, Karel Bartošek, an historian, Rudolf Battek, a sociologist and former MP, Jan Tesař, an historian (the last two have already had a term in prison without trial before their re-arrest), Dr. Bžoch, a literary historian of Bratislava have all, as far as we know, now been in custody for several months. A number of others were held for shorter terms, and then released, but are still subject to surveillance – for instance, veteran sociologist Prof. Klofáč is reported to have spent a week in prison, and leading philosopher Prof. Kosík, Prof. Kalivoda and others have suffered similar treatment. These are men deeply concerned with the 'human face' of socialism, men with an enormous contribution to make to the life of their country, whose sole 'guilt' is that they refuse to accept the repressive regime imposed by military occupation. Whether or not political trials are to follow, the damage to the intellectual life of Czechoslovakia can hardly be over-emphasised. For a small country, with limited natural resources, a country that has always had to rely on the skills and the brains of its people, such a state of affairs could be materially and morally disastrous.

---

## POSTSCRIPT

*We reprint the following brief article which appeared in The Times on 13 June 1972 in order to bring the events described above up-to-date.*

New arrests have taken place recently in Prague, Brno and other towns in Czechoslovakia. The arrested people are interrogated for hours and days on end. Some of them have been released, but the threat of further interrogations hangs over their heads. They live in nervous anticipation of the early morning ring on the door bell, the appearance of two stalwarts in standard leather coats who will search their flats, scrutinize every piece of paper, examine their typewriters and without any explanation re-arrest them. Their telephones will most likely be tapped (30,000 are tapped in Prague alone), many will be constantly shadowed, and some of their friends will become panic-stricken and avoid public contact under various pretexts. A few will refuse to succumb to the atmosphere of intimidation, and will ostentatiously maintain friendly ties.

A name frequently brought up during the last interrogations is that of Jiří Pelikán, former head of Czechoslovak Television and member of the Communist Party's Central Committee. Mr Pelikán now lives in Rome where he publishes *Listy*, a bi-monthly journal of the Czechoslovak Socialist Opposition. *Listy* and underground broadsheets continue to circulate although possession of 'subversive' publications is a penal offence.

A number of detainees have been linked with Mr. Pelikán, including Milan Hübl, former Rector of the Party school, Jaroslav Sabata, formerly an adviser to Mr Dubček and Party secretary in Brno; Jiří Litera formerly of Prague's municipal Party committee; and Karel Kyncl, a well-known communist journalist. They were arrested between November and January, and are all charged with undermining the Republic. Some are also charged with incitement against the socialist system. The aim of legal proceedings will

be to discredit well-known personalities of the 1968 movement, both in Czechoslovakia and abroad.

The STB are connecting Mr V. Ochetta, the Italian journalist who was arrested in January and later released, with this case and are apparently trying to 'discover' further 'proofs' of contacts with the West in general and with Mr Pelikan in particular. The indictment may be enlarged to include Article 105, which covers espionage, so that any contact with the Czechoslovak Marxist opposition abroad and any opposition within the country could in future be defined as espionage. This carries a prison sentence of up to 15 years.

The case is ready to be submitted to court but the green light has not yet been given by the party leadership. Well over one hundred detainees await the fateful signal from the political leaders. During his visit to Moscow in March, Vasil Bilak, the hardliner responsible for security matters, discussed the question of trials with the Soviet leaders. It was decided that trials would be held in order to intimidate the still very much alive 'Right', but that they should be carefully timed and conducted in a way that would not arouse much attention in the world outside, and thereby harm Soviet interests in other spheres. There would be a series of trials involving small groups with a time lapse between them.

For instance, Dr. Premysl Vondra, a former employee of the Prague Institute of Adult Education, is linked with Dr Ota Krizanovsky, a former lecturer at a regional party college, imprisoned since 31 January, and Dr Karel Kaplan, a former research worker at the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences and secretary of the Piller Commission (investigating political trials of the 1950s), who was released on 14 April after spending two and a half months in jail. The charges against Dr Kaplan under Article 106 (threat of divulgence of state secret) were not dropped. The STB may have decided to make him a scapegoat for all the leaks concerning the political trials of the fifties.

The group is also to include Dr Josef Belda, another historian. Dr Jaroslav Klofac, a sociologist, who was arrested with others on 31 January, but released after 48 hours' detention, was at first accused of taking part in 'secret meetings in the Sumava restaurant where the participants engaged in anti-State discussions and organized anti-State activities'. Now he is to be a prosecution witness in the trial against Dr Vondra and the others. The group is charged under Article 98 of the penal code with distributing anti-State broadsheets and leaflets in the MITAS factory in Prague where these intellectuals were employed as workers before their arrest.

In the meantime the STB is continuing with unabated vigour to investigate Czechoslovak citizens' contacts with the West European Left, particularly with Italian communists. They are, for instance, showing intense interest in

the activities of the famous Italian communist composer, Luigi Nono.

The party leadership, dissatisfied with the degree of consolidation in all spheres of society, has also launched a further round of screening tests. These will affect non-party people in the first place, but a further purge of the passive, opportunistic and demoralized Party is being prepared. The model screening questionnaire issued by the party leadership a year ago included questions on activity before and after 1968, attitudes towards various events, such as the campaign in support of Dr Smrkovsky in January 1969, Jan Palach's self-immolation and the Czechoslovak victory over the Soviet Union at ice hockey in March 1969, which evoked uninhibited nationwide celebrations and indirectly caused Dubček's downfall.

One can only guess at what the Party hopes to gain by posing the same questions a second time. Probably more details will be demanded this time. Replies will be compared with the previous answers and with new information which those questioned disclose about themselves and others in the meantime. Questions concerning relatives' political activities are more comprehensive than they were in the fifties.

The authors of the questionnaire are interested in the slightest change of relatives' employment or function in employment because any such change is the result of a previously political evaluation. Some new items have been added, for example viewpoints on the dismissal of politically unreliable colleagues. At the Academy of Science a person's attitude towards further dismissals for loss of political confidence is one of the key indicators of 'mature political consciousness'.

Each Ministry drew up its own questionnaire reflecting its specific requirements. Particular attention was paid to the Ministry of Education because the leadership is accorded scant esteem by scientific workers, teachers and students. This Ministry prepared 66 questions which were regarded as nonsensical even by the most diehard of dogmatists, Dr Vaclav Kral, an historian who reduced the number to 18 for the Institute of History.

The screening is to be concluded by the end of June. The population at large has treated it with disgust. Many people who successfully passed the previous loyalty tests have expressed doubts about the efficacy of such purges. They point out that screening tests do not induce people to cooperate with the regime but only to make a show of carrying out directives to disguise their real opinions, and above all to try to survive unscathed without becoming involved in any way. The Party leadership is warned even by its supporters that in the event of a crisis evoked by internal or external events it will not be able to rely on anybody, and that the 'rightist forces' are itching to turn this to their own advantage.

As a minor preventive measure, editorial work published by University departments or scientific institutes have been temporarily suspended, and a

number of scientific journals have had to postpone publication until after the screening.

Control over possible 'rightist' activity has been tightened recently. In April editors of all newspapers and journals were instructed to ascertain the identities of contributors using pseudonyms. Special commissions were formed at workplaces to decide whether these freelance writers should be allowed to publish their articles. Journalists must now obtain written approval before quoting names of people interviewed. Newspapers and television programmes have been roundly criticized for referring to the wrong kind of people.

In a further attempt to stop the rot, lectures by professors whose political views come under question are attended by 'students' who afterwards submit detailed reports to the authorities. But apparently even this kind of activity is slowly becoming a mere formality.

**David Michal**

© *The Times* Reprinted by kind permission of Times Newspapers Ltd.

The 4 July issue of *Newsweek* was banned in Brazil because of alleged 'negative references' to the Trans-Amazon Highway, a national prestige project.

## CZECHOSLOVAKIA

**Valerio Ochetto**, the Italian journalist who had been arrested on a charge of 'inciting individuals and groups to hostile and anti-state activities' in January this year (*not* February as reported in INDEX No. 1) was released on 17 February after 43 days' detention.

On 23 April the Prague **Narodni Divadlo** ('National Theatre') announced the last-minute cancellation of the performance of *Henry V* it was due to have given in Florence a few days later. The official reason given by both the theatre and the Czech state agency for cultural exchanges was an alteration in the theatre's artistic programme. Despite protests to the Czech Embassy in Rome, the Italian Embassy in Prague and the Czech Minister of Culture, the decision remained unchanged.

The April issue of the Czech *Journalists' Union* review reported that 1,222 journalists had been expelled from the Union since Mr. Dubček's fall in 1968. The Union's chairman **Josef Valenta**, said that 265 'aggressive right-wing' members had been expelled and that a further 150 'close collaborators' had 'had their membership terminated' – a slightly more lenient measure. The remaining 807 had left the Union in the middle of 1970 when members were obliged to hand in their old membership cards in exchange for new ones – a device to purge the journalists by not giving them new cards. Since membership in the union reflects the standing of newsmen with communist party organizations, expulsion or termination of membership effectively curtails a journalist's career.

**Otomar Krejča**, a leading Czech theatre director and prominent liberal during the reform era, was dismissed without explanation from his post early in April by the Ministry of Culture. His company, **The Theatre Behind the Gate**, was due to participate in the London World Theatre Season, but

it was not allowed to come.

**Luděk Pachman**, the chess grand master, was tried in Prague on 4 and 5 May on charges of subversion, slandering the Republic, incitement and preparing a felony. He was sentenced to two years' imprisonment but was allowed to go free in view of poor health and the 18 months he had spent in prison awaiting trial.

On 19 July **Prěmysl Vondra**, a former journalist, was sentenced to 2 years 4 months imprisonment on charges of producing and circulating clandestine leaflets before the parliamentary elections in November 1971. Two other defendants, **Josef Belda** and **Ota Křižanovski**, both former party members, received suspended sentences of 12 and 18 months respectively.

**Jiří Litera**, a former secretary of the Prague City party committee and leading party theoretician of the Dubček era, was jailed for two and a half years on 20 July on charges of subversion. **Josef Stehlik**, a former central committee employee, was sentenced to two years in prison and **Antonín Rocek**, a worker, received a suspended sentence of one year. All three were said to have been responsible for producing a clandestine chronicle *Pokrök* ('Progress'), urging people to think democratically. Litera and Stehlik were also accused of possessing copies of two Czech émigré journals, *Svědectví* ('Witness'), published in Paris, and *Listy* ('Letters'), published in Rome.

