

September 5, 1968

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 10289

wished, or could have imagined. Employee election rights have also been adversely affected. The Board has developed a combination of doctrines which de-emphasize significance of elections, especially when the results of the election do not favor unionization.

These are just a few of the substantive areas where the testimony indicates a deviation by the Board from the Intent of Congress as expressed in the Taft-Hartley Act.

I have not mentioned the Board's curious interpretations of "free speech"; the improper use of its judicial powers; its refusal to give force and effect to the rulemaking powers which Congress charged it to use; the apparent failure of the Board to act evenhandedly when different parties seek its protection; the political sensitivity of the Board as evidenced by the rapid changes of its decisions in response to changing political circumstances; the power of the General Counsel to bar or delay recourse to the Board; or the other unfortunate tendencies of the agency which were disclosed during the Subcommittee's sessions.

Obviously more is involved here than merely mistaken or inadequate administration by the NLRB. For example, National Small Business Association's strong statement to the Committee presented case after case showing alleged disregard of Congressional intent by the Board. If the NLRB or other administrative agencies do display a generous tendency to apply statutory law as they see fit, then this has serious implications for our governmental system. Instead of public policy being established according to the wishes of the people through the representatives they elect and send to Congress, policy is being made by a small group of government officials responsive not to the American people but to other forces. It means that labor law is being devised to serve the interests of unions or management, or the Board itself, but not to serve those of the American working man.

If this is indeed true, then the fault ultimately lies with Congress. It is Congress's responsibility to take a greater interest in the work of the NLRB and other agencies, and to impress upon them Congress's determination to see that its legislative will is being obeyed.

THE NATURE OF THE HEARINGS

The recent hearings on the NLRB are part of a general study by Senator Ervin's Subcommittee into the present-day meaning and significance of the constitutional principle of "separation of powers". The National Labor Relations Board, like its sister agencies, the Federal Trade Commission, Securities Exchange Commission, and others, represents a deviation from a strict application of the separation of powers principle. The Board is, in theory at least, an organ of government combining portions of executive, legislative, and judicial powers. While it is independent of the direct control of the traditional branches, it is a creature of legislation and subject to a variety of controls and limitations imposed by the Congress, the courts, and the Executive. Controls imposed by Congress are, potentially at least, the most significant.

LOAN APPLICATION BY VALLEY CENTER MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT OF VALLEY CENTER, CALIF.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of an application by the Valley Center Municipal Water District of Valley Center, Calif., for a loan to assist in financing the construction of emergency and operational storage facilities and pipelines to connect

the storage facilities to its existing irrigation water distribution system, which, with an accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDING OFFICER:

A resolution adopted by the 82d Airborne Division Association, Inc., Mansfield, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to grant incentive pay to the airborne units of the Army Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors, County of Los Angeles, Calif., praying for the enactment of legislation to give a chance for homeownership to those who presently cannot achieve it; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the 82d Airborne Division Association, Inc., Mansfield, Ohio, commending the foreign policy of the United States relating to Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Tribal Council of the Ajarilla Apache Tribe of Indians, Dulce, N. Mex., requesting that appointments be made promptly to existing vacancies within the Indian Claims Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Ninth Guam Legislature, praying for the enactment of legislation to establish a Status Commission for the Unincorporated Territory of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter, in the nature of a petition, from the Governmental Affairs Institute, Washington, D.C., praying for the enactment of legislation relating to certain immigrants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the chamber of commerce of the City of Porterville, Calif., protesting the secondary boycott of California table grapes by AFL-CIO unions; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A petition, signed by Orlando E. Hartman, and sundry other citizens of the State of Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation relating to extension of the National Labor Relations Act to cover farmworkers; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. MONRONEY, from the Joint Committee on Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which were referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, dated August 2, 1968, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Raymond H. Lapin, of California, to be President of the Federal National Mortgage Association.

Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the nominations of 32 Army Reserve commissioned officers for promotion to the grade of major general and brigadier general.

I ask that these names be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations, ordered to be placed on the Executive Calendar, are as follows:

Brig. Gen. John L. Boros, and sundry other U.S. Army Reserve officers, for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army;

Brig. Gen. Kenneth W. Brewer, and sundry other Army National Guard of the United States officers, for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army; and

Col. Harry W. Barnes, and Col. Robert F. Wilson, Army National Guard of the United States officers, for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FANNIN:

S. 3999. A bill for the relief of Vladko Dimitrov Denez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 4000. A bill for the relief of Tsul Yan Wa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRUENING:

S. 4001. A bill for the relief of Sangvian Boonbangkeng, Wea Lum Phian, Yau Fo, Shu Wah Ip; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER:

S. 4002. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the feasibility and desirability of establishing an Upper Mississippi Valley National Recreation Area between Wood River, Ill., and Minneapolis, Minn., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MILLER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 4003. A bill for the relief of Theodore Atsidakos, and his wife Helen, and two children, Mary and Erethilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 4004. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate certain inequities involved in the taxation of employee stock options; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 4005. A bill for the relief of certain individuals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FEASIBILITY OF AN UPPER MISSISSIPPI VALLEY NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to study, investigate, and formulate recommendations concerning the feasibility and desirability of establishing an Upper Mississippi Valley National Recreation Area. This area would cover all or parts of the segment of the Mississippi River and adjacent lands between Wood River, Ill., and Minneapolis, Minn. The area to be studied under the terms of my bill includes portions of my own State of Iowa, and the States of Missouri, Illinois, Wis-

consin, and Minnesota. This area is readily accessible to more than 20 million people of the Midwest and comprises a wealth of American culture.

Although this area is already widely used for outdoor recreation purposes, such use is heavily concentrated and tends to disturb and destroy values which most people wish to use and enjoy. Because this area has so much to offer the Nation and millions of people living nearby, I feel that a comprehensive evaluation of its recreation potential should be concluded as soon as possible. One reason for such a survey is that adverse activities might endanger the prospects of future development of public outdoor recreation facilities.

The Corps of Engineers of the Department of the Army has conducted some significant studies in this regard. These studies should be more helpful in compiling a meaningful evaluation and report at the earliest possible time while also holding down the cost of the study called for in my bill—such cost being estimated at less than \$100,000.

Mr. President, the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has favorably reported a bill containing the same provisions as I am introducing. I urge the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to consider this bill at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record and also printed and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record as requested by the Senator from Iowa.

The bill (S. 4002) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the feasibility and desirability of establishing an Upper Mississippi Valley National Recreation Area between Wood River, Ill., and Minneapolis, Minn., and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MILLER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 4002

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior shall study, investigate, and formulate recommendations on the feasibility and desirability of establishing as an Upper Mississippi Valley National Recreation Area all or parts of the segment of the Mississippi River and adjacent lands between Wood River, Illinois, and Minneapolis, Minnesota, in the States of Missouri, Iowa, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. The Secretary shall consult with other interested Federal agencies, and the State and local bodies and officials involved, and shall coordinate the study with applicable outdoor recreation plans, highway plans, and other planning activities relating to the region.

Sec. 2. The Secretary shall submit to the Congress, within two years after the date of this Act, a report of his findings and recommendations. The report of the Secretary shall contain, but not be limited to, findings with respect to—

(a) the scenic, scientific, historic, outdoor recreation, and the natural values of the water and related land resources involved, including their use for driving for pleasure,

walking, hiking, riding, bicycling, boating, swimming, picnicking, camping, forest management, fish and wildlife management, scenic and historic site preservation, hunting, fishing, and winter sports;

(b) the potential alternative beneficial uses of the water and related land resources involved, taking into consideration appropriate uses of the land for residential, commercial, industrial, agricultural, and transportation purposes, and for public services; and

(c) the type of Federal, State, and local program that is feasible and desirable in the public interest to preserve, develop, and make accessible for public use the values set forth in subsection (a), including alternative means of achieving these values, together with a comparison of the costs and effectiveness of these alternative means.

Sec. 3. Pending submission of the report of the Secretary to the Congress, the heads of Federal agencies having administrative jurisdiction over the Federal lands within the area referred to in section 1 of this Act shall, consistent with the purposes for which the lands were acquired or set aside by the United States and to the extent authorized by law, encourage and provide maximum opportunities for the types of recreation use of such lands referred to in section 2(a) of this Act.

Sec. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, not to exceed \$100,000.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] be added as a cosponsor of my bill (S. 3777) to establish the U.S. section of the United States-Mexico Commission for Border Development and Friendship, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, my name be added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 179) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the nomination and election of the President and Vice President of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 387—RESOLUTION CALLING FOR EMERGENCY MEETING OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND DECLARATION OF DAY OF SOLIDARITY WITH CZECHOSLOVAKIA

THE MEANING OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, before the Kremlin staged its treacherous invasion of Czechoslovakia in the midnight hours of August 21, there were many in the Western World who believed that the Soviet leaders were reasonable men who were committed to the existence of the détente and who would therefore take no rash actions in Czechoslovakia.

Much more died in consequence of the Soviet invasion than the brave new freedom which had suddenly emerged in

Czechoslovakia after its long totalitarian night.

The myth of the détente also died with it, as well as the false feeling of security which this myth had spawned.

I have no doubt that, when the present crisis has passed, this myth will burgeon again, just as it did in the period after the suppression of the Hungarian revolution. But, for the moment at least, the eyes of the free world have been opened to the harsh fact that there is no essential difference between the comraunism of Brezhnev and Kosygin and the communism of Joseph Stalin.

It remains committed to the destruction of freedom for the simple reason that that the contagion of freedom constitutes a deadly menace to the total tyranny of communism.

This is something that I have been trying to tell the American people for many years now. Within the past 2 months alone I have taken the floor of the Senate on three occasions to warn against the myth of the détente and against the possibility that the Soviet Union would intervene by force to put down the freedom movement in Czechoslovakia.

I did so for the first time on July 15, in introducing a resolution reaffirming our support for Captive Nations Week. This resolution, in which I was honored to be joined by 13 other Senators, expressed the hope that the captive peoples would "in the years to come be permitted to determine their own future without the threat of external intervention."

On July 23, in speaking again about the crisis in Czechoslovakia, I submitted a resolution calling for the publication of the U.N. report on Hungary as a Senate document. I said that it was my hope that the republication of this report would serve the dual purpose of reminding world opinion about what happened in Hungary and that, if the Soviet leaders contemplated intervention, it would cause them to pause and reconsider.

Regrettably, this resolution was put over by the Rules Committee because of the pressure of last-minute business.

In the same speech I called for a more vigorous State Department policy, and said that the diplomacy of doing nothing will accomplish exactly nothing.

On this point, now that the deed has been done, I wish to read from an editorial assessment which appeared in the New York Times for September 3:

As this melancholy political tragedy proceeds, Americans would do well to assess soberly this nation's responsibility for last month's rape of Czechoslovakia. From Mr. Dubcek's triumph last January until the Soviet invasion, Washington did almost nothing to show serious goodwill toward the liberal regime. The excuse offered then was that the State Department feared to provoke Moscow action against Prague. In the face of the devastating blow Soviet troops actually did deliver, a more tenable view is that Washington's studied near-in-difference to Prague developments was correctly seen in Moscow as assurance the Kremlin could do as it pleased in bringing Czechoslovakia to heel. It is not a pretty chapter of American diplomacy.

On August 2, the final day before recess, I delivered a major speech on the myth of the détente in which I warned

again that the Red army might invade Czechoslovakia.

And on August 21, on the heels of the invasion, I issued a statement calling for an emergency session of the U.N. General Assembly to deal with the matter of Soviet intervention in Czechoslovakia.

I still believe such a session should be convened, and this is a major purpose of the resolution which I am introducing today.

Essentially my resolution is an action resolution, because, in the situation that confronts us today, pious declarations of sympathy are not enough.

A member nation of the United Nations has been invaded without warning and without cause of any kind by the military forces of five other member nations.

And although, nominally, the Kremlin is permitting the Czechoslovak Government to continue in office, in practice it is enforcing a ruthless dictatorship.

It has compelled the Czechoslovak Government, against its will, to reintroduce a rigid censorship over press and radio.

It has demanded the banning of Czechoslovakia's most popular literary and political magazine *Literarni Listy*.

It has virtually forbidden Czechoslovak trade with the West.

And according to recent information received by the American chapter of PEN, the world association of writers, Soviet intelligence agents, disguised as ambulance drivers, have been apprehending and beating up prominent Czech writers and removing them to undisclosed destinations.

Soviet aggression in Czechoslovakia, moreover, has raised the specter of further Soviet aggression in Europe.

On the heels of their occupation of Czechoslovakia, the Red Army and its satellite armies embarked on a series of threatening maneuvers on the frontiers of Rumania and Yugoslavia, similar to the maneuvers which preceded the invasion of Czechoslovakia. And these activities are all the more alarming because they have been synchronized with a violent propaganda campaign against the Rumanian and Yugoslav leaders which resembles the propaganda campaign against the Czech leaders prior to the invasion.

Only yesterday the crisis in Europe was dangerously enlarged when the Soviet Ambassador to Bonn presented to the West German Government a list of arrogant demands which bore some of the earmarks of a ultimatum. Among other things, the Kremlin demanded that the Bonn government call off its efforts to establish normal cultural and trade relations with the Communist countries of Eastern Europe.

Against the background of Soviet intervention in Czechoslovakia no one can say for certain just how far the Soviets are prepared to go. Against this background, too, it becomes clear that Soviet promises and guarantees are utterly worthless.

The coming period will be a period of testing that will require all the wisdom and all the resolution of which we are capable.

There are many measures that must be taken to secure the peace and to deter

the Soviets from further aggression. But, in my opinion, the first of these measures is resolute action on the part of the free world to condemn the Soviet occupation of Czechoslovakia, to bring the Kremlin to bar before the United Nations, and to mete out punishment in the form of economic sanctions.

That is why I am submitting my resolution.

My resolution calls upon the administration to designate September 30, the anniversary of the infamous Munich agreement, as a day of solidarity with the Czechoslovak people.

I think that it is altogether fitting that the enslavement of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet tyranny be observed in conjunction with the anniversary of the pact which paved the way to its enslavement by the Nazi tyranny.

On this day let us, by every proper means, tell the Czechoslovak people, that, in their battle to win for themselves the right to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," they have the fervent support of the American people.

Let us demonstrate.

Let us protest.

Let the church bells ring out across the country.

And let us as a nation reinforce our condemnation by taking those essential diplomatic, political, and economic actions spelled out in the resolution which I submit today.

Mr. President, I submit a resolution calling for an emergency meeting of the General Assembly and calling for the administration to declare September 30 as a day of solidarity with Czechoslovakia, because that is the date of the Munich betrayal.

Mr. President, in submitting by resolution I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD a number of articles and editorials dealing with the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, and with the intellectual ferment in the Soviet Union which made the Soviet leaders so fearful of the contagion of freedom.

I also ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the full text of my resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution, articles, and editorials, will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 387) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

S. RES. 387

Whereas the Congress of the United States is on record as supporting the struggle of the captive nations to recover their national freedom and their basic human rights; and

Whereas the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia on August 21, abetted by the armies of four Communist satellite governments, constituted a flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and of the rule of law in the affairs of nations; and

Whereas, as President Johnson has pointed out, "The excuses offered by the Soviet Union are patently contrived. The Czechoslovakian government did not request its allies to intervene in its internal affairs. No external aggression threatened Czechoslovakia"; and

Whereas the Soviet secret police, under the protection of the Red Army, are now in the

process of liquidating the hard-won freedoms of the Czechoslovak people of re-installing a police state dictatorship; and

Whereas, in the past fortnight, the Soviet Army and its satellite armies have been conducting threatening maneuvers on the frontier of Rumania and Yugoslavia, similar to the maneuvers which preceded the invasion of Czechoslovakia; and

Whereas the Soviet Government further enlarged the crisis by submitting a list of outrageous demands to the Government of West Germany: therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate—

(1) that the administration should call for an emergency session of the U.N. General Assembly to deal with the Czechoslovak crisis and with the wider crisis this has produced throughout Central Europe;

(2) that at this session the administration, with the support of other free nations, should ask for the imposition of economic sanctions against the aggressor countries, until they abandon their aggression and remove their troops from Czechoslovakia; and that, despite any protests that may come from the now captive government of Czechoslovakia, the administration should also ask for the establishment of a special U.N. committee, similar to the U.N. Committee on Hungary, to gather all available information and to report back to the General Assembly;

(3) that, in advance of such action, the administration should impose an immediate embargo on the shipment of all industrial and technological equipment to the Soviet Union and to the communist bloc countries which participated in the invasion, and that it should invite the other free nations of the world to join in parallel action;

(4) that, in conjunction with the anniversary of the Munich agreement on September 30, the administration should proclaim a day of solidarity with the people of Czechoslovakia, to be manifested in appropriate observances across the country, and that it should invite the participation of other free governments with a view to making this day an international day of solidarity with the Czechoslovak people in their heroic struggle to retain their freedom; and, finally, be it

Resolved, That the Senate will support such measures as may be necessary to reduce the threat of further Soviet aggression in Europe.

The articles and editorials ordered to be printed in the RECORD, are as follows:

1. THE SOVIET OCCUPATION OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA [From the New York Times, Aug. 31, 1968] SADNESS AND FEAR ARE DESCENDING ON PRAGUE—CZECHS SEE THEIR 8 MONTHS OF LIBERTY IS NEAR AN END—HELPLESSNESS IS VOICED

(By Clyde H. Farnsworth)

PRAGUE, August 30.—A heavy sadness has descended on this beautiful city, which Goethe described as "a gem in the crown of the world." You feel the sadness when walking on the Charles Bridge across the Vitava with a young blond law student who says repeatedly, "I am not afraid"—but you know she is.

You pass several Russian soldiers munching bread at the entrance of a Soviet-occupied building on the Opera Square. She looks at them and then, almost with tears in her eyes, says, "It is terrible what they have done."

There is an older Czech talking quietly with an American in a coffee house near Maxim Gorki Square. A third party, unknown to either of them, sits down at their table. The older man suddenly finds an excuse to leave.

FEAR IS COMING BACK

It is the fear that personal liberties, so much enjoyed over the last eight months, are suddenly being taken away—the fear that the

S 10292

Government can never resist the overwhelming Russian military pressures to end the political reforms.

Now, Czechs are again afraid of being informed on, afraid of the secret police.

The Russians have pulled most of their troops out of the city. But the tanks are not far away and, three miles southeast of the city center in the suburb of Vrsovice, heavy mortars have been emplaced. They could fire their shells into Wenceslaus Square.

The informed Czech tells you that the plight is tragic. To prevent bloodshed the Government has to accept Russian demands and curb political freedom. But in doing this it loses the confidence of the people.

This reality, the feeling of helplessness beside the tremendous display of Russian power, explains the poignant sighs and pauses when Czechoslovak leaders address the nation.

It explains the bitter tone of the underground poetry plastered on the storefronts:

"Welcome friends—

You have come as brothers,

And now our blood lies on the ground.

"Welcome friends—

Thank you for the roses

On the graves of our children.

"Welcome friends—

With salt in our eyes

We welcome you."

Underground writers quote Talleyrand's words to Napoleon: "You can do everything with bayonets except sit on them."

The writers also refer to an old Czech saying: "After three days a guest and a fish begin to smell."

With most of the tanks removed, Prague looks normal again. During the day there is business as usual and there are traffic jams in the streets.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 31, 1968]

**ELEVEN CZECH WRITERS REPORTED SEIZED—
PEN IS INFORMED DISGUISED SOVIET AGENTS
ARE BEATING AND ARRESTING AUTHORS**

(By Henry Raymond)

The American chapter of P.E.N., the world association of writers, said last night it had received word that Soviet intelligence agents in Czechoslovakia, disguised as ambulance attendants, were secretly rounding up writers and journalists.

The report was received by Robert Halsband, president of the American center, in a cablegram from the association's international headquarters in London. Mr. Halsband said the cablegram was based on information given by "a reliable source," a writer who had just arrived from Prague.

The cablegram said that at least 11 Czech writers, including Ladislav Mnacko, the novelist, and Prof. Adolf Hoffmeister, president of the Czech center of P.E.N., had been beaten unconscious by Soviet secret "agents disguised as ambulance attendants" before they were driven to an undisclosed destination.

NOVEL SATIRIZED LEADERS

The cablegram asserted that ambulances were used for the arrests to "divert attention of Czechoslovak citizens and police." The following writers and newspapermen were listed as having been seized:

Professor Hoffmeister, Mr. Mnacko, Bohumil Hrabal, Karel Kosk, Alexander Kliment, Vaclav Havel, Ludvik Vaculik, Milan Uhde, Jiri Kolar, A. J. Liehm and Vladimir Blazek.

The report was the first indication of Mr. Mnacko's fate following the invasion Aug. 21. The stocky, 49-year-old former journalist fled Czechoslovakia last year in a protest against Prague's pro-Arab policies, but he returned some months ago to participate in the liberalization movement of Alexander Dubcek, First Secretary of the Czechoslovak Communist Party. He is best known in the West for his novel "The Taste of Power," a satire on the Communist party leadership that was published here earlier this year by Frederick A. Praeger, Inc.

The cablegram, signed by David Carver, the international secretary of P.E.N.—the initials stand for Poets, Essayists and Novelists—jolted American members of the association who had hoped conditions in Czechoslovakia would ease following the talks in Moscow last weekend.

"This is shocking news," said Arthur Miller, the playwright and president of the international P.E.N. Club.

Reached at his home in Connecticut, Mr. Miller said he would begin "right away" to gather signatures from American writers and poets for an appeal to the Soviet Government and the Union of Soviet Writers on behalf of their Czechoslovak colleagues.

PROTEST SENT TO PODGORNY

Mr. Carver's communication arrived shortly after Mr. Halsband and Mr. Miller had sent a routine protest to President Nikolai V. Podgorny appealing for the release of Czechoslovak writers arrested during the Soviet occupation. They said the information about the arrests was based on newspaper reports and had not been independently confirmed.

Several hours after receiving the report of the new arrests, Mr. Halsband and Mr. Miller sent two more protests, one to the president of the Soviet Writer's Union and another to the Ministry of Interior in Prague.

The message to President Podgorny was made public by Mr. Halsband early yesterday afternoon, a few hours before he received Mr. Carver's cable. The message said:

"P.E.N.'s American Center joins with International P.E.N. in urging release of Czech and Slovak writers reported held following occupation of Czechoslovakia. We ask this in a spirit of deep concern and hopefulness on behalf of the world community of letters."

Mr. Halsband, a professor of English literature at Columbia University, acknowledged that the association had been asked by several Czech writers to delay their protest, contending that it might further harden the Soviet attitude.

"We waited for almost a week, until we became convinced that the situation was not improving," he said.

APPEAL TO SOVIET WRITERS

The appeal to the Soviet writers said:

"As fellow writers, the American Center of P.E.N. urges you to exert your influence to protect writers in Prague from reported arrests. We make this appeal in the name of the world community of letters.

Mr. Miller said that, while his first protest to President Podgorny was based on rumors, "we now have concrete information just out of Czechoslovakia of a real wave of repression."

The author, who returned yesterday morning from Chicago, where he attended the Democratic National Convention as a delegate from Connecticut, said that he would probably have a new petition ready over the weekend.

Mr. Miller predicted that the Czechoslovak crisis would become a central issue at the annual meeting of P.E.N.'s executive committee, which opens in Geneva Oct. 6. The meeting is scheduled to be attended by at least a dozen from Eastern Europe.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 2, 1968]
**SEVEN DAYS OF INTERVENTION IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA—ENTRY BY SOVIET-LED ARMIES
STIRRED RISE OF WIDE RESISTANCE**

(NOTE.—The following reconstruction of events in the first seven days of the occupation of Czechoslovakia was prepared by Tad Szulc and Clyde H. Farnsworth, New York Times correspondents in Prague.)

PRAGUE, September 1.—A Soviet MIG-21 jet fighter screamed over the roofs of sleep-

ing Prague a few minutes after 1 o'clock on the morning of Wednesday, Aug. 21. As it landed at Ruzzen International Airport, its wing companion flew on a direct approach to the airport.

There was silence for a few minutes, and then the first Antonov-12 four-engine turbo-prop transport pierced the clear night sky over this city, its green and red running lights blinking against the darkness on its descent to Ruzyne.

Within a minute another heavy AN-12 followed from the east. Then, the roar over the capital was unabating as, at 50-second intervals, transport planes touched down at Prague Airport, disgorging crimson-bereted Soviet airborne troopers.

Two hours earlier, a column of Soviet T-55 tanks had crossed the Czechoslovak frontier from East Germany at Cinovec, a quiet village, 60 miles northwest of Prague, and now its forward elements were nearing the residential suburb of Kobylisy. Young Soviet tankmen in black leather headgear peered out of their turrets, their hands on their 50-caliber machine guns.

The invasion of Czechoslovakia had begun. At 1:50 A.M., the city was told in a Prague radio broadcast, delivered in quiet tones:

"Last night, Aug. 21, about 11 P.M., the armies of the Soviet Union, the Polish People's Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the Hungarian People's Republic and the Bulgarian People's Republic crossed the national frontiers of Czechoslovakia without the knowledge of the President of the Republic, the National Assembly, the Government, the First Secretary of the Communist party or any of their bodies."

Then the radio station went off the air.

The airlift was the biggest ever carried out by the Soviet Union outside its frontiers. Within the first seven hours, 250 aircraft put down here a full airborne division complete with small armored vehicles, fuel and supplies.

Along with the Soviet, East German, Polish, Hungarian and Bulgarian columns entering Czechoslovakia through 18 crossing points from the north, northwest, south and east, this airlift formed the vanguard of what in days to come was a massive invading army reported to number 650,000 men equipped with the most modern and sophisticated weapons in the Soviet military catalogue.

Prague alone was filled and ringed with 100,000 troops and 2,000 tanks, while, at the Kremlin in the evening of Tuesday, Aug. 27, Czechoslovak leaders were being forced into signing an agreement giving Moscow total control over the destiny of this republic of 14 million people.

The events of the intervening seven days ranged from the drama of the early street battles in Prague and other Czechoslovak cities between Soviet tanks and youths armed with sticks and Molotov cocktails to the poignant tragedy of the secret Moscow negotiations with the Czechoslovak leaders freshly released from Soviet captivity.

