

on censorship

index

2/1974

75p/\$2

THE

The Portuguese context / Women's Lib context

3 MARIAS

A SWEDISH

A Swedish journalist writes from jail

'WATERGATE'?

ROY

On Solzhenitsyn's 'Gulag Archipelago'

MEDVEDEV

The Turkish universities / Spain's skin-deep liberalism / Australia: a little progress / USSR Victor Jara — four songs / 'Be angry, my son!' Czechoslovakia / Indonesia / Book reviews

editor: Michael Scammell
assistant editor: George Theiner
editorial board: Louis Blom-Cooper, Edward Crankshaw,
Stuart Hampshire, Dan Jacobson, Stephen Spender

reference and INDEX/Index: James Collins
advertising: Susan Strachan
distribution and subscriptions: Philip Spender
design: Hannah Oorthuys and Françoise Berserik

index

summer 1974, volume 3 number 2

		page
The Editor	Notebook	3
Ioannis Papadopoulos	Be angry, my son! A Greek surgeon's letter from prison to his 7-year-old son	11
Antonio de Figueiredo	The three Marias: The Portuguese context	19
Faith Gillespie	The Women's Liberation context <i>New Portuguese letters (an extract)</i>	22 26
Jan Guillou	A Swedish Watergate? One of the journalists involved in the 'IB Affair' writes from prison	29
Victor Jara	Four songs Lyrics by the Chilean songwriter killed during the 1973 coup	34
Bülent Tanör	Turkish universities fall silent A detailed account of the effect of martial law on Turkey's academic life	39
	The impact of martial law in Turkey A list of university lecturers imprisoned or interrogated by the police	47
John Butt	Spain's skin-deep liberalism A look at Spain's new Press Law and the reasons behind attacks on bookshops and publishing houses by right-wing extremists	51
Allan Healy	A little progress Australian censorship under the Labour administration	55

	Czechoslovakia 1974:	
	A strange way to criticise Graham Greene	61
	Snow White blacklisted	63
Frantisek Janouch	Unlimited persecution	63
	INDEX/Index appears between pages 64 and 65	
Roy Medvedev	On Solzhenitsyn's <i>Gulag Archipelago</i>	65
	For the record	
	USA: <i>Fahrenheit 451 in North Dakota</i>	75
	Czechoslovakia: <i>Checkmate for Pachman?</i>	75
	USSR: <i>Consigned to oblivion</i>	76
	Indonesia: <i>The case of Ashadi Siregar</i>	76
	Books	
Alfred Friendly	<i>The Anderson Papers</i> by Jack Anderson with George Clifford	79
Iain Elliot	<i>Ten Years After Ivan Denisovich</i> by Zhores A. Medvedev	80
Richard McKane	<i>Joseph Brodsky: Selected Poems</i> , translated and introduced by George L. Kline, with a foreword by W. H. Auden	82
	<i>Poems of Anna Akhmatova</i> , selected, translated and introduced by Stanley Kunitz with Max Hayward	83
Jean C. Texier	<i>Television, Authority and Money</i> by Jacques Thibau	84
	<i>The Shadow in the Cave</i> by Anthony Smith	85
Leslie Jankovich	<i>Satellite Broadcasting</i> by Abram Chayes, James Fawcett, Masami Ito and Alexandre Charles Kiss	86
Ann Vickers	<i>Abuse of Psychiatry for Political Repression in the Soviet Union</i>	88
David Pryce-Jones	<i>Nazi Propaganda</i> by Z. A. B. Zeman	90
	Letter to the Editor	
Anne Barnard	Hidden censorship	91
	Contributors	92
	Back numbers of Index	93
	Subscription form and rates	95, 96

Notebook

Last January I had the interesting experience of becoming headline news for a day. The Soviet weekly, *Sovietskaya Rossiya*, had devoted a whole page to an attack on me and news of this was picked up by Western correspondents and transmitted back to London. Moscow Radio also gave prominence to the article in its broadcasts in English, and this is what they said.

Moscow Radio on 'smuggled manuscripts'

'The Moscow newspaper *Sovietskaya Rossiya* has published a report by Ilya Yurchenko about the unseemly activities carried out in the Soviet Union by one Michael Scammell of London. Here are the main points of the article.

'Not long ago customs house officials could not help noticing the peculiar behaviour of one of the tourists returning to Britain from the Soviet Union. As a matter of fact, such peculiarities are nothing new to the customs officials. After all, when a person starts looking around nervously, when his suitcase is light yet he is trembling, well it's not a bad idea to have a look at what he is carrying. No, there was neither gold nor Soviet money in the luggage of Michael Scammell, but, oh-ho-ho, that innocent-looking tea caddy, that indeed was interesting. That neat-looking little packet straight from the factory, as it were, didn't contain tea at all, but documents and not innocent-looking ones either. Sixteen handwritten sheets, looking like ordinary traveller's notes, faithfully scored lines, unfinished phrases, names, more or less coded, and those laconic lines did in fact contain a big volume of information calculated to be damaging to the interests of the Soviet State.

'Ilya Yurchenko goes on to write in the paper: Officially, Michael Scammell is a translator from Russian into English. He is in reality an agent of anti-Soviet groups abroad and of organisations hostile to our country such as the ill-famed NTS, or Popular Labour Alliance. Of course, he didn't present any credentials from the NTS. However, under the guise of a tourist he was in fact engaged in collecting information for such circles as those and such organisations to use against our country, against its peace policy, with the object of trying to spoil the friendly relations existing between the Soviet Union and other States and peoples.

'Scammell scavenged anything that might be used for these aims, including material from the spheres of literature and art. Ilya Yurchenko goes on to write in the article: Among writers and people engaged in the arts, some are well known, their names are popular. Others, of course, are not so

popular and, indeed, others are hardly known at all. Alas, that is the way of the world. Talents vary. So, if you look hard enough, you can always get hold of the work of some unrecognised genius. Then, having sent his work abroad on the sly you can be sure of the services of certain ever ready publishers, especially those who work for the fearfully anti-Soviet NTS. They will make changes, then get it into the press somehow or other; they'll turn everything into a sensation and make a real hullabaloo about the author, putting him across as a fighter, as a crusader and champion for some sort of ideas which are supposedly suppressed, gagged and such like. Specialists from the Possev Publishing House, run by the NTS, and from the BBC can distort things in such a way as to turn the most humdrum hack writer into a fighter for an idea.

'In this respect, writes Ilya Yurchenko, the job Michael Scammell was trying to pull off was quite interesting. He had got hold of some stories written by Lydia Chukovskaya, whose name is not well known although she is quite an elderly lady. Having won no recognition among Soviet readers in her youth, she decided to try her luck in another direction by way of the illegal export of her manuscripts. Go-betweens lent her a hand and the NTS published a couple of her little books. Lydia Chukovskaya was asked at the Union of Soviet Writers why she had acted as she did. What was it that had made her approach publishers who had long been notorious for their hatred towards the Soviet Union? Oh dear, I really didn't know anything about it, replied the wide-eyed 63-year old lady, nor how they got hold of my manuscripts. So it would seem that she had nothing at all to do with it. However, writes Ilya Yurchenko, we could say to this author: Oh come off it, your attentive friend, Michael Scammell, among other things was carrying a note from you to Zhores Medvedev who has been deprived of his Soviet citizenship for activities unworthy of a Soviet citizen. In the note you empowered him to receive in the West any royalties due to you. So perhaps it was poverty and the difficulties of life that impelled Lydia Chukovskaya to take such a step. No, it wasn't that at all. She lived in good conditions, being well off and having a flat in the centre of Moscow and a cottage in the country.

'Ilya Yurchenko goes on to write in the article: Michael Scammell and others like him who pose as defenders of unrecognised versifiers and prose-writers love to harp on the note of the underprivileged. There is in Moscow a sculptor, Vadim Sidur by name. In the foreign press you can read about the awful conditions in which he finds himself - a semi-basement where hardly a ray of sunlight can penetrate. There he lives and works. We would like to inform the author of that sad story that in

fact Vadim works in a big workshop more than 1,200 square feet in area and with good lighting. In this he was helped by the Artists' Fund of the USSR. He and his wife live in a three-roomed flat and the reason he tries his work abroad apparently is due to the fact that art-lovers in our country simply don't like what he turns out, and that unrecognised artist was snapped up and boosted by such advertising agents as Scammell and company. In spite of everything, writes Ilya Yurchenko in conclusion, Michael Scammell has a dearth of clients: try as hard as he may to unearth new clients it simply doesn't work. Somehow he just can't get hold of addresses. It is disheartening. The reason for his failure would seem to be the fact that there is an ever more healthy atmosphere of co-operation and respect in relations nowadays, and this applies to intellectual ties among other things. It is the atmosphere of the Soviet policy of peace among the nations. Such then is the situation in which Michael Scammell writes with irritation about his clients: they are very depressed. They feel the West is letting them down. Well, well, what is to be done? What with the advance of détente and the corresponding improvement in the political climate, how can such paying business be kept going. There are no new methods. The only thing to do is to harp even louder on the same old notes: it is essential to help the Zionists in the West to raise a rumpus. Always keep the clients in view and raise a row if need be. The more noise, the better. Such are the plans of Scammell himself and such is the written advice that he gives to his friends.'

The lie and the smear

Now the interesting thing about this article from the point of view of propaganda is its almost unrelieved mixture of lies, smears and innuendo. Some of the lies are merely for embroidery. Thus, far from looking around me nervously and trembling with anticipation, I approached the customs desk with my customs form still not fully completed, since I wished to enquire about the status of part of a cheap, nineteenth-century brass folding icon that had been given me as a memento. Hardly had I had time to open my mouth, however, than I was surrounded by a posse of customs and KGB officials and hustled off to a back room for searching and questioning. And as might have been expected, the piece of brass that I handed them was duly entered as 'contraband' and valued at the staggering price of – five roubles.

Other lies that might just come into the category of embroidery are the allegations that the NTS and the BBC 'alter and distort' manuscripts

or statements that they receive before making them public, and the laughable suggestion that the sculptor, Vadim Sidur's studio is equipped with 'good lighting'. In the first place, if his studio is a basement – which even *Sovietskaya Rossiya* doesn't deny – then it is quite logical to say that 'hardly a ray of sunlight can penetrate there'. In fact, *no* rays of sunlight get in. And if this seems a natural, well-lit place for an artist or sculptor to be, let us look forward to the time when the 'socialist realist' academicians of the Soviet establishment will also be assigned to basements, instead of the vast palaces they inhabit today – also by the grace of the Artists' Fund.

However the truly important lies in this little piece are first, that I was carrying some of Chukovskaya's stories with me, and second, that her two books were published in the West by the NTS.

The first charge is nonsense, as is clear if only from the fact that no titles or details are given. But it is interesting how the security police persist in their fantasies, for it is precisely 'manuscripts of stories' that they were looking for when I was detained and searched. Indeed, after about an hour of questioning, the exasperated KGB officer came straight out with it and asked quite openly: 'But haven't you got any manuscripts by Lydia Chukovskaya?' And so, even though I had none and they found none, it was decided to put it into the story for the sake of verisimilitude. In fact, such an excuse was needed very badly, for, as we shall see, the 'material' turned up by the search represented a pitiful haul for so much trouble. Perhaps I should also mention in passing that the police seemed equally worried lest I was carrying 'a posthumous book by Kornei Chukovsky' – Lydia's distinguished father and a known 'liberal' in the Soviet literary establishment.

As to the second principal lie – that Lydia Chukovskaya's books were published in the West by the NTS – this has to be seen in the context of the smears and innuendoes with which the article is larded. Thus I am hinted to be a member, or even an agent, of this terrifying organisation – a message that many readers of the article, even Western readers, drew from it. But if one looks carefully one discovers that this is never actually stated: 'He is . . . an agent of anti-Soviet groups abroad and of organisations hostile to our country, such as (my italics) the ill-famed NTS or Popular

Labour Alliance'. In fact the name or nature of these mysterious 'groups' or 'organisations' that I am supposed to be an agent of is never stated. Later on, the same technique is used to smear alleged 'unrecognised geniuses' who 'can be sure of the services of certain ever ready publishers, especially those who work for the fearfully anti-Soviet NTS', and who can turn to 'specialists from the Possev Publishing House run by the NTS'. In this way everyone either within or without the Soviet Union who thinks or writes differently from the accepted line or offends the Soviet bureaucrats in any way is assigned to the organisation the Soviet authorities regard as their most virulent and dangerous opponents in the West.

Unfortunately for Comrade Yurchenko, this particular lie about NTS being the publishers of Lydia Chukovskaya is easily exposable and it has already been fully exposed by the third principal in this affair, Zhores Medvedev. Medvedev published a fully documented rebuttal of Yurchenko's charges in a letter to the *New York Review of Books* dated 7 March, 1974, and since most of our readers will not have seen the letter, we are reproducing it here as well. At the beginning of his letter Medvedev goes over some of the same ground, so we are reprinting only that part of it which deals with this specific charge.

'Anti-Soviet Organisations'

I could go on to list and dissect the other innuendoes, such as that Lydia Chukovskaya is untalented, that her books and ideas are only 'supposedly' suppressed (let *Sovietskaya Rossiya* publish or even only discuss them if that is the case), that 'art lovers in our country simply don't like' the work that Vadim Sidur produces (he is never allowed to exhibit, so how can the 'art lovers' form an impression?), or that I was 'smuggling manuscripts for money' (an allegation that appears in the original article but is unaccountably omitted from the summary), but such slanders speak plainly for themselves.

Could it be, however, that the anti-Soviet organisation the author has in mind is Writers and Scholars International? It would be tempting to think so, but there are several reasons for discounting this possibility. In the first place, there is no reason at all for not mentioning it by name in the article. On the contrary, to turn up yet

another imperialist nest would be a nice little coup for *Sovietskaya Rossiya* or its KGB informants. But alas, that poor descendant of the famed scourge of the Revolution, the Cheka, has fallen on hard times. Despite the fact that INDEX is subscribed to by the Moscow Postal Administration and other Soviet institutions, the KGB officers at the airport and the prompters of Yurchenko were oblivious of my connection with it (thanks to the long validity of British passports, mine still shows my last occupation on it) and on my way into Moscow the customs officer solemnly inspected and then allowed me to take in no less than nine back issues of the magazine. Worse still, Yurchenko has failed to take note of earlier damning developments in this 'case'. For instance, the fact that the KGB had offered to sell me a Solzhenitsyn manuscript – which was trumpeted to the whole world by Solzhenitsyn last August in his interview with two Western correspondents. There he referred to the editor of INDEX and described the whole incident in some detail (see INDEX 4/1973), and this was subsequently published abroad. So there was no excuse for not knowing these facts by January.

Yurchenko, however, makes no mention of these facts and is content to follow standard practice in falling back on the tired convention of the NTS smear. This shows conclusively that I was in fact by no means the main target in this little campaign, but rather a 'means to an end' – that end being the defamation and discrediting of Lydia Chukovskaya in order to rationalise and provide some semblance of grounds for her disgraceful and cowardly expulsion from the Writers' Union. And if further evidence for this were needed, I should point also to something that was not at all apparent to Soviet readers, nor even to Western correspondents at the time, namely that the entire incident at the airport had taken place in June 1973, not January this year, the time of Lydia Chukovskaya's expulsion and the time of the whole attack.

Meanwhile Lydia Chukovskaya has been placed in an extremely difficult and possibly even dangerous position by her expulsion from the Writers' Union, but her spirited reply, which we reprint below, makes plain her defiance of this vindictive action and her scorn of the bureaucratic and totally unliterary mediocrities who passed judge-

ment on her. And she also brings out the fact of a most interesting development, namely that for the first time since Stalin dragooned the writers into a single Writers' Union in 1934, there is a significant number of Soviet writers who no longer belong to it. True, some of them have since gone abroad, notably Solzhenitsyn and Vladimir Maximov. But when you add to their names those of Alexander Galich, Vladimir Voinovich, Lev Kopelev, Chukovskaya herself, you have a collection of talent that easily rivals the writers who remain within the official union. The balance of forces, of course, is grossly unequal: all the money, resources, power of patronage and access to publication is on one side of the scales and on the other is nothing but the intangible virtues of honesty, sincerity, courage and freedom of spirit. But the very fact of such a confrontation is highly significant and I would suggest that the Writers' Union will never be the same again. Much of its strength lay in the very fact of its monolithic unity and the utter isolation of those who were formerly expelled, like Akhmatova, Zoshchenko and Pasternak. But now the outcasts are too many to be easily shrugged off and it will be interesting to see what effect this has on the Union's future development.

Can censorship be exported?