## EAST GERMANY

Early in April, the East German government refused to allow **Professor Werner Bauch**, the landscape architect, to leave the country and go to Strasbourg to accept the European Award for Nature Preservation.

## ETHIOPIA

In late March **Patrick Gilkes**, a British professor of history conducting private research in Ethiopia, and **Miss Moira Larson**, an American sociology lecturer at Addis Ababa University, were detained on suspicion of involvement in local student

ition party organ *Min-ju-jon-son*, in which the poem appeared, were all arrested together with the poet himself and various other well-known figures. The publications concerned were confiscated by the Korean CIA. Although the defendants were released on bail following lengthy court proceedings, the charges brought against them under the Anti-Communist Law were never dropped. At the beginning of April 1972, however, Kim Chi-hah published in the Catholic magazine *Creation* another poem entitled 'The Rumour', which was a satirical work dealing with the problem of authority. Shortly after publication the president and chief editor of the magazine were taken to the CIA headquarters for examination and the poet was arrested. The South Korean press was forbidden to report his arrest. Following an international appeal, the poet was transferred to a sanatorium for treatment of the chronic tuberculosis, from which he has suffered for many years, on condition that he cease to write critically of the government. It is believed that no charges have been brought against him.

#### SOVIET UNION

**Leonid Plyushch** was arrested in Kiev in January and has been charged with 'anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda'. He is a cybernetician who used to work at the *Cybernetics Institute* in Kiev and has published various articles. He is a founder-member of the Moscow-based *Action Group for the Defence of Human Rights in the USSR*, which recently appealed for his release.

The sociologist **Vatslav Sevruck** was arrested in January in Vilnius. He is the author of a number of works that circulate in *samizdat* form, and is threatened with internment in a psychiatric hospital, apparently for an alleged connexion with the *Chronicle of Current Events*.

In February, **Anatoly Reshetnik** a lecturer in history and social studies was sentenced in Sverdlovsk to two years in ordinary-regime labour camps for making critical statements and writing an open letter in defence of **Alexander Solzhenitsyn**.

It was announced on 4 April that the latest attempt to present **Alexander Solzhenitsyn** with

the 1970 Nobel Prize for literature had failed, **Solzhenitsyn** had organized a private ceremony in a Moscow flat and the prize was to have been presented by **Dr. Karl Ragnar Gierow**, secretary of the *Swedish Academy* on Sunday, 8 July. Among the guests were to have been a number of prominent Soviet figures, including the Soviet Minister of Culture, **Yekaterina Furtseva**. **Dr. Gierow** was refused a visa without explanation, but it is thought that the refusal may have been connected with a long interview that **Solzhenitsyn** gave to two American correspondents two days beforehand.

**Anatoly Reshetnyk** was brought to trial early in April in Kiev for writing an open letter in defence of **Solzhenitsyn** to the Moscow literary weekly *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, after it had printed an article attacking **Solzhenitsyn**. The newspaper did not print **Reshetnyk's** letter and the KGB demanded that he withdraw it. When he refused, he was dismissed from his post as lecturer in political economy at the *Sverdlovsk Technical Institute* and was later arrested. He was tried *in camera* and the verdict is not yet known.

The novelist **Vladimir Maximov** was reported in April to be under considerable pressure to condemn and attempt to prevent the publication of his book, *The Seven Days of Creation*, in the West. Rumours that he was likely to be brought to trial did not materialise and no further action was taken against him. The novel has already appeared in a western Russian-language edition and *Weidenfield & Nicolson* are publishing it in English.

One of the eleven Moscow Jews who supported a request for an interview with **President Nixon** during his visit to the Soviet Union, **Levi Joffe**, a mathematician, poet and one of Moscow's foremost teachers of Hebrew, was conscripted for two years and told to await his call-up papers, at the end of April. The others were **Boris Aimbinder**, **Dan Roginsky**, **Victor Yachot** and **Sergei Gurbits**, all physicists; **Vladimir Lerner**, a systems analyst; **Gavriel Shapiro** and **Mikhail Kliatchkin**, engineers; **Mark Nashpits**, a dentist; **Pavel Abramovich**, a scientist and **David Markish**, a writer. All of these

men were arrested on 25 April after having sent a letter to a number of different organizations in which they stated their intention to demonstrate before **President Nixon** because they had not been allowed to emigrate to Israel as they wished. Three of them were forcibly conscripted but the remainder refused to go. **Victor Yachot** was examined by two military doctors and a woman psychiatrist who told him that he ought to go to a mental hospital.

**David Bonavia**, Moscow correspondent of *The Times* since 1969, was expelled from Russia in May because of 'systematic activities incompatible with the status of a foreign correspondent'. His expulsion followed an attack in the April issue of *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, the weekly newspaper of the Soviet Writers' Union, which had published on 22 March an article accusing him of 'misinforming' his readers and of 'slandering' writings. It had published several similar articles attacking **Mr. Bonavia** during the preceding year. The 22 March issue also included a series of readers' letters expressing indignation at his alleged activities and demanding his expulsion, although it was noted that the signatories lived in cities where *The Times* was unobtainable.

**Nina Strokatova**, wife of the Ukrainian writer and literary scholar, **Svyatoslav Karavansky**, was sentenced to four years of strict-regime in corrective-labour camps on 19 May in Odessa. **Miss Strokatova** is a microbiologist who used to work at the *Odessa Medical Institute* and who has published articles in scientific journals. She was charged with 'anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda' — allegedly circulating *samizdat* materials — but her sentence is thought to be not unconnected with her brave defence over the years of her husband, who has been in prison on charges of nationalism continuously since 1944, except for a brief period of freedom in 1960-65. He is due for release in 1979.

**Yury Melnik** was sentenced in Leningrad on 19 June to three years in strict regime labour camps for alleged 'anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda', apparently in connexion with the publication of the unauthorized journal *Chronicle of Current Events*. He is an astro-physicist.

On 21 June the historian **Pyotr Yakir** (son of the former Army Commander **Iona Yakir**, shot by **Stalin** in the military purge of 1937) was arrested in Moscow. **Yakir** was one of the leaders of the human rights movement in the Soviet Union and in 1969 helped to form the *Action Group for the Defence of Human Rights in the USSR*. The first volume of his autobiography was published in Russian by *Macmillan* this spring and the English translation (to be called *Childhood in Prison*) is due to appear this summer.

#### SPAIN

**Luciano Rincón**, journalist and writer from Bilbao, who was arrested in May 1971, was sentenced in March 1972 to five years' imprisonment for 'insulting the Head of State' in an article published in the Spanish-language journal *Cuadernos* published by *Ruedo Iberico* in Paris.

Employees of the suppressed newspaper *Madrid* made a public appeal to the authorities in March to allow the newspaper to resume publication in order to prevent it from going out of business. The outspoken paper had been silenced four months previously by the *Ministry of Information and Tourism* for alleged 'administrative irregularities'. Government officials claimed that they were anxious to see the paper reopen, provided a formula could be found to resolve the dispute, but nothing came of the appeal. Meanwhile the publisher of *Madrid*, **Rafael Calvo Serer**, is living in Paris. If he returns to Spain he will face charges of 'compromising the peace and independence of the state'.

The 9 and 10 March issues of *La Croix*, containing articles on the Assembly of the Spanish episcopate and extracts from a letter by **Cardinal Vilot** to **Cardinal Enrique y Tarancon** (the Archbishop of Madrid), were seized by the authorities.

A well-known cartoonist and film director, **Manuel Summers Rivero**, was brought to trial on 12 March, accused of offending the Catholic religion by a series of vignettes published in September 1971 in *Sabado Grafico*, a popular weekly, devoted to the National Assembly of Bishops and Priests

The trustees of *Columbia University*, which awards the *Pulitzer Prizes* and a national reporting award on the recommendation of an advisory board, took the unprecedented step on 1 May of voicing their strong disapproval of the recipients. The annual Pulitzer Prize for public service was awarded to *The New York Times* for its publication of the 'Pentagon papers', which dealt with background to the Vietnam war. The national reporting award went to **Jack Anderson** for his revelations about decision-making in Washington during the Indo-Pakistan war. Both awards had been granted for the publication of closely-guarded government papers, which had evoked much discussion and criticism of the newspapers and journalists concerned (see INDEX No. 1, pp. 75-77: the exchange between Peter Calvocoressi and Anthony Lewis). With their announcement of the awards, the trustees issued a covering announcement stating that they had 'deep reservations about the timeliness and suitability of certain of the journalism awards'. If it had been up to the trustees alone, they said, 'certain of the recipients would not have been chosen', but they did not disclose the names of the 'certain recipients' to which they objected.

#### VENEZUELA

In March 28,000 students resumed studies at the *Central University* in Caracas, which contains over half the student population of Venezuela. The University has been described as a symbol of the 'Latin American students' highly nationalistic struggle for academic liberty, free attendance, political innovation and almost complete autonomy'. Two years ago the university became a sanctuary for marxist guerrillas fighting the elected

government. Troops occupied the campus in October 1969, but severe disruptions prevented normal working and many students went to prison, some of whom are still there.

#### YUGOSLAVIA

On 27 June the Serbian Orthodox *Bishop of Žiža*, **Vasilije Kostić**, was sent to jail for one month for a speech that he had made to a church assembly in October 1971 attacking certain defects in the educational system of Yugoslavia.

The result of the appeal of **Mihajlo Mihajlov** against his conviction for publishing an article and a letter in the *New York Times* has still not been announced at the time of going to press. His request for a passport, however, has been refused by the ministry concerned, although he has received invitations to lecture in Italy and the USA. Mr. Mihajlov was also appointed in June as a special correspondent of the Universal Press Syndicate in New York, but his accreditation was refused by the Yugoslav authorities. This is thought to be the first such refusal of accreditation for 10 years.

Printing workers of the Belgrade monthly *Savremenik* ('The Contemporary') 'refused to print, the July number because it was to contain a short story by **Milovan Djilas**.

#### CORRECTION

The name of the Belgian economist deported in March from Western Germany (INDEX index no. 1) should have read **Professor Ernst Mandel**.

