

on censorship

index

1/1973

50 p

Turkey on the slippery slope
Dogan Ozguden and others

Irish TV sackings Paul O'Higgins

Un-American activities
Geoffrey Ryan

Barber Novak's dictatorship
Jiri Hochman

Spain's golden silence
Diego Dieguez

Poems by Kim Chi-hah

editor: Michael Scammell
assistant editor: Jenefer Coates
editorial board: Victoria Brittain, Stuart Hampshire,
Peter Reddaway, Stephen Spender

reference and Index *Index*: James Collins
advertising: Susan Strachan
distribution: Philip Spender
subscriptions: Michael Murray
design: Hannah Oorthuys

index

spring 1973 volume 2 no.1

	Turkey on the slippery slope	page 3
Dogan Oztgüden	<i>The press under martial law</i>	4
	A Turkish journalist on the press and its present difficulties under martial law	
	<i>Postscript on the universities</i>	11
Osman Turkey	<i>International Federation of Journalists in Istanbul</i>	13
	An account of the F I J's 11th General Assembly and its concern for Turkish journalists	
	<i>'Hope' fades</i>	15
	How a Turkish film was deprived of its prize	
Paul O'Higgins	The Irish TV sackings	21
	The facts about the dismissal of the entire board of Radio Telefís Eireann and how it came about	
Geoffrey Ryan	Un-American activities	25
	The first of two articles on the U S A's most famous congressional committee plus an extract from its hearings	
Kim Chi-hah	'Groundless rumour' and other poems	39
	Kim Chi-hah's controversial long poem on South Korea's social problems, introduced by <i>Phil Billingsley</i>	
Ken Zeilig	Anatomy of a security risk	53
	A Canadian journalist on how Dr Istvan Meszaros overcame government opposition to take up his university post in Toronto	
Dobrica Cosić	Trials, verdicts and naive questions	61
	The Serbian novelist's now banned article questioning the trials of writers and intellectuals in Yugoslavia	

Jiří Hochman	Barber Novak's dictatorship	71
	Two chapters from the satirical novel <i>Stag Ford</i> about an imaginary Czech village that has 'dropped out' of communism	
	Index index	i-xvi
	a chronicle of censorship and the suppression of freedom of expression throughout the world, appears between pages 80 and 81	
Victor Swoboda	Cat and mouse in the Ukraine	81
	How <i>samizdat</i> publication is being threatened by a rising wave of arrests and persecution in the Ukraine	
Diego Diéguez	Spain's golden silence	91
	Spain's censorship as experienced by a Spanish novelist	
Peter Schumacher	Press censorship in Indonesia	101
	A brief look at the state of the press in post-Sukarno Indonesia	
	For the record	
	The complete text of two documents instructing Czech librarians on how to censor and classify their holdings	104
	A Soviet professor on academic solidarity	109
	<i>Spicing the national stew</i>	111
	<i>'Dead Souls' in Rumania</i>	113
	Letters to the editor	115
	Books	
John Grigg	Pressures on the Press by Charles Wintour	119
Neville March-Hunnings	Censorship in Britain by Paul O'Higgins	120
Robert McDonald	Journals of Resistance by Mikis Theodorakis	122
Thompson Bradley	<i>Novy mir: A Selection 1925-67</i> by Michael Glenny	124
Ben Whitaker	The Right to Say No by Judith Todd	125
Christopher Cviic	Croatian Orthography	127
	Contributors	129
	Subscription form	133

Index is published by Writers & Scholars International
35 Bow Street, London WC2R 7AU. Telephone 01-240 2254

Subscriptions £2 for 1 year, £5 for 3 years

Copyright © Writers & Scholars International 1973

Printed in England by Villiers Publications Ltd, London NW5

Ken Zeilig

Anatomy of a security risk

The case of Dr Istvan Meszaros underlines a disturbing trend since the end of the sixties by Western Governments to attack certain areas within the university. It is the kind of attack which universities, indeed, all those who have any part at all in intellectual life today should resist. The principle at stake is intellectual freedom; unfettered speech in the Academy. The issue is whether any government has the right to label a man a security risk and then, using this formula which involves a cloak of secrecy, to destroy a man, his family, and his career.

This particular case began on 20 October 1971 when Dr Meszaros received a letter from the Division of Social Science at York University, Toronto, expressing an interest in having him come to the university to teach. In January 1972, Meszaros and his family went to Toronto for a few days where he had discussions with colleagues at the university. As a result of that visit, Meszaros received a five-year contract in late February. He accepted the contract which was to begin on 1 July 1972.

The Board of Governors at York ratified the contract in early March and when it was received in Brighton on 21 March, Meszaros wrote to the Canadian High Commissioner's Office in London to apply for landed immigrant status. The forms were posted on 30 March. Two interviews at the Canadian High Commissioner's Office in London, followed. On 21 April Dr and Mrs Meszaros had

their civil interview where the points system¹ and their documents were checked. The second interview, a 'political' interview,² was conducted on 1 June.

On 14 July the Canadian High Commissioner's Office in London sent Meszaros a letter which rejected the application. The letter said that admission could not be approved because it would be 'contrary to Canadian public interest' (a euphemism for security risk).

Also, in that letter there was a meaningless clause which stated that Meszaros should not proceed to Canada without first obtaining written authorisation from the London Immigration office. Legally, as a British citizen, Meszaros was entitled to go as a visitor wherever his passport was accepted, unless the Immigration Authorities could show cause.

At this point, York University intervened. A senior staff member at York University, Professor Neal Wood, was in Britain on a sabbatical and he sent telegrams to the President of York and to others. An appeal was set in motion by York University. Meszaros was assured that this was a 'perfectly normal' thing to happen to left-wingers applying for immigration status in Canada. York University itself had had at least three appointees halted at the border in the past and other would-be applicants had declined to submit to harassment. Anyway, they seemed quite certain that eventually as a result of the appeal procedure Meszaros would get his visa. On the strength of that assurance he put in his resignation to Sussex University. Sussex did not accept it at first because they thought that as things were not one hundred per cent certain the resignation should be left on the table. But eventually they had to accept the resignation in September because there were various other people whose future depended upon what happened to Meszaros.

On 19 September Meszaros, ignoring the warning in the High Commissioner's letter, exercised his

¹This is an elaborate method of point-getting, devised to measure an immigrant's suitability by taking account of age, education, marital status, health, employment possibilities, and current employment in Canada.

²It was not called political by the authorities - it was a letter requesting further questioning and information. The meeting on 1 June lasted less than 30 minutes during which time Dr and Mrs Meszaros were questioned separately: 'Were you/are you members of the Communist Party?' 'Did you have anything to do with the Hungarian secret police?'

lawful right to go to Canada as a visitor in order to look into what had happened to his university appeal and to speed up a decision to resolve the problems. After he had been in Toronto for four days, on 22 September, it was learned that the University appeal had been rejected. The rejection seems to have been based on Meszaros's decision to go to Canada as a visitor, for Immigration Minister, Bryce Mackasey, was quoted in the *Toronto Star* as saying: 'He could have stayed in England and I told him I would have reviewed the case, but he chose not to, instead coming here illegally'. This diversionary tactic served to deflect public attention from the original issue of whether Meszaros could be granted a landed immigrant's status or not onto the secondary question of whether or not his entry as a visitor had been legal and in the event turned out to be a major complicating factor. Meszaros himself was 'enraged' (to quote his own words) by this betrayal of a basic principle and determined to fight the battle through to the bitter end.

Meanwhile Meszaros's Toronto lawyer, Paul Copeland (a specialist immigration lawyer), had advised him to apply *internally* for immigrant status. This he did on 22 September (on the same day, coincidentally, that he learned that his London appeal had been turned down). At this point, when it became apparent that Meszaros was going to press his case further, the Department of Manpower and Immigration made its first move towards a compromise and offered Meszaros a special one-year visa which would allow him to teach on the condition that he withdrew his application for an immigrant's visa. He refused this 'deal', stating that he was determined to clear his name. And it was during this sequence of events that an assistant to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration implied that Meszaros might be a Russian KGB agent.

As an internal applicant for landed immigrant status, however, Meszaros was now on a different footing from when he had applied from London. It meant that he had access to an appeal procedure. Armed with this right of appeal, for which the immigration department were under obligation to show cause, Meszaros's lawyer served a writ of *mandamus* on the Office of the Immigration Ministry to reach a decision on the internal application, and if the decision was negative, to show

cause. For tactical reasons, this was left until 10 October, a few weeks after the refusal to allow the York University appeal of 22 September.

The Immigration Office responded to this writ by instituting a deportation order on the ground that Meszaros was a non bona fide visitor, thus sticking to their diversionary tactic and deliberately confusing the issue. For as long as they could proceed with the non bona fide visitor issue they didn't have to answer the writ of *mandamus*. But there were already signs that something was wrong with the government's case. Another gesture of conciliation was made, offering to drop the security risk charge if Meszaros would make certain concessions. As Meszaros recalled the situation later: 'Mr Mackasey, through his special assistant Zaive Levine, made us an offer as late as 17 October saying that everything ... almost everything had been cleared up. The matter was almost settled. There was only one last little thing that the Minister would like to look into and they thought that even that would be cleared up ... let me simply go back to England for a fortnight to let the Minister save face. And he used that expression five times in the course of the conversation - that the only problem was not really me or me being a spy or anything of the kind, but to find a way, a formula, through which I could let the Minister save his face.' But Meszaros, after the humiliations he had endured and in the light of the Immigration Department's tactics, was in no mood to save the Minister's face.

The deportation hearing lasted until 15 November and resulted in an order against Meszaros. An appeal against that decision was lodged immediately. Had the case continued, this appeal would have gone to the Immigration Appeal Board, which is independent of the Minister, but by now the Canadian elections had intervened and resulted in the appointment of a new Minister of Manpower and Immigration - Robert Andras (Bryce Mackasey, although returned with a substantial majority, was not re-offered his former post and was in fact dropped from the Cabinet).

The new Minister was less concerned with the diversionary non bona fide visitor issue and more intent to examine the merits of the case: was Meszaros' presence in Canada really contrary to the interest of the Canadian public? Briefly, the answer was no. But the machinery for unscrambling the

case at this point was rather complicated and face still had to be saved on behalf of the Department as a whole. On 22 December 1972, therefore, the office of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration Robert Andras, in Ottawa, issued the following statement: 'Professor Meszaros has full access to the judicial process as evidenced by his Appeal currently before the Immigration Appeal Board. Furthermore, the Government has no intention of inhibiting the range of action that the Board could take. I have explained that as Minister I have no power to withdraw the deportation order as the law does not permit me to do so ... while the case is before the Immigration Appeal Board. As it now stands the appeal process of the case must proceed unless Professor Meszaros himself chooses to withdraw his appeal and return voluntarily to the United Kingdom. I am prepared to stand by the offer made by my predecessor to review the case should Professor Meszaros return to the United Kingdom.'

The courses now open to Meszaros were either to remain and go through with the appeal procedure concerning the Deportation Order (based on the irrelevant issue of whether he had entered Canada legally or not) or to go back to England, abandon the appeal and continue with the original application or reapply. In other words, it was still necessary to leave Canada just as Mr Mackasey's assistant had suggested. But this time it was with the new minister's assurance that the renewed application was just a formality and would not be rejected. Accordingly Meszaros returned to England, reapplied and left for Canada once more on 22 January 1973.

And so, it is a story with a happy ending. But the question arises as to how such an incident could occur in the first place and how it is that a man's entire career can be placed in jeopardy as a result of mere hearsay and rumour. Would it have happened if Meszaros had not been Hungarian, or if his political philosophy had been of the right instead of the left? Or was there some truth after all in the allegations that Meszaros' Marxism had been translated into concrete political action?

His academic colleagues are overwhelmingly of the opinion that this was not so. Tom Bottomore, Professor of Sociology at Sussex University, has characterised Meszaros as follows:

I don't think that he regards himself as being a political activist at all except in specific and unusual circumstances, as for instance in Hungary when he expressed his opposition to Stalinism in a particularly critical period; and since he came to England in 1959 he has shown himself to be a scholar. As a scholar he's quite outstanding and a very stimulating teacher. First, because he knows extremely well Marxist philosophy and in a more general way the philosophy of the social sciences, secondly, because he has a definite point of view - a critical point of view which he expounds well - and thirdly, because he's always ready to engage in debate about this point of view, about his ideas and other people's ideas. He's not a dogmatist.

Professor Roy Edgeley, also at Sussex, commented on the allegation that Meszaros had links with the KGB:

All the facts speak against it. He was one of the first citizens of a communist state to speak out against Stalinism in 1953 when, as a student of Georg Lukács, a Hungarian Marxist theoretician, he deplored what was going on in Hungary - against Lukács' advice incidentally. He has taught for thirteen years in British universities and in that period scrupulously observed the academic code and has never been the object of any complaint by the university authorities. Istvan is being penalised for his opinions and not for his actions.

Finally the late Tibor Szamuely, who was noted at his University (Reading), where he lectured in Politics, and from numerous articles he contributed to the *Spectator* as a right-winger and an anti-communist, commented shortly before his untimely death:

I would from my very brief knowledge of Meszaros and his writings say that this is a very unlikely contingency ... I would need considerable proof to accept this. What we have here is a very unconvincing story about a man whose activities, whose name, indeed, I would imagine, would be completely unknown to the public. And the public is asked to take it or leave it. A very unsatisfactory state of affairs! ... The question is: is he a danger to the state? I would say from what I know - no. I mean he can't be a danger ... He's not the kind of person who'd lead a crowd of enraged young students to the barricades. By no means! Moreover, in the last few years we've had more than our fair share of unfortunate happenings in universities. I have never seen his name mentioned.

All that this leaves is rumour and speculation. Some observers maintain that the rumours started

with anti-communist members of the Hungarian emigré community in Britain, who were alarmed by Meszaros' past and jealous of his reputation. Some of them, it is true, are of the opinion that no Marxist can be a good Marxist, but no-one has gone on record actually believing what has been whispered about Meszaros behind the scenes.

The parties who come worst out of the affair are the Canadian government and, to a lesser extent, Canadian academics, who have witnessed this sort of incident in the past without doing a lot to help. Still, it may be that the publicity will bring some ultimate benefit. Meszaros himself is surprisingly optimistic, and his, perhaps, should be the last word on the subject:

I hope my case has improved the conditions of academic and intellectual freedom. The Association of Canadian Colleges and Universities has established a committee in connection with this case which has the task of looking into the procedures; and then they engaged a lawyer to deal with this problem, to work out the proper machinery for future appointments, not only permanent appointments but also visiting appointments - visiting professors. There are many people involved in the same predicament as myself . . . I hope that this case has contributed to other cases. I am convinced that the new minister who reviewed the case will look into how such decisions are possible at all and how they should be avoided in the future because I am sure they weren't pleased about it! And why should these things happen? Why isn't it possible to admit at some point that an error, a mistake, has been made? Are they gods?

New Humanist for poetry

Recent poets include:

Philip Larkin
D. J. Enright
Lawrence Durrell
Jon Stallworthy
Douglas Dunn
Elaine Feinstein
John Miles
Andrew Waterman
Robert Conquest
Jeni Couzyn
Martin Seymour-Smith
J. R. Howell
Michael Longley

New Humanist for the arts

Recent articles include:

Solzhenitsyn Considered
by **W. J. Igoe**
Eroticism In Art
by **Peter Spence**
Shakespeare, Humanist or
Christian?
by **Roger Manvell**
A Look at George Orwell
by **Jeremy Sandford**
Behind the Mirror - Some
Reflections on Art & Science
by **David Dickson**
Bob Dylan - Twisted Truth
by **Mick Farren**

New Humanist for you

Include it in your choice each month.

New Humanist, the new magazine of political, social and philosophical analysis with book reviews, new poetry, chess and crossword page, is available through your local newsagent or from branches of W. H. Smith and J. Menzies at 15p. For a free copy write to: Dept. IX, New Humanist, 88 Islington High Street, London, N1 8EL.

Canadian government v. the universities

Istvan Meszaros is the latest in a growing list of academics who have been refused entry to Canada for unspecified security reasons and his case has raised international cries of protest.

The Hungarian-born Marxist scholar is appealing an immigration board order to deport him for being in Canada illegally and is continuing his fight 'to clear my name'.

Many before Meszaros fought decisions to bar them from the country because they were considered risks to national security. Some won and are now teaching in Canadian universities, several of them at York University, which hired Meszaros. Others gave up and went to teach elsewhere.

'Dozens have had the same kind of difficulties as Meszaros,' says Gabriel Kolko, a history professor who came to York from the United States in 1970. An outspoken critic of American involvement in Vietnam, he was first denied a visa, then allowed to stay.

D. I. Davies, a sociologist who came to York this year from Queen's University in Kingston, calls immigration officials 'insensitive political idiots'.

He said Ottawa rejected the application earlier this year of Hamza Alavi, an anthropologist at Meszaros' former university, apparently because of his involvement in the Bangladesh movement.

'He quit his job and sold his house,' says Davies. After personal appeals to Ottawa failed, 'We tried to persuade him to come anyway and fight but he thought that if the country doesn't want him, why should he?'

Davies says that another man who was rejected was Michael Halliday, an internationally renowned linguistic professor hired last year by the University of British Columbia.

His only political activity was membership in a university Communist club 20 years ago, Davies says. Halliday finally went to teach in Kenya.

A celebrated case was that of Irene Rebrin, a language teacher at University of British Columbia who fought for more than four years before she was allowed to remain in Canada.

The Peking-born woman was branded a security risk and ordered deported under a Conservative government in 1959, a year after she arrived from Brazil on an alien's passport.

She then lost a fight against the decision in the Supreme Court of Canada but was allowed to stay because of pending libel actions she had launched arising out of a *Toronto Telegram* report of her case.

Meszaros, too, has filed notice of libel against the *Globe and Mail* and Zavie Levine, executive assistant to then-immigration minister Bryce Mackasey.

Miss Rebrin's immigration fight ended in December 1963, when Guy Favreau, then immigration minister, granted her landed immigrant status after reconsidering her case. A month later she dropped the suit against the *Telegram* for what was reported to be a substantial out-of-court settlement. The amount wasn't disclosed.

In 1969, Kasimir Laski, a Polish economist hired by York, was refused entry. A member of the Communist party since 1945, he was head of Poland's Central School of Planning and Statistics, then

went to Vienna to work for the Austrian government.

Commenting at the time on his decision to make no plea for a change in the decision after learning that Canada considered him a risk to national security, he said: 'Who needs to run from one police state to another?'

Andreas Papandreou, an economist who experienced 'some delay' but no serious difficulty in getting a visa to teach at York, says: 'We have been hugely embarrassed here at York. It gives the university a rather bad look in Europe.'

Papandreou was a cabinet minister in Greece in the ministry of his late father, Georges Papandreou, deposed by a military coup in 1967.

He notes that the academic community has close international ties and stories circulate quickly.

When a university invites someone to join its staff, and that person has trouble getting into the country 'it makes the university look pretty impotent,' Papandreou said.

Luigi Bianchi, a physicist who came to York from the US in 1971, had to wait a year for a visa and was finally cleared after an RCMP officer interviewed him.

Bianchi says he was arrested twice in the US for taking part in anti-war demonstrations but was never convicted of anything.

'A person's political beliefs should not be scrutinised by anybody,' he says. He also notes that negative decisions are often reversed after immigration authorities get more evidence.

'It seems to me they should get all the evidence in the beginning,' he says, noting that doubts about him delayed his visa when he could have been interviewed right at the start.

Gabriel Kolko claims that the Canadian government relies on US intelligence for its information on prospective immigrants, whatever country they come from.

He says that Ottawa should be forced to define what it means by national security and that universities should set up some kind of formal procedure to deal with cases such as that of Meszaros, rather than leaving the individual to do it on his own.

An immigration department spokesman in Ottawa said that when applications are rejected for security reasons, 'that's as much as we'll say. And we certainly won't comment on statements by professors in that regard.'

Donald Savage, of the Canadian Association of University Teachers, says that the problem could be solved by adopting a suggestion made by a group of York law professors: they want the Immigration Act changed to give employers the right to make appeals to the immigration board on behalf of employees.

This would have allowed York to appeal 'and would have saved Meszaros a great deal of difficulty,' Savage says.

Kolko, the York history professor, says that if Ottawa goes on rejecting professors, it will hurt universities' chances of hiring good people.

'No one will want to take a job there,' he says. 'Only the most bland, cautious, uncritical individuals will be allowed in.'

Donna Dilschneider in *The Toronto Star*, 14 December 1972. The original article has been slightly shortened.

An appeal on behalf of Professor Meszaros

The following letter was sent to the Hon. Robert Andras, Minister of Manpower and Immigration on 12 December 1972.

To: The Hon. Robert Andras
Minister of Manpower & Immigration
OTTAWA

Dear Mr Minister
As members of York University, we want to express our profound concern at the handling of the application of Professor Istvan Meszaros for landed immigrant status. Our concern is shared by the academic community across Canada which has appealed to your Department on numerous occasions to bring justice to bear in the case.

May we remind you of the following points contained in a resolution passed by the Senate of York University:

1. Professor Meszaros is a scholar of international distinction, and one of the world's pre-eminent authorities in his field;
2. He has been a consistent and outspoken opponent of oppression and a courageous advocate of civil liberties in his native Hungary; for this reason he had to flee Hungary at the time of the Soviet invasion in 1956; and
3. His acceptability as a citizen of a Western democracy has been demonstrated by his having been granted citizenship in the United Kingdom in 1965, as well as having been admitted to residence in Italy in 1956, in both cases after full security clearance.

These facts speak for themselves. The presence of such a distinguished scholar and respected and courageous citizen will be of clear benefit to this country. Canada's reputation as a free and civilised nation requires that Professor Meszaros be granted landed immigrant status.