Arising out of all this there is one point that I would like to take a little further. To be involved with the manipulations of a secret police force is of course a disgusting and degrading business (far worse than having them look in your underpants is the sense of their utter cynicism and disregard for truth: it is extremely unnerving to realise that your interlocutors are deliberately lying to you and don't care whether you know it or not). Consequently there is a temptation to forget or ignore such episodes and push them to the back of your mind (thereby seeming to acquiesce in the accusations), or else to answer in kind and risk falling into the trap of accepting some of their grotesque, degrading assumptions.

In this case the assumption that is most pernicious is that governments somehow have the right to dispose not only of their subjects' bodies (which in itself is questionable, but is widely accepted), but also of their minds and souls and the intellectual products of those minds as well. Implicit in

the Soviet government's attack on Lydia Chukovskaya and myself were the following assumptions: (a) that Lydia Chukovskaya had no right to give manuscripts to a foreigner and send them abroad; (b) that if she did so, this was sufficient grounds for taking administrative sanctions against her and expelling her from the Writers' Union (i.e. depriving her of her livelihood); and (c) that for me to carry such manuscripts across a national frontier was in itself a criminal act, namely smuggling. (This last assumption is actually formulated on the customs declaration forms that have to be completed by foreigners at Moscow Airport. These define as articles which have to be declared to the customs officers 'all written materials, whether in printed or handwritten form'. Naturally this stipulation is honoured more in the breach than by observance, but it does mean that *any* written or printed material whatsoever, ranging from a used bus ticket to a whore's telephone number, is potential contraband, the concealment of which is technically an infringement of the law.)

Now the danger of this kind of practice is twofold. First there is the very spread of the concept that governments are omnipotent in all spheres material and spiritual. Countries, like individuals, teach by their example, and powerful countries exert an influence that is correspondingly powerful on the world around them. It is no secret that not only Communist countries, but also a growing number of dictatorial regimes the world over are seeking to impose their will on ever greater areas of their subjects' lives and that the claims of government are daily being pushed further and further.

Such a trend is bad enough in itself and threatens or already circumscribes the freedom of millions of people throughout the world, but almost worse is the creeping acceptance that such practices are achieving in the sophisticated democracies of the West. For instance, there is the steady spread of the double standard. Western intellectuals, while not for an instant countenancing the spread of Soviet-type practices to their own countries, are often perfectly prepared to regard the existence of these practices elsewhere as 'normal'. Just try asking an academic specialist, for example, on the Soviet Union or Czechoslovakia to take in a letter or a book on

his next scholarly visit or cultural exchange. Ten to one you will be met with expressions of dismay, or evasions, or pious comments to the effect that such an action 'will do more harm than good' to the recipient (even when it has all been arranged beforehand and the recipient *wants* the letter or book). Imagine, too, the panic if you suggest he take in a book by Orwell, Koestler or – God forbid! – Solzhenitsyn. And you can turn this round, according to taste, and suggest to the specialist on Brazil, Spain, Greece or Turkey that he take with him books by Sartre, Guevara or Cohn-Bendit, or deliver a letter to such and such a person in the capital city, and again you are likely to be met with polite evasions or outright refusal. Many is the laugh (albeit uneasy) I have had from academic seminars by pointing out that some of those present are keeping their mouths shut about the countries they have visited not because they have nothing to say, but because they wish to make sure of their visas for a further visit. Yet these are academics whose very profession is the search for truth and is predicated on freedom of thought, inquiry and communication.

I do not, of course, want to attack the academic community at large, nor cultural exchanges or simply tourism. Academics of all disciplines and degrees often perform tremendous services by keeping some sort of lines of communication open with 'closed' territories, maintaining contacts and carrying ideas (and sometimes even books) back and forth. Discretion and silence are sometimes essential to the valuable work they are doing. Equally, much of what I have said applies with just as much force to writers, artists, performers and even journalists who travel to these countries. But the overall danger remains the same, namely of accepting, however implicitly, superficially or subconsciously, the assumptions that flow from authoritarian government about the exchange of information and ideas. After all, if the visiting intellectual or academic can be intimidated even before he has left his homeland into dropping his normal assumptions about the way he should go about his business and can be made to divest himself of his usual yardstick of moral behaviour, the work of the host country is done before he even arrives. He will be little or no trouble to them while there, its simpler citizens will become convinced of the normality

of their way of life because all visitors accept it without question, more restive souls will become convinced of the hopelessness of protest when even free-spirited foreigners submit to these restrictions without a murmur, and it will be a relatively easy matter to maintain strict censorship when few feel strong or righteous enough to break it. Furthermore, if the visiting scholars and intellectuals can be silenced even for the period after they return home, this censorship will be exported abroad in a most dramatic fashion. 'Silence is consent' (or 'participation is consent') may not be in the minds of the visitors, but it is certainly in the minds of the host governments and of their captive populations.

It is essential, therefore, to be on guard against the kind of easy compromises and indulgence that can lead so quickly to acceptance of specious reasoning (or even legislation) and thence to the betrayal of our comrades and colleagues in embattled societies. In the view of INDEX, there can be no such thing as 'contraband' in the realm of ideas. Books, words, images have an inalienable right to pass from person to person, across frontiers, oceans and hemispheres, and no authority on earth has the right to stop them. We at INDEX will do everything in our power to see that nobody does stop them, and if that should mean technically 'smuggling', then we will smuggle as well. But let it be understood that it is the act of suppressing ideas that constitutes the crime, not the setting of them free.

The Editor

TO THE SECRETARIAT OF THE MOSCOW SECTION OF THE UNION OF SOVIET WRITERS

Lydia Chukovskaya

In a few minutes you will unanimously expel me from the Union. I shall move from membership in the Writers' Union into another category – the category of those expelled from the Union. This is painful, since there are many talented, honest, and upright people in the Union. At the same time, it is flattering if one remembers that this category of expelled persons included Zoshchenko and Akhmatova in their day, that Pasternak died expelled, and that Solzhenitsyn, Galich and Maximov were recently expelled. I do not equate myself with such giants as Akhmatova or

Solzhenitsyn, but I am proud that you were compelled to take the same measures against me as against them.

Today you will sentence me to the most extreme punishment for a writer – non-existence in literature. But you long ago began to separate me from my readers; that is, by not reissuing my old books and not publishing my new ones. It is completely within your power to make any writer entirely non-existent – in the present, and even in the past. The press is in your hands – in the hands of the presidiums, the secretariats, and the boards. You stopped reissuing my works on Miklukha-Maklai, on Herzen, on the Decembrists, on Boris Zhitkov, my critical articles, and my book *In An Editor's Laboratory*, so that I had almost no existence in the consciousness of readers. But up until now it has been permissible to refer to my books here and there, in publications with a small printing. Now, however, you will forbid even that. Articles in the Soviet press praising my books will be sent to the 'special custody sections'; i.e., they will be hidden from readers. After the American publication of my old book, *Going Under*, you tore out my reminiscences of Kornei Chukovsky which had been printed in the magazine *Semya i Shkola*. After the foreign publication of my article, 'The Wrath of the People', you removed my reminiscences of Kornei Chukovsky from a book published by Detgiz (State Children's Literature Publishing House).

Expulsion from the Union rounds out the sentence to non-existence. I was not and I am not. (At a session of the Bureau of the Children's Section, Comrade Kuleshov has already stated that I did not exist; and the reader has no opportunity to object – anywhere.)

But will I exist? Always, when performing acts like this, you have forgotten – and you are now forgetting – that you control only the present and to some extent the past. There is still another court with jurisdiction over the past and the future: the history of literature. Just remember: your predecessors persecuted Mikhail Bulgakov for years and did not publish him for decades; and now you boast about him throughout the world. Just remember: on orders from above, a certain Yudin once published in *Pravda* an article about Kornei Chukovsky titled 'The Vulgar and Dirty Concoction of Kornei Chukovsky'. At the

time you did not take Chukovsky's side. On the contrary, you aggravated the persecution. You never stood up for the word. Yet today you honour Kornei Chukovsky as one of the founders of Soviet literature, and protect him from me. As for Yudin, if he goes down in history it will only be as the author of that shameful article, since he has no other claims to fame. Yet at the time you supported Yudin, and almost expelled Kornei Chukovsky from your secretariat.

The history of literature, and not you, will decide who is a writer and who is a usurper.

In 1885 Tolstoy wrote to Urusov: 'Yes, the word is the beginning of everything: the word is the holy thing of the soul . . . The word is one deity that we know; and it alone makes and remakes the world.'

The word – the spirit – has fled from you.

With this kind of word you cannot control things or take them in hand, even if you have very strong and very long arms. The position of the word in our country is truly desperate. If a person says something that does not coincide with your opinions of the moment, he is labelled an anti-Soviet. If in a foreign country someone criticises something done in our country, it is called meddling in our internal affairs. That is the way you control things. But with the word, the holy thing of the soul, you can amuse, cure, make happy, expose, and alarm people, but you cannot control things. You can exercise control only through hindrances to the word, obstacles to the word, dams built against the word: by removing books from the plan, from the library, by breaking up type that has been set, by not publishing, by expelling an author from the Union, by shifting a book from the '74 plan to the '76 plan, and appropriating the paper for yourself, or publishing the prose of Filev in a printing of a million copies. That is the way you control things. Hampering. Hindering. Prohibiting.

'The word is the sacred part of the soul. It alone remakes the world.' Even you are powerless to hinder it.

Despite all the obstacles you have set up – in '37-'38 and before, in '46, in '49-'51, in '58, '66, '68, and '69 – Russian literature is alive and will go on living.

. . . But the Muse went deaf and blind,
Germinating in the earth as a grain,

So that, phoenix-like, she can rise again
From the ashes into the blue air.

What do they do – those you have expelled? Write books. After all, even prisoners have written books, and are writing them. And what will you do? Write resolutions.

Go ahead and write!

9 January, 1974

I was expelled from the Writers' Union on 9 January, 1974, chiefly for my article, 'The Wrath of the People'. The expulsion took place under the slogan: 'Comrades, it goes without saying that we are not going to discuss Chukovskaya's article *on its merits*'. They discussed it, *not on its merits*, for about two

hours. Even I was allowed to speak. I spoke about the fact that Russian literature was unkillable. And I ended with the words: 'I can tell you in advance that an Alexander Solzhenitsyn Square and an Academician A. D. Sakharov Avenue are inevitable in Moscow, the capital of our common homeland.'

The members of the secretariat resolved unanimously: 'To expel, with extensive press coverage.'

A month has gone by, and there has not been one word in the press about my expulsion. But on 12 January, 1974 a libel written in order to besmirch my private and social life and that of my friends, was published in *Sovietskaya Rossiya*. In his day, Herzen called such articles 'mud-cures'.
L. K. Chukovskaya

The Attack on Lydia Chukovskaya

Ilya Yurchenko, the author of the article in *Soviet Russia*, asserts that Lydia Chukovskaya published her books with the anti-Soviet organisation NTS, and that they were printed by the émigré publishing house Possev. He also claims that during the search, stories written by Lydia Chukovskaya were confiscated from Michael Scammell. All these assertions of Ilya Yurchenko are, of course, lies. I have seen the official customs record [that was given to Scammell] of the confiscated items; it contains only a listing of Michael Scammell's personal notes (sixteen handwritten pages). Lydia Chukovskaya's letter to me was not recorded, as the confiscation of this letter was illegal. No stories by Lydia Chukovskaya were involved at all.

Concerning Lydia Chukovskaya's books published abroad, it should be stated that these publications have no connection either with NTS or with the publishing house Possev. The story *Sofya Petrovna* appeared in the United States in *The New Review (Novy Zhurnal)* in 1966. It was published in book form in Paris, under the title *Opustely dom (Deserted House)* by the book store Librairie des Cinq Continents, which specialises in the sale of Russian, primarily Soviet books. This book store has no relationship to NTS or to Possev. Lydia Chukovskaya's story *Spusk pod vodu (Going Under)* was published in Russian in 1972 by the Chekhov Publishing Corporation in the USA. This corporation

also bears no relation to Possev. Both books by Lydia Chukovskaya have been translated into several languages by independent commercial publishing houses.

The short novel *Sofya Petrovna* was written by Lydia Chukovskaya in 1939-1940. In 1963 this novel was submitted to the publishing house Sovetsky pisatel, it received a favourable evaluation, and was approved for publication. The publishers signed a contract with the author, but in 1964, when the publication of all works dealing with the problem of Stalinist repression was banned, the publishers discontinued the publication of Lydia Chukovskaya's novel, which at that time was being type-set. Lydia Chukovskaya sued the publishers for breach of contract. The writers' suit was heard April 24, 1965, in the People's Court of the Sverdlovsk district of Moscow. The record of the court proceedings subsequently circulated as a *Samizdat* document. In the West it was published in 1972 by the Alexander Herzen Foundation in Amsterdam, as part of the collection *Political Diary (Politichesky dnevnik)* (pp. 51-57) . . .

These are the facts . . . But now *Soviet Russia* is attempting to entangle the whole affair in cobwebs of lies. These lies were also transmitted by the Soviet radio in English and other languages, through broadcasts to many countries.
Zhores A. Medvedev
London, England

Czechoslovakia 1974

A strange way to criticise Graham Greene

Last December, in a letter to the New Statesman, Graham Greene amused its readers by pointing to the lighter side of the otherwise gloomy scene in the 'normalised' Czechoslovak media. This provoked the Prague Communist Party political and ideological weekly Tribuna to make an irascible attack on the left-wing London magazine, omitting to mention that the offending letter had come from the pen of one of the major writers of our time.

The full text of the letter and a slightly abbreviated version of the Tribuna article are given below, the latter in a translation provided by the Radio Free Europe research department.

A Strange Czech Tale

SIR, In the tragic situation which arose in Czechoslovakia with the intervention of the Russians one is always glad to find certain elements of comedy and perhaps the following story just come to me from a reliable female source who has left the country may be of interest to your readers.

'The absolute ruler of Prague Television is a fearful lady by the name of Balášová, about whose exploits legends are told, only they are not legends. This Comrade Balášová ordered that no employees be admitted to work who wear blue jeans, especially women. So in the morning the door guard checks on everyone and those who wear blue jeans are sent home to change, the time they spend thus is of course regarded as absence without excuse, a very unpleasant thing in a socialist country. However, Comrade Balášová is not satisfied with this mild arrangement. She further issued orders that no female employees or performers can come to work bra-less.

'So the door guard started to check on this piece of female apparel by going over the backs of the entering comrades with his palm. Several of the women hit him on the nose, so a female guard was assigned this duty. Then Comrade Balášová had a photo made of the model male haircut, short, no sideburns. There are four

photos, full face, left and right profiles, and from the back. Every performer who is to be seen on the TV screen is compared with these model photos and his hair is 'adjusted'. If he refuses, he is not allowed to appear on the TV screen.

'Recently, a pop singer from Estonia came to Prague, on contract, to tape a few TV songs. His hair was found lacking in shortness, he refused to have it adjusted, and was sent back to Estonia without having taped his songs. Two Polish saxophonists consented to wear short-haired wigs, a Hungarian tenor saxophonist refused, and since they had to allow him to appear on the screen – he was a member of a big band – the cameramen received orders never to focus their lenses on him.'

A postscript to this story: 'Comrade Balášová has been finally defeated. After she had successfully banned all long-hairs from the Czechoslovak screen, the TV brought the annual marathon race, sponsored by the party daily *Rudé právo*, to the screen. This is one of the best-known marathon runs in Eastern Europe, and runners from all over the world come to take part in it. The whole race was broadcast by the TV, with cameras placed on special cars, so that they could follow the leading runner. After about one third of the run had been over, an Argentinian athlete got into the lead and remained in the lead to the end, and won.

'His name escapes me, it sounded somewhat English, like Moore. Anyway, this progressive marathonian had his hair so long that in order not to have his vision impaired he had to bind it with a female ribbon. And he remained on the screen for over an hour, and was even shown in many close-ups, including the one when he was receiving the cup from the hands of some CP functionary. So the long-hairs had their revenge, eventually.

'It's the same thing as with literature. What is allowed to a foreign writer of renown is forbidden to the poor local subject of the party. The

Hungarian tenor-man was avoided by the cameras on orders from Balášová. But you cannot shun the marathon winner, especially if he comes from the capitalist camp.'

Graham Greene Paris

(*New Statesman*, 28 December 1973)

A Strange Way of Providing Information

The propagandists, and frequently the official representatives, of the capitalist world often voice demands for so-called free exchanges of information and contacts in the spheres of science, culture, tourism, sports, etc. At the same time they accuse the socialist countries of surrounding themselves with all kinds of barriers and of preventing a free flow of information and ideas and a free movement of persons. How some people in the West envisage 'a free flow of information' and the way in which they contribute to 'exchanges of cultural values' is clearly demonstrated in a recent offensive article in the London weekly *New Statesman*, whose interest in Czechoslovakia in general clearly has anti-communist overtones. In its December issue the paper published an article entitled 'A Strange Czech Tale', alleged to be a letter from a reader in Paris, which slandered the management of Czechoslovak Television in an almost embarrassingly feeble manner. The article indicated that the information was obtained from tainted members of our outcast Right, and this clearly emerges from the bilious tone of the entire piece.