#### SOURCES

*Chronicle of Current Events* (Amnesty Publications), *Daily Telegraph*, *International Press Institute Reports*, *Le Monde*, *Politika* (Yugoslavia), *Radio Free Europe Situation Reports*, *Sunday Telegraph*, *Sunday Times*, *The Guardian*, *The Observer*, *The Times*, *Ukrainian Herald* ('Visnik'), *UK Press Gazette*.

## ZINOVIA FRANKO'S OPEN LETTER

*During the recent wave of arrests of intellectuals in the Ukraine [see INDEX no. 1, p. 87], the following open letter was published in the Ukrainian newspaper Radyanskaya Ukraina.*

Foreign radio and press have recently been doing their utmost to inflate the question (which is of their own invention) of persecution in the Soviet Ukraine of men of culture.

My name also appeared in this noisy anti-Soviet hullabaloo, more than once, with the tag 'granddaughter of the famous Ukrainian writer Ivan Franko'.

Recent events (I mean the arrest of the Belgian subject Ya. Dobosh) have opened my eyes to a number of facts. I started to think seriously about what was happening.

And that is why I am turning to you with an open letter, as someone who has on her conscience an offence against her fatherland, an offence which is justly classified under the criminal code as anti-Soviet activity. Now the time has come for me to review my actions soberly and critically, to free myself from this burden and to return to my contemporaries — the workers of Soviet Ukraine.

My offence lies in incorrectly and distortedly understanding and interpreting certain shortcomings and difficulties in our life. Although I did not take part in person in preparing various slanderous anti-Soviet documents, I did, however, circulate them among my friends. One of these documents I passed abroad. While doing this I was very well aware that the circulation of these documents harmed the Soviet state and the Ukrainian people.

Making use of my friends and relatives abroad, I made contact with many foreigners of Ukrainian descent who came to the Ukraine as tourists. To a number of these I gave information of a political nature which was known to me, tendentially treating certain events in the life of the Soviet State. I conceded that this information could be used abroad for the ends of anti-Soviet propaganda, but I consciously closed my eyes to this possibility.

In my state of political blindness I did not notice that I began to pass information to disguised representatives of hostile foreign nationalist centres connected with the intelligence services of imperialist states. Such a one turned out to be Yaroslav Dobosh, who was caught red-handed. And this was already the path which could lead to treason. But I was stopped on this path in time, and for this I am truly thankful.

I fully understand my offence, and deeply condemn all those actions of mine which have brought harm to my Fatherland.

I also came to understand why the enemies of the Ukrainian people catch so readily at my surname — Franko — and why I was so necessary to them. They tried to make use in their anti-Soviet struggle of the name of my famous grandfather — Ivan Franko — an ardent internationalist and revolutionary democrat.

If I am forgiven, I will put all my strength into honest work in order to atone my guilt before the people.

I have understood everything. And may this understanding come to all those, who hold their Soviet Fatherland dear, and who have not lost the sense of dignity befitting the Soviet man, and who do not wish to remain in the shameful situation of an 'inner' émigré.

**Zinovia Franko**

*Radyanska Ukraina, 2 March 1972*

## LETTER FROM YUGOSLAVIA

The political and police action taken by the Yugoslav authorities against the intellectuals [see INDEX No. 1] has continued on a somewhat diminished scale. At the time of writing, early in July, the measures taken against writers, journalists and university faculty members in Croatia have probably passed their peak, although a number of trials are still in progress and the largest trial of all — that of a dozen leaders of the cultural organization *Matica Hrvatska* — is due to be held in the autumn. At the same time, although in a considerably milder form at the moment, a similar action has been started against Serbian nationalism. This has led to the banning of a number of newspapers and other publications and even to trials of journalists, publicists and faculty members in Belgrade and Novi Sad. It is true to say that the majority of cases concern people who are known for their Croatian nationalist or Serbian nationalist tendencies, but there has also been a gradual increase of cases in which intellectuals whose beliefs have nothing at all to do with nationalism have been subject to banning orders or trials. This leads one to the conclusion that it is no longer only nationalistically-minded people who are suffering, but a much wider circle of Yugoslav intellectuals who are now experiencing less freedom of expression than they enjoyed up till September last year.

\* \* \*

At the end of May the Central Committee of the League of Communists of Croatia published in Zagreb a document under the title of 'Report on the Position of the League of Communists of Croatia Regarding the Infiltration of Nationalism into its Ranks'. Leafing through the 310 pages of this Report one finds the names of about 200 Croatian writers, journalists, school teachers and university faculty members who have either had difficulties with the authorities in the course of the last few months, or can expect them in the near future. The accusations made against them in the Report are extremely varied, but the material forming the basis of these accusations is almost always the same, that is to say, it consists of quotations from writings or public speeches made before the time of the recent emergency. Thus it is fair to say that the guilt of all the accused Croatian intellectuals comes down to one and the same thing, namely that they freely and publicly aired opinions and ideas which until December 1971 were considered legitimate and legal in Yugoslavia, but are now politically unpalatable and in some cases are being interpreted as matter for criminal prosecution.

In view of the fact that the information given in the Report carries an official seal, it is fair to regard this as the most authoritative and complete account of events in Croatia to date and it is from here that the following facts have been drawn. In Zagreb the two leading literary critical journals, the monthly *Kolo* and the bi-monthly *Kritika* have been closed down completely. The journals *Encyclopedia Moderna*, *Croatica*, *Republika* and a number of journals in the Croatian provinces have been forced to change their



Front cover of the Report on the Position of the League of Communists of Croatia Regarding the Infiltration of Nationalism into its Ranks.

entire editorial staffs as a condition of being allowed to continue in print. The newspapers *Hrvatski tjednik* ('Croatian Weekly') and *Hrvatski Gospodarski list* ('Croatian Economist') have been banned completely and their editorial staffs dismissed. In addition, the editorial staffs of the leading Croatian current affairs weekly *Vjesnik u srijedu* ('Wednesday Herald') and of the youth newspapers *Studentski list* ('Student News') and *Omladinski tjednik* ('Youth Weekly') have been almost completely replaced. And the same thing has happened in a number of newspapers in the Croatian provinces.

A large number of prominent Croatian journalists and publicists have been dismissed from their posts, including Božidar Novak, director of the largest newspaper publishing house in Zagreb and recipient of last year's highest award for journalism; Milovan Baletić, editor-in-chief of *Vjesnik*, together with the editors of the domestic, political and cultural pages and approximately a half of the editorial staff; Ivo Bojanić, director of Zagreb radio and television; Tomislav Golubović, director of television programmes; Lucija Spajić, director of radio; and about a dozen editors in the radio and television service. In addition to these, approximately a hundred Croatian journalists have lost their jobs. Of these about six or seven are due to stand trial and the rest will have considerable difficulty in future in continuing in their profession.

The Report also mentions a number of leading Croatian writers. Two of them, the poet, essayist and journalist Vlado Gotovac, and the poet Zlatko Tomičić are in jail awaiting trial, while another two, the literary critic Vlatko Pavletić and the poet Željko Sabol are out on bail awaiting trial. Apart from these, a number of writers are strongly attacked in the Report, including the prize-winning writer, Petar Šegedin, Grgo Gamulin, Danilo Pejović, Miroslav Vaupotić, Branimir Donat, Tomislav Ladan and a number of others.

Among the others in prison are three university professors, Dr. Šime Djodan, Dr. Franjo Tujman, and Dr. Marko Veselica [see INDEX No. 1], while about twenty others are attacked in the Report, including Ivo Frangeš, Chairman of the Department of Croatian Literature, Ljudevit Jonke, Chairman of the Department of Croatian Language and Dr. Ivo Supek, Professor of Theoretical Physics. On the other hand none of the men under attack has yet been removed from office, nor have demands for this been made. From this point of view, the situation of secondary school teachers in the provinces is more difficult, since many of them have been forced to leave their jobs under pressure from the local authorities.

\* \* \*

Serbia until now has not come under the same kind of pressure as Croatia, but there are signs that the situation there too is growing difficult for writers, intellectuals and scholars. The evidence for this is contained in a Serbian party document very similar to the Croatian Report. The Serbian document, published by the Central Committee of the League of Communists of Serbia, is entitled 'Documentation of the Roots, Ideology, Phenomena and Actions of Nationalism in Serbia' and has been summarised in the 2 July number of the Belgrade weekly *NIN*. In general it appears that the Serbian document is milder than the Croatian Report. There are relatively few direct attacks on personalities, although a number of intellectuals are referred to as possessing pronounced nationalist tendencies, including the leading Serbian novelist Dobrica Ćosić, the historian Joca Marjanović, professor of linguistics Pavle Ivić, the satirist Brana Crnčević, the painter and film director Mića Popović and a number of people somewhat less well known.

Somewhat sharper are the accusations levelled against certain institutions and publishers labelled as 'hotbeds of nationalism'. Among them are the law, philological and

philosophical faculties of the universities of Belgrade and Novi Sad, the publishing houses *Prosveta* ('Enlightenment') and *Srpska književna zadruga* ('Serbian Literary Cooperative'), the newspapers and magazines *Umetnost* ('Art'), *Anali* ('Annals'), *Književne novine* ('Book News'), *Student*, *Stradija*, *Vidici* ('Viewpoints') and *Jež* ('The Hedgehog') as well as several organs of the Serbian Orthodox Church. It is also clear from this document that changes have been made in the editorial boards of *Student*, *Stradija*, *Jež*, and *Umetnost*, while Dobrica Ćosić's novel *Moć i strepnje* ('Power and Foreboding') has been banned and removed from sale.

In addition there have, it appears, been a number of trials in Belgrade and Novi Sad, which may be a harbinger of more serious sanctions against the Serbian intellectuals. Three of the editors of *Student* have recently been sentenced to suspended prison terms of from ten to fourteen months for allegedly harming the interests of Yugoslav foreign policy, while the number which gave rise to the prosecution was banned. The author of a recent book *Krajina i Krajišnici* ('The Krajina and its Inhabitants'), Jovan Zubović, was given a three year suspended sentence on the basis of certain nationalist remarks. More seriously, three young student journalists were sentenced to jail for periods of from one to three years for allegedly falsifying Yugoslav foreign policy and insulting certain individuals; and these sentences were not suspended. Finally there is the case of Professor Miloš Djurić of the Belgrade law faculty, who is under investigation for an article he wrote last year criticizing the draft of the new Yugoslav constitution. Professor Djurić is still at liberty while the investigation continues and it is not known whether he will go for trial or not.