RECONSTRUCTION OF 7 DAYS

This article is a reconstruction of the seven days based on the accounts of the Czechoslovak clandestine radio network formed after the invasion, the testimony of participants, information supplied by Communist sources and direct observations by correspondents of The New York Times.

As the Soviet columns rolled through Prague's darkened streets at dawn on Aug. 21 and as dozens of cars careened throughout the city with honking horns to summon the citizens to a protest meeting at the Old Town Square, 20 men were gathered in a four-story domed and marble-pillared building on the right bank of the Vitava River, which flows through Prague.

They were the 11 full members of the ruling Presidium of the Central Committee of the Czechoslovak Communist party, its three

September 5, 1968

alternates and the party secretaries, and they had been meeting continuously since 2 o'clock in the afternoon to try to deal with the situation.

The meeting had been called by Alexander Dubcek, the First Secretary of the party, the man who personified Czechoslovakia's democratization effort begun last January and defiance of Moscow's orthodoxy.

DECEPTIVE MILDNESS

Mr. Dubcek, a deceptively mild-looking but tough man of 47, had called the session to debate a letter he had received the day before from Leonid I. Brezhnev, the General Secretary of the Soviet Communist party berating him for allegedly failing to honor agreements made at the confrontations in early August between the Czechoslovaks and their Soviet-led critics at Cierna and Bratislava.

These confrontations left the public impression that the Warsaw Pact nations had grudgingly accepted Czechoslovakia's democratization with some minimal restraints.

At the Presidium meeting, held in a small conference room with modern decor and heavy armchairs, the Dubcek liberals clashed with the pro-Moscow conservative members.

The principal battle was over a 13-page report on the internal situation in Czechoslovakia, prepared by Drahomir Kolder, a Presidium member, and Alois Indra, a party secretary. These two conservatives sought approval for their report, which in effect constituted acceptance of Soviet demands for eradication of the democratizing experiment.

Mr. Kolder and Mr. Indra suggested, in fact, that the Presidium lay aside the Bratislava agreement and reconsider instead the so-called Warsaw Letter sent by the Soviet Union and its four allies in mid-July and calling for a virtual political surrender.

EVENLY DIVIDED

The Czechoslovak party leadership was fairly evenly split between liberals and conservatives, but the moderates complicated the situation by their uncertainty. At one point, for example, Frantisek Barbirek, a Slovak member of the Presidium, deliberately absented himself for a prolonged period to avoid participating in several inconclusive votes.

Premier Oldrich Cernik, one of Mr. Dubcek's closest associates, called the Kolder-Indra proposal a "betrayal" of the Bratislava accords. Frantisek Kriegel, another liberal member of the Presidium, said the proposal should be withdrawn because it "negates Cierna and Bratislava."

Vasil Blak, then the Slovak party leader and a member of the national Presidium, took the side of Mr. Kolder and Mr. Indra. Antonin Kapek, an alternate Presidium member and head of the large C.K.D. machinery plant in Prague, also lined up with the conservatives.

The atmosphere in the room was reaching an explosive point when Premier Cernik went out to an adjoining office to make one of his periodic phone calls to Col. Gen. Martin Dzur, the Defense Minister.

SOVIET AIRLINERS LAND

Reports had been reaching the Presidium all day of Soviet troop movements along Czechoslovak frontiers. A Moscow report in mid-afternoon spoke of an urgent session of the Soviet party's Central Committee. Mr. Cernik knew that at 10 P.M. an unscheduled Soviet Aeroflot airliner had landed at Ruzyne Airport.

This was the first thing to alarm him. The plane, he had been told, did not unload passengers but simply sat in the darkness on a taxiway. At 11 P.M., Mr. Cernik was informed that another unscheduled Aeroflot flight had arrived from Lvov in the Soviet Ukraine.

A group of unidentified civilians left the airport and rushed to the city. Later it developed that they had gone to the Soviet Embassy, in the tree-shaded Bubenec dis-

trict of Prague, which was to be the command post for the invasion.

The first Aeroflot plane, as Mr. Cernik and his friends discovered later, was a mobile air-traffic control post brought to Ruzyne to direct the airlift.

PRESIDIUM GETS NEWS

When Mr. Cernik returned to the meeting at 11:40 P.M. having spoken again with Defense Minister Dzur, he was pale. He whispered a few words to Mr. Dubcek. Visibly shaken, Mr. Dubcek rose and announced to the group:

"The armies of five countries have crossed the frontiers of our republic and are occupying us."

Commotion broke out in the room, and Mr. Dubcek tried to restore order.

"It is a tragedy," he said, his voice cracking. "I did not expect this to happen. I had no suspicion, not even the slightest hint that such a step could be taken against us."

The men were excited, talking, shouting, gesticulating. Some of them left the room to make telephone calls, then returned.

Tears were streaming down Mr. Dubcek's face. He said: "I have devoted my entire life to cooperation with the Soviet Union, and they have done this to me. It is my personal tragedy."

CONSERVATIVES NOT UPSET

An official who attended the meeting said later that the conservatives—Mr. Indra, Mr. Kolder, Mr. Blak and Oldrich Svestka, a Presidium member and editor of the party newspaper Rude Pravo—"did not seem terribly upset or even surprised." They soon left the building.

Mr. Dubcek telephoned President Ludvik Svoboda at Hradcany Castle, and the two men discussed the situation. Then Mr. Dubcek and Premier Cernik drafted a proclamation to the nation that the Prague radio began to broadcast at 1:50 A.M.

After having stated that the invasion had taken place without the knowledge of the Czechoslovak authorities, the proclamation urged Czechoslovaks to remain calm and not to resist. The armed forces were given the same order.

The first elements of the Soviet airborne division had already secured the airport and were moving into the city.

Premier Cernik left for the one-story building housing the Straca Military Academy across the Vitava River from the Central Committee to preside over an emergency session of his Cabinet. Mr. Dubcek and his liberal colleagues remained in the Central Committee building to await developments.

LEADERS ARE SEIZED

These developments came quickly. At 3 A.M., as the capital was wide awake and stunned, Soviet armored personnel carriers and armored scout cars drew up at the Military Academy. Airborne troopers, their sub-machine guns at the ready, surrounded the building.

A detachment burst into the academy and arrested Mr. Cernik and the ministers with him. Soldiers tore up the telephone switchboard. At gunpoint, one witness said, they forced some of the ministers to give up their wristwatches. Mr. Cernik was led to an armored car and driven away.

Shortly after 4 A.M., airborne units and some of the tanks that had advanced from the East German border surrounded the Central Committee building. A few minutes later, three armored cars led by a black Soviet made Volga automobile arrived.

Mr. Dubcek, Mr. Kriegel, Josef Smrkovsky, the President of the National Assembly; Cestmir Cisar, a party secretary, and Vaclav Slavik, a member of the secretariat, were around a table discussing their next moves. They were the hard core of the party liberals.

A squad of Soviet soldiers and several civilians rushed into the meeting. They

grabbed Mr. Dubcek, Mr. Kriegel and Mr. Smrkovsky and led them to one of the armored cars. Mr. Cisar was taken out separately. Somehow Mr. Slavik escaped detention.

The armored car with Mr. Cisar went to central police headquarters at Bartolomejska Street in midtown and he was placed in a cell. The vehicle carrying Mr. Dubcek, Mr. Smrkovsky and Mr. Kriegel drove to the airport. Premier Cernik was already there under guard.

The four men were led to a Soviet transport plane, pushed with rifle butts. The plane took off immediately, and one hour later it landed at Try Duby military airport in Slovakia. The four men were driven to a barn outside the nearby spa of Sliac and kept there under guard. They were treated harshly and insulted. As Premier Cernik was to tell the Cabinet later, "I feared for my life and that of my comrades."

As the news of the invasion spread in Prague by the clanking of the tanks, the roar of the troop transports and telephone calls from neighbors and friends, young workers and students rushed to the Prague radio building on Vinohradska Street to erect barricades.

So long as the radio continued broadcasting, the young people felt, the world would know what was happening. It was a race against time. The Russians had already achieved their first objectives by neutralizing the centers of the government. Later in the morning, they would surround Hradcany Castle and place the President under virtual house arrest.

Buses, trucks and the street cars were commandeered by the youths to try to block the progress of the tanks from the nearby National Museum toward the radio building.

As dawn broke, thousands of youngsters poured into Wenceslas Square just below the National Museum and moved toward Vinohradska to man the barricades. They hurled rocks at the tanks and waved the Czechoslovak flag while screaming defiance at the Russians, who were nervously manning their machine guns.

SHOOTING BREAKS OUT

Most of the Russians were puzzled by the reaction. They had been told that they had been invited to help crush a counterrevolution and they expected to be welcomed.

Tanks slipped through the barricades and fires raged in the twisted wreckage of overturned buses and trams. By 7:25 A.M. the radio building was surrounded by infantry soldiers, and tanks were rampaging trying to scatter the crowds.

The first blood was spilled shortly after 7 A.M., when a tense Bulgarian tankman fired his machine-gun, first, above and, then, directly into people on the sidewalks. Two unarmed Czechoslovak soldiers and a woman were killed.

The radio station went off the air at 7:21 A.M. after a woman had announced in an emotion-choked voice: "This is the end."

There were a few bars of Smetana's "Vltava Suite," and then the Czechoslovak national anthem, and finally silence. But an hour later, the radio came surprisingly back on the air, demanding the departure of the invaders and calling for a national protest strike and for blood donors for the wounded.

"DO YOU WORK HERE?"

The Soviet forces seemed to lack instructions on how to proceed.

At the television station on Maxim Gor'ky Square, a Russian army captain named Orlov jumped down from his armored squad car and pounded on the door. After several minutes the nightwatchman appeared. Captain Orlov told him:

"Step out of the way, we are going to occupy the television station."

"Do you work here?" asked the elderly watchman.

"No," the stunned captain replied.

September 5, 1968

"Then you can't come in," said the watchman, slamming the door in the captain's face. The nonplussed captain had to radio his command headquarters for further instructions. The troops outside the radio building also did not seem quite sure what their mission was.

Tanks raced up and down the streets like charging bulls, while young men rushed out from the sidewalks with flaming gasoline-soaked rags trying to ignite the tanks' fuel stores. Five were set afire and one had to be abandoned. While the attacks went on, other tanks stood idle on the streets, their engines off, with crews quietly watching the show.

At 11 A.M. the troops surrounding the radio building finally got their orders to move inside and stop the broadcasting. The station went off the air, only to be replaced within a half hour by the first underground transmitter of the clandestine network.

The network, coordinating 15 stations around the country, not only provided news about the occupation, but became the chief rallying point for the developing passive resistance.

ADVANCE PLANNING

The planning behind it was the work of Jiri Pelikan, the articulate, bushy-haired, 42-year-old director of the state television. Weeks earlier he and his associates had devised a contingency plan. This advance planning and the services of professionals who went underground accounted for the high standards of the clandestine network.

The Russians tried to locate the stations but were slow in getting direction-finding gear to Prague. The radio itself was instrumental in delaying a train carrying the needed detection equipment. At Ceska Prevoza, a rail junction 80 miles east of the capital, Czechoslovak railroad workers refused to man a train after having been alerted by the radio. For hours the train was left to sit in the yard.

FACTOR IN PROPAGANDA WAR

The clandestine network was a major element of the psychological warfare that was developing between the resistance leaders and the occupiers. Unable to stop the transmissions, the Russians began to seize portable radios from listeners in public places.

One of the memorable posters pasted up after the invasion portrayed Russian tank men as Arab merchants with displays of transistors on carpets laid out in the streets.

The Russians, in attempt to make themselves heard by the population, set up their own station, Radio Vltava, but hardly anyone listened to its announcements, delivered with a foreign accent.

The clandestine radio urged citizens to engage the Russian soldiers in discussion to try to convince them that there was no counterrevolution in the country. Hundreds of people sought out the tank crews, infantrymen and paratroopers and asked the basic question: "Why have you come here?"

Most Czechoslovaks speak Russian, which has been a compulsory foreign language in school since the Communist take-over in 1948.

Most of the discussions were friendly enough. However, the Czechs found that many of the young Russian soldiers knew little about the outside world. The reply to the basic question was usually "we follow orders."

Some of the Russians held up what they said were unfired weapons to show that they had not been among those who had taken blood or scarred buildings.

One sensitive noncommissioned officer said he wished he could doff his uniform and merge with the crowd.

On the second day of the occupation, the radio advised the people to ignore the Russians. Though discussions continued, the groups were smaller.

But on Friday a general strike emptied the streets, leaving Soviet troops isolated, surrounded by almost total silence, for an hour. Not knowing what to expect, many fired indiscriminately into the air.

ROAD SIGNS OBLITERATED

The clandestine radio also promoted what was perhaps the cleverest of the passive resistance measures—the obscuring of street signs and house numbers to confuse the occupying troops.

People put up spurious detour signs to delay additional tank columns coming from Poland. In the streets of Prague, signs went up showing Soviet troops the shortest way home, "Moscow—1,500 kilometers."

The radio campaign was supplemented by underground newspapers, printed on flatbed presses in secret basement plants and distributed by factory workers. The papers bore the names of many of the newspapers closed by the occupying troops.

Young men in cars and trucks drove swiftly through the city center, dropping off bundles of newspapers and leaflets. Crowds surged on the sidewalks to gather them up.

The Russians countered by dropping some of their own leaflets from helicopters and having the troops distribute the Moscow newspaper Pravda. A Czechoslovak who accepted these publications often found them snatched from his hands and was accused of collaborating.

Like the clandestine radio network, the equestrian monument to St. Wenceslas in Wenceslas Square became a symbol of resistance.

Youths gathered there to make speeches denouncing the occupation. Despite a curfew, youths manned the monument 24 hours a day and defied Russians who tried to disperse them by shooting over their heads.

POLITICAL MOVE THWARTED

On Thursday, Aug. 23, as the defiance mounted in the streets and gunfire echoed through the city, the Soviet Union turned to the political aspects of the occupation.

Moscow had evidently expected to form a government under President Svoboda—to assure constitutional continuity—and to reorganize party leadership with trusted men.

Two steps were promptly taken by ambassador Stepan V. Chervonenko, the political chief of the invasion, and by Gen. Ivan G. Pavlovsky, a Soviet Defense Minister and commander of the invasion forces.

After reported consultations with the Russians, Jan Piller, a conservative Presidium member, called on President Svoboda at Hradcany Castle to present him with a list of a "worker and peasant" government with the request that he remain as chief of state.

President Svoboda, an army general, a convinced Communist and a Hero of the Soviet Union, refused. He said he would discuss nothing until the Czechoslovak leaders had been released. A message from Ambassador Chervonenko also failed to budge the President.

TROJKA IS SHORT-LIVED

Overnight Wednesday the Czechoslovak conservatives had met with Mr. Chervonenko and other Soviet officials at the Praha Hotel, which is used by the Central Committee. The Soviet group was disappointed by the small turnout and by the reluctance of the Czechoslovaks to join the leadership that the Russians proposed to establish.

After hours of deliberation it developed that only Mr. Bilak, Mr. Koidar and Mr. Indra were prepared to go on the new Presidium. To complicate matters, these three party officials apparently were unable to agree among themselves as to who would serve as First Secretary. The decision was made for the three to serve jointly as party leaders.

The announcement of the trojka was greeted with public derision, and it vanished

from sight almost as soon as it had been invented. The Soviet political maneuver had failed.

THE SECRET CONGRESS

In a countermove by the Czechoslovak liberals, hundreds of delegates began streaming secretly during the night to the huge C.K.D. plant in Prague to hold the extraordinary 14th congress of the party.

The congress had been originally scheduled for Sept. 9, and the delegates were elected during the summer. Most of them were pro-Dubcek and it was taken for granted that the new Central Committee and Presidium to be elected by the congress would be overwhelmingly liberal.

The delegates were informed by the clandestine radio that the congress would be held Thursday morning at the C.K.D. plant. The organizers assumed correctly that inasmuch as the radio was publicly announcing that the plant would be the site of the congress, the Russians would conclude it was being held elsewhere. This tactic worked.

The delegates were introduced into the plant disguised as workers. The plant's armed people's militia, traditionally supporters of the conservatives, stood guard.

The underground congress elected a liberal 160-man Central Committee, which in turn chose its 27-man Presidium. Mr. Dubcek was reelected First Secretary, but in his absence Venek Silhan, an economics professor, was chosen to act in his place.

At this stage, Mr. Dubcek and his colleagues were being moved from Silac to Lvov, in the Soviet Ukraine, with a stop at Transcarpathian town of Mukachevo. They had not been permitted to change clothes; they were inadequately fed, and were exposed to insults and maltreatment.

SVOBODA FLIES TO MOSCOW

On Friday, Aug. 23, President Svoboda suddenly flew to Moscow following a 7 A.M. meeting in Hradcany Castle with Ambassador Chervonenko. Mr. Svoboda said in a brief statement that he was going to the Kremlin to seek a resolution of the crisis and that he would return the same evening.

Flying on the same plane were Mr. Indra and Mr. Bilak, but Czechoslovak Government spokesmen made it clear that they were not members of the Svoboda delegation. Among those actually accompanying the President were Deputy Premier Gustav Husak, a Slovak and a friend of Mr. Dubcek, and Defense Minister Izur.

President Svoboda was received in Moscow with honors usually accorded a chief of state, but his Soviet hosts soon realized that he was in no mood for compromise. He made it clear from the outset that he would not undertake to negotiate until Mr. Dubcek and his colleagues were freed and invited to participate in the talks.

On Saturday Mr. Dubcek and the three other imprisoned liberal leaders were flown from Lvov to Moscow and driven to the Kremlin.

INTERNED AIDES HAGGARD

They were a haggard, mentally and physically exhausted group, but it was a victory for the Czechoslovaks to have won their freedom. President Svoboda sent a message to the nation that, in view of the arrival of the four men, he was remaining at least another day for additional talks.

In Prague, this news evoked the first moment of optimism since the invasion. But the Russians countered by sending additional forces to the capital. Soviet strength there rose from 35,000 men on Wednesday to 50,000 on Friday and 90,000 on Sunday as the talks dragged on.

Mr. Smrkovsky, the President of the National Assembly, was not exaggerating when he said later that the Czechoslovaks had negotiated "in the shadow of tanks and planes."

September 5, 1968

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 10295

The pressure was so immense that on Monday, Aug. 26, Mr. Svoboda, Mr. Dubcek and the others agreed to sign the agreement. A communiqué gave no real indications of the substance of the accord.

CZECH LEADERS RETURN

At 5:20 A.M. Tuesday, President Svoboda and the others landed at Ruzyně Airport. By that time many of the tanks had disappeared from large parts of the city center and were assembled in parks and side streets. Trolleys and buses were running on normal schedules.

People seemed to be breathing a little easier and everyone seemed to be returning to work. At Hradcany castle, a Czechoslovak honor guard once again took up its post and the presidential flag flew from the castle staff.

Under the Moscow accord, the Russians agreed to a gradual troop withdrawal in return for a renewal of press censorship, the disbanding of non-Communist political groups, the gradual removal of liberals from office and increasing Soviet control over administration. In addition, two Soviet divisions are to be permanently stationed along the border with West Germany.

It was a high price to pay to get the tanks out of Prague but the Czechoslovaks had evidently little choice but to pay it. Mr. Svoboda, Mr. Dubcek, Mr. Smrkovsky and the others made this clear in radio speeches last week.

The invasion, said Mr. Smrkovsky, was "a tragedy of small nations placed in the center of our continent."

BERLINERS DEMONSTRATE DURING "DAY OF GERMANS"

BERLIN, September 1.—Rightists and leftists demonstrated today at the annual "Day of the Germans" sponsored by refugee groups in West Berlin. The police kept the opposing groups apart and there were no serious incidents.

About 30 rightist youths showed up to cheer the appearance or representatives of the right-wing National Democratic party who attended under a general invitation to all West German state legislatures.

The presence of the controversial rightists, plus rain, kept attendance to about 5,000 in an outdoor stadium seating 25,000.

Speakers emphasized German solidarity with the beleaguered Czechoslovak people. Mayor Klaus Schütz attacked East Germany, which joined the Soviet-led invasion of Czechoslovakia, saying the East Germans had forfeited every right to talk about the rights of peoples.

PRAVDA CRITICIZES A CZECH WEEKLY—ASKS FOR CLOSING OF LIBERAL WRITERS' PUBLICATION

(By Henry Kamm)

Moscow, September 1.—Pravda, the newspaper of the Communist party, complained today that the Czechoslovak press was slow to adapt itself to renewed censorship.

Pravda centered its attack on one of the most liberal of Czechoslovak publications, Literarni Listy, the weekly of the writers' union. Literarni Listy has been published clandestinely since the occupation and has not lost the sarcastic sting that made it a favorite of the intellectuals and youth.

The Soviet party organ characterized the underground weekly as a "wasps' nest" that "continues to exist somewhere in a backyard and continues to play its abject role as one of the main ideological centers of counter-revolution."

"Every sensible person understands, however, that such a game cannot continue," Pravda declared. "The counterrevolutionary forces must be and will be bridled."

EDITOR IS CRITICIZED

Jan Prochazka, a member of the weekly's editorial board, was singled out in Pravda for having "concocted an article containing revolting and mean slander of the Soviet Union

and the international Communist movement" in last Wednesday's issue.

Literarni Listy has a history of suppression. Its current editors were responsible for the former weekly of the writers' union, Literarni Noviny, which was banned last summer by the regime of Antonin Novotny. Some of its editors, including A. J. Lihem and Ludvik Vaculik, were punished by or suspended from the party and not restored until after the start of the liberalization earlier this year.

Literarni Listy rose to a circulation of 300,000 in a country of 14.5 million and became a forum of liberal ideas. It maintained its political position in ironic language and savage cartoons. Its success was so great that before the invasion there were plans for English and German-language editions.

POLES ASSAIL WRITERS

(By Jonathan Randal)

WARSAW, September 1.—The state-controlled Polish television stepped up a resurgent "anti-Zionist" campaign today, charging "Zionists" with responsibility for the "counter-revolution" Czechoslovakia.

Branding some of the Czechoslovak liberal writers as Zionists, the Prague correspondent of Polish television linked them with Czechoslovak criticism this spring of what has been officially admitted was an anti-Semitic witch-hunt in Poland.

The television man denounced Eduard Goldstuecker, the president of the Czechoslovak writers union; Ladislav Mnacko and Pavel Kohout, novelists, and Arnold Lustig and Jan Prochazka of the weekly literary Listy. [Mr. Lustig arrived in Israel on Sunday as an immigrant, the Associated Press reported from Haifa.]

"The Zionist forces were the most active of those who attacked Poland in March and allowed themselves in an atmosphere of intolerance and anti-Communism to designate the future Communist leaders of Czechoslovakia," the Polish correspondent Czeslaw Berenda said.

He said that many of these writers "do not share these difficult days with the citizens of Prague" and had fled to the West.

Defense Minister Wojciech Jaruzelski praised Polish occupation troops, believed to number 45,000 men, for fulfilling their "patriotic and internationalist duties."

Polish correspondents accused "counter-revolutionaries" of seeking to pit one occupying army against another by praising Polish troops as "cultured and chivalrous" and depicting the Soviet troops as "brutal and hostile."

Zygmunt Broniarek, writing in the party newspaper, Trybuna Ludu, said a Czechoslovak Army officer had denied that his country was heading toward counter-revolution or was about to leave the Warsaw Pact. These were among avowed reasons for the Soviet-led intervention.

Another correspondent denied rumors that Polish troops were going hungry and that an epidemic was raging in their ranks.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 3, 1968] PRAVDA CAUTIONS CZECHS ON TRADE—ASSERTS ONLY "IGNORAMUSES" SEEK TIES WITH WEST

(By Raymond H. Anderson)

Moscow, September 2.—Pravda declared today that only a "pitiful handful of political ignoramuses" in Prague were interested in reorienting Czechoslovakia's trade toward the West and soliciting hard-currency credits.

A long article in the Soviet Communist party paper stressed that it was advantageous for Czechoslovakia to trade primarily with the Soviet Union and other Communist countries.

Shortly after Prague's reform program was undertaken last winter, leading economic

officials began to speak of the urgency of obtaining up to \$500-million in credits to modernize the Czechoslovak industry.

The possibility of the Soviet Government's supplying the hard-currency credit was raised during visits here by Czechoslovak leaders, but Moscow held back, apparently hoping to use the prospect of a loan to influence the Czechoslovaks to restrain their reforms.

Damage to Czechoslovakia's economy from the turmoil in the wake of invasion by troops of the Soviet Union and four Communist allies seems to have made foreign credit more urgent than ever. The Czechoslovaks have said that they expect to discuss the question of reparations with the Soviet Union.

OBLIGATION IS SEEN

Pravda emphasized that all Communist countries had an obligation to strengthen their bonds of political and economic cooperation "for the sake of the victory of our common goal."

The paper complained that some Czechoslovaks had joined a critical chorus against Comecon, the Soviet bloc's economy community, and it rejected protests that trade within the group was "one-sided, to the advantage of the Soviet Union."

Raw-material imports by Czechoslovakia from the Soviet Union, Pravda declared, have been at prices favorable to Czechoslovaks.

The Soviet Union, the paper continued, supplies 99.5 per cent of Czechoslovakia's needs in crude oil at a price of 273 crowns (about \$40) a ton delivered to refineries. It quoted Rude Pravo, the Czechoslovak party paper, as having estimated that oil imported from Iran, for example, would cost the Czechoslovaks 408 crowns (\$60) a ton.

OTHER IMPORTS LISTED

The paper said that the Soviet Union supplied the bulk of Czechoslovakia's other raw-material imports, including 83.6 per cent of the iron ore and 53.3 per cent of other metals, 53.8 per cent of the cotton imports and most of the country's wheat imports.

Many of the Soviet Union's exports to Czechoslovakia, the article declared pointedly, are scarce materials that Moscow could sell in hard-currency markets.

In the other direction, the paper continued, Czechoslovakia's industry benefits greatly from the large market afforded by the Soviet Union for industrial products.

"True patriots" in Czechoslovakia understand the importance of maintaining and expanding economic ties with the Soviet Union, Pravda emphasized. It added:

"Only a pitiful handful of political ignoramuses dream about 'broadening the scope' for flirtation with imperialist monopolies, which seduce simpletons with their big moneybags, 'fat' credits, 'advantageous deals,' and similar lavish promises that lead directly to the yoke of dependence on foreign capital."