The letter states that the management of Prague Television had issued a regulation forbidding its female employees to come to work in blue jeans or without brassières – that is, clad in a fashion which some girls began to favour in this country last summer. Allegedly a guard at the entrance checked to see that this regulation was being obeyed – particularly the second part of it – in a most assiduous and thorough manner, which earned him a punch on the nose from some women comrades. And after this female guards were entrusted with this task.

The letter then went on to discuss problems that have arisen for the management owing to a second regulation, to the effect that no one with long and unkempt hair may appear on the screen. Foreign guests, including some from

socialist states, who do not wish to obey these regulations pose the greatest problem in this respect, rejecting model photographs showing how one should look in profile, full face, and from the back.

The old proverb 'Where there is smoke, there is fire' does indeed apply to the second part of the letter. Our television managements are keenly aware of the impact that what is seen on the screen has on the minds of the viewers, so far as patterns of behaviour are concerned. The mannerisms of the announcer, commentator, singer, or actor, the way he behaves and looks on the screen – these are not matters involving a small private group; rather, they are models of behaviour that can influence millions of people, particularly impressionable young viewers. If, for instance, the participants in the various television discussions and interviews, or the performers in the other productions, were to smoke incessantly, it would be difficult to persuade young people that this essentially harmful habit is not part of a normal pattern of social behaviour. . . .

The English word 'tale' has several meanings: a narrative, a story, a fairy tale, but also gossip, twaddle, or nonsense. The title of the alleged letter is affectedly cultural, in an effort to evoke an association with Shakespeare's *The Winter's Tale*. The contents of this letter and its ridiculous attempts to comment on the 'tragic situation in Czechoslovakia' in this manner, further lessening the credibility of such descriptions of conditions in this country by absurd 'sans-brassière' stories, bear out the fact that the entire effort is not a tale but silly twaddle. One can only recommend that the London paper concern itself more with the manner in which British television fulfils its social function, and whether, particularly now that British society is in deep crisis, the real opinions and social needs of English workers can be expressed on it, rather than worrying about the problems of our television. □

(' – vr – ' in *Tribuna*. No. 6, 6 February 1974)

The following text has been taken from a letter sent to The Times by Professor František Janouch and published on 21 March 1974. Professor Janouch, a leading Czech nuclear scientist, was 'allowed to emigrate' at the end of last year by the Husák regime which he had consistently opposed since the Soviet invasion of 1968. He now works in the Niels Bohr Institute in Copenhagen.

Unlimited persecution

The proposal by the International PEN Club to declare 1974 as the year of general amnesty for political prisoners deserves wide public support.

Beside the judicial persecution there exists, however, another kind of persecution of people for their opinions which is more widespread and more difficult to define. One may call it extra-judicial persecution. It assumes many forms: the writer cannot write or publish his books, the scientist is not allowed to work in his science or to publish his papers, the teacher – to teach, the journalist – to work in the media, the actor to act, the singer to sing, the director to direct plays or films, the priest to preach, the surgeon to treat his patients.

The consequences of extra-judicial persecution are often worse than a short term spent in jail; persecution unlimited in time means, in fact, in our epoch of fast development and rapid change in all fields of human knowledge, a loss of qualification and ex-

Snow White blacklisted

Prague, 2 January—Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs have joined other victims of cultural ostracism in Czechoslovakia. A recording of the famous children's tale is among about 1,000 records withdrawn from circulation under an order that came into effect at the end of the year.

Others included recorded language courses in Russian, German, French, English, Spanish and Chinese. All were probably withdrawn because the composers had been blacklisted or the performers had emigrated.

Record shops were sent a list of records to be withdrawn 'according to directives of 7 November 1973'. But it is not known whether the Ministry of Culture or the new administration of Supraphon, the Czechoslovak record company, issued the directives.

Some of the banned records bore the titles 'Popular Russian Songs', 'Swiss Yodlers' and 'Popular Slavic Songs'.

The withdrawn records include musical works ranging from folk songs and jazz to classical items, including works by all the great Czech composers. Some recordings of Janáček's *Glagolitic Mass* and Ryba's *Czech Christmas Mass* were banned while other recordings of these composers remain on sale.

Historical records no longer available include 'The National Slovak Insurrection', the 'Munich Betrayal' and the 'Insurrection of the People of Prague'.

Among the banned theatrical recordings are Sartre's *Séquestres d'Altona* and Kundera's *Key Owners*. Mr Kundera is on the black list.

The Times, 3 January 1974.

perience. For an intellectual it is equivalent to a life sentence or even to the supreme penalty.

The demand for a general amnesty of political prisoners should, therefore, be accompanied by at least an equally strong international campaign against all possible forms of extra-judicial persecution of opinion. Both campaigns deserve the support also of scientific bodies of all kinds.

The problem is that scientific and professional organisations often refuse to discuss these issues, regarding them as involving 'political activity' incompatible with their professional or scientific character. This attitude is not, in my view, correct. Assisting the promotion and development of science, international contacts and cooperation is one of the chief aims inscribed in the constitutions of most learned societies. The fight against the persecution of scientists is, therefore, not a political matter, but part of the professional activity which serves the development and progress of science.

Both campaigns should also be supported by various international committees such as the Pugwash movement, the World Federation of Scientific Workers, etc. Let us be clear about this – the responsibility of scientists and intellectuals for the future fate of mankind is inseparable from their responsibility for the future and the fate of their imprisoned or otherwise persecuted colleagues. My own experience has demonstrated the effectiveness of such international support and solidarity. □

The Writer's obligation

A writer's prime obligation is to be true to his vision. As a citizen, his obligation is to face the facts of the social and political context in which he lives, however bewildering those facts may be and however impotent he may consider himself to be in terms of action. Neither of these obligations is by any means simple. But I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to Mr Solzhenitsyn, to Mr Sakharov, to Mr Amalrik, to Mr Bukovsky, and to the many other men and women in the Soviet Union, for their refusal to abandon their principles, for their dignity, for their remarkable courage. In what becomes every day a more monstrous world of betrayal, horror and sheer lunacy the rigour of a critical compassion sustained in these people seems to me truly impressive, and instructive.

**Harold Pinter, in a speech made in Vienna on
12 December 1973, when he received an Award for
European Literature**

index index

INDEX *Index* is a quarterly chronicle of events around the world published to illustrate the ways in which freedom of expression is being variously curtailed or denied. Such a chronicle cannot hope to be complete or to present a comprehensive picture of this problem, but is offered as a supplement to the information and comment appearing elsewhere in these pages. The information given is as accurate as we are able to make it, but its accuracy cannot be guaranteed and we would appreciate any corrections or additions that readers are able to provide.

ARGENTINA

The privately owned news agency *Noticias Argentinas* was reported in December to be facing possible closure after the Secretary for Communications had issued an order on 26 December withdrawing its use of four government radio transmission frequencies from the end of the year. The agency distributed the international report of *United Press International* to 62 subscribers, 56 of which were domestic newspapers and radio stations receiving the service by radio-teletype. Although no reason was given for the cancellation, a government source said it was because the agency was acting as a 'front' for UPI on the domestic market. The agency, which was set up following the August prohibition of foreign news agencies from transmitting news about Argentina for the use of the country's newspapers or news broadcasts (see *Index* 3/1973 p.i), claimed that UPI, one of the two agencies affected, held no financial interest in it but was supplying only a foreign news service.

A printing works which produces two Buenos Aires newspapers – *Mayoria*, the semi-official paper of the Peronist movement, and *El Mundo* – was badly damaged on 7 January when armed men planted explosive charges and threw fire-bombs.

BRAZIL

In a series of arrests among Roman Catholic activists following the election of General Ernesto Geisel as President, **Dermly Azevedo**, a journalist on the staff of the Uruguay afternoon newspaper *Ultima Hora*, was arrested, together with his wife, on 17 January, while on the following day **Maria Nilde Mascellani**, an educator who had worked

closely with a group of bishops who denounced abuses of human rights in Brazil, was also detained. Some days later several students from the Catholic Pontifical University were arrested. Observers said that the arrests appeared to be a hardening of the government's position on church activities, such as its closing of the Catholic radio in Sao Paulo and its ban on mission work among Indians.

The critical left-wing Rio de Janeiro weekly *Opinio*, so frequently in disfavour with the authorities (see *Index* 2/1973, p.i; 3/1973 p.i; 4/1973 p.i) was in January if anything more heavily censored than usual – something its readers had been able to perceive by the prominence given in its pages to extracts from Norman Mailer's life of Marilyn Monroe, blank pages being no longer permitted.

Brazilian newspapers were forbidden to report demonstrations which took place in Brussels against the Brazil commercial fair held there at the beginning of November.

BULGARIA

Rabotnichesko Delo reported on 15 February that the Sofia Municipal Court had sentenced three people to prison terms ranging from three to five years on charges of anti-Bulgarian activities. They were said to have illegally disseminated literature and propaganda material containing appeals for the overthrow of the socialist regime and to have been spreading slanderous allegations against socialist countries. The defendants were **Vladimir Makarov** who received a sentence of five years' imprisonment and a fine of 1,000 leva; **Teodossi Belyakovski** who received a sentence of three years' imprisonment and a fine

of 200 leva; and Catherine Lvov who received a sentence of four years' imprisonment and a fine of 500 leva. No information is available about the first two defendants, but Catherine Lvov is a young French specialist in Oriental languages who was on the staff of the French National Centre for Scientific Research in Paris and had been doing research in Sofia at the time of her arrest in September 1973. She was charged with disseminating clandestine literature from the Soviet *samizdat* (which, according to a report in *Le Monde*, she admitted) and of contacts with White Russian circles in West Germany and France. She was released in March and allowed to return to France.

CAMBODIA

Jean-Jacques Cazaux, a correspondent of *Agence France-Presse*, was expelled from the country on 6 February, a week after his arrival. His expulsion was said to have been demanded by the National Defence Committee which objected to his dispatches.

CHILE

On 26 November the correspondent of the Yugoslav news agency *Tanjug*, Momcilo Pudar, was arrested and questioned by the police. He was released the following day and later expelled.

Censorship was imposed from 12 January and lifted on 5 February. (The censorship in reality affected only the conservative press since all left-wing publications are banned.) During the period the daily *La Segunda* was banned for a day for 'spreading alarmist news' while *Tribuna* was banned indefinitely for 'false reporting'. *La Prensa*, the Christian Democrat paper, also had a leading article censored for criticising the junta's interference with the judiciary.

During January the Union of Journalists asked the junta to release 40 of its members who had been detained since their arrest in September.

CHINA

A documentary film on China by the Italian film director Michelangelo Antonioni was sharply

attacked in the *People's Daily* and on Radio Peking on 30 January and in almost every issue of the paper during the following week. The initial criticism of the film covered a full page of the party organ and accused Antonioni of anti-Chinese propaganda and of serving the interests of the Soviet Union. It said the film concentrated on poverty and backwardness in China instead of showing the country's economic and social progress and that it depicted the Chinese people as ignorant, unhygienic and gluttonous. Even the colours of the film were criticised as too gloomy. The film, which has never been publicly shown in China, was shot there in 1972 when Antonioni was invited to China as the guest of the government. It has been on release for about a year.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Twelve of the 46 intellectuals and former party supporters who went on trial in Prague and Brno during July and August 1972 (see *Index* 2/1972 p.90 and 3-4/1972 pp.114-115) were released on probation on 21 December. They included Jan Šabata who had received a two and a half year sentence and his sister, Anna Šabatová, who had received a three and a half year sentence (which had later been reduced on appeal to three years – see *Index* 1/1973 p.ii). Others in the group included Přemysl Vondra, a former employee of the Prague Institute of Adult Education, Josef Stehlik, a former central committee employee, and Jaroslav Jira, a former Students' Union secretary. All of them had received sentences of between two and three years and spent just under two years in prison, including pre-trial detention. With the release of this group, it was estimated that about a dozen of the original defendants were still in prison. (Of the original 46 defendants, 13 received suspended sentences and a number of others including Karel Kyncl, the former television journalist, had already completed their sentences.) These included Dr Jaroslav Šabata, a former professor at Brno University and a former party secretary for Brno (and the father of two of the defendants referred to here) who received a six and a half year sentence. According to unconfirmed reports early in January this sentence was further increased after it became known that he

had appealed in a letter smuggled out of prison to the British Communist Party to act as a mediator between the present regime in Prague and its socialist critics within the country.

Two leading members of the Church of the Czech Brethren were served with suspension orders by the authorities in a decree dated 16 January – the fifth anniversary of Jan Palach's self-immolation – and were ordered to leave their parishes by 28 February. The decree added that their salary payments, which are made by the state, would cease from that date. They were Pastor Jakub Trojan of Libiř and Pastor Alfred Kocáb of Mladá Boleslav, both well known for their support of humane socialism – the former had officiated at Palach's funeral. The Church of the Czech Brethren represents the branch of Czech protestantism most closely identified with the radical traditions of the Hussite Reformation and many of its clergy were associated with the 'Prague Spring' of 1968. Since the Soviet invasion of that year it has been severely harassed, with several of its members imprisoned on charges of 'anti-State agitation' and more having been forbidden to hold office.

The Bucharest correspondent of the Italian Communist Party newspaper *Unitá*, who had gone to Prague to cover the visit of Herr Brandt, the West German chancellor during December, was detained for 25 hours and, without explanation, was ordered to leave the country. The correspondent of the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* was refused an entry visa to cover the visit.

EGYPT

Mohammed Hassanein Heykal was removed from his post as editor of *Al Ahram*, the country's leading newspaper, and chairman of the paper's publishing company by President Anwar Sadat in a decree published in Cairo on 3 February. During the 17 years of his editorship the paper's editorials, and particularly Heykal's own Friday column, 'Frankly Speaking', were quoted and analysed by the foreign press all over the world as providing an authoritative assessment of the Middle East situation. Although the reasons for removing Heykal, a lifelong friend of the late

President Nasser, are not known, observers said he had been increasingly regarding himself as the defender of Nasser's radical heritage against excessive Western influence and had misgivings about Egypt's relying too exclusively on American diplomacy in its dealings with Israel.

It was announced on 8 February that press censorship would end at midnight and that only military information would in future be subject to censorship.

GREAT BRITAIN

In the course of the trial of John Poulson, an architect, and George Pottinger, a former senior civil servant, on charges of corruption, Mr Justice Waller said early in January that newspapers reporting certain statements made during the proceedings might later find themselves in contempt of court – a view that appeared to some lawyers experienced in the law of contempt to widen that law and to impose a new, or at least a totally unfamiliar, restraint on full reporting. The trial was the first in a series of connected but separate trials, the others being still to come, in which Poulson would be coupled with other defendants whose names had been referred to, sometimes at length, in the course of the trial; and evidence introduced was thought to be potentially prejudicial to the interests of such parties at a later trial – which led the judge to remark that he could not himself see how newspapers could report that evidence without running the risk of being in contempt of that other trial. He said that he would accordingly institute a warning system during the proceedings in which he would alert reporters present to evidence which was potentially contemptuous.

GREECE

The journalist Nikolaos Kiaos was among 25 people deported to the island of Yaros at dawn on 29 December. All were believed to have been arrested after the demonstrations in Athens in November (see *Index* 1/1974 p.iv) but no students were known to be among them. (Yaros is a deserted rocky Aegean island without water 55 miles east of Athens and the camp there, created

out of plaster' – a reference to the former Prime Minister's obsession with lurid surgical metaphors.

Radio transmission of music by **Stavros Xarchakos** (who was also reported to have been arrested) and **Yannis Markopoulos** was forbidden in January together with songs sung by **Manolis Xylouris** and **Themis Adreadis** who had both publicly expressed support for the students during the demonstrations.

Thirty actors and singers were banned from Greek radio and television during January. No reason was given but most of them are known to have expressed support for the students during the demonstrations. The actress **Aliki Vougiouklaki** and the actor **Angelos Antonopoulos** were summoned to the KYP (the Greek equivalent of the CIA) where they were told to 'keep quiet or expect the worst'.

Pantelis Voulgaris, a film director, and his wife, **Olga**, were arrested in February, apparently for attempting to send abroad film material about the November demonstrations at the Athens Polytechnic.