\* \* \*

In general it may be said that the rest of the country has been much less affected by the present trend than Serbia and especially Croatia. In Bosnia and Herzegovina the intellectual climate has always been less liberal than in many of the other republics, so that it is not uncommon for changes to be imposed on publishing houses and newspapers. In Macedonia and Montenegro the republican party organisations have so far limited themselves to criticism. And it is only in Slovenia, the northernmost and most developed of the Yugoslav republics, that there have been echoes of the events in Croatia. The student newspaper *Tribuna* ('Tribune') recently had three successive issues banned and has now been required to make changes in its editorial board. The veteran Slovenian literary critic Josip Vidmar has also been making violent attacks on some of the more progressive Slovenian writers, but no sanctions have been imposed.

All these measures place a question mark over previous expectations of a steady move in the direction of greater freedom of expression in Yugoslavia and hopes that its unique variant of communism would prove amenable to this freedom. Since the measures taken may still be characterized as mild, there is a possibility that they may be stopped within a short period of time. Otherwise, if they gather momentum, one fears that a far larger number of Yugoslav writers and intellectuals will be affected before very long.

G.H.

# 'GOD KEEP ME FROM GOING MAD'

Alexander Solzhenitsyn

---

*This is the first ever publication in English of verse by Solzhenitsyn. The passage in question is an extract from a longer autobiographical poem composed in 1950-53 while Solzhenitsyn was serving a sentence in a labour camp in North Kazakhstan. This camp formed the setting of Solzhenitsyn's celebrated novel, One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich. The verse was quoted in a samizdat article on the novel called Ivan Denisovich and the Writer's Spiritual Mission by Venyamin Teush, a former schoolteacher colleague and close friend of Solzhenitsyn. Teush signed it with the pseudonym D. Blagov.*

There never was, nor will be, a world of brightness!  
 A frozen footcloth is the scarf that binds my face.  
 Fights over porridge, the ganger's constant griping  
 And day follows day follows day, and no end to this dreary fate.

.....

My feeble pick strikes sparks from the frozen earth.  
 And the sun stares down unblinking from the sky.  
 But the world *is* here! And will be! The daily round  
 Suffices. But man is not to be prisoned in the day.  
 To write! To write now, without delay,  
 Not in heated wrath, but with cool and clear understanding.  
 The millstones of my thoughts can hardly turn,  
 Too rare the flicker of light in my aching soul.  
 Yes, tight is the circle around us tautly drawn,

But my verses will burst their bonds and freely roam  
 And I can guard, perhaps, beyond their reach,  
 In rhythmic harmony this hard-won gift of speech.  
 And then they can grope my body in vain –  
 'Here I am. All yours. Look hard. Not a line. . .  
 Our indestructible memory, by wonder divine,  
 Is beyond the reach of your butcher's hands!'

My labour of love! Year after year with me you will grow,  
 Year after year you will tread the prisoner's path.  
 The day will come when you warm not me alone,  
 Nor me alone embrace with a shiver of wrath.  
 Let the stanzas throb – but no whisper let slip,  
 Let them hammer away – not a twitch of the lip,  
 Let your eyes not gleam in another's presence  
 And let no-one see, let no-one see  
 You put pencil to paper.  
 From every corner I am stalked by prison –  
*God keep me from going mad!*<sup>1</sup>

I do not write my verses for idle pleasure,  
 Nor from a sense of energy to burn.  
 Nor out of mischief, to evade their searches,  
 Do I carry them past my captors in my brain.  
 The free flow of my verse is dearly bought,  
 I have paid a cruel price for my poet's rights:  
 The barren sacrifice of all her youth  
 And ten cold solitary years for my wife –

The unuttered cries of children still unborn,  
 My mother's death, toiling in gaunt starvation,  
 The madness of prison cells, midnight interrogations,  
 Autumn's sticky red clay in an opencast mine,  
 The secret, slow and silent erosive force  
 Of winters laying bricks, of summers feeding the furnace –  
 Oh, if this were but the sum of the price paid for my verse!  
 But those others paid the price with their lives,  
 Immured in the silence of Solovki, drowned in thunder of waves,  
 Or shot without trial in Vorkuta's polar night.

1. The first line of a poem by Pushkin.

Love and warmth and their executed cries  
 Have combined in my breast to carve  
 The receptive metre of this sorrowful tale,  
 These few poor thousand incapacious lines.  
 Oh, hopeless labour! Can you really pay the price?  
 Do you think to redeem the pledge with a single life?  
 For what an age has my country been so poor  
 In women's happy laughter, so very rich  
 In poets' lamentations!  
 Verse verse – for all that we have lost,  
 A drop of scented resin in the razed forest!  
 But this is all I live for! On its wings  
 I transport my feeble body through prison walls  
 And one day, in distant exile dim,  
 Biding my time, I will free my tortured memory from its thrall:  
 On paper, birchbark, in a blackened bottle rolled,  
 I will consign my tale to the forest leaves,  
 Or to a drift of shifting snow.

But what if beforehand they give me poisoned bread?  
 Or if darkness beclouds my mind at last?  
 Oh, let me die *there!* Let it not be here!  
*God keep me from going mad!*

Translated by Michael Scammell

# The Guinea-pigs (an extract)

Ludvík Vaculík

---

*The publication of Ludvík Vaculík's novel Sekyra ('The Axe') 1966 was among the few major literary events in Czechoslovakia since the end of the war. In closely-woven prose, the journalist-narrator described the transformation – and its impact on the people who made it and suffered by it – of the countryside he had known as a boy.*

*In the summer of 1967, Vaculík addressed the Writers' Conference in Prague. The nature of political power was his theme and he assumed that 'none of us was born for the sake of being governed easily'. A year later, Vaculík drafted the Two Thousand Words manifesto, the most incisive statement on democratic socialism that appeared in the course of the Czechoslovak reform movement. Vaculík has now left Prague and lives in self-imposed provincial exile somewhere in the region described in The Axe. From Prague, he is threatened by the power he had dared to question.*

*The Guinea-pigs, Vaculík's latest novel, has been published abroad but not in Czechoslovakia. It is a fable for children about relations between animals and people and about life and work in a bent bank, where all the frauds are properly accounted for and all the clerks' conspiracies public. It is a subtle book, unlikely to be popular with the censor: it may be seen as being full of political implications. But political satire aside, it is also very funny, as this chapter shows. Chapters one and two of the book introduce the reader to a 'typical' Czech family, consisting of father, mother, two sons – Vašek, aged 13, and Pavel, 9 – and Pavel's Christmas present, the guinea-pig Albin. In chapter three the action is removed to the state bank where father works as a clerk.*

## Chapter 3

It was the end of the year. Doing the accounts in a bank is quite different, of course, from stocktaking in a bookshop. You can't stop all the currency in circulation, stack it up and count it. No, stocktaking in a bank can only be described as, well, beyond description.

The proper thing to do with anyone who removed money (stole it, shall we say?) would be to throw him out of his job or even to lock him up, as used to happen in pre-war Czechoslovakia or before that in Austria-Hungary. But people can never bring themselves to do this. We have a terrifyingly strong trade union, what with every employee belonging to it. There was some talk about setting up another one; if there were two, they wouldn't be so embarrassingly powerful. However, this was only discussed unofficially. Unofficially, my dears, means standing in front of the tobacco kiosk. When a senior bank official mooted this theory *away* from the kiosk he was sent to prison. Just one prison sentence, one thief out of the way: a poor effort.

There is little fun to be had out of taking more money from the bank than your proper salary, because the chances of your getting home with it are pretty slim. Still, every time the sheer hopelessness of it all makes us give up stealing, the word gets round again that this or that colleague managed to make off with a tidy round sum. These reports fire us with fresh zeal, which is then dampened by the sudden revival of alertness amongst the guards. So what's the good?

There's one old senior clerk called Chlebeček in our branch of the State bank. He should have retired ages ago, but the bank holds on to him because he's the only person around who still understands what Lombard loans are. Not that these ever happen in our system; being a characteristic of capitalist credit business they don't actually interest us. But Chlebeček's survival is due to the fact that every so often someone rings up from the Ministry of Foreign Trade and asks what 'Lombard' means. What does it, indeed? Don't ask me.

Now this Chlebeček, a much overlooked man, sat down one day with a sheet of squared paper and put some thoughts together that he had been working on for months past. What he came up with caused a sensation right through the bank. Everyone had known for a long time that the money the guards used to confiscate from us never turned up in the safe the next day. But what this Chlebeček found out was that it never got back to the bank at all, not even *via* the market. Any of you children who may be destined in later life to boast that he has worked in the business world must at this point in the story – future connoisseur that he is – be seized with wonder and dire premonition. For if the banknotes in question had simply been pulped, we could have seen this as a touchingly naive, morally respectable, counter-inflationary device organised by the usual ill-informed circles outside the economic network. But we could hardly believe that they *were* being pulped. For the fact of the matter is that for one reason or another the total amount of money in circulation has actually been getting smaller. As soon as it falls below a certain level, the tolerable ratio between the number of banknotes in circulation and the number of employees in the bank will be upset and people will have to be sacked. That was what Chlebeček saw

coming – a cheerful message indeed for the New Year.

But enough of the bank, children dear. Let us turn to our pets, so much prettier and more soothing. Here I am, lying on the ground next to my guinea-pig and watching him closely. After long observation I find myself in a state of mind that I used to experience years ago, but had forgotten. When was the last time I *watched* anything really hard? When I was a little lad out in the fields. Let us consider, now, Observation as a State of Mind.

Modern life has an active quality. We are forever thrusting forward. The whole existence of our society, whether it is working or praying or amusing itself, is imbued with aggressiveness – acknowledged, encouraged, approved and taken for granted by the planning staffs. I'm not even thinking of fields like industry and diplomacy; prayer itself I regard as an aggression against God. The object of all the planning that is bred and instilled into us is, in the last resort, the attainment of satisfaction. This is the direction we move in, even on Sundays or when we're asleep, so that we feel any interruption of those movements as a delay in the satisfaction process. Everything that happens, the whole broad stream and sweep of events (including mild and pleasurable ones) must really be seen as a collision between civilised aggression-impulses. Nobody waits for anything any more, so there is nothing worth waiting for. And no one watches anything. Nobody practises or cultivates observation, no one teaches it, and everyone, unwittingly, has stopped doing it. Perhaps old people unconsciously succumb to it when they are not too busy remembering the past or putting their thoughts together, or dozing off, or even dying off when nobody's keeping an eye on them. True, we have our special institutions and laboratories for 'Observation'. But there the purpose of observation is production or investment. It has to yield a profit. So it has nothing in common with the kind of observing that I have in mind.

