

# **THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF COMMUNISM IN 1970**

---

---

**HEARINGS**  
BEFORE THE  
**COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY**  
**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**  
NINETY-FIRST CONGRESS  
SECOND SESSION

---

JUNE 23, 24, AND 25, 1970  
(INCLUDING INDEX)

---

Printed for the use of the  
Committee on Internal Security



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

52-587

WASHINGTON : 1970

---

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office  
Washington, D.C. 20402—Price 40 cents

COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

RICHARD H. ICHORD, Missouri, *Chairman*

CLAUDE PEPPER, Florida

JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Ohio

EDWIN W. EDWARDS, Louisiana

RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH, Indiana

RICHARDSON PREYER, North Carolina

ALBERT W. WATSON, South Carolina

LOUIS STOKES, Ohio

WILLIAM J. SCHERLE, Iowa

DONALD G. SANDERS, *Chief Counsel*

RICHARD L. SCHULTZ, *Associate Chief Counsel*

ALFRED M. NITTLE, *Legislative Counsel*

JOHN F. LEWIS, *Coordinating Editor*

GLENN E. DAVIS, *Editorial Director*

ROBERT M. HORNER, *Chief Investigator*

WILLIAM G. SHAW, *Research Director*

(II)

## CONTENTS

June 23, 1970: Testimony of—	Page
Monika Flidr.....	4632
Emilio C. Callojo.....	4648
June 24: Testimony of—	
Alexey Vasilyevich Levin.....	4657
June 25, 1970: Testimony of—	
Jiri Mladek.....	4679
William R. Kintner.....	4696
Index.....	i

(III)

IV

The House Committee on Internal Security is a standing committee of the House of Representatives, constituted as such by the rules of the House, adopted pursuant to Article I, section 5, of the Constitution of the United States which authorizes the House to determine the rules of its proceedings.

RULES ADOPTED BY THE 91ST CONGRESS

House Resolution 7, January 3, 1969, as amended by House Resolution 89, February 18, 1969

RESOLUTION

Resolved, That the Rules of the House of Representatives of the 90th Congress, together with all applicable provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, be, and they are hereby adopted as the Rules of the House of Representatives of the 91st Congress \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

RULE X

STANDING COMMITTEES

1. There shall be elected by the House, at the commencement of each Congress,

\* \* \* \* \*

(k) Committee on Internal Security, to consist of nine Members.

\* \* \* \* \*

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

\* \* \* \* \*

11. Committee on Internal Security.

(a) Communist and other subversive activities affecting the internal security of the United States.

(b) The Committee on Internal Security, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make investigations from time to time of (1) the extent, character, objectives, and activities within the United States of organizations or groups, whether of foreign or domestic origin, their members, agents, and affiliates, which seek to establish, or assist in the establishment of, a totalitarian dictatorship within the United States, or to overthrow or alter, or assist in the overthrow or alteration of, the form of government of the United States or of any State thereof, by force, violence, treachery, espionage, sabotage, insurrection, or any unlawful means, (2) the extent, character, objectives, and activities within the United States of organizations or groups, their members, agents, and affiliates, which incite or employ acts of force, violence, terrorism, or any unlawful means, to obstruct or oppose the lawful authority of the Government of the United States in the execution of any law or policy affecting the internal security of the United States, and (3) all other questions, including the administration and execution of any law of the United States, or any portion of law, relating to the foregoing that would aid the Congress or any committee of the House in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Internal Security shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Internal Security, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise,

V

the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

\* \* \* \* \*

28. To assist the House in appraising the administration of the laws and in developing such amendments or related legislation as it may deem necessary, each standing committee of the House shall exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of any laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of such committee; and, for that purpose, shall study all pertinent reports and data submitted to the House by the agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

\* \* \* \* \*

## THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF COMMUNISM IN 1970

TUESDAY, JUNE 23, 1970

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY,  
*Washington, D.C.*

### PUBLIC HEARINGS

The Committee on Internal Security met, pursuant to call, at 10:25 a.m., in Room 311, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C., Hon. Richard H. Ichord, chairman, presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Richard H. Ichord of Missouri, Claude Pepper of Florida, and Louis Stokes of Ohio.

Staff members present: Donald G. Sanders, chief counsel, and Richard L. Schultz, associate chief counsel.

The CHAIRMAN. The meeting will come to order. A copy of the resolution authorizing these hearings will be inserted at this point.

(The resolution follows:)

#### RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the Congress of the United States in the Internal Security Act of 1950, has heretofore declared its findings that there exists a world-wide Communist movement whose purpose it is by espionage, sabotage, and other means to establish a totalitarian dictatorship in countries throughout the world; that the establishment of such dictatorship results in the denial of fundamental rights and liberties; that in the United States the Communist organization has thousands of adherents awaiting and seeking to advance a moment when overthrow of the U.S. Government by force and violence may seem possible of achievement, and that the Communist organization in the United States, together with other circumstances of the international Communist movement, presents a clear and present danger to the security of the United States and the existence of American institutions;

WHEREAS, the validity of these findings was reiterated in Public Law 90-237, approved by the President on January 2, 1968;

WHEREAS, recent events transpiring within the United States and data which has come to the attention of the Committee indicate that the Communist Party USA, continues its support of, and allegiance to, the international Communist movement, including its purpose to establish totalitarian dictatorships in those countries in which it operates;

WHEREAS, in order to assess the extent and severity of the current threat of the Communist movement within the United States for the purpose of evaluating the necessity for remedial legislation, together with the exercise of oversight function in relationship to the administration of the Internal Security Act of 1950, the Committee desires to adduce testimony and evidence concerning the Communist Party USA at the present time and in very recent years; and in view of the intention of international communism to impose its system of government on the people of the United States, the Committee also desires to adduce testimony and evidence concerning the effects of communism on the individual rights and liberties, and the quality of life thereby, of peoples of various nationalities already subjected to Communist government;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that investigation be conducted and hearings be held by the Committee on Internal Security, or a subcommittee thereof appointed by the chairman for that purpose in Washington, D.C. or at such place or places, and on such date or dates as the chairman may designate,

(4631)

4632

relating to the purposes, objectives and activities of the Communist Party USA, to advance the objectives of the world Communist movement, the strategy, tactics and means it employs or would employ to achieve such objectives, its affiliation with other organizations, domestic, foreign, or international, the extent of its influence, direction, support or control of any such other organization, the extent to which it may act in concert with, aid or assist, or be supported by foreign Communist powers, their agents or nationals, the effect of Communism on the individual rights and liberties, and the quality of life thereby, of peoples of various nationalities already subjected to Communist government, and all other facts in relation to the foregoing.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee meets this morning to receive testimony from witnesses who have escaped from behind the Iron Curtain in search of freedom.

Consistent with the mandate of this committee in assessing the extent and severity of the communist movement within the United States for the purpose of evaluating the necessity for remedial legislation in the exercise of our oversight function of the committee in relation to the administration of the Internal Security Act of 1950, the committee in these hearings will receive testimony from persons whose individual rights and liberties have been repressed and who, from grim experience, can furnish current personal information with regard to life behind the Iron Curtain.

Whom do you have as the first committee witness this morning, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. SCHULTZ. Miss Monika Flidr, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Miss Flidr, it is a pleasure to welcome you to the committee. Will you first raise your right hand and be sworn.

Miss Flidr, do you solemnly swear that you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Miss FLIDR. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

#### TESTIMONY OF MONIKA FLIDR

Mr. SCHULTZ. Would you state your full name and address please?

Miss FLIDR. My name is Monika Flidr, and I live at 10 West 66th Street in New York City.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What is your place of birth?

Miss FLIDR. I was born in Prague, Czechoslovakia.

Mr. SCHULTZ. How long did you live in Czechoslovakia?

Miss FLIDR. I lived there 24 years.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What was your occupation upon arriving at adulthood?

Miss FLIDR. I was a teacher at a junior high school.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What grades did you teach there?

Miss FLIDR. I taught children from 9 to about 14, 15 years of age.

Mr. SCHULTZ. When did you come to the United States?

Miss FLIDR. I came to America almost 5 years ago now.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Have you, since your arrival here, been in contact with recent defectors, people coming from Czechoslovakia?

Miss FLIDR. Yes, frequently.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Do you have relatively current information as to the living conditions over there at this time?

Miss FLIDR. I do. I am also frequently reading Czech newspapers and they are quite revealing.

4633

Mr. SCHULTZ. What newspapers do you read?

Miss FLIDR. I am reading, among others, *Pravda*, also *Rude Pravo*, which is the official newspaper, and I am reading quite a few others as they come my way.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Miss Flidr, would you describe for the committee your reasons for leaving Czechoslovakia?

Miss FLIDR. I detested living in a totalitarian state with an absolute dictatorship, with all its lack of freedom.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Would you describe for us how you left, what you had to do to leave Czechoslovakia?

Miss FLIDR. Legal emigration from the country practically does not exist. It exists according to the Constitution, but the people who apply are waiting for years and years and they never get any answer. You do not do that any more. You just do not ask for legal emigration. You just have to wait and try to escape.

Now I was lucky. Five years ago all tourist offices were run by the state—I mean, by the party. This is not a private business; all the money goes to the state.

Mr. SCHULTZ. When you say "party," what party is this?

Miss FLIDR. That is the Communist Party. You have to pay them, and at that time they started to capitalize on the people's desire to travel and they established short trips. In my case it was a 3-day business trip to Vienna, for which I had to pay my 1 month's salary, and I was permitted to go by bus to Vienna.

They made sure that we would not escape. The police checked with us the day before to see that we did not sell any of our possessions and we did not get any passports. It was the communist leader of the group who had one group passport.

Mr. SCHULTZ. You say the police checked with you. What did they actually do?

Miss FLIDR. They came to our apartment and had a look that everything was in its place, that the more valuable possessions were not sold out.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Is this a common practice of people who plan to leave the country, to sell possessions?

Miss FLIDR. Well, today, no. Of course, if you do want to escape, then you do try to do that. But practically today it does not exist any more because the people cannot travel at all. These trips were curbed and there is no freedom of travel whatsoever.

About half a year ago I read an official notice in the newspapers that people can travel to Western countries only on official state business and that means you are communists and are not expected to stay.

Mr. SCHULTZ. You mentioned that "we" left Czechoslovakia. Who went along with you?

Miss FLIDR. It was my mother and myself.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What steps did you take to prepare yourself to leave Czechoslovakia?

Miss FLIDR. Well see, the steps are mostly mental. You have to decide to leave your country, which you love, and to come to a country which is absolutely unknown to you because the communist propaganda in Czechoslovakia and in other countries just doesn't give you any objective information about Western countries.

Practically after we made up our mind, we just tried to smuggle through France some proofs of our education and that was all. Other-



4634

wise, we just left with practically two small luggages and that was about it.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Let's talk about the education first, since you were a teacher. What is the basic goal of education in Czechoslovakia? Is it to teach and educate the students or is it to advance the communist ideology?

Miss FLIDR. It is both, with the emphasis on the second part. Absolutely the absolute indoctrination and infiltration of our students is most important. Then, of course, you do teaching, too, but all the teachers in Czechoslovakia, not only during their studies but also during their professional life, have to go to frequent meetings where they are asked and taught how to indoctrinate children.

Practically while you teach any subject, you are supposed to place the achievements of communism and try to inject some bad remark about the Western World.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Are the textbooks controlled by the Communist Party?

Miss FLIDR. Oh, absolutely. As a matter of fact, it is so different from, for example here. The teachers or the principals don't have any word in selection of the textbooks. As a matter of fact, there is no selection. For every grade for certain subjects there is only one textbook which went through very strict censorship and you have to teach exactly according to that textbook. And at a certain time of the year, let's say in December at all grades throughout the whole of Czechoslovakia you are supposed to teach that subject from approximately the same page of the textbook.

The CHAIRMAN. At that point, Mr. Counsel, do you mean that there are textbooks for all of the subjects taught within the grade? I thought you said there is only one textbook for that grade?

Miss FLIDR. For each subject. You don't have a choice. Let us say in political science, in history, or in math or any other subject you cannot decide which textbook you want to teach from; there is only one for that subject.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Do students with inquiring minds ask questions or challenge statements in the textbooks?

Miss FLIDR. No, they do not. It is such an atmosphere of hypocrisy, everybody is so afraid. You do not dare to do it because you know, should you ask any nonconformist question, it would be in your personal record. It would follow you throughout your whole life. You could not continue in your studies, you could not get a decent professional position later on, you could not do anything; you could not travel, you could not get an apartment, you could not even buy a cow. So children do not ask these questions and the parents discourage them, and very often nice teachers who do not want them to be unhappy later on discourage them, too.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Are teachers required to be a member of the Communist Party?

Miss FLIDR. No, they are not, but there are other restrictions. For example, a teacher cannot go to church. According to our Constitution, theoretically you do have a right to belong to the faith of your choice. Practically, for example, if you are a teacher, you must not go to the church because it does not compare with the communist morals, with the communist personality.

Mr. SCHULTZ. You mention that the textbooks were controlled and that you taught strictly from them. Were you able to deviate in any manner or give any type of interpretation to what was in the textbooks?

Miss FLIDR. It was dangerous. You would not dare to give interpretation, but often when, in your opinion, some information was skipped from the textbook, you could let the pupils know by giving them that information and saying, "but this is bad, it isn't so, and you should realize where the truth is." But you were giving the information which was not supposed to be given. Of course, you had to protect yourself.

Mr. SCHULTZ. You mentioned that at your own risk you would go to church. Does the law of Czechoslovakia take into consideration the dignity of the individual?

Miss FLIDR. Absolutely not. You are practically an automaton. You are either supposed to submit yourself or you can give up any idea of a decent human life, not to speak about your profession.

Mr. SCHULTZ. You mentioned that you had a constitution. Are human rights accorded by this Constitution, but subject to recall?

Miss FLIDR. We do have a constitution, but it exists only in theory. In practice practically every freedom, every right which you get is so curbed and limited that you cannot exercise it, you cannot use it anyhow.

Mr. SCHULTZ. I know that you have seen in this country freedom of speech. Is freedom of speech, from the standpoint of dissent of students, allowed in Czechoslovakia?

Miss FLIDR. No, it is not allowed whatsoever. If the Communist Party and the police let the situation go that far as to some demonstration, which happens very infrequently, then the student leaders do go to prison and anyone who is involved is stopped from going to school again and the punishment is severe. That means the end of your professional life and of your studies.

Mr. SCHULTZ. You mentioned that they go to jail. How do they go to jail, as a political enemy or as a criminal?

Miss FLIDR. The pretense is that a band of hooligans sort of disturbs the order of the quiet streets of Prague, or something like that, and that is what you read in the newspaper. And yet when you are there, you do realize that this is a serious and nonviolent, very orderly attempt at a demonstration, which of course cannot be tolerated in a communist state and described as such.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Do they ever grant permits to demonstrate?

Miss FLIDR. Pardon me?

Mr. SCHULTZ. Does the government ever grant permits to demonstrate?

Miss FLIDR. Oh, no, nothing whatsoever. The only so-called demonstrations are the demonstrations which are ordered, and that means that all the students at all schools have to go to the streets and listen to the communist speeches of the communist leaders, which celebrate the achievements of communism. This is so-called spontaneous demonstration.