On 10 January **John Mouzakis** and **Michael Kantzourakis**, two state employees, received prison sentences of 10 months each at the Special Military Court in Athens on charges of insulting the regime and defying martial law by singing a rhyming anti-fascist slogan while riding a motorcycle in Athens. **Stamatis Christou**, a construction worker, facing a similar charge, received a prison sentence of one year at the same court on the same day for advocating in a bus the creation of a guerrilla movement.

HUNGARY

On 10 January **Miklós Haraszti**, a young Hungarian left-wing radical writer, received an eight-month suspended prison sentence on a charge of 'incitement against a fundamental institution of the Hungarian State' after he had criticised the wage system. The indictment was based on the manuscript of a book entitled *Darabber* ('Piece Rates') he had offered under contract to the Magvető publishing house in which he dealt with

his experiences while working at the Vöros Csillag tractor factory in Budapest and in which he quoted from workers claiming that the wage system was geared against them and that the management had little interest in their problems. When the book was rejected by the publishers in March 1973 as 'hostile in spirit' Haraszti was alleged to have clandestinely distributed duplicated copies of it for which he was arrested in May 1973. He had been set free after two weeks and his trial was set for September but had twice been postponed. (See *Index* 1/1974, pp.79-84.)

INDONESIA

The government was reported in January to have revoked the publishing licences of five Jakarta daily newspapers – including the English-language paper the *Jakarta Times* and the right-wing daily, *Nusantara* – together with three weekly papers on charges of publishing allegedly tendentious reports. Two broadcasting stations were also closed down. All universities, colleges and 10 high schools in Jakarta were closed and on 20 January a country-wide ban was imposed on any activities which could lead to demonstrations. These developments followed anti-Japanese rioting by students a week earlier in which 11 people had died.

JAPAN

In what was considered the first test case to establish principles for the activities of the press under the 1947 Constitution, Judge Takashi Yamamoto of the Tokyo District Court acquitted **Takichi Nishiyama**, a senior reporter on the staff of *Mainichi Shimbun*, a leading daily newspaper, on 31 January on charges of violating the country's Official Secrets Act when he had obtained copies of three classified Foreign Ministry telegrams in 1972. The documents, which concerned negotiations between the United States and Japan for the return to Japan of the island of Okinawa, were said by the judge not to have endangered Japan's diplomatic position since they were made public after the negotiations had been completed. However, a former secretary in the Foreign Ministry who had handed the telegrams to the correspondent, was found guilty of violat-

American producers, prior to its distribution in South Africa early in January.

SOUTH KOREA

In their first public action since November (see *Index* 1/1974, pp.viii-ix) a group of some 30 prominent civil leaders initiated a movement for constitutional reform on 24 December when they launched a campaign to collect a million signatures petitioning **President Chung Hee Park** to reinstate the constitution which he had suspended under martial law in 1972 to increase his powers. A strong government warning against continuing the movement was said by **Chang Chun Ha**, the group's spokesman, to be 'a challenge to the people's right to petition'. On 28 December the government responded by banning reports and editorials critical of the President's political reforms – a measure seen by observers as the first step by the government to reimpose direct control of the press which it had lifted following the student demonstrations in November (see *Index* 1/1974, pp.viii-ix). The Culture-Information Ministry said, without elaborating, that violations would be dealt with as matters of national security. On 7 January a group of 61 writers and academics issued a public statement calling for constitutional reform, saying that despite the government's strong disapproval of their action they could no longer remain silent 'as defenders of the human spirit and spokesmen for the national conscience'. In a decree issued the following day the President proclaimed emergency measures prohibiting all opposition to the constitution under penalty of up to 15 years' imprisonment. (Foreign correspondents were warned that the new measures also applied to them.) Accordingly on 24 January police arrested seven medical students at Yonsel University on charges of violating the President's decree. On 2 February they received sentences of between five and ten years' imprisonment at the special court-martial established at the Ministry of Defence. On the same day a further three students at the medical college of Seoul National University were also arrested. On 1 February **Chang Jun Ha**, a former National Assembly member and prize-winning publisher, together with a political scientist, received sen-

tences of 15 years' imprisonment each on a similar charge. The Seoul district prosecutor's office announced on 5 February that **Chun Kwan-Wu**, a former managing editor of the *Dong-A Libo*, the country's largest circulating newspaper, was being investigated on the same charge. At the same time the prosecutor also announced the arrests of five prominent literary figures who were among those who had issued the statement of 7 January; they were **Lee Ho Chui**, a North Korea-born novelist who had defected to the South while serving in the communist army during the 1950-3 Korean war and who is considered one of the country's most promising writers; **Chung Eul Byung**, a novelist and subcommittee chairman of the Korean Writers' Association; **Im Hun Yung**, a literary critic and university lecturer; **Kim Uh Jong**, a literary critic and university professor; and **Chang Byung Hee**, a literary critic and college lecturer. Under further emergency measures proclaimed early in April, the President banned campus assemblies and all non-academic activities by students, imposing a possible death penalty for violators.

SOUTH VIETNAM

Four American journalists were arrested on 26 January after filming in an area controlled by the Vietcong and their films and tapes were confiscated. They were released the following day. **James Markham**, the head of the *New York Times* bureau in Saigon, was arrested in Binh Dinh on 28 January and questioned about a week's visit to an area controlled by the Vietcong in the province of Binh Dinh. His notes and files were confiscated although the authorities had undertaken to return them. He was released the following day.

SOVIET UNION

On 13 February **Alexander Solzhenitsyn** was forcibly deported from the Soviet Union and deprived of his Soviet citizenship. The series of events leading up to his expulsion had begun on Friday 8 February when he was served with a summons to appear at the State Prosecutor's Office in Moscow. His wife was alone when the summons was brought and refused to accept it on

the grounds that no charges were stated. On Monday 11 February a second summons was delivered and was again rejected, this time by Solzhenitsyn himself. On Tuesday 12 February a group of uniformed and plain clothes policemen burst into Solzhenitsyn's flat, arrested him and took him to Lefortovo Prison. It is not known what took place on the night of 12 February, but according to one reliable source, Solzhenitsyn was told to choose between exile abroad or being put on trial for high treason under Article 54 of the Soviet Criminal Code. Solzhenitsyn, it is said, chose trial, but the authorities retreated from their position and instead placed him on a plane bound for West Germany. He arrived at Frankfurt airport on Wednesday 13 February and has since taken up residence in Switzerland.

At the beginning of March **Pavel Litvinov**, the grandson of Maxim Litvinov, the Foreign Minister of the Stalin era, was granted an exit visa and arrived in Paris on 18 March. He had earlier spent four years in exile in Siberia for taking part in a protest in the Red Square in Moscow in 1968 against the invasion of Czechoslovakia. **Boris Shragin** a Professor of Education, and **Yelena Semeka** were also granted exit visas about the same time.

In early December 1973 the Riga mathematician **Lev Ladyzhensky** was arrested and charged with 'anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda'. On 7 December the flat of another Riga mathematician, **Valery Buiko**, was searched in connection with Ladyzhensky's case, and works by Prince Kropotkin, Valery Chalidze, Zhores Medvedev, and others were confiscated. In 1969, when Ladyzhensky spoke out in defence of Ilya Rips, who set himself on fire in Riga in protest against the invasion of Czechoslovakia, he was dismissed from his post at Riga University.

In August 1973 the flat of the Moscow sociologist **V. M. Dolgy** was searched. In a statement dated 26 September he described the intensive interrogations he had been subjected to by the KGB. The interrogators threatened him with numerous reprisals, including suppression of his writings, unless he revealed who had given him works by Solzhenitsyn, Berdyayev, Sakharov and Osip Mandelstam. He refused.

At the end of December 1973 **Anatoly Marchenko**, author of *My Testimony*, underwent a search of his house in Tarusa, during which his own manuscripts and a copy of Solzhenitsyn's *August 1914* were confiscated. At an interrogation he was threatened with reprisals unless he co-operated with the KGB's demands.

Vladimir Osipov, who lives near Vladimir, announced last March that he would cease publication of the *samizdat* journal *Veche* in the face of KGB threats to arrest him. This announcement was soon answered by other *Veche* collaborators, who denied Osipov's right to close down the journal and declared their determination to continue. [In this connexion, *Index* owes its readers – and *Veche* – an apology. It was wrongly reported in *Index* 2/1973 that *Veche* was a pseudo-*samizdat* journal produced with KGB connivance, and closed down in early 1973. It is, in fact, a genuine *samizdat* publication, nine issues of which have appeared in the last three years. Issues 1-5 and 8, each of which is up to 300 pages in length, have reached the West. In May 1973 Osipov reported that the manuscript of No. 7 of *Veche* had been confiscated by the KGB during a search. Osipov, who served a seven-year camp sentence from 1961 to 1968 for editing an early *samizdat* journal, has suffered frequent police harassment since founding *Veche* (see *Index* 3-4/1972)].

In a trial in Oryol which took place from 4 to 6 March **Victor Khaustov** (see *Index* 2/1973) was sentenced to four years in a strict-regime labour camp and two years of exile on charges of 'anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda'. **Gabriil Superfin** (see below), who appeared as a witness, withdrew the evidence he had given at pre-trial interrogations, stating that it was false and had been given as a result of 'a moral weakness' under KGB pressure. At first he refused to give any testimony in court, but later stated that the actions with which Khaustov was charged had been committed by himself. Khaustov denied this and himself took the responsibility.

In early 1974 some 30 intellectuals, mostly in Moscow, were interrogated in the case of the scholar **Gabriil Superfin**, who was arrested last July (see *Index* Nos. 2, 3/1973). At the trial of

Victor Khaustov (see above) Superfin appeared as a witness. In March Superfin's mother engaged the lawyer Lev Yudovich to defend her son, but the Moscow Bar Association then forbade Yudovich to travel to Oryol (where, for inexplicable reasons, the case was being conducted), giving as a reason 'the great volume of legal work in Moscow'.

Vladimir Bukovsky, who is imprisoned in Institution VS 389/35 in the Perm Region, has recently been subjected to increased persecution, including systematic confiscation of his mail and internment for three months in a punishment cell. On 27 February his mother and friends appealed to Amnesty International and other humanitarian organisations to try to save his life. They stressed that his health is very poor and he is serving a total sentence of 12 years.

On 9 January the Moscow author and human rights publicist **Lydia Chukovskaya** was expelled from the Union of Soviet Writers, mainly for her *samizdat* article in defence of Andrei Sakharov, 'The People's Wrath'. Chukovskaya's books *The Deserted House* and *Going Under* have appeared in *samizdat* and in English, but have never been published officially in the Soviet Union (see 'Notebook').

On 16 and 17 January the novelist **Victor Nekrasov** (see *Index 3/1973*) underwent a 42-hour search of his flat in Kiev. Seven sacks of books, manuscripts and personal papers were confiscated by a team of nine agents. In March he stated in a letter that he had been interrogated for six days and was also told that his works would not be published in the USSR unless he joined in denunciations of Alexander Solzhenitsyn and Andrei Sakharov. Nekrasov expressed his admiration for these men and his distress that Solzhenitsyn, Sinyavsky, Maximov and other creative people had been forced out of the country by the severe conditions of Soviet censorship. Contrary to some reports, Nekrasov has not, at any rate yet (late March), been expelled from the Writers' Union.

In February the Moscow writer **Vladimir Voinovich** was expelled from the Writers' Union. Voinovich is well-known both for his stories and novels and for his civic activity. In December he

wrote a satire on the newly formed Soviet agency designed to control the publication abroad of all works by Soviet authors, viewing it as a new instrument of censorship and appropriation of writers' income.

In February the well-known writer **Vladimir Maximov** (see *Index 3/1973*) left the Soviet Union legally with his wife, only a few weeks after he had, initially, been refused permission to do so. At press conferences in Paris, London and Brussels Maximov spoke of the oppression of fellow-writers and defenders of human rights in the USSR. Maximov was expelled from the Writers' Union last summer.

In January the poet and ballad singer **Alexander Galich**, expelled from the Writers' Union two years ago, was refused permission to travel to the US to visit a relative, on the grounds that this would be ideologically undesirable. Galich is completely banned from publishing or performing his works in the Soviet Union.

In January the poet **Victor Nekipelov**, arrested in July (see *Index 1/1974*), was transferred to the Serbsky Institute of Forensic Psychiatry in Moscow for an in-patient examination. The result of the examination is not yet known.

The 35-year-old Kiev cybernetician **Leonid Plyushch** (see *Index 2-4/1972, 1-4/1973, 1/1974*), imprisoned in the prison-hospital at Dnepropetrovsk, was reduced in early 1974 to a condition in which he could neither write, read, nor take exercise. In an appeal of 12 February to Western humanitarian organisations Andrei Sakharov, Elena Bonner and four colleagues foresaw Plyushch's death unless powerful interventions could put an end to the forcible administration to him of drugs and obtain his release.

In January three members of the Moscow-based Initiative Group for the Defence of Human Rights protested against a new KGB method of attempted censorship. The mathematician **Tatiana Velikanova**, the biologist **Sergei Kovalev** and the linguist **Tatiana Khodorovich** pointed out that they and their human rights friends were increasingly being told by the authorities: 'Vouch for this or that friend of yours who's in prison, and his fate will

be eased: if he's in prison we'll improve his conditions, or even let him out, and if he's in a prison psychiatric hospital we'll transfer him to an ordinary hospital.' The authors' comment: 'What must be vouched for is simple: that the prisoner and his guarantor will in future be silent.' They announced their refusal to make such agreements.

In Lithuania the KGB has launched a big drive over the last year to suppress *samizdat* and, in particular, the *samizdat* journal *A Chronicle of the Lithuanian Catholic Church*. Since early 1972 nine issues of this journal have appeared, the first seven of which have so far reached the West. It has reported on repressions in secular as well as religious life. Its average length is 40-50 pages.

In early 1973 a wave of arrests in Kaunas included **Antanas Sakalauskas**, a lecturer, **Isidorius Rudaitis**, a doctor and radiologist, and **Vidmantas Povilonis**, an engineer. Then on 20 November several dozen homes, mostly in Vilnius and Kaunas, were searched simultaneously in connexion with 'Case No. 345', large quantities of *samizdat* were confiscated, and **Petras Plura**, **Povilas Petronis** and **Jonas Stasaitis** were arrested and charged with illegal production of *samizdat*. **A. Reskevicius**, a Kaunas physicist, and his wife **D. Raskiniene**, a mathematics lecturer at the Kaunas branch of Vilnius University, were threatened with criminal prosecution, and steps were taken to dismiss them from their jobs.

In Kiev the lawyer **I. S. Ezhov** has been forced into retirement from the bar, as punishment, after he vigorously defended the young Jewish and *samizdat* activist **Alexander Feldman**. Feldman was sentenced to three-and-a-half years in prison on 23 November. In his appeal, which has circulated in *samizdat* and reached the West, Ezhov demonstrated the trumped-up nature of the case against Feldman and the multiple infringements of legal procedures at the trial.

In April 1973 the Leningrad artist **Yury Ivanov** was forcibly interned in a psychiatric hospital in Leningrad, then sent to the Kashchenko Hospital in Moscow, then back to Leningrad to the No. 3 Skvortsov-Stepanov Hospital. Ivanov has spent 16 years in camps as a political prisoner. In 1971 he was released from the Mordovian camps, where

he had drawn some well-known sketches of fellow prisoners, and sent to live in Smolensk. In 1972 the KGB exerted great pressure on him to give evidence in the Yakir-Krasin trial, but he refused to give the false testimony demanded of him, which concerned the *samizdat Chronicle of Current Events*. From then until his internment he was severely harassed by the authorities. His internment took place under civil commitment procedures and is therefore not linked, formally at least, with any criminal charges. In January he wrote an open letter so that it could be known 'what crimes are committed behind the walls of medical institutions'.

The cybernetician and *samizdat* publicist **Pyotr Grigorenko** (see *Index 3/1973*) was transferred in September from a prison-hospital to ordinary mental hospital No. 5 of the Moscow Region at Stolbovaya Station. In October the hospital director, Dr Vladimir Kosyrev, promised a Swedish psychiatrist, Dr Carlo Perris, that Grigorenko would be released in mid-November. The promise was not kept and in January a psychiatric commission ruled that Grigorenko's treatment must be continued. He is now 66 and is blind in one eye.

The well-known Moscow sculptor **Ernst Neizvestny** recounted at an informal news conference on 15 March that the authorities had systematically rejected 40 requests by him to travel to the West in response to professional invitations. They had also refused permission, for over a year now, for the erection of a headstone designed by him on Nikita Khrushchev's grave, commissioned by the ex-leader's family. [We apologise for wrongly reporting in *Index 2/1973* that Neizvestny had applied to emigrate to Israel.]