CZECHS' FALL CONFIRMS RED DOMINO FEARS

(By Joseph Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—Freedom has died in Czechoslovakia, not drowned in brave and youthful blood as it was in Hungary, but brutally strangled with cold, inhuman power and calculation, only a few weeks after the wretched Czechs began rejoicing over their new birth of freedom.

The best evidence now is that this shocking deed began to be planned from the moment the members of the Soviet Presidium discovered, at the Cierna meeting, that they could not break the will and unity of their Czech colleagues. If that is true, the soothing Cierna communiqué was mere dust thrown in the eyes of the Czechs and the rest of the world, to give the Soviet leaders time to decide on their next move.

Certainly, the Soviet armies never ceased to be concentrated along the Czech frontiers,

but were instead augmented and also went through exercises obviously preparatory to invasion. Perhaps the men in the Kremlin hoped, for a while, that Dubcek and the others would draw the correct inference and would move preventively to destroy their country's new-won freedom with their own hands.

At any rate, the thing has happened. A civilized and ancient country, in the very center of Europe, is now to be held down by a foreign occupying army and to be ruled by open hirelings of its foreign masters.

What, one wonders, will be the reaction of those men of the left whose indignation waxes so hot when it is a question of Western or even American "imperialism"? What difference will these people find, between the occupation of Czechoslovakia by Adolf Hitler and the occupation of Czechoslovakia by Leonid Brezhnev and his jolly crew?

One can already hear the self-deluding explanations, that the Soviets have made a "great mistake" (such a splendid silver lining for the Czechs!) because of "the effect on world opinion" of this piece of calculated ruthlessness. The same damn fools said the same things about Hungary.

But by their own grim standards, the Soviets have made no mistake at all. They do not parrot twaddle about the "discredited domino theory" (which always makes one wonder just who discredited it). They knew that sooner or later the dominoes would begin tumbling in Eastern Europe if freedom was permitted to be reborn there. And they therefore moved against the Czechs as they had moved against the Hungarians.

Such are the cruel realities. The prime question is whether the smallest notice will be taken of these cruel realities in the left-wing academic and intellectual circles in this country. The left-wing academics and intellectuals have more and more wallowed in self-deception throughout the last seven years; and by their wallowings they have managed to deceive millions of other rather more sensible people.

Seven years is the time-frame, because that is the period that has elapsed since the Cuban missile crisis. President John Kennedy did not refer scornfully to the "discredited domino theory." He believed in it, as he once publicly testified; and for that very reason he risked a thermonuclear confrontation to get the Soviet missiles out of Cuba.

This great achievement led directly to the liquidation of the second Berlin crisis—that domino theory at work again! And these events produced what can only be called a widespread Dr. Pangloss-illusion. All was now supposed to be "for the best in this best of all possible worlds," as the good doctor kept telling poor Candide.

More specifically, the remorseless fangs of history were supposed to have been drawn. The cold war was supposed to be over. The Soviet Union was supposed to be rapidly evolving into the kind of peaceable, unmilitary, genially free society in which the left-wing academics and their chums, the liberal editorial writers, could give their egos runs in the yard with perfect impunity.

Well, who can believe this now? Brezhnev has demonstrated once again that everyone should have known all along—that the Soviets never hesitate to use military force if they think they do so with impunity; that they care not a snap of their fingers for "international morality" or "world opinion"; and that they will do anything they believe it is safe to do to serve their own hard interests.

What can doubt, then, that they may one day support Arab genocide in Israel, which will give them the riches of the Middle East, if they begin to suspect that no one will interfere? And what can more rapidly nourish such Soviet suspicions than the kind of collapse of American resolve that Senators Eugene McCarthy, Ted Kennedy and others are now seeking to promote?

SOVIET UNION'S COUP DISPELS LIBERAL MYTH (By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—The "Communist myth," so often brushed aside by "liberals" as imaginary, has all of a sudden become a reality. The argument of the "doves" that the Soviet Union and most of the Communist-bloc states in Eastern Europe constitute no threat to world peace and that they should be given trade benefits and other concessions by the United States has evaporated overnight.

The world is back again to where it was more than a decade ago when the Soviet armies crushed an uprising of the people of Hungary. Then, after having connived to weaken the NATO alliance in Europe, the Soviets proceeded to build up North Vietnam and finally to provoke Hanoi's aggression against South Vietnam as a means of diverting American attention from Europe.

In virtually all free nations today a unanimous condemnation is being expressed against the Soviet Union for its invasion of Czechoslovakia and its attempts to suppress the few freedoms that have been allowed the people there. The hopes of the Czechs for a degree of independence from Soviet domination were abruptly shattered as the Soviet armies, aided by military forces of East Germany, Hungary, Bulgaria and Poland—puppets of Moscow—crossed the Czech border. In the capital at Prague the leaders who had dared to institute reforms in the Communist system have been imprisoned.

President Johnson stated the case clearly when he said that "a defenseless country" has been invaded in order to "stamp out a resurgence of ordinary human freedom." He added:

"The excuses offered by the Soviet Union are patently contrived. The Czechoslovakian government did not request its allies to intervene in its internal affairs. No external aggression threatened Czechoslovakia. The action of the Warsaw Pact allies is in flat violation of the United Nations Charter."

There are, of course, in the United States a few politically minded critics who immediately cried out that Russia is merely doing what the United States did in Vietnam. No parallel, however, exists because the South Vietnamese government formally requested the help of the United States after trying in vain to repel by itself the infiltration by the Communists from North Vietnam. The Moscow government makes no secret of the fact that within the last three years it has provided billions of dollars worth of munitions and supplies to the North Vietnamese to carry on the aggression against South Vietnam.

The case for American assistance to South Vietnam now will be strengthened before world opinion. It is clear that the Soviet government does not extend military or economic aid and then let go of its control over the smaller countries, but insists instead on dominating their governments and denying them a right to rule themselves. The United States has explicitly stated that its objective in South Vietnam is to assure the people there the right of self-determination and that, once this is accomplished, our troops will be withdrawn.

Since the Soviet Union has a veto in the Security Council of the United Nations, this leaves the question to be handled by the General Assembly of the U.N., which can adopt a resolution as it did in 1956 condemning the Soviet Union for "depriving Hungary of its liberty and independence." But it is doubtful that such a resolution will make any more impression today on Moscow than it did 12 years ago.

Meanwhile, the world has been awakened to the somber fact that military power exerted by the Soviets in defiance of the provisions of the United Nations Charter can at any moment break the peace on every continent. A stronger alliance of nations than the U.N. will have to be formed in order to be able to mobilize a military force of such

strength as to command the respect of would-be aggressors.

The Soviet Union has not only made a big error in Czechoslovakia, but it has assumed that the United States is powerless to draw together the other nations of the world to thwart any further extension of Soviet imperialism. World opinion, however, can quickly be mobilized. For it now is evident that the policies of the present Moscow regime are no different from those which prevailed under Khrushchev or Stalin. The Communist drive for world domination still threatens the peace of mankind and makes a "detente" with the present leaders in the Kremlin a dangerous policy of acquiescence in Communist imperialism.

2. THE THREAT TO RUMANIA AND YUGOSLAVIA [From the New York Times, Aug. 25, 1968] HUNGARY ACCUSES RUMANIA OF FOLLOWING THE IMPERIALIST'S LINE ON CZECHOSLO- VAKIA—TWO NEWSPAPERS SCORE CEAUDESCU— BUCHAREST CROWDS OBSERVE NATIONAL HOLIDAY WEEKEND IN A CAREFREE MOOD (By Israel Shenker)

BUDAPEST, August 24.—The Hungarian press sharply assailed President Nicolae Ceausescu of Rumania today for his stand in the Czechoslovak crisis.

Having withheld attack yesterday in deference to the Rumanian National Day, the controlled press here accused Mr. Ceausescu of parroting the imperialist line on Czechoslovakia.

Magyar Memzet found it "very strange" that on the part of high-ranking leaders of Rumania, "incomprehension in the highest degree and even willful misinterpretation can be experienced."

The newspaper added: "There is a strange similarity between the tone and the content of Ceausescu's speech and the phrases repeated a hundred times a day by Western radio stations."

On Wednesday, Mr. Ceausescu called the Soviet-led intervention in Czechoslovakia "a big mistake and a severe danger for peace in Europe and socialism in the world." He said that there was no justification for the occupation of Czechoslovakia and warned that "intervention into the internal affairs" of other Communist parties must end.

INDEPENDENT SPIRIT SHOWN

For several years Rumania has shown an increasing desire for independence from Soviet direction, but Mr. Ceausescu views this week were unprecedentedly plainspoken. There was considerable speculation about how the Soviet Union would react to the Rumanian leader's utterances.

By degrees, Rumania has in fact managed a partial withdrawal from the hegemony of her powerful neighbor. The clearest and latest evidence was the failure of Bucharest to participate in the invasion of Czechoslovakia.

Until now, the Hungarian Communist party—along with fraternal parties elsewhere in Eastern Europe—has refrained from attacking Rumania.

With the wraps now off, the Budapest newspaper Esti Hirlap, organ of the Budapest Communist Party Committee, joined the fray. It, too, attacked Mr. Ceausescu by name—and said Rumania should remember that the Soviet Union liberated it from the Germans in World War II.

SOVIET DENOUNCES CEAUDESCU

Moscow, August 24.—The Soviet Government newspaper Izvestia denounced President Ceausescu today for aiding the Czechoslovak "counter-revolution" through his speeches.

As an example of Mr. Ceausescu's alleged help to counter-revolutionaries, Izvestia cited his statement that "no one can act as an advisor or mentor on how and in what way socialism should be built."

September 5, 1968

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

Izvestia, in an article by Vladimir Kudryavtsev, said that the thesis that each country chooses its own path to socialism was correct, but was being abused.

"Certain people so ignore the principles that are common to all socialist countries that they contribute to the Czechoslovak counter-revolution in its desire to break Czechoslovakia away from the socialist commonwealth, Izvestia said.

RUMANIANS ENJOY HOLIDAY

(By John M. Lee)

BUCHAREST, August 24.—Despite continuing anxiety over Czechoslovakia and possible repercussions for Rumania, Bucharest settled back today to enjoy a warm, sunny holiday weekend.

Seemingly carefree crowds in sports clothes swarmed through the lush Cismigiu Gardens in the downtown area, packed the sidewalk cafes and outdoor restaurants and strolled down the broad tree-lined Margheru Boulevard, the Champs-Élysées of Bucharest.

There were long lines for Italian movies and for a Tarzan picture so old that it starred Johnny Weismuller. The only uniforms in evidence were on traffic policemen and guards at Government buildings.

Yet, transistor radios brought, newscasts to restaurant tables, and small crowds gathered to hear the latest bulletins. Almost every other person seemed to have a morning newspaper, turned to Czechoslovak developments.

PEOPLE TALK READILY

Rumanians talked readily to visitors and condemned the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia. "It is an impossible situation," said a young woman student. "How do the Russians think they can do this?"

How did she think Rumania had escaped a similar repression?

"Perhaps we are better diplomats," she smiled.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 29, 1968]

TITO SEES AIDES AS CONCERN OVER SOVIET GROWS—BELGRADE BELIEVED FEARFUL OF A SURGE IN NEO-STALINISM—BUT APPREHENSION OVER PERIL OF INVASION SEEMS EASED

(By Paul Hofmann)

BELGRADE, YUGOSLAVIA, August 28—President Tito reviewed the Czechoslovak situation with aides today amid apparently deepening concern within the Yugoslav regime over what it fears is a surge of Neo-Stalinism in the Soviet Union.

An official announcement said today that Marshal Tito had conferred with Trpe Javoklevski, the Yugoslav Ambassador in Prague, on the northern Adriatic Island of Brioni. The announcement conveyed to the public the information that the President was back in his summer residence after five days in and near Belgrade, and that he was still concerned about Czechoslovakia.

Many Yugoslavs saw Marshal Tito's return to Brioni as a sign that a crisis that they felt had menaced their country as well as Czechoslovakia had passed.

The President came to Belgrade from Brioni last week and warned in a speech Friday that Yugoslavia would fight against any threat to her independence. The clear implication was that Soviet political or military pressure might present such a threat.

REGIME SILENT ON ACCORD

Though many Yugoslav Army specialists who were recalled to active service over the weekend are still with their units, the feeling today was that if there ever had been a Soviet threat to attack Yugoslavia it had receded.

Government spokesmen would not comment on the agreement reached in Moscow to settle the dispute between Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union. "There isn't even a Czechoslovak reaction yet," one official said.

Newspapers were cautious and skeptical on whether the Moscow agreement would work.

Borba, a Belgrade newspaper close to the Communist party apparatus, said that "time and practice" alone would tell the value of the accord.

Vecernje Novosti, the afternoon edition of Borba, said that socialism had in the past paid much too high a price to agree to return into Stalin's "pen of obedient sheep."

Anxiety here over a possible resurgence of Stalinism in the Soviet Communist party is caused by concern that Moscow may again tend to regard Yugoslavia as a part of the Soviet sphere of influence. This is a concept that led to the break between Stalin and Marshal Tito in 1948.

The Yugoslav Communist party is engaged in a nationwide campaign to remind its members and the people at large that the Yugoslav system is different from that of Soviet-bloc Communism, not only in its rejection of the Czechoslovak invasion but also in its social and economic institutions at home.

In the hundreds of local meetings that the Communist party is organizing these days, expressions of sympathy for Czechoslovakia are coupled with the praise for Yugoslavia's own "road toward socialism."

Self-management—the participation of Yugoslav workers in the managerial decisions affecting their plant or enterprises—is being hailed as the cornerstone of the Yugoslav system and as an example that the Czechoslovak reformers intend to follow.

RUMANIANS HEAR OF DEMAND

(Special to the New York Times)

BUCHAREST, August 28.—Rumors circulated in Bucharest today that the Soviet Union had commanded Rumania to allow Warsaw Pact military maneuvers on Rumanian territory. But Foreign Office officials said they had no information on such a demand.

Despite Rumania's strained relations with the Soviet Union, the Government has maintained nominal membership in the Warsaw Pact. However, Rumania has not participated in maneuvers under the treaty since 1962, and is generally inactive in Warsaw Pact affairs.

The new line of "continuing counterrevolution" is apparently designed to justify a lengthy stay of the Warsaw Pact occupation troops to "protect socialism" in Czechoslovakia. But for the young party member it only caused confusion.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 29, 1968]

RUMANIAN LEADERS BAR CZECH-TYPE LIBERALISM BUT VOW INDEPENDENCE—CITIZENS SAY THEY WOULD FIGHT RUSSIANS; NATION IS SEEKING CLOSE ECONOMIC TIES TO WEST

(By Ray Vicker)

BUCHAREST.—Unlike Czechoslovakia, Rumania poses few threats to the Soviet Union on purely ideological grounds.

Indeed, the leaders in this East European capital are about as eager to stray from orthodox Communist doctrine by eliminating press censorship and police powers as are the men in the Kremlin.

Yet Rumania exercises its own brand of national independence, free of Soviet domination. It was this strain of independence—with the determination to maintain it—that led President Nicolae Ceausescu to support the Czech regime so vigorously that he placed Rumania's army on alert "to defend our Socialist homeland" against a similar invasion.

Last week thousands of students, workers, soldiers and farmers marched in patriotic parades and staged political rallies in a show of unity behind President Ceausescu's government. Their fervor can't be misinterpreted. "If the Russians come," says a mechanic "we should fight them—everywhere."

That a clash of arms between Rumania and Russia will yet take place seems less likely than it did a few days ago. The uproar that greeted the Soviet-led invasion—and its limited success in de-liberalizing the Czech regime—makes this an increasingly unpopular form of political persuasion.

Moreover, in recent days, Rumanian leaders have considerably played down their criticism of the Soviets, possibly in response to Russian countercharges that any Rumanian fears of invasion are completely unwarranted.

AN END TO INTERFERENCE

But the more moderate Rumanian tone doesn't reflect any basic change in the sentiments of the government or the 19 million citizens. "An end must be put for good and all to interference in the affairs of other states and of other parties," declares Mr. Ceausescu, who is Communist Party leader as well as Rumania's president.

An architect, Theodor Sturdza, simply asks: "Who can trust the Russians after the invasion of Czechoslovakia?"

Not that Russians were winning popularity contests here even before their misadventure in Czechoslovakia. Rumania's independent position began taking shape in 1961, in fact, as a reaction to a Soviet master plan calling on her to concentrate on agricultural and raw materials production for trade with other Communist bloc countries. Instead, Rumania adopted its own economic program, emphasizing industry and closer trade relations with the West.

By 1967, Rumania had asserted itself to the point that only 47% of its trade was with Socialist countries. The first of six British-made jets have been delivered to Rumania's airline—with Yugoslavia the only other East European nation to utilize Western aircraft.

Rather than purchase oil from Russia, Rumania recently concluded a substantial contract to buy from Iran. And an American concern, Universal Oil Products Co. of Des Plaines, Ill., has built a \$22 million oil refinery for Rumania—which again snubbed Russia on the deal.

VISITING THE UNITED STATES

Talks with trade officials here clearly indicate that Rumania would like even closer economic relations with the U.S. Recently Deputy Premier Alexandru Birladeanu spent several weeks in the U.S. investigating ways Rumania might acquire more technical equipment for developing industries.

There is also an emotional aspect to Rumania's current dispute with the Soviet Union. "Nobody in Rumania likes the Russians," says a student at Bucharest University. He says that after Russian was dropped as a compulsory second language a few years ago, "nobody would take it—English and French are the languages we study."

To be sure, a visitor from the West is quickly reminded that this Communist country still maintains tight central controls and all the trappings of a police state.

When a foreigner began snapping photographs not long ago of a barefoot woman in a marketplace in the city of Craiova, a policeman briefly placed him under arrest. Later, when he dropped in on friends in Tirgu Jiu, a police car pulled up at the door within minutes to investigate.

The press is not free in a Western or even Czechoslovakian sense. But during the current crisis the Ceausescu government has permitted newspapers the exceptional freedom of reporting all Czech developments. Radio Bucharest similarly has transmitted all available statements by Czech leaders and all clandestine radio broadcasts.

Unlike the Czechs, the Rumanians have almost no concept of democracy and practically none of the thirst for personal liberty that was demonstrated in Czechoslovakia. Rumania has never experienced a Western-

S 10298

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 5, 1968

style democracy, and there are few demands for political change.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 30, 1968]
**RUMANIANS FIRM; WARN RUSSIANS—AGAIN
 URGE TROOPS PULL OUT—TELL OF BLOC
 "TENSION"**

(By John M. Lee)

BUCHAREST, August 29.—Rumanian Communist leaders declared today that they attached the "utmost importance" to the complete withdrawal of Warsaw Pact forces from Czechoslovakia "in the shortest time."

The officials also appeared to warn the Soviet Union against further incursions that might exacerbate relations between Communist countries. They asserted:

"It is imperative that absolutely nothing should be undertaken that might worsen these relations or deepen the divergencies and breed fresh sources of tension."

The firm declarations were contained in a statement by the Executive Committee of the party's Central Committee, published in the party newspaper, *Scintela*, and other papers. It was the first Rumanian comment on the Soviet-Czechoslovak agreement reached in Moscow on Tuesday.

The agreement called for the gradual withdrawal of forces as soon as conditions in Czechoslovakia are "normalized." Two divisions are to remain behind to help guard the West German border.

TONE TERMED RESOLUTE

Western diplomats were impressed by the resolute tone of the Rumanian comment. In their view, Rumania is continuing to insist that each national Communist party should be able to determine its own development, as the Rumanian party has done, free from outside interference.

The statement did nothing to yield to criticism by the Soviet Union, Hungary and Poland of Rumania's breakaway stance.

"The Executive Committee expresses to the Communists of Czechoslovakia, to the Czech and Slovak people, its feelings of warm sympathy, of support and full internationalist solidarity," the statement said.

It recalled that Rumania had expressed "anxiety and disapproval" over the invasion of Czechoslovakia Aug. 20, and it noted that the return to office of Czechoslovak leaders and the resumption of activity by party and government bodies "create conditions for undertaking the complex tasks facing them."

"At the same time," the statement went on, "the Executive Committee considers of utmost importance the carrying into effect of the complete withdrawal, in the shortest time, of the armed forces of the five socialist countries from Czechoslovakia."

POLAND ASSAILS RUMANIA

(By Jonathan Randal)

WARSAW, August 29.—Poland assailed Rumania today for having placed "sovereignty and independence" above allegiance to Soviet-led Communism. The criticism came in an article observers interpreted as a possible prelude to further pressures on the Bucharest regime by the orthodox Communist nations.

An unsigned 2,500-word article in the party newspaper, *Trybuna Ludu*, reflecting the views of the Polish leadership, castigated Rumania for having denounced the invasion of Czechoslovakia in disregard of the "supreme dictate of the moment."

In language that recalled the strong words employed in the state-controlled Polish press against Czechoslovakia in past months, the article, also attacked President Nicolae Ceausescu of Rumania by name for the first time since the invasion last week.

Observers said that this was a practice normally reserved for the most serious inter-party polemics.

Also for the first time since the invasion, Wladyslaw Gomulka, the Polish party leader, consulted with members of the ruling 12-man Politburo. The official Polish press agency limited its report to noting that he had discussed "present problems of the international situation."

Also present were five other Politburo members, regional party leaders, Central Committee department directors and others who were described as certain ministers.

Trybuna Ludu also criticized Rumania for having established diplomatic relations with West Germany last year and for having failed to break diplomatic ties with Israel after the war in the Middle East in June 1967.

Rumania is the only Eastern European country that has established relations with Bonn and the only one that did not follow Moscow's lead in breaking with Israel last year.

The newspaper said that Rumanian support for Czechoslovakia "indicates that the objective was not 'defense of democracy and sovereignty' but disintegration of the socialist commonwealth."

[From the Baltimore Sun, Aug. 31, 1968]

**BLOC TROOPS SAID TO MOVE ON ROMANIA—
 CZECH RADIO REPORTS NINE RUSSIAN DIVISIONS
 NEAR BORDER**

(By Stuart S. Smith)

PRAGUE, August 30.—A Czechoslovak radio station transmitting from somewhere in Bohemia said today that the Warsaw powers are massing troops along their borders with Rumania.

According to the broadcast, the Soviet Union has moved nine military divisions into Bucovina alone. Bulgaria, it said, has transferred two divisions of troops to its frontier with Rumania and Hungary has deployed three divisions along its eastern boundary.

COOPERATION CALL

In London, Joseph Luns, the Dutch Foreign Minister, said the situation in the Balkans is a serious cause for concern and called for improved Atlantic alliance cooperation.

In New York, Corneliu Manescu, the Rumanian Foreign Minister and current United Nations General Assembly president, held talks with United Nations officials to sound out their attitude toward a possible invasion of his country. Mr. Manescu also spoke with George W. Ball, the United States Ambassador to the United Nations.

TROOP WITHDRAWAL

Bucovina and Moldavia are former Rumanian provinces which the Soviet Union took from Rumania at the close of World War II.

Two weeks ago, President Nicolae Ceausescu indicated that the Rumanian military forces had been withdrawn from the Warsaw Pact command and simultaneously ordered the immediate arming of the country's Workers' Militia.

TANK PULLOUT TERMS ARE SET FOR PRAGUE
 (By a Sun staff correspondent)

PRAGUE, August 30.—The Soviet military commander here warned today that Russia will keep its tanks in the Czechoslovak capital until the citizens remove the anti-Soviet slogans from the city's wall.

The Czechoslovak National Front Organization later appealed to the people to remove the offending placards.

Radio Prague quoted the commander, Gen. Ivan Velichko, as saying all posters, signs and banners would have to be taken down or painted over before he would transfer his forces.

DUBCEK POSITION

The announcement conflicts with Alexander Dubcek's speech Tuesday which said

the invading military units were to be removed forthwith.

Shortly after his return from his Moscow negotiations with the Kremlin's top officials, Mr. Dubcek, the Czechoslovak Communist party leader, said "we agreed" that the occupation forces "in the towns and villages will immediately depart to designated areas. This is naturally connected with the extent to which our own Czechoslovak authorities will themselves be capable in individual towns of insuring order and normal life."

Except for the first few days immediately following the Warsaw powers' attack, there has been no public disorder in Czechoslovakia, and some major cities, Pilsen, for example, have had no sizable occupation units since the middle of last week.

TWO HUNDRED TANKS REMAIN

Prague, however, is still jammed with Soviet military equipment, including at least 200 battle tanks, more than that many armored cars, numerous howitzers, one or more heavy motor batteries, machine gun emplacements and other heavy arms.

Although the soldiers and their weapons are no longer occupying the Government and party headquarters, they still hold most of the capital's newspaper offices, radio and television stations, printing plants and other key communications points, including the Prague airport.

Many large fields within easy firing range of the city's heart are full of Soviet troops, helicopters, military communications equipment and other paraphernalia.

REBUKE ON INVASION

The Czechoslovak National Front's central committee also rebuked the Warsaw powers, declaring that their invasion violated the "basic norms of international law."

The committee also called upon the occupation authorities to release the political prisoners they have arrested during the last ten days and to refrain from interfering any longer in the nation's affairs.

Soviet officials have demanded that what they call the "illegal" newspapers here stop publishing; and that the free Czechoslovak radio stations be silenced.

3. CZECHOSLOVAKIA BEFORE THE OCCUPATION
 (From the New York Times, Sept. 20, 1967)

**A CZECH WRITER DESCRIBES HIS INNER
 STRUGGLE**

(By Richard Eder)

PRAGUE, September 19.—"The social revolution has triumphed in our country, but the problem of power is still with us. We have taken the bull by the horns and we are holding on, and yet something keeps biting us in the seat of the pants."

With these words Ludvik Vaculik, a 41-year-old Prague writer, began a speech, delivered two and a half months ago, whose repercussions are still agitating party and intellectual circles in Czechoslovakia. Spoken at the writers' congress at the end of June, the words of Mr. Vaculik and four or five other writers transformed what had been expected to be a stormy session into something verging on a revolution.

For the last three years or so, Czechoslovak cultural activity has been the freest and most inventive in Eastern Europe, in striking contrast to the conservative attitude of most party leaders. Films, plays, novels and literary essays have, with varying degrees of directness, voiced demands for personal freedom and the supremacy of private values.