Observation in the true sense, as I said before and very approximately, is a state of mind. I will now refine that and say that it is a *form of existence*. It is continuous in time, shall we say, a passive, quiet, wordless form of being. Waiting for something? No, what for? For the true observer, time does not fly. He is not like a farmer, waiting for his crop to come up. He is not even interested in the results of his observation. He is not like a cat, studying the behaviour of mice. The observation I mean is a bodily state that leaves undisturbed the attitude of the mind – a mind gripped, but not strained, by anticipation. It is neither pleased nor repelled, for it passes no judgement. Observation is connected with the power to forget oneself, which makes it something that man, alone of the animals, is capable of, yet which requires the abandonment of human self-interest in the event observed. The ideal observer would be God, whose eye has no line of communication to His paws to allow Him to interfere in the course of events. God alone neither assists nor prevents anything; He watches things without seeing them as it

were, or sees them but has His money invested in another firm.

However, children dear, let us not even talk about God. Let us rather speak of our pets, which are smaller and easier to understand. I managed to get hold of a wooden packing crate and made it into a cage for the guinea-pig. The front side has a wire netting panel in it the height of a child's splayed hand. To make the guinea-pig feel safer from attack by carnivores – not that we have any around – I fitted a lid on top. But Pavel was not satisfied even with that and also put in a box that a clockwork car had been packed in. The guinea-pig promptly manoeuvred itself into this as if it had been a burrow, twisted round inside it with an effort that dishevelled every hair on its body, then folded itself contentedly and, resting its face on its forepaws, sat gazing out like a tobacco-kiosk woman, whiskers and all.

We were afraid at first that Pavel would kill the animal with constant carrying around. He certainly pays it enough attention. But he has a pretty good idea of the different needs of a four-week old guinea-pig and a nine-year old boy. Lucky guinea-pig not to have ended up belonging to one of your teenage lasses or, worse still, one of your dear-little-angel girls. Now they're the worst thing out, these days. They've got no work set for them, in fact practically nothing to bother about at all, so once they take it into their heads to look after something they pretty well ruin it. Thanks to their inane mothers. *Inane*, that means lazy, dolled up and thoroughly cheap. Those mothers of yours, you sweet angels, make me sick. You incompetent little nitwits – and I'm not only thinking about your piano-playing – you scare me stiff when I start wondering what sort of wives our boys are going to marry. We shall have to throw you down the front steps. Now don't be nervous; light up your silly imaginary cigarettes-of-the-future and mark my words, while there's still time. I can just imagine how one of you little angels, at Pavel's age, would look after a guinea-pig if it came into your hands. You'd squeeze it, you fatheads, and stroke it and muzz it around till it lost all its appetite out of sheer bliss, and its fur fell out and its eyes went dim. Then you'd bury it. I can just imagine the weeping and mourning – you'd enjoy that bit. Then you'd bring wee flowers to lay on its wee grave.

Now Pavel's way of looking after his guinea-pig shows responsibility. He cleans its cage out and moistens its corn regularly. He makes sure it has the privacy it wants. Pavel too might be tempted to imagine that it had got its nice white coat dirty and needed a bath. But he knows a guinea-pig mustn't get into any water or it'll die. For a long time Pavel worried about when a guinea-pig actually goes to sleep and whether it can get any sleep at all in our place. The only times we saw ours asleep it was sitting up with its eyes half-open. When Pavel finally caught it lying on its side, like a piglet, he came rushing to tell us about it. Albin, he concluded, must have got used to us.

'He's house-trained now,' he said.

'How can he be, without a house of his own?' objected Vašek.

'House-trained' refers to the owner's house,' said the resident schoolmarm.

'And that,' said I, 'means our house.'

So Vašek made a steel-tube scaffolding all round Albin's cage, just like a real-life tenement house. Then he made a concrete-mixer out of an old round food-tin with a rod through the middle and a little electric motor to drive it. Then came a builder's trowel and dipper and buckets, and pulleys and tackle to haul the mortar and stuff up the side. Every morning when Vašek was leaving for school two bricklayers appeared called Mr Kalfuss and Mr Malfuss, climbed up their ladders and across the planking on to the scaffolding and started work. After school Vašek would hurry home to catch them before they knocked off. There they would be, Mr Kalfuss and Mr Malfuss, just eating their sandwiches, drinking their beer and enjoying a smoke. The house was finished in the record time of two weeks.

'Now you've got a proper house for that Albin of yours,' Vašek explained to Pavel as he dismantled the scaffolding.

'Thank you, Mr Kalfuss and Mr Malfuss, and thank *you*, Vašek,' said Pavel.

'Mr Vašek,' the overseer corrected him.

We expected Albin to escape from his cage and get trodden on. But a guinea-pig is different from a kitten. It has no desire for a change of address, no curiosity. Quite the contrary, it's unhappy and squeaks if we take it out of its cage. Now it has learnt to negotiate the wire netting. At first it used to crawl up clumsily, catching its paws in every hole. Now it has found out how to bounce off the netting, jumping up against one edge of it and falling right across it and down the other side. But it only uses this route to get *inside*; actually to climb *out* is something it would never dream of doing.

It never sets out to do anything. I just can't understand about Karásek's guinea-pig walking on to his hand. Why I can't understand it is because if we put *ours* on the ground it always moves away from us, never towards. And it runs along close to the wall, like a mouse. It's only in the security of its cage that it behaves relatively normally and shows mildly gregarious inclinations. It will come up toward a hand placed in front of the netting, but only when it's hungry. It stops if you tickle the back of its neck, and half closes its eyes. But if you stroke the top of its head it will biff your hand away in a sudden fit of bad temper. It won't suffer its hindquarters to be touched at all – it tries to run away, and if it can't, it makes a fretful squeaking and turns angrily against the hand that annoyed it, chattering with its teeth. I am quite sure that if it were the right size, if it came up to my knee say, it would chew off your hand. (*Your* hand, not mine; *I* wouldn't be teasing it.) Those pairs of incisors, top and bottom, are on the go almost continuously whenever there's anything to discuss. But they never bite anyone. At first we imagined that a guinea-pig wouldn't have enough strength to

bite right through someone's finger. However, Eva had the experience of feeling her finger taken by mistake, *purely* by mistake, when she was offering the guinea-pig a carrot and it couldn't wait. So we found out that it had quite enough strength. And this enabled us to deduce that Pavel had had his nose bitten and hadn't just scratched himself as he claimed.

I often lie down on the floor to have a good look in to the cage. The guinea-pig sits quite still for a while, waiting to see what impact I am going to have on his life. Then it stirs itself cautiously and, finding that nothing dreadful results, takes a few stealthy steps. Within a few moments it's forgotten about me. Here and there it picks up a hay-stalk and starts honing its teeth on it. Then it goes on again, muttering quietly to itself and dropping its business behind it from time to time. Tiny dry droppings they are; we sometimes find large quantities in Pavel's bed and at one time thought of taking *him* to the doctor. I like to see Albin sit up on his behind and clean his face with his forepaws as he snorts gently. Then he feels an urge to scratch himself, rolls over on one side and tickles the back of his ear with a hindpaw. I feel he doesn't have a bad life with us, and he even seems to have put on weight.

Sometimes I ask myself what a guinea-pig really amounts to. Is it just a furry little machine? An aberration of the Divine mind, tripped up somewhere by lack of formal education? Who holds the responsibility for this little bundle that walks, makes noises of a sort, looks around and breathes? Still, I don't have that urge of all healthy young lads – to see inside it. Its floor is flat and warm. If I pick the little thing up it twitches in mid-air, flays around with its harmless paws and then collapses like a sackful of warm intestines. Extraordinary, quite extraordinary. I put it on my open palm; it turns this way and that, sniffing my hand and craning over the edge into the depths – but it doesn't take the plunge. It knows what's what. There's only one direction and it finds that one out: up my wrist and into my sleeve. Presto and there he is, burrowing deeper and deeper. Wonderful sensation.

I can't reconcile myself to the idea of such objects being bought and sold. Why is it allowed? It would be equally fair to sell me to the guinea-pig. Oh, these questions of right and wrong. . . You can go on buying animals one after another and no one even asks you what you've done with them. *Done* with them? It didn't get on with the others, you say; it was vicious; it was too big for its boots; it was cheeky – I had to give it away. Why, a horse is a thousand times bigger than our guinea-pig but it's no better off. Why don't we buy slaves nowadays? It's only what we're accustomed to. Horror is horror, whoever's involved. Don't you tie any frogs up on the garden gate, wicked boys! Nor any women down on the table, wicked soldiers! Senior clerk Chlebeček is an extraordinarily ugly spectacle. Bleary, protruding eyes? red, weepy nose; bad teeth. And smelly feet. The guinea-pig's fur smells like

a baby goat's. I put it back in its cage now and the thought quite shakes me: it's only been with us a few days and it's already convinced that it has a home here, with rights of residence, rights of intimacy and sovereignty and postal secrecy. No sooner do you release it from danger and let it run back home than it has a good pee, grooms its coat and pedicures itself – you can hear it trimming its claws where they've grown too long. Then it withdraws into its little box, turns round inside it with a great fuss, rests its head on its arms, watching and breathing, and closes its eyes. It's Sunday afternoon. The wife has fallen asleep over *Literární noviny* and by now she's equally oblivious of the weekly paper and of that ghastly little girl in her school. The boys have gone off to the railway station – anything but get on with their homework. When I can get up off the ground I shall have a look inside Pavel's report book. But I can't move – the messages aren't reaching my paws.

Having finally managed to get my paws into motion again I rummaged around in Pavel's satchel. No report book, though plenty of other reading matter. And yet nothing in it about guinea-pigs. An odd omission, I thought, and decided to write a piece on the spot for the school reader series. It went like this:

GUINEA-PIGS. We have a guinea-pig at home. It is small and sweet. It has white fur and red eyes. We call it Albin. Albin breathes, sits and watches. It watches all day. It eats greens, rye and hay. It makes a lot of tiny droppings. Pavel wonders why and shouts out: 'Albie, Albie! What are you doing there?' Vašek shouts to Pavel: 'He's only small!' Mummy shouts: 'He's only small so he must eat a lot.' And Daddy shouts: 'What goes in must come out.' We all love little Albin.