The denial of immigrant status without right of appeal to an independent tribunal violates the spirit of the Canadian Bill of

Rights and all accepted traditions of due process, and jeopardises the freedom of Canadian universities to hire the scholars and teachers of their choice. We urge that you discontinue deportation proceedings and address yourself to the merits of Professor Meszaros's application.

I. M. Abella
George W. Adams
Robert Adolph
Matthew Ahern
Wolfgang Ahrens
R. K. Allan
W. W. Anderson
William H. Angus
E. R. Appathural
Barry Argyle
H. W. Arthurs
G. O. Aspinall
W. R. Augustine
E. Baar
David Bakan
John M. Barber
Alain Baudot
David Bell
James D. Benson
Howard Bernstein
Luigi Bianchi
B. D. Bixley
Naomi Black
Edward Blackstock
Joanna Blake
Rosemarie Blenkinsop
Ronald L. Bloore
R. Bordessa
T. M. Boyd
Marcel Boyer
E. Boyman
Michael Boyer
G. Brant
Carol Bream
Earl Breech
Gina Bridgeland
Brian Bucknall
J. Buttrick
R. B. Byers
Barry Callaghan
D. M. Cameron
W. H. Cannon
Ken Carpenter
T. Carrington
D. Carveth
R. C. Casto
R. E. Chace
B. N. Cham
Michel Chevalier
J. M. Choukroun
D. M. Cohen
W. R. Coleman

Michael Collie
B. Colman
John Conway
Ramsay Cook
F. B. K. Cooper
Michael Copeland
Irwin Cotler
J. Cotnam
Jane Couchman
M. B. Coukell
D. F. Cousineau
C. B. Cragg
A. J. K. Crawford
Michael Creat
R. D. Cuff
Griffith Cunningham
M. J. Cunnings
J. Cuff
Frank Davey
David Davies
A. J. Diamond
L. M. Dill
P. B. R. Doob
Edgar Dosman
G. V. Doxey
Robert Drummond
J. Durlak
R. Durocher
G. Echard
Mark Egnal
Sydney Eisen
R. Ellenwood
William Empson
J. A. Ernst
D. R. Ewen
R. E. Fancher
Alain Favrod
N. N. Feltes
Faith Fernalid
Donald Fine
H. Flakierski
Bruce Flattery
F. J. Fletcher
A. Forer
C. D. Fothergill
Robert Fothergill
Edith Fowke
C. D. Fowle
Michael Friendly
J. D. Friesen
Chris Furedy
W. G. Gairdner

Roger Gannon
I. J. Gentles
M. Gewurtz
J. R. Gibson
Kenneth Gibson
G. A. Ginsburg
H. K. Girling
Kenneth Golby
G. Gold
R. Goranson
J. L. Granatstein
A. Grant
Ernest G. Griffin
Suzanne M. Grew
Ruth Grogan
Helene Guegan
M. Gurstein
E. Hagerman
Jane Banfield Haynes
Robert H. Haynes
Wilson A. Head
I. B. Heath
John A. Heddle
Stephen Hellman
M. Carole Henderson
Lucille Herbert
Jon B. Higgins
M. A. Hill
Ruth F. Hill
R. M. Hobson
Grey Hodnett
J. David Hoffman
Richard Hoffmann
John Hogarth
C. E. Holloway
Donald Holoch
Anthony Hooper
A. J. Hopkins
E. Hopkins
M. S. D. Horn
S. E. Houston
Gerry Hunnius
Valerie E. Hume
G. Hunter
V. J. Hunter
John Hutcheson
C. D. Innes
W. C. Irvine
S. Jeffers
G. H. S. Jordan
A. Kandil
S. Kanya-Forstner
B. Kasinka
Morris Katz
S. Katz
J. D. Keehn
Juan Keone
S. O. Kjellberg
S. Kirschbaum
K. Koenig
Paul Kohn
Gabriel Kolko
Allan Koretsky
Joanne Kramer
R. J. P. Kuin
J. G. Laframboise
E. Lander
R. S. Lang
Diana Lary

N. M. Lary
E. Latowsky
C. Lay
Irving Layton
Sidney N. Lederman
Dennis Lee
Leon Leeds
T. L. Legoff
Christian Lenhardt
L. Lerman
George Levenson
A. B. P. Lever
S. Levine
Janet Lewis
C. C. Leznoff
L. E. Licht
Allen M. Linden
John Livingston
B. G. Loughton
P. E. Lovejoy
Gordon Lowther
O. R. Lundell
C. R. McArthur
Kent McCallum
John D. McCamus
P. McConkey
J. C. McConnell
Thelma McCormack
James R. McKay
Alex McLeod
J. McMaster
D. J. McQueen
K. McRoberts
Francis MacKenzie
Peter D. Madaugh
S. Madras
W. H. Magney
J. M. Maguashca
R. W. Major
Eli W. Mandel
H. Mandel
C. J. Marino
R. A. Mark
James Mason
John May
S. Miles
P. M. Mitchell
P. B. Moens
F. J. Morgan
C. D. Morley
Alex Murray
W. A. W. Neilson
Vivian Nelles
Monique Nemni
J. Newson
Elaine Newton
Christopher Nichols
D. M. Nicholls
Calvin Normore
Liisa North
G. O'Brien
Philip Olin
A. J. Oliver
P. N. Oliver
B. N. Olshen
Th. Olson
M. Ondaatje
Hiroshi Ono
J. E. Page

Juan Pascual-Leone
A. M. Patterson
I. E. Pearce
R. E. Pearlman
N. J. Penner
Tom Philbrook
W. W. Piepenberg
Anne Pilgrim
O. G. Pilgrim
Richard Pious
E. W. Pitcher
R. W. Poetschke
B. Polka
Stan Pollin
Helje Poore
W. D. Posgate
Jeanene Pratt
John Punter
Michael Quealey
P. Rajagopal
M. J. Rehner
Hollis Rinehart
Deborah Roazen
Paul Roazen
Pierre Roberge
Howard Robertson
Sid Robinovitch
Murray G. Ross
Ross Rudolph
E. Lee Ruff
Eric Rump
Selwyn Ryan
R. Sabourin
C. M. Sadowski
A. S. M. Saleuddin
J. R. Savary
D. H. Samuel
John T. Saywell
S. Schoenfeld
R. Schneider
H. Schueler
R. Schultz
G. B. Shand
A. A. Shapiro
G. G. Shepherd
M. Shepherd
David Shugarman
Harvey Simmons
M. Silver
I. Silverman
R. Skomro
David W. Slater
W. W. Small
Cyril Smetana
O. E. Smylie
Francis Snyder
D. Solgar
Ian Sowton
J. Spina

P. Stamp
A. D. Stauffer
C. J. Stephens
Viola Stephens
P. D. Stevens
Mary Stewart
J. C. Stovel
J. H. Stuckey
G. J. Szablowski
Yvette Szmidt
J. S. Tait
Sol. Tanenzapf
W. Tarnopolsky
Claude Taton
G. Tatham
M. E. Taylor
Rashesh Thakkar
Kensuke Tokaichi
Daniel Trietnik
Allan Trojan
Kathryn Troyer
Shu-Ying Tsau
Albert Tucker
Alice Turner
Jon Unrau
Pastor Valle-Garey
Ian Walker
S. Walker
R. Wallace
A. Wallis
J. Warkentin
Jack Warwick
G. D. Watson
Margaret Watson
Mavis Waters
Richard Weisman
K. H. Weige
Gerda Werkele
M. Westcott
Les Wheatcroft
Thomas Whipple
Lewis White
D. Wiesenthal
Neil J. Williams
Don Willmott
John Willoughby
M. L. Wittenberg
R. I. Wolfe
S. Wolfe
M. Wolfram
Ellen Wood
Neal Wood
P. Yashinsky
John Yolton
H. Zeitman
Fred H. Zemans
S. Zerker
Jacob S. Ziegel
M. Zimmerman

This appeal is supported also by the York Student Federation and by students of Calumet College.

Toronto Globe & Mail, 20 December 1972

Dobrica Cosić

Trials, verdicts and naive questions

Dobrica Cosic is a Serb and one of the best known novelists in Yugoslavia today. During the second world war he was a political commissar with Tito's Partisans and afterwards served as a politician and leading member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party. He made his literary reputation with his first novel Daleko le sunce ('Far Is the Sun'), published in 1951, and since then has published several more novels and stories. His latest novel Moć i strepnje ('Power and Foreboding') was banned after publication last year and removed from sale (see INDEX no.2, 1972, p.147).

The present essay was written in the summer of last year and published in the August 1972 issue of the Belgrade philosophical journal Filozofia. For printing this and an editorial on the same subject the journal was subsequently banned (see INDEX nos.3-4, p.126). The text of this English version has been shortened by about two thousand words.

1

Tomorrow in the Belgrade District Court the trial opens of Mihajlo Djurić, Professor of the Faculty of Law, charged with 'the criminal act of hostile propaganda'. For twenty-six years now I have carried on an intellectual dialogue with Mihaljo Djuric and have been his colleague in public affairs. Am I not an accomplice to his 'criminal act'? An accomplice, a witness, a judge? Or am I just a reader of *Politika*? Or one of those who sit in cafés fulminating against events in which human thought is put on trial? Or do I keep my mouth shut, my only response a shrug of the shoulders, a smile and an enigmatic shake of the head? Or am I one of those wise, infallible political tacticians, always 'reliably informed', who qualify, in other words negate, all their public pronouncements by references to the veiled mystery of persons and strategies deriving from the domain of 'high politics'? What are we really doing, all of us, in these trials, these courts, faced by our implacable prosecutors? And what will the future, say, ten years bring to us, present or future criminals, and to our prosecutors and judges?

When, where and how shall we speak about this nightmare that is not confined to us alone, that haunts our consciences and colour, our fearful anticipation of the outcome of certain social, as well as judicial, events, our anxiety as to the fate of democratic socialism in our country?

If it were only a question of ethics and civic courage, our conscience, as yet not quite dead, might redeem itself by other means in our increasingly apathetic society. However, in this case, we are taking a stand not just in relation to a political policy, but also to those who are both the object and psychologically the moral determinants of that policy: we are taking a stand on a matter of great complexity which may have far-reaching historical and social consequences, a matter which demands the total commitment of our social and intellectual being, a matter which is not closed by a simple verbal declaration of one's views. I began to compose this text in my mind in 1970, after Vlada Mijanović, a student of the Belgrade Philosophy faculty, had been sentenced to imprisonment. At that moment I was again beset by those questions that, for all their naiveté, have a fateful significance for us, contemporaries and communists, and that are worth answering only if we have the strength to overcome at least some of the forms of traditional political pragmatism and moral conformism. Namely:

Is it inevitable that in a country where the revolution triumphed so dearly and so decisively, a country which continued the revolution by its resolute, virile stand against Stalinism and which roman-

tically announced to the world the birth of democratic socialism, the humanist socialism of self-management, is it possible that in such a country, twenty-seven years after the foundation of a socialist order, the student militants and their Marxist humanist professors who were involved in the Belgrade student movement of June 1968 are being politically slandered, persecuted and put on trial, and that an idealistic rebel is being thrown into prison – a young man who has not yet assented to the universal ‘political wisdom’ of the conformist and careerist intellectual in our still poor and ill-educated country (which would pay any price not to be)?

Is it possible that revolutionaries have begun to persecute and imprison their unruly children now that the children are showing dissatisfaction with their fathers? Is it possible that the Yugoslav ‘left’ – in power since 1938, is now persecuting its own ‘left’ in the classic brutal tradition of Stalin and the Comintern?

In the name of what historical and social principles are young dissidents with extreme revolutionary views and humanists who criticise the status quo on behalf of a liberal Marxism and a more humane socialism the objects of greater persecution than those backward loyalist elements who have integrated with such ease into the system and general mentality of our society?

These painful, naive questions of mine were at first countered by the traditional and not-so-naive suspicion: what makes you so sure that Mijanović, known as ‘Vlada Revolution’, a poor and angry student, of whom all you know comes from two chance meetings and a few words spoken by him, was not really mixed up in something anti-Yugoslav and counter-revolutionary, that he was not involved in political conspiracy with the Chinese, Americans or Russians? The world is full of frauds and plotters, this is a century of spies and agents provocateurs; the powers that aim to dominate the world are competing for the soul of Yugoslavia, our country is the arena for conflicting ideologies and interests – a country that is objectively threatened.

But when I read the verdict of the Belgrade District court sentencing Vlada Mijanović to one year’s strict-regime imprisonment, when I read the judge’s summing up, I was deeply shamed by that ‘justice’ pronounced ‘in the name of the people’ – the people who it once seemed had abolished such ‘justice’ for good.

On the 22 February 1972 I read on page six of *Politika* that the District Court of Novi Sad had sentenced a student, Sándor Rózsa, to three years’ strict-regime imprisonment for ‘hostile propaganda’ and ‘incitement to racial hatred and intolerance’, while Otto Tolnai, the editor of *Uj Symposium*, received a year’s strict-regime imprisonment for having published, as editor of the journal, Rózsa’s incriminating article entitled ‘Daily Abortion’. I was horrified by the terrible severity of these sentences. What had those young Hungarians done, what had they written?

Are they really perhaps the spies of some foreign power seeking to destroy our system in order to enslave us and restore Capitalist or Stalinist rule? Perhaps they are conspirators at the head of a

counter-revolutionary separatist movement aiming at the secession of the Vojvodina from Yugoslavia? Perhaps there’s a plot . . .

In the following days I read the text of the verdicts against Rózsa’s and Tolnai as well as a translation of ‘Daily Abortion’, the article for which the author and editor were convicted. Rózsa’s text, if not read as a ‘burlesque’ as it was described by Tolnai at the trial, or as a satire in the form of a dialogue, which is perhaps nearer to its true character, but as a rather inept piece of topical journalism about the state of mind and attitudes of one section of Yugoslav youth, unfortunately contains little of worth. However one chooses to read the article, it contains in my view quite a number of inaccuracies and biased judgements, particularly when speaking of the position of Hungarians in present-day Yugoslavia and relations between the Yugoslav nationalities. I am utterly convinced that Hungarians are not treated like ‘blacks’ in Yugoslavia or Serbia and that a worker of Hungarian origin is not doubly exploited for being a Hungarian. I also firmly believe that in Serbia and the Vojvodina the national rights of all nationalities have achieved a high degree of democracy, perhaps a higher degree than that known in any present-day state in the world.

But are a few inaccuracies and political falsehoods sufficient to inflict three years’ strict imprisonment on a young man who is disillusioned and dissatisfied with social conditions, who till recently was a Youth leader and the producer of a Hungarian cultural programme ‘Youth Forum’, someone who is, moreover, a tubercular student and the son of impoverished peasants? Three years of strict-regime imprisonment for a single political error, consisting of some political falsehoods and half-truths, for which in any case he apologised and excused himself at the trial – does this really exemplify that ‘humane’ social relationship that is declared to be the fundamental principle of our self-managing socialism? Is it possible that in a democratic socialist society a student can be condemned for one undesirable article to three years’ jail, which can ruin his life? Should Otto Tolnai, the author of thirteen works and editor of one of the best-produced journals in our country, be compelled to stand in the dock like any common criminal and suffer a year’s suspended strict-regime imprisonment because of one editorial error of judgement – for which he apologised to the court? Meanwhile high-ranking officials are not sent to jail for political errors, even when these have far-reaching and fatal consequences for the country. And a good thing too that they are not sent to jail; nobody should be sent to jail for his ideas, views or mistaken opinions. But why, then, is there a different policy for students and intellectuals, for dissidents and those ‘below stairs’?

On 8 January 1972 *Politika* reported (in small type) that court proceedings had been initiated against two students, Milan Nikolić and Pavluška Imširović, who had been arrested on 6 January. A fortnight later, another student, a girl called Jelka Kljajić, was arrested. Everything that I myself knew and was able to learn of these students from their fellow students and their professors

showed that traditional suspicions were out of the question.

I have met Milan Nikolić, a student of the Philosophy Faculty, two or three times, I have heard him speak in public discussions and I have read articles by him. He has impressed me as a very intelligent, serious and hard-working young man who happens to hold vehement and doctrinaire Marxist views. The proletarian premises of his reflections on our society had for me the tone, the fervour and naiveté of the revolutionary idealism that had characterised the generation of Young Communists to which I myself had belonged. I was confident that Milan Nikolić ranked among the finest representatives of the new generation of intellectuals, who will perpetuate the socialist tradition, conceived in the spirit of Svetozar Marković,¹ in the culture and history of our people. Today I am even more convinced of this, having seen Milan Nikolić and Pavluško Imširović in handcuffs in the dock, and beside them the tiny, frail Jelka Kljajić, too weak to bear handcuffs and chains. All three are accused of 'grave criminal acts – hostile propaganda and associating against the nation and state'. Moreover, according to the press, they set up a 'Founding group for a revolutionary workers' party', wrote and distributed leaflets, took advantage of the forum of the Philosophy Faculty to spread their ideas, and were participants in the Fourth Trotskyist International!² Milan Nikolić, according to the newspapers, claimed at the trial that the 'Founding group' did not exist, nor, as far as he knew, did the 'Trotskyist International', and that he had written, in a perfectly legal way, an address for the Assembly of the League of Students entitled 'We demand', which was not of a hostile character.

I shall have to finish this text before a verdict is passed on these students.³ Whatever the verdict, I tremble for the future of a society and socialist order which, beset as it is by immense difficulties – backwardness, folly, illiteracy, thievery, corruption, unfair privileges, social injustice and inequality, external pressures and obstacles, the burdensome legacy of its past, several hundred thousand workers abroad, widespread dissatisfaction and social unrest – imprisons and tries students for their lack of understanding, their disobedient thoughts, their angry dreams. Can it be that our society and state have no more dangerous enemies than these revolutionary, utopian students who desire for their country greater freedom, social justice and equality than it enjoys at present? Do such aspirations really represent a threat to the 'rule of the working people'?

It seems that even their professors have begun to pass judgement on these dissatisfied, restless young people who strive to understand the world around them and to achieve their ideals and aims – lecture halls are being turned into court-rooms for unruly pupils. A fortnight ago the council of the Novi Sad Philosophy Faculty condemned yet another young political sinner: indifferent to their own responsibilities, faculty members expelled Djordjije Vuković, a junior lecturer in the Department of literary theory, one of the most talented students of his generation and a former editor of the Belgrade paper *Student* during its best post-war period. His crime

¹ Co-founder of the first Serbian social-democratic party at the end of the 19th century.

² A reference to the so-called 'Fourth International' that unites the world's Trotskyist groups under a single umbrella organisation. The Belgrade students attended a meeting of the International in Brussels but are not known to have been members.

³ Nikolić and Imširović were sentenced to two years' imprisonment and Jelka Kljajić to 18 months (see INDEX nos.3–4, p.127).

was to have criticised on some account the Provincial Committee of the League of Communists of the Vojvodina, and, so they say, insulted its President, thus disqualifying himself once and for all as a teacher and educator of the young. The offended President, who is also one of our highest officials, himself began his lightning political career as a student activist, not to say leader. This former student made no bones about becoming a traditional President; from his august position he gave his younger colleague, who had turned from politics to scholarship and literature, the traditional 'reprimand' for political criticism: his chosen vocation was taken from him and he was left, a state enemy, without work, in other words, without bread.

But in this whole affair we are less concerned with a President who is unable to forgive a junior lecturer a verbal attack, than with the apathy and unconcern of the professors who passed judgement on Djordjije Vuković. I cannot refrain from recalling to their conscience as professors, educators and scholars, our strong and honourable tradition of academic independence for those responsible for the fate of young people, to whom they give not only a specialised training but also a moral education. Why have they, whose moral and political qualifications to educate the young are not disputed by anyone, so lightly forgotten this? Are the intellectual integrity of university professors and the self-managing autonomy of the university so 'flexible' that they can covertly yield to traditional pressures? Yes, I know people don't want to give themselves headaches with the problems of some 'hothead'. And people don't want to run risks. Yes, I know all the things that people don't want.

But what then will be left of enduring human values in a headache-less society? What will tomorrow be the culture, the spiritual and moral heritage of a nation whose creative intelligentsia is today bought by traditional privileges so that it may enjoy moral ease, spiritual lethargy and a 'sane', practical, headache-less head?

If we scorn such naive questions and refuse to face these dilemmas we are perhaps rejecting our historical role, that humanist role which science and art, reason and conscience alone can play in the task of creating a civilised and socialist society.

2

Today, 15 July 1972, at the bottom of a page in *Politika* given over to tourist news, next to 'Today's Weather', we read that the investigation has been completed of Professor Mihajlo Djurić, charged with nationalist activities, that is, 'acts hostile to the state'. On 18 March 1971 Professor Mihajlo Djurić expressed his views on the Constitutional Amendments⁴ at a discussion of these Amendments organised by the Law Faculty, to which he was invited presumably as an expert and as a professor of the Law Faculty. His other criminal act consists of an article entitled 'The Rock of Discord', which appeared in the journal *Art* in the autumn of 1971 in a number devoted to an examination of the pros and cons of building Meštrović's mausoleum on Lovćen.⁵

⁴ The Constitutional Amendments, which proposed greater autonomy for Yugoslavia's individual republics and the establishment of a national 'presidential commission' to ensure a smooth transfer of power after the death of President Tito, were published in draft form in the summer of 1971. Intensive public discussion was invited at all levels of society and it was at one of these discussion sessions that Prof Djurić made his offending remarks.

⁵ A mausoleum commemorating Prince-Bishop Peter II Petrović Njegoš, Montenegro's most celebrated ruler, was designed and built by the sculptor Ivan Mestrovic in the 1950s. Owing to the official policy of discouraging nationalism, however, it has never been erected and is stored in packing cases in the Montenegrin town of Cetinje.

None of us who has his own views about the Constitutional Amendments, or the Meštrović mausoleum or about Djurić's views on the mausoleum and amendments, and who is neither a Cetnik⁶ nor emigré, can accept that – even for the sake of a valid social principle – differences of opinion be investigated and judged in court by criminal law. No-one who is sincere and consistent in his allegiance to democratic socialism can consider it either normal or lawful that men should be sent to jail for their opinions or that any view differing from 'ours' should be declared a criminal act against the state and the 'rule of the working people'.