DIRECT CHALLENGE TO REGIME

At the writers' congress those themes were distilled into a far more direct challenge to the regime. In essence Mr. Vaculik and others insisted that freedom as a concession was not enough, and that the regime must

recognize freedom as a right, surrendering part of its power through such a recognition.

Mr. Vaculik's speech, as well as the other speeches at the congress, have not been published in Czechoslovakia, but word of them has spread. Reports of the speech have appeared in West German and Swiss papers.

Mr. Vaculik, who has been denounced by President Antonin Novotny and other high party officials, and who faces party disciplinary action, told the congress that the party monopoly of power made its liberalizing gestures suspect.

FIRM GUARANTEES DEMANDED

"I can see a continual attempt, with all the dangers it implies, to bring back the bad times," he said, "What use is it that we have been given the literary fund, the publishing houses, the journals Behind all this is the threat that they will take it back if we are unruly."

"We are told that the old abuses are not being committed," he continued. "Am I supposed to feel grateful? I don't, I see no real guarantees."

"Why can't we live where we want? Why can't tailors spend three years in Vienna, and painters 30 years in Paris, and come back to live here without being regarded as criminals?"

He went on to speak of the effect that the party monopoly of power had on the country.

"Power is a specific human condition," he said. "It overwhelms the rulers and the ruled and threatens the health of both."

He suggested that the instability of a democracy was preferable to the rigidity of the present system.

CITIZEN IS RENEWED

"There the government falls, but the citizen is renewed," he said. "On the contrary, where the government remains continually in power, the citizen falls."

"He does not fall at the execution post. That happens perhaps to a few dozen or a few hundred only, but this is enough. For this is followed by the whole nation's falling into fear, into political apathy, into trivial concerns and into a growing dependence on smaller and smaller masters."

Speaking "as a citizen of a state that I will not renounce, but in which I cannot live happily," he assailed the mediocrity to which life had been reduced.

"I believe that the citizen is extinct in our country," he said. "We are joined by the most despicable of ties: a common frustration."

He said the system elevated "the most pedestrian types" and submerged "the complex personalities, individuals with personal attractiveness, and most of all those whose character and deeds had become an unspoken standard of decency."

Mr. Vaculik, who played an active role in the party when younger, said that the party did not hesitate to use threats of torture or blackmail as well as temptation to hold its followers. It appeals to the ambitious and the greedy, as well as to "the selfless but poorly informed enthusiasts of whom I am one."

ANSWER: "I DON'T KNOW"

He told the Congress that he was criticizing not Socialism but power, even though the organs of power tried to confuse the two. As to whether they could be disentangled at this late date, in order, as he put it, to "translate the dream into reality," he said the only answer he could give was, "I don't know."

Though his views are widely echoed, Czech writers and intellectuals have disavowed as a fraud a purported protest manifesto attributed to more than 400 intellectuals and printed in the West. The document accused the party of a "witch hunt."

After the writers' Congress there was an immediate effort by the party to condemn Mr. Vaculik and three other speakers, Pavel Kohout, Ivan Kline and A. J. Liehm all were replaced as candidates for the Central Committee of the Writers Union.

The literary magazines and the newspapers came out with editorials attacking the speakers, following the lead of President Novotny and of the party's cultural overseer, Jiri Hendrych.

Nevertheless, it was noted that the editorials were not so strong as they might have been. There is, in fact, a tendency among a number of more conservative writers who have good party connections to defend the right of Mr. Vaculik and the others to speak as they did while disagreeing with what they said.

The party Central Committee is expected to announce its verdict at the end of the month, both on the individual writers and on the broader question of whether there is to be a formal curtailing of intellectual freedom. Despite the anger of the party leaders, there are widespread reports that the efforts of the more influential members of the intellectual community to prevent a crackdown will succeed, at least partly, and that the party decision will be some form of compromise.

PREPARED FOR WHAT COMES

Mr. Vaculik, a pale, casually dressed man who speaks modestly of his work—he has published two novels, the most recent of which won wide praise—says he is prepared for whatever comes. Sitting in the writers' club over a lemonade, and pausing to talk with fellow writers who came up to greet him affectionately, he spoke briefly of himself.

The son of a carpenter in a Moravian village, he worked as an apprentice in a shoe factory and, when World War II ended, came to Prague to study.

"I joined the party in 1946—back when there were a number of choices," he said. "I thought it had the most courageous program, the most logical one. As time went by and things didn't work, I thought it was because certain figures were no good."

"Later I began to suspect that the system itself was * * *

"I would start over again from the beginning," he said with a smile, "from where I was in 1946. I would try to work, to write, to see what I could do, I would be free."

Expulsion from the party would jeopardize his job on the editorial board of Literarni Noviny, the principal literary magazine. Other members of the board, including the editor, Dusan Hamsik, said, however, that they saw no reason why he should be removed.

Asked why, in view of his opinion of the party structure, he did not resign, Mr. Vaculik answered:

"If the people who think as I do, and there are very many, would stay in the party and work, perhaps we could make the party what it ought to be."

He said this tentatively, as if not especially convinced, and added: "But I wouldn't advise young people to join it. Three years ago, perhaps I would have. Now I think it is too difficult."

What should young people do if they do not join the party?

"I have no answer," he said. "Perhaps that is why they are so apathetic, so selfish, because they have no answer either. They do not have the illusion about the party that we did, and they don't believe in anything else."

He paused, and then said with the mixture of puzzlement and regret that Czechoslovaks of his generation use when they speak of the people in their twenties: "They are so poor. And so free."

[From the Baltimore Sun, July 11, 1968]
RED TROOPS MOVING IN, CZECHS HEAR—RADIO PRAGUE QUOTES NEWS REPORTS FROM WEST GERMANY

(By Stuart S. Smith)

BONN, July 10.—Quoting West German news reports, Radio Prague said tonight that more foreign Warsaw Pact troops are marching into Czechoslovakia.

"We can only hope there is no reason to worry," Radio Prague commented.

Earlier this evening the Czechoslovak Defense Ministry admitted the Soviet Union is balking over the withdrawal of its soldiers. Soviet, Polish and Hungarian units entered Czechoslovakia in May and June for the Warsaw Pact "staff exercises."

NEW SITUATION

"A new situation has arisen," a ministry spokesman explained during an interview with Radio Prague. "The whole matter is being negotiated anew," he said.

On July 2 Major General Josef Cepicky, the Czechoslovak spokesman for last month's Warsaw Pact maneuvers, said during a television program "all foreign armies will be out of our territory within three days."

Asked about this statement during tonight's broadcast, the Defense Ministry official commented: "Since it [the Soviet withdrawal] has not yet achieved, it means a new situation has arisen. The whole matter is being discussed anew. I cannot make a comment at this time. Perhaps tomorrow."

SOME 27,000 SOVIET TROOPS

Prague sources said that as of last night there were 27,000 Soviet troops in Czechoslovakia but added that additional troops, particularly from Hungary, are currently marching into the country.

Reliable Communist officials said Monday that Czechoslovak leaders had capitulated to Kremlin demands that foreign Warsaw Pact troops remain on Czechoslovak territory until further notice.

Soviet Marshal Ivan I. Yakubovsky, the Warsaw Alliance military commander, has reportedly refused to recall his men from Czechoslovakia on the grounds that Antonin Novotny, the discredited former president and party chief, agreed that the maneuvers could continue through August.

BEGAN JUNE 20

The maneuvers began June 20. On June 30 the Polish, Czechoslovak and Soviet news agencies announced that the maneuvers had ended. Soon thereafter, however, Tass, the official Soviet agency, withdrew the story, even though it had already been printed in Pravda, the Soviet party newspaper, and stated the maneuvers would continue. Czechoslovak officials immediately said the maneuvers were over, all reports to the contrary notwithstanding.

Yesterday Col. Gen. Martin Dzur, the Czechoslovak Defense Minister, said that 35 per cent of the foreign troops had left the country and that discussions with the Warsaw Pact command were taking place about sending the rest home.

WRITERS' UNION OBJECTS

Today, though, Prague officials close to the Czechoslovak Communist party leadership, said the foreign troops will remain and will be reinforced. General Dzur, it was added, has threatened to resign.

The Czechoslovak Writers' Union has sent a letter to the Soviet Embassy in Prague warning that the continued presence of Russian soldiers in the country might cause "indignation" among the Czechoslovak citizens. This, however, may well be what the Kremlin is waiting for as an excuse to stamp out the democratization movement.

This morning Prague newspapers demanded that their Government announce a

S 10300

definite date for the departure of the last foreign soldiers. There have been no foreign garrisons in Czechoslovakia since the end of World War II. The limited number of Soviet officers who advised the Czechoslovak Army left the country some years ago and there is no plan to ask them to return, Czechoslovak officials say.

Several offices have been flooded with letters. Their telephone switchboards have been swamped with calls asking when the foreign soldiers are to leave.

"If everything is all right what is preventing the officials of our Army from giving precise information?" inquired *Mlad Fronta*, the Czechoslovak Youth Union Daily. "Unclear and contradictory information only increases the uncertainty and plays into the hands of those who spread alarming reports."

The East German, Polish, Hungarian, Bulgarian and Soviet Communist parties have written notes to the Czechoslovak Communist party expressing their concern about the liberalization movement. The letters differ in tone. The Ulbricht regime's is said to be the toughest, allegedly accusing the Czechoslovak leadership of being revisionists.

SUMMIT REJECTED

Late Monday the Czechoslovak party Central Committee Presidium reportedly rejected demands to attend a Communist summit conference this week.

The Prague newspaper *Zemedeľske Noviny* commented: "It would hardly be of any use if we were to go to the conference table in the role of . . . heretics." The newspaper said Czechoslovakia is ready to have bilateral talks with any interested party provided the country's sovereignty is respected.

In Moscow this morning *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, a political and literary newspaper, charged that counter-revolutionary forces have developed in Czechoslovakia. The term is reserved only for the Kremlin's worst enemies. It was applied once to describe the Hungarian uprising which the U.S.S.R. crushed with its tanks in 1956.

MANIFESTO ASSAILED

Literaturnaya Gazeta asserted that the recent Czechoslovak "Two Thousand Words" manifesto signed by the country's leading intellectuals and sportsmen was a quote "Provocative, inflammatory, anti-Communist, counter-revolutionary action program."

The manifesto has found wide support among the Czechoslovak citizens even though the party Presidium said it went too far. It called for strikes in the event the new leadership is unable to purge the Czechoslovak party of the foot-dragging conservatives.

Thus far, however, Prague has been exceptionally quiet. The citizens there are well aware of what is at stake and are not going to be provoked into anti-Soviet demonstrations. What might happen if the conservatives deliberately staged an anti-Russian incident as an excuse for bringing the Soviet troops into the city is another question.

[From the Baltimore Sun, July 15, 1968]

BLOC TROOPS REMAIN ON CZECH SOIL—SOVIET, POLISH FORCES DELAY PULLOUT; REDS MEET IN WARSAW

(By Stuart S. Smith)

BONN, July 14.—The withdrawal of Soviet and Polish troops from Czechoslovakia has been postponed because of heavy weekend traffic, CTK, the Czechoslovak news agency, announced tonight.

Prague television said the Warsaw Pact military command ordered the recall put off "until the evening and night hours." "Not a single foreign soldier left Czechoslovak state territory today," the station reported.

TUESDAY TIME SET

Yesterday *Vecerni Praha*, a Prague evening newspaper, said the last foreign units would cross the Czechoslovak frontier at 9 A.M. Tuesday.

Meanwhile, Soviet, East German, Polish, Bulgarian and Hungarian Communist party and Government leaders met in Warsaw today to discuss once again the Czechoslovak liberalization movement.

Czechoslovak officials boycotted the meeting. Romania was apparently not even invited.

LETTERS WERE SENT

Radio Prague noted that the five countries had earlier sent letters to the Czechoslovak party Presidium expressing fears about the fate of Czechoslovak socialism.

"Negotiations were to be held on the subject of these fears," a Radio Prague political commentator said, adding: "We have not accepted this invitation."

Today's meeting in Warsaw was the fourth Communist summit conference since Alexander Dubcek ousted Antonin Novotny from his position as Czechoslovak party secretary January 5.

ROSTER OF HIGH REDS

Among those attending the Warsaw talks were Leonid I. Brezhnev, Soviet party chief; Nikolai V. Podgorny, Soviet President; Alexei N. Kosygin, Soviet Premier; Walter Ulbricht, East German party boss; Willi Stoph, East German Premier; Janos Kadar, Hungarian party leader; Todor Zhivkov, Bulgarian party chief and Premier; Wladislav Gomulka, Polish party leader, and numerous other top officials.

The presence of so many high-ranking persons indicates the seriousness with which some of Czechoslovakia's Warsaw Pact allies take Mr. Dubcek's demands that the Communist movement permit his country to develop a system of democratic socialism without outside interference.

NEVER BEEN SO UNITED

This morning *Prace*, the Czechoslovak trade union newspaper, carried a report from the Polish capital reporting, "In Warsaw they will negotiate about us without us."

An accompanying editorial asserted that "our nation has never before in its history been so united and of the same opinion as it is today."

The nation, *Prace* declared, stands firmly behind Mr. Dubcek, Premier Oldrich Cernik; Josef Smrkovsky, the National Assembly president, "and the progressive representatives of the Communist party and Government."

These forward-looking leaders, the paper said, quite clearly showed our friends, as well as those who criticized our liberalization process, that they represent a sovereign people and a sovereign state.

Prace and other newspapers were again full of resolutions from the public declaring that Czechoslovakia will go its way come what may.

The Czechoslovak Academy of Science, for example, wrote to the Soviet Academy of Science, one of whose members recently accused Czechoslovakia of betraying the Communist cause. "The friendship with your country," the Czechoslovak scientists pointed out, "is still the basis" of the policy. However, the letter added, "we insist that you try to better understand what is going on in our country."

The Czechoslovak academicians invited their Soviet colleagues to send a delegation "to visit us" so that the Soviet scientists would "not only get the information about our country that is being greatly distorted in your press."

A letter from the Prague Hospital staff read in part: "We reject all the slander concerning our leading representatives. The letter rebuked the Soviet for accusing Czechoslovak officials of revisionism and counter-revolutionism, asserting, "we are also a cultured nation with a tradition of many centuries and with a high average intelligence."

REMOVE FOREIGN SOLDIERS

"We want to build Socialism, but on the basis of the highest freedom for man and on humanist values. We demand that everyone take our liberalization process for what it is. Leave us our Sovereignty and remove all foreign soldiers from our territory."

A *Prace* reporter talked with some Soviet Army officers yesterday, reporting that they had packed and expected to be gone within two days. "This is your affair and we wish you much luck," the *Prace* reporter said the Soviet officer told him.

ANTI-BONN POSITION

Trybuna Ludu said it was especially concerned by the efforts of certain Czechoslovak officials to revise the Warsaw Pact's common stand against the Federal Republic of West Germany.

Shortly after Romania recognized West Germany, the other Eastern European alliance states met and reached a secret agreement that none of them would exchange ambassadors with Bonn unless the Federal Republic:

1. Formally recognized the East German Government.
2. Recognized the Oder-Neisse line as Germany's permanent frontier with Poland.
3. Renounced all access to nuclear weapons.
4. Declared the 1938 Munich treaty invalid from its inception.

WARSAW ATTACK

In Warsaw this morning an unsigned but plainly official article in *Trybuna Ludu*, the Polish Communist party newspaper, sharply attacked Czechoslovakia, warning that no country can be permitted to break out of the common front.

"If in a Socialist country the forces of reaction threaten the basis of socialism it is at the same time an assault on the interests of the other Socialist countries," *Trybuna Ludu* asserted.

The paper clearly showed that the five orthodox Communist nations are deeply concerned about the very existence of the Warsaw Pact, commenting: "Its strength and ability to endure" depends upon the internal developments in each member country.

THREATENS SECURITY

"He who would break the backbone of the Socialist States threatens the basis of our alliance, our unity and the security of our fraternal countries," the newspaper declared, adding:

"It is NOT so much the fact that the anti-Communist reaction is rising against socialism, for this it does all the time everywhere, but above all that its activity and its appeals are tolerated "in Czechoslovakia" within the framework of 'democratization' and are not met with determined resistance."

Trybuna Ludu complained that the anti-Communist reaction is finding a "favorable tribune" in the "columns of the Czechoslovak press, on the radio and on television" as well as "in the ranks of the party itself."

[From the Washington Evening Star, July 18, 1968]

CZECHS AGAIN DEFEY SOVIET BLOC, STICK TO LIBERAL POLICY

PRAGUE.—Bolstered by the support of President Tito and Western Europe's two biggest Communist parties, Czechoslovakia's liberal Communist leadership defied the Kremlin and its orthodox allies in Eastern Europe again today.

The Czechoslovak party's presidium replied to the tough demands from the Soviet Union and four other Red governments for reversal of Prague's liberal course by declaring there is nothing "counter-revolutionary" about it.

"We don't see any realistic reasons permitting our present situation to be called counter-revolutionary," the party presidium said

September 5, 1968

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

in a statement published by the Czechoslovak news agency CTK.

FEAR SPREAD OF DRIVE

The statement replied to a letter from the Warsaw conference Sunday and Monday of Communist leaders from the Soviet Union, East Germany, Poland, Hungary and Bulgaria. The Russians, Germans and Poles particularly fear the liberal ferment in Czechoslovakia will spread to their own potentially restive people.

The Czechoslovak reformist regime of Alexander Dubcek already had pledged to continue liberalization, saying it had full support of the people.

The Warsaw letter and a further declaration by the Soviet Communist party's central committee were published in the Soviet press today. They amounted to the strongest and most extraordinary public demands made on a Soviet ally in recent years.

CLAIMS REJECTED

The Czechoslovak presidium called the party central committee to meet tomorrow to approve the reply to the Warsaw letter.

The reply rejected claims by the fearful orthodox that the Communist system in Czechoslovakia was in danger, that the country was preparing to change its foreign policy and "that there is concrete danger of separating our country from the Socialist society."

It expressed surprise at the criticism and said the Czechoslovak Communists consistently base their actions on the principles of Socialist internationalism, the Warsaw Pact alliance and the development of friendly relations with the Soviet Union and other Socialist states.

PURGE DEMANDED

The demands by the Soviet Union and hard-line allies called for Dubcek to restore dictatorial party control, reimpose press censorship and purge liberals from the party. The Warsaw letter accused the Czechoslovak leaders of failing to correct an "absolutely unacceptable" situation.

It also vowed support for the remaining conservatives whom the liberals hoped to oust from the party central committee at a party congress in September.

Neither the letter nor the resolution of the Soviet party, urging "a decisive struggle," said what action would be taken if the Dubcek regime did not give in to the demands.

Meanwhile, the Italian Communist party reaffirmed its solidarity with the Czechoslovak liberalization drive today and called for independence for every Communist party in the world.

BACK CZECH COURSE

The Italian Communist leadership said it "is convinced that the understanding and fraternal and faithful support by the other Communist parties can make a valid contribution to the Czechoslovak Communist party to fight the dangers present in this process of renewal."

An Italian delegation and French Communist party chief Waldeck Rochet were in Moscow earlier this week to urge that the Czechoslovaks be left alone to develop their own policies.

The Prague government announced that Rochet will arrive tomorrow.

Sources in Belgrade disclosed plans to visit Prague by both Tito, who has taken his country along an independent course since he broke with Stalin in 1948, and Romanian Communist leader Nicolae Ceausescu, who has been increasingly defiant of Kremlin control.

A public opinion poll published in Prague yesterday showed the people are overwhelmingly behind Dubcek, and 91 percent of those queried asked that Russian troops withdraw as soon as possible.

The Czechoslovak army said Soviet troops who stayed after the end of Warsaw Pact maneuvers last month were moving out "according to schedule." It said "all Soviet troops" would leave the country but gave no date.

[From the Washington Evening Star,
July 30, 1968]

THREAT TO CZECHS MUTES LIBERALS
(By David Lawrence)

Paradoxes are numerous these days, but none is more conspicuous than the absolute silence about Czechoslovakia which is being maintained by virtually all the groups, organizations, college professors, liberals and others in America who zealously expound the doctrine that people have a right to determine their own form of government.

No such silence prevailed when Rhodesia, for example, tried to solve its internal problems with respect to racial relations. In fact, the United States has joined with other members of the United Nations in imposing almost total sanctions on trade with Rhodesia.

But here is Czechoslovakia threatened by military intervention by the Soviet government if something in line with Moscow-style communism is not adopted. Yet no voices are raised anywhere in Europe or in this country even to express sympathy with the democratic elements in Czechoslovakia which are trying to modify their form of government. Meanwhile, the Soviets are making military threats and have actually mobilized troops on the border of Czechoslovakia to coerce the latter into acceptance of Moscow's dictatorial policies.

The Czech leaders are not trying to abolish communism, but seeking to modify it so that it will be more democratic. They already are permitting considerable freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom of the press. The Soviet government, however, apparently feels it has the right to dictate to the leaders in Prague what they may or may not do in domestic policies.

Members of the 11-man Communist body ruling Czechoslovakia are conferring with top Soviet leaders who have come from Moscow to a meeting on Czech territory near the Soviet border. Upon the outcome of this conference depends whether the Soviet Union will intervene militarily to force the present government to come to terms or will establish a new regime that will adhere to the kind of communism which the Soviets apply throughout the areas they control. Moscow is being supported by Poland, East Germany and Bulgaria—over which it maintains an iron hand—and to a lesser extent by Hungary, which is still occupied by Soviet troops.

The Kremlin leaders are demanding of Czech officials that they turn back toward the Soviet kind of communism—including a resumption of press censorship and the suppression of all non-Communist political activities. Even more, the Czechs are being coerced into maintaining their alliance with the Communist-bloc nations and are being warned about getting too friendly with West Germany or other non-Communist countries. The threat of Soviet military intervention is constant.

The crisis is bound to affect the future of the satellite states in Eastern Europe. Yugoslavia under Tito long ago broke away from Soviet domination, but does have friendly relations with Moscow. Rumania, too, has in recent years asserted more and more independence.

It is understandable that the American government would, for diplomatic reasons, choose to be silent. Washington has kept a hands-off policy in the Czechoslovak controversy because of a belief that nothing should be done that would give Moscow a chance to blame Western governments for what is happening in Czechoslovakia.

When the United States goes to the assistance of a country which is trying to determine its own form of government—such as South Vietnam—"liberals" denounce this as "aggression." Yet they remain silent as the Soviets seek to deny even to "liberal" Communists the right to set up their own system of government within Czechoslovakia. The mobilization of Soviet military forces is plainly a threat of aggression against Czechoslovakia, but none of the Communist parties—in France, Italy or this country—is willing to recognize it.

Certainly there is nothing to prevent private organizations and some of the articulate professors and scholars in America and Western Europe from condemning publicly in most vehement terms the Soviet intervention in the internal affairs of Czechoslovakia. But silence seems to be the rule.

[From the New Leader, Aug. 26, 1968]

WHY MOSCOW FEARS THE CZECHS

(By Victor A. Velen)

The New Course in Czechoslovakia is one of the most important political and social phenomena of the postwar period. Should it be repressed by Soviet intimidation or armed intervention, the repercussions could cause a serious regression in international relations. Should it succeed, this union of democracy and socialism could become a political model for other countries to follow, in the West as well as in the East.

In the effort to explain their position to the Russians, the present Czech leaders have portrayed the New Course as a revival rather than a betrayal of socialism—a revolution aimed at transforming an authoritarian, pseudo-socialist society into a humanitarian "socialist democracy." That the Russians have been incapable of grasping its real nature is understandable, since recent events in Czechoslovakia represent the antithesis of the evolution of Soviet society. Their fear is also understandable, since these events call into question the very viability of the Soviet political system. For they offer proof once again that freedom is a basic motive in history, that the more a society advances, the more imperative the need for freedom becomes.

Throughout their 20-year history, a chronic ailment of the so-called "peoples' democracies" has been a steadily diminishing national consensus. Immediately after World War II, power in these countries was held by a relatively large number of disciplined, idealistic Communists backed by the mass of the working class and the intellectuals. The period of Stalinist terror, and the years of uninspiring collective rule, narrowed down this base of power to an ossified governmental bureaucracy and a sterile Party apparatus. The average citizen became alienated from public life, concerned only with his personal economic and political survival.

In the past decade, however, a new political consciousness has been awakening among the younger generations, who have begun to reject the system that raised and indoctrinated them. They have come to recognize that "man does not live by bread alone": A comparatively secure job and an advanced social security system has not been able to replace their yearning for certain fundamental political ideals.

The revolutionary rumbling in Hungary and Poland following Stalin's death were efforts to broaden the bases of these regimes by eliminating Stalinist methods and practices. But in both cases the primary motivating factor was nationalist sentiment in defiance of Russian domination. The common denominator of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters and the Polish reformists was that they were anti-Russian, and to the extent that they identified the Russians with socialism, also anti-socialist.

The historical and social premises of the Czech revolution are entirely different, as have been its results. Except for East Germany, Czechoslovakia is the only country in Eastern Europe with an old artisan and industrial—as opposed to a rural—tradition. It shared in the general Western European Enlightenment, and has had experience in the formation of democratic ideas and institutions. That is why, incidentally, Czechoslovakia was one of the few countries in Eastern Europe to have a prewar Communist party—the third strongest in the country—represented in Parliament. Thus the search for a new social pattern has not sprung from national aspirations or hatred of the Russians, but from a desire to combine socialism with the older Czechoslovak humanitarian, democratic heritage.

This combination is basically nothing more than a return to pre-Marxian socialism, usually regarded by Communists as petit bourgeois and utopian. It is predicated on the belief that modern socialism can move forward only on the basis of the freedoms (the bourgeois freedoms, as Marx called them) wrung from the ruling classes in the course of centuries of struggle—out of which emerged the great principles of modern democracy that invest sovereignty in the people.

These principles have surfaced spontaneously in Czechoslovakia since last January, but naturally they will not suffice in themselves. They must be anchored in institutions so that no change in line can sweep them away administratively, as has happened in Poland, for example. The road traveled from the "Polish October" of 1956, with its affirmation of free speech, to the anti-Semitic, fascist campaign waged by the Polish regime in repressing the students during the Warsaw riots of 1968, is ample proof that to survive principles must be transformed into legislation.