That is what you see, thousands of people which listen or are forced to shout communist slogans. But this is preceded by weeks of preparation, when the principal calls all the teachers and he says you do have to make pupils come. If they do not come, they have to bring a doctor's certificate. Otherwise, it will have bad consequences for them. So

that is the first demonstration prepared on order. When it is something that you yourself advocate, you just do not dare even to start anything resembling a demonstration.

Mr. SCHULTZ. As a school teacher, were you in the upper pay strata of the working group in Czechoslovakia?

Miss FLIDR. It is very paradoxical in Czechoslovakia. People with academic education, with academic background, are not paid much better than the workers, because the workers and the farmers are supposed to be the careers of the regime, the supporters of communism. So they are getting material privileges. As a young high school teacher you definitely do not make more than a semiskilled or a skilled worker. Even, let's say, as a physician, after a couple of years your salary still is not much more than a salary of skilled workers.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Could you comment for us on the availability of goods that you could purchase with your salary?

Miss FLIDR. I was making about 1400 korunas a month. If I were to tell you about the goods, I don't think that I will speak in dollars. My salary would then be just the nominal value rather than the practical value of money.

It is enough to say that if you, as a tourist, coming to Czechoslovakia—you get 14 korunas for one of your dollars. If I, as a Czech, tried to purchase a dollar for my travel or any other purposes, I have to pay 35 to the state bank. Now that depends which exchange you will take for your basis.

If you say how much do I make in terms of 35 korunas, which I have to pay for one American dollar, then perhaps I would make something about \$50 a month. Now if I would go with my salary and I would try to buy a suit for a boy or for a young man, it would cost almost the entire 1 month's salary which a young high school teacher would bring home. If you would try to buy electric appliances, such as televisions or refrigerators, you would speak in terms of at least 2 months' salary. You know this is the situation now.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What are the availabilities of these items?

Miss FLIDR. The availability is very limited. For example, if you try to buy such a thing as a car, you have to wait about 4 years. Now here is one of the subtle ways in which a communist regime can really keep you oppressed.

You know, should you say anything against communism itself, on your record and before you get the car, the committee which decides whether you get it or not judges your recommendations and your record. And should you even say anything against communism, you could forget even such a thing as a car.

It is not only with the goods, it is with apartments. If you get married and you just want to live in an apartment of your own, you have to apply for it. You wait about 15, 20 years and, again, if you misbehave from the viewpoint of Communist Party standards, you can forget it. You don't even get a chance of getting a place of your own.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What are the qualities of the goods once you can get on the list to get them?

Miss FLIDR. The quality is getting more and more mediocre and the thing is you cannot practically appeal anywhere. There is no competition. Everything is state controlled; they are set standard prices. You cannot go to any competition. If you want to buy that good,

you have to get it. If you are dissatisfied with it and you complain about it, usually in the newspapers you get the answer, which is practically an excuse and it does not help you any.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Let's get a little more basic than an automobile. How about the foodstuffs, the things that you put on your table, are they always available? Are they of good quality?

Miss FLIDR. In Czechoslovakia we practically don't have housewives. Even a married woman with little children has to go to work because they just could not afford to buy basic food and clothing for the family if she would not work. The availability is bad.

If you go back from the office in the evening with a small child in one hand and a shopping bag in the other, what happens is you go through very long lines, through queues in practically all stores, and you pay exorbitant prices.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Who sets these prices?

Miss FLIDR. These prices are set by the state. When I say "by the state," I mean by the Communist Party, because the chief executives, the leaders of the country, are communists. It is well known that it is not the President, but the first secretary of the Communist Party who has the executive power, the greatest executive power over the country. So when I say "the state," I mean the Communist Party, because all key positions are being held by devoted communists.

Mr. SCHULTZ. To what extent could you own personal or real property?

Miss FLIDR. It is very confused. If I would not make sense to any American when I try to explain it, please stop me. For example, theoretically you are permitted to own a home of your own. That means a little house, in theory. And according to the Constitution, you know, certainly you should be entitled to having it.

Now in practice even if you own a home, one person of your family can only have one room. So, in other words, if there is mother, father, and one child, if you have a big home you can only live in three rooms of that home. You cannot yourself rent the rest of the rooms. The communist committee which distributes apartments assigns you a tenant and you are forced to accept that tenant.

If your child grows and 20 years later you want that tenant's room for your now grown-up child and his family, you cannot get that room. This is an open secret. You read about it in the newspapers. Although you do own that house, you practically don't have any power of decisionmaking over it.

Mr. SCHULTZ. How about personal property, your watch, your rings, this kind of thing?

Miss FLIDR. Well, there are things which are practically unobtainable, much too expensive in any communist country. A thing such as jewelry or furs, that is undreamed about. Even if you are a working woman with good education and your husband is a professional, still these are the things which are unobtainable. You spend so much on food and basic clothing that you are not able to afford these things.

Maybe even you are afraid to have them, because furs and jewels—that shows that you are bourgeois minded and that you are hostile to the regime, that your set of values is wrong.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Do you have a black market in Czechoslovakia?

Miss FLIDR. Well, there is quite a black market with the goods which cannot be obtained in Czechoslovakia, namely, the Western

goods, namely with American dollars. There is a store which is called Tusaks, and if you obtain any Western currency, for that Western currency you can buy Western goods in that store, which is sponsored by the state, by the Communist Party.

Now that leads to quite a black market, such that an American who sells his \$1 to the Czechoslovakian Bank for, let's say, 14 korunas is offered by the Czechs about 90 or 100 korunas for that \$1, because the people are just dying to get some foreign goods of good quality, which is unavailable on the domestic markets.

Mr. SCHULTZ. If you don't have the Western dollars, you cannot shop there?

Miss FLDR. No, you cannot. This is one of the ways how the regime tries to get the money. They do not support Western citizens to send parcels to Czechoslovakia. As a matter of fact, they eliminated this by setting such high custom dues that my friends frequently send me the packages back.

If I send them a sweater or a little transistor radio, they cannot afford to pay the custom due. They have to send it back. Therefore, the government practically forces the people to write to their relatives that they want foreign currency. Now if that foreign currency is sent to Czechoslovakia, your friends or relatives are not permitted to hold it. They have to go to the bank and right away exchange it for korunas or for this special Tusak currency with which they can buy foreign goods.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Are there any particular benefits for the hierarchy of the Communist Party, such as shopping or hospitals?

Miss FLDR. This is a very interesting point. Very often, frequently you hear now you have free medical care in Czechoslovakia. I would like to make a couple of comments about that.

First of all, you practically have no money left after you buy basic food and modest clothing. You could not afford to pay for medical care. That is one thing. You practically pay for it by paying the exorbitant prices which the state forces you to pay. Now if you go to the hospital or to the doctor, you don't have any choice. There is a district doctor.

The city—the district is virtually cut into districts and all people living within a certain region of the city have to go to the doctor who is assigned to them. If you do not like that doctor for professional or personal reasons, you still have to go to him.

When you want an appointment, you do not get any. You come in the waiting room, you spend there hours and hours, and you get only a very limited time with your doctor.

So although you do not pay anything, these are the gross disadvantages which you have, and frequently you talk to the people who say they would prefer to pay for it and get good care at their convenience.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Do all Czechoslovakians have the same quality of care?

Miss FLDR. It practically works that way. If you are a communist and you have good recommendations, you get pushed practically everywhere. You have the connections and you do get a preferential treatment. A little telephone call from a party member, even if he does not

know anybody at the hospital or anywhere, can make a world of a difference.

(At this point Mr. Pepper entered the hearing room.)

Mr. SCHULTZ. You mentioned as a teacher you were not a member of the Communist Party. When you were growing up and attending grade school, did you belong to the Czechoslovakian Youth Party?

Miss FLIDR. Yes, you have to.

Mr. SCHULTZ. At what age did you join this group?

Miss FLIDR. For every age of school children in Czechoslovakia there is only one youth organization, which is established by the party. For very young children it is so-called Sparkle, and very small children who just start school go to that.

Then as you grow and about third or fourth grade you join the Young Pioneers. Then at a later age, when you are approaching about 15, you join the Czechoslovakian Youth, which was the organization which you mentioned.

Each of these organizations is preparing you for the next organization. There are no organizations such as Scouts, or if any mother decides she would like to start some organization for the children, she cannot.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What is the objective of these various organizations?

Miss FLIDR. These organizations are supposed to contribute to your political education and to prepare you to be a good communist. You are frequently listening to the communist literature, to the experts from communist books. You are discussing communist morality, the idea of a communist citizen.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Would you say that these youth groups are a prerequisite to later obtaining a job?

Miss FLIDR. Oh, absolutely. It is not exactly of obtaining a job but to obtain a job of your choice or at least almost of your choice, or if you do want to continue with your school education after you are through with your compulsory school education, then the membership in these organizations is an absolute prerequisite.

Mr. SCHULTZ. You mentioned the work of your choice. Are workers free to choose their place of employment?

Miss FLIDR. Again my explanation will sound a little confusing and absolutely unreal. At the end of each school year the graduating class cannot practically choose what they want to do. The principal of every school gets a certain quota. In other words, only a certain amount of the students from that school can continue with their education, only a certain amount can go into certain professions, and then comes the time when the political connections and affiliations and convictions of your parents are examined very closely. Then is the time when, if you are from a communist family, you have an enormous advantage. You can have excellent grades and yet you might not be admitted at a school of your choice, and yet someone with very low grades can.

Then you read very openly in our newspapers—I read just about 3 months ago in our newspapers that this is done because the children from families of workers or farmers from good communist families do not have the advantages of the home background, and even if their grades are bad, they have to be supported and accepted primarily before the students with better grades but from intellectual families.

This is admitted very freely, very publicly in the newspapers. That is the dictatorship. There is nobody whom you could come to for help or whom you could appeal to.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Once a person gets out of school, gets a job, whether in a professional category or factory, how is the labor controlled or how is his productivity assessed?

Miss FLIDR. You are getting a monthly salary and in most cases that salary is available, unchangeable salary. It is very infrequent that you would be profit motivated, like the more you produce the more you made. That mostly does not happen. Therefore, you work for the state and you do get that certain salary.

As far as your professional advancement or raises are concerned, very often even if you do a good job, if you are not politically reliable, still someone who is mediocre professionally but better off politically, considered more reliable, gets a better and supervisory position, which is also better pay.

Mr. SCHULTZ. How do they know if you politically reliable?

Miss FLIDR. Practically from the time you go to school you have your personal record. Things such as little remarks against the regime are collected and put down about you, and practically at all key points of your life this record is read by the people, by the communist committees who do the decisionmaking. If there is anything going against you, any careless sentence, any implication that you are dissatisfied with the regime, that you do not like communism, that you have democratic tendencies, that you criticize, you are made very aware of it.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Does a worker have a choice to engage in conversation with regard to wage and price demands?

Miss FLIDR. No. This practically does not exist. As a matter of fact, you are not only not permitted to speak or discuss your wages, you are not even permitted to change your jobs. What I will say will sound confusing. I try to be as brief and as concise as I can.

Let's say you work in one town in one profession and you want to move to another town. Now what happens? Basically you need two things: a job in another town and an apartment in another town. Let's say you decide, first, you go to look for an apartment. You come to the national committee run by the communists in that town and you say, "I would like an apartment." They tell you first you have to have the job here. So you try to look for a job and they tell you first you have to have an apartment here. Unless you are a resident, you cannot get a job.

Therefore, what avenue is opened to you in such a case? If you want to change jobs or move into another city, it is only to do it through communist channels. You have to apply with your supervisors, with the communist committee at your job, and you have to ask to be officially transferred. If you are officially transferred through these channels, then you can try to exchange your apartment or to apply and wait 15, 20 years to get an apartment in that other city. If you don't do that, you practically have to stay where you are.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Are unions permitted? Does the union representation help you in any way?

Miss FLIDR. Unions are practically nominal, absolutely without any power whatsoever. Their function has been reduced maybe to distribute awards, 2 or 3 weeks in spas or in resorts as a special award to

good workers. But that is about it. They do not help you with any professional grievances.

It is no institution to appeal to. Everybody is forced to join; nobody does it voluntarily. The purpose is that you are formally enrolled so that it looks good in our communist statistics and that you pay your membership dues. It cannot help you with anything, and very often the unions are run by party members and you can't expect any objective decision from these people anyhow.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What is the electoral process in Czechoslovakia? Do you have elections?

Miss FLIDR. We do have elections, but it is definitely not a free election. What happens is you are presented with the nominees on the ballot. Now you do not know anything about them. There aren't any newspaper articles, nobody is permitted to stand up and attack that nominee, say, "I have objections against him for this and this reason." That is not permitted, that does not exist. It can't happen through any channel. Now you get that ballot and you do not know anything about these people. You are totally unfamiliar with their background except that you know and you can take it for granted that they are good communists and that they were very carefully selected.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What is the public reaction to this, the workingman on the street, what is his reaction?

Miss FLIDR. Well, everybody's reaction is that you are scared. You do not dare to do anything. You simply just cross that little box and you know even if you would not—first of all, you are afraid not to do that. Then you know even if you would not, nothing would change. That person still would be elected and the whole election is practically a mock election. It is not a free election.

As a matter of fact, in many cases the election is so-called manifestation election. You check the boxes in front of everyone else, and if you wish to go behind the curtain, you can. But you are afraid to go behind the curtain because that would imply that you are going to vote against the candidates presented to you and that is a very bad thing to do.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Miss Flidr, as a student who grew up in Czechoslovakia and as a teacher who is now a resident of the United States, what is your thinking now as to the communist movement and its international aspect? In other words, what are its aims and what did you learn to be the goals of international communism?

Miss FLIDR. First of all, it would be an absolute dependency of all communist countries on the Soviet Union. This dependency would show in economic terms. We would have to sell our goods with loss to the communist Russia rather than to sell them at a free market.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Could you give us an example of that?

Miss FLIDR. For example, what I read in our newspapers was very revealing. It is a little question. Although we have a very strict censorship, if you do not attack the basic communist doctrines, if you just bring up a little question and it is a concrete question, it can slip in.

A young engineer asked, he said, "We are buying crude oil from Soviet Russia and we pay them \$20 for a unit of crude oil, and yet, when they sell it to the West, I recently learned that the West is paying them \$10 for the same amount of the same quality crude oil. How



come?" The editorial answer was, "You were wrong only in one point. We don't pay \$20. We pay \$21.50." And there was no explanation. Now this might be a little trivial example, but it is a concrete example. These things do happen frequently.

Before any major decision, whether political or educational or an economic one, is made, it is made for us in Moscow and then just executed in the country. I would say that the communists are definitely trying to expand their world influence and world power, and one, of course, very illustrative example of how to hold their domination was Hungary in 1956.

I feel that in terms of world expansion of communism, the communists are not going to stop in front of anything, in front of the most brutal and deplorable step, as they have proved it so many times in the past. And that would be what I feel about it.

I spent my life there, and the means which they employ are very brutal and very effective and very drastic.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions.

(At this point Mr. Pepper left the hearing room.)

The CHAIRMAN. What was the year you left Czechoslovakia?

Miss FLIDR. It was 5 years ago. That means in 1965.

The CHAIRMAN. When did you come to the United States?