Foreign correspondents in Moscow have been subjected to increased official harassment in recent months. This has taken the form of press attacks on them, temporary detentions, and confiscation of their film or notes after they have covered demonstrations by Jews or Germans wanting to emigrate. Especially strongly attacked have been the Americans **Roger Leddington** of AP, who was denounced at length in the *Literaturnaya gazeta* on 14 November, and **Gordon**

Joseloff of UPI, who was detained last autumn, then had his notes confiscated in January and received an official warning. The US Embassy has lodged several protests at this harassment.

At a meeting of the Ukrainian Writers' Union in Kharkov in January it was disclosed that the poets **B. Chichibabin** and **V. Borovy** have been expelled from the Union 'for unworthy behaviour'. No details were given of the nature of the behaviour or the date when the expulsion took place.

The two research workers of the Institute of Philosophy of the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences, **Vasyl Lisovy** and **Yevhen Pronyuk**, arrested in July 1972 for writing a protest against the recent wave of persecutions in, and the economic exploitation of, the Ukraine, and for possessing some 70 copies of it ready for posting to Soviet personalities (see *Index* 1/1973, p.x), were sentenced early in December 1973 in Kiev to five years' strict regime camps and to three years' camps and four years' exile respectively, both on charges of anti-Soviet propaganda.

The Ukrainian historian **Valentyn Moroz**, sentenced in 1970 to a total of 14 years for his essays on problems of Ukrainian culture and history (see *Index* 1/1972, p.87), has since been the target of particularly vicious treatment in Vladimir prison, where violent common criminals have regularly been placed in his cell and set upon him, resulting in his being savagely beaten up and on one occasion knifed. With his health dangerously failing, he is not given any medical care; he has recently been transferred to solitary confinement, and it has been reported that drugs are now mixed with his food in order to produce mental deterioration. Premier Kosygin's undertaking to the Canadian Prime Minister, Pierre Trudeau, in October 1971 to look into Moroz's case (see *Ibid.*) has not yet been fulfilled.

Three Ukrainian women prisoners, **Stefania Shabatura**, an artist, **Nina Karavanska-Strokatova**, a microbiologist, and **Iryna Stasiv-Kalynets**, a poet, sentenced in 1972 to totals of eight, four and nine years respectively on charges of anti-Soviet propaganda (see *Index* 2/1972, p.97, and 3-4/1972, p.121), sent an appeal to the UN Secretary-General from the Mordovian labour

camps on 10 December 1973 in which they maintained that the 1972 wave of arrests was directed against those ethnic Ukrainian intellectuals who advocated the preservation and development of Ukrainian culture and language, and that such persecution was a violation of the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights; they disagreed with every point of their indictments and demanded an open and just re-trial in the presence of a UN representative. The same three women and some others including **Iryna Senyk** and **Sylvia Zalmanson**, went on a hunger strike on 5-10 December 1973, demanding freedom of creative activity in the camps during non-working hours. Earlier, in April, after Shabatura had complained to the USSR Procuracy against the ban on her painting in the camp, she was given a week's detention in a punishment cell.

There can now be no doubt that the publication of the works of **Vasyl Symonenko** (1935-63), the most popular Ukrainian poet of the post-Stalin period, which were planned to appear in a 300-page edition de luxe of 20,000 copies in Kiev late in 1972, has been cancelled altogether rather than delayed. The publication of a new book of poetry by **Lina Kostenko** (b. 1930), one of the most prominent poets of the same period, also announced at the same time, must have been likewise abandoned. She was known for her sympathies with dissidents (see *Index* 3-4/1972, p.174).

SRI LANKA

The government was reported in March to have restricted the quota of newsprint allocated to *Independent Newspapers Ltd.*, while the government-owned *Associated Newspapers* was said to have received its full quota.

TUNISIA

Several students and academics were among hundreds of people being detained without charge or trial at the end of January after their arrest in November for distributing an anti-government tract. They included **Amel Chaambouni** and **Mouri Abid**, both academics, together with **Michel Cantal-Dupart**, a French official attached to UNESCO (who had been temporarily released

from prison in August) and **Maria Heichert**, the German librarian at the Goethe Institute in Tunis – all four of whom were alleged to have been tortured, **Abid** and **Madame Chaambouni** having had twice to be admitted to the military hospital in Tunis following interrogation.

TURKEY

A number of progressive teachers were reported in November 1973 to have been transferred to various villages and in Mardin province alone 250 had been moved to other places during the last year. Over a thousand teachers were reported to have resigned for financial reasons and when the President of TOB-DER, the Teachers' Association, protested to the Prime Minister about the situation he was told in reply that the Minister of Education had been informed of the 'allegation'. A senator of the Republican People's Party also complained in November about the practice of appointing teachers according to their police files and said that 'in no democracy is there such a practice'. He also stated that new teachers could not be appointed because of delays in the preparation of their police files and that as a result hundreds of teachers were without jobs.

On 20 January the Ankara district military tribunal once again imposed its original sentence of six years' and eight months' imprisonment on **Professor Mumtaz Soysal** of Ankara University on a charge of spreading Communist propaganda in his text-book *Introduction to the Constitution* after the military court of appeals had for the fourth time reversed it on 9 November (see *Index* 1/1974, p.xiii; and for details of earlier proceedings *Index* 1/1972 p.90, 1/1973 p.xiii, and 2/1973 p.xiii). Professor Soysal was not arrested but allowed to continue teaching constitutional law at the Faculty of Law pending a further appeal to the military court of appeal.

The following was among 109 provisions in a coalition protocol signed jointly on 25 January by **Necmettin Erbakan**, the chairman of the Islamic right-wing National Salvation Party, and **Bülent Ecevit**, the leader of the social democratic Republican People's Party and the then Prime Minister-designate:

Undemocratic limitations imposed on rights and liberties will be lifted; all our laws will be cleansed of limitations imposed on the freedom of thought, belief and expression; and the freedom of the press will be guaranteed in all its aspects.

The protocol also stated that a general amnesty Bill would immediately be introduced in Parliament enabling the release of those convicted of 'opinion and conviction offences' – which would include the hundreds of political prisoners who have been sentenced or who are awaiting sentence for their left-wing or right-wing views.

UGANDA

On 29 October 1973 General Amin banned all leading Kenya English-language newspapers from the country. The papers affected include the *Sunday Post*, the *Sunday Nation*, the *Daily Nation*, and the *East African Standard*, all of which were alleged to be sabotaging the country by their policy of 'supporting imperialists, Zionists and colonialists'. (Due to an oversight this entry was omitted from the last issue of *Index*; but we feel that it warrants noting even at this late date.)

URUGUAY

Carlos Quijano, the publisher and editor-in-chief of the leading left-wing critical newspaper *Marcha*, was arrested, together with the paper's editor, **Hugo Alfaro**, on 11 February after the paper had published a short story by **Winston Nelson Marra** about the assassination of a police official by Tupamaro guerrillas. The story was claimed by the authorities to be pornographic and the entire issue of the paper was seized. **Juan Carlos Onetti**, the country's leading novelist, and **Mercedes Rein**, another writer, both members of a literary jury which had awarded the short story a prize, were also arrested, as was (later) **Julio Castro**, another member of the paper's staff. The arrests on a charge of pornography were seen by one observer to indicate the government's wish to silence the paper (it had earlier suspended it temporarily – see *Index* 3/1973, p.xii) – without however implying political motivation. It was learnt in March that Marra was serving a two-year sentence in a common-law prison and that the others were still being detained without trial.

The communist daily newspaper *El Popular* was temporarily closed by the authorities from the beginning of January to the end of February and the editor was reported to have been arrested. The other communist paper, *Cronica*, was also closed. The magazine *Compañero* was reported in March to have been closed for nine editions after it had published articles that were alleged to have tended 'to perturb public tranquillity and order'.

THE VATICAN

On 5 February the Vatican announced that the Pope had decided to remove **Cardinal József Mindszenty** from his position as Archbishop of Esztergom (which includes Budapest) and Primate of Hungary when (it was later stated) he had learnt of Mindszenty's intention to publish his memoirs. The cardinal had apparently informed the Vatican of their contents which are reported to include scathing political attacks on communism and on alleged concessions by the Roman Catholic Church to communist governments. The Vatican is said to have feared that the book would impair its efforts at improving relations with Budapest. The cardinal had been absent from his diocese for 25 years having left Hungary in 1971 after seven years in prison and 15 years of seclusion in the legation of the United States in Budapest. The Hungarian government had been urging the Vatican to replace him for more than a decade and it is believed that in return for this the Pope had asked for greater freedom for resident bishops.

YUGOSLAVIA

A further attempt was made on 14 January to expel eight members of the Faculty of Philosophy at Belgrade University when the university's governing assembly formally demanded their removal and instructed the faculty's council to initiate proceedings to that effect. The assembly's decision was taken after the eight had rejected an offer the previous week to leave the faculty voluntarily to take up research positions at three other institutes in Belgrade. After the governing assembly's demand there was speculation in Belgrade about the response of the Philosophical Faculty which had signed an agreement in Decem-

ber permitting the government to make 20 nominations of its choice to its 40-member governing council. (For a fuller account of the activities of this group, their names and the charges against them, see *Index* 2/1973 pp.61-64, p.xv; 1/1974, p.xiv.)

Police seized the tape recordings of a discussion at the annual seminar sponsored by the Serbian Institute of Philosophy which was held in central Serbia during the first week of February; a number of those attending the meeting were also questioned. About the same time the police raided the premises of the students' organisation at the Faculty of Philosophy at Belgrade University and detained six students for questioning while their homes were searched and books, consisting mainly of Marxist classics, were seized. The students, together with others at Zagreb and Ljubljana, had earlier passed a resolution in support of the eight dissident Belgrade professors and lecturers. In the resolution the students attacked the authorities for their attempted expulsion of the group, calling it a 'bureaucratic action' which was 'threatening creative Marxism'. Philosophical students at Belgrade had earlier threatened to strike if they were dismissed.

Žarko Vukosavlević and **Aleksandar Nikašinović**, the editor-in-chief and the editor respectively of the youth magazine *Kekec*, were reported in February to have been expelled from the League of Communists for publishing an allegedly false language map of Yugoslavia.

Early in March the Criminal Council of the Subotica Court imposed a one year strict prison sentence on **Kálmán Karoly**, a teacher from Senta and a former correspondent of the Subotica Hungarian-language newspaper *Magyar Szó*, on a charge of having written an article which was alleged to have 'falsely depicted the socio-political conditions in Yugoslavia' and to have attacked the self-managing system there.

SOURCES

Agence France-Presse
Amnesty International Newsletter
Arab Report and Record (London)
 Associated Press
A Chronicle of Human Rights in the USSR
 (New York)
A Chronicle of the Lithuanian Catholic Church
 (*Samizdat*)
The Daily Star (Beirut)
The Daily Telegraph
 EFE (Spanish News Agency, Buenos Aires)
Eleftheri Ellada (Athens)
Eleftheri Patriida (Athens)
The Guardian
International Herald Tribune
International Press Institute Report
Literaturna Ukraina (Kiev)
Milliyet (Ankara)
The New York Times
The Observer
 Paris Radio
Politika (Belgrade)
 Reuter
Rabotnichesko Delo (Sofia)
The Times
The Washington Post
Yeni Halkci (Ankara)
Yeni Ortam (Ankara)

Roy Medvedev On Solzhenitsyn's 'Gulag Archipelago'

Soon after the publication of Solzhenitsyn's The Gulag Archipelago in Russian in Paris last January, it became known that the dissident Soviet historian, Roy Medvedev, had written a long review of the book in which he supported the overwhelming mass of facts cited in it but took issue with Solzhenitsyn's interpretation of the meaning of the Russian Revolution. Medvedev is a Marxist who, while not denying many of the excesses committed by the Bolshevik Party in its seizure of power, assigns to the Revolution – and particularly to Marxism – a positive and progressive role in Russian history. At the same time he is a bitter opponent of Stalinism and his best known and longest work, Let History Judge, is devoted to an exposure of Stalin and Stalinism from a Marxist point of view.

Because of his attitude to Stalinism and his hostility to the present Soviet system of government, Medvedev cannot publish his works in the Soviet Union and is forced to circulate them in samizdat (typewritten manuscript form). It is in this form that they reach the West and, in some cases, are published. The present review has been quoted in articles in The Times and the New York Times, but this is its first full publication in English. The page references are to the Russian edition of The Gulag Archipelago published by the YMCA Press in Paris.

In this article I have tried simply to express a brief, provisional opinion on Alexander Solzhenitsyn's new book. This is not merely because the author has published only the first of three or four volumes, but because the import of what has already appeared alone is too great to be immediately grasped and evaluated. Solzhenitsyn's book is saturated with terrible facts difficult to absorb even in much smaller doses. It contains concrete descriptions of the fates of hundreds of individuals, fates extraordinary and tragic, but still so typical of the past few decades. It is a book filled with reflections and observations,

many of them profound and truthful, some perhaps not always accurate, but all arising from the tremendous sufferings of tens of millions of people, unparalleled in the many centuries of our nation's history. No-one came away from that terrible 'Archipelago' of Stalin's camps and prisons the same as he went in, not just where his age and health were concerned but also with regard to his ideas about life and about people. No one will, I believe, rise from his chair after reading this book the same as he sat down to open it at page 1. In this sense there is quite simply nothing in either Russian literature or the literature of the world with which I can compare Solzhenitsyn's book.

The facts upon which Solzhenitsyn bases his narrative

A certain I. Solovyov has written in *Pravda* (14 January) that the facts contained in Solzhenitsyn's book are inauthentic, the fruit of a diseased imagination or cynical falsification by the author. . . . This is, of course, untrue. I cannot agree with some of Solzhenitsyn's interpretations and conclusions. But it must be firmly stressed that all the basic facts he cites in his book, and especially all the details of prison life and the agonies endured by prisoners from the day of their arrest until their death (or, in rarer cases, until their discharge) are absolutely authentic.

Of course, so extensive a piece of artistic investigation based on the author's own impressions as well as on evidence and accounts (both first- and second-hand) supplied by more than 200 former prisoners will inevitably include some inaccuracies, especially since Solzhenitsyn was obliged to write his book in absolute secrecy and had no opportunity to discuss it prior to publication even with many of his close friends. But in a work of this importance these inaccuracies are so few as to be of no significance. I believe, for instance, that the scale of the deportations from Leningrad (the 'Kirov stream') in 1934-5

was smaller than Solzhenitsyn indicates. Tens of thousands of people were deported, but not a quarter of the population of what was already by then a city of two million. But I also do not have any precise figures; I can only rely on fragmentary evidence and my own impressions (I lived in Leningrad for more than 15 years). It is hard to believe the anonymous informant of Solzhenitsyn who told him of Ordzhonikidze's habit of having two pistols lying to his right and left on his desk whenever he talked with the old engineers. To sniff out men who had been officials in the old Tsarist bureaucracy (and not all of them at that but mainly those from the judicial organs, the gendarmerie, and suchlike) the GPU did not need to make use of accidental notes by third persons. Lists of all these people could be found in local archives and published reference books. I think Solzhenitsyn exaggerates the numbers of peasants deported during the years of collectivisation (15 million). But if we add to the victims of those years the peasants who died of starvation in 1932 and 1933 (in the Ukraine alone there were no less than 3-4 million of them) we may obtain a figure a little larger than Solzhenitsyn's. After the death of Stalin, not ten but something in the region of a hundred MGB-MVD executives were imprisoned or shot (in some cases without an open trial). But still this is a trifling number by comparison with the large number of criminals from the 'Organs' who have remained at liberty and even been given various responsible posts. In 1936-7 Bukharin was not, as Solzhenitsyn writes, a member of the Politburo but simply a candidate member of the Central Committee.

But all these – and some other – inaccuracies are totally immaterial in a work of artistic investigation conceived by Solzhenitsyn on so grand a scale. On the other hand there are other 'defects' which Solzhenitsyn himself mentions in his dedication: he has not 'seen it all', he has not 'remembered it all', he has not 'divined all of it'. He writes, for example, about the arrest of amnestied and repatriated Cossacks in the mid-twenties. But surely the campaign to 'dispossess the Cossacks' and the mass terror on the Don and in the Urals in the winter and spring of 1919 had even more terrible consequences than he suggests. This campaign lasted 'only' just over two months, but it

caused the Civil War with all its excesses to drag on for no less than one year and gave the White army dozens of new cavalry regiments. And the shooting of 500 hostages in Leningrad, which is allotted just two lines in the *Cheka Weekly Bulletin* ('Ezhenedelnik VChK') . . . To describe all this we shall need many more books. I believe that they will be written.