The Czechs fully recognize this. That is why their first concern, after they eliminated the most powerful Stalinist elements in the highest echelons, was to establish the freedoms of speech and assembly as law. In place of Lenin's simplistic equation, "socialism plus electrification equals communism," the Czechs have devised a more advanced and at the same time more ancient equation, which could be rendered: "Human rights guaranteed in a democratic state, plus scientific progress, plus socialism might at some future date become communism."

The Czechs are probably the first modern society to transform a totalitarian state into one where the citizens actively and effectively participate in the *res publica*. Translated into terms of East European politics, totalitarianism has meant the uncontested rule of an oligarchy—neither elected nor revocable—which claims not only to rule in the name of the proletariat but also to be its supreme expression. In fact, this oligarchy has no connection with the proletariat and maintains its power monopoly for the sake of power alone. The elevation of Marxist theory into a state religion—an empty conglomerate of hollow phrases and formulae—has precluded the objective analysis of real problems and consequently any attempt to solve them.

Czech philosophers have worked for the past eight years to break through this totalitarian vise, and the Prague spring owes much to their conclusions. Writing in the Italian Communist weekly *Rinascita* last June, Karel Kosik went to the heart of the matter: "The Czechoslovak events do not constitute one of the usual political crises, one of the usual economic crises, but rather a crisis in the underlying premises of contemporary ideas on reality as a system of general manipulation, Humanistic socialism, for whose existence or non-existence the struggle is taking place now in Czechoslovakia, is a revolutionary and liberating alternative. . . . If the Czechoslovak experiment should succeed—

and its success depends on whether it will be realized without compromise and half-solutions—we shall be confronted with practical proof that the system of general manipulation may be overcome in its own main contemporary forms: bureaucratic Stalinism and capitalist democracy. . . ."

From January 1968 on, the Czechoslovak public has become aware of the beginnings of "participatory democracy": Political and special interest groups have mushroomed, the organizational and ideological activities of the Communist party have included a greater percentage of its membership. At no time since the Russian Revolution (with the exception of the resistance movements in World War II), has a European Communist party known such an abrupt increase in popular support. According to a public opinion survey published in *Rude Pravo* on July 13, in January only 17 percent of the population had confidence in the ability of the Party to lead the state; by July this figure had increased to 51 percent, with 89 percent supporting the policies of the government.

If widespread participation and support continues, the Czechoslovak experiment may provide a solution to crises that have plagued the social systems of both East and West. Since World War I, for example, it has become increasingly evident that Western parliamentary rule is an inadequate instrument of modern government. Indeed, the more a society relies on scientific solutions, the more "partitocracy" (to use the Italian expression for party rule) comes to resemble authoritarian rule, though still retaining its democratic image in the minds of the people.

Conceivably, the replacement of parties by autonomous political and economic interest groups, intellectual clubs, youth circles, trade unions, agricultural cooperatives, etc., would constitute a permanent forum for national policy and planning much more responsive to the will of the people than the congresses and parliaments of the west. The kind of political stagnation that took place in France under the party rule of the Fourth Republic might no longer be possible. This remodeling of the political organs of state, based on the direct participation of all strata of the population, is a modernized version of the principles set forth by the early humanitarian socialists and anarchists: Saint-Simon, Fourier, Proudhon and Kropotkin.

All speculation is idle, of course, so long as Czechoslovakia remains in an almost impossible political situation. It is virtually surrounded by hostile governments which, in the name of socialism, fear any form of revitalization based on popular expression and assent. The Soviet Union is far less concerned about the independent course taken by Rumania, for instance, because the authoritarian, bureaucratic structure of the state has so far not been challenged there.

The possibility of direct Soviet intervention in Czechoslovakia now appears to depend largely on Russia's judgment of its feasibility. Every likely protest for intervention—including clumsy and obvious attempts at provocation—has certainly been sought. As the war of nerves continues, the world is witnessing new and unequivocal proof of the fundamental differences between libertarian socialism and the authoritarianism of the Soviet stamp.

Although Lenin can in no sense be considered a democrat (when Spanish Socialist leader Urrutia de los Rios asked him about freedom in the Soviet state, he answered, "*La liberte? Pour quel faire?*"), he conceived of the dictatorship of the proletariat as a temporary institution, lasting only until socialism had been established. He also envisaged restrictions on freedom of the press as temporary. Both of Lenin's views are now major heresies in Soviet thinking. The distance that separates the first government *equipe* of the Soviet Union, composed of such brilliant intellectuals as Bukharin, Zinoviev and

Lunacharski from the Brezhnev-Kosygin team is a measure of the extent to which the Soviet ruling class has been transformed into a mediocre and self-perpetuating bureaucracy, imprisoned in its own rigid ideological armor.

Despite the short period of reform and thaw under Khrushchev, the present Russian leadership not only identifies increasingly with the Stalinist past but is also reverting to Stalinist practices. The repression of dissent, started with the sentencing of writers, Andrei Sinyavsky and Yuli Daniel, has continued in a succession of other trials and condemnations designed to bring recalcitrant intellectuals into line. In contrast to Czechoslovakia, the protests of a few intellectuals and students have been lost among the believing mass. The sociological conditions needed to foster a widespread demand for democratization of the Soviet system are not as yet present.

Formalized, primitive Marxism continues to be accepted unquestioningly, as well as credited with the great technological advances made by the Russians. Lenin's mummy is still the most revered icon of the Russian cathedral. And the fumes of self adulation have not begun to clear the altars. Polemicizing against the Czech philosopher Vaclav Hencel, who affirmed that socialism can be divided into authoritarian and democratic models, *Pravda* stated flatly: "There can be only one kind of socialism and that is Soviet socialism, which is the supreme form of democracy."

So long as the present Soviet leadership is in power, Russian opposition to the New Course in Czechoslovakia is not likely to soften. Nor is there much chance of a similar evolution taking place in the Soviet Union in the near future, for it would be contrary to the almost exclusively autocratic Russian historical tradition. Nevertheless, while the Czechoslovak experiment may not guarantee the jobs of the party bosses, if allowed to survive, it may well guarantee the future of socialism.

EXCERPTS FROM A SPECIAL EDITION OF THE CZECHOSLOVAK NEWSPAPER, TRIBUNA CTEVRENOSTI

"What is happening here is not a movement whose aim is the restoration of the old order, but a movement which is meant to carry the socialist revolution to a higher, more perfect stage of development, closer to its aims. . . ."

EDUARD GOLDSTUCKER,
President of the Writers Union.

"One of the basic interests, and hence one of the necessities of a country having the cultural and industrial level of Czechoslovakia should be to open its borders to the entire world. I believe that to enclose oneself within a Chinese wall is an expression of weakness. . . ."

JIRI HANZELKA,
Engineer.

"Today the matter of democratization is no longer only an affair of the [mythical] seven courageous men. I would say that it is a concern of all of us, of the hundreds of thousands. I would even say, millions of people in our country. . . . I would like to express my conviction that either we will live in this country in freedom, or we will not live at all. . . . In a revolution of the type which we are now experiencing—a revolution of the word, a revolution of ideas and not of barbaric, violent acts—the solution cannot be simply that the old caste system give way to new privileges, in order solely that new groups take over the power positions and others again appropriate the monopoly of ideas, the implementation of justice, and the education of our children. The solution is that today and tomorrow the entire nation should partake in these duties and responsibilities. . . ."

September 5, 1968

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 10303

"Socialism, if it wants to succeed, if it wants to be an attraction center for the world, cannot be built on hatred, suspicion, lies and violence, but, on the contrary, should offer man more freedom than any other system, because otherwise its creation would have been useless. . . .

"They are asking us whom we side with in this world. We are with those who, as we, have not renounced the struggle, have not given up the hope that our life could be better. We are on the side of the enslaved, of the suffering, of the unhappy. We are with those who reject the curse of racism, the humiliation of anti-Semitism, persecution and chauvinism, and the conceit of narrow nationalism. We are with those who, gathered around the declaration of human rights, want our time to be friendlier than Hell."

"VZHIVAZH" NVA

Author.

4. INTELLECTUAL FERMENT IN THE SOVIET UNION

[From the New York Times Magazine]

THE NEW TRIALS IN RUSSIA Stir Memories of Stalin's Days: This Is the Winter of Moscow's Dissent

(By Patricia Blake)

Moscow has just experienced an unusually fierce winter, many smaller towns were snow-bound, and grave concern is being expressed in the press about air pollution—all of which is very convenient for Russian intellectuals, who commonly characterize their conditions in meteorological images.

For example, Vladimir Bukovsky, who was sentenced last September to three years in prison for having organized a demonstration protesting the arrest of writers, has offered a comment on the miasma of intellectual life. In a sketch called "A Stupid Question," which appeared before his arrest in the underground magazine Phoenix, Bukovsky complained to a physician: "I just can't stand it any longer. I tried at first to ignore it but I couldn't. . . . I can't, you see, take a really deep breath. . . . The doctors can't help me. . . . But I do so want to take a deep breath sometimes, you know, with all my lungs—especially in the spring. . . . There seems to be some obstruction to breathing. Or isn't there enough air?"

Recently, Yevgeni Yevtushenko complained of the same trouble. In "Smog," a poem datelined Moscow-New York, published in the Soviet magazine Znamya in January of this year, he writes that he is gasping for air. The locale is purportedly New York, but the weather conditions are Russian and clearly recognizable as such by the Soviet reader. Notices have been posted in bars, the poet says, which read: "You can breathe easily only through vodka."

Yevtushenko uses the device of putting words in the mouths of American writers. Allen Ginsberg is made to say: "Darkness is descending, / darkness! / This is the smell of outer hell. / There is no excuse for those / who can breathe in this stench! In a world of moral vacuum, / in a world of fog and chaos / the only halfway decent person / is he who suffocates." In the same poem, Arthur Miller (who has publicly spoken out against the trials of writers in Russia) is described as "stern in his terrible prophecy." Miller supposedly says: "There will be still more burnings at the stake / by Inquisitions, / Smog / is the smoke of these stakes to come."

The atmosphere is indeed heavy with menace. Not since 1963, when Khrushchev carried on a ferocious campaign against the liberal intelligentsia, has creative life in Russia seemed in such jeopardy. The two recent trials of writers in Moscow represent only the most visible surface of what is actually taking place. The arrests of hundreds of intellectuals, for offenses ranging from the distribution of anti-Soviet propaganda to armed conspiracy, and other sinister signals sug-

gest that a policy decision has been made, at the highest level, to reintroduce terroristic methods to stifle dissent.

These attempts at coercion have produced, not submission, but defiance more open and more widespread than at any time in the Soviet Union's entire history of persecution of intellectuals. The Communist leadership in Russia, and in parts of Eastern Europe as well, is being confronted with such spectacles as street demonstrations in Moscow, student riots in Warsaw and, in Prague, a resistance among intellectuals so massive that, in Czechoslovakia's newly favorable political climate, it appears to have succeeded in obtaining a reversal of cultural policy.

The pattern of repression, as it has evolved under Brezhnev and Kosygin, is not so easily charted as it was under Khrushchev. For one thing, the style of new leadership in dealing with the unruly intelligentsia is more subdued. No longer is the chief of state heard denouncing abstract painters as homosexuals who (in Khrushchev's words) use human excrement instead of paint. There are no more mass meetings with writers and artists in the Kremlin, no more vast campaigns in the press against internationally known literary figures like Voznesensky and Yevtushenko.

Aims and methods have changed as well. Khrushchev believed for a time that he could turn the aspirations of the liberal intellectuals to his own political purposes; he attempted to gain their support by offering them a measure of freedom, but when they responded, not with gratitude but with ever greater demands, he turned on them with the full range of his celebrated invective. These repeated attempts to woo, then subdue, the intelligentsia produced the seasonal "thaws" and "freezes" that characterized cultural life under Khrushchev.

In contrast, the new leaders have always shown a determination not to allow the intelligentsia to play any sort of political role. Plagued with other problems inherited from Khrushchev, they at first seemed merely to be trying (with little success) to contain the most vociferous libertarians among the intellectuals. Now, however, they have been compelled to take notice of three problems that have strikingly intensified in the post-Khrushchev era: (1) the spread of dissent; (2) the breakdown of controls over the intelligentsia; (3) the publication abroad of suppressed works by Russian writers, much of which is damaging to the prestige of the Soviet leadership, the system and the ideology.

Thus, while Khrushchev relied largely on bombast and threats against dissidents (which he was unwilling or unable to carry out) the present leaders have introduced the technique of staging political trials of intellectuals, while at the same time giving the K.G.B. (Committee for State Security—the secret police) far greater powers in dealing with the intelligentsia than at any time since Stalin's death.

The fact that this policy of selective terror was applied with increasing intensity in 1967, the year of the 50th anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution, is a measure of the leadership's alarm over large-scale and unrestrained expressions of dissent. The crackdown has, in fact, come as a surprise to Western observers, and to many people in Russian literary circles who believed that the Soviet leadership would make no move to repress the intellectuals until after the anniversary celebrations last November. The existence of dissent would be played down, they said; an appearance of national unity had to be maintained, as well as a semblance of solidarity among the foreign Communist parties still more or less loyal to Moscow. The trial of the writers Andrei Sinyavsky and Yuli Daniel in 1966 had provoked such vehement opposition among foreign Com-

munist leaders that it seemed unlikely the Soviet authorities would invite further embarrassment along these lines.

A number of officially inspired attempts were made before the anniversary to still the continued reverberations of that trial. Many newsmen in Moscow, and visitors from abroad, were systematically informed that Sinyavsky and Daniel would be released on the occasion of the general amnesty in November, provided the Western press would stop reporting the plight of the two writers and left-wing intellectuals would stop agitating about the case. "Dr. Zhivago." The recent writings of Alexander Solzhenitsyn and other suppressed works would soon be published, they were told. It was even suggested that censorship was about to be abolished, the only impediment to complete cultural freedom in the Soviet Union being the meddlesomeness of foreigners.

Nothing of the sort, of course, took place. Instead, the dawn of the anniversary year 1967 was marked by the arrest of a large group of intellectuals in Leningrad whose number has been estimated at from 150 to 300 persons. Precautions were taken by the authorities to prevent this action from causing an international sensation. The arrests were made among obscure persons, in a city where foreign journalists are not stationed. No mention of the arrests was made in the Soviet press. It is only recently, therefore, that some details of the Leningrad case have become known.

The roundup took place in late February or early March, 1967. Among those arrested were a number of Leningrad University professors, law and philosophy students at the university, poets, literary critics and magazine editors. At least one closed trial of four persons is known to have been held, and another is said to be in preparation now. Among those already tried, one is a Professor Ogurtsov, a specialist on Tibet at the university, who was condemned to 15 years at hard labor—the maximum sentence, short of death. A second, Yevgeni Vagin, an editor of a multivolume edition of Dostoyevsky, was sentenced to 13 years.

Those arrested were charged with conspiracy to armed rebellion. It was alleged that they were members of a terrorist network, with contacts abroad, which operated under the guise of various philosophical societies, including a "Berdyaev Circle," named after Nikolai Berdyaev, the Christian philosopher who was an opponent of the Soviet regime because of its suppression of freedom. Members of similar groups, said to be linked with the Leningrad organizations, have reportedly been arrested in Sverdlovsk and in several towns in the Ukraine.

The Leningrad arrests are clearly the most menacing of the coercive actions against intellectuals that have been undertaken in the post-Khrushchev period. This is the first time in Soviet history that intellectuals are known to have been arrested and tried for possession of arms for the purpose of rebellion against the state. The charge is indeed so grave that it irresistibly raises the question of whether the arms case was not fabricated by the K.G.B. The purpose of such a provocation would be to smear the whole liberal intelligentsia, which, it might now be alleged, is so disaffected as to be capable of armed rebellion—thus opening the way to arrests on a much larger scale. The attempt by the K.G.B. to connect the Leningrad organizations with groups in other parts of the country suggests that something along these lines is in progress. Moreover, the possession of small arms, of which the Leningrad intellectuals are accused (in Sverdlovsk, they allegedly acquired machine guns), appears preposterous. Under peacetime conditions it would be extremely difficult to smuggle arms into the Soviet Union, and the rigid system of arms control in the police and

S 10298

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 5, 1968

style democracy, and there are few demands for political change.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 30, 1968]
**RUMANIANS FIRM; WARN RUSSIANS—AGAIN
 URGE TROOPS PULL OUT—TELL OF BLOC
 "TENSION"**

(By John M. Lee)

BUCHAREST, August 29.—Rumanian Communist leaders declared today that they attached the "utmost importance" to the complete withdrawal of Warsaw Pact forces from Czechoslovakia "in the shortest time."

The officials also appeared to warn the Soviet Union against further incursions that might exacerbate relations between Communist countries. They asserted:

"It is imperative that absolutely nothing should be undertaken that might worsen these relations or deepen the divergences and breed fresh sources of tension."

The firm declarations were contained in a statement by the Executive Committee of the party's Central Committee, published in the party newspaper, *Scintela* and other papers. It was the first Rumanian comment on the Soviet-Czechoslovak agreement reached in Moscow on Tuesday.

The agreement called for the gradual withdrawal of forces as soon as conditions in Czechoslovakia are "normalized." Two divisions are to remain behind to help guard the West German border.

TONE TERMED RESOLUTE

Western diplomats were impressed by the resolute tone of the Rumanian comment. In their view, Rumania is continuing to insist that each national Communist party should be able to determine its own development, as the Rumanian party has done, free from outside interference.

The statement did nothing to yield to criticism by the Soviet Union, Hungary and Poland of Rumania's breakaway stance.

"The Executive Committee expresses to the Communists of Czechoslovakia, to the Czech and Slovak people, its feelings of warm sympathy, of support and full internationalist solidarity," the statement said.

It recalled that Rumania had expressed "anxiety and disapproval" over the invasion of Czechoslovakia Aug. 20, and it noted that the return to office of Czechoslovak leaders and the resumption of activity by party and government bodies "create conditions for undertaking the complex tasks facing them."

"At the same time," the statement went on, "the Executive Committee considers of utmost importance the carrying into effect of the complete withdrawal, in the shortest time, of the armed forces of the five socialist countries from Czechoslovakia."

POLAND ASSAILS RUMANIA

(By Jonathan Randall)

WARSAW, August 29.—Poland assailed Rumania today for having placed "sovereignty and independence" above allegiance to Soviet-led Communism. The criticism came in an article observers interpreted as a possible prelude to further pressures on the Bucharest regime by the orthodox Communist nations.

An unsigned 2,500-word article in the party newspaper, *Trybuna Ludu*, reflecting the views of the Polish leadership, castigated Rumania for having denounced the invasion of Czechoslovakia in disregard of the "supreme dictate of the moment."

In language that recalled the strong words employed in the state-controlled Polish press against Czechoslovakia in past months, the article, also attacked President Nicolae Ceausescu of Rumania by name for the first time since the invasion last week.

Observers said that this was a practice normally reserved for the most serious inter-party polemics.

Also for the first time since the invasion, Wladyslaw Gomułka, the Polish party leader, consulted with members of the ruling 12-man Politburo. The official Polish press agency limited its report to noting that he had discussed "present problems of the international situation."

Also present were five other Politburo members, regional party leaders, Central Committee department directors and others who were described as certain ministers.

Trybuna Ludu also criticized Rumania for having established diplomatic relations with West Germany last year and for having failed to break diplomatic ties with Israel after the war in the Middle East in June 1967.

Rumania is the only Eastern European country that has established relations with Bonn and the only one that did not follow Moscow's lead in breaking with Israel last year.

The newspaper said that Rumanian support for Czechoslovakia "indicates that the objective was not 'defense of democracy and sovereignty' but disintegration of the socialist commonwealth."

[From the Baltimore Sun, Aug. 31, 1968]

**BLOC TROOPS SAID TO MOVE ON ROMANIA—
 CZECH RADIO REPORTS NINE RUSSIAN DIVISIONS
 NEAR BORDER**

(By Stuart S. Smith)

PRAGUE, August 30.—A Czechoslovak radio station transmitting from somewhere in Bohemia said today that the Warsaw powers are massing troops along their borders with Romania.

According to the broadcast, the Soviet Union has moved nine military divisions into Bucovina alone. Bulgaria, it said, has transferred two divisions of troops to its frontier with Romania and Hungary has deployed three divisions along its eastern boundary.

COOPERATION CALL

In London, Joseph Luns, the Dutch Foreign Minister, said the situation in the Balkans is a serious cause for concern and called for improved Atlantic alliance cooperation.

In New York, Corneliu Manescu, the Rumanian Foreign Minister and current United Nations General Assembly president, held talks with United Nations officials to sound out their attitude toward a possible invasion of his country. Mr. Manescu also spoke with George W. Ball, the United States Ambassador to the United Nations.

TROOP WITHDRAWAL

Bucovina and Moldavia are former Rumanian provinces which the Soviet Union took from Romania at the close of World War II.

Two weeks ago, President Nicolae Ceausescu indicated that the Romanian military forces had been withdrawn from the Warsaw Pact command and simultaneously ordered the immediate arming of the country's Workers' Militia.

TANK PULLOUT TERMS ARE SET FOR PRAGUE

(By a Sun staff correspondent)

PRAGUE, August 30.—The Soviet military commander here warned today that Russia will keep its tanks in the Czechoslovak capital until the citizens remove the anti-Soviet slogans from the city's wall.

The Czechoslovak National Front Organization later appealed to the people to remove the offending placards.

Radio Prague quoted the commander, Gen. Ivan Velichka, as saying all posters, signs and banners would have to be taken down or painted over before he would transfer his forces.

DUBCEK POSITION

The announcement conflicts with Alexander Dubcek's speech Tuesday which said

the invading military units were to be removed forthwith.

Shortly after his return from his Moscow negotiations with the Kremlin's top officials, Mr. Dubcek, the Czechoslovak Communist party leader, said "we agreed" that the occupation forces "in the towns and villages will immediately depart to designated areas. This is naturally connected with the extent to which our own Czechoslovak authorities will themselves be capable in individual towns of insuring order and normal life."

Except for the first few days immediately following the Warsaw powers' attack, there has been no public disorder in Czechoslovakia, and some major cities, Pilsen, for example, have had no sizable occupation units since the middle of last week.

TWO HUNDRED TANKS REMAIN

Prague, however, is still jammed with Soviet military equipment, including at least 200 battle tanks, more than that many armored cars, numerous howitzers, one or more heavy motor batteries, machine gun emplacements and other heavy arms.

Although the soldiers and their weapons are no longer occupying the Government and party headquarters, they still hold most of the capital's newspaper offices, radio and television stations, printing plants and other key communications points, including the Prague airport.

Many large fields within easy firing range of the city's heart are full of Soviet troops, helicopters, military communications equipment and other paraphernalia.

REBUKE ON INVASION

The Czechoslovak National Front's central committee also rebuked the Warsaw powers, declaring that their invasion violated the "basic norms of international law."

The committee also called upon the occupation authorities to release the political prisoners they have arrested during the last ten days and to refrain from interfering any longer in the nation's affairs.

Soviet officials have demanded that what they call the "illegal" newspapers here stop publishing and that the free Czechoslovak radio stations be silenced.

3. CZECHOSLOVAKIA BEFORE THE OCCUPATION

[From the New York Times, Sept. 20, 1967]
**A CZECH WRITER DESCRIBES HIS INNER
 STRUGGLE**

(By Richard Eder)

PRAGUE, September 19.—"The social revolution has triumphed in our country, but the problem of power is still with us. We have taken the bull by the horns and we are holding on, and yet something keeps biting us in the seat of the pants."

With these words Ludvik Vaculik, a 41-year-old Prague writer, began a speech, delivered two and a half months ago, whose repercussions are still agitating party and intellectual circles in Czechoslovakia. Spoken at the writers' congress at the end of June, the words of Mr. Vaculik and four or five other writers transformed what had been expected to be a stormy session into something verging on a revolution.

For the last three years or so, Czechoslovak cultural activity has been the freest and most inventive in Eastern Europe, in striking contrast to the conservative attitude of most party leaders. Films, plays, novels and literary essays have, with varying degrees of directness, voiced demands for personal freedom and the supremacy of private values.

DIRECT CHALLENGE TO REGIME

At the writers' congress those themes were distilled into a far more direct challenge to the regime. In essence Mr. Vaculik and others insisted that freedom as a concession was not enough, and that the regime must

other people of conscience and vested authority. It served to mobilize the intelligentsia already united by the onslaughts of 1963, into expressing its indignation almost with a single voice. It made many older intellectuals, silent until then with their fearful memories of Stalinism, openly commit themselves to the liberal camp. And it raised the issue, in the most compelling public fashion, of the contradiction between "Socialist justice" and brutal reality.

The significant fact about the trial is that the two writers, charged with circulating "anti-Soviet" writings, readily admitted that they were the pseudonymous authors of the works in question, but denied that they were guilty of a crime. Their testimony and final pleas constitute a defense less of themselves than of literature itself, and a condemnation, in overwhelmingly eloquent terms, of the grossly simplistic and Philistine criteria applied to literature by the Soviet authorities for the past 30 years. Had they pleaded guilty, as the court evidently expected, they would have got off with lighter sentences. (Sinyavsky was condemned to seven years of hard labor and Daniel to five.)

It was clear that they wished to make examples of themselves, so that others might carry on after them. This hope was completely realized. The trial utterly failed in its purpose of terrorizing intellectuals. On the contrary, the behavior of the defendants infused the liberal intellectuals community with a new sense of pride and honor. Sinyavsky and Daniel had established a standard of conduct which henceforth others would strive to meet. In sum, the moral quality of intellectual life in Russia was immeasurably raised by their action.

Not one prominent writer in Russia, except Mikhail Sholokhov, could be found to endorse the trial, while protests signed by hundreds of famous writers, scholars and scientists poured into Government agencies and newspapers. Opposition to the trial by European Communists became so strident that foreign Communist newspapers were banned for a time from Soviet newsstands. But, substituting for a free press, the foreign short-wave radio stations, the Voice of America, Radio Liberty, the B.B.C. and Deutsche Welle repeatedly beamed the trial transcript (which had been smuggled abroad) and the text of all the protests to their millions of listeners in Russia.

Thus the Sinyavsky-Daniel trial boomeranged by causing a national and international scandal, as well as by stiffening the intelligentsia's resistance. In May, the Congress of the Stalinist-dominated Soviet Writers Union was boycotted by leading liberals, and Alexander Solzhenitsyn, Russia's finest living prose writer, addressed his now-famous letter to the congress demanding the abolition of censorship. He charged that the K.G.B. had confiscated his manuscripts and that the leadership of the Writers Union, far from defending authors from such outrages, had a long history of being "always first among the persecutors" of writers who were slandered, exiled, imprisoned and executed. The reaction of the authorities was simply to hit harder—in Moscow, at the heart of resistance.