Miss FLIDR. I came to the United States approximately 5 months later.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your occupation in this country?

Miss FLIDR. I teach. I went to school here, I got my master's degree in special education of the deaf, and I teach deaf children in New York.

The CHAIRMAN. In a deaf school?

Miss FLIDR. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. What did you teach in Czechoslovakia, what grades did you teach there?

Miss FLIDR. I taught Czech and Russian languages and literature, and it was from, I suppose, sixth to ninth grades.

The CHAIRMAN. Now you said that a school teacher in Czechoslovakia, as a practical matter, could not attend the church of his choice. Were there penalties involved, and what penalties were involved?

Miss FLIDR. Yes, it started before you became a teacher, while you were still in training. In my own personal experience there was a girl in our class who played organ in the church. She played organ in the church. It was a matter of music rather than a matter of faith. She was a Catholic, but still she did go there just to play and suddenly disappeared from our class. She was not permitted to continue with her teaching education, teaching preparation.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you find out what happened to her?

Miss FLIDR. No. She was just asked to leave the classes. That was about it. Well, forced, that is. There wasn't any other penalty as far I know, but this is drastic enough.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean she was removed from her duties as a teacher?

Miss FLIDR. She was not permitted to continue attending the university where she was preparing to become a teacher.

The CHAIRMAN. So she was not a teacher, she was a student?

Miss FLIDR. She was studying to become a teacher. Then if you,

as a school teacher, should go to church or believe in God, the penalty would be either a sort of like disciplinary procedure with you. You would be called and you would be asked not to do it again and, should you choose not to obey, then the penalty would be your being transferred to some small village somewhere in the mountains where you could not badly influence young souls of our children.

The CHAIRMAN. Now you stated you joined one of the communist youth organizations. Did you become a full-fledged member of the Communist Party in Czechoslovakia?

Miss FLIDR. No, this was a youth organization.

The CHAIRMAN. How far away were you from becoming a member?

Miss FLIDR. Very far away, let me put it this way. We have 14 millions of Czechs. We were for 20 years under an absolute communist dictatorship. As I said, and I hope partly got across, the membership in the party has great numbers of professional, economic, material advantages. Yet, out of 14 millions of Czechs we have only one and a half million of members of the Communist Party.

Now practically I cannot give any statistics now, but I can speak from my own personal experience. At the school while I went to school, while I taught school, there was a hundred percent membership in all of these youth organizations because if you did not join, you just could not study. You could forget all of your plans for your life, even those limited plans which you can make in a communist country.

The CHAIRMAN. I am sure there were great monetary benefits with only approximately a million and a half out of 14 million population being members of the Communist Party, and this in and of itself would serve as an encouragement for people to become members of the Communist Party?

Miss FLIDR. Well, naturally being a communist, as I mentioned before, even if you were professionally not quite up to the standards, if you were politically reliable, still you would get a key position and with that would go a much better financial reward.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you say it is very difficult to become a full member in good standing of the Communist Party in Czechoslovakia?

Miss FLIDR. I would say it depends pretty much also on your family background, not only on yourself. If your parents had any private business of their own before the communists took over, you were practically sort of in a way branded for life. I think it does practically exclude you from becoming a member, nowadays, of the party.

The CHAIRMAN. It is much easier, then, for a child of parents who are communists to become a member in good standing?

Miss FLIDR. Yes, definitely for such a child from such a family it is almost a matter of fact, should he or she have such a desire.

The CHAIRMAN. I am very interested in your testimony in regard to the exchange rate and the desire of the Czechoslovakian Government to obtain dollars. I know that several people of Czech descent in this country send dollars to relatives in Czechoslovakia and I was talking to one such person the other day, who periodically sends money to some of her relatives.

I was curious as to how the recipient of the dollars handled the exchange. Now I am sure that in most cases they will convert those dollars to korunas in order to spend them in Czechoslovakia, rather than going to the Western stores to spend the money.

Miss FLIDR. I would say rather opposite.

The CHAIRMAN. Most of the dollars are spent in the Western stores for Western goods?

Miss FLIDR. Yes, they are. Also, here we are coming back to the black market. I know from my own personal experience if you wanted any good present for Christmas or anything like that, you would try to buy these korunas, "tuzak" korunas, from anybody who would get them.

Now if a person is getting dollars from America and turns them into Czech currency and they get practically 14 korunas for \$1, why would they do it?

The CHAIRMAN. Is that what you would get?

Miss FLIDR. It is opposite from what you think. If you get the money, you get the same amount which the tourist gets. It does not exist now because you cannot travel, but during Mr. Dubcek's time you were permitted to travel, and when you were in need of dollars for foreign travel, you had to pay 35 to get one of them.

The CHAIRMAN. If you received that money, you could go to the black market?

Miss FLIDR. Exactly; that is the point I was driving at.

The CHAIRMAN. How much?

Miss FLIDR. When I was in Czechoslovakia, what I knew we paid at the black market for \$1 was approximately 45 korunas. Lately, with so many people escaping, I recently talked to a young lady who came from Czechoslovakia, and she said that the latest prices for dollars—I mean for real dollars, not for Tusaks korunas—were as much as 90 korunas per \$1, because people were trying to accumulate dollars if they wanted to escape.

The CHAIRMAN. Now this person was sending cash and then she would follow it up later on with inquiries to the recipient as to whether the cash was actually received?

Miss FLIDR. They would not get the cash. They would not get American dollars. They would either get korunas or "tuzak" korunas.

The CHAIRMAN. But this person was sending dollars over, not sending it in the form of a check or anything like that. Was there some concern of the person going to the black market that the authorities might check the mail, which check would indicate how many dollars they were getting?

Miss FLIDR. That is a very interesting comment. I can only describe my personal experience. You see, there are no statistics available what happens along that line. That is one of the very typical features of communist propaganda. They will not put in the newspapers statistics showing any dissatisfaction or anything, you know, bad for the regime.

The CHAIRMAN. You consider that the mail is secure, or is it sometimes opened?

Miss FLIDR. I think it is definitely sometimes opened. I made an experiment. I sent a couple of times a couple of bank notes of American dollars in a very well-wrapped envelope, and a couple of times it has gotten through without any official mark on it. But once it happened that it had a stamp, an official stamp on it which said, "You are asked to exchange this money within"—I don't know what period of time—"at the nearest state bank." So obviously there is an occasional check.

4645

The CHAIRMAN. And apparently the Czechoslovakian Government is trying to keep the recipients from exchanging the money on the black market, which, of course, would be a better deal for them.

Do you have any questions, Mr. Stokes?

Mr. STOKES. I have just one or two, Mr. Chairman.

Miss FLIDR, you mentioned housing in Czechoslovakia. Let me pursue that just a little bit with you. Now do they have such as we have here in America, different levels of values of housing, let's say, as we have a home for \$10,000, we have a home for \$20,000, one for \$30,000, one for \$50,000. Do they have various levels of housing like that?

Miss FLIDR. There are various levels, but these are mostly remnants from what is called in our country capitalistic society. In other words, nowadays people do not build their own homes; they could not afford it. It is much too expensive. It is very infrequent and it happens mostly like in the villages, where the farmers build little homes, little houses.

But practically to build a home or house in, you know, a city or residential area, you do not do it as a private person. As far as building of modern housing, your only way how you can get an apartment is to apply and wait, as I said, about 15, 20 years to get an apartment, or the government, the state, would let you buy a cooperative apartment. Then you wait for about 5 years, you pay an exorbitant amount of money, and then you get an apartment. Again it is a little apartment, one room for one person. If it has above a certain square yardage, you have to pay anything in excess of that.

Mr. STOKES. You mentioned having to pay an exorbitant amount of money. How would a person acquire an exorbitant amount of money?

Miss FLIDR. It is incredible. You simply do it by the fact that, although you might have a small child or two who do need your wife's full-time care, you send her to work. You save, you eat more potatoes, less meat, because meat is very expensive. Instead of buying a piece of fruit for your wife or yourself or your children, you give that fruit only to your children. That is how you try to get that money.

Mr. STOKES. Now, in your cities, do they have slum conditions?

Miss FLIDR. If I describe you my last apartment which I had, any slum here is in a more decent shape and, living on welfare, I could fix it more decently than I was able to fix my Czech apartment in Prague before I left.

My mother and I had what you would term two and a half rooms. We had no hot water. The water was in the corridor. We had one common lavatory, no bathroom with a bathtub available to us at any time. We had practically to take showers with the friends.

But we could use the lavatory in the lobby, common to all the people. Now we were trying to renovate it and practically every koruna which we could save was spent on renovating the apartment. For that it was not only very expensive, but for whatever you did you needed a special permission of the committee, of the building committee of that district. There was a lot of wasting and red tape involved in that, too.

I felt like Alice in Wonderland when I came here and I realized how very little you pay for basic things, such as paint and little things which you need for a household. This in Czechoslovakia is absolutely incredibly expensive. I remember we were trying to build a new door, just a new folding door, two-part folding door to divide two of our

4646

rooms, and I paid one and a half months of my salary for a simple installation. There was a hole there. They installed two wing doors and I paid that just to have it installed.

Mr. STOKES. You mentioned welfare a few moments ago. Do they have a welfare program?

Miss FLIDR. It works this way in Czechoslovakia. If you are healthy, you are not permitted not to work. Now, in other words, if you are a man and you decide not to work because you might be fired or because you cannot find a job according to your qualifications, you do not go on any sort of welfare. You have to find a job and if that job is under your qualifications, too bad. If a man does not work and he is healthy, he is a parasite of the society and he goes to prison. If I may put in one little personal comment, that is one of the very few things which I liked about communism.

Mr. STOKES. I would deem from that you probably do not have any unemployment in that country, do you?

Miss FLIDR. No. Even if people could not work according to their qualifications or talents, there would still be other work found for them. This would go for a man. Men do have to work. Otherwise, really they are parasites. It is unheard of for a man who would not work unless he is very sick.

Then you do have a sort of welfare. You do get a part of your salary and free medical care.

Mr. STOKES. Let me ask you this: Is there anything such as hunger that exists in that country; would you say that?

Miss FLIDR. It is not a hunger, but it is a constant, I would say, quarter hunger or half hunger, if you can draw such a distinction. I have a couple of children from underprivileged families in my class at school where I teach now and if I look at the lunches which they bring in their little lunch boxes to school, it is so fantastic, the quantity and the quality. It is unheard of in Czechoslovakia. So while there is no hunger, there is certainly, you know, you just cannot afford very decent food. You do not have hunger.

Mr. STOKES. I see. Thank you, Miss Flidr.

The CHAIRMAN. Miss Flidr, I am personally acquainted with a Protestant minister in Prague. Of course, he is having a very rough time of it now. The only members of his church are middle-aged people and elderly people. There are no young in the services whatsoever.

When the communists took over in Czechoslovakia, he owned a small cottage in the country and, of course, that was confiscated. He experienced what you related. I don't know how many rooms were in the house but it was deemed too large for him and his wife. All of the children were gone. I think most of the children have come to this country or at least have gotten out of Czechoslovakia. People were moved into his house. But my question is this: Does this only apply to non-communist people? How about the communists? I am sure that a higher party official gets more than one room per family.

Miss FLIDR. They get definitely apartments of better quality. To be perfectly frank, Mr. Chairman, I can't speak about quantity because these things which you can freely criticize here, like personal life of a leader of your country, a political leader of your country, you are not permitted to criticize in any communist country. You do not get any evidence.

4647

If I were now in Czechoslovakia and I wanted to know how many rooms—I don't know how many the district party leader has—there would be no way to find out. I could not really say.

I know quite for sure one thing from my own personal experience, that there was an attempt to move us out of the first good apartment which we had and move us into a bad apartment and give our good apartment to somebody who was very prominent in the party. I am not sure about the quantity. I am sure, though, about the better quality.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you given the reason why they were requiring you to move?

Miss FLIDR. The reason was that, when we lived in that apartment, he had more children than we did. He lived in a smaller apartment than we did. So while we did not have an excessive apartment at that time, still, because he was a prominent party member, they would have moved us out of our apartment, and it cost us sort of a lot of complaining and appealing, and, you know, trying to find friends around to stay in our apartment.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you say your mother was also a teacher?

Miss FLIDR. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. We appreciate your testimony.

Mr. Counsel, do you have any further questions?

Mr. SCHULTZ. With your permission, I might ask one final question.

Miss FLIDR, since we do have a right to criticize in this country, what would be your criticism of the United States?

Miss FLIDR. It will sound paradoxical. I am not sure it will sound popular and it will be a little strange coming from the mouth of a person who left a totalitarian dictatorship, coming to seek freedom, if I would say I feel in this country the authorities should have more power and more authority and more respect than they are having right now. I feel that while enough freedom is certainly a wonderful thing, when it borders with almost anarchy, there should be some curbs.

I have felt very strongly on two issues. One was the student disorders. I felt that while students here get from their families and father, freedom and security and a right to a good education, if they seek more, if they seek utopia, fine, but they should not seek it violently and showing vandalism. There are certainly other more constructive ways. So I felt that more should be done and less should be permitted.

I also felt that such authorities as, for example, police should have more power and should be perhaps less attacked, because I would not dare to have a son of my own become a policeman in this country. I would consider it much too dangerous.

The CHAIRMAN. I have one more question. What is the age of enfranchisement, the age for voting in Czechoslovakia?

Miss FLIDR. At my time it was 21.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you vote in any of the elections?

Miss FLIDR. No, I just passed that age. I was in the meantime before we left and I did not get to the elections, but my mother voted very many times, of course, naturally, and so did my father.

The CHAIRMAN. Were there any opposition candidates that were filed in any of the elections?

4648

Miss FLIDR. No, it was not even done nominally. It was not even done for pretense. That is the dictatorship.

The CHAIRMAN. You don't have the opportunity to vote for or against the party?

Miss FLIDR. No, absolutely not. You would expect that at least for a pretense purpose there would be some opposing candidates or there should be at least something done just to keep the Constitution, just to keep the pretense, just to put the show on, but there was none.

The CHAIRMAN. You only voted for or against the one party candidate, the one candidate?

Miss FLIDR. That's right.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. Again we appreciate your testimony.

Call the next witness, please.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Mr. Emilio C. Callejo.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand, Mr. Counsel, that Mr. Callejo will be accompanied by Dr. Portell-Vila. Will you please be seated, Dr. Portell-Vila.

First of all, Dr. Portell, I think I should ask you some questions about your qualifications as an interpreter, since Mr. Callejo will be speaking through you. Have you had experience interpreting Spanish to English and English to Spanish previously?

Dr. PORTELL-VILA. I have done that several times and I once worked for the Foreign Policy Association as a translator and put into Spanish the book *Problems of the New Cuba*. I have also worked at times in international conferences as a translator, Spanish to English and vice versa.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Dr. Portell-Vila. First, I will have to administer a special oath to you. Will you please stand.

Do you solemnly swear or affirm the testimony you are about to translate before this committee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, to the best of your knowledge, so help you God?

Dr. PORTELL-VILA. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Callejo, do you solemnly swear that you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God? [translated through Dr. Portell-Vila]

Mr. CALLEJO. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

**TESTIMONY OF EMILIO C. CALLEJO, AS INTERPRETED BY  
DR. PORTELL-VILA**

Mr. SCHULTZ. Mr. Callejo, would you state your full name and address?