Perhaps those of us who have, or try to have, our own views about objects and ideas, men and society, politics and ethics, are by this very fact influenced by our memories of the not-so-distant past, of trials similar to that of Mihajlo Djurić. And in a socialist country, what is more. For this twentieth century of ours will be seen by our descendants and historians as the century of trials aimed at views differing from those of the Judge and Prosecutor. Are those of us who try to think predestined by our class and historical social conditioning to be fearful, are we blinded by spectacles of every kind of tint to 'real social transformations and trends', are we by nature suspicious of what is 'new and emergent'? Are we really weaklings whose historical perspective falters in the face of a few trials? Are we all cowards, imagining dangers everywhere, 'pessimists' who can only see what is dark and negative in society, 'disillusioned intellectuals' who project their 'loss of faith in socialism' onto a generation, the entire intelligentsia, the nation?

Maybe. And would that it were just my professional writer's imagination which weaves such gloomy fears and forebodings.

Nevertheless there are certain points in the Mihajlo Djurić case too obvious to be passed over. First: Mihajlo Djurić is on trial not just for his views, but for views he expressed 16 months ago – not at a political meeting but at a professional meeting of the organisation where he works, the Law faculty. It was a meeting summoned by the dean or the faculty council or some other responsible body, in accordance with the directives of our leading political bodies. At this point Mihajlo Djurić's views on the constitutional amendments were not denounced by the assembled company – the most eminent experts and professors of Constitutional Law – as 'destroying the fraternity and unity of our peoples' or 'Greater Serb nationalism', a fact which points to certain unequivocal conclusions diametrically opposed, of course, to those of Djurić's prosecutors and judges. For does not this trial herald the beginning of a judicial investigation into the discussions, speeches, lectures, conversations, interviews, articles, studies and books written by our socially committed contemporaries over, say, the last decade? Might not our investigators and prosecutors take a list of 'restless spirits' – such a list as we all know is easily drawn up – and begin to read their works, employing their notorious skill to extract words and sentences of 'hostile propaganda', 'anti-self management concepts', 'Greater Serb beliefs', 'counter-revolutionary tendencies', etc, so

⁶ The name of patriotic Serbian guerrillas who opposed the German invasion during the second world war. They also opposed Tito's Partisans, but were outmanoeuvred by the latter and are regarded with great hostility by the present Yugoslav regime.

that on the basis of this and similar evidence they might carry out a classic 'purge' of our self-managing society?

Should by some misfortune such a state of affairs come to pass, let me before it is too late take advantage of the freedom to whisper: if this method of gathering evidence from speeches and discussions were to be applied, for instance, to certain of the speeches and discussions of our leading politicians, if the Prosecutors' scissors were to snip out evidence of 'hostile propaganda' from Parliamentary records, speeches at Central Committee meetings, public discussions and statements, the only true, rightminded supporters of socialism left would consist mainly of prosecutors and judges, with maybe an investigator or guard or two. Well, of course it's out of the question. Absurdity breeds absurdity.

The trial of Mihajlo Djurić unfortunately confirms the degree to which people are afraid to resist the suppression of intellectual freedom. While Djordjije Vuković was judged by his apathetic or easily intimidated professors, Mihajlo Djurić is being judged by his apathetic or ambitiously 'disciplined' colleagues. We live in an age when in itself a traditional political trial is no great cause for wonder; there have been in the past and will be in the future such trials – and not just in our country; they also take place in societies with greater civil liberty and stronger legal and moral traditions and culture than ours. But what really provokes wonder and deep distress is the moral, intellectual and professional apathy of the professors of the Belgrade Faculty of Law, men whose role it is to instruct the young in law and justice, truth and conscience, human and civic responsibility.

If we go deeper into the question of trials in our present society, it is also impossible to ignore the verdicts and judgements passed on intellectuals, writers and university professors, 'humanists' and 'philosophers' by those of our contemporaries who can get away with saying anything, and whose words, ideas and views are never exposed to public criticism or examination. In recent years these ideological and political courts and tribunals have been set up on the slightest of pretexts and their number has increased at an alarming pace. Moreover all this takes place within the context of a consumer-oriented, hedonistic, corrupt liberalism which confuses and demoralises the truly revolutionary and democratic aspirations of our society as embodied in the undeniably anti-Stalinist spirit of the principle of self-management. This hedonistic, consumer-liberalism, which is opposed to the higher aspect of democracy, has been shown by modern history to create a most favourable climate for the growth of social, spiritual and moral apathy.

Which of the major figures of Serbian literature and culture has not at some time politically 'erred' and ideologically 'gone astray', has not suffered political and ideological condemnation, slander and humiliation? How many revolutionaries and partisans – writers – have not ideologically 'deviated' into 'nationalism' or some other new-named (in the old way) hostile activity? How many professors in the humanities, how many Marxist scholars and professors,

socially committed intellectuals, have escaped being denounced as anti-self management demons?

Even the most extreme conformists – not to put a finer word on it – amongst the intelligentsia, and within their ranks those who at present are past-masters of slander and the political smear, have in their time been condemned and punished. We can all remember the days when their poetry, prose and essays were denounced by political bodies and officials as anti-Marxist, anti-socialist, petit-bourgeois ‘contraband’, as surrealist, pornographic, pessimistic, idealistic, etc. Among them are former political outcasts, who have known the despair of unjust condemnations, ostracisation, attacks in the press and other publications, but who now, in their turn, have become professional denouncers, cunning witnesses and authoritarian judges, arrogantly pronouncing verdict on dissident contemporaries. However, the evolution of literary sinners into political saints, modernists into conservatives, surrealists into social realists, liberals into reactionaries, is an ancient and well-known phenomenon common to all cultures and all epochs. Far more pernicious than their practical role is the general social mission of such men: they are the ones who provide the other prosecutors and judges with the most authoritative public alibi, they are a moral screen for every kind of malpractice.

3

Great principles are great partly because their adherents are continually subject to temptation, and because a high price has to be paid for consistently keeping to them. It seems to me that we are today confronted by yet another temptation, one which I admit is complicated to discuss, but which we cannot responsibly pass over in silence. I am referring to the trials taking place in Croatia today.⁷

I prefer to be naive, to err in my attempts to understand even those things which I cannot accept, or cannot conceive, rather than be secure in my unconcern for what fatally concerns us all.

Putting aside questions of the degree of statehood and autonomy of the individual republics within the Yugoslav federation, the future of freedom and progress is subject to the same conditions for all of us: our possibilities are similar, the factors involved are the same. Even if we do not have precisely equal shares of the national wealth, there are certain evils that transcend the attributes and peculiarities of any one republic.

Does not the principal source of the troubles that have broken out in Croatia lie in the fatal falsehoods that have underlain and instigated the present clamour, inspiring and nourishing a movement whose moral and ideological significance is more disastrous than anything in the recent history of our peoples? These distortions of the history, economy and culture of one's own and other peoples, these deeply rooted mythologies and mystifications are being demolished not by concrete evidence, documents, genuine reasoning and accurate criticism; instead they are being dealt with by political condemnation and trials. Instead of attacking the myths and false-

⁷ A reference to the trials of Croatian writers and intellectuals that took place in the autumn of 1972 (see INDEX nos.1 and 2 and INDEX Index in this issue).

hoods, the inaccurate statistics and ‘expert arguments’ that have been relayed via authorised reports and the official press and television and thus stirred up a ‘mass movement’, they arrest the dupes of these official falsehoods, while the falsehoods themselves remain secure from criticism and examination. Deluded by a false idea of the position and situation of their people within the Yugoslav community, many of the ‘storm-troopers’ are now the dupes of another trick – unjustly and undeservedly they are treated as the ‘leaders’, in fact scapegoats, while the real offenders continue to enjoy all the privileges of their positions dating from the time of the ‘movement’. But for the moment let's not go any further into this painful subject.

Not all means are good in the struggle against the nationalist plague. Revolutionary, socialist ends cannot be achieved by ‘any means’ without those means finally threatening and negating the ends themselves.

However if there is proof that these writers and intellectuals under arrest have *acted* against the constitution, if they have worked for the restoration of some form of the ‘Independent State of Croatia,’ if they have maintained organisational links with émigré Ustasis⁸ or forces that aim to destroy the socialist order in Yugoslavia, then let them be tried by the Constitution and laws of the country. If it can be proved that they really are guilty, let them be brought to trial and not be kept in custody any longer than your common or not-so-common criminal. But if they are *guilty only of what they have said or written in public*, and of what is therefore already known to the public, then the court is not a suitable social instrument to deal effectively and lastingly with their reactionary ideas and their wrongheadedness (which at their climax could not be opposed without risk). It is both a good deal more socialist and more effective to create the general social conditions in which progressive social forces can expose and defeat in an open and relentless confrontation of ideas and views the ideological conspiracy behind the ‘mass movement’. Today a society that creates political martyrs and victimises people for their ideas is both backward and politically unhealthy.

We have a sufficient number of alert, courageous, intellectually honest and well-informed people who can deal more effectively with these poisonous ideas and fantasies (and make the whole matter more plain to all the peoples of Yugoslavia) than can any courts or prisons. Who is so bold as not to believe in the intellectual powers of the Croats and the country as a whole?

4

This evening we are informed on television that Professor Mihajlo Djurić has been sentenced to two years' strict-regime imprisonment.

So the trials continue, and more lie ahead of us. In the old, dark, dirty court buildings, before a small audience of idle onlookers, to the modest and traditional ritual accompaniment of lawyers' replies and the defence of their ‘defendants’, the courts will continue to

⁸ The name of the Croatian Fascist separatist movement that set up a puppet government under the Nazis during the second world war.

pronounce the same verdict on views which for all their variety are always the same 'criminal acts' – and all this in the 'name of the people'.

A society that does not have a developed conscience, that is, an awareness of values and of injustice, a society which is not distressed by injustice and falsehood, is a society that has no need of freedom, or democracy or socialism. A society that is reconciled to the evil of life and history. It may be that the most far-reaching consequences of these trials and verdicts do not lie in the denial of the basic human rights proclaimed by the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. The most crucial and serious consequence of all verdicts is the silence within the courts and the indifference surrounding them.

Loss of freedom and the absence of freedom are not rare in the life of a man and a people; what is worse is when hope as well as freedom is lost. As long as hope is not lost, man is not defeated. While there is hope, there is freedom: the struggle for it continues.

However, besides the naive questions and naive dilemmas posed by our particular situation, there are also numerous and extremely convincing reasons, as experience has shown us, for reconciling ourselves to our reality. Our present society, from the existential, historical point of view, acts just as every political society always has towards those who want to change and improve it, who aspire to something higher and better, freer and more human. Society, or the men who have its powers and means at their disposal, subjugates and destroys the upright and unsubmissive, the utopians and revolutionaries. From time immemorial their fate has always been the same; it would seem that this certainly still holds in our own country and time today; they have chosen the way of suffering and sacrifice. Then let every man to his own.

And yet: maybe it still makes sense to do everything we can not to become a society in which hope, above all, has been crushed. I still want to believe, I still try to believe, that the way to awaken and revive hope may lie in genuine adherence to a principle – a return to that extraordinary, stimulating and life-giving message contained in the Programme of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia – so often invoked, and so often disregarded: 'Nothing created should be so holy to us that it cannot be surpassed and replaced by something even more progressive, more free, more human.'

17 July 1972

Jiří Hochman Barber Novak's dictatorship from the unpublished novel 'Stag Ford'

Jiří Hochman was a foreign correspondent for the Prague daily *Rude pravo* throughout most of the 1960s, did a highly successful stint in Washington and wrote a book on Castro's Cuba. In 1968 he was a conspicuous supporter of Dubcek in the pages of the weekly *Reporter* and in 1972 was arrested and held for several months in prison. A long-time sufferer from T B, he had a serious stroke and was released, under pressure, on grounds of ill-health. The charges against him still stand, however, and it is likely that he will be tried in the near future.

Stag Ford is a novel by the Czech writer, Jiří Hochman, who was one of Czechoslovakia's foremost foreign correspondents until he was 'purged' in 1969 after the Soviet invasion of his country (see *Notes on left*). The bulk of it was written in 1968, at the height of the liberalisation under Dubcek, but the manuscript was completed too late for publication before Dubcek's fall and was subsequently brought out abroad in Czech by the Index Verlag (no connection: the similarity of names is pure coincidence) in Cologne in 1970.

The title of the novel refers to an imaginary village of that name which Hochman locates in the former Sudetenland, on the border with Germany. Through a freak explosion that is never accounted for, Stag Ford has been cut off from the outside world in the early years after the war and has consequently developed independently of the communist system in surrounding Czechoslovakia, but at the same time does interact with it in a very special way. For some unexplained reason, people can only get into or out of Stag Ford as a result of a 'time slip', usually after an accident, so that they enter a different dimension as it were. In this way a series of individuals 'disappear' into Stag Ford after suffering accidents at a particular bend on an obscure country road. These disappearances have baffled the police for years, but only when, for the first time, a resident of Stag Ford 'emerges' into the real world of Czechoslovakia do they begin to piece together the clues which lead them towards the answer to the riddle.

The novel possesses an extremely complex narrative form which heightens the sense of mystery and confusion. Most of it is narrated in flashbacks which hinge on the stories of the Stag Ford inhabitant – an old man called Piskacek – as told to the police during his interrogations. And naturally the main vehicle for the satire is humour. For not only does the old man know and remember the 'normal' people who have 'slipped' into Stag Ford as a result of road accidents, but he also points out how happy and well-adjusted they are in this 'dropped-out' hamlet.

The satire, of course, springs from the juxtaposition of the two worlds, but Hochman's device is somewhat more subtle than this simple comparison implies. For the explosion that has cut Stag Ford off from the rest of Czechoslovakia can also be likened to that 'explosion' in 1948 that cut Czechoslovakia off from 'normal' Europe. Thus Stag Ford is also a microcosm and its own village politics mirror in many ways the development of larger Czechoslovakia.

In the two chapters we have selected here, the first (chapter

four) shows two ordinary, reasonably goodhearted police officers from the traffic department. Mareš and Klika, grappling with the problem of whether the old man is insane or not. And in chapter nine Piskacek himself tells the story of Stag Ford's dreadful life under the temporary dictatorship of Barber Novak (for Novak read 'Novotny') until he was overthrown.

Chapter four Dr Frühauf's patient

Mareš had no time for mysteries.

Being a plain fellow, his mind not overloaded with education, he was cut out for one of two things – to be a devout believer in one or another religious denomination, or an equally upright atheist. And the times had so decreed that Mareš was both policeman and atheist.

His speciality over the past twenty years or so had been road accidents; for him the job was not just a matter of routine, he performed it with due thought and with no hard feelings towards the offenders. The somewhat rare quality of tolerance derived, no doubt, from the fact that in his private capacity, as a motorist, he had had his share of accidents. Nothing serious, but enough at least to account for the philosophical view he was wont to sum up in the remark: 'The steering wheel is round and the chap who holds it human.'

Fortyish, his hair going a bit thin on top, Mareš liked his beer well cooled and hated hustling. The case of the 32nd kilometre as they called it, was more of a worry to him than to any of the others engaged in it. He had handled some eight hundred accidents in the course of his career, some of them real posers, including a few more or less ingenious attempts at insurance fraud, and twice there had been cases of manslaughter. But none had ever been left unsolved. There had been times when he had been obliged to work with colleagues in the criminal department, for whom he harboured an unspoken aversion. And with this business now he hated to think if he and Klika failed to come up with an explanation, it would have to go to the criminal department after all. Mareš regarded this as a personal affront.

So here he was again, sitting in the waiting-room of Dr Frühauf's department – in off-duty time, actually – thumbing through a glossy magazine. He had counted at least seven buxom girls in swim suits by the time Anna, the officer on duty, came to announce: 'Piskaček is waiting for you in number 23.'

Mareš thanked her, got up and walked down the corridor to a small room with two beds (one bed empty, because Klika had requested that Piskaček should have a room to himself). A round table and two armchairs stood near the window. Piskaček was sitting in one of the chairs, a handkerchief peeping out of the pocket of his

blue-striped hospital dressing-gown, the fingers of his thick-veined hands pressing tobacco into a charred, black pipe.

Mareš *knew* that Piskaček wasn't mad. On that he trusted his own reason, so that even if Frühauf had maintained the opposite, he wouldn't have believed him. But Frühauf, for that matter, maintained no such thing. On that point, at least, he and Mareš agreed. But that was just the trouble, because if anything could have helped build up an acceptable version of the case it would be Piskaček's mental derangement.

As Mareš came into the room, the old man greeted him with a good-natured smile, extracted his forefinger from the bowl of the pipe and held out his hand.

Well, I'm glad to see you again, Mr Commissioner, sir, he said, starting the conversation easily as man to man. It's as dull as ditchwater here, and no mistake.

At previous encounters Mareš had vainly tried to get Piskaček to use a different form of address. It was, to say the least, embarrassing that he addressed Klika as 'Mr Inspector' which, in the old police hierarchy, was a much lower rank. Yet Klika was Mareš's superior, actually by three grades. Piskaček didn't argue, but he wouldn't change. Of all the people revolving round him in this strange world he liked Mareš best. He would have been agreeable to using the title 'Chief Commissioner' perhaps, but lower than 'Commissioner' he would not go. Fortunately, Klika took it as a good joke.

There were several reasons for Piskaček's partiality for Mareš. First, he felt at ease with this homely, uncomplicated fellow, who, what is more, had treated him right from the start as an ordinary, normal person.

True, there was an age gap, but their backgrounds were similar. They even hailed from the same part of the country, as they discovered quite early on, not so much by their accents as by certain phrases and turns of speech. There were moments when the old man reminded Mareš of his father and, now and then, he even caught glimpses of his grandad, which was yet another reason for refusing to accept that the old chap was off his rocker. And really, the more he listened the more Mareš found that what Piskaček said made sense; he spoke naturally, 'from memory', and the strange, incredible thing about his story was not so much *what* he described, as the underlying questions: *where* was the root of it all, *how* did it begin, and *what* would happen next?

Apart from that, Mareš found nothing strange or incredible in the story. There seemed to be little difference between the life the old man had lived 'before' and 'after'. And it was his account of the little, everyday matters that Mareš found so convincing. He made a point of enquiring about the details he could check from his own experience. And so far Piskacek hadn't slipped up once.

In these interviews Mareš's approach differed from Klika's (they were not, in any respect, interrogations – not even when Klika was on the job); instead of concentrating on the case as such, that is, how Piskaček had arrived at the scene of the mysterious accidents.

unusual features are to be observed – with the sole exception, perhaps, of the use of the local Catholic church as a week-day propaganda centre, no such case having, to our knowledge, been recorded in the Republic, even in the days when such centres were highly favoured by the central government.

True, a somewhat unconvincing element is to be found in connection with the downfall of barber Novak, that is, in the circumstance that after weighing up the awkward situation in which he found himself, he resigned of his own volition. Although by any normal standards of conduct this step might seem natural, it should be remembered that in political life these standards have not been observed since the days of antiquity.

(... *From the authentic record. Piskacek:*) You know, Mr Inspector, sir, you can't blame it all on Novak. Perhaps he wasn't really the worst of that lot, but he was the one who came out on top, so when we remember the real bad times we still say – in Novak's day.

You see, sir, the man wasn't even a proper barber. He'd never really learnt the trade. We found that out to our cost, as I'll tell you later, sir.

Nobody knew for sure where he came from. Fact is he was one of the first in Stag Ford. Took possession of one house he did, then another, and for a time he lived right away on his own, then back he came to the village, a few weeks before that explosion it was, sir.

Mind you, I don't say he didn't whitewash those houses he lived in, he did that, sir, not that I'd hold it against him particularly, there was quite a bit of whitewashing done in those days and as far as that goes Novak wasn't one of the worst, that I must say.

Well, in the end, when he'd settled down in the village, and by then there were quite a few people about, he said he'd open a barber's shop, and he'd stock some toilet goods – soap, and perfume and stuff for the ladies to paint their faces, you know.

But that didn't last long, sir. For one thing it turned out he wasn't much of a hand at the shaving – all scratched the chaps were, and he even cut old Miller's ear. Can you see a proper barber doing that, sir? As for the shop, that wasn't much better. After the explosion he couldn't get the stuff anyway, and Novak wasn't a one for making it himself. Buy cheap and sell dear, that was about his mark.

Well later Charousek, the chemist, started making perfumes and things, a real clever chap he was, all the things he managed, but that's another story.

The way I'm describing that Novak to you, sir, you might think you'd only to set eyes on him to see what a bonehead he was, and that we weren't much better ourselves seeing how easily we were hoodwinked. Only you see, sir, it wasn't that simple, not with Novak, nor with the way we were hoodwinked.

For one thing, there were plenty of charlies like him around in the beginning, though most just came and went away again. A real mix-up it was, and nobody in the district office seemed to know

about us. I can't recall, sir, that anyone from up there came to see us, only Father Domecek, and that was at the time it blew up. Father Domecek came for old Father Gross's burial, then he got stuck here with us.

Then you see, sir, that Novak never threw his weight about. More on the quiet side he was and not one to talk much because he had a bit of a stutter. But his mates did the talking for him. And they said Novak was the only one that could get us out of the mess, and Novak would fix everything, and that was our only hope, that we had Novak, and so on and so forth. They kept on about it, and they made out how good he was till quite a few people started to believe them and thought, my word, he must be a clever chap that Novak, and all along I said to myself he was a mug.

Then there were others who didn't really know him, so why not believe he was good, and when it was too late they began to find fault with him, when he was in the saddle and he'd seen to it nobody could grumble out loud – let alone do anything else against him.