The first of the Moscow trials, in September, 1967, involved three young men charged with organizing a demonstration on Pushkin Square against the arrest of some literary figures a few days earlier. In the second trial, at the beginning of January, 1968, four young people, including two underground writers, Alexander Ginzburg and Yuri Galanskov, were accused of circulating an underground magazine, Phoenix '66.

Galanskov was said to have privately drafted a new constitution for the Soviet Union and distributed it among his friends. Ginzburg was also charged with editing and circulating a "White Book" on the Sinyavsky-Daniel case, consisting of the trial transcript, protests by Soviet intellectuals and a letter

of his own to Kosygin in which he said: "I love my country and I do not wish to see its reputation damaged by the latest uncontrolled activities of the K.G.B. I love Russian literature and I do not wish to see two more of its representatives sent off to fell trees under police guard."

Ginzburg was sentenced to five years and Galanskov to seven. The third defendant, who turned state's evidence, was let off with two years, while the fourth, who was accused merely of typing manuscripts for the others, received a one-year suspended sentence.

In these trials, the authorities made determined efforts to seal off the proceedings so that any resistance on the part of the defendants would not become public. Except for a handful of relatives of the accused, the courtrooms were packed with pre-selected persons, who, according to one witness, read magazines or dozed during the trials, rousing themselves from time to time to utter "animal-like hoots and cries for severe penalties." The September trial received a brief mention in a Moscow newspaper, which stated that the accused had confessed their crime.

Thereupon, a 30-year-old physicist, Pavel Litvinov, the grandson of the late Foreign Minister Maxim Litvinov, saw to it that the actual testimony of one defendant was communicated to the foreign press.

It showed that the defendant, the 25-year-old writer Vladimir Bukovsky, not only had pleaded not guilty but had defended his right to demonstrate publicly under the Soviet Constitution. He protested that the investigation of his case had been conducted, not by the prosecutor's office, but by the K.G.B., in violation of the law. Bukovsky, who was sentenced to three years, ended his plea as follows: "I absolutely do not repent for organizing the demonstration. I find that it accomplished what it had to accomplish, and when I am free again, I shall again organize demonstrations—of course, in complete observance of the law, as before."

Litvinov further made public the record of his interrogation by a K.G.B. officer in which he defied a threat to arrest him if he circulated the Bukovsky transcript. After it was sent abroad, Litvinov told an American newsman that he had not been bothered since by the K.G.B. "When the K.G.B. sees that a man is not afraid of them, they do not call him in any more for more conversation. When they call him again, it's for good." Litvinov was immediately fired from his teaching job.

Ginzburg and Galanskov pleaded not guilty at the five-day trial in January. Said Ginzburg of the contents of his White Book, "Any patriot is obliged to give up his life for his country—but not to lie for it."

News of the defendants' resistance quickly leaked out to the crowd of some 200 sympathizers who gathered on the street, in freezing weather, outside the courtroom. What took place was tantamount to a five-day press conference by friends of the accused with foreign journalists. K.G.B. men continuously mingled in the crowd, taking pictures of the protesters. Shouted a former major general, Pyotr Grigorenko: "You can't intimidate me. I bled for this country!" As the defense lawyers filed out of the courtroom, they were given red carnations by persons in the crowd.

Among those who kept a vigil outside the courtroom were Alexander Yessenin-Volpin, the son of the famous poet Sergel Yessenin, who committed suicide in 1925 and Pyotr Yakir, the son of Maj. Gen. Iona Yakir, who was executed during the purges of the Red Army in 1937, then "posthumously rehabilitated" after Stalin's death. Yakir distributed an appeal saying that the trial "has gone beyond all bounds in suppressing human rights. Even Andrei Vyshinsky would have envied the organization of this trial."

Shortly before the court sentenced the de-

fendants, Pavel Litvinov and Mrs. Yuli Daniel issued a statement to foreign journalists, asking that it be published and broadcast as soon as possible. "We are not sending this request to Soviet newspapers because that is hopeless," they said. They called the trial "a wild mockery of justice . . . no better than the celebrated trials of the nineteen-thirties, which involved us in so much blood that we still have not recovered from them." The judge, they said, allowed only evidence "which fits in the program already prepared by the K.G.B."

Following this, 12 intellectuals, including Litvinov, Yessenin-Volpin, Yakir and Grigorenko addressed a similar statement about the trial to the Presidium of the conference of 66 Communist parties that opened at the end of February in Budapest for the purpose of strengthening their unity. One can imagine the reaction of the Soviet authorities on learning that the first news to reach the world of this parley consisted in front-page stories in The New York Times and other Western papers of an appeal by 12 Russian intellectuals to the conference's participants "to consider fully the perils caused by the trampling of man in our country."

One consequence of the Moscow trials was that the convicted writers gathered support from persons completely outside Moscow literary and intellectual circles, and for entirely extra-literary reasons. For example, among the signers of the appeal to the Budapest Conference were a former major general, the son of a general and the son of a Foreign Minister, a leader of the Crimean Tartar minority and a Russian Orthodox priest.

From as far away as Latvia came a letter to Mikhail Suslov, the Politburo member and party ideologist, from the chairman of a model collective farm who, in 1964, had been highly praised in the Soviet press. This letter, which was published, not in Russia but in The New York Times, called on the party to reach an understanding with the young rebels, rather than put them on trial. "Such dissenters will," the writer predicted, "inevitably create a new party. Ideas cannot be murdered with bullets, prison or exile." After describing the remoteness of the countryside where he lives, he said, addressing the Central Committee of the party, "If information has reached us on the broadest scale, you can well imagine what kind of seeds you have sown throughout the country. Have the courage to correct the mistakes that you have made, before the workers and peasants take a hand in this affair."

Protest against the trial also brought together two formerly distinct and antithetical groups within the intelligentsia itself. Until now, only one group, the "loyal opposition"—well-known published writers and respected scholars and scientists—had publicly expressed resistance, in relatively moderate terms, against attempts at coercion by the authorities. Now another group, "the underground"—dissidents who despair of effecting change through established channels—was making itself heard with unprecedented boldness in response to the persecution of Ginzburg and others among their members.

These two groups were first seen to join forces when 31 leading writers, scholars and scientists (including three members of the Academy of Sciences) addressed a protest against the Ginzburg trial to the Moscow City Court. Later appeals by loyal oppositionists included one signed by 80 more prominent intellectuals, and another signed by 220 top scientists and artists, from Moscow, Leningrad, Kharkov, Magadan and Dubna, the Soviet atomic center. In mid-March, 99 mathematicians, including seven Lenin Prize winners, rallied around Yessenin-Volpin (who is both an underground poet and a mathematician) in a protest against his forcible confinement in a lunatic asylum after he had participated in the

demonstration outside the courtroom at the Ginzburg trial.

The central issue raised by all these protests (none of which was even mentioned in the Soviet press) was perhaps most eloquently defined by Pyotr Yakir in an appeal which is now being widely circulated in Moscow. "The inhuman punishment of members of the intelligentsia is a logical extension of the atmosphere of public life in recent years," he wrote. "The process of the restoration of Stalinism is going on—slowly but remorselessly." "The naive hopes" encouraged by de-Stalinization in 1956 and 1961 have not been realized. On the contrary, "the name of Stalin is being pronounced from the highest platforms in an entirely positive context."

Yakir, who spent 17 years in a Stalinist camp, deplors the fact that 10th-rate books praising Stalin are being published, while those that describe his crimes are being suppressed. His statement ends with an appeal to creative people in Russia to "raise your voices against the impending danger of new Stalins and Yezhovs. . . . We remind you that people who dared to think are now languishing in harsh forced-labor camps. Every time you are silent, another stepping-stone is added, leading to new trials of a Daniel or a Ginzburg. Little by little, with your acquiescence, a new 1937 may come upon us."

Does the future hold a return to terror on the scale of the great purges of 1937-38? Clearly, the Soviet leadership finds itself in an impossible dilemma. On the one hand, it must now be clear that much larger doses of terror must be administered if the intelligentsia is to be silenced, and its influence on public opinion curbed. One sinister omen was contained in an article in Pravda last March 3, in which the recent Moscow trials were said to be as justified as the purge trials of the thirties—trials that have scarcely been mentioned favorably in the Soviet press since Khrushchev's de-Stalinization speech in 1956. On the other hand, the cost of a return to mass police terror would be incalculably high. It would reverse the effect of all Soviet policies designed to bring Russia into competition with the modern world, including those that offer individual incentives for industrial production and technological and scientific creativity. Moreover, the internal dynamic of the Stalinist police state, once provided by the myth of Stalin and by ideology, could not be restored in a society now rent by skepticism and dissent. Finally, a powerful secret police apparatus on the Stalinist model might well devour the political leaders who had revived it.

How Brezhnev and Kosygin will deal with this critical situation is still unclear. On the surface it would seem that a brutal showdown is at hand. Yet the Soviet leaders may be borne by the force of inertia and indecision that has determined their handling of other crises, both domestic and foreign. If so, we may be certain that the aspirations of the liberal intelligentsia, rising now for more than a decade, will continue to confront the leadership in irreversible and irremediable conflict.

[From the New York Times, July 22, 1968]
TEXT OF ESSAY BY RUSSIAN NUCLEAR PHYSICIST
URGING SOVIET-AMERICAN COOPERATION

(NOTE.—Following is the text of an essay, titled "Thoughts on Progress, Peaceful Co-existence and Intellectual Freedom," by Academician Andrei D. Sakharov, Soviet physicist, as translated by The New York Times from the Russian manuscript.)

The views of the author were formed in the milieu of the scientific and scientific-technological intelligentsia, which manifests much anxiety over the principles and specific aspects of foreign and domestic policy and over the future of mankind. This anxiety is nourished, in particular, by a realization

that the scientific method of directing policy, the economy, arts, education and military affairs still has not become a reality.

We regard as "scientific" a method based on deep analysis of facts, theories and views, presupposing unprejudiced, unfeared open discussion and conclusions. The complexity and diversity of all the phenomena of modern life, the great possibilities and dangers linked with the scientific-technical revolution and with a number of social tendencies demand precisely such an approach, as has been acknowledged in a number of official statements.

In this pamphlet, advanced for discussion by its readers, the author has set himself the goal to present, with the greatest conviction and frankness, two theses that are supported by many people in the world. The theses are:

[1]

The division of mankind threatens it with destruction. Civilization is imperiled by: a universal thermonuclear war, catastrophic hunger for most of mankind, stupefaction from the narcotic of "mass culture" and bureaucratized dogmatism, a spreading of mass myths that put entire peoples and continents under the power of cruel and treacherous demagogues, and destruction or degeneration from the unforeseeable consequences of swift changes in the conditions of life on our planet.

In the face of these perils, any action increasing the division of mankind, any preaching of the incompatibility of world ideologies and nations is madness and a crime. Only universal cooperation under conditions of intellectual freedom and the lofty moral ideals of socialism and labor, accompanied by the elimination of dogmatism and pressures of the concealed interests of ruling classes, will preserve civilization.

The reader will understand that ideological collaboration cannot apply to those fanatical, sectarian and extremist ideologies that reject all possibility of rapprochement, discussion and compromise, for example, the ideologies of Fascist, racist, militaristic and Maoist demagogues.

Millions of people throughout the world are striving to put an end to poverty. They despise oppression, dogmatism and demagoguery (and their more extreme manifestations—racism, Fascism, Stalinism and Maoism). They believe in progress based on the use, under conditions of social justice and intellectual freedom, of all the positive experience accumulated by mankind.

The second basic thesis is that intellectual freedom is essential to human society—freedom to obtain and distribute information, freedom for open-minded and unfeared debate and freedom from pressure by officialdom and prejudices. Such a trinity of freedom of thought is the only guarantee against an infection of people by mass myths, which, in the hands of treacherous hypocrites and demagogues, can be transformed into bloody dictatorship. Freedom of thought is the only guarantee of the feasibility of a scientific democratic approach to politics, economy and culture.

But freedom of thought is under a triple threat in modern society—from the opium of mass culture, from cowardly, egotistic and narrow-minded ideologies and from the ossified dogmatism of a bureaucratic oligarchy and its favorite weapon, ideological censorship. Therefore, freedom of thought requires the defense of all thinking and honest people. This is a mission not only for the intelligentsia but for all strata of society, particularly its most active and organized stratum, the working class. The worldwide dangers of war, famine, cults of personality and bureaucracy—these are perils for all of mankind.

Recognition by the working class and the intelligentsia of their common interests has been a striking phenomenon of the present day. The most progressive, internationalist and dedicated element of the intelligentsia

is, in essence, part of the working class, and the most advanced, educated, internationalist, and broad-minded part of the working class is part of the intelligentsia.

This position of the intelligentsia in society renders senseless any loud demands that the intelligentsia subordinate its strivings to the will and interests of the working class (in the Soviet Union, Poland and other socialist countries). What these demands really mean is subordination to the will of the party or, even more specifically, to the party's central apparatus and its officials. Who will guarantee that these officials always express the genuine interests of the working class as a whole and the genuine interests of progress rather than their own caste interests?

We will divide this pamphlet into two parts. The first we will title "Dangers," and the second, "The Basis of Hope."

DANGERS

The threat of nuclear war

Three technical aspects of thermonuclear weapons have made thermonuclear war a peril to the very existence of humanity. These aspects are: the enormous destructive power of a thermonuclear explosion, the relative cheapness of rocket-thermonuclear weapons and the practical impossibility of an effective defense against a massive rocket-nuclear attack.

[1]

Today one can consider a three-megaton nuclear warhead as "typical" (this is somewhere between the warhead of a Minuteman and of a Titan II). The area of fires from the explosion of such a warhead is 150 times greater than from the Hiroshima bomb and the area of destruction is 30 times greater. The detonation of such a warhead over a city would create a 100-square-kilometer [40 square-mile] area of total destruction and fire.

Tens of millions of square meters of living space would be destroyed. No fewer than a million people would perish under the ruins of buildings, from fire and radiation, suffocate in the dust and smoke or die in shelters buried under debris. In the event of a ground-level explosion, the fallout of radioactive dust would create a danger of fatal exposure in an area of tens of thousands of square kilometers.

[2]

A few words about the cost and the possible number of explosions.

After the stage of research and development has been passed, mass production of thermonuclear weapons and carrier rockets is no more complex and expensive than, for example, the production of military aircraft, which were produced by the tens of thousands during the war.

The annual production of plutonium in the world now is in the tens of thousands of tons. If one assumes that half this output goes for military purposes and that an average of several kilograms of plutonium goes into one warhead, then enough warheads have already been accumulated to destroy mankind many times over.

[3]

The third aspect of thermonuclear peril (along with the power and cheapness of warheads) is what we term the practical impossibility of preventing a massive rocket attack. This situation is well known to specialists. In the popular scientific literature, for example, one can read this in an article by Richard L. Garwin and Hans A. Bethe in the Scientific American of March, 1968.

The technology and tactics of attack have now far surpassed the technology of defense despite the development of highly maneuverable and powerful antimissiles with nuclear warheads and despite other technical ideas, such as the use of laser rays and so forth.

September 5, 1968

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

Improvements in the resistance of warheads to shock waves and to the radiation effects of neutron and x-ray exposure, the possibility of mass use of relatively light and inexpensive decoys that are virtually indistinguishable from warheads and exhaust the capabilities of an antimissile defense system, a perfection of tactics of massed and concentrated attacks, in time and space, that overstrain the defense detection centers, the use of orbital and fractional-orbital attacks, the use of active and passive jamming and other methods not disclosed in the press—all this has created technical and economic obstacles to an effective missile defense that, at the present time, are virtually insurmountable.

The experience of past wars shows that the first use of a new technical or tactical method of attack is usually highly effective even if a simple antidote can soon be developed. But in a thermonuclear war the first blow may be the decisive one and render null and void years of work and billions spent on creation of an antimissile system.

An exception to this would be the case of a great technical and economic difference in the potentials of two enemies. In such a case, the stronger side, creating an antimissile defense system with a multiple reserve, would face the temptation of ending the dangerous and unstable balance once and for all by embarking on a pre-emptive adventure, expending part of its attack potential on destruction of most of the enemy's launching bases and counting on impunity for the last stage of escalation, i.e., the destruction of the cities and industry of the enemy.

Fortunately for the stability of the world, the difference between the technical-economic potentials of the Soviet Union and the United States is not so great that one of the sides could undertake a "preventive aggression" without an almost inevitable risk of a destructive retaliatory blow. This situation would not be changed by a broadening of the arms race through the development of antimissile defenses.

In the opinion of many people, an opinion shared by the author, a diplomatic formulation of this mutually comprehended situation for example, in the form of a moratorium on the construction of antimissile systems, would be a useful demonstration of a desire of the Soviet Union and the United States to preserve the status quo and not to widen the arms race for senselessly expensive antimissile systems. It would be a demonstration of a desire to cooperate not to fight.

Two Doctrines Decried

A thermonuclear war cannot be considered a continuation of politics by other means (according to the formula of Clausewitz). It would be a means of universal suicide.

Two kinds of attempts are being made to portray thermonuclear war as an "ordinary" political act in the eyes of public opinion. One is the concept of the "paper tiger," the concept of the irresponsible Maoist adventurists. The other is the strategic doctrine of escalation, worked out by scientific and militarist circles in the United States. Without minimizing the seriousness of the challenge inherent in that doctrine, we will just note that the political strategy of peaceful coexistence is an effective counterweight to the doctrine.

A complete destruction of cities, industry, transport and systems of education, a poisoning of fields, water and air by radioactivity, a physical destruction of the large part of mankind, poverty, barbarism, a return to savagery and a genetic degeneracy of the survivors under the impact of radiation, a destruction of the material and information basis of civilization—this is a measure of the peril that threatens the world as a result of the estrangement of the world's two superpowers.

Every rational creature, finding itself on the brink of a disaster, first tries to get away from the brink and only then does it think about the satisfaction of its other needs. If mankind is to get away from the brink, it must overcome its divisions.

A vital step would be a review of the traditional method of international affairs, which may be termed "empirical-competitive." In the simplest definition, this is a method aiming at maximum improvement of one's position everywhere possible and, simultaneously, a method of causing maximum unpleasantness to opposing forces without consideration of common welfare and common interests.

If politics were a game of two gamblers, then this would be the only possible method. But where does such a method lead in the present unprecedented situation?

The War in Vietnam

In Vietnam, the forces of reaction lacking hope for an expression of national will in their favor, are using the force of military pressure. They are violating all legal and moral norms and are carrying out flagrant crimes against humanity. An entire people is being sacrificed to the proclaimed goal of stopping the "communist tide."

They strive to conceal from the American people considerations of personal and party prestige, the cynicism and cruelty, the hopelessness and ineffectiveness of the anti-Communist tasks of American policy in Vietnam, as well as the harm this war is doing to the true goals of the American people, which coincide with the universal tasks of bolstering peaceful coexistence.

To end the war in Vietnam would first of all save the people perishing there. But it also is a matter of saving peace in all the world. Nothing undermines the possibilities of peaceful coexistence more than a continuation of the war in Vietnam.

The Middle East

Another tragic example is the Middle East. If direct responsibility on Vietnam rests with the United States, in the Middle East direct responsibility rests not with the United States but with the Soviet Union (and with Britain in 1948 and 1956).

On one hand, there was an irresponsible encouragement of so-called Arab unity (which in no way had a socialist character—look at Jordan—but was purely nationalist and anti-Israel). It was said that the struggle of the Arabs had an essentially anti-imperialist character. On the other hand, there was an equally irresponsible encouragement of Israeli extremists.

We cannot here analyze the entire contradictory and tragic history of the events of the last 20 years, in the course of which the Arabs and Israel, along with historically justified actions, carried out reprehensible deeds, often brought about by the actions of external forces.

Thus in 1948, Israel waged a defensive war. But in 1956, the actions of Israel appeared reprehensible. The preventive six-day war in the face of threats of destruction by merciless, numerically vastly superior forces of the Arab coalition could have been justifiable. But the cruelty to refugees and prisoners of war and the striving to settle territorial questions by military means must be condemned. Despite this condemnation, the breaking of relations with Israel appears a mistake, complicating a peaceful settlement in this region and complicating a necessary diplomatic recognition of Israel by the Arab governments.

In our opinion, certain changes must be made in the conduct of international affairs, systematically subordinating all concrete aims and local tasks to the basic task of actively preventing an aggravation of the international situation, of actively pursuing and expanding peaceful coexistence to the level of cooperation, of making policy in such

a way that its immediate and long-range effects will in no way sharpen international tensions and will not create difficulties for either side that would strengthen the forces of reaction, militarism, nationalism, Fascism and revanchism.

International affairs must be completely permeated with scientific methodology and a democratic spirit, with a fearless weighing of all facts, views and theories, with maximum publicity of ultimate and intermediate goals and with a consistency of principles.

New Principles Proposed

The international policies of the world's two leading superpowers (the United States and the Soviet Union) must be based on a universal acceptance of unified and general principles, which we initially would formulate as follows:

[1]

All peoples have the right to decide their own fate with a free expression of will. This right is guaranteed by international control over observance by all governments of the "Declaration of the Rights of Man." International control presupposes the use of economic sanctions as well as the use of military forces of the United Nations in defense of "the rights of man."

[2]

All military and military-economic forms of export of revolution and counterrevolution are illegal and are tantamount to aggression.

[3]

All countries strive toward mutual help in economic, cultural and general organizational problems with the aim of eliminating painlessly all domestic and international difficulties and preventing a sharpening of international tensions and a strengthening of the forces of reaction.

[4]

International policy does not aim at exploiting local, specific conditions to widen zones of influence and create difficulties for another country. The goal of international policy is to insure universal fulfillment of the "Declaration of the Rights of Man" and to prevent a sharpening of international tensions and a strengthening of militarist and nationalist tendencies.

Such a set of principles would in no way be a betrayal of the revolutionary and national liberation struggle, the struggle against reaction and counterrevolution. On the contrary, with the elimination of all doubtful cases, it would be easier to take decisive action in those extreme cases of reaction, racism and militarism that allow no course other than armed struggle. A strengthening of peaceful coexistence would create an opportunity to avert such tragic events as those in Greece and Indonesia.

Such a set of principles would present the Soviet armed forces with a precisely defined defensive mission, a mission of defending our country and our allies from aggression. As history has shown, our people and their armed forces are unconquerable when they are defending their homeland and its great social and cultural achievements.

Hunger and overpopulation

Specialists are paying attention to a growing threat of hunger in the poorer half of the world. Although the 50 per cent increase of the world's population in the last 80 years has been accompanied by a 70 per cent increase in food production, the balance in the poorer half of the world has been unfavorable. The situation in India, Indonesia, in a number of countries of Latin America and in a large number of other underdeveloped countries—the absence of technical-economic reserves, competent officials and cultural skills, social backwardness, a high birth rate—all this systematically worsens the food balance and without doubt will continue to worsen it in the coming years.

September 5, 1968

The answer would be a wide application of fertilizers, an improvement of irrigation systems, better farm technology, wider use of the resources of the oceans and a gradual perfection of the production, already technically feasible, of synthetic foods, primarily amino acids. However, this is all fine for the rich nations. In the more backward countries, it is apparent from an analysis of the situation and existing trends that an improvement cannot be achieved in the near future, before the expected date of tragedy, 1975-80.

What is involved is a prognosticated deterioration of the average food balance in which localized food crises merge into a sea of hunger, intolerable suffering and desperation, the grief and fury of millions of people. This is a tragic threat to all mankind. A catastrophe of such dimensions cannot but have profound consequences for the entire world and for every human being. It will provoke a wave of wars and hatred, a decline of standards of living throughout the world and will leave a tragic, cynical and anti-Communist mark on the life of future generations.

The first reaction of a Philistine in hearing about the problem is that "they" are responsible for their plight because "they" reproduce so rapidly. Unquestionably, control of the birth rate is important and the people, in India for example, are taking steps in this direction. But these steps remain largely ineffective under social and economic backwardness, surviving traditions of large families, an absence of old-age benefits, a high infant mortality rate until, quite recently, and a continuing threat of death from starvation.

It is apparently futile only to insist that the more backward countries restrict their birth rates. What is needed most of all is economic and technical assistance to these countries. This assistance must be of such scale and generosity that it is absolutely impossible before the estrangement in the world and the egotistical, narrow-minded approach to relations between nations and races is eliminated. It is impossible as long as the United States and the Soviet Union, the world's two great superpowers, look upon each other as rivals and opponents.

Social factors play an important role in the tragic present situation and the still more tragic future of the poor regions. It must be clearly understood that if a threat of hunger is, along with a striving toward national independence, the main cause of "agrarian" revolution, the "agrarian" revolution in itself will not eliminate the threat of hunger, at least not in the immediate future. The threat of hunger cannot be eliminated without the assistance of the developed countries, and this requires significant changes in their foreign and domestic policies.

Inequality of American Negroes

At this time, the white citizens of the United States are unwilling to accept even minimum sacrifices to eliminate the unequal economic and cultural position of the country's black citizens, who make up 10 per cent of the population.

It is necessary to change the psychology of the American citizens so that they will voluntarily and generously support their government and worldwide efforts to change the economy, technology and level of living of billions of people. This, of course, would entail a serious decline in the United States rate of economic growth. The Americans should be willing to do this solely for the sake of lofty and distant goals, for the sake of preserving civilization and mankind on our planet.

Similar changes in the psychology of people and practical activities of governments must be achieved in the Soviet Union and other developed countries.

In the opinion of the author, a 15-year tax equal to 20 per cent of national incomes must be imposed on developed nations. The imposition of such a tax would automatically lead to a significant reduction in expenditures for weapons. Such common assistance would have an important effect of stabilizing and improving the situation in the most under-developed countries, restricting the influence of extremists of all types.

Changes in the economic situation of underdeveloped countries would solve the problem of high birth rates with relative ease, as has been shown by the experience of developed countries, without the barbaric method of sterilization.

Certain changes in the policies, viewpoints and traditions on this delicate question are inescapable in the advanced countries as well. Mankind can develop smoothly only if it looks upon itself in a demographic sense as a unit, a single family without divisions into nations other than in matters of history and traditions.