As soon as I had finished this article I sent it off to the School Reader Section at the Ministry of Education. I'm already looking forward to Pavel's surprise when his teacher hands him the next issue of his Czech anthology.

Translated by Deryck Viney

This excerpt is published by arrangement with The Third Press, 444 Central Park West, New York, who have the English-language copyright. They will be publishing THE GUINEA-PIGS in the U.S. later this year. This translation © W.S.I.

# INTERNATIONAL PEN AND ITS WRITERS IN PRISON COMMITTEE

David Carver

---

P.E.N. has developed to its present status as the only international writers' organisation from an idea that occurred to a woman novelist and poet, C.A. Dawson Scott, in the autumn of 1921. Mrs. Scott's notion was to bring together in the interests of freedom of expression writers of many nationalities, irrespective of their political views, colour, religion or the lack of it. She probably had little idea that P.E.N. would be capable of such growth that now, some fifty years later, it spans the globe, having eighty-two Centres in over sixty countries. The only notable absentees are the U.S.S.R. and Communist China.

The ruling body of P.E.N. is the Annual Congress which ratifies the work of the Executive Committee, which is composed of two delegates from each autonomous Centre officially appointed to serve. P.E.N. has a Charter to which all Centres and all members of Centres are required to subscribe. This Charter, which has gradually evolved from resolutions passed at early Congresses, has four clauses, as follows:-

P.E.N. affirms that:

1. Literature, national though it be in origin, knows no frontiers, and should remain common currency between nations in spite of political or international upheavals.
2. In all circumstances, and particularly in time of war, works of art, the patrimony of humanity at large, should be left untouched by national or political passion.
3. Members of P.E.N. should at all times use what influence they have in favour of good understanding and mutual respect between nations: they pledge themselves to do their utmost to dispel race, class and national hatreds, and to champion the ideal of one humanity living in peace in one world.

4. P.E.N. stands for the principle of unhampered transmission of thought within each nation and between all nations, and members pledge themselves to oppose any form of suppression of freedom of expression in the country and community to which they belong. P.E.N. declares for a free press and opposes arbitrary censorship in time of peace. It believes that the necessary advance of the world towards a more highly organised political and economic order renders a free criticism of governments, administrations and institutions imperative. And since freedom implies voluntary restraint, members pledge themselves to oppose such evils of a free press as mendacious publication, deliberate falsehood and distortion of facts for political and personal ends.

After fifty years it is not perhaps surprising that in some quarters views are held that the Charter is inadequate to present needs, and in fact certain amendments have recently been tabled for discussion. It seems likely that the consensus of opinion throughout the association will be to retain the Charter in its present form as a document still relevant and in any case historical, and adopt an 'amendment' which will constitute an addendum.

While the Charter of P.E.N. is specific in its requirements it can best be regarded as an expression of ideals which Centres must do their utmost to implement. Centres in countries which have a one-party governmental system must inevitably find it more difficult to achieve this consistently, especially in regard to complete freedom of expression with its corollary the condemnation of arbitrary censorship, than Centres domiciled in countries with a democratic or parliamentary system. It is, however, one of P.E.N.'s major achievements that its Congresses can be attended by delegates holding a variety of political opinions and yet able to take part in a meaningful debate. In fact P.E.N.'s international meetings can be claimed to be models of their kind in that they provide a free platform from which nothing is excluded except the bald political statement. The Thirty-ninth International Congress is due to be held in Manila, the capital of The Philippines, in November of this year, the Jubilee Congress having been held in Dublin in September 1971.

P.E.N. has always concerned itself with the plight of writers, and over the years has helped materially and spiritually the hundreds of writers who have gone into voluntary exile following repressive measures taken by totalitarian governments either of the Right or the Left. When in 1933 Hitler came to power in Germany scores of writers and journalists, mostly of Jewish blood, fled their country. There was a large exodus also from Austria following the Anschluss in 1938. Funds were raised on a large scale and with these it was possible to sustain the refugees during the period when they were trying, not always successfully, to establish themselves in Britain and earn some sort of a livelihood. Arthur Koestler's Fund for Exiled Writers, to which he devoted the whole of the profits from his play 'Darkness at Noon', was administered by P.E.N., and the fund still exists with charitable status in the U.S.A., but

alas now with empty coffers.

Since the Second World War and the return to their native countries of many writers who had made their temporary home in London, P.E.N.'s humanitarian work has been concerned more with attempting to persuade governments to cease harassing writers whose views are inimical to the prevailing political climate and with asking for clemency for those unfortunate enough to be arrested and thrown into prison or incarcerated in labour camps, often without proper trial.

In 1960, following the adoption of a resolution tabled at the P.E.N. Congress in Rio de Janeiro that year by the Centre for Writers in Exile, a *Committee for Writers in Prison* was established with powers to take what action was considered necessary but with the obligation to report to the Annual Congress. Prior to the formation of this Committee the General Secretary, acting in his official capacity, and in association wherever possible with the P.E.N. Centres of the countries concerned, endeavoured to persuade governments to exercise clemency, and even occasionally to release a writer from prison. With the formation of a permanent Committee which included amongst its members such distinguished literary figures as Arthur Miller, Storm Jameson, Rosamond Lehmann and Victor van Vriesland, P.E.N. was able to widen its work in this field. As Arthur Miller once remarked during a debate on the annual Congress Report, the Committee 'is rarely out of business'. That more and more writers at the present time are held in prison, often after savage sentences at rigged trials, or harassed and persecuted or confined to their homes or otherwise restricted is undeniable. P.E.N. therefore welcomes wholeheartedly the establishment of Writers & Scholars International and believes that the chances of helping those unfortunate colleagues who fall victims of arbitrary action by governments are greatly strengthened thereby. Up till now it has been P.E.N.'s practice not to publish detailed reports of the Writers in Prison Committee's activities, nor is it its habit to claim credit where through its efforts writers have been released or had their sentences commuted. A great deal of the Committee's work is done in private and will continue to be so.

It should be said that the work of the Writers in Prison Committee is widely regarded throughout International P.E.N. as the association's most important activity. That it has become so is an indication of the ever-increasing pressures by authority on writers in general. P.E.N.'s critics have often argued that more attention is paid to victims of Leftist governments such as the Soviet Union than to those of the extreme Right, and indeed these have, perhaps inevitably, received more publicity than their no less unfortunate fellow writers in such countries as Greece, Spain and Brazil. The persecution of Olga Ivinskaya, the friend of Boris Pasternak, against which P.E.N. protested vehemently, the trial and condemnation of Sinyavsky and Daniel, to

plead for whom the General Secretary went to Moscow, the severe harassment of Solzhenitsyn, still a major issue, are cases in point. But P.E.N. through its Committee has acted with equal fervour on behalf of the great Greek poet Yannis Ritsos, now grievously ill, and the Nigerian playwright Wole Soyinka — an emissary went specially to Lagos to make on-the-spot enquiries. Very recently P.E.N. collaborated with a group of prominent British publishers in securing the release and subsequent acquittal of the Brazilian Enio Silveira, and at its London meeting in April of this year the International Executive Committee passed a resolution calling for increased pressure on the Czech Government to cease its campaign against writers and intellectuals who actively supported the former Dubček Government in the so-called 'Prague Spring'.

In the history of any association there are events which in retrospect stand out as high and notable achievements. One such in P.E.N.'s past took place in Ragusa, now called Dubrovnik, in 1933.

On 25 May 1933 a resolution, which called upon the Congress to reaffirm provisions of the P.E.N. Charter which had been formulated in Brussels in 1927, was presented by the American delegate, Dr. Henry Seidel Canby. This concluded:

We likewise call upon the International Congress to take definite steps to prevent the individual centres of the P.E.N. founded for the purpose of fostering goodwill and understanding between the races and nations, from being used as weapons of propaganda in the defence of persecution inflicted in the name of Chauvinism, racial prejudice and political ill-will.

The passing of this motion provided the machinery by which the German delegates might be asked to give an account of their position, but in the meantime a score of delegates had got together and framed a more explicit resolution which the Germans refused to accept on the grounds that it was political. During the interval between the sessions and at the suggestion of the then International President, H.G. Wells, the delegates responsible for this resolution conferred with their German colleagues and amended it in such a way that all were apparently satisfied. Although it was couched in general terms, it nevertheless referred to the destruction of books. The German delegates informed the Chairman that they would support this motion on condition that there should be no discussion. Mr. Wells refused to bargain. He declared that the P.E.N. existed very largely to advocate freedom of expression, and that if those who had come to Yugoslavia with the intention of discussing the extremely critical situation in Germany were prevented from doing so, the P.E.N. would be stultifying itself; he thereupon threw the meeting open to discussion.

And now came the moment of drama. The English delegate, Hermon Ould, asked for permission to speak. He said that with every desire to maintain peace and to please the twenty-one delegates who had worked so hard to reach a common understanding, he was unable to agree to the passing of the

resolution without discussion; he had been sent by the English Centre to enquire into the position of the German P.E.N. in relation to the Hitler regime, and he would not be fulfilling his duty as a delegate if he failed to do so. He therefore asked permission to put the following two questions:

1. Had the German P.E.N. Centre protested against the ill-treatment of German intellectuals and the burning of the books?
2. Was it true that the Berlin Centre had issued a notice to its members depriving those of Communist or 'similar' views of their rights to membership, thereby violating the first rule of the P.E.N., that it should stand aside from politics?

Ernst Toller, the German poet and dramatist, whose appearance provoked enthusiastic applause, suggested that the resolution should be passed, and he would then speak. Mr. Wells, however, stated that he had allowed discussion, that the English delegate's questions were legitimate and if Herr Toller wished to speak he should speak now.

'If Herr Toller is allowed to speak', said one of the German delegates, Herr Fritz Otto Busch, 'we must withdraw our support to the resolution'.

Mr. Wells saw no reason for departing from his decision. Many writers of distinction were present and wished to speak, and he was not going to prevent them. This declaration was received with general applause. Whereupon the four German members walked out of the building. A long and excited demonstration ensued, the character of which could not be doubted. The withdrawal of the Germans could only be regarded as a means of escape from an impossible situation. Some of the Austrian, Swiss and Dutch delegates temporarily withdrew, but returned to their seats before the uproar had subsided. And by the autumn of that year the German Centre had ceased to exist.