Mr. PORTELL-VILA. Emilio Callejo, 1437 South 28th Street, Arlington, Virginia.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Mr. Callejo, did you, with the assistance of Dr. Portell-Vila, prepare a narrative type statement for presentation here this morning with regard to your background and immediate trip to the United States?

Mr. PORTELL-VILA. Yes, he did.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Do you have that statement in front of you, Dr. Portell?

Mr. PORTELL-VILA. Yes, I do have it here.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, with your permission and in the interest of time, I would like permission for Dr. Portell-Vila to read this narrative statement which they prepared together, a narrative statement of Mr. Callejo's background and leading up to his trip to the United States, his defection to the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed. I think that would facilitate the proceedings.

Mr. PORTELL-VILA. Emilio C. Callejo was born in Barcelona, Spain, to a family which owned property in Cuba. He is 40 years old, married, and his wife is Cuban born. They have a daughter 7 years old.

In 1945 he went to live in Havana, Cuba, and in 1953 became a Cuban citizen. He studied accountancy at the Professional School of Commerce in Havana and, from 1955 to 1960, worked for Docal Construction Co., a firm of contractors engaged in a number of public works. In 1960, with a better-paid job, Mr. Callejo went to work for Kiko-Plastics, Inc., an industrial concern in the plastics industry.

Kiko-Plastics was taken over by Castro in 1962. Mr. Callejo resented the working conditions and the general situation imposed on the country by the communists, but was afraid of reprisals if he asked for a permit to leave the country. The house he owned at Marianao, a Havana suburb, had been seized by Castro as was all other private property in Cuba.

In 1965, when hundreds of small boats and yachts were transporting Cubans to Florida, Castro declared that anybody who wanted to leave the country was free to do so by applying for a permit to leave. Mr. Callejo discussed the situation with his wife and decided to tell the government that they wanted to leave. He was immediately fired from his job in reprisal.

Relatives in the United States urged him to come by way of the "Freedom Flights" (Varadero Beach to Miami), but this took time. The only job he could get was to drive the car of a physician in Havana until new regulations by Castro affecting those who wanted to leave Cuba reached him.

In order to repay the government for what Cuba was supposed to have done for the Callejo family, he had to work as a fieldhand in agricultural jobs. Leaving his family in Havana, he first cut sugarcane at the "Josefita" sugar mill near Palos, some 35 miles southeast of Havana.

After nearly 1 year there, because of his training in accountancy, they sent him to work with the construction crews building dams at Jimaguayú and Santa Cruz, Camagüey Province, some 350 miles from Havana. Those who wanted to leave Cuba lived in huts and barracks and engaged in forced labor, away from their families. Food was scarce and bad. There was no proper hygiene and armed guards were always in evidence.

The working day consisted of 10 hours, 7 days a week. Medical care was poor, at best. Constant indoctrination over the radio and in political meetings was the order of the day, and there were no religious services or opportunities for recreation. An atmosphere of fear pervaded the daily life of the virtual prison camp. There were constant reminders of the worker being a "gusano" or "worm," the name applied to those who did not accept communism under Castro.



From the dams Mr. Callejo was transferred to sugarcane cutting again, briefly at Esmeraldas, and then at the "Senado" sugar mill, northern Camaguey, near Nuevitas, where he spent the longest period of his punishment for leaving Cuba.

He explains: "I was considered, as were thousands and thousands of Cubans trying to leave, to owe the communist state my labor. A ledger listed how many thousands of arrobas (an arroba equals 25 pounds) we owed. The minimum daily quota was 99 arrobas. Very rarely could I do it, so I was in arrears, showing a deficit month after month. When in March 1970 the permit to leave reached the camp, several of my fellow prisoners surreptitiously pitched in, adding to my pile of cane until I finally paid my 'debt' to Castro with such forced labor."

Mr. SCHULTZ. Mr. Callejo, do you recognize this paper as the statement which both of you prepared?

Mr. PORTELL-VILA. As far as he knows English, that is what he did.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Would you ask Mr. Callejo, please, how wages and prices are set in Cuba, how he was paid for cutting sugarcane so that he could come to the United States?

Mr. PORTELL-VILA. He says that they were paid for what they were doing with their job, that theoretically it was \$3.20 in agricultural work. They paid more in other things, but cutting sugarcane, \$3.20. But that out of that money he had to pay the government 75 cents a day for food and there were days in which he was unable to reach what they called the goal, the assignment. He could not fulfill the assignment, so there were days in which he had only cents left to comply with what he was supposed to have for eating.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Mr. Callejo, were you able to support your family on what you earned?

Mr. PORTELL-VILA. Friends and relatives were supporting the family while he was working in agriculture, and that was the only way they could accomplish that because he was not earning enough for himself and for the family.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What were the quantity and quality of consumer goods in Cuba, Mr. Callejo?

Mr. PORTELL-VILA. He says that they are entitled to have one-fourth of a pound of bread a day, but as to milk, fresh milk only to children under 7 years of age, and from 7 to 14 years of age and people after 65 years of age they could have evaporated milk; the children from 7 to 14 years of age, six cans of condensed milk a month. As to meat, one-fourth of a pound a week in Havana, because outside of Havana they are supposed to eat less meat.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Why are they supposed to eat less meat outside of Havana?

Mr. PORTELL-VILA. He says that, first, it is a problem of distribution. Havana being a big city, it is possible to distribute meat there more efficiently, and when going into the country the situation is by far different. Also they take into consideration that people living in the rural districts have a chance to forage around and get something else to complete their diet.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Mr. Callejo, as a CPA who worked in Havana prior to the Castro regime, what changes did you see in the living conditions and employment conditions, and who controlled these changes?

(At this point Mr. Stokes left the hearing room.)

Mr. PORTELL-VILA. He says that theoretically the salaries have remained the same one they had before the advent of communism, but that in practice the situation is by far different because of difficulties to acquire, to purchase what they need. The purchasing power of the people has gone down because money doesn't have the same value applied to what they can get to sell to the people, and everything is sold by the state.

Therefore, they find that they cannot buy goods with a low price because they are controlled by the government, so they had to be going not to buy things which are more expensive. Therefore, that affects the possibility to be able to cover all of the expenses of a household.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Mr. Callejo, did you have any supervisors in either your work as a CPA or in the cane fields earning your way over here—did you have any supervisors who were Russians?

Mr. PORTELL-VILA. The direct people controlling the work were Cubans and he never had any Russians directing him in his work.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Were these Cubans who were his supervisors members of the Communist Party, and was this a prerequisite?

Mr. PORTELL-VILA. He says that it was not a requisite that they had to be members of the Communist Party, although most of them were, and that usually they had military men controlling them, and when they were civilians, they were civilians belonging to the militia and had a uniform, too, and that these people could belong to the Communist Party and at times didn't belong to it, but that they were the ones in charge.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Were there any disadvantages in not belonging to the Communist Party? Would he himself have been better off had he joined the Communist Party?

Mr. PORTELL-VILA. He says that what they have there is a communist state in which all the people controlling and ruling everything, the bigwigs, the important people have to be members of the Communist Party; that in his case if he had belonged to the Communist Party, then he should have had a better time in these last years.

The fact that he chose to leave Cuba and not to join the party, that makes him liable to all these hard times he was supposed to have, and that is the case of anybody who is trying to do the same thing. He did leave Cuba.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Señor Callejo, would you comment for us on the freedom of elections, employment, and education.

Mr. PORTELL-VILA. He says that there are no elections in Cuba along political lines. The only way you can find something resembling an election is in the labor unions, but that even those they have a candidate who had the blessings from the party, and that is the one who has to be chosen to be leader in the unions.

As to freedom in the schools, he says there is none because the teachers are all the time watched by the party to find out what they are teaching in school and that it is more important that political indoctrination be made, that they are judged for the effectiveness with which they can push forward the cult of Fidel Castro or anything belonging to the Cuban revolution and that is the paramount job of a teacher. If he wants to be safe, that is what he has to do because he is all the time watched by those who are supervising the work.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Señor Callejo, when did you come to the United States?

Mr. PORTELL-VILA. March 18, 1970.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Mr. Callejo, would you have any reflection on American citizens who came to Cuba to cut sugarcane?

Mr. PORTELL-VILA. He says that these people are totally mistaken in what they are doing and in what they are supposed to learn by going to Cuba because they are subjected to indoctrination. They are very well treated, they are having everything that Cubans cannot have, and in this way they come back thinking that the situation is by far different from what it really is. That they are, in fact, socialist tourists of communist Cuba, all expenses paid, touring the country, even the type of work they have to do is by far less than what other people are supposed to be doing at the same time.

The CHAIRMAN. At that point, Mr. Counsel, Mr. Callejo, were any of the Venceremos Brigade assigned to the camp where you were?

Mr. PORTELL-VILA. He says that they were all the time kept apart from these groups coming from abroad, because they were the people who wanted to migrate. Because they were the people who wanted to emigrate, they were in a special low category in which they were not going to mix with these other people, that personally he was never working in any place where they were nearby.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed Counsel.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Señor Callejo, is criticism of the Cuban Government permitted?

Mr. PORTELL-VILA. He says that there is not the slightest possibility of airing any type of criticism of the government, and specifically he wants to point out that all communication media, radio, television, newspapers, and so on, are controlled by the government. Even if anybody wanted to risk his life by attempting any criticism, he was not going to have a chance to make it because he was not going to have access to the mike or to the camera or to the printed press.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Señor Callejo, is there any dissent by students, college students, any demonstrations?

Mr. PORTELL-VILA. He says that college and university students are somewhat integrated into the system, because otherwise they are not allowed to be involved in college and university, so that this is a requisite, for them to be considered loyal to the government to enter college or the university. And therefore those people will work with the government no matter what they think in private.

But that among the present university and high school students there is a tremendous amount of dissatisfaction, not only because of the political aspect of the indoctrination, and so on, but also because 3 years ago they were told that they had to make a contribution to the government of 30 working days, that this was going to be just once. They went there and worked 30 days. Then the period was extended to 45 days, and now they have been working 6 months at the same time that they are supposed to be studying for university and high school.

They have announced with this coming school year that 9 months of the year they would have to be in the fields working and learning what they can in their spare time.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Señor Callejo, what is the penalty for dissent, and is it publicly stated?

Mr. PORTELL-VILA. He says that it all depends upon the degree of dissent, that there is a type of dissent that is made by going to the

paredon, because it is considered to be dangerous to the state. There are other types for which they will impose years in jail, other cases in which they would impose years of forced labor in state farms. Those are the three. He said there are three degrees and the most serious offense will call for shooting wall or paredon, and then the others would be jail terms and forced labor in the state farms.

The CHAIRMAN. Señor Callejo, to what extent is private ownership of real estate or personal property permitted?

Mr. PORTELL-VILA. He said that there is no real estate property in Cuba of any type, that even if you were living in what was your house, your home, you cannot leave that place without asking for a permit because that doesn't belong to you any more. It belongs to the state. As to a car, you can buy a car. Then you are entitled to have a car, but nothing as to real estate.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Señor Callejo, is there a problem with the black market?

Mr. PORTELL-VILA. He says that there are three main sources for operations in the black market. There are the people who are working in the state stores and shops and that they pilfer whatever they can so that they make a small robbery and they take this home and then they look around for clients to whom they can resell what they have been getting. That is widespread.

Then there are the people who succeeded, when they got an authorization card, to put more people into the authorization card than they actually have. And sometimes people, as in his case have left the country and they can't appear. Those people are receiving more food or more clothes or more shoes than they really were entitled to, so they have a surplus and then they go around reselling these to other people.

But the more serious cases are the people who belong to the militia and the armed forces. Those are influential people and also the high bureaucracy of the regime because those people are influential, and because they are influential they get things that the general people cannot have and, therefore, from these people they can get many other things which usually are not obtainable. But these people have extra.

May I ask him something in connection with the black market?

About the diplomats accredited there, he says that some of them work in the black market, some of them because they want to make money and some of them because of pity for the conditions of the people, and that he himself has benefited in several cases from these diplomats who were able to procure something, to get something for them, his family, because they wanted to help. But in certain cases there is selling done, too.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Señor Callejo, is there freedom of religion and does membership in a church preclude Communist Party membership?

Mr. PORTELL-VILA. He says that the communists cannot have religious belief and that a man who goes to church and the party knows about that, he will be immediately expelled from the party, that there is complete incompatibility between being a member of the church and being a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Señor Callejo, is there a constitution and what does the Constitution of Cuba provide in the way of human rights for the individual?

Mr. PORTELL-VILA. He says that the Constitution of 1940 has been totally abolished and there is just one law in Cuba which reaches every-

4654

where, and that is what Fidel Castro will order. That is the only law which is in operation.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Señor Callejo, is there a secret police and how does it function?

Mr. PORTELL-VILA. He says that the best organized, the thoroughly organized group of the police is a G-2, which operates, supported by informers, in such a way that they have a complete dossier of anybody appearing before the G-2, and that they are masters in psychological torture. They will not go down to the meeting most of the time.

What they can do is put a person at a table and have a number of floodlights on his face for hours. He cannot see who is questioning him. The person is on the other side of the table. This person will be reviewing for him everything he or she has done for years because they have all the information in their possession. Then they will be questioning and questioning and the person will refuse to answer and they will insist and after being there 1 hour, there will be a recess and another one will come with fresh questioning and with more direct confrontation. And that will last 1 day and will follow with another day until the person will break down and will admit whatever they want because he wants to get rid of that situation in which he has been for some time.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Señor Callejo, did you ever experience this yourself?

Mr. PORTELL-VILA. He says that he was never in the hands of the G-2 because he was completely apart from politics, but that some people he knows have told him about what they went through at the hands of the G-2.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Señor Callejo, is a Cuban who is charged with a crime afforded a speedy trial and on whom does the burden of proof fall?

Mr. PORTELL-VILA. He says that for small offenses there is something they call criminal local, which is people in the neighborhood without any legal training will hold a sort of kangaroo court to judge somebody who had said something and was in a fight, for instance. That person who was in a fight will appear before the local court in the street. They would conduct it in the street. Then this person would be subjected to a complete analysis given by the informers in the block about everything he has done in his life so as to expose him as a person who has to be punished. This is in the case of this irregular type of court.

Then there is a revolutionary court. The revolutionary court begins with some more regular rules of the game and then they have to appear there and they can listen to the accusation. They can put up a statement about their guiltiness or their innocence, but all the time it will be the court which will decide if what he alleges was acceptable or nonacceptable, if he was right or guilty, and so on, and there would not be any chance.

He says that there are lawyers appearing for the defense in these cases, but they are appointed by the court and usually these lawyers appointed by the court are all the time playing the game the court has assigned to them. And therefore there is not a chance for anybody to have a real lawyer to defend his case.

At times they begin by saying something nice about the person brought before the trial and they end it by joining the prosecutor and saying that the person has to be punished. So there is not a chance for justice.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I have one final question.

Señor Callejo, is there any accountability on the part of the government to the individual? Does public opinion control or force changes in the Cuban Government?