You ask where he came from sir, well upon my soul I don't rightly know. He said from Holesovic, that he had a big barber's shop there in Prague near the station. But a chap called Kocourek who turned up just then and knew those parts well, he said there'd never been such a shop there. I was in the pub at the time and I heard him. So Novak said it wasn't in Prague but somewhere up north, but Kocourek said that was nonsense, there wasn't any such place where he mentioned. Over six foot he was, that Kocourek, and hands like shovels, so Novak couldn't go for him and just cleared off, and we never got to the bottom of it. But when they celebrated his fiftieth birthday, that was when Novak was boss, they said he came from Holesovic in Moravia. Well, he didn't talk like a Moravian, but it's a big country, so you never know, do you, sir?

(*Query from Lt. Mares:* What happened to Koucourek?)

Piskaček: Oh, that was before the explosion. He was from Pilsen and had come to repair his sister's house. He left just before it happened and he was the one that called in on Father Domecek to ask him to come and perform the last rites for Father Gross.

Mareš: Just carry on grandad, what happened next with Novak?)

Piskaček: Well, if you're so taken up with that Novak, Inspector. But those were bad times in Ford, we don't much like talking about them, or if we do, then it's to make sure we don't bungle things again. Why, do you know, sir, in the end they even put up a statue of him on the village green. Must have cost a pretty penny, a chap called Bureš knocked it up from some stuff, why it wasn't even a likeness, standing there he was pointing somewhere over to the left – bloody awful it looked, but it was well on for two years before we took it down, I suppose we were afraid he might come back or something.

You know, sir, he didn't govern alone, not at first he didn't anyway, and it's my belief he didn't later either, why he'd never have thought up all that nonsense that went on, he couldn't have,

Piskaček, it must be noted that he displays a degree of political immaturity indicating a deficiency of the most elementary education. Mr Piskaček appears to hold romantic, indeed naive views on the organisation of modern society. Although in respect of the regime of Mr Novak certain theses, otherwise of general validity, are not fully applicable, for instance theses pertaining to revolutionary law and revolutionary power, we must, nevertheless, avoid harbouring any illusions about bourgeois parliamentarism, that besetting sin of all misguided theories of pluralism. And it is precisely this type of illusion that must, in our opinion, inevitably follow from the views expressed by Mr Piskacek. I would advise the prison authorities to devote greater attention to the elementary political education of their charges.

(Marginal note by Major Klika: Mareš, how did you come by the fellow?)

(Marginal note by Lt. Mares: Comrade Major, we employ him half time, otherwise he's an alcoholic. M.)

(From the authentic record. Piskacek:)

And we had no choice just then, or that's how it looked to us. And they boosted him, why they even wrote it on the walls – 'We Want Novak', they wrote. And whoever said a word against him, or even seemed a bit doubtful like, they were on to him at once – like old Charousek, that he was you know what, sir, homosexual as they say. Why upon my soul, sir, how can a chap that's impotent be homosexual? You know he can't be. And that Charousek was a real saint, never even looked at a woman, let alone a chap!

And so it happened, sir, after that miserable harvest in fortyseven it was, along they went one morning to the parish hall and they put Novak in. And there he was, as firm as a rock. Three and a half years he ruled over us!

Well, sir, it's all nicely written out in our village chronicle. I'm no hand at telling it, I forget the half of it and half I get wrong, but schoolmaster Krejza, he wrote it down and everything's there. And do you know, sir, what he called those times? The Dictatorship of Barber Novak, sir. The Dictatorship of Barber Novak.

Lovely, isn't it?

Mareš got the old man to repeat to him, by degrees, the 'broader version' of his story, from beginning to end. Piskaček was glad that Klika, too, was beginning to show an interest in these matters, but Mareš had gone further into them, and you could see he knew what was what – why, once he had suddenly remarked: Look here, granddad, that smithy could have been fixed up right at the start, the way that Kovanda chap did it when he joined you. You needn't have wasted four years tinkering about like that.

That was what Piskaček liked most of all about Mareš – he talked almost like one of them.

At first the old man had no idea of what Mareš had been doing before a recruiting drive pulled him into the police force. But when, for the third time, the policeman had broken into the narrative with a suggestion, a straight question evinced the information that he had been a skilled fitter. Which caused Piskaček to remark: With a first-class trade like that, Mr Commissioner, whatever made you join the coppers?

This was the second time Mareš had brought the tape-recorder. Though he had never set eyes on such a thing before, Piskaček was quite unmoved. He asked no questions, hardly looked at the machine, having such confidence in his Commissioner that he probably wouldn't have batted an eyelid if a piano had appeared.

In a while Anna brought them coffee; Piskaček fished out of his locker a bottle of Becher herbal liqueur (anyway, Mareš had given it to him, with Frühauf's permission) and with a steady hand for his age he poured out into two clean glasses that had once held mustard.

It won't be long now before they discharge you, granddad, said Mareš. You're as fit as a fiddle. The only thing is, where? You can't go home, can you? Unless, of course, you're holding something back, you know! So we're looking out for a place where you can live. The Major has in mind a nice Home for pensioners. You'll have company, people to chat with, and play cards; and you'll have enough cash for the odd pint of beer. What do you say to that?

Well, you know, I don't much mind, Mr Commissioner, replied Piskaček. I expect that'll be alright, I'm on my own, anyhow, all my family are in Stag Ford. Only I don't want to be taken for a loony. The old boys'll talk among themselves, won't they, and what am I to tell them about myself? I can't say anything but what I've been telling you here, and that's suspicious, isn't it? And I've got accustomed to you and the Inspector. That's what's worrying me.

We'll visit you, Mareš assured him. It's not far from Prague. We'll see you're alright.

Piskaček finished his coffee, sipped the liqueur and began to light his pipe. But Mareš intervened: Don't light up just now, I want you to go on telling me about things, just carry on from where we left off last time. And while you're talking, your pipe would go out.

Piskaček took a final puff, stroked the faded tablecloth and nodded: Pleased to oblige you, Mr Commissioner. And you can be sure I won't keep anything back. Why should I? It's just that

there are things I don't know about and others I don't understand. Like what really happened, how it all started, you know. But nobody in Stag Ford knows anything about that – not a soul, Mr Commissioner. Of course, people keep puzzling their heads about it, but mostly it's just idle chatter.

What do they say, granddad? Tell me about it. Tell me what people think.

That set Piskaček off.

He talked for the whole of two hours, just like the last time. That was the limit for the tape. Though Mareš didn't like having to interrupt the old man, he made excuses about pressure of work and not wanting to tire him and said he'd be back in a couple of days.

In the end they had two more sessions.

Piskaček spent eight hours retelling his story, and Mareš had a transcript done of all the relevant matter. When it was ready, they checked Mareš's record against the one Frühauf had made and against the original report from Krupicna. Piskaček had never once contradicted himself. His story about the people who figured in the cases of 1950, 1958 and 1959 was entirely convincing. It was just that *altogether*, viewed objectively, it was nonsensical.

So they agreed, for the meantime, not to add this record to the file.

That was on Tuesday.

On Wednesday morning Mareš placed on Klika's desk a Telex message conveying a request from the local police for help in the search for a foreign soldier listed as missing. This man had disappeared after a crash at the 32nd kilometre. And he had disappeared in very strange circumstances, in circumstances that both Klika and Mareš knew by heart.

Piskaček's story was, after all, appended to the 32nd kilometre file.

Let people make what they liked of it.

Chapter nine Excerpts from B-111/68

(*Note by J. Pecka PhD.*) The description of Novak the barber seems entirely credible. Petty dictators of this type were, at one time, to be found in many localities. A deviation from the usual practice can, however, be seen in the circumstance that the dictatorship of barber Novak originated, as stated more than once in the record, in *isolation* from external influences or, shall we say, from the central pattern, and in the absence of such influences the local community might well have been capable of resisting attempts to establish a regime of this nature.

Nevertheless, apart from the conditions under which the totalitarian system originated, the methods employed by Novak to *maintain* his power are undoubtedly familiar and no particularly

why I've told you, sir, he was a bit wanting, thick-skulled I'd say, he wasn't a one to have ideas. And a little shrimp of a fellow he was, couldn't have been much over five foot, but his hair was all nicely plastered down, mighty particular about that Novak was.

The next man under him was a chap called Petrik. They came to Ford together, but Petrik wasn't even a half-baked barber, he wasn't anything. But he could talk your head off, and think up campaigns – that's what they called them, sir, in those days. This Petrik was a fat little chap with spectacles, always smiling, like a priest. But what a rascal, sir! I'd say he was even worse than Novak, though he wasn't one to stick his neck out and he made sure Novak announced all the worst of their silly schemes.

What with one thing and another, sir, when I look back and turn it all over in my mind, you know, there's one thing strikes me. Some people, the ones who can't turn their hands to anything useful, if they want to make their mark in the world then there's just two things they can do – be thieves or bosses. Well just plain stealing, in a law-abiding village you know, sir, it's a ticklish business, because sooner or later a light-fingered fellow'll get nabbed. So it's really safer for layabouts like that to try their hands at running the show, because anyway they do it mostly so they can steal. And then, sir, seeing as how they don't make much of a job of running things, and it's not their place to do it, they're really robbing people of a proper government. Though that's not the end of it, to be sure, whatever they may say they always look to themselves first. Upon my word, our Novak was a case, him and his mates, and I can tell you all about it, sir, if you wish.

(... *Note by M. Vanicek PhD.*) The philosophical conclusion concerning the tendency of the incompetent and unsuccessful to compensate their sense of inferiority by getting power over other people is interesting and, indeed, the reasoning is essentially correct. The proposition that unsuitable rulers 'rob society of a proper government' indicates a keen sense of judgement on the part of the narrator, Mr Piskaček, for it appears that he is instinctively referring to the fact that one of the main sources from which the citizen derives his right to competent government lies in taxation. The rationality of this proposition speaks against the view that Mr Piskaček is mentally unstable, yet in some measure it also confirms that view, because to express such a theory in the presence of a police officer indicates a certain lack of prudence.)

(*Marginal note by Major Klika: Mareš, for goodness sake tell that man Vanicek to stop blathering, tell him we're from the traffic department.*)

(*Marginal note by Lt. Mares: As a historian Vanicek is concerned only with the year 1946, he hasn't a clue that there's any such thing as a traffic department. And he's as blind as a bat anyhow.*)

(*From the authentic record. Piskacek:*)

So you can understand, sir, what that Novak was really getting at, I should tell you first that things in Ford weren't so simple politically. You see, what with the outlying farms and all, there was

five hundred or so of us in those days, but a heap of children among them. Not much good for these political parties it wasn't, and anyhow we had our hands full, there weren't many people wanting to get up to monkey tricks of an evening. Well, we had three parties, on paper that is, not four like there were outside just after the war. You see, sir, in all that to-do we forgot about the Czech Socialists. Well, we had the Clericals, but they weren't really organised, not till much later, after Novak fell and Father Domecek took it in hand. Then we had the Social Democrats, but they were just old Charousek the chemist and maybe ten others. I used to go with them, sir, that Charousek was such a decent chap, and clever too, always ready to give advice and help people. Chemist I keep saying, but he'd never have made a living as a chemist in Ford, he had a sort of shop where he sold everything, but he was a real chemist, sir, and a good one, the mixtures he could make, may God rest his soul.

Now I mustn't run on – well, we had the Communists too. Shustr that was, and the people he brought with him from Benesov, where the Germans had a shooting range during the war. Ten or so of them there were.

When the big bang came in 'fortysix – and that was just the day after we buried old Father Gross – there was a fine to-do, everyone trying to get out. Why, sir, I'll tell you straight, I tried it myself, clambered over those hills I did getting on for two months before the fit left me. Some carried on longer, but the real madness was over by autumn. For one thing, winter was coming, the days were drawing in, people got together in the village and tongues started wagging. I think we all knew we'd have to make do somehow till we managed to get out or people from the outside found a way to our village.

But about what to do, on that everybody was of a different mind. Mostly people looked to themselves, they stocked up at home and there was quite a bit of thieving, I'm sorry to have to admit that, sir. Really I don't recall much about that winter, but I do remember the talk about Novak, how good he was and how he'd be the salvation of us all – that was when it started. It puzzled me for a long time, sir, why for Christ's sake Novak of all people. He cut my hair once, I've still got his mark on my neck, a real nobody he seemed to me, but I wondered if I'd been mistaken.

Mark you, sir, there wasn't anybody else just then; if we'd been able to pick and choose, but when it came to the point there was only Novak and his boys, so there it was. Anyway, what decent chap would take it into his head to order others about all of a sudden?

So it strikes me sometimes, sir, that if there's any medicine at all against those Novaks, then it has to be taken beforehand. Once you've got your Novak it's too late, do what you like, there he sits and wild horses won't shift him. Believe me, sir, the main thing is to be able to choose. When people can't choose, then begging your pardon, sir, there's bugger all you can do about it.

(*Note by V. Humplik PhD.*) In assessing the narrator, Mr

country's major newspaper, as it came off the presses and authorised distribution only after each edition had been cleared. The police action was taken because the newspaper ignored instructions not to report on the political manoeuvring within the government to decide on a successor to President Emilio Medici whose term expires in 1974.

Early in January *Opinão*, an independent and authoritative critical journal, reported in one of its weekly issues that it had been told by the federal police that future issues would have to be submitted each week for 'previous revision' – a measure imposed on about four other newspapers in the country.

Early in January the Ministry of Justice banned the sale of Picasso's 'Erotic Engravings' after they had been available for three years because they were 'contrary to public morals and good behaviour'.

It was reported in November that **Jorge Fidelino de Galvão Figueiredo**, the economics editor of *Visão*, who had been held in São Paulo prison since February, was sentenced to four years' imprisonment for 'spreading subversive propaganda'. He was charged with the publication of a clandestine bulletin *Venceremos* and accepted responsibility.

BURMA

It was reported in October that the government had withdrawn the printing licences of 31 publications because, according to an official announcement, many publishers either had not paid taxes or had sold or illegally lent out their licences.

CAMBODIA

Gaston Beaudet, a French cameraman arrested in July 1971, was released in October 1972.

It was reported in November that the newspaper *Lout Laos* had been suspended for 'endangering the security of the State'. It was the third newspaper to be banned within a month.

It was reported in December that **Jean Pierre Challard**, the French journalist and correspondent of the US magazines *Time* and *Life*, had been expelled in connection with a 'police affair'.

CANADA

Dr Istvan Meszaros, the Marxist lecturer who had been refused entry into Canada in September (see INDEX Nos.3–4, p.114), won his appeal against the decision of the immigration authorities in January and received an entry visa to allow him to take up his appointment later in the month (see also p.53).

CHAD

It was reported in November that **Marie-Claire Leroy**, head of the *Agence France-Press* in Fort-Lamy, had been expelled by the authorities for unspecified reasons.

CHILE

On 13 October the government took over all radio stations and on the 23rd closed down three opposition stations for six days for broadcasting programmes which had not received prior government approval.

COLUMBIA

Karl Staff, a Swedish journalist, was arrested and expelled on 18 July on suspicion of subversive activities, the police claiming that he had had contacts with guerrilla organisations.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Luděk Pachman, the Czechoslovak chess grandmaster who was convicted of subversion in May (see INDEX No.2, p.90), was allowed to leave the country for West Germany on 29 November after frontier officials had impounded his exit visas earlier in the month.

Thirty intellectuals and former party supporters who had received prison sentences in the series of trials held in Prague and Brno during July and August 1972 (see INDEX Nos.3–4 pp.114–5) had appeals against their sentences rejected by the Supreme Court in mid-November. Three of the 46 persons convicted had their sentences reduced as a result of appeals; they were: **Anna Sabatova**, whose sentence of three and a half years was reduced to three years; her brother **Vaclav Sabata**, whose two-year term was suspended for three years; and **Karel Cejka**, whose sentence of two

years was reduced to 18 months. Most of the 13 others had received suspended prison sentences and did not appeal.

Jiří Lederer, the journalist and author, who had been sentenced to two years' imprisonment in February 1972 (see INDEX No.1, p.82) was released on 12 December after serving 10 months and appeared at the Prague City Court the following day to petition for the return of written material confiscated during house searches by security police officials in January 1972 just before his trial.

On 12 December the regional court in Pilsen rejected an appeal by **David Hathaway**, a British minister of the *Pentecostal Church*, against a two-years' prison sentence passed on him in October on a charge of incitement after he was arrested in June at the Czechoslovak-West German border carrying bibles and pamphlets in his luggage.

Jaroslav Vostry, the founder and director of the Prague *Cinoherni Klub* theatre, was dismissed from his post by the Ministry of Culture in November.

It was reported in October that the journalists **Jiří Hochman** and **Vladimir Nepraš** (see INDEX No.1, p.82) had been temporarily released from prison for reasons of health after serving six months (see also p.71).

EGYPT

Early in January the government decided to suspend studies in the country's five universities after a week of student protests demanding the release of 45 students detained on charges of distributing leaflets criticising the government. Earlier members of the *Egyptian Press Syndicate* called for an end to press censorship and drew attention to the students' claim that some of them – 40 at that date – were being persecuted by the authorities for being outspoken. It was announced on 23 January that the authorities had released the detained students and that the universities would reopen on 27 January.

In a broadcast on 21 November *Radio Cairo* said that 'political quarters' in Cairo were considering applying a 'total boycott' to the *BBC* because it was engaging in hostile propaganda against the

Egyptian people and was 'serving as a Zionist tool'.

EAST GERMANY

A number of West German and foreign correspondents were refused accreditation when the treaty between East and West Germany was signed in East Germany on 21 December on the grounds that there was not sufficient room in the building of the Ministers' Council where the ceremony was held; but one correspondent who was present estimated that there was room for double the number of 240 journalists who were admitted. Although arrangements had been made in advance, West German television could not transmit the press conference which followed, nor could the West Berlin radio station *SFB*, although other reporters had no difficulty in giving a live report. The West German journalists' union later made a protest and the Opposition announced that it would raise the matter in the *Bundestag*. The treaty specifically mentions facilitation of journalists' work, guaranteeing the right of West German journalists to work in the *GDR* with free access to information sources and uncensored reporting.

EIRE

The nine members of the Authority (governing board) of the *Radio Telefís Eireann (RTE)*, were dismissed by the government on 24 November for their alleged failure to comply with the directive, issued under Section 31 of the Broadcasting Authority Act, 1960, by Gerard Collins, *Minister of Posts and Telegraphs*, in October 1971 (see INDEX Nos.3–4, p.116). The government's action followed the broadcast in a radio programme, *This Week*, on 19 November of an account of an interview said to have been given in the early hours of the same day by Sean MacStiofain, the Provisional Republican leader who was standing trial in Dublin on charges under Section 21 of the Offences Against the State Act. (For a fuller account see p.21.)

Kevin O'Kelly, a news features editor with *Radio Telefís Eireann*, was sentenced to three months' imprisonment on 25 November for contempt of the Special Criminal Court during the trial of Sean MacStiofain. He refused a directive by the court to identify the voice on a tape produced during

report which said that Washington and Hanoi had come to an agreement on the 'neutrality' of South Vietnam. It was reported in November that *Tien Tuyen*, a daily newspaper, was seized for reports about the peace talks along with three other newspapers in Saigon. About the same time the publisher of the newspaper *Dai Dan Toc* had been fined for publishing two articles from foreign news agencies that the government considered detrimental to the national interest.

It was reported in December that a Saigon court had imprisoned three newspaper editors for contravening the press law by publishing articles 'harming national security', 'glorifying communism and neutralism' and 'encouraging immorality'.

SOVIET UNION

Number 27 of the unofficial *samizdat* journal *Chronicle of Current Events* appeared in Moscow in November and will be published by *Amnesty International* in English in February.

Among the people arrested apparently in connexion with the *Chronicle of Current Events* (see INDEX Nos.3-4, p.120), the cybernetician **Leonid Plyushch** has been ruled insane and was sentenced in January by a Kiev court to indefinite detention in a prison-hospital. The astronomer **Kronid Lyubarsky** received five years in a strict-regime labour camp for 'anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda' at a closed trial at Noginsk in October. The Novosibirsk scientist **Alexander Rybakov** was ruled insane in Moscow's *Serbsky Institute* in the late summer and is presumed to have been dispatched by a court to a prison-hospital. In September the Muscovite **Roald Mukhamedyarov**, author of some *samizdat* memoirs, was arrested, followed in December by the Moscow engineer **Irina Belogorodskaya**, whose arrest was apparently a KGB retaliation for the appearance of *Chronicle* 27. In January the KGB threatened that if *Chronicle* 28 appeared, the literary critic and translator **Anatoly Yakobson** would be arrested.

In the autumn of 1972 **Andrei Dubrov**, author of an appeal in defence of **Pyotr Yakir** (see INDEX Nos.3-4, p.120) and of an essay on the political control of Soviet students published in Paris, was at the last moment deprived of his permission to

emigrate to Israel and subjected to intensive interrogations.

The physicist **Valery Chalidze** was allowed in November to travel to the USA and give some lectures, but in December was deprived of his Soviet citizenship so that he could not return home.

A Kiev psychiatrist, **Dr Semyon Gluzman**, who had been arrested in May 1972 apparently for writing a *samizdat* analysis of the case of General Grigorenko (which has only just reached the West), was sentenced in Kiev in October to seven years in strict-regime labour camps plus three years of internal exile. An appeal by Academician **Andrei Sakharov**, published in *The Times* (9 December), called on the world psychiatric profession to intercede for Gluzman and to institute an international enquiry into all perversions of psychiatry in the service of political repression.

In January **Pyotr Starchik**, who worked until his arrest in April at Moscow's Institute of Psychology, was ruled insane by a court and dispatched to the prison-hospital in Kazan for indefinite detention. Starchik was charged with 'anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda'. His religious beliefs apparently contributed to the psychiatric report finding him 'non-responsible'.