While *Pravda* tries to prove that Solzhenitsyn's facts are inauthentic, *Literaturnaya gazeta* (16 January) sets out to convince its readers that Solzhenitsyn's book contains nothing new. This too is untrue. Although I have been a student of Stalinism for over ten years, I found a great deal in Solzhenitsyn's book that I did not know. Leaving aside old camp inmates, I doubt whether any Soviet citizen, even somebody who still remembers the Twentieth and Twenty-Second Congresses of the Soviet Communist Party well, is aware of one tenth of the facts which Solzhenitsyn cites. And young people are in all probability unaware of even a hundredth of these facts.

Solzhenitsyn on the Vlasovites

Many [Soviet] papers are writing that Solzhenitsyn condones, whitewashes and even glorifies the Vlasovites. This is a deliberate and malicious distortion. Solzhenitsyn writes in *The Gulag Archipelago* that the Vlasovites became wretched hirelings of the Hitlerites, that 'the Vlasovites could have been tried for treason' (p. 249), that they took up arms with the enemy and fought at the front with the desperation of doomed men. Solzhenitsyn himself and his battery were all but wiped out in East Prussia when they were attacked by Vlasovites. But Solzhenitsyn does not oversimplify this problem of the 'Vlasovites' and other similar units in the Fascist armies.

For many of us the innumerable 'streams' of Stalinist repressions contained our own particular tragedies. I know, for instance, that for Alexander Tvardovsky it was the 'dispossession of the kulaks', the campaign in which his own father was deported. A hard-working peasant from a poor family, recently a soldier in the Red Army, and a supporter of Soviet power, he was deported across the Urals with his entire family. Only his middle son by pure chance escaped this fate: he had already left home to study in the

town, and it was he who was to be our great poet. The young Tvardovsky was then obliged to repudiate his father. He gives an account of all this in his last poem *By Right of Memory*.

For my own family it was the repressions in 1937-8 which became a tragedy, in particular the purges of Red Army commanders and commissars, during which, as a divisional commander and lecturer at the Military-Political Academy of the RKKA (Workers' and Peasants' Red Army), my father was arrested and perished. These people were dedicated to the Soviet regime, to socialism and to the Bolshevik party; they had fought in the civil war, and because of this I thought of them as romantic heroes and never would believe that they were 'enemies of the people'.

For Solzhenitsyn it was not his own arrest that became a profound personal tragedy, but the cruel and terrible fate of millions of Soviet prisoners-of-war, men of his own age, 'twins of the revolution', the men who formed the greater part of our regular army in June 1941. This army was smashed and surrounded in the first days and weeks of the war because of the criminal miscalculations of Stalin, who had failed to prepare either the army or the country for war; because of the absurd and foolish orders issued by Stalin on the very first day of the war; because of his desertion of his post in the first week of the war; and because of the lack of experienced commanders and commissars in the army, who had already been destroyed by Stalin. About three million soldiers were taken prisoner at this time, and approximately another million later, in the 'cauldrons' of Vyazma, Kharkov, the Kerch peninsula and Volkhov. But the Stalin government betrayed its soldiers in captivity also by refusing to recognise (Tsarist) Russia's signature on the international convention on prisoners-of-war, as a result of which Soviet prisoners received no assistance through the International Red Cross and were condemned to death by starvation in German concentration camps. And those of the prisoners who survived were betrayed yet once more by Stalin when, after the victory, they were almost all arrested and sent to swell the population of the Gulag Archipelago . . . This triple betrayal of its own soldiers is seen by Solzhenitsyn as the gravest,

most vile crime perpetrated by the Stalin regime, a crime unprecedented in all the thousand years of the existence of the Russian state. 'I felt', writes Solzhenitsyn, 'that this story of the millions of Russian prisoners-of-war had transfixed me once and for all like a cockroach under a pin' (p. 245).

Only a tenth of our prisoners-of-war were recruited into Vlasov's units, German police detachments, workers' battalions, or detachments of 'voluntary' helpers of the Wehrmacht. The majority of those recruited sincerely hoped, once they had been fed and given arms, to go over to the Soviet army or the partisans. They soon discovered that their hopes were misguided: opportunities of going over were all too rare.

Solzhenitsyn neither condones nor glorifies these desperate and unfortunate men. He does, however, ask the court of posterity to take into account certain extenuating circumstances: these young and frequently none too literate men, most of them village lads, were demoralised by defeat; in captivity they were told over and over again 'Stalin has repudiated you', 'Stalin doesn't give a damn for you', and they could see for themselves that this was indeed the case and that their fate was starvation in a German camp.

Of course, one cannot agree with everything that Solzhenitsyn says either. I, for instance, can feel no pity for Yury E., a Soviet officer who, according to Solzhenitsyn, instead of starving in a camp, quite deliberately went over to the side of Hitler, became a German officer and even ran a school for intelligence officers. It is clear from Solzhenitsyn's book that this Yury E. only went back to the Soviet army when he saw that the Germans had been totally defeated, and he did so not because his Homeland beckoned enticingly, but with the idea of communicating 'German intelligence secrets' to our own intelligence service, that is, to all intents and purposes, in the hope that he would be recruited from German intelligence into the Soviet MGB. Furthermore, this Yury was convinced that war between the USSR and her allies would break out immediately after the defeat of Germany and that in this war the Red Army would be speedily defeated.

As for the fierce engagement at Prague between several large Vlasovite divisions and

German units of ss General Steiner, it is an undeniable historical fact. What happened, happened.

Almost all the 'Vlasovites' were sentenced to 25 years in the camps, and almost all of them died, unaffected by any of the amnesties, in imprisonment and exile in the North. I too believe that for the majority of them this was too severe a punishment. For the guilt in this tragedy rests with Stalin far more than with anyone else.

On the 'liberalism' of the Hitlerites and Russian Tsarism

Another charge brought against Solzhenitsyn is that he minimises the evil deeds of Hitler and the brutalities of Russian Tsarism.

A study of the German 'Gulag Archipelago' was never part of Solzhenitsyn's task, although in a number of cases he does mention Gestapo tortures and the inhuman way the Fascists treated Soviet prisoners-of-war. But it is a fact that Solzhenitsyn in no way diverges from the truth when he writes that Stalin had begun mass repressions, the deportation of millions, torture and faked trials long before Hitler came to power. And all these things were still going on in our country many years after the defeat of German Fascism.

It is even more difficult to compare the Russian Tsars with Stalin in this respect. Solzhenitsyn has quite a lot to say on the subject of imprisonment and penal servitude under the tsars: it was a common topic of conversation among prisoners, particularly if they included an Old Bolshevik (prisoners from other socialist parties had almost all perished even before the war). To the prisoners of the '40s the old prisons and conditions in exile described in these conversations seemed like some kind of holiday camp. And then there was the scale of the repressions . . . During the revolutionary years 1905-7 and the subsequent years of reaction the Tsar's butchers shot, over one year, the same number of workers, peasants and tradesmen as the number of people either shot or who died in the camps in the course of one day in the Soviet Union of 1937-8. What possible comparison can there be here!

The finest chapter in the book

I think different people will find that different chapters in Solzhenitsyn's book make the greatest impression on them. Of particular importance in my view are the chapters called 'The Bluecaps' and 'On the Supreme Measure'. In them the author achieves an extraordinary depth of psychological analysis of the behaviour of both prison warders and their victims. Here he goes deeper even than Dostoyevsky.

By this I do not mean to say that Solzhenitsyn's artistic genius is greater than that of Dostoyevsky. I am not a specialist in literature. But clearly the Stalinist prisons and camps, the transportations and deportations which Solzhenitsyn went through one hundred years after Dostoyevsky's arrest and penal servitude provided the author of *The Gulag Archipelago* with ten times the opportunity that the author of *Notes from the House of the Dead* had for investigating different forms of evil in the human soul and human institutions. Solzhenitsyn has coped with the task as only a great writer can.

Solzhenitsyn on Stalin

Scattered throughout Solzhenitsyn's book are many profound and accurate remarks and observations made, as it were, *en passant* about the person of Stalin. However, the author sees Stalin's personal role in the catastrophe which befell our country and even in the creation of the Archipelago which is the subject of Solzhenitsyn's study as so slight that he separates most of his remarks about Stalin from the main body of the text in the form of brief annotations and footnotes. Thus for example in a commentary at the foot of the penultimate page (605) of the book Solzhenitsyn writes: 'For a long time both before my imprisonment and during my prison years, I too believed that Stalin had set the ship of the Soviet state sailing in a fateful direction. But then Stalin quietly died - and did the ship alter its course all that much? What individual, personal imprint did he impart to events but doleful obtuseness, wilfulness, self-adulation? For the rest, he trod the beaten path exactly.'

Dealing very briefly in Chapter 2 with the 1937-8 repressions (why go into detail about 'what has already been extensively described and will be repeated many times more'), during

which the main body of the party leadership, the party intelligentsia, officers and political staff in the Red Army, as well as the majority of the top managers of the economy and the Komsomol leadership were exterminated in the torture-chambers of the NKVD, and during which top-ranking members of the Soviet government, the NKVD itself, the diplomatic service and so on, were forcibly relieved of their posts, Solzhenitsyn (again in a footnote) writes: 'Now, as we look at the Chinese cultural revolution (which also happened in the seventeenth year after a final victory), we can surely detect some historical pattern. And even Stalin himself begins to seem merely a blind and superficial executive force' (p. 80).

It is hard to agree with this view of Stalin's role and significance in the tragedy of the '30s. It would of course be erroneous to dissociate the epoch of Stalinist terror entirely from the revolutionary epoch which preceded it. There was no fundamental, sharply-defined boundary between the two epochs either in 1937, as many people believe, or in 1934, as Khrushchev claimed, or in 1929, as Solzhenitsyn himself earlier believed, or in 1924, when Lenin died and the Trotskyite opposition was smashed, or in 1922, when Stalin was appointed General Secretary of the Bolshevik Party. Nevertheless, in each of those years, as well as in some others, there occurred crucial turns in political development which require special consideration.

There is, of course, a direct connection between the party which seized power in October 1917 and the party which ruled the USSR in 1937, 1947, 1957 and 1967, the year in which Solzhenitsyn was completing *The Gulag Archipelago*. But this connection does not mean the party has always been identical. Stalin did not 'tread the beaten path'. Even during the first years of the Revolution he did not always follow in Lenin's footsteps, while later on, he was to lead the party in quite a different direction with every step he took. Outward resemblance in this instance merely masks a very great inner difference, in some respects even an antithesis, and the changeover to this antithesis was by no means natural, determined and inevitable. A deeper, scientific analysis, which I have no doubt will one day be applied to the events which are

the subject of Solzhenitsyn's artistic investigation, will indisputably show that even within and inside the framework of the system of party, state and social relations created in Lenin's Russia, Stalin, by a series of actions, produced a radical turn-about in which only a veneer of so-called Leninist norms, only the terminology of Marxism-Leninism was preserved. Stalinism in many ways is the denial and bloody destruction of Bolshevism and all the forces of revolution, and, in a certain sense, is the very essence of counter-revolution. We are not, of course, saying that Lenin's legacy and the Leninist period in the history of our revolution do not call for the most serious and critical analysis.

Solzhenitsyn has not set himself the task of investigating the phenomenon of Stalinism, its nature, its peculiarities, the history of its development, or its premises. In all probability, for Solzhenitsyn the concept of Stalinism simply does not exist as such, for Stalin 'trod the beaten path exactly'. Solzhenitsyn's book contains virtually nothing in the way of what one might call historical background. The book begins with a chapter called 'Arrest' in which the author immediately underlines the fact that it is only 'the world of convicts, the world of outcasts' that he is investigating and describing, 'that mysterious and fearful land of Gulag', its geography, structure, social system, written and unwritten laws, population, customs, rulers and subjects. Indeed Solzhenitsyn really has no need of any historical background, for his 'Gulag Archipelago' appeared as early as 1918 and since then has developed in accordance with internal laws of its own.

The one-sided treatment, interspersed, it is true, with the occasional - and often very profound - historical comment, is maintained throughout the whole book. Of course, such an approach is the author's legitimate right.

Nonetheless, without saying a word about Stalinism, and while apparently denying the validity of the concept absolutely, Solzhenitsyn's artistic investigation into one of the chief constituents of the Stalinist system greatly assists the study of the criminal and inhuman system of Stalinism as a whole. Solzhenitsyn is mistaken in his supposition that the basic features of the system have been preserved intact even to the

present day, but it is true that it has still not disappeared entirely from our social, political and spiritual life. Solzhenitsyn's book deals Stalinism and neo-stalinism a tremendously powerful blow. In this respect Solzhenitsyn has done more than any of us.

Solzhenitsyn on Lenin

Even in his young Komsomol days Solzhenitsyn had had his doubts about the wisdom and integrity of Stalin. This doubt, which Solzhenitsyn expressed in one of his letters from the front, was the reason for his arrest and conviction. But at that time he had no doubt whatsoever that 'the October revolution was splendid and just and that the people who led it to victory were filled with a lofty purpose and entirely selfless' (p. 229). Now Solzhenitsyn thinks differently, both of the October revolution and of Lenin.

Of the many charges which Solzhenitsyn today – directly or obliquely – brings against Lenin, we shall deal only with two. Solzhenitsyn feels that in 1917 Lenin insisted on carrying through a new 'proletarian and socialist revolution' in Russia although neither Russia nor the Russian people was ready for such a revolution or needed it. And Solzhenitsyn also feels that Lenin indulged to excess in terrorist methods of struggle against his political opponents.

It is easy to point to a revolutionary's mistakes fifty years after the Revolution. But the first socialist revolution is inevitably a step into the unknown. There is no yardstick, and the revolution's leaders have no one's experience to go by. In this situation it is impossible to calculate and weigh everything in advance and only then take decisions. Events can be foreseen only a few days or weeks ahead at the very most. The most important decisions are taken and methods of revolutionary struggle adopted – or adjusted – as events happen. Lenin understood all this perfectly and frequently quoted Napoleon: 'First of all join battle – then see how things go.' You cannot have such a revolution without risk, risk of defeat and the risk of making mistakes. But not to give the call for revolution when it has become possible is also a very great risk for a revolutionary party.

It is therefore not surprising that Lenin and the Soviet government he headed made plenty

of miscalculations and mistakes. Those mistakes prolonged the civil war in Russia and made it all the more bitter. Those miscalculations delayed the transition to NEP and at first intensified economic dislocation. Nor did the rapid revolution in Europe which Lenin hoped for materialise to give Russia technical and cultural assistance. The Soviet government had gone too far in the restrictions it had imposed upon democracy in our country.

I could go on with this list of blunders and miscalculations. But there is no cybernetic technique that will help prove that the armed uprising on 24 October 1917 was a historically premature step, or that all the subsequent villainous deeds of the Stalinist regime stemmed from this fatal error of Lenin's. For even after the death of Lenin the way ahead for our party was an excursion into completely unexplored territory. Unfortunately the party leadership which succeeded Lenin had neither his intellect, nor his erudition, nor his ability to find the right solution to the majority of difficult situations. They therefore failed to make use of even a small part of the opportunities the October Revolution had given them for rapid advance towards a genuinely socialist, democratic society. Even today we are still very far from this goal. Not only did Stalin not 'tread the beaten path exactly' (there are no such 'exactly beaten paths' in history). He very soon rejected even the few landmarks Lenin had designated in his last writings.

In revolutionary and civil war situations no government can manage without one or another form of violence. But even the most impartial historian must admit that the reasonable limit of the use of violence was exceeded many times over in the very first years of the Soviet regime. From the summer of 1918 our country was swamped in a wave of Red and White terror. Most of these acts of mass violence were quite unnecessary and damaging, even in the light of the logic and interests of the class struggle. This terror merely hardened the attitudes of the opposing sides, dragged out the war and gave rise to new and needless violence.

Regrettably, Lenin himself in the first years of the revolution uttered the words 'execution by shooting' far more frequently than was

called for by the developing situation. Solzhenitsyn cites Lenin without distorting his words, though with disapproving comment. But it is unlikely that anyone today would approve of an order such as this one issued by Lenin to the chairman of the Nizhegorod Provincial Soviet G. Fyodorov (9 August, 1918): 'You must strain every nerve . . . immediately impose mass terror, *shoot and deport hundreds* of prostitutes, soldiers inclined to drink, former officers and suchlike' (underlined by Lenin, Complete Works vol. 50, p. 142). Deport – yes, but why murder women?

These abuses of power are regrettable and should be condemned. But still this terror at the time of the civil war did not predetermine the dreadful terror of the Stalin era.

Lenin made many mistakes, and he admitted many of them himself on many occasions. The honest historian must record all these errors and abuses of power. But the sum total of Lenin's activities was, we are convinced, positive. Solzhenitsyn thinks otherwise. But that is his right. In a socialist country each man must have the opportunity to express his views and opinions on the activities of any political leader.