Mr. PORTELL-VILA. He says that if the public opinion had any bearings on the situation in Cuba, Castro was not going to be in power, that Castro has organized a type of consultation of public opinion at the rallies that from time to time he holds. These rallies are prepared beforehand very carefully, so there will be a hard-core group of people close to the rostrum and when he puts up a question and says, "Do you agree?" all of those people will agree with him. And if someone far away would say he was not in agreement, he was going to have a terrible time, so nobody dares to say.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Thank you. No further questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Callejo. Of course, most of the people who live in this free society never experience living under a totalitarian regime such as exists in Cuba and in Czechoslovakia, and perhaps we are not in a very good position to competently evaluate or fully appreciate the freedom that we do have in this society.

You have lived in both and certainly you have gained a privilege of living in this society by enduring considerable punishment and have made great sacrifice. I hope, sir, that you are successful in all your good endeavors and I wish you much happiness.

Mr. CALLEJO. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. You do have your wife and child with you, do you not?

Mr. PORTELL-VILA. They are here with him.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you been able to obtain employment yet?

Mr. PORTELL-VILA. He is taking an intensive course in English at the John Marshall School for the job he has and he is learning English at the same time.

The CHAIRMAN. Very good. Dr. Portell-Vila, I want to thank you for your appearance here as interpreter.

Mr. Counsel, I am a little concerned, however, about the appearance of our record. It is my understanding that you will have other witnesses throughout the course of these hearings who will be speaking through an interpreter.

Mr. SCHULTZ. No, sir, we have no more.

The CHAIRMAN. In the event we do encounter this situation again, either have a stenographer who can take the testimony in the language in which it is given or set it up with the interpreter where you can have verbatim translation. I am a little concerned about the record.

If we had a stenographer who could take the testimony in Spanish, we would not have to worry so much about the verbatim translation. I know this is the first time this has been done, but I do not want to proceed in this manner again. There is too much opportunity for error.

The next time we do have a witness, make sure that we proceed in that manner so we can have our record either in Spanish or in English or whatever language is given verbatim.

Thank you again, gentlemen. Good luck to you.

The meeting will be adjourned until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning. (Whereupon, at 12:30 p.m., Tuesday, June 23, 1970, the committee adjourned, to reconvene at 10 a.m., Wednesday, June 24, 1970.)

## THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF COMMUNISM IN 1970

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 24, 1970

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY,  
Washington, D.C.

PUBLIC HEARING

The Committee on Internal Security met at 10:05 a.m., pursuant to recess, in Room 311, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C., Hon. Richard H. Ichord, chairman, presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Richard H. Ichord of Missouri and William J. Scherle of Iowa.

Staff members present: Donald G. Sanders, chief counsel, and Richard L. Schultz, associate chief counsel.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

The committee meets today for the purpose of continuing to hear testimony from refugees from behind the Iron Curtain and other places.

Whom do you have as your next witness, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. SCHULTZ. Mr. Alex Levin.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Levin, will you please come forward, sir.

It will not be necessary for Mr. Levin to speak through an interpreter?

Mr. SCHULTZ. No, sir; he is very articulate.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Levin, it is a pleasure to welcome you to the committee. Will you remain standing and first be sworn, sir.

Mr. Levin, do you solemnly swear that you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. LEVIN. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Please be seated.

Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

### TESTIMONY OF ALEXEY VASILYEVICH LEVIN

Mr. SCHULTZ. Mr. Levin, would you state your full name and address please.

Mr. LEVIN. My name is Alexey Vasilyevich Levin, and I live in New York City. That is what I can answer. I would not like to give any accurate address because of security of my own.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Mr. Levin, what is your place of birth?

Mr. LEVIN. Moscow.

Mr. SCHULTZ. How long did you live in Russia?

Mr. LEVIN. For 38 years.

Mr. SCHULTZ. When did you come to the United States?

Mr. LEVIN. In June of 1968.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What is the extent of your education?

Mr. LEVIN. I graduated from Moscow Institute of Physical Engineering in the specialty of nuclear physics.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Would you describe for the committee, please, the circumstances surrounding your leaving Russia and your subsequent defection to the United States?

Mr. LEVIN. The external circumstances are that I was permitted by Soviet authorities to go as a tourist to Turkey. I decided not to go back to the Soviet Union. I came to some Turkish and American authorities in Turkey and asked them for political asylum in the United States. After a while I was granted political asylum in 1968.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Would you describe for us how you happened to get a trip to Turkey?

Mr. LEVIN. I went there as a Soviet tourist, as a member of a Soviet tourist group there for 10 days.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What were the prerequisites for you to go on this trip?

Mr. LEVIN. Excuse me.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What did you have to do to be allowed to go on this trip as a tourist?

Mr. LEVIN. First of all, I must have had a very clear record in the secret police and a very good record in social life and society, as a member of society, and then I must have had some special permission for going abroad. After clearance in many party meetings and so on, I was permitted to go abroad for 10 days as a tourist.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Now were you a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. LEVIN. No, I wasn't.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Were you a member of Komsomol?

Mr. LEVIN. Yes, I have been a member of Komsomol from the age of 14 years old to 27. And at the time of my decision to ask for political asylum I was not a member of any Communist organization.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Would you describe for us what Komsomol is?

Mr. LEVIN. It is very difficult to describe. I think that Komsomol is an organization for youth—it is like maybe Hitler—the purpose of which is to prepare young people for membership in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and to unite young people for political indoctrination for political work and not to let young people go.

Mr. SCHULTZ. You say you joined Komsomol when you were 14 and left it when you were 27?

Mr. LEVIN. Yes.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Would you have then been eligible to join the Communist Party?

Mr. LEVIN. They asked me to join the Communist Party twice, but I did not refuse openly because if you did, I would not go for abroad. I told my party's secretary that I am not yet mature to have this responsibility to be a party member.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Now you mentioned that you had to have the party permission to go on your trip to Turkey. Did they question the fact that you were not a member of the party?

Mr. LEVIN. They did. As they did in the district party meeting, why didn't you, why aren't you a member of the Communist Party? I told that I am going to be a member of that party, but I would like to be more mature to take this responsibility. It was, of course, not true, but I didn't have any choice.



4659

Mr. SCHULTZ. Were there any other checks made on you prior to leaving on your trip for Turkey?

Mr. LEVIN. There are two parallel checks when a Soviet citizen goes for abroad. There is secret police check, which is a principal checking of the person, and there is also called open check during hearings in many party meetings, from the local level to the highest level, in the regional party meetings, and so on. It doesn't matter whether you are a member of the party or not.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Mr. Levin, what extent of freedom is there in Russia for travel, and how did you happen to get this trip and why Turkey, how did it happen to be Turkey?

Mr. LEVIN. It is very long to explain because it is very complicated to go for abroad for a Soviet citizen. As all things, the traveling for abroad, and especially to so-called capitalist countries, is planned by the central committee of the Communist Party and trade unions and the Department of Treasury.

They issue comparatively, say, very small quantity of permissions to go, and those permissions are distributed throughout the Soviet Union. My research institute, for example, received only two permissions in a year to go for abroad into so-called capitalist countries, and it was one permission for Syria and one permission for Turkey.

I chose permission for Turkey because it was much cheaper than to Syria. It was only 200 rubles, which means \$200 approximately. After you have permission, you must be cleared. But if your institute doesn't have a "permission" at all you can't get permission from another institute. It was supposed to be for their work.

Mr. SCHULTZ. For how many years had you planned to leave Russia; how long had you had this idea?

Mr. LEVIN. If you count from 1968, when I made the decision practically, I got my idea when I had been a student in the physical institute. It means that it is about for 5 years I seriously thought about getting away from there.

Mr. SCHULTZ. So then is it true that for 5 years you more or less groomed yourself to have a good reputation, background, to be prepared, to take advantage of a trip if you could get one?

Mr. LEVIN. That is perfectly right.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What made you decide to come to the United States; what had been your training in school with regard to the United States?

Mr. LEVIN. Of course, in primary school we studied American—United States geography and economics, but economics was supposed to be rotting in the United States and Americans, especially influential Americans, were conceived as hating communism and the Soviet regime and there was not much education on the Americans in the primary school.

In the institute there was only the political point of view on America, which means that capitalist America wants to destroy the Soviet Union and they are an enemy of the Soviet Government and this nonsense like that.

Mr. SCHULTZ. If these are the things that you learned, what made you decide to come to the United States? Had you met people from the U.S.?

Mr. LEVIN. Yes; I met several people from the United States, traveling Americans, and I liked them very much.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Was this permitted openly?

Mr. LEVIN. Not openly, because three times when I met Americans in Moscow, I didn't notice my tails after the departing Americans. But I changed three or four times taxis and buses for in any case not to be checked in the records because it is some possibility to be tailed to your home to have your identity after you meet foreigners, especially Americans, who were supposed to be all spies in the Soviet Union.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Had you met a foreigner in your own home, would there be a possibility someone would report this?

Mr. LEVIN. Yes, of course. A lot of Americans in Moscow and during the travel in Soviet Union are followed by secret policemen, and I noticed that, and they are not very clever in following. That is why I must be careful of that in that case. Of course, I didn't have any affairs with them; it was only talking and sightseeing. That is all. But nevertheless you might be careful.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Is travel within the country permitted? Could you change your place of employment, place of residence?

Mr. LEVIN. I could travel in the Soviet Union freely in every town which was not closed for secret reasons, as nuclear installations, and so on. You could travel now very freely in the Soviet Union. But to work—for example, it is impossible to change the place of working, for example, from Moscow to Leningrad or to Kiev, because there is, as they call it, the logical change. You cannot be hired into some work in another city without police permission for leaving, and the police cannot grant you permission for leaving without work, you see, and this is a change. It is only in special cases you can change your work place from one town to another, a big town. Of course, you can go to villages to work and so on.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Are unions permitted in Russia?

Mr. LEVIN. Unions?

Mr. SCHULTZ. Labor unions.

Mr. LEVIN. Well, there are central labor unions; trade unions did you mean?

Mr. SCHULTZ. Yes.

Mr. LEVIN. Yes. There is quite a pyramid, a hierarchy of trade unions. There are central committees of trade unions and down to local trade unions.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Now do these trade unions represent the worker and do they negotiate on behalf of the worker in prices, wages, overtime?

Mr. LEVIN. Yes, in some sense they represent employees in the Soviet Union, but in a very specific way. They distribute, for example, passes for resort houses, free resort houses, and they arranged your sick leaves, sick payment and sick disability permission, and they distribute travel permissions, like that. But since labor strikes in the Soviet Union are prohibited and are very severely suppressed, they don't have any role in raising salaries or in confronting government on the part of workers.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Mr. Levin, is a worker paid on the basis of his productivity?

Mr. LEVIN. I don't think so; no. There is some system for workers, for laborers, if you produce more products, then are you paid more, but the rates are rising and it is all the same.

4661

Mr. SCHULTZ. In other words, a worker who produces more sets a higher standard?

Mr. LEVIN. Yes, a standard for the unit of products.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Now does this worker that raises the standard get rewarded?

Mr. LEVIN. He is rewarded only once or twice, and after that the standards are higher and here he produces more, but he receives the same. And that is why the rest of the workers are indignant about that, most of them.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What is the quality and quantity of goods produced in Russia?

Mr. LEVIN. I would say very poor, very bad quality. I would say that. Sometimes it is very good, but—

Mr. SCHULTZ. Can you give us an example of the availability of any specific commodity or item in the market that could fluctuate?

Mr. LEVIN. The Soviet Union suffers—so-called planned economics of the Soviet Union suffer from a lot of shortages from time to time. For example, in the last summer all along in the Soviet Union there weren't matches available in the country. It wasn't because the Soviet Union has no ability to produce matches, but one plant for matches was closed and there were no matches. Then after a time some other product vanished from the market and you cannot have them.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Why would they close a plant like that, say a match plant?

Mr. LEVIN. I don't understand.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Why would they close it up? You said they closed up a plant and there were no matches on the market. Why would they do that?

Mr. LEVIN. Because of some kind of an anarchy principle in the Soviet Union, because one government bureaucrat doesn't know what another bureaucrat is saying or doing, you see, and some minister or some high bureaucrat said, "OK, close this plant," for example, and another who is planning matches didn't know that and the plant was closed all right.

After that it was quite an uproar in the Soviet Union and it is very frequent like that.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Is this true of other items, wearing apparel, household furniture, as well as matches?

Mr. LEVIN. Yes, that's right.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What is the quality of these products?

Mr. LEVIN. Matches are very good in the Soviet Union.

Mr. SCHULTZ. I will be more specific. What is the quality of the clothing?

Mr. LEVIN. The quality of clothing is very impersonal; it is for the arithmetic average of the Russian gentleman or lady. It is plump and like a bag, very frequently, and it doesn't—well, you can feel that they never thought about people. It is a very poor quality, not because Russian people cannot do that, but because of the planned economy. You see, you must fulfill the plan. It is not to make them good. You must fulfill the plan in the units, 200,000 suits, for example, and that is all the director of the plant cares about. He is not concerned with quality of product and, of course, he is helped with the monolith of the state. You don't have a choice to buy any better products.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Don't the people complain about this poor quality?

Mr. LEVIN. Yes; there is a lot of complaints, especially when people go in shopping. You can hear a lot of complaints.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What happens to their complaints? Can you return the items; can you get a better quality suit?

Mr. LEVIN. Well, the products are returned in the Soviet department stores, for example, if one sleeve is shorter than the other. Then it will be returned, but it can't be returned if you bought a product and you say that I don't like the suit. Well, you are classy. That is all.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What is your observation as to the political control of the economy, the manufacturing plants, how does politics play a part in this?

Mr. LEVIN. In the economy?

Mr. SCHULTZ. Yes; related to the manufacturing of items that we are talking about.

Mr. LEVIN. Now the Soviet Union is penetrated with politics, with the Communist Party politics, because party officials are the head of planning committees, and the central committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is the leader, is supposed to be a leader, and is the single organ who orders all the economy. The Soviet economy is politics, too, because it is planned by party high officials and it is controlled by party high officials and the economy is responsible before them. You cannot differentiate between economy and politics.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Is this workable?

Mr. LEVIN. Yes, it is workable, but I think it is bad workable because the Soviet leaders plan the economy and decide what to do on big scales. They need so-called feedback, a feedback in the economy, because, OK, they ordered to produce the big quantity of some products, but they don't have immediate control of that, how the population buys them, how do they like them, and on and on. The feedback is absent.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Why don't they have feedback? Would this be the same as criticism of the government?

Mr. LEVIN. No, because of the structure of the Soviet economy. For example, if I am Mr. Brezhnev, I order economy to make these steps, these measures, and so on. I am feared by all around, by all officials, and if I issue a stupid order, for example, they would not dare to tell me that, well, it is stupid. They say, "OK, we will make this plan, Comrade Brezhnev." I will fulfill this plan, and it is all right and it doesn't matter how stupid my order is.

They all make these, and it is fulfilled and that is all. They would not dare to tell me that I did not fulfill your order. It is like the army, you see. It is like an army in battle. The commander is not tried in the battle. Nevertheless you must obey him, and it is the same with the Soviet economy.

Mr. SCHULTZ. So the economy is based on the political direction and it is not challenged?

Mr. LEVIN. That's right.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What benefits do employees have in, say, well where you worked? You worked in research. What benefits did you have with relation to hospitalization, start with that. Did you have hospitalization provided for you?