In November four scholars of Buddhism, who had earlier been arrested in Ulan-Ude, the capital of Buryat-Mongolia, were ruled insane. They were **Alexander Zheleznov**, **Yury Lavrov**, **Vladimir Montlevich**, an ethnographer from the Leningrad Museum of Atheism and Religions, and **Donatas Butkus** from the Museum of Ethnography in Vilnius. The leader of these scholars, who were charged with having a Buddhist world-view, forming a religious group and performing 'acts of religious fanaticism', was **Bidya Dandaron**, a research officer of the *Buryat Institute of Social Sciences*. Dandaron, who is the author of books on Tibet and Buddhism, was sentenced in Ulan-Ude in December to five years of ordinary-regime camps. In the autumn other scholars specialising in oriental religions were subjected to flat-searches and interrogations, notably **Oktyabrina Volkova** and **Alexander Pyatigorsky**, both of Moscow, **Bronislav Kuznetsov** and **Valery Rudoi** of Leningrad, and **Linart Miall** of Tartu in Estonia.

Volodymyr Raketsky, a young Kiev journalist, was sentenced to five years of strict-regime camps in the summer for 'anti-Soviet agitation' of an apparently Ukrainian nationalist character. The *Chronicle of Current Events* 26 confused his name with that of **Vladimir Rakityansky**, so the item about Rakityansky in INDEX Nos.3-4, p.123 in fact concerns Raketsky. There is no reason to believe that Rakityansky has been arrested or sentenced.

In August **Yury Yukhnovets**, who had been expelled from the Journalism Faculty of *Moscow University* in 1958 in his fourth year, was arrested in Moscow.

Meri Kezheradze, a lecturer in English at the *Pedagogical Institute* in Tbilisi (Georgia), was sacked from her job last summer for practising her religion.

In November the poet and publicist **Yury Galanskov** died in Camp 3 of the Mordovian complex, after an operation for peritonitis which he was forced to undergo despite the strong opposition of himself and his friends. He had been reduced to a state of extreme weakness by being forced to do manual labour since 1968 despite serious stomach ulcers. In 1968 he was sentenced to seven years in strict-regime labour camps for editing the *samizdat* journal *Phoenix* '66.

Zinoviyy Antonyuk, a Candidate of Sciences of the *Kiev Institute of Cybernetics*, who had been arrested in January 1972 (cf. INDEX No.1, p.87), was sentenced in August to seven years' strict-regime camps and three years' exile for circulating *samizdat*. Among other things, he was charged with copying the *Ukrainian Herald* No.3 (October 1970) on film, which was then taken to Czechoslovakia; he denied having had any part in passing the film on.

Ihor Kalynets, a poet, arrested in July 1972 (see INDEX No. 3-4, p.121), was sentenced in late November to nine years' imprisonment and three years' exile. Reportedly the court was unable to prove his having written or circulated any 'anti-Soviet' material.

The poet **Vasyl Stus**, arrested in January 1972 (cf. INDEX No.3-4, p. 123), was sentenced in early

September in Kiev to five years' strict-regime camps and three years' exile. Charges were based on: a draft of an article (not circulated) on the famous Soviet Ukrainian poet, the late Pavlo Tychyna; a letter to official agencies criticising the fact that young Ukrainian writers are denied publication; telling two jokes deemed 'anti-Soviet'; and the publication of a collection of his poetry in Ukrainian *Zymovi dereva* ('Winter Trees'), in Brussels in 1970.

Two research workers of the *Institute of Philosophy of the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences*, **Vasyl Lisovy** and **Yevhen Pronyuk**, were arrested in early July 1972. Lisovy had written a letter to the Soviet authorities protesting about the latest wave of persecutions and supporting his protest with an analysis of the condition of Ukrainian culture and economy. Some photographic copies, addressed to prominent Soviet personalities, had been confiscated from Pronyuk before they could be posted.

A teacher of English, **Ivan Kovalenko**, who had been arrested in January 1972, was sentenced in July in Kiev to five years' strict-regime camps for possessing *samizdat* works of Dzyuba, Chornovil and Moroz (cf. INDEX No.1, p.87 and Nos.3-4, pp.121, 166) and for having spoken, in his school's SCR, against the 'internationalist aid' to Czechoslovakia.

The poet **Hryhorii Chubay**, arrested in January 1972 (cf. INDEX No.1, p.87), was in fact released after three days' detention.

Further details are now known concerning the charges levelled against the teacher **Oleksander Serhiyenko**, arrested in January 1972 and sentenced in Kiev to seven years' strict-regime camps and three years' exile (cf. INDEX No.1, p.87 and Nos. 3-4, p.122). The main charge was that he had made, for himself, marginal notes on 33 pages of a *samizdat* copy of Dzyuba's *Internationalism or Russification?* while reading it; the court classified this as editorial corrections, and he was accused of collaboration in the creation of an anti-Soviet work (although he was not acquainted with Dzyuba). He was also charged with having spoken against the 'internationalist aid' to Czechoslovakia and about the Ukraine's right to self-determination.

Further to being expelled from the Writers' Union for reading *samizdat*, the literary scholar **Viktor Ivanysenko** (see INDEX Nos.3-4, p.122) was also expelled from the Party and dismissed from the *Institute of Literature*.

The investigation of the cases of the Ukrainian literary critics **Ivan Dzyuba**, arrested in April 1972 (see INDEX No.3-4, p.121), and **Ivan Svitlychny**, arrested in January 1972 (see pp. 82-9), has spread beyond the Ukraine's boundaries: in June the flat of the Latvian poetess, **Vizma Belševica**, a member of the Writers' Union, was searched by the KGB in Riga in connexion with the Dzyuba case, and in July the KGB interrogated the Moscow critic **Leonid Pinsky** and **Ye. A. Grin**, in Svitlychny's case.

The writer **Zinoviyy Krasivsky**, sentenced in 1968 to 17 years (five in prison, seven in camps and five exile) as a member of the organisation 'Ukrainian National Front', was tried again in December 1971 in prison for the writing and dissemination, in oral and written form, of 'nationalist' poems, among them one entitled 'Apocalypse'. In spring 1972, the notorious D. R. Lunts et al. commission of the *Serbsky Institute* declared him legally insane and in the late 1972 he was in the prison's hospital wing awaiting transfer to a special psychiatric [prison] hospital.

A collection of stories by the 73-year-old well-known Soviet Ukrainian writer **Borys Antonenko-Davydovych** was removed from last year's catalogue of books to be published in 1973 when the latter was already at the page-proof stage (*Novi knyhy Ukrainy* 1973, p.170). Known for his sympathies with dissident writers, he was named in the poet **Mykola Kholodny's** recantation last summer (see INDEX No.3-4, p.122) as having been a 'bad influence' on Kholodny. Antonenko-Davydovych protested against this calumny in a letter to *Literaturna Ukraina*, which remained unpublished. In reply, the authorities have promised to have his 'frozen' book published, but only if he condemns in print the 'activities' of the arrested Ukrainian intellectuals.

V. I. Zakharchenko, a writer from Cherkassy in the Ukraine, was expelled from the *Writers' Union* 'for anti-social behaviour contravening the statutes of the W.U.' in late October 1972. The

official announcement gave no details, but it is known that in June 1970 his flat in Donetsk was searched and books and papers were confiscated, after which he moved to Cherkassy to avoid further harassment.

Yu. Zbanatsky, Chairman of the Kiev branch of the *Writers' Union* of the Ukraine, would like the Union to exercise preliminary censorship. Speaking in October 1972 at the branch's board meeting he regretted that the prose writers' section had not read the MS of **I. Bilyk's** historical novel *Mech Areya* ('Arey's Sword'), 'negligently admitted into print' by a Kiev publishing house and now turning out to have 'serious ideological and artistic defects'.

In spite of persistent attempts to suppress it, issue No.6 of the *samizdat* journal *Ukrainian Herald* appeared in March 1972. In December 1972 it was published in Ukrainian in Paris. The contents include a letter to the authorities dated 26 October 1970 from the poet **Mykola Kholodny** (arrested in 1972: see INDEX No.3-4, p.122) on the difficulties of young authors getting published; the second part of a lengthy essay by **V. Chornovil** on Dzyuba's *Internationalism or Russification?* (see also p.81); reports of individuals being persecuted for using Ukrainian in offices and schools; details of a campaign against the Ukrainian folk song choir *Homin* and its members, culminating in its dissolution in September 1971 on charges of 'nationalism'; and further details about the formation of the *Nina Strokatoval Defence Committee* (see INDEX No.2, p.97) in December 1971. Apart from one member, **Leonid Tymchuk** of Odessa who may still be free, the rest of the committee have since been arrested (**Pyotr Yakir**, **V. Chornovil**) or in some cases (**Iryna Stasiv-Kalynets**, **Vasyl Stus**) sentenced to imprisonment.

Mykhaylo Braychevsky, Candidate of Historical Sciences and a senior research worker at the *Academy of Sciences* of the Ukrainian SSR, was dismissed from the *Institute of History* in September 1972 as part of a four per cent staff reduction at the Academy aimed at members entertaining 'nationalist and anti-Soviet moods'. Braychevsky's dismissal is thought to be connected with an article he wrote six years ago, entitled 'Annexation or Reunification', and submitted without success to a Soviet publishing house. In

1971 the article was published in a Ukrainian émigré journal in Canada, *Novi dni* ('New Days') and last year came out as a separate brochure. In April 1972 Braychevsky publicly dissociated himself from its publication abroad but not from the article itself.

SPAIN

Following the resignation of academic staff in September (see INDEX Nos.3-4, p.124-5) the governing body of the *University of Valencia* resigned on 10 October in protest against the refusal of the *Ministry of Education* to renew the annual contracts of eight professors. The government claimed that the conduct of the eight during the previous years' courses had been 'suspect' - probably because of their political convictions, according to academic sources. The governing body, which had announced its intention of resigning the previous month, consisted of the rector, **Rafael Bartual**, the two deputy rectors, five deans, the secretary-general and the director of the Institute of Educational Sciences.

It was reported in October that the Supreme Court had quashed the conviction of **Federico Villagrán**, editor of the Malaga newspaper *Sol de España*, on charges of contempt for refusing to reveal the name of the writer of a letter to his paper. It was also reported that a recent issue of the magazine *Indice* had been seized, apparently because it contained an interview with an opposition member.

It was reported in November that the public prosecutor had asked that **Rafael Calvo Serer**, publisher of the suppressed newspaper, *Madrid*, now in liquidation (see INDEX Nos.3-4, p.124) be sentenced to seven years' imprisonment and a fine of 50,000 pesetas for 'offences against the authority of the State'. The publisher has been living in voluntary exile in France since the end of 1971.

On 1 November a naval tribunal in El Ferrol in north-east Spain imposed 42-month sentences and a fine of about £2,000 (or an additional six months' imprisonment for failing to pay it) on each of four people accused of distributing 'subversive propaganda' aboard the frigate 'Balears'. Prison sentences totalling 16 years had meanwhile

been imposed by a public order tribunal in Malaga on **Pedro Cueto Lucas** on charges of spreading 'subversive propaganda' and reorganising the Communist Party in Malaga. The tribunal acquitted nine of the 38 people accused and handed out prison sentences from one to 10 years on most of the remainder.

The *Spanish Supreme Court* ruled on 6 January that all communist tracts are not necessarily 'illegal propaganda' and therefore not necessarily illegal in Spain. The ruling was the result of an appeal against the *Public Order Court*, which had found two defendants guilty of illegal propaganda after customs police found a number of communist-inspired books and pamphlets in their luggage; they were each sentenced to one year's imprisonment and fined about £60. After studying the evidence in the appeal case, the Supreme Court accepted the defence argument that the communist literature in question dealt only with communist doctrine and internal disputes among communists and did not refer specifically to Spain. The defence maintained that under the law only literature which 'attacks the Spanish state or its political regime' is illegal propaganda. The two defendants were acquitted.

Jose Maria Moreno Galvan, an art critic and a professor at *Madrid University*, was finally brought to trial on 27 January after a long series of postponements. He was charged with holding a 'non-pacific reunion' as a result of having defied a ban of lectures to commemorate Picasso's ninetyeth birthday in November 1971 (see INDEX No.1, p.88). On 8 February he was sentenced to two years' imprisonment.

In December six Catalan writers had their passports confiscated and were each fined 200,000 pesetas after sitting as members of the literary jury at the *Floral Games*, an annual competition of Catalan poetry and prose, which was held on 29 October at the *University of Geneva*. They were **Josep Maria Castellet**, **Alexandre Cirici-Pellicer**, **Fèlix Cucurull**, **Josep Fauli**, **Albert Manent** and **Joan Iriadú**.

Manuel Sacristan, a Marxist professor of economics at the *University of Barcelona*, was arrested on 22 December and accused of 'insults to members of the government and illegal propaganda'.

ran into further difficulty the same day over a film screen the prosecution wanted erected in the courtroom, on which the jury would be shown projections of photo transparencies of many of the documents. After the defence had protested that the screen would have blocked the view of the proceedings for the press and spectators and was 'entirely improper', the judge ordered a smaller one to be used. **Dr Daniel Ellsberg** and various members of the defence claimed privately that the government was intentionally seeking to keep the public from seeing the trial. On 28 January the judge ruled that the government could not withhold from the defendants reports made by experts hired by the Defence and State Departments showing that the release of more than half the documents did not endanger America's national defence. **Daniel Ellsberg** is accused with **Anthony Russo** on eight counts of espionage and seven counts of theft and conspiracy.

URUGUAY

It was reported in November that a new State Security Law containing restrictive press provisions had come into force.

On 15 January the government banned three editions of the evening paper *Ultima Hora*, organ of the left-wing coalition **Frente Amplio**, for publishing a report about an army captain and doctor who had given up his post in the Military Hospital of Montevideo, in protest against the torturing of political suspects and the use of medical science in the administration of torture.

WEST GERMANY

In October the *Bonn Landgericht* rejected a complaint by the head of the Bonn office of the illustrated magazine *Quick* against the seizure of material from its office by the police in August (see INDEX Nos.3-4, p.126).

YUGOSLAVIA

On 5 October **Zlatko Tomičić**, a Croatian writer and former editor of *Knjizevni List*, a literary magazine, was sentenced to three years' strict imprisonment for criminal activity against the people, espionage and hostile propaganda; he was found

to have falsely represented the political, economic and cultural position of the Croatian people and to have openly expounded separatist ideas.

Four former Croatian student leaders received sentences of between one and four years' imprisonment in Zagreb on 5 October. The trial began two months earlier when all were charged with 'counter-revolutionary activity and with trying to separate Croatia from Yugoslavia'. They were **Dražen Budiša**, the former president of the Zagreb Students' Organisation, who was sentenced to four years; **Ivan Zvonimir Čičak**, the former student pro-rector, and **Ante Paradžik**, the former president of the Croatian Students' Union, each of whom received three years; **Goran Djodig**, the former vice-president of the Zagreb Students' Union, who was the only one to cooperate with the court, received one year.

On 6 October a further six Zagreb University students were sentenced to between one and two years' strict imprisonment while another received six months. All seven were charged with attempts to overthrow the Yugoslav social order and elected representatives bodies, and with abuse of the freedom of the press, public speech and assembly before their arrest in December 1971.

Vlado Gotovac, the poet and former editor of the suppressed weekly, *Hrvatski Tjednik*, and **Dr Hrvoje Šošić**, the economist, both members of the suppressed Croatian cultural organisation *Matica Hrvatska*, who were arrested after President Tito denounced this organisation in December 1971 (see INDEX No.1, p.91), were sentenced to four and two and a half years' imprisonment respectively on 26 October. Gotovac, who was accused of mis-using his newspaper to propagate Croatian separatism and to have deliberately presented a distorted picture of Croatia's position within the Yugoslav Federation, was also banned from all public activity for a further four years, including the publication of any his writing. Dr Šošić was alleged to have demanded that Croatia should seek membership of the United Nations, have a separate national bank and the right to obtain foreign loans. Both the accused denied the charges which Gotovac described as 'absurd'.

A further three members of the *Matica Hrvatska* went on trial in Zagreb on 9 October - **Dr Marko**

Veselica, Jožo Ivičević-Bakulić and **Zvonimir Komarica**. The prosecutor alleged that they had established an illegal counter-revolutionary group within the *Matica Hrvatska* and had organised the student strike in Zagreb in November 1971 in order to create a political crisis and start a revolution. On 24 November Veselica was sentenced to seven years' imprisonment, Ivičević Bakulić to five years and Komarica to two years.

On 20 November the *Supreme Court of Serbia* permanently banned distribution of the July-August issue of the literary magazine *Gradina* because of an article which 'could cause incorrect interpretation of social relations and thus bring about anxiety among citizens'.

The following foreign newspapers were seized for publishing articles offensive to the authorities: *Corriere della Sera*, issues of 29 October and 1 November, *Die Zeit* of 3 November, the *Daily Express* of the same date and *Der Spiegel* of 6 November.

Johann Balvany, an Austrian journalist, was expelled in November for being involved in 'enemy activities'.

On 14 November the Belgrade District Public Prosecutor's Office temporarily banned a current issue of *Student*, the Belgrade University students' magazine, because of an article which 'presented a distorted picture of the socio-political situation in Yugoslavia'. The magazine has been frequently banned in the past (see INDEX No.1, p.91).

On 15 November Belgrade District Court placed a permanent ban on the book *Preispitivanja* ('Reexamination') by **Dr Mihajlo Marković**, a professor at Belgrade University, because of a chapter which contained 'false and distorted arguments causing alarm among the population'.

In October the current number of *Glas Concila*, the largest Catholic fortnightly in the country, was banned for publishing 'false and alarming information' and for 'inciting people to disobedience against the constitution and the law'.

Dragoljub Ilić, director of *Belgrade Television*, who was severely criticised in September for a 'politically harmful comment', was reported in December to have resigned.

On 3 January **Mihajlo Mihajlov**, the lecturer and critic, announced that his appeal against a one-month sentence for publishing an article in the *New York Times* in October 1970 had been rejected by the *Supreme Court of Vojvodina*. At the same time he released the text of a letter he had written to President Tito requesting that he be permitted either to find employment or else to receive a passport and travel abroad. At the end of January he was informed that on the recommendation of President Tito he was to be allowed to take up a post at the *Serbian Institute of Art and Literature*. It appears, however, that he will still have to enter an open competition for the post and his employment is not yet assured. Meanwhile it is still not clear whether he will have to serve the month in jail.

SOURCES

Amnesty Publications, Ankara Daily News, The Australian, BBC Summary of World Broadcasts, A Chronicle of Current Events, The Daily Telegraph, Evening Tbilisi, The Financial Times, The Guardian, International Herald Tribune, International Press Institute Reports, Radio Free Europe Situation Reports, The Irish Times, The Journalist, Le Monde, The Observer, The New York Times, Reuters, The Sunday Times, Sydney Sunday Telegraph, The Times, U.K. Press Gazette, Ukrainian Herald.

Victor Swoboda

Cat and mouse in the Ukraine

A great deal is now known about the professional difficulties of dissident intellectuals in the Soviet Union and the publication problems of outspoken Russian writers. These have led to the rise of the phenomenon known as samizdat or 'self-publishing' in manuscript form. Far less, however, has been written about similar activities in the non-Russian parts of the Soviet Union, notably in the Baltic republics (Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia) and the Ukraine.

In the Ukraine the problems of the writers are intimately bound up with the problem of Ukrainian cultural independence and Ukrainian autonomy and are complicated by the political bogey of 'nationalism'. But apart from this the Ukrainian writers' situation has much in common with that of their Russian colleagues, as is shown by a series of trials and by the ries of a samizdat journal, the Ukrainian Herald, that is remarkably similar to the Russian Chronicle of Current Events.

In our last issue we published an extract from Mykhaylo Osadchyy's autobiographical novel The Mote in order to convey something of the flavour of today's literary life in the Ukraine, and now Victor Swoboda discusses some typical cases.

Two significant dates occurred very recently within a day of each other: Britain's entry into the enlarged European Economic Community on 31 December 1972 and, on 30 December, the fiftieth anniversary of the formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Their proximity naturally suggests some comparisons. The EEC is expected to progress from economic co-operation to political unity around 1984 (shades of Orwell!), while the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, having none of Andrei Amalrik's apprehensions (*Will the USSR Survive until 1984?*), proclaimed in *Pravda* apropos of its anniversary: 'The Union of Socialist Republics is the most viable and perfect form of organisation of a multinational State, [in which] the closest unity, all-round blossoming and steadfast *rapprochement* of all nations and nationalities are determined by the nature of our system and are an objective law of the development of Socialism.'

It seems to be generally understood (though not laid down in so many words) that any nation signatory or accessory to the Treaty of Rome may at any time abrogate the treaty and withdraw from the EEC. The right of each of the fifteen nations, the Union Republics, which signed the Treaty of Union on 30 December 1922 or joined the Soviet Union later, to withdraw from the Union is actually laid down both in the treaty and in the current USSR Constitution, Article 17: 'The right freely to secede from the USSR is reserved to every Union Republic.' But, in November 1960 in the Ukraine, a lawyer and a member of the propaganda network of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU), Lev Lukyanenko, together with some colleagues and friends discussed whether the question of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic's secession from the USSR should be put for decision before the Ukraine's parliament, the Supreme Soviet, or to her citizens by a referendum. As a result Lukyanenko was secretly sentenced to death (commuted to fifteen years' imprisonment in labour camps) and six other people to terms of from seven to fifteen years in a travesty of a trial in which the prosecution and the judges violated many provisions of Soviet law itself.¹

This kind of overreaction suggests that the present Soviet regime does not believe in the stability of the professed 'closest unity' between the Union Republics, which is not really surprising, since the regime can never be sure even of its own legitimacy while no meaningful elections are held (the first – and so far only – democratic elections under the Soviet Bolshevik regime were held in November-December 1917 to elect a Constituent Assembly, which was promptly dissolved by the Bolsheviks because they had failed to win a majority in it).

¹ See *Ferment in the Ukraine* ed. MICHAEL BROWNE (Macmillan, London and Praeger, New York 1971) pp.16-8, 33-93.