David Carver is the General Secretary of International PEN.

## Clive Jordan

**Uncensored Russia**, edited by Peter Reddaway, Cape, £5.00.

**Red Square at Noon**, by Natalia Gorbanevskaya, Andre Deutsch, £2.95.

**Ferment in the Ukraine**, edited by Michael Browne, Macmillan, £4.50.

'The Ukrainian soul is fast asleep throughout Russia's vast spaces, oppressed by fear and lulled by chauvinist incantations'. Thus the Ukrainian political prisoner Mykhaylo Horyn wrote bitterly from Vladimir Prison. His metaphor of sleep could be extended to the peoples of the Soviet Union as a whole — no rejuvenating slumber, but rather the coma of concussion, with the mass bludgeoned and hypnotized into unconsciousness by Stalin, whose shadow still lies across Russia. Now, some sleepers are waking up, rubbing their eyes and telling their friends what they see. These three books provide further evidence of a varied and developing civil rights movement — and the resultant repressions; because the bad dream is all

around them still when they wake, the nightmare from Dr. Caligari's cabinet, the realization that the evil Dr. Caligari is not dead, and that the apparently sane storytellers are themselves inmates of his insane asylum. Unfortunately the Soviet authorities' recent vile practice of declaring dissenters insane and shutting them up in mental hospitals makes this no idle comparison. Chekhov's story *Ward 6*, in which a provincial doctor is committed to his own mental hospital, takes on a prophetic meaning for such victims; the writer Valery Tarsis, who first recounted this bizarre form of punishment in 1963, gave his thinly-veiled fiction the title of *Ward 7*.

These asylum prisons ('special psychiatric hos-

pitals') and their medical tortures are just one extreme of a barrage of sanctions available against anyone who inconveniently disagrees with the Soviet establishment. These range from the ordinary prison or labour camp, with differing standards of severity, or exile, for 'serious' offenders, to a host of administrative penalties, most commonly expulsion from the Party, youth or professional body (in the Soviet Union there is always some organization to be expelled from), for those who show any signs of 'waking up'. Peter Reddaway's invaluable compilation *Uncensored Russia* reveals the nature and scope of dissent and repression in the period from April 1968 to December 1969 (one of re nascent Stalinism) as it was covered by the first 11 issues of the unofficial Moscow journal, *A Chronicle of Current Events*. (Recent numbers are published in English by Amnesty International.)

Since the *Chronicle* is itself a notable piece of *samizdat* self-publishing, prepared in typescript by unknown editors, duplicated and circulated by hand, it owes its very form and existence directly to the Soviet censorship — a censorship which, to take just a few of the more ludicrous examples from *Uncensored Russia*, excises remarks in a museum's visiting-book, expels a reviewer from job and Party for too favourably reviewing the wrong book, confiscates alike a Hemingway novel and Marx's *Das Kapital*, deprives an imprisoned painter of his paints, seizes private tape-recordings of songs by a critic of the regime, and describes a copying machine as 'quasi-military equipment'. This is not yet the world of Ray Bradbury's *Fahrenheit 451*, where *all* books are banned and burnt; the fear of the written word testifies to its power. As a Soviet apologist puts it, the word is a weapon in the ideological struggle, to be used in the interests of Fatherland and people.

In this war of words, the possession of *samizdat*, which sets out to counterbalance 'official' printed material, is often made punishable by imprisonment, usually under Article 190 of the Russian Criminal Code dealing with the preparation and distribution of unintentional libels against the Soviet system. More serious libels with intent are covered by Article 70, the measure invoked in 1965 against the writers Sinyavsky and Daniel. These two articles, and their equivalents in the 'autonomous' Soviet republics, are the substance

of the authorities' legal case against the dissenters, and their interpretation is the subject of much debate and protest both in *samizdat* publications and in the courts.

Literary censorship, and especially the case of Sinyavsky and Daniel, could be described as the trigger of the whole human rights movement in the Soviet Union. If the work of Sinyavsky and Daniel could have been published openly, the fact of its publication abroad could not have been used against them at their trial. And it is from the protests against this trial that the movement has spiralled, narrow at its starting-point but growing ever wider, so that Galanskov's 'White Book' of *samizdat* materials about the Sinyavsky-Daniel proceedings resulted in the Galanskov-Ginzburg trial of 1968, which itself provoked Pavel Litvinov's own 'white book', *The Trial of the Four*. This trial also, for the first time, gave rise to protests from far-flung corners of the Soviet Union, and permitted the dual revelation of a hard core of intellectual protesters and a platform of grievances which went far beyond the original call for freedom of artistic expression. After the intervention in Czechoslovakia, Soviet dissent reverberated with echoes from abroad. At home it grew to embrace the question of the rights of national minorities, especially Ukrainian, Jewish and Crimean Tatar, and of religious believers, the *religiozniki*. And it threw up a number of brave and determined individuals whose protest letters to Soviet authorities, the United Nations and foreign worthies, together with their own trials and sentences, were epicentres of minor earthquakes, each leading to further investigations and arrests, each reported and discussed in the constantly expanding volume of *samizdat*.

From these outstanding individuals, themselves merely the most publicized and vocal representatives of the tens of thousands of political prisoners in the camps, one man can perhaps be singled out: former Major-General Piotr Grigorenko, whose activity covers virtually the whole gamut of the human rights movement, from protest against the trials of Moscow intellectuals, condemnation of Russian action in Czechoslovakia, accounts of his own maltreatment in prison and psychiatric hospital to his championship of a national minority, the 500,000 Tatars left from those deported by Stalin to Central Asia from the Crimea. It was

the cause of the Crimean Tatars which first brought together the Moscow radicals and the representatives of an aggrieved national minority. In the 'Catch 22' situation of the Soviet Union today, the eminently sane Grigorenko has paid the penalty for his humanism: repeated imprisonment in mental hospitals where he can remain indefinitely after being declared insane. Not long after his imprisonment, in the spring of 1969, the first formal human rights group, the 'Action Group for the Defence of Civil Rights' was formed, with 25 members from different parts of the country, to lobby international public opinion on behalf of political detainees such as Grigorenko. It provides plain evidence, together with the *Chronicle* itself, that a Russian human rights movement, as distinct from a number of unconnected protests, actually exists.

All this the *Chronicle* both reflects and brings into focus. To clarify the sequence of related events, Peter Reddaway has arranged selected material from the first 11 issues by subject matter, connected by his own illuminating commentary and with a wealth of notes and rare photographs. The journey through these dense and sombre thickets is initially daunting, but eventually rewarding. The *Chronicle* emerges as a genuine mouthpiece of the Russian 'alternative society'. Although it is willing to editorialize on major issues such as the invasion of Czechoslovakia, its approach is deliberately austere, concerned mainly to tell truths which the official journals dare not or will not tell, and to gain credence by the manner of the telling. So it records demonstrations, summarizes and sometimes quotes unpublished protest letters, and lists arbitrary actions by the authorities.

Like our Western counter-cultures, the elements questioning Soviet orthodoxy vary widely, but the *Chronicle* does have its own inner unity. The key is its concern to give the victims of repression a human face. So it prints biographies of notable political prisoners, with their camp addresses where known, and sometimes the birthdays of their children, and it even records events such as hunger strikes in the twilight world of the prison camps. What unites the dissenters is a determination not to sink again into the anonymous barbarism and arbitrary rule of Stalin's time. Though some leading personalities discussed in the

*Chronicle*, like Solzhenitsyn or Anatoly Marchenko, have had direct experience of Stalin's rule, many of the dissenters are 'new people', the reluctant heirs of the Stalinist period, even to the extent of having lost parents in Stalin's purges. If their movement has developed its own spiralling momentum, they know that the consequences of Stalin's tyranny are also still being worked out — not least in official indifference to the deported and deprived national minorities.

'Unsearchable is the book of our destinies,' wrote the Elizabethan polemicist Thomas Nashe. 'One murder begetteth another: was never yet bloodshed barren from the beginning of the world to this day.' The dissenters are trying to prove Stalin's bloodshed barren after all, and paradoxically see the law as their surest weapon — that very law which, in the hands of Stalin's other heirs, is used unjustly to condemn them, but actually guarantees freedom of speech, the Press, assembly and processions under Article 125 of the USSR constitution. Hence their concern to debate legal issues with their accusers and point out violations of the legal code to appropriate quarters inside and outside the Soviet Union. Hence the space which the *Chronicle* gives to accounts of political trials, ensuring the publicity they are guaranteed under the law but denied in practice. The *Chronicle* records and embodies an attempt to combat Stalinism by upholding exactly those 'alternative' civilized standards, of humanity, legality and responsibility which go by default of official Soviet life.

*Red Square at Noon* amplifies the *Chronicle's* account of just one of those assertions of responsibility, the tiny, peaceful sit-down demonstration in Red Square on 25 August 1968 against the Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia. All 8 demonstrators were arrested. One denied her participation and was released; one — the fine arts specialist Victor Fainberg — was so badly beaten up in the Square that he was declared insane to prevent him appearing in court; and five were subsequently charged, tried and sentenced to exile or labour camp for terms of two and a half to five years. Only one who admitted her part, the poet Natalya Gorbanevskaya, was released, because she was the mother of two small children, one of whom she took with her to Red Square in a pram. Her response to this unexpected freedom (as Daniel

Weissbort described in the spring number of *Index*) was two-fold. First, she addressed a letter to the world's press describing the demonstration and its results, reaffirming hostility to Russian policy in Czechoslovakia. Second, she compiled the present book which is a further account of the demonstration, the medical examination which declared her technically insane, and the trial of her fellow protesters. By the end of 1969, after this book had appeared in *samizdat*, she was confined to a psychiatric prison from which she re-emerged earlier this year.

Natalya Gorbanevskaya's activities spring from the same sense of the obligations of freedom which characterizes the *Chronicle*. She decided to write her protest letter to the press because 'I have remained free and must therefore see the matter through to the end'. Time has approved her actions. World-wide publicity has transformed a failed political gesture into a milestone in the Soviet human rights movement.

*Red Square at Noon* is no *Armies of the Night*; unlike Norman Mailer, Gorbanevskaya deliberately reins in her imagination. The dominant impression is one of sturdy commonsense, a feminine practicality which notes how she hemmed the banners before transporting them to Red Square under the blankets of her child's pram. Much of the book consists of documents from other hands, but the author's personality is there just the same. It must be the poet speaking when the destruction of their simple slogans provokes her to say 'I shall never forget the sound of ripping cloth'.