Mr. LEVIN. Yes; hospitalization and medical treatment in the Soviet Union is free of charge. If you are sick, then you are calling a physi-

4663

cian from the hospital. This physician checks you and issues a so-called disability, sick disability, stating that you are sick for 3 days. And if you were sick longer, he provides this. After that, if you don't die and you are healthy again, you come to the trade union, the local trade union, and on disability you are paid half of your salary for the days of your illness.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What is the availability of doctors? How easily can you see a doctor?

Mr. LEVIN. There is special clinics in the Soviet Union, and there are physicians over there, doctors, and you could be granted an appointment to him in this clinic. You are treated there free, of course, without any charge.

Mr. SCHULTZ. You mention that all Russians have free hospitalization. Is there any difference in the quality of hospitalization?

Mr. LEVIN. There are systems, several systems of hospitals in the Soviet Union. There are hospitals for ordinary people. There is so-called Fourth Department of Minister of Public Health. The Fourth Department is considered to be for Kremlin high officials, for high party officials.

There is capitalism in these hospitals because you have your own personal doctor. You have the best equipment and the systems there are very liberal. But ordinary people can't be accepted there.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Who are ordinary people?

Mr. LEVIN. Well, ordinary people like me, who are not high party officials, who don't work in the hierarchy in the central committee or the Supreme Soviet or high officials in the Kremlin. There are military headquarters, special hospitals for high commanders.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Is this quality of this medical care different?

Mr. LEVIN. That is not a word, it is incomparable. It is, of course, different, but it is not to that difference. It is incomparable. The cost of treatment, the cost of food and treatment in hospitals for ordinary people is 60 cents per day, but it is about \$4 or \$10 in the hospitals for central committee and our other so-called closed hospitals and closed clinics.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Now is the availability of this hospital tied directly to the position or job of the Russian involved? Is the availability of being able to go to this hospital tied directly to the job or position that the man holds? You mentioned you were not able to go to these, the higher officials could go to this type of hospital.

Is it directly tied to his job? Suppose he loses his job, can he still go to that hospital?

Mr. LEVIN. No, he doesn't. If he loses his job, for example, if he is chief of department in the central committee apparatus and if he is demoted to being a head of some research institute, he loses this permission. It is not permanent at all. It is for fitting high officials only and you are deprived of your official villa and so on, you are deprived of all privileges you have.

Mr. SCHULTZ. We were talking about fringe benefits or benefits of employees. Do they have any discount purchasing for employees? Do you have any special stores where you could get a discount?

Mr. LEVIN. It is the same system as with hospitals. They have closed stores from the general public, closed department stores with foreign clothing, only with foreign clothing, with all products. As

people say, they are in capitalism already for those central party committee officials.

Mr. SCHULTZ. The average workingman, then, is not allowed to shop in this store?

Mr. LEVIN. No, of course, because there are no signs on these closed department stores. There are no signs announcing that this is a department store; it is closed. It is not advertised, and there are guards there. You can't penetrate.

There are special coupons, and coupons are very cheap for high party officials, and they are distributed in the central committee or in the Supreme Soviet in the highest government offices. And they don't pay money, as usual; they pay with these coupons.

Mr. SCHULTZ. The coupons are awarded by the political party; is that it?

Mr. LEVIN. Yes, that's right.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What about the housing of the workers, Mr. Levin? Would you describe for us your house or apartment that you had in Russia?

Mr. LEVIN. I was there the chief of a scientific group and my wife is chief engineer of the forestry, but we had only one room in the whole apartment. We had, in the same apartment, two neighboring families and we could not be granted any other apartment. We could not buy carpet for the apartment because we were supposed to have a lot of square feet, as they call them.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Are you allocated by the government so many square feet?

Mr. LEVIN. Yes, that's right. It is allocated by municipal officers of Moscow and of every city.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Who owned the apartment which you live in?

Mr. LEVIN. The Soviet Union.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Are you allowed to own real estate, ground and homes? Can you own one yourself if you could afford to buy it?

Mr. LEVIN. Yes, I am allowed, but it is impossible in Moscow to do that. It is possible in villages and the countryside to buy your own house, but it is not—well, it is practically not available in Moscow or in Leningrad to buy. In the suburbs there are houses, very ancient houses.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Who owns most of the property in Moscow and Leningrad? Does the government own it?

Mr. LEVIN. Yes, only the government, because the government owns even you, not your thoughts, not yet. All property, all homes, all land and apartments, they are owned by the government only.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What about personal property such as your watch, ring, accumulation of money?

Mr. LEVIN. It is mine, if I didn't make some criminal offense under which it is all confiscated. But it is all mine: I bought it.

The CHAIRMAN. Before you leave the matter of the living quarters, Mr. Counsel, you say you and your wife only had one room?

Mr. LEVIN. Yes, that's right.

The CHAIRMAN. How many square feet or square meters are contained in the room?

Mr. LEVIN. It was 18 square meters, it is very difficult now.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have any children?

4665

Mr. LEVIN. I have a son there.

The CHAIRMAN. The three of you lived in the apartment in the one room?

Mr. LEVIN. Not three of us, because my son was born after I left the Soviet Union. There were two of us.

The CHAIRMAN. You are a researchist?

Mr. LEVIN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the extent of your education and training?

Mr. LEVIN. I was trained as a worker in scientific, in nuclear science in experimental.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have the equivalent of a college education?

Mr. LEVIN. Yes, it is a university education. I have an equivalent of master's degree in science.

The CHAIRMAN. How about your wife, what kind of an education did she have?

Mr. LEVIN. She has master's degree in forest engineering.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you should have drawn a pretty good salary. How many rubles per month?

Mr. LEVIN. I earned 150 rubles per month. It is a little bit more than average.

The CHAIRMAN. How much would your wife make?

Mr. LEVIN. 140. If taxes is subtracted, then I was paid 120 approximately and my wife 118, like that.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you had about 238 rubles income. Was this house assigned to you, this apartment? Did you pay anything?

Mr. LEVIN. We didn't pay apartment because we had only one room and we paid about 10 rubles per month for our room.

The CHAIRMAN. There was a rental charge?

Mr. LEVIN. Yes, well, we paid to the state, of course, for renting this apartment. It is quite cheap.

The CHAIRMAN. Was this apartment assigned to you or did you go house-looking like you do in the United States, or what?

Mr. LEVIN. It is assigned by the police office, by the district police office, because you have a passport. Every Soviet citizen has a passport on him, and there is special pages where is the police registration. And when you begin to live in some apartment, you must have police registration at this address and this apartment and so on, and it is mentioned in the police registration where do you live exactly.

The CHAIRMAN. How about other people with the equivalent jobs and training and education that you had, had comparable housing? From the reports I have gotten from Russia, I thought the housing conditions were better than that. I thought a person with your education and training and your position, with your wife working, too, that you would normally have a better apartment; an apartment of 18 square meters is certainly not very much.

Mr. LEVIN. I would not say that, because as I know from my personal practice, we had an average place for our position. It is average. Of course, it is better than under Stalin, because Stalin neglected building construction of apartment buildings. In Khrushchev's time and now, there is big construction of buildings, but it is not enough in Moscow.

The CHAIRMAN. Could you have gotten any larger quarters or better quarters if you had applied for them?

52-587-70-6

Mr. LEVIN. No, I don't think so, because it is nine square meters per person. It was supposed to be a very high rate and if I applied to the state, to the Moscow municipal offices, for a new apartment in new apartment building, I would be denied at once.

The CHAIRMAN. I see. Proceed, Counsel.

Mr. SCHULTZ. You mentioned there were other people living in the the apartment. Did you mean in the actual same apartment with you?

Mr. LEVIN. Yes, we shared the same kitchen and toilet and bathroom and corridors.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What items of, well, not luxuries, but what items did you have in your kitchen such as a refrigerator, stove, and this kind of thing, as opposed to the apartment you have here in New York?

Mr. LEVIN. I was surprised that when you rent an apartment there is a refrigerator. It is unusual for me, of course.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Did you have a refrigerator in Russia?

Mr. LEVIN. No, in Russia I didn't have. I didn't have. There is gas stoves there, and that is all.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What kind of heating did you have in your apartment?

Mr. LEVIN. Gas.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Was each apartment individually heated?

Mr. LEVIN. Yes.

Mr. SCHULTZ. We were talking about private property, amassing money. Did you have a bank account, a checking account in Russia?

Mr. LEVIN. Well, I had a bank account. There are no checks, the system for granting and receiving checks in the Soviet Union. You are paid only by cash in your work, your salary pay. There are no checks, only by cash, everywhere by cash, that is all.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Mr. Levin, you mentioned that you could accumulate personal property unless charged with a crime, and then it would be taken. What type of a crime would result in this property, personal property going to the state?

Mr. LEVIN. If you earn some money illegally, by speculation, and if you have some transactions with foreigners, for example, selling them icons and receiving dollars and, after, reselling dollars, you could have quite a fortune by this way. You can buy gold things and a lot of other things; you can buy even a car. It is suspicion.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Are you talking about, in effect, a black market?

Mr. LEVIN. Yes. It is black market or stealing state property, when you are working as a cashier, for example.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What happens to somebody who is convicted of a crime over there, say, a crime of theft? After they get out of prison, can they go back to work?

Mr. LEVIN. It depends on what work do you want. For example, if I am in prison when I worked in a high party position or as an engineer, I would have difficulties to find equivalent work after imprisonment, because no personnel office would be willing to hire you.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Mr. Levin, you mentioned that you and your wife shared an apartment and now have a child since you left. Have you made any efforts to have your wife and child join you?

Mr. LEVIN. Yes, I have. I received from the State Department, verified by the State Department and by the Soviet Embassy here, an affidavit inviting my wife and son coming to me for a visit. But



after 2 years she was refused by the Foreign Ministry to come to me. After that I wrote a personal letter to Kosygin and I never received an answer. I don't know what else to do.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What was the basis of this refusal? What answer did they give you?

Mr. LEVIN. The Soviet authorities are very angry with me because I made this independent decision that I did not want to go back. They called it the traitor of the Soviet Union. I am sure that it is the most serious offense of the Soviet Union to go abroad and to refuse to go back. It doesn't depend on the reason for that.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Is this set out by law, by the Constitution?

Mr. LEVIN. It is unconstitutional, of course. But they have a special article in the Criminal Code, which states the person who refused to go back to the homeland is a criminal offender, and is punished by 15 years' imprisonment or facing the firing squad, like that. It is not constitutional at all.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Mr. Levin, if you did go back, would you be considered a political prisoner as opposed to a criminal who steals something?

Mr. LEVIN. No, I would be tried under this article 64-A in Criminal Code and would be given about 15 years of imprisonment there in concentration camps.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Would you receive the same treatment or go to the same prison as a thief?

Mr. LEVIN. No. I would be sent to the political concentration camp, because I am even dangerous to the thieves, because thieves are considered as citizens. But I would be considered as an anti-Soviet person and I would be sent only to a political prison.

There are a lot of people who try to cross the Soviet border, which is tremendously difficult, and they were caught and were thrown into prison for from 7 to 12 years, and I would make company with them without any doubt.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What would you do in this concentration camp? Would you be working, forced labor?

Mr. LEVIN. The concentration camp is a device for forced labor under very meager conditions. You are undernourished there, but you work like an elephant mostly in forestry in the industry, cutting wood and loading wood on platforms. So concentration camps mostly are in Siberia or in the northern part of the Ural Mountains where there are no skies, only mosquitoes over you, and you will be about 30 years older after 7 years in prison there.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Are these concentration camps solely for Russians or are they for foreigners who would get in trouble over there?

Mr. LEVIN. They had a special concentration camp for foreigners. They don't mix foreigners with political prisoners in the Soviet Union, because the Soviet prisoners in the concentration camp are supposed to stay forever there if he doesn't change his state of mind, his political views. But foreigners are frequently freed, for example, English prisoners and so on.

Mr. SCHULTZ. You mentioned if you were to return to Russia you would be considered a traitor; however, this was not set out by the Constitution. What allowance is there in the Russian Constitution with regard to freedom of speech?

Mr. LEVIN. There are special beautiful words there in the Constitution that every citizen of the Soviet Union has a right for free speech, free publication, free demonstrations, and the state apparatus must help those citizens who decided to have speech and demonstrations, but it never happens.

Mr. SCHULTZ. You say it never happens. Do they have disturbances such as student demonstrations and this type of thing?

Mr. LEVIN. When Sinyavskiy and Daniel were on trial, they were tried and sent to the concentration camps for writing poems and stories, and Western literary journals published the stories. They were sent to the concentration camps and students and professors in Moscow came to the Pushkin Monument to demonstrate against the trial of them. A lot of demonstrators were fired from their work and until now quite a few of them were imprisoned for no reason.

Mr. SCHULTZ. How was this consistent with the Constitution?

Mr. LEVIN. It is unconstitutional, of course, but the Constitution is window dressing for Italian Communists or for American Communists only. They didn't care about the Constitution and they don't care about the rights of people. Those things as imprisonment of any person is decided by the secret police and party committees only, without any constitution. There is no constitution court or appeal for offenders breaking the Constitution.

Mr. SCHULTZ. In other words, those freedoms of speech and right to publish, as you mentioned, provided by the Constitution can also be taken away by the Constitution or in its interpretation?

Mr. LEVIN. It had never been taken by a constitution, but the secret police and party apparatus deprives people from those rights.

Mr. SCHULTZ. You mention the secret police. How do they operate?

Mr. LEVIN. The secret police in the states like the Soviet Union is a very complicated apparatus. The secret police are everywhere, in your work, they inform on you. The secret police department in my institute would hire among workers some informers, approximately 1 in 4 of 20 colleagues, for example, and they have very complicated tasks, the secret police.

They are Gallup Polls in the Soviet Union, your Gallup Polls in the Soviet Union. They are censors, political censors of the party committee. They have a pressure to operate with plain clothes. They have intelligence services, counterintelligence services.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Do these secret police have the right to bring a charge against you directly?

Mr. LEVIN. Yes. They are not legally—for example, if I am a professor in the Soviet Union, I come to the notice of secret police, and they begin an investigation and after investigation they make my appearance before either closed court or open court, most frequently before a closed court, "closed chamber" as they call it. The judge is under full obedience of the secret police, without any hesitation and without any exception.

Mr. SCHULTZ. On whom does the burden of proof lie? If you are charged with a crime, do you have to prove you are not guilty or do they have to prove, the prosecutor has to prove that you are guilty?

Mr. LEVIN. In legally speaking, the judge decides whether I am guilty or not. But in practice, the secret police decides, especially in political offenses, and so on. The secret police decides that.

In pure criminal cases, theft and so on, the judge decides, very frequently, and you have a right to appeal, and there were cases when your appeal is granted and you are freed. There were some cases like that.

Mr. SCHULTZ. You mention that the secret police kind of function as our Gallup Poll in sensing the thoughts of the people. Is this public opinion ever a determining factor in formulating national policy or changes?

Mr. LEVIN. No, public opinion doesn't influence the Soviet leaders. I think that they are making investigations, the secret police make investigation of that case to feel to what extent Soviet people, Soviet society, is dangerous for the leaders, you see. It is for survival of the apparatus.