The Ukrainian SSR with its territory of 234,000 sq. miles is slightly larger than France and its population (48 million in 1972) almost equals that of France, comprising one-fifth of the USSR total and being second only to the population of the Russian Republic. By the number of its speakers, Ukrainian is the second largest Slavonic language after Russian. The Ukraine's capital, Kiev, was founded in the 6th century, and she had never been a dependency of Moscow (which first appeared in 1147) until 1654, when she submitted herself to the Muscovite Tsar's protectorate. And it was only in the late 18th century that the last vestiges of the Ukraine's autonomy within the Russian Empire were eroded.

The results were disastrous, particularly in the cultural sphere: a country with nearly complete literacy, supplying scholars and clerics to culturally backward Moscow in the 17th and early 18th centuries, had become 87 per cent illiterate by the late 19th century, following governmental bans on Ukrainian in publishing and education.

Meanwhile, as elsewhere in Europe and the Russian Empire, the 19th century in the Ukraine was marked by rising national consciousness. One of its manifestations was the rise and growth of Ukrainian literature, which the Tsarist government tried to contain and suppress by the usual methods of censorship, as well as prosecuting individuals for the writing and possession of manuscript literature (the forerunner of today's *samizdat*) or for the appearance of their works in foreign print. (Parallels with the present situation are striking, down to the amazing fact that the poems deleted in 1950-55 by the Soviet censor from the 'complete' works of Taras Shevchenko - the Ukraine's national poet - were almost exactly the ones that had offended the Tsar's censors a hundred years beforehand.)

With the collapse of the Russian Empire after World War I and in the two 1917 revolutions that followed, a series of independent states arose in its former non-Russian borderlands which the Russian Bolsheviks rushed to reconquer. By 1920, the bulk of the Ukraine was in their hands. In order to create support for themselves among the non-Russian populations of the newly created Soviet Republics, now incorporated into the USSR, the Bolsheviks initiated in 1923 the policy of the 'indigenisation' of the Party and government apparatus and of cultural life. In the Ukraine the result was that not only was Ukrainian in the ascendant in official use, publishing, education at all levels and in flourishing scholarship, but also a vigorous Ukrainian literature developed, enjoying a comparatively broad freedom of expression, despite the existence of 'temporary' censorship [see INDEX nos.3-4, 1972].

This progress was brought to an abrupt end in 1932-3, when Stalin ordered the compulsory collectivisation of agriculture in the Ukraine, resulting in several million dead, mostly peasants, in the 1933 famine. At the same time Stalin's 'Great Terror' claimed in the Ukraine over two million victims, chiefly among intellectuals,

Background

Vasyl Symonenko

the Party and government at all levels. In 1933, genuine scholarly and cultural activity all but ceased, the policy of Ukrainisation was reversed and literary activity abruptly dropped to a fraction of that of the preceding years, with literature being subjected to rigid control and direction by the Party leadership under Stalin. World War II claimed a further four million victims in the Ukraine, but the post-war period brought no hoped-for relaxation in Stalin's anti-Ukrainian policy.

Stalin's death and the denunciation of his crimes by Khrushchev in 1956 inaugurated the 'Thaw' and raised new hopes. Meanwhile, a new generation grew up without first-hand experience of the Great Terror and not paralysed by their elders' fear. In the Ukraine, this generation produced a number of new writers, poets and critics in the late 1950s and early 1960s who defied antiquated literary dogmas and searched for new ideas and ways of expression. The work of one of them, Vasyl Symonenko (1935-63), presents particularly striking paradoxes and also typifies the dilemma of the thinking individual in Soviet society.

Symonenko's poetry is officially described as 'the voice of a faithful patriot, the son of his people, the voice of a Communist' and as expressing his 'ardent love for the Party', and his works regularly appeared in official periodicals and were produced in book form by state publishing houses between 1957 and 1966, while a new collected edition was announced to appear in late 1972. Though the first half of his official characterisation is amply confirmed in his works, there is nothing to suggest that he did love the Party; on the contrary, he significantly wrote in his diary: 'I am against a new religion, against the hypocrites who are not without success trying to transform Marxism into a religion, into a Procrustean bed for science, art and love. . . . If Marxism does not withstand the savage onslaught of dogmatism it is doomed to become a religion. No teaching must be allowed to monopolise the spiritual life of mankind.'

Quite a few of Symonenko's poems did not, however, pass the censor, while several others suffered various cuts, and the case of one of them is quite remarkable. In some Western dictatorships, censors have been known to remove unacceptable matter at the last minute, leaving tell-tale blanks in the finished product; the pre-revolutionary Russian censor did the same. The Soviet censor, on the other hand, works secretly, prefers to leave no trace of his activity if at all possible, and generally wishes his existence were not known to the public, including authors. Thus, when the poem which Symonenko called 'To the Ukraine' was first published in a collection of his poetry in 1964, four out of the original eight stanzas were omitted without the gaps being indicated (one of the four banned stanzas had the significant lines: 'Let Americas and Russias silent be | when I speak with thee [viz. the Ukraine]'). When reprinted in 1966 in a volume of his collected poetry, this poem still had only four stanzas, but rows of dots were inserted indicating

the positions of the stanzas deleted by the first censor (see illustration right), an unusual example of the censor being successfully defied by (presumably) the editor.

The full text of the poem is in any case very well known in *samizdat*, as are Symonenko's other unpublished or cut poems, which started to circulate, with his own active assistance, in considerable numbers as early as 1961, if not before (this is, as far as can be ascertained, the first instance of large-circulation *samizdat* in the Soviet Union). According to some estimates, the number of type-script, photographic and tape-recorded copies of his poems, both unpublished and published but out of print, has far exceeded published book runs (the three 1962-6 editions of his poetry totalled 31,000 copies).

Among his unpublished poems, 'To the Kurdish Brother' may be singled out for note. In it, he exhorts 'the Kurd' mercilessly to fight 'chauvinists' who 'have come to rob you of your name and language'; 'our fiercest enemy, chauvinism, fattens on the blood of harassed peoples'; and there is no relaxing, he concludes, 'until the last chauvinist on the planet drops into the yawning grave'. Undoubtedly, the censor saw here the use of 'Aesopian language' and it was obvious to him that 'the Kurd' stood for 'the Ukrainian', so that naturally the poem could not be printed. Instead it was circulated widely in *samizdat*. And although the author's reputation was not assailed on account of this poem either in his lifetime or posthumously, a grim sequel occurred in 1968, when an agricultural college lecturer, Mykola Kots, was sentenced to seven years' camps and five years' exile, chiefly for circulating 70 copies of the poem, in which he had replaced 'the Kurd' by 'the Ukrainian'.

Symonenko died on 14 December 1963, leaving his outspoken diary, which soon joined his poetry in *samizdat* circulation. Within a year, they both reached the West, where the diary and his unpublished poems appeared in Ukrainian in January 1965. Soon, in March-April, the Soviet establishment reacted to this in some articles in the Kiev papers in which several of Symonenko's friends were blamed for having after his funeral taken his manuscripts and allowed them to circulate; only two of those friends were actually named, Ivan Svitlychny and A. Perepadya.

After a seeming lull of four months, in late August - early September 1965 some two dozen Ukrainian intellectuals were arrested in a synchronised swoop in several cities of the Ukraine on charges of 'anti-Soviet propaganda', in fact for reading and distributing handwritten, typed or photocopied *samizdat* literature which deplored the Ukraine's colonial status under Russia as well as the resulting inferior status of Ukrainian culture. The most prominent among those arrested was the 36-year-old literary scholar and critic, Ivan Svitlychny, a research worker with the Institute of Literature of the Ukrainian S S R Academy of Sciences, a man of great erudition and kindly quiet personality, whose objectivity of judgment and uncompromising integrity had been greatly valued by readers

Задивляюся у твої зіниці
Голубі й тривожні, ніби рань.
Крешуть з них червоні блискавиці
Революцій, бунтів і повстань.

Україно! Ти для мене диво!
І нехай пливе за роком рік,
Буду, мамо горда і вродлива,
З тебе дивуватися повік.

.....

Одійдіте, недруги лукаві!
Друзі, зачекайте на путі!
Маю я святе синівське право
З матір'ю побути на самоті.

.....

Хай палають хмари бурякові,
Хай сичать образи — все одно
Я проллюся крапелькою крові
На твоє священне знамено.

Eight months in prison that never were

and young writers alike, while being a thorn in the flesh of conservative mediocrities in the literary establishment. Although, for the first time in Soviet history, the arrests in the Ukraine were immediately followed by public protests the Soviet authorities managed to keep these arrests and the ensuing 1966 trials secret from the outside world for a whole seven months, until on 2 April 1966 the Swiss *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* reported the 1965 arrests giving no prisoners' names apart from Svitlychny, who was believed to have been sentenced and deported. But later reports indicated that he was still awaiting trial for 'smuggling Symonenko's anti-Soviet manuscripts to the West'.

However, after eight months' detention and interrogations Svitlychny was released without trial, obviously because he had nothing to do with the 'smuggling' of Symonenko's works (there was also the minor embarrassment of describing as 'anti-Soviet' the writings of a poet officially held to have been a faithful Communist). Svitlychny's release, which took place on 30 April 1966, was not reported in the Soviet press, and it took another month for the news to reach foreign correspondents in Moscow. Meanwhile, Ukrainians in the West, particularly the large ethnic Ukrainian community in Canada, had become alarmed by the several reports appearing in April and staged protests and demonstrations, including one before the Soviet Embassy in Ottawa in late May. To counter this, the latter's Press Office published a skilfully worded press release (see illustration) obviously meant to produce the impression that Svitlychny had never been arrested without actually saying so, and it indeed succeeded: for instance, the Toronto *Globe and Mail* (30 May 1966) understood it as follows: 'A release from the Soviet Embassy on Friday denied that the men had been arrested...' Subsequently,



SOVIET NEWS BULLETIN

Published by the Press Office
of the USSR Embassy in Canada

161 AUGUSTA STREET
OTTAWA 2, TEL. 236-7228

PRESS RELEASE

Friday, May 27, 1966

FABRICATIONS ABOUT DETENTION OF UKRAINIAN AUTHORS

Kiev. Some newspapers published by Ukrainian nationalists

abroad have claimed lately that the Ukrainian authors Ivan Svitlychny and Ivan Dziuba have been arrested and convicted.

These rumours are groundless and have a purely provocative nature. The writers Ivan Svitlychny and Ivan Dziuba have never been committed to trial and are at liberty.

further efforts were made by the Soviet authorities to project a favourable image of Svitlychny abroad, notably in a Kiev weekly published specially for Ukrainian émigrés, *Visti z Ukrainy* ('News from the Ukraine'), where it was stated among other things that Svitlychny's work 'has attracted the attention of readers both in the Ukraine and abroad by interesting new ideas, outspokenness and originality'.

Meanwhile, in late 1966, five documents concerning the Lukyanenko group case (mentioned above) were dispatched to Svitlychny from the Mordovian prison camps (230 miles ESE of Moscow). Svitlychny, recognising these prisoners' petitions as being about a travesty of justice similar to that experienced by himself and particularly by his twenty fellow-prisoners sentenced in 1966 to various terms, forwarded these petitions not only to the addressees but also in copies to some other personalities so as to give publicity to an injustice secretly perpetrated behind closed doors. He furnished the collection of these documents with an introduction (see *Ferment in the Ukraine*, pp.31-2) explaining his own stand with characteristic restraint and understatement.

Although nothing happened to him at the time, the KGB never forgot this challenge and from 1969 subjected Svitlychny to ever-increasing harassment: his flat was searched and manuscripts confiscated, on other occasions he was summoned for ominous 'talks', and it was becoming obvious that the KGB were preparing their revenge on Svitlychny for having publicly revealed the surreptitious injustice done by them to the Lukyanenko group, as well as for having supported appeals in favour of other unjustly imprisoned dissidents, notably Vyacheslav Chornovil² and Valentyn Moroz.³ The right moment came when on 30 December 1971 the Central Committee of the CPSU ordered the suppression of *samizdat* periodicals, chiefly the *Moscow Chronicle of Current Events*, and the *Ukrainian Herald* which started appearing in January 1970; this served as a signal for the arrest, on 12 January 1972 alone, of some twenty dissident intellectuals in various Ukrainian cities, and of several more over the months to follow. Many have now been sentenced and some released, but the three whose names were given in the official announcement about the arrests (published in Kiev papers a month after the event, on 11 February), Svitlychny, Chornovil and Yevhen Sverstyuk,⁴ have so far (mid-February 1973) not been tried after more than thirteen months in prison (the legally permitted maximum for investigation is nine months). The most specific accusations against Svitlychny, Sverstyuk and Vasyl Stus⁵ were inserted into L. Seleznenko's recantation,⁶ where it was said that they held 'hostile views concerning the nationalities question', 'wrote or disseminated slanderous and anti-Soviet works and nationalistic poison', and 'slandered the nationalities policy in our country'; the actual 'views', 'works' or 'slander' are not further specified in any way.

² Vyacheslav Chornovil is a journalist and editor of the *samizdat* collection of documents *The Chornovil Papers* on the 1965-6 trials. In 1967 he was sentenced to three years' imprisonment for this book, then reduced to 18 months' by a general amnesty. Having been released in 1969 he was re-arrested in January 1972 and still awaits trial [see INDEX nos.3-4, 1972, p.166]

³ Valentyn Moroz is a historian. In 1965 he was sentenced to 4 years' imprisonment on a charge of advocating the secession of the Ukraine from the USSR. A year after his release in 1969 he was sentenced to a total of 14 years of imprisonment and exile for three essays on Ukrainian problems and an essay on the prison camps, *Report from the Beria Reservation* [see INDEX no.1, 1972, p.87]

⁴ A literary critic and author of *The Cathedral in Scaffolding*, published abroad in 1970 [see INDEX nos.3-4, 1972, p.166]

⁵ A poet and literary critic arrested during the KGB round-up in January 1972 and sentenced to 5 years' labour camp and 3 years' exile [see INDEX no.1, 1972, p.87; Nos.3-4, 1972, p.123 and INDEX Index in the present issue].

⁶ See INDEX nos.3-4, 1972, p.123.

From Lenin's internationalism to Brezhnev's russification

Ivan Dzyuba, now 41, is another prominent literary critic who has over the years been subjected to a similar cat-and-mouse treatment. Starting in 1950, he, like Svitlychny, soon gained prominence, castigating mediocrity and encouraging new trends in Soviet Ukrainian literature which appeared in the late 1950s and early 1960s. The degree of regard he achieved may be gathered also from the fact that in 1960 an article of his was selected for publication in the prestigious Moscow English-language monthly, *Soviet Literature* (no.10). But his outspokenness and forward-looking ideas made him enemies in the conservative literary establishment, and he was threatened with expulsion from the Writers' Union of the Ukraine (WUU) in June 1962.

Within a day or two of the 1965 mass arrests, on 4 September 1965, Dzyuba, supported by Chornovil and Stus, staged a public protest against the arrests before a large audience in the Kiev cinema 'Ukraina' - the first such protest in Soviet times. By the end of the year he submitted a book-length memorandum to the Party and government in Kiev in which he argued that the cause of Ukrainian intellectual unrest was the fact that the present Soviet leadership had abandoned Lenin's nationalities policy. This was the only correct one in Dzyuba's opinion and he therefore exhorted the leadership to relinquish the Russian chauvinist course - against which Lenin had also fought - and to return to the Leninist line before it was too late to avert disaster. Dzyuba's well-documented memorandum, irrefutably argued from the Marxist-Leninist point of view, was distributed to 25 regional Party secretaries for comment, and copies soon began circulating in the Ukraine and elsewhere in the USSR.

In November 1966 Dzyuba was singled out for praise by Dr S. Kryzhaniv'sky, a professor occupying a high position in the Institute of Literature of the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences and a Party member, in his report to the Fifth Congress of the WUU. Commenting on the large number of mediocrities who manage to get into print, he remarked: 'For them there is only one medicine: sharp criticism. Unfortunately, we have hardly any critics who have the courage to say the truth to their faces, as do, for instance, Anatoliy Shevchenko and partly I. Dzyuba. The presence of such critics is extremely necessary and important.'

The qualifier 'partly' does not make good sense, and could not have been spoken by Kryzhaniv'sky: this is in fact a good example of the censorship's other face, 'creative', as opposed to destructive; the word was obviously inserted there by the censor (or else by a cautious editor exercising 'preliminary self-censorship') because unqualified praise of Dzyuba could not be allowed after his protests against the arrests. By a remarkable coincidence, less than 24 hours earlier this particular censorship device was neatly unmasked by the First Secretary of the WUU, Oles' Honchar, in his report to the same Congress when he revealed that only the previous day a 'partly' was inserted in a newspaper article of his ('mountain slopes are being partly denuded': the context was a conservationist plea).

Before long, Dzyuba's memorandum reached the West and was published in English as *Internationalism or Russification? A Study in the Soviet Nationalities Problem*, and then in the original Ukrainian. A year later, this was countered by a lengthy 'refutation' produced by Soviet authorities for the Western reader in Ukrainian, and soon also in English.⁷ This 'refutation' is based on the falsification of evidence, laced with abusive language, and, as refutations go, is an utter failure; it is submitted to a thorough analysis in the Postscript to the second English edition (1970) of Dzyuba's book. In December 1969, Dzyuba was charged by the WUU's Kiev branch with having written his *Internationalism or Russification?* 'from politically erroneous un-Marxist positions', which book had become 'food for the enemies of the Soviet system', and for this he was to be expelled from the WUU. When the matter came up from the branch for confirmation before the WUU's Presidium on 26 December 1969, however, Dzyuba read out a statement in which he reaffirmed his adherence to 'the principles of scientific communism and the teaching of Marx, Engels and Lenin', whereupon the Presidium permitted Dzyuba to remain a member of the WUU. But two years later, soon after the January 1972 swoop, Dzyuba was 'prosecuted' by the WUU all over again for the same 'crime', and at its Presidium meeting of 2 March 1972 was expelled 'for a flagrant violation of the principles and requirements of the WUU's statutes, for the preparation and dissemination of materials of an anti-Soviet and anti-communist nature which express nationalist views, slander the Soviet system and the Party's nationalities policy, and are actively used by our class enemies in their struggle against the Communist Party and the Soviet State'.

The 'materials' mentioned were in fact limited to the same single work, *Internationalism or Russification?*, but nevertheless, Dzyuba was arrested on 18 April and remains in prison, untried, to this day.

It is worth pausing for a moment over the main charge against Dzyuba, which is 'the preparation and dissemination of materials of an anti-Soviet ... nature which slander the Soviet system'. The last part of this accusation is unfounded: Dzyuba has never slandered, i.e. made untrue statements about, the Soviet system, since the correctness of the facts quoted in his book has never been disproved (the only 'refutation' attempt having been found to be based on blatant falsifications). The meaning of 'anti-Soviet', on the other hand, has never been defined by Soviet authorities and has been interpreted by the judiciary in an extremely arbitrary way. In this connexion the *Ukrainian Herald's* definition of this term, which is included in the editorial statement of aims prefacing every issue, is relevant:

The *Herald* will include ... information on violations of freedom of speech and other democratic freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution, on judicial and extra-judicial repressions in the Ukraine, on violations of national sovereignty (instances of chauvinism and Ukrainophobia) ... on the condition of Ukrainian political prisoners ... on various acts of protest etc. ...

The *Ukrainian Herald* is in any case neither an anti-Soviet nor an anti-

⁷ B. Stanchuk (pseud.), *What I. Dzyuba Stands For, and How He Does It (Once more about the book Internationalism or Russification?)*, Kiev, 1970, 196 pp.

Communist publication. In its content and aims it is entirely legal and constitutional. The criticism of individuals, agencies, institutions, including the highest ones, for errors committed in the solution of internal political problems, in particular for violations of the democratic rights of individual and nation is not considered by the *Herald* to be anti-Soviet activity, but is regarded as the right and honourable duty of every citizen guaranteed by the principles of socialist democracy and by the Constitution ...

The *Herald* will not reproduce documents ... which are anti-Soviet, that is, negate the democratically elected Soviets [councils] as a form of citizens' participation in governing the country.

This statement epitomises the stand of all Ukrainian dissidents whose views are known from *samizdat*, including Dzyuba. Indeed, it is absolutely impossible to find in his *Internationalism or Russification?*, or in any other writings of his or of any other known dissident, a negation of the democratically elected Soviets.

Raising the curtain

M. Jean-Philippe Lecat, a Secretary of State in M. Pompidou's administration, on the government's need to inform the public (*Le Monde*, 30 November 1972).

You could imagine a development of this sort: when the public authorities had given up even unconsciously making propaganda and shrouding themselves in secrets, when journalists had given up doubting and systematically suspecting everything, when the public stopped believing itself hoodwinked, when everyone had taken to being loyal, then you could imagine a national information organisation coming into being which could be used as an impartial source of reference. Such an organisation would be as useful to journalists and officials as to a union, for example, or a local association or group of schoolchildren or an assembly of the cardinals and bishops of France. From today we must try to create that spirit. And in order to do so the main thing we must do is 'raise the curtain'. We only need to keep the principle of it for certain major questions, but not so as to give the impression that the government has something to hide. What we need at the level of foreign or economic policy, for instance, would not be of any use when it came to government action as a whole. For the notion of a government secret has been stretched to include the entire administration: the appointment of a village policeman is almost as secret as a plan of war. Journalists on the provincial dailies that I regularly visit have told me about their concern over this matter.

The 'normalisation' of Czechoslovak cultural institutions was last year extended to the libraries. Reprinted below are the texts of two sets of detailed instructions issued to librarians to ensure that the state's cultural policy is carried out in full.