Solzhenitsyn and Krylenko

Solzhenitsyn does not look kindly in his book upon any of the Russian revolutionary parties. The Social Revolutionaries are terrorists and phrase-mongers, 'never led in dignified fashion'. The Mensheviks are evidently phrase-mongers and no more. But Solzhenitsyn reserves his harshest words for the Bolsheviks who, although they were able to seize and hold power in Russia, did so with a display of extreme and quite unnecessary brutality. Among the Bolshevik leaders Solzhenitsyn particularly singles out N. V. Krylenko, the Chairman of the Supreme Revolutionary Tribunal and Procurator of the Republic, who was also chief prosecutor at many 'show' trials during the first years of the Soviet regime. Solzhenitsyn devotes two chapters almost exclusively to these trials ('The Law as a Child' and 'The Law as a Man'), and Krylenko's name frequently appears in other chapters.

It can of course be argued that the first years of Soviet power were a time when the Soviet republic was struggling with all its might to

survive. And that if the Revolution and Soviet power were what was needed, they had to be protected from their many and merciless enemies, and this could not have been done without war and revolutionary tribunals and without the Cheka. But even with these reservations one cannot fail to see how unjust and senselessly harsh these 'judicial' and extra-judicial reprisals were in many cases, how many dull-witted and infinitely embittered people there were both in the Cheka and in the various other tribunals. In this situation Krylenko soon became one of the chief stage-managers, not unlike the chairman of the Jacobin tribunal [Jean Baptiste] Coffinhal who, in company with a few royalists, sent ordinary citizens (among them seventy-year-old women and eighteen-year-old girls), revolutionaries dissatisfied with Robespierre, and the eminent chemist Lavoisier to the guillotine. (When Lavoisier asked simply to be allowed to complete an important series of experiments Coffinhal replied: 'We don't need scientists'.)

Of course, Krylenko was no exception among the Bolsheviks. But not all the leaders of that party were like Krylenko. Unfortunately it is not only the most honest and courageous people of the day who become revolutionaries. Envenomed, vain, ambitious, mercenary-minded people, cold-hearted, light-fingered people, as well as many who are simply unintelligent, foolish fanatics capable of anything: all these people too tend to jump on the revolutionary bandwagon, especially at the moment when enthusiasm is on the upswing. But this is absolutely no reason to condemn all revolution and all revolutionaries.

There is one more thing that has to be taken into account. For the revolutionaries the chief ordeal turned out to be not the prisons or the forced labour, not the courageous attacks under machine-gun fire from the White Guards, not the hunger or cold, but power, and – in the beginning – almost unlimited power at that. It has long been known that power depraves and corrupts, and can often deprave and corrupt even the finest people. Unfortunately I am obliged to note that very many Bolsheviks failed to pass this ordeal by power. Long before they themselves died in the mincing-machine of

Stalin's repressions, these people had organised and participated in innumerable and brutal repressions, most of them entirely unwarranted, unnecessary and damaging. But it certainly does not follow from this that even before the revolution these Bolsheviks were equally unjust and cruel, equally indifferent to people's sufferings, or that even then they were not guided by the finest motives and the loftiest aims and ideals.

Solzhenitsyn understands this corrupting influence of power on people. With the utmost candour he writes that after a hard and hungry year of life as a soldier, a year of regimentation and exhausting square-bashing, during which he suffered more than a few injustices at the hands of the most junior commanding officers, he himself forgot all this completely the moment he became first a lieutenant and, shortly afterwards, a captain. In his own mind he began to draw a sharp dividing-line between himself and the soldiers he commanded, grew less and less understanding of the burden of their life at the front, set himself further and further apart from them as if he belonged to a different species, a different caste. Without pausing to reflect, he enjoyed all the privileges of an officer, addressed men who were fathers and grandfathers over-familiarly, was capricious with his personal orderly and sometimes even was so exacting toward his soldiers that once, during an inspection, an old colonel felt it necessary to reprimand him. 'It turned out', Solzhenitsyn confesses, 'that those officer's epaulettes that had trembled and fluttered on my shoulders for only two short years had sent a scattering of golden, poisonous dust into the space between my ribs' (p. 551). Furthermore, Solzhenitsyn nearly became an officer in the NKVD: attempts were made to persuade him to go to an NKVD college, and had he been pressed harder he would have agreed. Recalling his time as an officer Solzhenitsyn, pitiless toward himself, admits: 'I saw myself as disinterested and selfless. But all the while I was a fully trained butcher. And if I had landed in the NKVD college under Yezhov, perhaps I would have popped up in just the right place under Beria? . . .' (p. 175).

But if Solzhenitsyn underwent such a change during his two years as a junior officer, what about Krylenko, who, in an even shorter time,

shot up from virtually an ensign to the position of Supreme Commander of the entire Russian army, and then to chairman of the Supreme Tribunal, Deputy People's Commissar for Justice and Chief Prosecutor of the RSFSR. Although Krylenko had graduated in two faculties before the revolution, his extraordinary power intoxicated and stultified him beyond recognition.

'Evidently' writes Solzhenitsyn, 'evil too can have a threshold value. Yes, man spends his whole life oscillating, tossing between good and evil, he slips, stumbles, staggers to his feet, repents, then disappears into the darkness again - but so long as the threshold of evil is not overstepped, retrieval is still within the realm of possibility, and he himself remains within the bounds of our hope. When, by virtue of the density or degree of his evil deeds or the absoluteness of his power, he crosses that threshold, he has departed from humanity. Perhaps irretrievably' (p. 182).

'Let the reader who expects this book to be a political exposure bang it shut now,' Solzhenitsyn writes elsewhere. 'If only it were as simple as that! That somewhere there are evil people scheming to do evil deeds, and all one has to do is single them out from the rest and destroy them. But the dividing-line between good and evil cuts through the heart of every man. And who will destroy a piece of his own heart? . . . During the lifetime of one heart this line shifts its position, now constricted by exultant evil, now freeing space for dawning goodness. The same man at different ages and in different situations in life can be quite a different person. Now on the devil's side, now the saints'. But his name does not change, and to it we impute everything' (pp. 175-6). In this profound observation by Solzhenitsyn we can find at least a partial explanation for the drama and the downfall of very many Bolsheviks: long before they became the victims of Stalinist terror, they had become by no means the smallest cogs in a machine of arbitrariness created much earlier.

What are Solzhenitsyn's proposals?

But if power depraves and corrupts, if politics, as Solzhenitsyn writes, 'is not even a science, but an empirical field which no mathematical system can describe, and which furthermore is

a prey to human egoism and blind passions', and if all professional politicians are 'boils on society's neck, preventing it from freely turning its head and moving its arms' (p. 393), to what should we aspire? How should we build a just and humane community?

This is something that Solzhenitsyn discusses *en passant*, putting his thoughts in parenthesis without any explanation or elucidation in detail. But even from these brief remarks it is clear that Solzhenitsyn would regard as the most equitable society one 'which was headed by people able to lend rational direction to its activities' (pp. 392-3). Such people are, in the first instance, the engineers and the scientists (workers, in Solzhenitsyn's opinion, are merely industrial adjuncts to the engineer). But who will charge himself with the moral leadership of society? What emerges from all Solzhenitsyn's arguments is that no political doctrine, but only religion is capable of assuming the moral leadership of society. Only faith in God can serve as a basis for a humane morality; only those with a profound faith found it easy to endure all their tribulations in the camps and prisons.

But these ideas smack of utopianism, and are not even all that original. Solzhenitsyn strikes a blow of tremendous force at all forms of political lie. He rightly calls upon Soviet people, and above all young people, not to lend assistance to falsehood and not to co-operate with falsehood. But people have not only to be persuaded of the falsity of one or another political doctrine: they have to be given a truth, be convinced of the truthfulness of certain views. However, for the overwhelming majority of Soviet people religion no longer is and no longer can become the truth, and it is highly unlikely that young people in the 20th century will look to faith in God for their guidance. And without politics or political struggle, how will the engineers and scientists be able to take upon themselves the direction of public affairs or even simply the management of the economy?

But even if this were possible, how is one to prevent a society of this kind from degenerating into a dictatorship of technocrats? And will the transfer of the functions of the moral leadership of society to religion not lead in time to the appearance of the very worst form of theocracy?

On the subject of the 1937 repressions Solzhenitsyn writes: 'Perhaps 1937 even needed to happen in order to show how little all their *world view*, which they so blithely paraded by turning Russia inside-out, smashing her strongholds and trampling her holy places, is worth . . .' (p. 138). This, as we can easily divine, is a reference to Marxism. But Solzhenitsyn is wrong. It was not Marxism which begot the perversions of Stalinism; and the suppression of Stalinism will certainly not mean the collapse of Marxism and scientific socialism. And Solzhenitsyn knows perfectly well - and says so elsewhere - that religious ideology also allowed the two-hundred-year atrocities of the Inquisition, and the burning and torture of heretics.

In any case I find myself little attracted to Solzhenitsyn's ideals. I am profoundly convinced that in the foreseeable future our society must be built upon a combination of socialism and democracy, and that it is precisely the development of Marxism and scientific communism which will be most conducive to the creation of a just and humane community.

Engineers and scientists must carry far more weight in our society than they do today. But this by no means precludes a scientifically organised political leadership as well. Such a leadership presupposes in particular the abolition of all privileges for (government and political) leaders, the rational limitation of political power, self-government wherever possible, extension of the powers of local authorities, separation of the legislative, executive and judicial authorities, the limitation of all political posts to fixed terms of office, complete freedom of speech and belief, including, naturally, freedom of religious belief and the freedom to proselytise, freedom of organisation and association for people and groups of all political shades, free elections with equal rights for candidates of all political groupings and parties to stand, etc., etc. Only such a society, free also, of course, from the exploitation of man by man and based on public ownership of all the chief means of material production, can ensure unimpeded all-round progress for mankind as a whole and for each individual.

And as long as we do not have a genuinely socialist democracy in this country, our development will continue to be sluggish, one-sided and

deformed, and such spiritual giants as Solzhenitsyn will rarely appear in our midst.

Before his arrest Solzhenitsyn regarded himself as a Marxist. After undergoing the harsh ordeals he describes with such relentless veracity in *The Gulag Archipelago*, Solzhenitsyn lost his faith in Marxism. That is a matter for his conscience and his convictions. Any sincere change in belief merits respect and understanding. Solzhenitsyn exposed no one and betrayed no one. Today Solzhenitsyn is an opponent of Marxism and he does not hide the fact.

Marxism, of course, will not die through hav-

ing lost one of its former adherents. Indeed, we believe Marxism can only gain by a polemic with such an opponent as Solzhenitsyn. It is, after all, far better that Marxism should have such an opponent than for it to have such 'defenders' as Sergei Mikhalkov or Alexander Chakovsky. A 'scientific' ideology which has to be foisted upon people by force or under threat of force would be worthless. Fortunately, true scientific socialism has no need of that. □

27 January 1974

Translated by Hilary Sternberg

Czechoslovakia Checkmate for Pachman?

Ludek Pachman, the chess Grand Master who was jailed in Prague for his opposition to the 1968 invasion of Czechoslovakia but was later released and, in November 1972, allowed to emigrate to Germany, is finding it impossible to take part in international tournaments.

He is not being invited to international events as the organisers fear that his presence might lead to a boycott by the Russians and by other East European chess federations. Pachman himself does not believe that any such boycott would take place. For one thing, he is on very friendly terms with the leading Soviet players, and he points out that a boycott works both ways – while it may be true to say that the West needs the Soviet stars, they in turn can hardly afford to miss all the important tournaments in the West.

Last year Pachman was able to take part in only one contest – that in Netanya, Israel. 'The Israelis aren't afraid,' he commented, and in any case there

was never any question of Soviet participation in the 'Netanya 1973' tournament.

It would seem to be equally out of the question that Pachman could represent his new country of domicile – German chess masters must be citizens of the Federal Republic, or at least residents for a minimum of five years. When he enquired about the possibility of playing for Germany, he was told by the President of the Chess Association, Schneider: 'Surely you don't seriously imagine that we're going to jeopardise our good relations with certain federations?'

Another Czech chess master in exile, Luboš Kaválek, has been more fortunate: he went to America and, after a short interval, was able to start playing for the United States. □

(From the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 31 January 1974)

USSR Consigned to oblivion

Academician Benjamin Levich, the Moscow electro-chemist whose outspoken defence of human rights for scientists has incurred official displeasure (see INDEX 3-4/1972, pp. 216-9 and 3/1973, p. ix) is too distinguished to be sent, as his ailing son has been, to arduous military service in the Arctic. But there are other ways of freezing him out – his name can be erased from the scientific journals which make reference to him.

On p. 77 are two versions of the opening passages of an article by Professor P. P. Schmidt of Oakland University, Michigan, USA, in the *Journal of the Chemical Society*. At the top is the version printed in the West; below, the one reproduced photographically and circulated in the USSR, with Academician Levich's name painstakingly erased.

In a letter in which he brings this disgraceful treatment of the Soviet scholar to the attention of fellow-scientists, Professor D. B. Spalding of the Imperial College of Science and Technology in London points out that two years of persistent protests by Western scientists 'have failed to move the Soviet authorities to restore to Benjamin Levich his full academic and civil rights (the freedom to teach, to publish, to have a telephone and to correspond freely).' □

All too many who write about government have been seduced by those who govern. The press, like the powerful, often forgets its obligations to the public. Too many Washington reporters consider it their function to court the high and mighty rather than to condemn them; to extol public officials rather than expose them. It is far more pleasant to write puffery about the powerful, of course, than it is to probe their perfidy. Public office-holders are usually likeable; that is why they get elected. Many reporters are taken in by this personal charm, are awed by the majesty of public office; and they become publicists rather than critics of the men who occupy the offices . . .

Those taken in adopt the attitudes of the people they cover. They become the lapdogs of government instead of the watchdogs over government. They wag their tails and seek approval instead of growling at the abuses of power . . . Like the politicians and the special seekers, these men sell a little of themselves each day; and the chumminess between the power structure and the press apparatus robs the reporters of their integrity. □

A depressing decade Iain Elliot

10 Years After Ivan Denisovich by Zhores A. Medvedev (translated from the Russian by Hilary Sternberg)
Macmillan £3.95

Although Zhores Medvedev has in general succeeded admirably in his desire to produce 'a picture of some of the social phenomena of the past decade', his account in certain respects is disappointing. Dr Medvedev wrote this book in 1972 before receiving permission to leave the USSR for a sabbatical at the National Institute for Medical Research in London. He has since been deprived of his Soviet citizenship in the Politburo's drive to suppress unorthodox views within the Soviet Union.

In 1964 Medvedev had become personally acquainted with Alexander Solzhenitsyn, who wrote to Medvedev expressing his support for the geneticist, then under official attack for criticising the now discarded Lysenko theories of biology.

Alexander Solzhenitsyn has long been regarded as a weathervane for Soviet politics. Only a decade ago, when his work could be openly published in the USSR, the prospects seemed relatively

bright; but the subsequent malicious, officially orchestrated campaign against him, continuing even after his expulsion, leaves little ground for optimism.

For Medvedev to illustrate the recent fate of intellectual freedom in the USSR by concentrating on the individual example of Solzhenitsyn is therefore a valuable project; unfortunately the great writer remains a shadowy figure and the narrative is marred by Medvedev's railing, often inaccurately, against émigré Russian organisations or Western journalists, diplomats and publishers.

Although much of the information in Medvedev's book is already available in the West, it is nonetheless remarkable that such a comprehensive account could be compiled within the USSR. Glimpses at first hand not only of Solzhenitsyn, but also of the poet and liberal editor Tvardovsky, the courageous physicist Academician Kapitsa and several other prominent Soviet intellectuals help to enliven an otherwise depressing chronicle of the deteriorating official attitude towards Solzhenitsyn. From being hailed as 'a writer gifted with a rare talent' (*Pravda*, 23 November 1962) and 'a true helper of the Party' (*Izvestiya*, 18 November 1962) he has sunk in the proclaimed estimation of the Soviet media to being a 'slanderer for whom there is no place among Soviet people' (*Pravda*, 16 February 1974).

Medvedev offers some valuable insights into the machinery of state control over literature in the USSR, as he traces Solzhenitsyn's struggle for the right to publish his work in his own country - beginning with the successful appearance of *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* (*Novy Mir*, November 1962) and ending with an analysis of the crude campaign of abuse in the Soviet press (March - April 1972) which had been levelled at *August 1914*.