Therefore, government policy, legislation on the family and marriage and propaganda should not encourage an increase in the birth rates of advanced countries while demanding that it be curtailed in underdeveloped countries that are receiving assistance. Such a two-faced game would produce nothing but bitterness and nationalism.

In conclusion on that point, I want to emphasize that the question of regulating birth rates is highly complex and that any standardized, dogmatic solution "for all time and all peoples" would be wrong. All the foregoing, incidentally, should be accepted with the reservation that it is somewhat of a simplification.

Pollution of Environment

We live in a swiftly changing world. Industrial and water-engineering projects, cutting of forests, plowing up of virgin lands, the use of poisonous chemicals—all this is changing the face of the earth, our "habitat."

Scientific study of all the interrelationships in nature and the consequences of our interference clearly lag behind the changes. Large amounts of harmful wastes of industry and transport are being dumped into the air and water, including cancer-inducing substances. Will the safe limit be passed everywhere, as has already happened in a number of places?

Carbon dioxide from the burning of coal is altering the heat-reflecting qualities of the atmosphere. Sooner or later, this will reach a dangerous level. But we do not know when. Poisonous chemicals used in agriculture are penetrating into the body of man and animals directly and in more dangerous modified compounds, causing serious damage to the brain, the nervous system, blood-forming organs, the liver and other organs. Here, too, the safe limit can be easily crossed, but the question has not been fully studied and it is difficult to control all these processes.

The use of antibiotics in poultry raising has led to the development of new disease-causing microbes that are resistant to antibiotics.

I could also mention the problems of dumping detergents and radioactive wastes, erosion and salinization of soils, the flooding of meadows, the cutting of forests on mountain slopes and in watersheds, the destruction of birds and other useful wildlife like toads and frogs and many other examples of senseless despoliation caused by local, temporary, bureaucratic and egotistical interest and sometimes simply by questions of bureaucratic prestige, as in the sad fate of Lake Balkal.

The problem of geohygiene (earth hygiene) is highly complex and closely tied to economic and social problems. This problem can there-

fore not be solved on a national and especially not on a local basis. The salvation of our environment requires that we overcome our divisions and the pressure of temporary, local interests. Otherwise, the Soviet Union will poison the United States with its wastes and vice versa. At present, this is a hyperbole. But with a 10 per cent annual increase of wastes, the increase over 100 years will be 20,000 times.

Police dictatorships

An extreme reflection of the dangers confronting modern social development is the growth of racism, nationalism and militarism and, in particular, the rise of demagogic, hypocritical and monstrously cruel dictatorial police regimes. Foremost are the regimes of Stalin, Hitler and Mao Tse-tung, and a number of extremely reactionary regimes in smaller countries, Spain, Portugal, South Africa, Greece, Albania, Haiti and other Latin American countries.

These tragic developments have always derived from the struggle of egotistical and group interests, the struggle for unlimited power, suppression of intellectual freedom, a spread of intellectually simplified, narrow-minded mass myths (the myth of race, of land and blood, the myth about the Jewish danger, anti-intellectualism, the concept of lebensraum in Germany, the myth about the sharpening of the class struggle and proletarian infallibility bolstered by the cult of Stalin and by exaggeration of the contradictions with capitalism in the Soviet Union, the myth about Mao Tse-tung, extreme Chinese nationalism and the resurrection of the lebensraum concept, of anti-intellectualism, extreme anthropism and certain prejudices of peasant socialism in China).

The usual practice is the use of demagoguery, storm troopers and Red Guards in the first stage and terrorist bureaucracy with reliable cadres of the type of Eichmann, Himmler, Yezhov and Beria at the summit of the deification of unlimited power.

The Rule of Hitler

The world will never forget the burning of books in the squares of German cities, the hysterical cannibalistic speeches of the Fascist "fuehrers" and their even more cannibalistic plans for the destruction of entire peoples, including the Russians. Fascism began a partial realization of these plans during the war it unleashed, annihilating prisoners of war and hostages, burning villages, carrying out a criminal policy of genocide (during the war, the main blow of genocide was aimed at the Jews, a policy that apparently was also meant to be provocative especially in the Ukraine and Poland).

We shall never forget the kilometer-long trenches filled with bodies, the gas chambers, the SS dogs, the fanatical doctors, the piles of women's hair, suitcases with gold teeth and fertilizer from the factories of death.

Analyzing the causes of Hitler's coming to power, we will never forget the role of German and international monopolist capital. We also will not forget the criminally sectarian and dogmatically narrow policies of Stalin and his associates, setting Socialists and Communists against one another (this has been well related in the famous letter to Ilya Ehrenburg by Ernst Henri).

The Stalinist Period

Fascism lasted 12 years in Germany. Stalinism lasted twice as long in the Soviet Union. There are many common features but also certain differences. Stalinism exhibited a much more subtle kind of hypocrisy and demagoguery, with reliance not on an openly cannibalistic program like Hitler's but on a progressive, scientific and popular socialist ideology.

This served as a convenient screen for deceiving the working class, for weakening the vigilance of the intellectuals and other rivals in the struggle for power, with the treacher-

September 5, 1968

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 10309

ous and sudden use of the machinery of torture, execution and informants, intimidating and making fools of millions of people, the majority of whom were neither cowards nor fools. As a consequence of this "specific feature" of Stalinism, it was the Soviet people, its most active, talented and honest representatives, who suffered the most terrible blow.

At least 10 to 15 million people perished in the torture chambers of the N.K.V.D. [secret police] from torture and execution, in camps for exiled kulaks [rich peasants] and so-called semi-kulaks and members of their families and in camps "without the right of correspondence" (which were in fact the prototypes of the Fascist death camps where, for example, thousands of prisoners were machine-gunned because of "overcrowding" or as a result of "special orders").

People perished in the mines of Norilsk and Vorkuta from freezing, starvation and exhausting labor, at countless construction projects, in timber cutting, building of canals or simply during transportation in prison trains, in the overcrowded holds of "death ships" in the Sea of Okhotsk and during the resettlement of entire peoples, the Crimean Tatars, the Volga Germans, the Kalmyks and other Caucasus peoples. Readers of the literary journal *Novy Mir* recently could read for themselves a description of the "road of death" between Norilsk and Igarka [in northern Siberia].

Temporary masters were replaced (Yagoda, Molotov, Yezhov, Zhdanov, Malenkov, Beria), but the antipeople's regime of Stalin remains equally cruel and at the same time dogmatically narrow and blind in its cruelty. The killing of military and engineering officials before the war, the blind faith in the "reasonableness" of the colleague in crime, Hitler, and the other reasons for the national tragedy of 1941 have been well described in the book by Nekrich, in the notes of Maj. Gen. Grigorenko and other publications—these are far from the only examples of the combination of crime, narrow-mindedness and short-sightedness.

Stalinist dogmatism and isolation from real life was demonstrated particularly in the countryside, in the policy of unlimited exploitation and the predatory forced deliveries at "symbolic" prices, in the almost serf-like enslavement of the peasantry, the depriving of peasants of the most simple means of mechanization and the appointment of collective-farm chairmen on the basis of their cunning and obsequiousness. The results are evident—a profound and hard-to-correct destruction of the economy and way of life in the countryside, which, by the law of interconnected vessels, damaged industry as well.

The inhuman character of Stalinism was demonstrated by the repressions of prisoners of war who survived Fascist camps and then were thrown into Stalinist camps, the anti-worker "decrees," the criminal exile of entire peoples condemned to slow death, the unenlightened zoological kind of anti-Semitism that was characteristic of Stalinist bureaucracy and the N.K.V.D. (and Stalin personally), the Ukrainophobia characteristic of Stalin and the draconian laws for the protection of socialist property (five years' imprisonment for stealing some grain from the fields and so forth) that served mainly as a means of fulfilling the demands of the "slave market."

An Unpublished History

A profound analysis of the origin and development of Stalinism is contained in the 1,000-page monograph of R. Medvedev. This was written from a socialist, Marxist point of view and is a successful work, but unfortunately it has not yet been published. The present author is not likely to receive such a compliment from Comrade Medvedev, who finds elements of "Westernism" in his

views. Well, there is nothing like controversy! Actually the views of the present author are profoundly socialist and he hopes that the attentive reader will understand this.

The author is quite aware of the monstrous relations in human and international affairs brought forth by the egotistical principle of capital when it is not under pressure from socialist and progressive forces. He also thinks however, that progressives in the West understand this better than he does and are waging a struggle against these manifestations. The author is concentrating his attention on what is before his eyes and on what is obstructing, from his point of view, a worldwide overcoming of estrangement, obstructing the struggle for democracy, social progress and intellectual freedom.

Our country has started on the path of cleansing away the foulness of Stalinism. "We are squeezing the slave out of ourselves drop by drop" (an expression of Anton Chekhov). We are learning to express our opinions, without taking the lead from the bosses and without fearing for our lives.

Khrushchev Is Credited

The beginning of this arduous and far from straight path evidently dates from the report of Nikita S. Khrushchev to the 20th congress of the Soviet Communist party. This bold speech, which came as a surprise to Stalin's accomplices in crime, and a number of associated measures—the release of hundreds of thousands of political prisoners and their rehabilitation, steps toward a revival of the principles of peaceful coexistence and toward a revival of democracy—oblige us to value highly the historic role of Khrushchev despite his regrettable mistakes of a voluntarist character in subsequent years and despite the fact that Khrushchev, while Stalin was alive, was one of his collaborators in crime, occupying a number of influential posts.

The exposure of Stalinism in our country still has a long way to go. It is imperative, of course, that we publish all authentic documents, including the archives of the N.K.V.D., and conduct nationwide investigations. It would be highly useful for the international authority of the Soviet Communist party and the ideals of socialism if, as was planned in 1964 but never carried out, the party were to announce the "symbolic" expulsion of Stalin, murderer of millions of party members, and at the same time the political rehabilitation of the victims of Stalinism.

In 1936-39 alone more than 1.2 million party members, half of the total membership, were arrested. Only 50,000 regained freedom; the others were tortured during interrogation or were shot (800,000) or died in camps. Only in isolated cases were the rehabilitated allowed to assume responsible posts; even fewer were permitted to take part in the investigation of crimes of which they had been witnesses or victims.

We are often told lately not to "rub salt into wounds." This is usually being said by people who suffered no wounds. Actually only the most meticulous analysis of the past and of its consequences will now enable us to wash off the blood and dirt that befouled our banner.

It is sometimes suggested in the literature that the political manifestations of Stalinism represented a sort of superstructure over the economic basis of an anti-Leninist pseudosocialism that led to the formation in the Soviet Union of a distinct class—a bureaucratic elite from which all key positions are filled and which is rewarded for its work through open and concealed privileges. I cannot deny that there is some (but not the whole) truth in such an interpretation, which would help explain the vitality of neo-Stalinism, but a full analysis of this issue would go beyond the scope of

this article, which focuses on another aspect of the problem.

It is imperative that we restrict in every possible way the influence of neo-Stalinists in our political life. Here we are compelled to mention a specific person. One of the most influential representatives of neo-Stalinism at the present time is the director of the Science Department of the Communist party's Central Committee, Sergei P. Trapeznikov. The leadership of our country and our people should know that the views of this unquestionably intelligent, shrewd and highly consistent man are basically Stalinist (from our point of view, they reflect the interests of the bureaucratic elite).

His views differ fundamentally from the dreams and aspirations of the majority and most active section of the intelligentsia, which, in our opinion, reflect the true interests of all our people and progressive mankind. The leadership of our country should understand that as long as such a man (if I correctly understand the nature of his views) exercises influence, it is impossible to hope for a strengthening of the party's position among scientific and artistic intellectuals. An indication of this was given at the last elections in the Academy of Sciences when S.P. Trapeznikov was rejected by a substantial majority of votes, but this hint was not "understood" by the leadership.

The issue does not involve the professional or personal qualities of Trapeznikov, about which I know little. The issue involves his political views. I have based the foregoing on word-of-mouth evidence. Therefore, I cannot in principle exclude the possibility (although it is unlikely) that in reality everything is quite the opposite. In that pleasant event, I would beg forgiveness and retract what I have written.

THE CULT OF MAOISM

In recent years, demagoguery, violence, cruelty and villainess have seized a great country that had embarked on the path of socialist development. I refer, of course, to China. It is impossible without horror and pain to read about the mass contagion of inhumanism being spread by "the great helmsman" and his accomplices, about the Red Guards who, according to the Chinese radio, "jumped with joy" during public executions of "ideological enemies" of Chairman Mao.

The ideology of the cult of personality has assumed in China monstrous, grotesquely tragicomic forms, carrying to the point of absurdity many of the traits of Stalinism and Hitlerism. But this absurdity has proved effective in making fools of tens of millions of people and in destroying and humiliating millions of more honest and more intelligent people.

The full picture of the tragedy in China is unclear. But in any case, it is impossible to look at it in isolation from the internal economic difficulties of China after the collapse of the adventure of "the great leap forward," in isolation from the struggle by various groups for power, or in isolation from the foreign political situation—the war in Vietnam, the estrangement in the world and the inadequate and lagging struggle against Stalinism in the Soviet Union.

The greatest damage from Maoism is often seen in the split of the world Communist movement. That is, of course, not so. The split is the result of a disease and to some extent represents the way to treat that disease. In the presence of the disease a formal unity would have been a dangerous, unprincipled compromise that would have led the world Communist movement into a blind alley once and for all.

Actually the crimes of the Maoists against human rights have gone much too far, and the Chinese people are now in much greater need of help from the world's democratic forces to defend their rights than in need

of the unity of the world's Communist forces, in the Maoist sense, for the purpose of combatting the so-called imperialist peril somewhere in Africa or in Latin America, or in the Middle East.

The threat to intellectual freedom

This is a threat to the independence and worth of the human personality, a threat to the meaning of human life.

Nothing threatens freedom of the personality and the meaning of life like war, poverty, terror. But there are also indirect and only slightly more remote dangers.

One of these is the stupefaction of man (the "gray mass", to use the cynical term of bourgeois prognosticators) by mass culture with its intentional or commercially motivated lowering of intellectual level and content, with its stress on entertainment or utilitarianism, and with its carefully protective censorship.

Another example is related to the question of education. A system of education under government control, separation of school and church, universal free education—all these are great achievements of social progress. But everything has a reverse side. In this case it is excessive standardization, extending to the teaching process itself, to the curriculum, especially in literature, history, civics, geography, and to the system of examinations.

One cannot but see a danger in excessive reference to authority and in the limitation of discussion and intellectual boldness at an age when personal convictions are beginning to be formed. In the old China, the system of examinations for official positions led to mental stagnation and to the canonizing of the reactionary aspects of Confucianism. It is highly undesirable to have anything like that in a modern society.

Modern technology and mass psychology constantly suggest new possibilities of managing the norms of behavior, the strivings and convictions of masses of people. This involves not only management through information based on the theory of advertising and mass psychology, but also more technical methods that are widely discussed in the press abroad. Examples are biochemical control of the birth rate, biochemical control of psychic processes and electronic control of such processes.

Warns on Experiments

It seems to me that we cannot completely ignore these new methods or prohibit the progress of science and technology, but we must be clearly aware of the awesome dangers to basic human values and to the meaning of life that may be concealed in the misuse of technical and biochemical methods and the methods of mass psychology.

Man must not be turned into a chicken or a rat as in the well known experiments in which elation is induced electrically through electrodes inserted into the brain. Related to this is the question of the ever increasing use of tranquilizers and antidepressants, legal and illegal narcotics, and so forth.

We also must not forget the very real danger mentioned by Norbert Wiener in his book "Cybernetics," namely the absence in cybernetic machines of stable human norms of behavior. The tempting, unprecedented power that mankind, or, even worse, a particular group in a divided mankind, may derive from the wise counsels of its future intellectual aides, the artificial "thinking" automata, may be, as Wiener warned, become a fatal trap; the counsels may turn out to be incredibly insidious and, instead of pursuing human objectives, may pursue completely abstract problems that had been transformed in an unforeseen manner in the artificial brain.

Such a danger will become quite real in a few decades if human values, particularly freedom of thought, will not be strengthened, if alienation will not be eliminated.

Let us now return to the dangers of today, to the need for intellectual freedom, which will enable the public at large and the intelligentsia to control and assess all acts, designs and decisions of the ruling group.

Marx and Lenin Quoted

Marx once wrote that the illusion that the "bosses know everything best" and "only the higher circles familiar with the official nature of things can pass judgment" was held by officials who equate the public weal with governmental authority.

Both Marx and Lenin always stressed the viciousness of a bureaucratic system as the opposite of a democratic system. Lenin used to say that every cook should learn how to govern. Now the diversity and complexity of social phenomena and the dangers facing mankind have become immeasurably greater; and it is therefore all the more important that mankind be protected against the danger of dogmatic and voluntaristic errors, which are inevitable when decisions are reached in a closed circle of secret advisers or shadow cabinets.

It is no wonder that the problem of censorship (in the broadest sense of the word) has been one of the central issues in the ideological struggle of the last few years. Here is what a progressive American sociologist, Lewis A. Coser, has to say on this point:

"It would be absurd to attribute the alienation of many avant-garde authors solely to the battle with the censors, yet one may well maintain that those battles contributed in no mean measure to such alienation. To these authors, the censor came to be the very symbol of the Philistinism, hypocrisy and meanness of bourgeois society.

"Many an author who was initially apolitical was drawn to the political left in the United States because the left was in the forefront of the battle against censorship. The close alliance of avant-garde art with avant-garde political and social radicalism can be accounted for, at least in part, by the fact that they came to be merged in the mind of many as a single battle for freedom against all repression" (I quote from an article by Igor Kon, published in *Novy Mir* in January, 1968).

We are all familiar with the passionate and closely argued appeal against censorship by the outstanding Soviet writer A. Solzhenitsyn. He as well as G. Vladimov, G. Svirsky and other writers who have spoken out on the subject have clearly shown how incompetent censorship destroys the living soul of Soviet literature; but the same applies, of course, to all other manifestations of social thought, causing stagnation and dullness and preventing fresh and deep ideas.

Such ideas, after all, can arise only in discussion. In the face of objections, only if there is a potential possibility of expressing not only true, but also dubious ideas. This was clear to the philosophers of ancient Greece and hardly anyone nowadays would have any doubts on that score. But after 50 years of complete domination over the minds of an entire nation, our leaders seem to fear even allusions to such a discussion.

At this point we must touch on some disgraceful tendencies that have become evident in the last few years. We will cite only a few isolated examples without trying to create a whole picture. The crippling censorship of Soviet artistic and political literature has again been intensified. Dozens of brilliant writings cannot see the light of day. They include some of the best of Solzhenitsyn's works, executed with great artistic and moral force and containing profound artistic and philosophical generalizations. Is this not a disgrace?

Wide indignation has been aroused by the recent decree adopted by the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Republic, amending the Criminal Code in direct contravention of the civil rights proclaimed by our Constitution. [The

decree included literary protests among acts punishable under Article 190, which deals with failure to report crimes.]

Literary Trials Assailed

The Daniel-Sinyavsky trial, which has been condemned by the progressive public in the Soviet Union and abroad (from Louis Aragon to Graham Greene) and has compromised the Communist system, has still not been reviewed. The two writers languish in a camp with a strict regime and are being subjected (especially Daniel) to harsh humiliations and ordeals.

Most political prisoners are now kept in a group of camps in the Mordvinian Republic, where the total number of prisoners, including criminals, is about 50,000. According to available information, the regime has become increasingly severe in these camps, with personnel left over from Stalinist times playing an increasing role. It should be said in all fairness that a certain improvement has been noted very recently; it is to be hoped that this turn of events will continue.

The restoration of Leninist principles of public control over places of imprisonment would undoubtedly be a healthy development. Equally important would be a complete amnesty of political prisoners, and not just the recent limited amnesty, which was proclaimed on the 50th anniversary of the October Revolution as a result of a temporary victory of rightist tendencies in our leadership. There should also be a review of all political trials that are still raising doubts among the progressive public.

Was it not disgraceful to allow the arrest, 12-month detention without trial and then the conviction and sentencing to terms of five to seven years of Ginzburg, Galanskov and others for activities that actually amounted to a defense of civil liberties and (partly as an example) of Daniel and Sinyavsky personally. The author of these lines sent an appeal to the party's Central Committee on Feb. 11, 1967, asking that the Ginzburg-Galanskov case be closed. He received no reply and no explanations on the substance of the case. It was only later that he heard that there had been an attempt (apparently inspired by Semichastny, the former chairman of the K.G.B.) to slander the present writer and several other persons on the basis of inspired false testimony by one of the accused in the Galanskov-Ginzburg case. Subsequently the testimony of that person—Dobrovolsky—was used at the trial as evidence to show that Ginzburg and Galanskov had ties with a foreign anti-Soviet organization, which one cannot help but doubt.

[The reference here is to evidence given by Dobrovolsky in the pretrial investigation of the case of Vladimir Bukovsky, Vadim Delone and Yevgeny Kushev in early 1967. Dobrovolsky said there allegedly existed "a single anti-Communist front ranging from Academicians Sakharov and Leontovich to SMOG," an illegal group of young writers and artists.]

Persecution Is Charged

Was it not disgraceful to permit the conviction and sentencing (to three years in camps) of Khavistov and Bukovsky for participation in a meeting in defense of their comrades? Was it not disgraceful to allow persecution, in the best witchhunt tradition, of dozens of members of the Soviet intelligentsia who spoke out against the arbitrariness of judicial and psychiatric agencies, to attempt to force honorable people to sign false, hypocritical "retractions," to dismiss and blacklist people, to deprive young writers, editors and other members of the intelligentsia of all means of existence?

Here is a typical example of this kind of activity.

Comrade B., a woman editor of books on motion pictures, was summoned to the party's district committee. The first question was, Who gave you the letter in defense of Ginzburg to sign? Allow me not to reply to that question, she answered. All right, you

can go, we want to talk this over, she was told. The decision was to expel the woman from the party and to recommend that she be dismissed from her job and barred from working anywhere else in the field of culture.

With such methods of persuasion and indoctrination the party can hardly expect to claim the role of spiritual leaders of mankind.

Was it not disgraceful to have the speech at the Moscow party conference by the president of the Academy of Sciences (Mstislav V. Keldysh), who is evidently either too intimidated or too dogmatic in his views? Is it not disgraceful to allow another backsliding into anti-Semitism in our appointments policy (incidentally, in the highest bureaucratic elite of our government, the spirit of anti-Semitism was never fully dispelled after the nineteen thirties).

Was it not disgraceful to continue to restrict the civil rights of the Crimean Tatars, who lost about 46 per cent of their numbers (mainly children and old people) in the Stalinist repressions? Nationality problems will continue to be a reason for unrest and dissatisfaction unless all departures from Leninist principles are acknowledged and analyzed and firm steps are taken to correct mistakes.

Is it not highly disgraceful and dangerous to make increasingly frequent attempts, either directly or indirectly (through silence), to publicly rehabilitate Stalin, his associates and his policy, his pseudosocialism of terroristic bureaucracy, a socialism of hypocrisy and ostentatious growth that was at best a quantitative and one-sided growth involving the loss of many qualitative features? (This is a reference to the basic tendencies and consequences of Stalin's policy, or Stalinism, rather than a comprehensive assessment of the entire diversified situation in a huge country with 200 million people.)

Although all these disgraceful phenomena are still far from the monstrous scale of the crimes of Stalinism and rather resemble in scope the sadly famous McCarthyism of the cold war era, the Soviet public cannot but be highly disturbed and indignant and display vigilance even in the face of insignificant manifestations of neo-Stalinism in our country.

EFFECT ON OTHER PARTIES

We are convinced that the world's Communists will also view negatively any attempts to revive Stalinism in our country, which would, after all, be an awful blow to the attractive force of Communist ideas throughout the world.

Today the key to a progressive restructuring of the system of government in the interests of mankind lies in intellectual freedom. This has been understood, in particular, by the Czechoslovaks and there can be no doubt that we should support their bold initiative, which is so valuable for the future of socialism and all mankind. That support should be political and, in the early stages, include increased economic aid.

The situation involving censorship (Glavlit) in our country is such that it can hardly be corrected for any length of time simply by "liberalized" directives. Major organizational and legislative measures are required, for example, adoption of a special law on press and information that would clearly and convincingly define what can and what cannot be printed and would place the responsibility on competent people who would be under public control. It is essential that the exchange of information on an international scale (press, tourism and so forth) be expanded in every way, that we get to know ourselves better, that we not try to save on sociological, political and economic research and surveys, which should be conducted not only according to government-controlled programs (otherwise we might be tempted to avoid "unpleasant" subjects and questions).

The basis for hope

The prospects of socialism now depend on whether socialism can be made attractive, whether the moral attractiveness of the ideas of socialism and the glorification of labor, compared with the egotistical ideas of private ownership and the glorification of capital, will be the decisive factors that people will bear in mind when comparing socialism and capitalism, or whether people will remember mainly the limitations of intellectual freedom under socialism or, even worse, the fascistic regime of the cult [of personality].

I am placing the accent on the moral aspect because, when it comes to achieving a high productivity of social labor or developing all productive forces or insuring a high standard of living for most of the population, capitalism and socialism seem to have "played to a tie." Let us examine this question in detail.

The United States-Soviet Ski Race

Imagine two skiers racing through deep snow. At the start of the race, one of them, in striped jacket, was many kilometers ahead, but now the skier in the red jacket is catching up to the leader. What can we say about their relative strength? Not very much, since each skier is racing under different conditions. The striped one broke the snow, and the red one did not have to. (The reader will understand that this ski race symbolizes the burden of research and development costs that the country leading in technology has to bear.) All one can say about the race is that there is not much difference in strength between the two skiers.

The parable does not, of course, reflect the whole complexity of comparing economic and technological progress in the United States and the Soviet Union, the relative vitality of RRS and AME (Russian Revolutionary Sweep and American Efficiency).

We cannot forget that during much of the period in question the Soviet Union waged a hard war and then healed its wounds; we cannot forget that some absurdities in our development were not an inherent aspect of the socialist course of development, but a tragic accident, a serious, though not inevitable, disease.

On the other hand, any comparison must take account of the fact that we are now catching up with the United States only in some of the old, traditional industries, which are no longer as important as they used to be for the United States (for example, coal and steel). In some of the newer fields, for example, automation, computers, petrochemicals and especially in industrial research and development, we are not only lagging behind but are also growing more slowly, so that a complete victory of our economy in the next few decades is unlikely.