THE MINISTRY OF CULTURE OF THE
CZECH SOCIALIST REPUBLIC
Ref. No: 9696/72
Prague 31 May 1972
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

DIRECTIVES

1. These Directives are issued by the Ministry of Culture of the Czech Socialist Republic and relate to the screening of the contents of public libraries and the libraries of various institutions within the Czech Socialist Republic.
2. These Directives are intended to:
 - (a) make libraries a more effective and important means of fulfilling the cultural policies of the State; and
 - (b) ensure that libraries fulfil their educational responsibilities in both political and cultural fields.
3. These Directives are drawn up in accordance with Article 1, Section 3 of the Instructions, issued by the Ministry of Culture on 31 May 1972, Ref. No: 9695/72, which relate to the formation of special archives for certain publications.
4. The Ministry of Culture therefore issues the following Directives:

Article 1

All publications in public libraries and in the libraries of various institutions in the Czech Socialist Republic are to be screened. All anti-state and ideologically unsound publications are to be withdrawn from circulation. The Ministry of Culture of the Czech Socialist Republic, in conjunction with those central authorities and other bodies which administer the library network, is to be responsible for the screening process.

Article 2

1. Anti-state publications are publications of states.

of domestic or foreign origin, which:

- (a) Contravene the Constitution and the Laws of the Czech Socialist Republic; and
 - (b) Attack Marxism-Leninism; and
 - (c) Attack the policies of Socialist states and Marxist-Leninist parties.
- Among such publications are included:
- (d) Publications which defame the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic or any other Socialist state, or any representatives of such a state;
 - (e) Trotskyist or White Guardist publications;
 - (f) Fascist or revanchist publications and any publication by a Nazi collaborator; and
 - (g) Publications which strongly conflict with the principles of socialist morality.

2. Ideologically unsound publications are those, of domestic or foreign origin, which conflict with the basic principles of the policies of the Socialist states. In general, such publications shall be assumed to comprise:

- (a) Any form of revisionist or right-wing opportunist literature;
- (b) Publications defending and propagating the capitalist system;
- (c) Publications defending the Czechoslovak Republic existing before the Munich Agreement;
- (d) Publications which propagate various bourgeois political and philosophical attitudes;
- (e) Publications which oppose the foreign policy of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic;
- (f) Publications by any person of right-wing views or who is concerned with a theoretical justification of Social Democracy;
- (g) Publications by T. G. Masaryk, E. Benes or other bourgeois politicians;
- (h) Publications referring to the Czech Legions.

The following publications are regarded as ideologically unsound and their presence in public libraries and the libraries of various institutions is regarded as undesirable:

- (a) Publications by emigré authors, or authors connected with right-wing forces during 1968 and 1969, although the publications themselves are unobjectionable; and
- (b) Publications which, although themselves unobjectionable, contain ideologically unsound forewords or epilogues.

Article 3

1. The following administrative procedure is to be followed, so as to ensure a uniform screening of the contents of public libraries and of libraries of various institutions:

- (a) The Ministry of Culture of the Czech Socialist Republic shall set up a Central Commission. The commission shall consist of experts from political and scientific institutions, and the chairmen of the central departmental commissions for the library network (see Article 4). The Central Commission shall provide technical information and assistance to the central departmental and regional commissions of the National Committees.

- (b) Cultural departments in the Regional National Committees shall set up Regional Commissions. The Regional Commissions shall consist of employees of the above-mentioned cultural departments and, in addition, of directors of regional departmental commissions.
- (c) Cultural departments of the District National Committees shall set up District Commissions. The District Commissioners shall consist of employees of the above-mentioned cultural departments and, in addition, of directors of district libraries and chairmen of district departmental commissions.

2. The afore-mentioned Central, Regional and District Commissions shall, in the public libraries and the libraries of various institutions under their respective jurisdictions, organise and control the screening process, in accordance with the requirements laid down in Article 1 and shall evaluate the effectiveness of the said screening process.

Article 4

1. The central authorities and other bodies which administer the library network shall set up central, regional and district departmental commissions. These departmental commissions shall be responsible for screening all libraries which are situated within their respective areas of jurisdiction.
2. The commissions set up in accordance with Section 1 of this Article shall cooperate closely with the departmental commissions of the Ministry of Culture, set up in accordance with Article 3. The commissions shall operate in accordance with the directives of the commissions of the Ministry of Culture.
3. The commissions set up in accordance with the provisions of Article 3, shall also fulfil the functions of the departmental commissions of the Ministry of Culture.

Article 5

1. The screening of the contents of public libraries and of the libraries of various institutions is to be carried out by working parties appointed by the competent departmental commissions. The screening process is to be started by 20 June 1972.

From 20 June 1972 to 30 June 1972, District Commissions of the National Committees are to organise instruction courses for group leaders and are to prepare work schedules, so that all public libraries and libraries of various institutions in the district will be screened during the period from 1 July 1972 to 30 September 1972.

2. In the larger libraries, if sufficient space is available, publications withdrawn from circulation are to be stored in special rooms reserved for the purpose. Access to these rooms is to be reserved for the director of each library, or to authorised employees.

In the smaller libraries, publications withdrawn from circulation shall be wrapped up into parcels and the parcels shall then be sealed. The sealed parcels are to be left on the premises of the libraries concerned until further notice.

3. Each working party shall compile an alphabetical list of publications withdrawn from circulation in quadruplicate. In each list, each publication shall be listed by author, title, catalogue classification and the number of copies of the publication which have been withdrawn from circulation.

One copy of the list is seen to remain with the withdrawn publications, either in the special storage rooms, or within the sealed parcels, a second copy is to remain in the safe-keeping of the director of the library concerned, a third copy is to be sent to the District Commission of the respective National Committee and the fourth copy is to be sent to the respective district departmental commission.

Article 6

1. The afore-mentioned District Commissions are to compile a summary of titles from the lists they receive. The summaries are also to mention the number of copies of each publication withdrawn from circulation. Duplicate copies of the summaries, together with a report describing how the screening procedure was carried out and what results were achieved, are to be sent to the Regional Commissions of the National Committees by 15 October 1972.

2. The afore-mentioned Regional Commissions are to compile a regional title summary. The regional summary title list, together with the district

summary title lists and a report describing how the screening procedure was carried out and what results were achieved in the region, are to be sent to the Central Commission of the Ministry of Culture by 31 October 1972.

3. The Central Commission shall submit a report describing how the screening procedure was carried out and what results were achieved in public libraries and in libraries of various institutions to the Ministry of Culture of the Czech Socialist Republic by 20 November 1972. The report shall also contain proposals for further measures.

4. The Ministry of Culture of the Czech Socialist Republic is to discuss the report and the proposals submitted to it by the Central Commission, and is to reach a definitive decision on the disposal of publications withdrawn from circulation by 15 December 1972.

Article 7

The Ministry of Culture of the Czech Socialist Republic is to control and monitor the way in which the screening of public libraries and libraries of various institutions is carried out. The Ministry of Culture is also to take whatever steps may be necessary to eliminate all deficiencies that may then be discovered.

The Minister
Dr M. Bružek C.Sc.

THE MINISTRY OF CULTURE OF THE CZECH SOCIALIST REPUBLIC

Ref. No: 9695/72

Prague 31 May 1972

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

INSTRUCTIONS

- These instructions are issued by the Ministry of Culture of the Czech Socialist Republic and relate to special archives for publications held in public libraries and in the libraries of various institutions within the Czech Socialist Republic.
- These Instructions are intended to unify the methods of acquisition, cataloguing and use of anti-state and ideologically unsound publications.
- These Instructions have been drawn up:
 - In agreement with the relevant organs of the Central Government; and
 - In accordance with the provisions of Article 3, Section 5 of Law No: 53/1959 of the Penal Code, which relates to the unification of the library system (the Library Law).
- The Ministry of Culture therefore issues the following Instructions:

Article 1

- Anti-state publications are publications which:
 - Contravene the Constitution and the Laws of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic; and
 - Attack Marxism-Leninism; and
 - Attack the policies of Socialist states and Marxist-Leninist parties.
 Among such publications are included:
 - Publications which defame the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic or any other socialist state, or any representative of such a state;
 - Included under the publications listed in Sub-section (d) are publications containing inflammatory attacks, pamphlets and similar material;
 - Publications by emigrés which are aimed against the social system existing in Czechoslovakia;
 - Trotskyist and White Guardist publications directed against the USSR and other Socialist states;
 - Fascist, Nazi or revanchist publications and any publication by a Nazi collaborator;
 - Publications propagating national or racial discrimination; and
 - Publications which strongly conflict with the principles of socialist morality.
- Ideologically unsound publications are any other publications, which conflict with the basic

principles of the policies of the Socialist states.

3. The central administrative organs for the library network are to ensure that, as laid down in the Instructions issued by the Ministry of Culture of the Czech Socialist Republic, ideologically unsound publications are withdrawn from circulation in public libraries and libraries of various institutions. Such publications are then to be stored in special archives.

Article 2

- Special archives for anti-state publications are to be created only in:
 - The State Library of the Czech Socialist Republic; and
 - The Marxist-Leninist Institute Library of the Central Committee of the Czechoslovak Communist Party.
- Special archives for ideologically unsound publications are to be created in:
 - The State Library of the Czech Socialist Republic;
 - The Marxist-Leninist Institute Library of the Central Committee of the Czechoslovak Communist Party;
 - All State reference libraries;
 - All regional and municipal libraries in Prague, Brno, Ostrava and Plzen.
- Special archives for publications which are ideologically unsound may be created by the competent central administrative organs in other public libraries and libraries of various institutions only with the consent of the Ministry of Culture.

Article 3

- Lists of anti-state publications are to be designated P lists. Lists of ideologically unsound publications are to be designated Z lists.
- In cataloguing and storing anti-state and ideologically unsound publications and in compiling lists of such publications, the following procedure is to be observed:
 - The publications are to be recorded in the appropriate P or Z list.
 - Periodical publications are to be subject to the following procedure:
 - Individual publications are to be designated as unsound or not.
 - If a number of issues of a periodical publication have been bound into a single volume and certain issues are regarded as unsound, the whole volume is to be designated as unsound.
 - Special archives are to be located in places inaccessible to the general public.

Article 4

- Ideologically unsound publications may, in general, be borrowed by:
 - Designated scientific and political workers and other experts. The criteria for such permission is to be related to the social significance of the work of any applicant.
 - University students, in exceptional circumstances. In this case, the applicant will require the consent of the dean of his faculty. The applicant must collect the publication required in person and must, at the time of collection, present all the relevant documents.
- Anti-state documents may, in general, be borrowed by:
 - Members of the Central Committee of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, or of the Government. In this case, no special permission is necessary, but the publications must be collected by the applicant in person.
 - Scientific and political workers and other experts, not mentioned in Section 2, sub-section (a) of this Article, only with the consent of the Ministry of Culture of the Czech Socialist Republic. The applicant must collect the required publication in person.

Article 5

- Publications located in special archives may be transferred by means of the inter-library lending service only if the recipient libraries possess special archives as well.
- Any kind of duplication of ideologically unsound publications, or of anti-state publications, or of parts thereof may only be performed:
 - In exceptional circumstances; and
 - For libraries which possess special archives.
 - Such duplicates must be treated in the same way as the original publications.

Article 6

- The State Library of the Czech Socialist Republic (Special Archives Department) shall:
- Administer the central archive for anti-state and ideologically unsound publications;
 - Compile and maintain a comprehensive catalogue of all anti-state and ideologically unsound publications to be found throughout Czechoslovakia;
 - Issue, with the approval of the Ministry of Culture of the Czech Socialist Republic, a list of such publications to public libraries and libraries of various institutions, for their use;
 - Check on work connected with special archives in public libraries and libraries of various

institutions, in accordance with the Instructions issued by the Ministry of Culture of the Czech Socialist Republic;

(e) Provide the afore-said libraries with regular instruction and counselling on anti-state publications ideologically unsound publications and activities connected with special archives, in accordance with the Instructions issued by the Ministry of Culture of the Czech Socialist Republic.

Article 7

Directors of libraries and the competent managerial staff of institutions, bodies and organisations which previously contained special archives, created in accordance with the provisions of the Government Decree of 8 October 1958, No. 916, shall:

(a) Carry out a political evaluation of the contents of libraries under their control;

(b) Locate all publications which, in accordance with the provisions of Article 1, Sections (1) and (2) of these Instructions, are classified as anti-state or ideologically unsound publications, in the special archive;

(c) Report, by 31 December 1972, on the contents of the special archive to the Special Archive Department of the State Library of the Czech Socialist Republic;

(d) Ensure that this report:

(1) Is submitted in duplicate on filing paper of internationally recognised dimensions;

(2) Contains the following information for each publication which is listed therein:

A. Author's first name and surname

B. Title

C. Place and year of publication

D. Publisher's name

E. The letter Z or P for ideologically unsound or anti-state publications respectively.

(e) Withdraw from circulation all publications designated as P publications, until advised of a decision by the Special Archive Department of the State Library of the Czech Socialist Republic;

(f) Report on all newly acquired anti-state or ideologically unsound publications in accordance with the procedure laid down in this Article;

(g) Apply, without delay, to the Ministry of Culture of the Czech Socialist Republic, for permission to continue to maintain special archives;

(h) Discontinue the loan of publications if the said permission is not granted by 30 September 1972. In the event that the said application is refused, the Ministry of Culture shall decide, at

the same time, on the future disposal of the contents of the special archive.

Article 8

The provisions contained in these Instructions shall also be deemed to apply to anti-state and ideologically unsound publications borrowed from foreign libraries through the international library lending service.

1. These Instructions apply to all public libraries and libraries of institutions located on the territory of the CSSR.

2. These Instructions shall come into force on 1 June 1972.

The Minister

Dr Miloslav Bružek, C.Sc.

Soviet professor on academic solidarity

In the last number of INDEX we described how an appeal had been launched by scientists in Britain and other countries for the release of the Soviet scientist, Professor B. G. Levich, so that he could move with his family to Israel. One of the significant aspects of this appeal was the growing solidarity it revealed among the scientists of the world and a strong feeling that academic freedom was indivisible. This was not a complete picture of the situation among scientists, however, for there are many who believe that it is not the business of scholars and learned societies to concern themselves with the lives and working conditions of other scholars. Such a view is probably the majority one in countries such as Britain – judging by the recent response to the predicament of another detained Soviet scholar, Professor Alexander Lerner – and is apparently supported by Professor Brenet of the University of Brussels. The following statement was issued on 12 November 1972 by Professor Levich – who is still prevented from leaving the Soviet Union – in response to a letter he had received from Professor Brenet.

From Professor Benjamin Levich, Corresponding Member of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, Institute of Electrochemistry, Moscow, USSR

To all Scientific societies, associations and universities

Since I applied to the Soviet Authorities for exit visas eight months ago, my family and I have gone through various hardships. In particular, I am totally isolated from my foreign colleagues; for my telephone has been cut off; and few letters, either from me or to me, ever reach their destinations. Therefore I was pleasantly surprised to receive a letter from Professor Brenet, from the University of Brussels, one of the past-presidents of the International Society of Electro-chemistry, which Society has recently done me the honour of electing me as a vice-president. However, as soon as I read the contents of this letter, which is a copy of Professor Brenet's appeal to all the national secretaries of the Society, it became clear for me that this message had reached me not quite by chance.

Professor Brenet proposes that my predicament should be resolved by reference to humane principles, and by taking into account both my interests and those of my Government; but Professor Brenet also argues that the discussion of my case by international associations, such as the Society of Electro-chemistry, is inadmissible; for it would disturb its everyday work; and the problem is absolutely non-scientific. This means that Professor Brenet recommends that learned societies should keep strictly to the ancient principle of non-intervention.

One would like to ask if Professor Brenet would express this opinion so strongly if he were subjected to various kinds of oppression for having expressed the wish to leave Brussels and to find his new fatherland in, for instance, the Soviet Union; or if, while being the president of the International Society of Electro-chemistry, he were deprived by the Belgian Authorities of any possibility of ful-

filling his duty. Despite Professor Brenet's concern for human liberties, the principle of non-intervention objectively proves to be nothing but the notorious Policy of Munich, transferred into the fields of science and relations between scientists.

The problem with which Professor Brenet is dealing, namely whether a scientific association as a whole should interfere in the fate of individuals, is in my opinion one of principle. I would therefore like to express openly my view of the matter. I believe that the answer to this question was already given by the great Einstein, in his protest against the indifference of the Bavarian Academy of Science to the hardships of persecuted scientists. Albert Einstein declared that he had no wish to belong to any scientific society which could behave like that, no matter what the external pressure.

At present, when the role of science and scientists in the life of society has greatly increased, when science itself cannot develop while being limited to any single country, the situation has considerably changed. New concepts have appeared, those of professional honour and of the solidarity of scientists all over the world. I believe that nowadays the world scientific community cannot remain indifferent to the persecution of even one of its members for his national or religious convictions. The progress of science can by no means be separated from the problems of humanism and of the freedom of conscience of scientists. This is evidently why a great many individuals, universities and learned societies have declared their support for my colleagues and myself in our struggle for that right, recognised by civilised humanity, to decide for ourselves which country, the Soviet Union or Israel, is 'our country'.

My family has been detained in this country not because I am engaged in any political activity against the government (I am a scientist, not a politician); not because I wish to take with me any government secrets (I do not know any, since for the last 23 years I have never had anything to do with classified work); and not because my repatriation could possibly contravene any internal or international law accepted by the U.S.S.R. By no means. I am detained only because, in conformity with the dogma which is accepted in this country, the fate of the scientist is ruled not by any established principles of law, but by mysterious 'government considerations' or 'government interests'. Are scientists free human beings? Or are they the property of the government? This is the question which I believe to be of major significance for the future of all scientists, and for science as a whole.

The discussion of this problem with Soviet scientists is necessary and important, not only because they belong to the world scientific community and are also responsible for the future of science, but also because a number of Soviet scientists are members of leading party and government institutions; therefore their opinions are evidently very important for the solution of the problems of my colleagues and myself. Experience has shown that individual appeals have found no response in the hearts of leading Soviet scientists; this is one of the reasons why the activity of scientists as a body has

become so urgent. It is true that this kind of activity could perhaps disturb the everyday work of learned societies; and perhaps somebody will not be so happy about it. But what can guarantee the progress of science and culture in the long run? Hardly anything, if high moral principles are disregarded. And who is to be held responsible for the present situation? Those who created the problem? Or those who are the victims?

Stefan Kisielewski

Spicing the national stew

Stefan Kisielewski is a Polish journalist who has been publishing a weekly column, off and on, for the past 27 years in the Polish journal Tygodnik Powszechny. Last summer a selection of 100 of these was published in Polish in Paris, including 18 articles that had been banned, in whole or in part, by the Polish censor. In his introduction to the book, Kisielewski discusses the background to the articles and outlines some of the problems he has encountered, including those of dealing with the censor.

What was the general aim of this stubborn 'creativity' on the part of a columnist extending over a period of nearly thirty years? The common denominator of the articles was the author's profound belief – still unchanged – that satire and protest are a necessary element in national life. Satire and protest: there is no 'pro' satire, so satire is necessarily 'contra'. Without this spice the national stew will be tasteless, and we shall bring up the young without the right to protest. From this arises the need for legal opposition, an attitude which I have tried to represent in my columns, and beyond them as well. The opposition of a buzzing mosquito is still opposition.

Did I succeed? It depended, obviously, on the general political situation in the country, and this was reflected automatically in the more or less severe attitude of contemporary censorship. Censorship was a faithful companion to my columns, correcting or maiming them in a way that would remain imperceptible to the reader. For the Office of Press Control acts discreetly and secretly, forbidding publishers to leave any signs of its interference such as empty spaces, as censorship before the war sometimes did. This method is successful to some extent, because even a reader aware of censorship has difficulty in realising that the smooth text lying before him has been crossed out and changed. There is less trouble when the weekly column as a whole is banned (there are over a dozen of those in this collection, each marked with an asterisk). Things are worse when the text appears distorted, with cuts, with fragments or names crossed out, and the reader takes it for pure (or impure) gold. There is no way to tell him that the column has been castrated: desperate allusions to the shortage of appropriate subjects or demonstrative writing about the weather are of little help, while one may not write directly about the existence and activities of the Office of Press Control, because the article will then be confiscated (as an example, see the one entitled 'On Honest Dishonesty' – quite a flattering one, in fact).

This hidden activity of the censorship has its effect, influencing both the reader and the author. The reader, all in all, believes that the author means what he writes, while the author begins to change his ideas, adjust them to the (equally changeable) requirements of the censorship, avoid certain subjects, tone down various expres-

sions, etc. On the other hand, he becomes more skilful, tries to trick the censor, winks at the reader, uses dodges, allusions, plays on words. Some readers, aware of the situation, look for and appreciate such allusions. I flatter myself that, over the long years of journalistic struggle, I have educated a group of readers who can understand me; indeed, this is shown by the many letters I receive. But there is no doubt that there are readers who blame the author for what he has not written, unaware of his strained, complex, and changing position. Changing, because everything changes, including the instructions of the Office of Press Control, and that from one day to another and by 180 degrees. Yesterday you could not write a nasty word about a certain person, but today it would even be welcome. Under these circumstances, I have always tried to be faithful to my principles of nonconformism and did not attack those who 'might' or 'should' have been attacked at that moment. Actually, personal attacks are of a symbolic-substitute character in these columns, because censorship prefers one to attack persons rather than ideas. Be that as it may, *verbum sat sapienti* – or not, as the case may be, and then too bad for the author.

'Dead Souls' in Rumania

On 23 September 1972 the Bucharest theatrical season was inaugurated with a new production of Gogol's *The Inspector-General* by the Lucia Sturza Bulandra Theatre, whose manager at the time was the outstanding director, actor, and stage designer, Liviu Ciulei. Two further performances of this production took place on 26 and 28 September.