There is no trace, however, of tearing nerves. The 'insane' Natalya Gorbanevskaya is sane enough to write to the trial judge asking, uselessly, to be admitted. The trial transcripts show clearly the polarization between conservatives and radicals, between the court officers and the defendants. The high moral and mental qualities of her fellow demonstrators also emerge, but at the same time these are glimpses into the murky underworld of the instruments of censorship and repression, the KGB. These are the others, the 'members of the Committee' (in the graphic Ukrainian phrase 'the men from the hotel'), the plain-clothes men who actually followed some of the demonstrators to Red Square and were ready to arrest them the moment they began, who gave patently rigged

evidence yet could not be closely questioned in court, and refused to identify publicly their uniforms, names or military units. There is a fascinating insight, too, into their methods outside the court room, where friends of the accused were harassed by abusive hirelings drunk on free KGB vodka, where the rank odour of King Mob was in the air, and violence was prevented only by the presence of the foreign press.

The real kingdom of the KGB, though, is in the investigating rooms, camps and prisons. Perhaps the most remarkable document in Michael Browne's collection *Ferment in the Ukraine*, a dossier of Ukrainian dissent in the 1960's, is the essay written in a labour camp by the historian Valentyn Moroz entitled *A Report from the Beria Reservation*. In a frame of reference which touches effortlessly on Slavonic myth, African culture and Western literatures, Moroz satirizes the KGB mentality and that of the 'programmed man' invented by Stalin, the creator of the 'Empire of the Cogs'. It is also a scathing denunciation of the lawless conditions in the KGB's vast complex of camps throughout the swampy central Russian republic of Mordovia. Here most political prisoners are sent, and among them, by one estimate, Ukrainians comprise as many as 60 to 70 per cent. Dissent in the Ukraine is complicated, deepened and invigorated by national feeling. This looks back to the independent Ukraine of 1917-19, and draws inspiration from the 'spiritual treasury' of the Ukrainian language and literature, particularly the 19th century poet Shevchenko, who was himself sentenced by Tsar Nicholas I to army service in a remote province, and forbidden to write or paint. (The Ukrainian counterpart of Russian *samizdat* to this day is 'bootleg' literature, alluding to Shevchenko's defiance of the ban by hiding his poetry in his military boots).

Only echoes of the recent Ukrainian historical experience have reached the mainstreams of literature through Russian writers. Isaac Babel's story *Sulak*, hard and polished as meteorite, symbolizes the snuffing-out of resistance in the 1920's, and Anatoli Kuznetsov's novel *Babi Yar* vividly evokes the divided, Nazi-occupied Ukraine of the war years. The Nazi invasion allowed Ukrainian nationalism to flare again in the anti-Russian factions of the OUN and the UPA, which went on contesting Russian rule, sometimes by force of arms, till well

after the war. The unahppy survivors of these Ukrainian separatist movements are still languishing in the Mordovian camps, and figure in the list of post-war political prisoners at the end of Michael Browne's anthology.

Such a background gives dissent against Soviet censorship in the Ukraine more explicitly political overtones. Thus in the secret 'Jurists' trial' of 1961 in which the indictments were based on a brochure setting out political aims, the 7 defendants were charged not merely with anti-Soviet agitation, but also with treason, partly on the grounds that they had advocated secession of the Ukraine from the Soviet Union (which is actually the right of all Union republics, guaranteed by the Soviet constitution). Also the name of an OUN leader has provided the predominantly Russian authorities in the Ukraine with a convenient word of abuse: 'Bandera-ite'. So Ukrainian can be sneeringly described as 'the Bandera-ite tongue'.

Discrimination against the Ukrainian language, and the continuing 'Russification' of administration and teaching (that is, according to critics of the regime such as Ivan Dzyuba, author of *Internationalism or Russification?*), naturally add an anti-Ukrainian flavour to the censorship. Ukrainian works which promote pro-Ukrainian sentiments are quite likely not to be published in Russian; in searches for *samizdat* material, old books about the more heroic periods of Ukrainian history and any documents 'of a clearly national character' risk confiscation. A more disturbing possibility has been raised in an anonymous pamphlet which blames the burning-down in 1964 of the Library of the Kiev Academy of Sciences, the greatest Ukrainian library, on Russian chauvinism, and also mentions similar fires in two national libraries in Central Asia.

Concern for Ukrainian language and culture colours all the protests. One feature of this Ukrainian material is the readiness of men of letters to put themselves at risk by passing on petitions from the labour camps to the relevant authorities. The moving complaints from men involved in the 'Jurists' case', including one man who was duped by the KGB, were transmitted by the literary critic Ivan Svitlychny. In mid-1965, coinciding with the arrests of Sinyavsky and Daniel, a number of Ukrainian intellectuals were also arrested, tried and sentenced in secret. Among them was Moroz,

whose devastating pamphlet was passed on by the young journalist V.M. Chornovil, later arrested himself. His dossier about the 1965-66 trials and arrests has since reached the West as *The Chornovil Papers*. In April 1968 the 'Letter of the 139' about legal abuses in the 1965-66 trials, was addressed to the highest Soviet authorities by Ukrainian writers, academics and workers. It coupled Ukrainian civil rights cases for the first time with the Galanskov-Ginzburg trial, and thus with the *Chronicle of Current Events* and the main current of Soviet dissent. A native Ukrainian equivalent of the *Chronicle*, the *Herald*, began to appear in 1970, and a measure of continuing independence in the Ukraine from Moscow-based *samizdat* is no doubt to be expected.

The last letter in the book is a tragic complaint to the Human Rights Commission of the United Nations about drugging and poisoning of food in the camps and prisons, written by three of the prisoners in the 'Jurists' case' after 8 years of their sentence. It is a reminder that the United Nations has been a source of hope to Soviet dissenters. The very first issue of the *Chronicle* began by linking the date set for the Galanskov-Ginzburg trial with UN Human Rights Year 1967-8 and with the 20th anniversary of the UN's Declaration of Human Rights (the Declaration which one KGB guard remarked to a prisoner 'is only for Negroes'). This hope is in marked contrast to the way the United Nations has actually dealt with their appeals. Not only have these all gone unanswered; in October 1969, after a particular appeal by the Action Group for the Defence of Civil Rights, U Thant accepted a Soviet government argument and instructed all 50 UN information centres throughout the world to stop forwarding petitions – meaning that all Russian appeals would have to go through the mails and be subject to the normal censorship of letters. The UN's impotence is etched the more clearly against the *Chronicle's* account of prisoners in several of the camps being punished for hunger strikes in connection with International Human Rights Day, just two months later. At present the 16,000 petitions received annually are formally noted by the Human Rights Commission – and passed back for action to the national governments concerned. The irony is obvious. Is it too much to hope that one day the UN Human

Rights Division will have the authority and freedom of action it needs to respond properly to these victims? Meanwhile, Soviet dissenters will no doubt continue to surprise, embarrass and perhaps

occasionally convince the authorities by shaking the unfamiliar scarecrow of domestic public opinion. And in the awakening of world public opinion, these three books have a part to play.

# Daniel Weissbort

**Ungarded Thoughts**, by Andrey Sinyavsky,  
Translated by Manya Harari, Collins & Harvill Press, 1972, 95p;  
**Prison Poems by Yuli Daniel**, Translated by David Burg  
and Arthur Boyars, Calder and Boyars, 1971, £1.50;  
**Yuli Daniel, Stikhi Iz Nevoli**, Fond Imeni Gertsena,  
Amsterdam, 1971.

In the books under review, the two men whose trial in 1965 inaugurated the present phase of the official campaign against so-called dissidents in the Soviet Union, give us an intimate glimpse into their personalities that is not provided by their more widely known stories and essays. In the context of the continuing struggle for Civil Rights in the Soviet Union, it is enlightening and moving to have these books by Daniel and Sinyavsky to remind us so forcefully of the profoundly moral nature of the movement to which these men belong.

As Sinyavsky and Daniel are remembered for their fantastic, expressionistic stories, surrealistic in the reality-rooted, Gogolian sense (it is, incidentally, interesting to note how much Gogol, who has hitherto had few imitators in Russia, has influenced the more independent Soviet writers), the evident *religious* tone of the writings under review is startling.

Indeed, the most striking thing about Daniel's poems and Sinyavsky's often poemlike 'thoughts' is their profound seriousness: they are the reverse of cynical. There is also astonishingly little bitterness, little or no vindictiveness. On the contrary, both writers seem to have accepted their after-all self-willed destiny in a spirit that can only be described as Christian humility, though neither of them aspires to the martyr's crown — they are far too conscious of human frailty (their own, rather than that of others) for that. They accept their ordeals as expressions of a divine will whose purpose may at times be guessed, though it may also be impenetrable, Daniel inclining to the former

and somewhat more optimistic view and Sinyavsky to the latter and more darkly mystical one.

Sinyavsky is, indeed, altogether 'darker' in his writings than Daniel. I say 'darker' rather than 'more profound', because there are elements in *Ungarded Thoughts* that might strike a Westerner as almost pathological, having more to do with guilt feelings and repression than with depth of thought, though on the evidence of their writings, it is probably true to say that Sinyavsky is the more 'intellectual' of the two men. Sinyavsky's world, as it emerges from the pages of *Ungarded Thoughts* — and it is also, from one point of view, the world of present-day Soviet Russia — closely resembles the picture of *nineteenth-century* Russia that we find in Dostoyevsky and Gogol (particularly Dostoyevsky). There is the same soul-searching of an intensity and complexity that seems peculiar to Slavdom. Indeed, it is possibly misleading to try to analyse Sinyavsky's thought out of this context and disregarding the tradition to which he is so obviously more heir than Daniel, whose Slavic 'darkness' and gravity is lightened by a philosophical cheerfulness, an unemphatic and perfectly natural humility that is recognizably Jewish.

Though Sinyavsky insists again and again on the need for tolerance, he reveals himself as basically intolerant of the human condition, able to accept, say, its sexual manifestations as a reflection of forces of evil that have a necessary place in the scheme of things only insofar as they complement the forces of good. But, more immediately, for Sinyavsky, sexual fulfilment and satisfaction are largely linked with the wicked pleasures of tasting