They know how to make revolutions now, the party leaders, and they feel that they must feel the society. They don't have any newspapers who would print protests, who would show them that there is protest, so that is why they feel through the secret police tentacles.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Is there any accountability to the people at all from the party officials?

Mr. LEVIN. No, there is no such thing. Party officials, I can give you an example.

On October 13 Khrushchev was thoroughly Lenin, thoroughly Marxist, he was the greatest man of the world, and on October 14, after a day, he vanished from the Soviet Union. No newspaper could mention him even by name. There was an explanation that Nikita Khrushchev was sick and he applied for resignation and it was granted, but nobody believed that.

There is an accountability, but in a distorted way, and not a truthful way. The high Soviet officials don't hesitate to make false statements, and everybody knows that this is a false statement. I hate to mention it, but it is symbolical things. Everybody knows that it is a false statement, the government knows that it is a false statement, but nevertheless it is false and it appears in the Soviet newspapers.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What benefit is there from reading the newspaper then?

Mr. LEVIN. For me the Soviet newspapers are very dull and they were for wrapping matters, because it is very dull and it was not very interesting for me.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Does the party also control textbooks in schools?

Mr. LEVIN. Yes. There is very direct censorship system in the Soviet Union. They control all publication in the Soviet Union, beginning from textbooks to political books, and so on, and even the literary. Every printed line must be approved by censorship committees.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Are teachers required to be members of the Communist Party?

Mr. LEVIN. No, they are not required. It is preferable, but they are not required to be.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Would this affect their future if they would not be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. LEVIN. Yes, it would affect it. It is much easier to make a career when you are a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What limitations are placed on art and science?

Mr. LEVIN. I would say there is no art in the Soviet Union as art. Art can't live in prison conditions, you see. The most strict control the

4670

Soviet Government holds is on art, especially literature and painting art. You weren't supposed to be surrealist or abstractionist, for an example. You must obey some rules of so-called social realism. You have your limits, very strict limits, and the same about literature. You don't have a right to write about the real condition. You must give rosy pictures.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Why is abstract art prohibited, why would that be?

Mr. LEVIN. They call abstract painting as a product of the rotting capitalist world. For the Soviet painting, it was supposed that if you do that and if you exhibit your abstract painting, you are supposed to be rotting the Soviet people, you see. You are like the propaganda for the capitalist system, you see. It is nonsense, it is not serious for us, but it is very serious for Soviet officials; they are very serious in this accusation.

(At this point Mr. Scherle left the hearing room.)

Mr. LEVIN. For example, when I talked in my atomic institute where I worked, when I had a conversation with some low party officials about abstract painting and he told me that this is capitalist, a symbol of rotting, I said, "Kandinsky was Russian. Kandinsky was the beginner of abstract painting and was Russian." So, OK, he told me don't make an anti-sort of propaganda. That is all. So I was silenced.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Mr. Levin, do you have elections in Russia?

Mr. LEVIN. For my personal opinion we don't have elections in Russia, but officially we have them. But they are not secret; they are not democratic at all. It is window dressing for another world. Would you call it an election if you are given the ballot with a single name? There is no election campaign; there is no choice between the candidates.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Who selects the candidates?

Mr. LEVIN. Party officials only. They are selected by party officials, and under their strict orders he becomes a candidate, and you are supposed to vote for him. That is all.

They call Soviet elections, the party officials call them secret, but they are not secret. There is a long table, you come to the table, you are registered there that you appeared and you are given a ballot paper with one name signed there, and from this long table there is long carpet to the voting box.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Is voting required?

Mr. LEVIN. Yes, it is required and it is not secret. You go straight; you don't go through some cabins, and so on. If you go to some cabins, it means that you are against the party official.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you ever voted?

Mr. LEVIN. Yes, I voted many times.

The CHAIRMAN. You say the ballot only had one name on it. Is there any way to vote against that one name?

Mr. LEVIN. Yes, you can cross the name. But it would not be secret for you to cross this name because you are not able to cross it standing in the open in this room.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you ever known of anyone who would dare to cross out the name?

Mr. LEVIN. I crossed a lot of people there because I didn't like them. I knew them personally. In 1965 I was supposed to vote for the

party official by the name of Serov, who was president of the academy of painting, the art academy.<sup>1</sup> He is so hated, a reactionary in the art world in the Soviet Union, and I knew him personally and I saw how he oppressed all creative people in the Soviet Union. I cross him, but nevertheless there was 99.99 percent who voted for him.

The CHAIRMAN. Did they report how many people crossed him out?

Mr. LEVIN. They report, but nobody believes them, because even if half of the people or two-thirds of the people would cross him, would cancel him, they don't care about that. He was selected by the party officials and he would be.

The CHAIRMAN. Probably not very many people would dare to cross it out when it is not a secret ballot?

Mr. LEVIN. Of course they would not dare, but if they would dare, it is all the same. Because, for example, the counting commission, after the election, records that there are only minority who voted for him, the district party would say, "OK, forget about that. Write in some other figure." And that is all.

There is no democracy and there is no means to report about this violation, there is no means, there is no newspaper where a member of a counting commission would go and say that there is a violation of the law, of the Constitution. You would never be accepted. They say, "OK, forget about that." And everybody knows that, and nobody crosses him. I knew that it is useless; it is only for protesting inside me, that is all. If you know that it is useless, you don't care. You get your ballot and drop it and go out. I don't call such an election as an election. I call it a committee comedy, you see.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. SCHULTZ. I was just going to ask what the public reaction to this system is.

Mr. LEVIN. The "public" is a very wide word, you see. There is a different strata of public.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What does the Russian who has to go through this formality think of it?

Mr. LEVIN. The average Russian doesn't care about the party and about slogans, party slogans, and doesn't care about that. He wants to live to earn more, to make good conditions for himself. It is very good for me, because maybe 40 years ago he was enthusiastic about the new world, but now he is not enthusiastic at all about the Soviet system. He is neutral now.

There are a lot of stratas. There is proper Communists, proper party officials, but they are in a minority. There is active professors and they are a minority, too. A majority of them are in concentration camps, but not in the open public.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Mr. Levin, to what extent is there freedom of religion in Russia?

Mr. LEVIN. They have established you must be Orthodox or Muslim or you must believe in the Jewish religion, and so on, but you must not be Baptist and you must not fulfill religious gatherings in your house, only in the churches. A priest must not serve outside the church. It is prohibited by the law.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Does church membership preclude being a member of the Communist Party?

<sup>1</sup> Academy of Arts.

Mr. LEVIN. Yes, it precludes. You are fired from your membership if you frequent the church or wear a cross.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Does the government wage a propaganda campaign of sorts against the church?

Mr. LEVIN. That's right. They have freedom of religion in the Soviet Union, they call it as a freedom, but they wage vehement antireligion propaganda in the Soviet Union, but the church doesn't have the right to answer them. They don't have a right to make a speech before children in primary school or before students in universities. They don't have rights. They have only one publication in the patriarchy, but they don't have means for public appeal of revolution, no.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, do you have some additional questions?

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Levin. I have just a few questions that I wanted to ask you that came to mind.

How old are you?

Mr. LEVIN. I am 39 years old today, now.

The CHAIRMAN. What month in 1968 did you leave Russia?

Mr. LEVIN. What month?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, what month of the year?

Mr. LEVIN. April in 1968.

The CHAIRMAN. You were born in Moscow. Were you schooled in Moscow, too?

Mr. LEVIN. I completed my primary education in high school in the city of Tashkent and I came to Moscow for university education.

The CHAIRMAN. You were employed as a researcher; you were doing research work in Moscow before you left?

Mr. LEVIN. Yes, I did research work in Moscow.

The CHAIRMAN. You mentioned the Russian Constitution. It has been quite a while since I have read the Russian Constitution. I know that there are words in the Constitution which purport to guarantee certain freedoms to the individual. Of course, in our Constitution we have the first amendment which guarantees—freedom of speech, assembly, freedom of the press, and freedom of religion. This has been a problem which the country has wrestled around since its very inception just how far these freedoms do extend. Apparently they do not extend very far under the communist regime in Russia.

You mentioned the incident of attempted demonstration or dissents around Pushkin's statue in Moscow Square. Now you left in '68. Has this been more or less a favorite gathering place for dissenters and protesters where they have attempted to stage demonstrations over the years?

Mr. LEVIN. It is not favored by demonstrators, because there are very few demonstrations in Moscow. But this Pushkin monument is in the center of Moscow, not far away from the Kremlin, and Pushkin is the national poet in Russia, and it is a marked place in Russia.

The CHAIRMAN. You mentioned a demonstration. You left in '68. I remember one attempted demonstration being reported in the Western newspapers in October of 1969. I say "attempted demonstration" because it lasted only about 30 seconds before the Russian police moved in to break it up and cart the demonstrators away from Pushkin Square. That is when they were protesting the treatment of Rus-

sian intellectuals and liberals. Did they have demonstrations prior to that time while you were there?

Mr. LEVIN. Yes, they had demonstrations protesting the occupation of Czechoslovakia, for example, in Red Square.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the month of that?

Mr. LEVIN. In 1968, in August or September of 1968. I would not call that a demonstration because there were several protesters there with placards calling for the Soviet Government to stop occupation of Czechoslovakia. But all the people were relentlessly beaten and thrown to the prisons and immediately without hesitation, without any liberal doubts.

The CHAIRMAN. Apparently the government has clamped down even more since you left, because I know in February of this year—February 5, I believe it was—there were a couple of Europeans, I believe an Italian boy and a Belgian, who were given a year in jail for attempting to hand out leaflets. Then I have noticed more recently that they passed out 5-year sentences for attempts to hand out protest leaflets somewhere in Moscow—I believe it was in Moscow Square.

Then we also find reports of a new tactic being used to control this, and that is sentencing dissenters to an insane asylum. Do you know of any such action while you were in Russia of using sentencing to insane asylums?

It has been reported they did this to one general who had been protesting the treatment of Russian intellectuals, I believe.

Mr. LEVIN. They have a new tactic today. They throw the Soviet professors not to prison, but to mental hospitals, which not long ago compared to the Fascist gas chambers, and it is because it is more dangerous to be 7 years in a mental hospital than in a concentration camp, because it kills you mentally. But they are in mental hospitals for forced confinement. You are given special drugs which destroy your sleep, destroy your nervous system. And after 7 years in mental hospitals you are in mental disorder after that time.

The CHAIRMAN. You testified you were not a member of the Communist Party. Would life have been a lot easier if you were a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. LEVIN. Not a lot easier, but a little bit easier, because there are too many in the Communist Party. It is not absolute, but it would be preferable and it would be easier to make a career. For example, you would not be hired for a position of foreign ministry if you are not a party member.

The CHAIRMAN. How about your immediate associates, the people you work with as a researcher? Were most of them Communist Party members?

Mr. LEVIN. No. In research institutes and research work, only what you did makes a career. There is no political career in science at all, of course. There is a career in what you did because it is very difficult to control science by party apparatus, you see. You can control it politically by party slogans and party officials, understand that.

If they put a top research, party officials, well, science will suffer from that. They understand that. That is why among scientists in the Soviet Union there are very few party members. Most party members are in among engineers, are among writers, are among administration, but not in science and music and so on.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know how many Communist Party members there are estimated to be in the Soviet Union now?

Mr. LEVIN. I don't remember the figure, the data about that. I would say that between 10 and 20 million party members in the Soviet Union, maybe 18, maybe 15, something like that, but more than 10 million.

The CHAIRMAN. A great many of the young people are joining Communist youth parties, are they not, because of the benefits?

Mr. LEVIN. It is not fashionable now among younger people to be Communist. It is getting less and less fashionable. How could I say it? There is anti-impulse even, you can feel it. It is not good to be a Communist Party member among the younger generation, younger than mine, who are now 20, 25 years old. When you are accepted in the party, you are called a little bit strange. I know you can feel that idea. I know he is Communist and he wants to make a career. That is all. Nobody among the younger people now believes in communism and in the Communist dogma. There are a few from the twenties.

The CHAIRMAN. We have been reading several reports in the newspapers about discriminatory action being taken against the Jewish people. Did you observe any of that while you were in Moscow?

Mr. LEVIN. Yes, I observed it. In every more or less important or less important and responsible organization or apparatus, and so on, there are quotas for Jews to be hired. For example, in my research institute they didn't accept Jews at all in the atomic institute. There were Jews, but they are old now and they made great contributions to the Soviet nuclear bomb and to the Soviet nuclear research. That is why they are now head of the department, but younger Jews are not accepted in secret research institutes.

When I started, when I was a student of physical engineering institute, no single Jews were in my faculty, and in my faculty of this institute. There were a few students to go and study there.

Even in not secret institutes where I worked my last years in the Soviet Union there is a certain quota and there is some proportion, you see, and it is this proportion of Jews. And if this proportion of Jews to other nationalities is exceeded, Jews are not hired there.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you been able to establish any contact with your family at all?

Mr. LEVIN. I write to my family and I know how to write to my family, because I know what must be allowed to go. My correspondence is censored, of course, by secret police, and sometimes they don't allow my letters to get to my wife. But I correspond with her.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you feel your wife would like to join you here?

Mr. LEVIN. Yes, she wants very much to join me, but it is tremendously difficult, it is tremendous.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Levin, you are 39 years old. Are your parents still living?

Mr. LEVIN. Yes, my parents are now on pension. I waited until they go on pension to get away from the Soviet Union, because they are not harmed now. My father was in the air force, and secret police would make him quite a hard time for my defection, and I waited until he went on pension.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any further questions, Mr. Counsel?



I have further questions on the family matter there, but I won't ask them for the record now. I will ask them off the record.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Mr. Levin, the Communist Party of the United States frequently refers to their desire for peace in the world. What do the Communist officials mean when they say that they are seeking peace in the world?

Mr. LEVIN. It is very difficult to find logic in the Soviet propaganda statements. I think that by this they mean that America must get away, must withdraw the troops from Vietnam, from Europe, from every part of the world. That is what they mean that they are fighting for peace.

But they don't mention their troops in Czechoslovakia or Hungary or East Germany. I think that the Soviet propaganda made the statement to blame Americans and West Germany and the Western World for that.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What is meant by "democratic centralism," the term as used in the Communist philosophy?

Mr. LEVIN. In the Soviet Union democratic centralism, they call the Soviet Union a democratic country and they call all satellites as democratic republics. The word "democratic" is supposed to be very common in the Soviet propaganda. It is not democratic at all.

Centralism, it means that there is centralism in the Soviet Union; this is the hierarchy, there is one leader and in the center. But they wouldn't want to call it simply centralism, you see. But you must have some word for that; they would not call it Fascist centralism, only democratic. Centralism means that there is in the center, like a hierarchy, like a pyramid. This is centralism.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Mr. Levin, are there any neighborhood councils or committees which exercise control over your life in Russia, thinking of party organization, now?

Mr. LEVIN. "Exercise control," it depends on what kind of life. Party officials didn't control me if I want to eat or if I want to buy clothing, you see, but if you go out, if you go out of some limits, you would feel the control. For example, if you want to protest against the lack of free speech in the Soviet Union, you would feel control at once. It depends on what limits.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What I was trying to get at was the control more or less on a local, state, or district level. Do you have such a local organization of the party?

Mr. LEVIN. Yes, I did. I was in the physical technical department of my institute.