On 30 September, Radio Bucharest broadcast the following statement issued by the Rumanian Council for Socialist Culture and Education:

A great number of theatregoers have addressed themselves to the Council for Socialist Culture and Education protesting and expressing their dissatisfaction with the way in which the Lucia Sturza Bulandra Theatre has staged Gogol's play *The Inspector-General*. The staging and adaptation distort the work of the great playwright, something which is incompatible with the role of the Rumanian theatre as a platform for an authentic display of the treasures of both national and world-wide cultures. The Bureau of the Council for Socialist Culture and Education has decided to suspend these performances and to forbid the staging of this version by any other theatre in the country, and it will take steps to prevent a recurrence of this sort of thing in Rumania's cultural life.

The director of the banned production was Lucian Pintilie, one of the most talented stage and cinema directors in Rumania, and certainly one of the most 'unruly' ones. His well known political film *The Reconstruction*, in which he was accused of slandering Ceausescu, was released to the Rumanian public only after being withheld for a year in January 1970, probably due to the solid support from journalists and writers and publicity given to the film in the Western press. The ban was again implemented soon after the release. While the literary and cultural reviews had highly praised the film in 1970, the party papers found serious faults with it: it was said to lay exaggerated stress on grotesquerie and sarcasm and to propagate a pessimistic outlook on life. The subject was said to be untypical of real life in Rumania, and showed an improper use of Western artistic influences.

Since the showing of this film Pintilie has worked neither in the theatre nor in the cinema. His staging of *The Inspector-General* had been

announced for the 1971-72 theatrical season, but as a result of the 'cultural revolution', with its dampening impact on the theatre as a whole, there was no mention of it during that season.

It cannot be doubted that Pintilie was not the only artist to think that a performance of his staging of *The Inspector-General* would mark a new beginning for the Rumanian Theatre in general, after one year of almost total eclipse. In an article published by *Romania Literara*, 21 September 1972, Liviu Ciulei, the manager of the Bulandra Theatre, stated that staging this play seemed to him to be 'a particularly important moment in the beautiful and upward progress of Rumanian theatrical art ... a milestone along this road, an act which would mark the full maturing of the Rumanian theatre as a "Conscious Theatre".'

In the same paper Lucian Pintilie outlined the basic artistic and aesthetic concepts underlying his staging of Gogol's play. He wrote that his staging was a visualisation of certain critical conclusions and abstractions he had reached as a reader and a critic of Gogol's play. In his view 'a performance which is but the interpretation of an ordinary, collective, global view of the play is of no interest at all, and he pleaded for the necessity of shock effects in the theatre. So, it was no secret to anybody that Pintilie had no intention of presenting an uninspired, traditional and reassuring production of *The Inspector-General*.

Pintilie was accused by a leading Rumanian theatre critic, Radu Popescu of having staged the play in a way which did not evoke unequivocal ideas and conclusions: 'When trying to make out the ideas suggested by Pintilie in his staging, you come across many contradictions and much confusion.' He had strained too much after ideas and situations in order to create an atmosphere of 'violence, shock, crime and apocalypse', wrote Popescu, adding that Pintilie had staged a classical play as if it were a contemporary play. Popescu also wrote, however, that the production as a whole 'makes us continue to have confidence in Lucian Pintilie, who is one of our most gifted directors, whose work is always worthy of interest and of whom much can be expected'.

Liviu Ciulei was also open to criticism for allowing this production to take place in The Bulandra Theatre. But both had gained staunch support from artists, actors and writers in Rumania for the

type of theatre they stood for. The poet Ana Blandiana described the atmosphere in the theatre after the performance of *The Inspector-General*, together with her own reflections on the situation of the stage director, which are highly revealing: 'I remained in my seat, without any desire to leave, without having the power to tear myself away, and after the sound of the ovations had died down, I reflected on how unjustly things were distributed at the beginning of the world: whereas in order to create a *chef-d'oeuvre*, a writer needs nothing but a sheet of paper and a pencil, a director needs confidence, a huge amount of confidence which, in normal and unpoetic language, is called a stage set or a film studio'.

The theatre critic Valentin Silvestru, although he approved of the production of the play, was compelled to admit that 'the allusions and all too earthy contemporary details are not always marked by good taste'. Perhaps it was because of these allusions that the staging of this version was stopped – or possibly because the 'distortions'

affected a play written by a great Russian playwright.

As a result of the staging of *The Inspector-General*, Livui Ciulei was dismissed as manager of the Bulandra Theatre. This move has not been mentioned in the Rumanian press, but was reported in several Western newspapers on 8 November 1972. The Bucharest weekly magazine *Saptamina* indirectly confirmed the dismissal with an interview with George Dem. Loghin, the Bulandra's new manager, on 17 November.

Loghin, a professor emeritus and rector of the Bucharest Theatre Institute, gave his definition of a theatre manager's role. The manager exists to 'watch over the ideological purity of the performances', and he should have a 'sound professional and political training'.

This article is based on 'Rumanian Situation Reports' nos. 36, 43 and 45 prepared and issued by Radio Free Europe.

appeal is a Tribunal which sits in secret ... often he does not know himself what he is accused of, as it is normally considered that it is not in the national interest for him to face his accusers, to study the evidence against him, to see or cross-examine those who have given witness against him. The Tribunal will, after trial, recommend the release or continued detention of the detainee concerned.'

The second: '... because of the official secrecy which surrounds their operation ... people appearing before tribunals may be given only the vaguest information about the offences of which they are accused ... police evidence is based almost entirely on anonymous informers whose identity is not disclosed to the Tribunal and who are not made available for cross-examination ... a defendant's right to cross-examination may be so restricted ...'

These two reports appear to have much in common. The first is, in fact, an extract from INDEX by Judith Todd concerning the position in Rhodesia, the second from the *Sunday Times* of 14 January 1973 is about a situation much nearer home, that of Northern Ireland. Perhaps after all the distinction which Mr Hunnings would like to draw is not really so precise as may be thought, if different types of governments can use the same methods to achieve differing aims. And perhaps more important is the possibility that freedom of information and eventually freedom of expression can so easily be undermined even in what is considered the most liberal of countries.

M. LLOYD-THOMAS
Portishead, Bristol

Soviet censorship

DEAR SIR, With reference to the article in the *Daily Telegraph* on INDEX I note that it is stated that Mr Vladimirov is said to recall that 'the censorship was instituted by Lenin in 1918 as a "temporary measure".'

If this newspaper is quoting INDEX correctly, this does seem to be an extraordinary statement. Surely it is accepted that the works of writers in Russia have been censored for a much longer period - from the days of Richard Chancellor and Hakluyt, through Pushkin and Dostoevsky, to the 20th century. I happened to buy a book this week - 'The Real Siberia' by John Foster Fraser

(1902) - and almost the first words I read were as follows:

'You get the English papers in Moscow ... Should there be anything interesting about Russia ... you will find the column smeared out with the toughest of blacking. I have friends who confess to making periodic attempts to wash that blacking. They are never successful. The cartoon in *Punch* is frequently obliterated by a black smudge. A lady I know received a London illustrated paper. A half-page picture was blotted ... The picture was an advertisement of the Czar receiving ... a box of much boomed pills manufactured in the neighbourhood of St Helens, Lancashire!'

This would seem to sum up graphically the question of censorship in pre-First World War Czarist Russia. To state that censorship was not introduced until 1918 seems naive in the extreme.

P. BARLOW
31 Balmuir Gardens, SW15

L. Vladimirov writes: In my article, I dealt with the Soviet period only and never alleged that Lenin introduced censorship for the first time in Russian history. Certainly there was censorship in pre-revolutionary Russia, but its machinery was in no way 'inherited' by Lenin. The Bolsheviks strongly condemned censorship until they seized power; they promised to rid Russia of its secret police, censorship, internal passport system, etc. - only to restore and greatly reinforce those ghastly institutions.

As for censorship itself, it is very illuminating to compare its methods during the worst periods of Czarist rule with those of the Soviet period. There was no pre-printing censorship in Russia before Lenin's revolution. The censor had access to ready-printed texts only and could either 'smear out' something or just stop the distribution completely (in which case the publisher was legally entitled to complain to higher authorities). Pre-revolutionary Russian censorship was also very far from total - it dealt with newspapers, magazines and books only, not with films, music scores, art, advertisements, labels, stage actors' 'repertoires', etc. Finally, censorship before 1917 was not secret (the obliteration of parts of the printed text referred to in Mr Barlow's letter is the best proof of this).

Thompson Bradley Brave new world

Novy mir: A Selection, 1925-67

Edited and introduced by MICHAEL GLENNY
Jonathan Cape £5

Three years of sustained repression has cowed the Soviet literary press into dull submission. One looks in vain for even a glimmer of the hope and daring of the last decade. Censorship, of course, does not affect human lives directly, as do the secret arrests, kangaroo courts, and forced commitments to psychiatric wards, so that the present abject state especially of the literary journals has provoked less concern in the West than revelations about the fortunes of the underground (*samizdat*) press. Yet, the damage caused by rigid, crude censorship, the product of genuine bureaucratic fear, should be equally our concern, for its aim is to close down all outlets of expression to the newly re-awakened and vociferous intelligentsia and thereby cut off its life's blood.

Severely crippled in this process has been the most distinguished Soviet literary-political monthly *Novy mir* ('New World'), a direct descendant of the 'thick' journal which has played such a central role in Russian intellectual life for over 100 years. With his recent anthology of selections from *Novy mir* Michael Glenny offers a fitting, timely tribute to this journal at the point of its lowest ebb since the late 1940s. To Glenny our praise is due for introducing the journal to a wider audience and making available translations of some of its more exceptional works.

As is evident from some of Glenny's selections (particularly Bereztkov's 'On the Borderline of Peace and War' and Anikst's 'Rhinoceroses in New York' – and more obliquely Gladkov's 'Meyerhold Speaks') *Novy mir* deserves its fine reputation as much for ingenuity in circumventing the censors as for high editorial standards and courage. Its irregular, tardy appearance on the newstands always remains a sure sign of the continuing struggle. Censorship under the aegis of *Glavlit* is an unutterably frustrating and debilitat-

ing experience (see INDEX nos.3-4, 1972). It provides a veritable paradise for the hypocrite and time-server and mirrors in its oppressive philistinism and arrogance the deadly portrayal of tsarist bureaucracy by the 19th century dramatist Sukhovo-Kobylin. The destructive power of the censor extends far beyond the arbitrary right to deny publication or demand cuts and changes in a completed work. More pernicious is the anxiety this power creates within the writer while writing, and the subtle deformation it effects in order that a work may be made acceptable – all brilliantly depicted in *The First Circle* through the figure of the writer Galakhov. Or the despair that kills true creative impulse and aborts the desire to create even before it has been tried. The effects are felt not only immediately but for generations, as the tortured, hesitant revival of art after Stalin bears witness.

Censorship may be effective only in an intellectual and creative vacuum. It is not the whole problem, vile as it may be. Over two notable periods, although admittedly in somewhat freer times, by persistence and wit *Novy mir* provided its readers with a rich and varied diet of new works by first rank writers, poets, playwrights as well as promising first attempts side-by-side with reminiscences, political analysis, articles on science and economics, and acute literary criticism – despite *Glavlit*. In those remarkable earlier periods under the editorship of Vyacheslav Polonsky (1928-34) and later under Alexander Tvardovsky (1953-54, 1958-69) *Novy mir* refused to accept the existence of a cultural vacuum. Under quite different conditions both men ensured some form and hope of continuity in the best tradition of Russian art and letters.

As all chief editors of the journal, Polonsky was a party member, but he was also a member of the internationalist revolutionary intelligentsia and a most capable and erudite literary critic. He firmly believed that unfettered, multifaceted art for all the dissonance it produced was not only desirable but necessary to the development and life of a truly socialist society. In all his writings and his editorial policy at *Novy mir* he consistently reflected this perspective. Polonsky was engaged in a rearguard action of the retreat before the emerging Stalinist policy of total conformity and its dogma of bureaucratic realism, to use Georg

Lukács' apt term. It was a losing battle only momentarily, for it helped to sustain the tradition and to establish the principle firmly enough for another day. Though his choices are excellent, it is a pity that Glenny included merely two works for this period.

Tvardovsky was confronted with a more arduous task after the long Stalinist night, and he had decidedly less confidence in the creative relationship of art to politics and markedly less support than had Polonsky. Compromised as he was by the past and comprise as he had to in his high Party position, Tvardovsky nevertheless re-established *Novy mir* as a forum for the resurgent intelligentsia, crying out for a new art and an unvarnished look at the past. A talented poet, he was quick to find and encourage new, honest talent and, what was more risky, fought to publish suppressed works of purged artists and the often brutal writings of the survivors. It is a mark of his courage that for so long he stood alone exposed to attack, balancing between his ever more contradictory roles as Party member and poet-editor. The present book is mainly given over to Tvardovsky's tenure at *Novy mir* and is most complete in its representation of the literary side of his efforts with selections from Pasternak, Tsvetayeva, Bulgakov, Meyerhold and Solzhenitsyn. But the journal pressed the de-stalinisation campaign on a much broader front, and one misses the memoirs and political and historical articles which figured so prominently in practically every issue.

Valuable as it is, Glenny's book raises some unkind questions: for whom was it intended and why is it so lopsided in its emphasis? Surely it is not for the specialist who has access to the originals, since where his need is greatest – for works from the rare early numbers of *Novy mir* – the selections are most limited. Nor can it be directed towards the general reader to acquaint him with a varied offering of new works and authors, for the major emphasis is on literary works by already well-known authors. Why, one is forced to ask, is so much new and unknown material omitted? Glenny notes these criticisms and honourably takes full responsibility. One suspects that the publishers may have forced an uneasy, 'practical' compromise onto the editor and that they must take the blame for the lopsided

result. In spite of that, it is a worthwhile book if but for the stories of Pilnyak, Platonov and Tarsis. One may only hope that the publishers will one day have the foresight to let Michael Glenny complete the project with several more volumes.

Ben Whitaker In the land of the blind

The Right to Say No by JUDITH TODD
Sidgwick & Jackson £2.75

The Smith regime's censorship in Rhodesia, described by Judith Todd in INDEX nos.3-4, has its significant as well as its ludicrous side. It is encouraging that the regime, which outwardly professes such confidence, shows itself to be afraid of the effect of the publication of the mere name of Joshua Nkomo, the Rev. Sithole, or Garfield or Judith Todd. Mr Van der Byl and his censors have also succeeded in the difficult task of alienating all the Rhodesian newspapers – which normally are about as radical as the *Daily Telegraph* – so that, although far from sympathetic to African aspirations, they now despise the Rhodesian Front as well as thinking it misguided commercially. To this extent the censorship, as it so often is when crude and tangible, has been counter-productive (as well as inept: the *Bulawayo Chronicle* once printed in its Stop Press the story which it had been made to remove from its front page).

Another consequence, more perhaps of the 'censorship mentality' which leads to self-censorship than of censorship itself, is the extraordinarily blinkered horizon of the Rhodesian Front supporters. Everyone outside the *laager* is out of step with those inside. Anyone opposing them must be a communist. The Pearce Commissioners must be gullible if not corrupt. Archaeologists are wrong to believe that any ancestors of the 'munts' (the Shona word for 'child' or 'dumb one') could

Christopher Cvičić

Spellbound

Hrvatski pravopis ('Croatian Orthography')

compiled by DR STJEPAN BABIĆ, DR
BOZIDAR FINKA and DR MILAN MOGUS
Skolska Knjiga, Zagreb, 1972.

Photographic reprint, London 1973

All kinds of books get banned and even destroyed by illiberal governments, but the Tito government in Yugoslavia is probably unique in being responsible for the destruction of a handbook of spelling and orthography on the ground of its being 'a nationalist act of sabotage'. Almost immediately after the start of the big party and government purge in Croatia in December 1971, the entire printing of the *Croatian Orthography*, at that time awaiting distribution, was destroyed. But one copy survived and was smuggled abroad and reprinted by a Croatian anti-Tito group in the West.

Mr Josip Vrhovec, the new party secretary in Croatia who was appointed to his post after the dismissal of the former popular top leaders, Mr Miko Tripalo, Mrs Savka Dabčević-Kučar, and others in December 1971, did not mince words when he referred to the destruction of the book in October 1972. The book was 'neither Croatian nor scholarly', he is reported to have said to the Zagreb *Skolska Knjiga* firm which had originally produced it, and deserved its end 'on the rubbish dump'. Among his specific criticisms were that the authors tried to represent the eastern (Serbian) variant of the Serbo-Croat language as 'primitive' and to uphold the western (Croatian) one as 'culturally superior'. He also alleged that the nearly 20 per cent of Serbian children in Croatian schools would have been disturbed by the new Orthography, because although they do not speak the eastern variant, neither do they completely speak the western variant either – which the Orthography was said to be imposing on the Serbs in Croatia (who according to the 1971 census represent just over 14 per cent of the population in that republic).

The criticisms of the work's scholarship cannot easily be sustained. The three authors are all well-known Zagreb philologists, with solid reputations as both research workers and university teachers and editors. The *Orthography* had been commissioned by *Matica Hrvatska*, the oldest cultural institution in Croatia, in agreement with the relevant Zagreb university institutes and the Yugoslav Academy of Sciences in Zagreb. Their work was vetted and highly recommended for publication by, among others, a leading Croatian linguist, Professor Radoslav Katičić, of Zagreb University, who called it both a modern and moderate work, representing an advance on everything that had been done previously.

This reviewer finds it hard to disagree with this view. The book is, from the purely practical point of view, well put together and easy to use. Its tone is modern, brisk and certainly not exclusive or narrow-minded towards other languages, especially the Serbian variant of the Serbo-Croat language. On the contrary, the glossary lists many words, like *izvještačen*, *ljenština*, *osmatrač* and a number of others to which a Croatian purist might have objected as 'serbisms'. The editors decided, sensibly and broad-mindedly, that these words had acquired sufficient status in Croatian to be accepted without demur. Even where a western variant is recommended, this is only a mild suggestion in the interests of consistency. The reader is also struck by the considerable number of words dealing with Serbia, its history and especially the Serbian Orthodox church which have been included, probably to show that there was to be no hostility towards the Serbs in Croatia. In all ways, from a purely language point of view, the *Orthography* is probably the most authoritative guide to enlightened language practice in Croatia today.

But of course language and politics cannot be separated and it appears that the book suffered its sad fate not because of its lack of scholarship, but because of the political context in which it had appeared. The book was very much the result of most Croats' disenchantment with the workings of the so-called Novi Sad language agreement of 1954. That agreement affirmed the unity of the Serbo-Croat language, but also the equality of the two variants within it, the eastern (*ekavski* or Serbian) and the western (*ijekavski* or Croatian). This agreement was originally signed between

Matica Hrvatska and its Serbian counterpart, *Matica Srpska*, and subsequently agreed to by numerous writers and other public figures on both sides.

But before very long, the Croats started complaining that the agreement, which had produced a joint *Orthography* by 1960, was being used to 'squeeze' the western variant out of existence or reduce it to the status of a quaint provincial variant. There was much truth in this charge, though some of the things that were happening were simply due to the fact that the federal government, the army command, the party's presidium and various other big institutions, including the federal parliament, were in Belgrade, at the same time capital of Yugoslavia and of Serbia. But it undoubtedly irritated the Croats a great deal that all documents issued by the JAT airline, or the railway authorities were in the Serbian variant. Even more irritating was the fact that the language of command in the army was Serbian and that the entire terminology was based on the old royal Serbian army's terminology - neglecting the Croats' own recognised terminology preserved through centuries. Of course the fact that 85 per cent of the officers were Serbs or Serbian speaking Montenegrins probably accounted for this, but not entirely. The Croats suspected that what was in store for them was the creation of some amalgamated Yugoslav language with the Latin script but *ekavski* pronunciation - an old idea first given currency by the celebrated Serbian critic, Jovan Skerlić. This idea had many supporters in Croatia after the First World War when Yugoslavia was first formed. The official theory was that the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes were but three nations (tribes) of one people (the Macedonians were not then recognised as a separate nation) destined to merge into a single Yugoslav nation.

Post-war communist Yugoslavia was founded on the firmly federalist concept of complete equality for all Yugoslav nationalities, including the right to use their languages. But in the late 1950s the idea of creating 'Yugoslavs' and a 'Yugoslav language' began to gain ground in top party circles in Belgrade and was reflected in the 1963 constitution, which reduced the status of the federal republics. But when the powerful ex-secret police boss, Alexander Ranković, was overthrown

in 1966, the widespread dissatisfaction in Croatia with various aspects of Belgrade's nationality policy, including that in the field of language, came to the surface. In March 1967 seventeen leading Croatian cultural institutions, representing over 100 leading writers and academics, demanded that Croatian be given the status of a language in the constitution. This 'Declaration' provoked a hostile reaction in Serbia, where it was seen as a mischievous separatist act. But in 1971 *Matica Hrvatska* and various other Croatian cultural bodies decided to abrogate the Novi Sad agreement and go back to the state that had existed before 1954. The new *Croatian Orthography* was the direct result of this act.

When President Tito decided to sack Croatian leaders in December 1971, the idea of Croatian being recognised as an official language was dropped. Its implementation would have caused complications in, for example, Bosnia, where Serbs, Croats, and Muslims live together. Also, the Serbs in Croatia probably feared that the new *Orthography* could lead to their eventual assimilation as Croats. The Croats' reply to this was that it was up to the Croatian Serbs to decide themselves what language they spoke. This then is the complicated background to the publication of the *Orthography*, but the way out which was taken in December 1971 does not look like a permanent solution. The only solution that can help Yugoslavia's stability is one that will be seen by each nation as fully guaranteeing its cultural and political viability, i.e. the Croats must not try to assimilate the Serbs, but equally the Serbs cannot deny the Croats their right to call the language that they speak Croatian. There are hints that the present leaders realise that there can be no going back. Mr Mirko Božić, one of the new leaders in Croatia and himself a writer, said recently that the constitution of the Croatian Federal Republic spoke of the 'Croatian literary language' because this was the right description for the language spoken by both the Serbs and the Croats in Croatia. Perhaps, in the end, this is the approach that will win the day.