Solzhenitsyn's expulsion could not have been unexpected. In October 1968 he had told Medvedev that he did not expect to be brought to trial. 'They've already exhausted themselves in that direction with the trials of Sinyavsky, Daniel and the rest. . . Now they've got to think up something new.' It was soon being declared in Soviet editorials that Solzhenitsyn would not be restrained if he wished to leave for the West

'where his anti-Soviet works are received with such delight'. The writer refused to go to Sweden to receive his Nobel literature prize in 1970 as he feared it would mean becoming an exile. On reading Medvedev's account of Swedish spinelessness in the face of Politburo opposition over the Nobel Prize affair, it is easy to understand why Solzhenitsyn was later to denounce neutral countries for 'pandering' to every whim of the Soviet authorities in his *Letter to Soviet Leaders* (*Index* and Collins/Harvill, April 1974).

Alexander Tvardovsky emerges from the first as a brave and sympathetic figure, skilfully negotiating the publication of *One Day* in his journal *Novy Mir*. He approached Khrushchev's assistant Lebedev, who diplomatically read the novel to the First Secretary while he was holidaying on the Black Sea coast. (Medvedev discounts suggestions that Khrushchev's permission to publish had been obtained through his son-in-law, Alexei Adzhubei, the editor of *Izvestiya*.)

The sad, sordid events of the decade are all the more striking for the stark unsentimentality of their telling. In 1964 Solzhenitsyn was deprived of the Lenin Prize through the opposition of the literary establishment, aided and abetted by a neat example of KGB disinformation. (Although Tvardovsky later proved with the evidence of the USSR Supreme Court itself that Solzhenitsyn had a distinguished wartime record, libellous KGB aspersions about the reasons for his arrest in 1945 are again being trotted out - see for example *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, 20 February 1974.)

Tvardovsky did everything possible to have *Cancer Ward* and *The First Circle* published in the USSR. He also tried to prevent his protégé's expulsion from the Union of Writers in 1969, but, already a sick man and in trouble for his own work, Tvardovsky was unable to arouse a united demonstration in protest. Most writers, he said, preferred to 'fly away to save their own skin'. In 1970 his *Novy Mir* editorial board was dispersed and he himself was forced to retire. He died in December 1971; his journal *Novy Mir* under its new conformist administration has never recovered its former status.

Dr Medvedev covers various aspects of censorship in the USSR. While *One Day* had been passed by the Presidium itself, the flood of anti-Stalinist

works which followed was stopped by a wall of censorship. A novel by L. Semin, telling of the thousands of Soviet soldiers, released from captivity in Germany only to be despatched immediately to Soviet labour camps, was serialised in the Leningrad journal *Neva* in 1963, but was cut short on censor's orders. After a story was printed in *Novy Mir* about a soldier on leave being involved in a drinking bout, the head of the Soviet Army's political directorate forbade military libraries and officers to subscribe to the journal. Konstantin Simonov's *War Diaries* had already been printed when they were suddenly banned; 80,000 copies of *Novy Mir* had to be shredded and pulped. Even Sholokhov, that pillar of the conservative literary establishment, has had trouble with his latest novel *They Fought for the Motherland*, which he has been writing for the past twenty years and has not yet finished. A chapter on Soviet prison-camp tortures had to be replaced – with a discussion about fishing techniques.

The description by Zhores Medvedev of KGB manipulations of the press also makes fascinating reading. He tells how disinformation on Solzhenitsyn's family background was fed to a journalist of the German magazine *Stern*. His report was then reprinted in an 'abridged version' in *Literaturnaya Gazeta* (12 January 1972). Articles are also fed to Communist papers in the West and then reprinted in the Soviet press as 'Western comment'. The only copy of Solzhenitsyn's play *Feast of the Victors* was confiscated by the KGB. Against the author's express wishes, copies began to circulate and were then used in the campaign against him. One article from an Italian paper attacking the play was reprinted in the Soviet press. Medvedev later elicited that its Italian author lived in Moscow. He was also able to prove that an article in *Literaturnaya Rossiya*, 7 April 1972, attacking *August 1914*, though purporting to be translated from the Polish original, in fact had first been written in Russian.

Dr Medvedev adds to the substantial dossier on Victor Louis, the Soviet citizen who serves as correspondent for the London *Evening News*. It is not clear why the publishers (Macmillan) should have cut from the very proficient English translation a quotation from *Newsweek* – still

to be found in their Russian edition of Medvedev's book – saying that Louis is believed by many to be a KGB agent. Perhaps they have been overly cautious because the first Russian-language version actually had to be pulped for fear of libel.

Although in general showing extreme caution about accepting anything in the Soviet press as true, Dr Medvedev seems to have believed much that was alleged about Russian émigré organisations such as the NTS or the Possev and Grani publishing houses. The English version has omitted a few pointed remarks which still survive in the second Russian edition, yet an impression remains of Russian émigré activities which seems less than fair. Medvedev is against censorship, yet he supports the banning of anti-Soviet literature within the USSR.

But it could well be argued that *tamizdat* (Russian works published in the West and smuggled back into the USSR) plays a valuable part in the intellectual life of a society smothered by an oppressive political system. It is also worth considering the premise that the regime described so convincingly by Solzhenitsyn and by Medvedev himself can be substantially changed only by the conspiratorial means advocated by émigré organisations. Dr Medvedev's objections that certain actions of the KGB were 'manifestly against the law' seem unlikely to cost the leaders of that organisation any sleepless nights. □

Russian Poets Richard McKane

Joseph Brodsky: Selected Poems (Penguin Modern European Poets). Translated and introduced by George L. Kline, with a foreword by W. H. Auden. *Penguin Books* 85p

Poems of Anna Akhmatova Selected, translated and introduced by Stanley Kunitz with Max Hayward. *Collins-Harvill* £2.75

Brodsky's achievement in fourteen years of writing is difficult to rival. His own powers as a translator of the mystic English poets are remark-

able and during his trial for 'parasitism' in 1963 this was borne out by the testimony of the translation expert Etkind. One would have thought that his trial and exile in the Archangelsk region of North Russia would have left a definite impact on his poems. One might have expected a streak of bitterness, perhaps expressed in political poems. But Brodsky has never made a single political statement in his poetry although as he says in 'The End of the Fine Epoch': 'to live in the epoch of achievements with a high moral purpose is unfortunately difficult'. Yet the moral tone does come through in a similar way to that of the poet Osip Mandelstam, Brodsky says:

When all is said and done, a murder is a murder.
And we mortals have a duty to take up arms
against monsters . . .

Brodsky refuses to grapple with political figureheads and propagandistic poetry. He has succeeded in absorbing the best of the modern tradition of Russian poetry, which he was firmly grounded in by his mentor, the poet Anna Akhmatova. One sees glimpses too of 'the lame poet' Pasternak. In his treatment of Christian themes Brodsky rivals the Zhivago poems. And for Brodsky's friends who have not been able to read the two Russian editions of his poetry published in the West, the poems which circulate must have a similar impact.

In his Foreword, W. H. Auden notes: 'Mr Brodsky is not an easy poet, but even a cursory reading will reveal that, like Van Gogh and Virginia Woolf, he has an extraordinary capacity to envision material objects as sacramental signs messengered from the unseen.' It is not that things are personified but, like in the 'The Elegy for John Donne', the list of objects that surround the dead poet is recorded subjectively, so in fact each object becomes a subject in its own little dominion. Even lost buildings like the Greek Church in 'A Halt in the Wilderness' are held up to the memory's eye in their very destruction, although it is only the dogs and the poet recorder who remember it:

Moreover, the power shovel may have thought
the wall a dead and soulless thing and thus
to a degree like its own self.

George Kline's translations do not always keep the rhyme scheme, but occasionally he rises to

the original as in his delicate treatment of 'In village God does not live only in icon corners', with this quatrain:

The chance to know and witness all of this,
amidst the whistling of the autumn mist,
is, I would say, the only touch of bliss
that's open to a village atheist.

And this is more than juggling with word sounds which any translator can do but a faithful treatment of the text. It will be argued perhaps especially among poets that George Kline is not a poet, but these translations prove that he has a genuinely sensitive touch.

The long awaited translations of Akhmatova by Stanley Kunitz and Max Hayward, with facing Russian text, have at last appeared. The volume took five years to prepare and initially the small amount of poems included is disappointing. However, it is supported by the best short appreciation of Akhmatova in any language by Max Hayward. This sets her in her context as an Acmeist poet and also furnishes a few details of her personal life. The reader will have to wait for more details of her life for Amanda Haight's biography of Akhmatova, which is nearing completion. The Introduction draws on the widow Mandelstam's books which have now become standard textbooks on the Russian poetry scene. What emerges from these pages is Akhmatova's sense of sin and expiation. The suicide of the young cornet Knyazev in 1913 got under her skin to such an extent that it is one of the dominant themes in the extracts from 'Poem without a Hero'. But 'Poem without a Hero' is more than this and the harlequinade of 1913 and pre-revolutionary Russia. It hints at the great exodus to the Gulag Archipelago, the road down which so many of Akhmatova's contemporaries went. The fact that Akhmatova herself survived all this and still retains an exalted position in Russian poetry is remarkable. In fact already by the twenties she had written some of the most moving lyrics of this century. They were in the form of diary poems, highly personal freezing of objects against a background of rich emotions. As Sinyavsky remarked it was a new development that turned Akhmatova from these almost hermetic poems to social themes, and finally to the Leningrad

Elegies, one of which we have here, and 'Poem without a Hero'. In his note on the translation Kunitz says: Her life, in Keats' phrase, became 'a continual allegory', its strands interwoven with the story of a people.

Indeed her poems can be read in sequence as a twentieth century Russian chronicle. The only way to arrange them is in chronological order. But this defies Akhmatova's own tendency to write in cycles, and the poems would have been better supported if we could have had some of these cycles intact: 'The Sweetbriar Flowers', 'Cinque' and 'The Secrets of the Craft' could all have repaid a faithful Kunitz translation, but as it is we have no poems from any of these major cycles, which were written at the height of Akhmatova's powers. For those who have the original Russian, the facing Russian text although for simple comparisons invaluable, could well have been replaced by more English translations. If the English translations had been double the length and the price maintained then we could have had the whole of 'Poem without a Hero', which flows well in the Kunitz translation although it has lost completely the massive rolling rhythm of the original, a structure that Akhmatova developed, and was particularly suitable to conveying the idea of the 'roar and rumble', Blok's 'gul' of the revolutionary years.

Now that both Akhmatova and Mandelshtam have been translated into English in more than one version, the way should be opened for longer editions of their work in English. Also it would seem that a translation of Nikolai Gumilev, Akhmatova's husband, would find an interested public.

It is to be hoped that these two volumes of excellent translations will focus attention on Russian twentieth century poetry and enable translators and the public to give a wider appraisal to the Russian poets. □

the individual in his home to be exposed to tremendous emotional impacts of dramatic reports, creates an entirely new factor of possible demoralisation in political and military conflicts. This medium appears so effective that it should be subject to strict control – contrary to the Western concept of freedom of information.

But should the public opinion of a democracy be left unprotected while that of authoritarian regimes, sworn to the destruction of democracies, is subject to complete control? Here, we are very far from the democratic ideal of freedom of information. But, our reference argues, one must be clearly aware of what is at stake and decide what it is one really wants. At the very least, the public must be informed about the danger of its possible manipulation under the pretext of freedom of information through the mass media. Broadcasting satellites do not promise any exception.

The book performs a very useful service in this respect by illuminating the complex problems from several national viewpoints. It is an interesting and challenging discussion of the legal questions of satellite broadcasting. But, as the book emphasises, the actual realisation of freedom of information through satellites depends on very practical measures, both technical and organisational, and it is here that the real ground work is now needed urgently. We could do worse than ask IBI and RIIA to consider continuing their praiseworthy efforts along these lines. □

* 'The New Strategy' (in German) by General André Beaufre, *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, 2 September 1973, p. 37.

Lifting the veil Ann Vickers

Abuse of Psychiatry for Political Repression in the Soviet Union

Arno Press, New York

Distributed in Britain by *Aris and Phillips* £4.75

Since Vladimir Bukovsky's heroic decision to expose the abuse of psychiatry for political purposes in the Soviet Union, the documentation of the eight major cases (which Bukovsky managed to transmit in 1971 to the International Com-

mittee for the Defence of Human Rights) has been widely discussed in psychiatric organisations. Many statements and open letters, all condemning this inhuman practice, have been published. The Royal College of Psychiatrists in London, for instance, released a statement to the press in November 1973, urging the formation of an impartial commission of enquiry by a broadly based group of psychiatrists, and recently communicated it to national psychiatric bodies, including that of the USSR. But though over the past few years professional concern in the West has been steadily growing, it has not been sufficient to exercise any noticeable influence in the Soviet Union.

In November 1972 a young psychiatrist in Kiev, Dr Semyon Gluzman, was sentenced to seven years' imprisonment for compiling and circulating a document in which three Soviet psychiatrists criticised the official reports on General Grigorenko and demonstrated their internal inconsistencies.

While psychiatrists in the West, on the whole, are still slow to take more decisive steps, often restricted by statutory rules of their professional bodies and taken aback probably also by the complexities of the concept of mental illness, other intellectuals such as writers and lawyers are less inhibited.

In the first part, this useful book refers to the hearings of Dr A. S. Yesenin-Volpin, the Soviet mathematician, and of C. W. Boldyreff, interpreter and representative to the International Committee for the Defence of Human Rights, before the Sub-Committee (to investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws) of the Committee on the Judiciary of the US Senate. The hearing took place in September, 1972.

In his testimony Yesenin-Volpin reveals what happened to him and his friends when they criticised the actions of the Kremlin and expressed views that were not in accord with the officially prescribed communist spirit. Yesenin-Volpin was first arrested in 1949 and put into a mental hospital where he spent one year. His last incarceration was in 1968; he was then placed in a mental hospital for chronic patients, but as a result of a letter signed by 95 prominent Soviet scientists, he was released after about two months. This

well-known mathematician has been detained in mental institutions (an account of which he gives in his testimony) five times altogether. Each time he was diagnostically labelled as suffering from some form of schizophrenic illness.

Fourteen Appendixes presenting well selected extracts from the major 'Bukovsky documents' form the second part of the book. They open with Bukovsky's case and include the cases of General Grigorenko, N. Gorbanevskaya, Viktor Feinberg, V. Y. Borisov, V. Kuznetsov, I. A. Yakhimovich, M. A. Naritsa, G. M. Shimonov, V. I. Chernishov, V. I. Gershuni, L. I. Plyushch and others, published in full in *Samizdat*. The reader will also appreciate the full text of the open letters in support of the Soviet dissident intellectuals (e.g. the letter to *The Times*, published in September 1971 in support of Bukovsky's appeal and signed by 43 prominent British psychiatrists, Solzhenitsyn's letter on Medvedev's case, Mrs Z. M. Grigorenko's letter to the World Federation of Mental Health, Viktor Feinberg's letter to the Human Rights Organisation, compiled in a Soviet mental hospital and giving account of methods of torture used by 'medical' and 'nursing' staff in Soviet special psychiatric hospitals). Note is also made of protest actions and statements by concerned individuals and organisations in a number of western countries, so that the reader gets some idea of the scope of the problem.

The diagnoses of political dissidents who have been found 'mentally ill' or proclaimed 'not accountable' by commissions of Soviet psychiatrists – the one with the worst reputation being that of the Serbsky Institute for Forensic Psychiatry in Moscow – have been thoroughly analysed by concerned professionals in the West (e.g. the Swedish broadcast by Dr Goedfrits in April 1971, quoted in the book under review; Bloch, Shaw, Vickers in *New Scientist*, November 1972). Special attention was given to the diagnosis of 'schizophrenia' used in the cases of Bukovsky, Grigorenko, Gorbanevskaya, Yakhimovich, Feinberg, Medvedev, and to Professor Snezhnevsky's theory of schizophrenia and its relevance in the cases of the dissident intellectuals. Professor Snezhnevsky is the most senior and most powerful psychiatrist in the USSR, who reached this position by assisting in the Stalinist purges. Without his full co-operation, however concealed, the KGB

could not play the part they do in the Soviet psychiatric establishments.

Solzhenitsyn stresses that at a time of official political détente, it is even more desirable that any independently thinking person should look closer under the Soviet Government's cloak of seeming legality and judge for himself. 'We owe this to people like Jan Palach' (the Czech student who gave his life in protesting against violence and oppression), C. W. Boldyreff reminds us in his testimony.

At his trial in September 1967, Bukovsky cited an article in the Moscow *Pravda* about a three-year sentence for participation in May Day demonstrations in Spain and stressed the disturbing similarity between Fascist Spain and Soviet legislation on this issue.

In the barracks in the labour camp where Bukovsky was serving his sentence in 1967 a poster admonished the prisoners to 'Remember that work is the only way home'. 'Arbeit macht frei' was the welcoming poster in Hitler's concentration camps – perhaps no further comment is needed. □