It must also be borne in mind that our nation is endowed with vast natural resources, from fertile black earth to coal and forest, from oil to manganese and diamonds. It must be borne in mind that during the period under review our people worked to the limit of its capacity, which resulted in a certain depletion of resources.

We must also bear in mind the ski-track effect, in which the Soviet Union adopted principles of industrial organization and technological and development previously tested in the United States. Examples are the method of calculating the national fuel budget, assembly-line techniques, antibiotics, nuclear power, oxygen converters in steelmaking, hybrid corn, self-propelled harvester combines, strip mining of coal, rotary excavators, semiconductors in electronics, the shift from steam to diesel locomotives, and much more.

There is only one justifiable conclusion and it can be formulated cautiously as follows:

1. We have demonstrated the vitality of

the socialist course, which has done a great deal for the people materially, culturally and socially and, like no other system, has glorified the moral significance of labor.

2. There are no grounds for asserting, as is often done in the dogmatic vein, that the capitalist mode of production leads the economy into a blind alley or that it is obviously inferior to the socialist mode in labor productivity, and there are certainly no grounds for asserting that capitalism always leads to absolute impoverishment of the working class.

Progress by Capitalism

The continuing economic progress being achieved under capitalism should be a fact of great theoretical significance for any non-dogmatic Marxist. It is precisely this fact that lies at the basis of peaceful coexistence and it suggests, in principle, that if capitalism ever runs into an economic blind alley it will not necessarily have to leap into a desperate military adventure. Both capitalism and socialism are capable of long-term development, borrowing positive elements from each other and actually coming closer to each other in a number of essential aspects.

I can just hear the outcries about revisionism and blunting of the class approach to this issue; I can just see the smirks about political naiveté and immaturity. But the facts suggest that there is real economic progress in the United States and other capitalist countries, that the capitalists are actually using the social principles of socialism, and that there has been real improvement of the position of the working people. More important, the facts suggest that on any other course except ever-increasing coexistence and collaboration between the two systems and the two superpowers, with a smoothing of contradictions and with mutual assistance, on any other course annihilation awaits mankind. There is no other way out.

Two Systems Compared

We will now compare the distribution of personal income and consumption for various social groups in the United States and the Soviet Union. Our propaganda materials usually assert that there is crying inequality in the United States, while the Soviet Union has something entirely just, entirely in the interests of the working people. Actually both statements contain halftruths and a fair amount of hypocritical evasion.

I have no intention of minimizing the tragic aspects of the poverty, lack of rights and humiliation of the 22 million American Negroes. But we must clearly understand that this problem is not primarily a class problem, but a racial problem, involving the racism and egotism of white workers, and that the ruling group in the United States is interested in solving this problem. To be sure the government has not been as active as it should be; this may be related to fears of an electoral character and to fears of upsetting the unstable equilibrium in the country and thus activate extreme leftist and especially extreme rightist parties. It seems to me that we in the socialist camp should be interested in letting the ruling group in the United States settle the Negro problem without aggravating the situation in the country.

At the other extreme, the presence of millionaires in the United States is not a serious economic burden in view of their small number. The total consumption of the rich is less than 20 percent, that is, less than the total rise of national consumption over a five-year period. From this point of view, a revolution, which would be likely to halt economic progress for more than five years, does not appear to be an economically advantageous move for the working people. And I am not even talking of the blood-letting that is inevitable in a revolution. And I am not talking of the danger of the "irony of

history," about which Friedrich Engels wrote so well in his famous letter to V. Zasulich, the "irony" that took the form of Stalinism in our country.

There are, of course, situations where revolution is the only way out. This applies especially to national uprisings. But that is not the case in the United States and other developed capitalist countries, as suggested, incidentally, in the programs of the Communist parties of these countries.

As far as our country is concerned, here, too, we should avoid painting an idyllic picture. There is still great inequality in property between the city and the countryside, especially in rural areas that lack a transport outlet to the private market or do not produce any goods in demand in private trade. There are great differences between cities with some of the new, privileged industries and those with older, antiquated industries. As a result 40 percent of the Soviet population is in difficult economic circumstances. In the United States about 25 percent of the population is on the verge of poverty. On the other hand the 5 percent of the Soviet population that belong to the managerial group is as privileged as its counterpart in the United States.

The Managerial Group

The development of modern society in both the Soviet Union and the United States is now following the same course of increasing complexity of structure and of industrial management, giving rise in both countries to managerial groups that are similar in social character.

We must therefore acknowledge that there is no qualitative difference in the structure of society of the two countries in terms of distribution of consumption. Unfortunately, the effectiveness of the managerial group in the Soviet Union (and, to a lesser extent, in the United States) is measured not only in purely economic or productive terms. This group also performs a concealed protective function that is rewarded in the sphere of consumption by concealed privileges.

Few people are aware of the practice under Stalin of paying salaries in sealed envelopes, of the constantly recurring concealed distribution of scarce foods and goods for various services, privileges in vacation resorts, and so forth.

I want to emphasize that I am not opposed to the socialist principle of payment based on the amount and quality of labor. Relatively higher wages for better administrators, for highly skilled workers, teachers and physicians, for workers in dangerous or harmful occupations, for workers in science, culture and the arts, all of whom account for a relatively small part of the total wage bill, do not threaten society if they are not accompanied by concealed privileges; moreover, higher wages benefit society if they are deserved.

The point is that every wasted minute of a leading administrator represents a major material loss for the economy and every wasted minute of a leading figure in the arts means a loss in the emotional, philosophical and artistic wealth of society. But when something is done in secret, the suspicion inevitably arises that things are not clean, that loyal servants of the existing system are being bribed.

It seems to me that the rational way of solving this touchy problem would be not the setting of income ceilings for party members or some such measure, but simply the prohibition of all privileges and the establishment of unified wage rates based on the social value of labor and an economic market approach to the wage problem.

I consider that further advances in our economic reform and a greater role for economic and market factors accompanied by increased public control over the managerial group (which, incidentally, is also essential in capitalist countries) will help eliminate

all the roughness in our present distribution pattern.

An even more important aspect of the economic reform for the regulation and stimulation of production is the establishment of a correct system of market prices, proper allocation and rapid utilization of investment funds and proper use of natural and human resources based on appropriate rents in the interest of our society.

A number of socialist countries, including the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia are now experimenting with basic economic problems of the role of planning and of the market, government and cooperative ownership, and so forth. These experiments are of great significance.

Rapprochement Advocated

Summing up we now come to our basic conclusion about the moral and ethical character of the advantages of the socialist course of development of human society. In our view, this does not in any way minimize the significance of socialism. Without socialism bourgeois practicalism and the egotistical principle of private ownership gave rise to the "people of the abyss" described by Jack London and earlier by Engels.

Only the competition with socialism and the pressure of the working class made possible the social progress of the 20th century and, all the more, will insure the now inevitable process of rapprochement of the two systems. It took socialism to raise the meaning of labor to the heights of a moral feat. Before the advent of socialism, national egotism gave rise to colonial oppression, nationalism and racism. By now it has become clear that victory is on the side of the humanistic, international approach.

The capitalist world could not help giving birth to the socialist, but now the socialist world should not seek to destroy by force the ground from which it grew. Under the present conditions this would be tantamount to suicide of mankind. Socialism should ennoble that ground by its example and other indirect forms of pressure and then merge with it.

The rapprochement with the capitalist world should not be an unprincipled anti-popular plot between ruling groups, as happened in the extreme case [of the Soviet-Nazi rapprochement] of 1939-40. Such a rapprochement must rest not only on a socialist, but on a popular democratic foundation, under the control of public opinion, as expressed through publicity, elections and so forth.

Such a rapprochement implies not only wide social reforms in the capitalist countries, but also substantial changes in the structure of ownership, with a greater role played by government and cooperative ownership, and the preservation of the basic present features of ownership of the means of production in the socialist countries.

Our allies along this road are not only the working class and the progressive intelligentsia, which are interested in peaceful coexistence and social progress and in a democratic peaceful transition to socialism (as reflected in the programs of the Communist parties of the developed countries), but also the reformist part of the bourgeoisie, which supports such a program of "convergence." Although I am using this term, taken from the Western literature, it is clear from the foregoing that I have given it a socialist and democratic meaning.

Typical representatives of the reformist bourgeoisie are Cyrus Eaton, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, and, especially, President John F. Kennedy. Without wishing to cast a stone in the direction of Comrade N. S. Khrushchev (our high esteem of his services was expressed earlier), I cannot help recalling one of his statements, which may have been more typical of his entourage than of him personally.

On July 10, 1951, in speaking at a reception of specialists about his meeting with Kennedy in Vienna, Comrade Khrushchev recalled Kennedy's request that the Soviet Union, in conducting policy and making demands, consider the actual possibilities and the difficulties of the new Kennedy Administration and refrain from demanding more than it could grant without courting the danger of being defeated in elections and being replaced by rightist forces. At that time, Khrushchev did not give Kennedy's unprecedented request the proper attention, to put it mildly, and began to rattle. And now, after the shots in Dallas, who can say what auspicious opportunities in world history have been, if not destroyed, but, at any rate, set back because of a lack of understanding.

Bertrand Russell once told a peace congress in Moscow that "the world will be saved from thermonuclear annihilation if the leaders of each of the two systems prefer complete victory of the other system to a thermonuclear war I am quoting from memory." It seems to me that such a solution would be acceptable to the majority of people in any country, whether capitalist or socialist. I consider that the leaders of the capitalist and socialist systems by the very nature of things will gradually be forced to adopt the point of view of the majority of mankind.

Intellectual freedom of society will facilitate and smooth the way for this trend toward patience, flexibility and a security from dogmatism, fear and adventurism. All mankind, including its best organized and active forces, the working class and the intelligentsia, is interested in freedom and security.

Four-stage plan for cooperation

Having examined in the first part of this essay the development of mankind according to the worse alternative, leading to annihilation, we must now attempt, even schematically, to suggest the better alternative. (The author concedes the primitiveness of his attempts at prognostication, which requires the joint efforts of many specialists, and here, even more than elsewhere, invites positive criticism.)

[1]

In the first stage, a growing ideological struggle in the socialist countries between Stalinist and Maoist forces, on the one hand, and the realistic forces of leftist Leninist Communists (and leftist Westerners), on the other, will lead to a deep ideological split on an international, national and intraparty scale.

In the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, this process will lead first to a multiparty system (here and there) and to acute ideological struggle and discussions, and then to the ideological victory of the realists, affirming the policy of increasing peaceful coexistence, strengthening democracy and expanding economic reforms (1960-80). The dates reflect the most optimistic unrolling of events.

The author, incidentally, is not one of those who consider the multiparty system to be an essential stage in the development of the socialist system or, even less, a panacea for all ills, but he assumes that in some cases a multiparty system may be an inevitable consequence of the course of events when a ruling Communist party refuses for one reason or another to rule by the scientific democratic method required by history.

In the second stage, persistent demands for social progress and peaceful coexistence in the United States and other capitalist countries, and pressure exerted by the example of the socialist countries and by internal progressive forces (the working class and the intelligentsia) will lead to the victory of the leftist reformist wing of the bourgeoisie, which will begin to implement a program of rapprochement (convergence) with socialism, i.e. social prog-

ress, peaceful coexistence and collaboration with socialism on a world scale and changes in the structure of ownership. This phase includes an expanded role for the intelligentsia and an attack on the forces of racism and militarism (1972-85). (The various stages overlaps.)

In the third stage, the Soviet Union and the United States, having overcome their alienation, solve the problem of saving the poorer half of the world. The above-mentioned 20 per cent tax on the national income of developed countries is applied. Gigantic fertilizer factories and irrigations systems using atomic power will be built [in the developing countries], the resources of the sea will be used to a vastly greater extent, indigenous personnel will be trained, and industrialization will be carried out. Gigantic factories will produce synthetic amino acids, and synthesize proteins, fats and carbohydrates. At the same time disarmament will proceed (1972-90).

In the fourth stage, the socialist convergence will reduce differences in social structure, promote intellectual freedom, science and economic progress and lead to creation of a world government and the smoothing of national contradictions (1980-2000). During this period decisive progress can be expected in the field of nuclear power, both on the basis of uranium and thorium and, probably, deuterium and lithium.

Some authors consider it likely that explosive breeding (the reproduction of active materials such as plutonium, uranium 233 and tritium) may be used in subterranean or other enclosed explosions.

During this period the expansion of space exploration will require thousands of people to work and live continuously on other planets and on the moon, on artificial satellites and on asteroids whose orbits will have been changed by nuclear explosions.

The synthesis of materials that are superconductors at room temperature may completely revolutionize electrical technology, cybernetics, transportation and communications. Progress in biology (in this and subsequent periods) will make possible effective control and direction of all life processes at the levels of the cell, organism, ecology and society, from fertility and aging to psychic processes and heredity.

If such an all-encompassing scientific and technological revolution, promising uncounted benefits for mankind, is to be possible and safe, it will require the greatest possible scientific foresight and care and concern for human values of a moral, ethical and personal character. (I touched briefly on the danger of a thoughtless bureaucratic use of the scientific and technological revolution in a divided world in the section on "Dangers," but could add a great deal more.) Such a revolution will be possible and safe only under highly intelligent worldwide guidance.

The foregoing program presumes:

(a) worldwide interest in overcoming the present divisions;

(b) the expectation that modifications in both the socialist and capitalist countries will tend to reduce contradictions and differences;

(c) worldwide interest of the intelligentsia, the working class and other progressive forces in a scientific democratic approach to politics, economics and culture;

(d) the absence of unsurmountable obstacles to economic development in both world economic systems that might otherwise lead inevitably into a blind alley, despair and adventurism.

Every honorable and thinking person who has not been poisoned by narrow-minded difference will seek to insure that future development will be along the lines of the better alternative. However only broad, open discussion, without the pressure of fear and prejudice, will help the majority to adopt the correct and best course of action.

Proposals summarized

In conclusion, I will sum up some of the concrete proposals of varying degrees of importance that have been discussed in the text. These proposals, addressed to the leadership of the country, do not exhaust the content of the article.

[1]

The strategy of peaceful coexistence and collaboration must be deepened in every way. Scientific methods and principles of international policy will have to be worked out, based on scientific prediction of the immediate and more distant consequences.

[2]

The initiative must be seized in working out a broad program of struggle against hunger.

[3]

A law on press and information must be drafted, widely discussed and adopted, with the aim not only of ending irresponsible and irrational censorship, but of encouraging self-study in our society, fearless discussion and the search for truth. The law must provide for the material resources of freedom of thought.

[4]

All anticonstitutional laws and decrees violating human rights must be abrogated.

[5]

Political prisoners must be amnestied and some of the recent political trials must be reviewed (for example, the Daniel-Sinyavsky and Galanskov-Ginzburg cases). The camp regime of political prisoners must be promptly relaxed.

[6]

The exposure of Stalin must be carried through to the end, to the complete truth, and not just to the carefully weighted half-truth dictated by case considerations. The influence of neo-Stalinists in our political life must be restricted in every way (the text mentioned, as an example, the case of S. Trapeznikow, who enjoys too much influence).

[7]

The economic reform must be deepened in every way and the area of experimentation expanded, with conclusions based on the results.

[8]

A law on geohygiene must be adopted after broad discussion, and ultimately become part of world efforts in this area.

With this article the author addresses the leadership of our country and all its citizens as well as all people of goodwill throughout the world. The author is aware of the controversial character of many of his statements. His purpose is open, frank discussion under conditions of publicity.

In conclusion a textological comment. In the process of discussion of previous drafts of this article, some incomplete and in some respects one-sided texts have been circulated. Some of them contained certain passages that were inept in form and tact and were included through oversight. The author asks readers to bear this in mind. The author is deeply grateful to readers of preliminary drafts who communicated their friendly comments and thus helped improve the article and refine a number of basic statements.—A. Sakharov

PEOPLE MENTIONED IN SAKHAROV MANUSCRIPT

Aragon, Louis (born 1895): French Communist writer, who protested Soviet literary trials.

Beria, Lavrenti P. (1899-1953): Stalin's chief of secret police; executed by Stalin's successors.

Bukovsky, Vladimir: young Soviet writer; sentenced in September, 1967 to three years' imprisonment for participation in an unauthorized demonstration.

Clausewitz, Karl Von (1780-1831): Prussian general and military writer.

Crimean Tatars: Soviet ethnic minority, exiled in World War II for alleged collaboration with the Germans; fully cleared of accusation in July, 1967.

Daniel, Yuli M.: Soviet writer, sentenced in February, 1966, to five years' imprisonment on charges of having slandered the Soviet Union in books published abroad under the pen name Nikolai Arzhak.

Delone, Vadim: young Soviet poet; sentenced with Bukovsky to one year's imprisonment.

Dobrovolsky, Aleksel: contributor to Soviet underground magazine Phoenix 1966; arrested January, 1967 with Ginzburg and Galanskov; turned state's evidence; sentenced in January, 1968, to two years.

Ehrenburg, Ilya: the Soviet novelist who died last August at the age of 76.

Eichmann, Adolf: SS colonel who headed Gestapo's Jewish section; arrested by Israel in May, 1960; tried and executed in May, 1962.

Galanskov, Yuri: editor of Soviet underground magazine Phoenix 1966; sentenced in January, 1968 to seven years' imprisonment for anti-Soviet activity.

Ginzburg, Aleksandr: author of a book on the Sinyavsky-Daniel case that was published abroad; sentenced in January, 1968, to five years' imprisonment for anti-Soviet activity.

Glavlit: the Soviet censorship agency.

Greene, Graham: the British novelist, who protested Soviet literary trials.

Grigorenko, Pyotr G.: former major general in World War II; cashiered in 1964 on charges of anti-Soviet activity.

Henri, Ernst: pseudonym for a Soviet commentator; Semyon Rostovsky, who contributes frequently to the weekly Literaturnaya Gazeta.

Himmler, Heinrich: Hitler's secret police chief; suicide in 1945.

Khaustov, Viktor: sentenced in February, 1967, to three years' imprisonment for organizing demonstration on behalf of arrested writers.

Kushev, Yevgeny: young Soviet poet; sentenced in September, 1967, to one year's imprisonment for participation of protest demonstration.

Leontovich, Mikhail A. (born 1903): Soviet nuclear physicist; an associate of Andrei D. Sakharov.

Malenkov, Georgi M. (born 1902): a close associate of Stalin; expelled from the Soviet leadership by Nikita S. Khrushchev in 1957.

Molotov, Vyacheslav M. (born 1890): a close associate of Stalin; expelled from the Soviet leadership by Nikita S. Khrushchev in 1957.

Nekrich, Aleksandr M.: Soviet historian, author of book on the German attack on the Soviet Union in 1941; reported criticized and ousted from Communist party in 1967.

Semichastny, Vladimir Y.: chairman of the K.G.B., Soviet secret police from 1961 until relieved of his post in May, 1967.

Sinyavsky, Andrei D.: Soviet writer, sentenced in February, 1968, to seven years' imprisonment on charges of having slandered the Soviet Union in books published abroad under the pen name of Abram Tertza.

Solzhenitsyn, Aleksandr I.: Soviet writer; author of "One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich"; in official disfavor and unpublished in recent years.

Wiener, Norbert (1894-1964): American mathematician; founder of the science of cybernetics, which laid the basis for computer technology.

Yagoda, Genrikh G.: Stalin's chief of secret police from 1934 to 1936; supervised early phase of great purges; was himself purged and executed in 1938.

Yezhov, Nikolai I.: Stalin's chief of secret police from 1936 to 1938; supervised the main phase of great purges; disappeared in 1939.

Zasluch, Vera I. (1851-1919): early Russian Marxist who had correspondence with Marx and Engels; she opposed terrorism as

a revolutionary tactic and joined Menshevik faction against Lenin.

Zhdanov, Andrei A. (1896-1948): a close associate of Stalin, in charge of artistic and scientific policies at height of his career from 1945 to 1948.

OUTSPOKEN SOVIET SCIENTIST: ANDREI DMITRIYEVICH SAKHAROV

In the fall of 1958, the Soviet Communist party newspaper, Pravda, opened its authoritative pages to the views of two prominent nuclear physicists in a nationwide debate on educational reform.

Academician Andrei D. Sakharov, then 37 years old, and a fellow academician, Yakov B. Zeldovich, urged separate schools for specially gifted children to train the future generation of scientists at an early age.

The authors contended that it was indisputable that mathematicians and physicists, at least, were most productive in the early stages of their careers and that many of the great discoveries in those fields had been made by scientists aged 22 to 26.

Dr. Sakharov, for one, was reasoning from personal experience. He earned his doctorate in physics at the age of 26, joined in making a major physical discovery at the age of 29 and, at 32, was elected a member of the Academy of Sciences, the most prestigious position for a Soviet scientist, having skipped the usual intermediate stage of corresponding member.

In recent years Dr. Sakharov (pronounced SAH-khan-roff) has continued to voice his views on public affairs. But instead of being officially sanctioned by publication in Pravda, his opinions, often critical of domestic and foreign policy, were circulating in manuscript among friends and associates.

His latest essay, written last month and now available here, outlines a plan for Soviet-American cooperation and ultimate rapprochement that he views as the only way to save mankind from thermonuclear war, overpopulation and famine, and pollution of the environment.

MEMBER OF THE ELITE

As a member of the scientific and technological elite of Soviet society, and as a man with broad intellectual horizons and range of interests, Dr. Sakharov has not been afraid to speak out, even if his views are in conflict with official policy.

In the spring of 1966, as the new Soviet leadership was preparing to convoke the 23d congress of the Communist party, the country was abuzz with rumors that Mr. Khrushchev's successors were planning to rectify his unqualified 1956 condemnation of Stalin's rule.

Academician Sakharov then joined fellow nuclear physicists and other intellectuals in a petition sent to Leonid I. Brezhnev, the new party chief, opposing any planned restoration of Stalin's status. The petitioners said the Soviet people "will never understand or accept" a rehabilitation of Stalin and they warned of a new split in Communist ranks, between the Soviet party and the Communist parties of the West, if such a step were taken.

It is unclear whether the high prestige of the signers and their argument proved persuasive, but no dramatic steps to change Stalin's status were taken at the congress in 1966.

Later that year, Dr. Sakharov again joined a group of petitioners, this time to object to a newly adopted decree that made unauthorized protest demonstrations a crime.

Entirely the product of the Soviet period, Andrei Dmitriyevich Sakharov was born May 21, 1921, and was graduated from Moscow University during the war year of 1942. Source published biographical data contain no information about his personal life or family background.

He joined the Lebedev Institute of Physics in Moscow, where he earned his doctorate in 1947 while working with Dr. Igor Y. Tamm, a specialist in quantum mechanics who, in 1958, became one of three Russians to share the Nobel Prize in Physics.

Research by Dr. Tamm and his students led in 1950 to a proposal that provided the theoretical basis for controlled thermonuclear fusion—the harnessing of the power of the hydrogen bomb for the generation of electricity for peaceful purposes.

The principle, involving the use of an electrical discharge in plasma (ionized gas) and heat containment by a magnetic field, furnished the basis for much subsequent controlled-fusion research, in which a breakthrough to commercial application is yet to be achieved.

For their work, both Dr. Sakharov and his teacher were elected full members of the Soviet Academy of Sciences in 1953. While Dr. Tamm had held the probationary corresponding membership for 20 years, his young associate moved directly into the highest level of the Soviet scientific elite.

Since 1959, Dr. Sakharov has been associated with Academician Mikhail A. Leontovich in research on the theoretical aspects of controlled fusion.

Dr. Sakharov's work has been publicized in the popular literature. A book for the general reader by V. P. Kartsev, entitled "Stories About Physics," scheduled for publication in Moscow later this year, describes his design for an "explosive-magnetic generator," a device that would produce electricity from an explosion contained by a magnetic field.

Dr. Sakharov was probably influenced in his outlook by Dr. Tamm, himself a candidate and courageous scholar who has attended some of the Pugwash conferences on science and international affairs. The meetings, which brought together scientists of East and West, were named for Pugwash, N.S., a Canadian village where the first conference was sponsored by Cyrus S. Eaton, the Cleveland industrialist.

SENATE RESOLUTION 388—RESOLUTION RELATIVE TO DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE ELMER J. HOLLAND OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (for Mr. CLARK and Mr. SCOTT) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 388) relative to the death of Representative Elmer J. Holland of Pennsylvania, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, which appears under a separate heading.)

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1969—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 939

Mr. PASTORE (for himself and Mr. JAVITS) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H.R. 18037) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(See reference to the above amendment when submitted by Mr. PASTORE, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT NO. 941

Mr. MUNDT (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota) proposed an amendment to House bill 18037, supra, which was ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, RELATING TO CERTAIN DEDUCTION BY FARMERS—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 940

Mr. MILLEF. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to H.R. 2787, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a farmer an amortized deduction from gross income for assessments for depreciable property levied by soil or water conservation or drainage districts, a bill which is pending on the Senate calendar.

My amendment is designed to remove a present inequity in our Federal income tax law with respect to the tax treatment of insurance proceeds received by farmers resulting from the destruction and damage of crops by hail.

Mr. President, the technical problem arises when a farmer produces crops and, quite often, does not sell those crops until the following year. When those crops are destroyed in the same year in which he sells the previous year's crop, under the present tax law, he is required to report and pay tax on the insurance proceeds, which are a substitute for the income from the crops, and the income from the present year's crops in the same year.

If the farmer had not been subject to the vicissitudes of hail, his crops would have been raised and he would have sold them in the following year. There would then have been no doubling up of income.

All my amendment does is to give the farmer the opportunity, where he has consistently followed the practice of selling crops produced in one year in the following year, of avoiding this doubling up hardship.

I trust that the Members of the Senate will recognize this inequity and see fit to agree to my amendment. I propose to call it up at the appropriate time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that public hearings have been scheduled for Thursday, September 12, 1968, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building on the following nominations:

William J. Holloway, Jr., of Oklahoma, to be U.S. circuit judge, 10th circuit, vice a new position created under Public Law 90-347 approved June 18, 1968.

Lawrence Gubow, of Michigan, to be U.S. district judge, eastern district of Michigan, vice Wade H. McCree, Jr., elevated.

David G. Bress, of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. district judge, District of Columbia, vice Joseph C. McGarraghy.