Mr. SCHULTZ. How far does this breakdown now? I am talking about the neighborhood level. Do you have it in your neighborhood and the city having larger controls?

Mr. LEVIN. No, I don't have. Every Soviet citizen in the Soviet Union is controlled by his work, mostly, by party members. But, of course, there is control of secret police in the neighborhoods and policemen are there who would survey you. There is assigned policemen to every neighborhood. They control, for example, if you have drunken parties, to frequent, drunken parties. Your neighbors may inform a policeman, and the policeman would investigate why, how many, how frequent, and how much money they spent. They investigate you.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Mr. Levin, is there any limitation on the accumulation of wealth in the Soviet Union?

Mr. LEVIN. No, there is no limitation on that. You can buy a car, two cars, if you have money. You can buy a house out of the limits of the city, maybe two houses, but if you have legal money—if you buy, for example, two cars, I think that it is quite probably that the policemen will investigate where did you have money, because they know pretty sure that you can't have money if you are an engineer, you can't have money for two cars. Maybe there would be one car after 10 years of working, but not two cars. That is too much.

Mr. SCHULTZ. You could have savings accounts in banks?

Mr. LEVIN. Yes.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Mr. Levin, one final question. What criticism would you have of the United States now that you have lived here for 2 years?

Mr. LEVIN. I don't live here for a long time, for quite enough time. I think that the Government of the United States doesn't explain very sufficiently about his purposes in the Vietnam war. I feel that the Government of the United States hesitates to do that because people in the United States, as I feel, are under influence of liberal newspapers who know only part of the truth. Of course it is not very pleasant to have kids killed in the war. They are right to some extent, but there is another side. There is communistic Russia and the Chinese communists who like to invade not directly, but indirectly, all of Indochina. There is no doubt of Soviet intelligence, for example. I think you are not efficient in explaining this kind of thing.

Of course, there is crime, and you are too liberal with this crime. I am not accustomed to this liberalism with crime. I am a former Soviet citizen, and they are more efficient because of the system. They can't care about rights.

I cannot give you my opinion of the United States because I don't live here for enough time to make serious and mature convictions.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Mr. Levin, thank you very much. Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions.

Mr. LEVIN. I have one question to you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to know could you help me from your high position to influence the Soviet Government to allow my wife to join me? If you have any means, could you help me with that? I don't have any means to do that. I applied personally to Kosygin and I applied to the Soviet Government through legal channels and I don't have any right.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you visited with any of the State Department officials in this country?

Mr. LEVIN. No, not yet. I don't know how to do that, but I think that the Soviet Government would listen to you as a Congressman and maybe it could help.

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly, Mr. Levin: I intend to make contact with the State Department, and we will explore any possible way that we can help you to be reunited with your family.

You are obviously a very brave and courageous man, and I hope we are able to help you. I want to wish you great success and happiness and that you do find the peace that you have tried to obtain with such tremendous sacrifice.

Thank you very much. I can assure you I will look into the matter and do whatever I possibly can as a Member of Congress.

4677

Mr. LEVIN. Thank you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. Counsel, it is now 5 minutes until 12. You have one more witness scheduled for today?

Mr. SCHULTZ. Yes, sir; we do.

The CHAIRMAN. How long do you think it will take for his testimony?

Mr. SCHULTZ. I would guess about an hour.

The CHAIRMAN. Whom do you have scheduled for tomorrow?

Mr. SCHULTZ. We have Dr. William Kintner, University of Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. I wonder if it would be possible for Dr. Mladek to return tomorrow?

Mr. SCHULTZ. May I have just a moment to discuss it.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now 5 minutes to 12, and I expect an early roll-call this afternoon.

The meeting will be adjourned until tomorrow at 10 o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 11:55 a.m., Wednesday, June 24, 1970, the committee recessed, to reconvene at 10 a.m., Thursday, June 25, 1970.)

## THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF COMMUNISM IN 1970

THURSDAY, JUNE 25, 1970

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY,  
*Washington, D.C.*

### PUBLIC HEARINGS

The Committee on Internal Security met, pursuant to recess, at 10 a.m., in Room 311, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C., Hon. William J. Scherle presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Richard H. Ichord of Missouri, chairman, William J. Scherle of Iowa, Richardson Preyer of North Carolina, and John M. Ashbrook of Ohio.

Staff members present: Donald G. Sanders, chief counsel; and Richard L. Schultz, associate chief counsel.

Mr. SCHERLE. The committee will come to order.

Will the counsel call the first witness?

Mr. SCHULTZ. Dr. Mladek.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Mladek, will you stand and be sworn in.

Do you solemnly swear that you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. MLADEK. I do.

Mr. SCHERLE. Be seated. Counsel, proceed.

### TESTIMONY OF JIRI MLADEK

Mr. SCHULTZ. Dr. Mladek, will you state your full name and address please?

Mr. MLADEK. Jiri Mladek, New York.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Where were you born, Mr. Mladek?

Mr. MLADEK. In Bohemia in Czechoslovakia, Dasice.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Where have you spent most of your life?

Mr. MLADEK. In Prague, Czechoslovakia.

Mr. SCHULTZ. When did you leave Prague and come to the United States?

Mr. MLADEK. In December '66.

Mr. SCHULTZ. In what month did you request asylum in the United States?

Mr. MLADEK. On February 17, 1970.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Dr. Mladek, would you outline for us your educational background and your reasons for coming to the United States?

Mr. MLADEK. I finished law school in Prague in 1950 and I came to the United States as first secretary of the Czechoslovakia mission to the United Nations.

(4679)

4680

Mr. SCHULTZ. When you left the Legation to the United Nations, did you take any particular steps to leave? Did you advise them that you were leaving?

Mr. MLADEK. No.

Mr. SCHULTZ. You left without permission or without the knowledge of the Czechoslovakian Government?

Mr. MLADEK. Yes.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Would you describe for us your education in Czechoslovakia as it relates to the communist doctrine? Did you learn the teachings of Marx and Lenin while you are in high school and college?

Mr. MLADEK. The first lectures were in the party, which I joined in June 1945. Then in 1949, during my law studies, I was employed in foreign trade.

I was dismissed from my studies in '49. After an interview, I was permitted to resume my studies, but had to pass three exams on the history of philosophy, and economics of Marxism-Leninism.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Were these written exams?

Mr. MLADEK. No, they were oral exams.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Would you describe for us your entrance into the Communist Party? Why did you join the Communist Party?

Mr. MLADEK. I entered the party at the request of my father, who was director of a sugar mill of a small town in East Bohemia. He was 63 in 1945 and was quite ill. The chairman of the party, who was one of the workers in the sugar mill, advised my father and me to join the party. The sugar mills were to be nationalized, and all the employees, particularly in management, should be members of the party.

My father was afraid that he would otherwise be dismissed.

Mr. SCHULTZ. In other words, it would have been detrimental to your father's career if he did not join the Communist Party?

Mr. MLADEK. Yes.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Were you required to attend meetings?

Mr. MLADEK. No. I lived partly in Dasice with my parents and partly in Prague. I was registered only in this factory Communist Party organization in Dasice where I never worked and for that reason managed to escape attending party meetings.

I first attended a party meeting in 1949 in Prague in the place where I worked.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Dr. Mladek, did you belong to the Czechoslovakian youth group while you were in high school?

Mr. MLADEK. No.

Mr. SCHULTZ. You did not?

Mr. MLADEK. No.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Did they have any training or classes with regard to communist doctrine in the high school?

Mr. MLADEK. Because I was older, I was at the university after '45. Especially after '48, all schools started propagating the communist doctrine.

Mr. SCHULTZ. So after 1948 all of the schools had the communist doctrine?

Mr. MLADEK. Yes.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Are the textbooks controlled by the Communist Party?

Mr. MLADEK. Yes, they are.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What control was placed on the teachers?

Mr. MLADEK. The teachers are required to teach according to Marxist-Leninist doctrine. All school directors and many teachers are members of the party.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Is that a prerequisite, to be a member of the party?

Mr. MLADEK. No, it isn't for teachers.

Mr. SCHULTZ. How do the teachers handle questions of inquiring minds that may not be in consonance with the Communist Party doctrine?

Mr. MLADEK. I think for a teacher it is especially dangerous not to follow the party line because there are a lot of cases where the parents inquired of their children and the children told them that the teacher had said this or that. I remember several cases in Prague in which teachers were brought to trial because they had spoken against the socialist doctrine or against the principal interests of the socialist state.

One of these was only a small remark. One woman teacher on the 7th of March referred to the anniversary of President Masaryk; this was sufficient for the state prosecutor to put her on trial.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What was this teacher's status before the court? Was she a criminal charged with a crime?

Mr. MLADEK. There were special laws dealing with so-called political crimes. She was accused of having endangered the education of youth and of having violated the main obligations of a socialist teacher.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Dr. Mladek, you mentioned that in preparation for your degree you took an oral test. Did you also write a paper?

Mr. MLADEK. Yes, I wrote a paper to obtain a doctorate degree on the responsibility of the state. It was in 1950, the last year in which it was possible to write somewhat freely. For that reason, in my work I didn't use any ideas of Marxism or Leninism. It was based on so-called bourgeois doctrine.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What limitations are placed on the arts or sciences or writing of papers? You say yours was one of the last freely written.

Mr. MLADEK. Yes, because in the second part of 1950 all universities underwent a so-called reform. You were then permitted to write only on themes which were on a list approved by the party and by the directorate of the university, all in accordance with the teachings of the party.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Would you say today that there is a limitation on the freedom of expression in writing?

Mr. MLADEK. Yes, there is. There was an exception in the year 1968 because of the liberation movement in Czechoslovakia. But in all other years there was such a limitation.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What was this exception?

Mr. MLADEK. In that year as you could follow here in the newspapers, there was a large national liberation movement. The party was put aside and the people spoke freely and wrote freely in the newspapers. There were a lot of meetings where the people expressed their real opinions.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Dr. Mladek, when you finished your education, you went out to get a job. Would you describe for us what type of work you did and how you got your job?

4682

Mr. MLADEK. My first job after my studies was in the Legal Advice Bureau in Prague, a type of lawyers' collective similar to a law firm here. After the mandatory 4-year period of internship, I passed the bar examination and then for 2 years worked as an attorney in Prague.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Now in your legal work did you represent criminals or people charged with crimes against the state?

Mr. MLADEK. No. In 1956, as the youngest attorney in Czechoslovakia, I was assigned to the ranks of attorneys defending such individuals. I recognized the futility of the defense in such cases and, since I couldn't escape this responsibility in any other manner, I resigned from the bureau rather than have to handle them.

Mr. SCHULTZ. You resigned?

Mr. MLADEK. Yes, because the attorney had no real possibility of defending these people. Everything was prepared in advance by the state police, and the attorney had a very unhappy role in court.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Why is that? Where is the burden of proof in a criminal case?

Mr. MLADEK. The burden of proof is on the state prosecutor.

Mr. SCHULTZ. But you felt that the attorney who defended a person charged with a crime against the state would be handicapped?

Mr. MLADEK. Yes.

(At this point Mr. Preyer entered the hearing room.)

Mr. SCHULTZ. Why is that?

Mr. MLADEK. For example, in the common case of a person charged with anticommunist statements, the attorney could not defend him on the ground that he was simply exercising the right to freedom of expression, since this would be regarded as defense of the crime rather than the individual. This left the attorney without any real defense. There was only one acceptable philosophy in the world, and all expressions of opinion had to conform to it.

Mr. SCHULTZ. You mentioned that you resigned prior to defending persons charged with crimes?

Mr. MLADEK. Yes.

Mr. SCHULTZ. This would indicate that you had a choice, a freedom of working where you wanted?

Mr. MLADEK. As you know, as an attorney you were not a direct employee of the state. You were a member of the lawyers' committee and, for that reason, you could resign.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Where did you then go to work, Dr. Mladek?

Mr. MLADEK. I joined the Foreign Division of the Ministry of Finance, where I worked for 1 year as a senior legal adviser and for 1 year as administrator. I then became chief of the division.

Mr. SCHULTZ. You then worked in the finance aspect of the Czechoslovakian Government; is that right?

Mr. MLADEK. Yes.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Considering the economy of Czechoslovakia, finances with which you would be familiar, how was the economy controlled? Who controls the economy?

Mr. MLADEK. Everything is under the party, including the economy, in both a direct and indirect sense. If you wish to put some important proposal to the government, you first put it to the secretariat of the central committee. If this committee approves you can then put it formally to the government.

The Foreign Division dealt in matters concerning Western Europe and the so-called free world. There was another division for the socialist countries. All the proposals from these divisions were first brought before the party committee.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Do I understand correctly you are saying that you would present a program to the party and then if it was OK—

Mr. MLADEK. These were not programs, but rather precise proposals about what you intended to discuss with other countries, and in what financial context.

Mr. SCHULTZ. It would go first to the party, and then if OK'd it would be handled by the government?

Mr. MLADEK. Yes.

Mr. SCHULTZ. So it is correct, then, to say that the party is the one that controls the economy, as opposed to the government?

Mr. MLADEK. Yes.

Mr. SCHULTZ. How are wages and prices controlled?

Mr. MLADEK. Wages and prices are fixed at levels set by the party.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Is there any competition permitted?

Mr. MLADEK. No.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Do you have any forced labor in Czechoslovakia?

Mr. MLADEK. In the fifties there was forced labor. Some people were put into special camps.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Where did these people come from? Were they criminals?

Mr. MLADEK. People were put into these camps with out a formal trial or sentence.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Is it a crime not to work in Czechoslovakia?

Mr. MLADEK. Yes, because every citizen of Czechoslovakia has the right and the obligation to work for the benefit of the socialist society.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Now is this specifically contained in the Constitution?

Mr. MLADEK. Yes.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Does the Constitution grant rights to the people which it can also take away?

Mr. MLADEK. The Constitution grants all of what can roughly be described as human rights, but in a later paragraph it is stated that these rights can also be abolished by law in the interest of the socialist community. For that reason, all these rights could be described as conditional.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Would you say that the law takes into consideration the human dignity of the individual?

Mr. MLADEK. No. Theoretically it does, but in fact all your activity, all your thinking and acting must be in conformity with the interests of socialist society. All considerations of human dignity are ultimately subordinate to these interests. For that reason, in practice you are very limited in your behavior.

(At this point Mr. Ashbrook entered the hearing room.)

Mr. SCHULTZ. Let's return to the area of economy you were talking about. You mentioned forced labor in some areas. Do you have any idea of the number of people that would be involved in forced labor?

Mr. MLADEK. Yes, in the 1950's there were, I think, several 10,000 people.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Several tens of thousands of people?

Mr. MLADEK. Yes.



4684

(At this point Mr. Scherle left the hearing room, and Mr. Preyer presided.)

Mr. SCHULTZ. What is the availability of consumer goods? What is the quality?

Mr. MLADEK. The quality is quite low. There have been several attempts to improve quality, some of them moderately successful, others merely making matters worse. Roughly we can say that the quality is a little better in Czechoslovakia than in other socialist countries because Czechoslovakia had an advanced economy before the war. Some part of it seemed to remain; everything was not absolutely spoiled.

But in general, Czechoslovakia's economy has been going down and down under the communist regime. Some of the East European countries were modernized and showed improvement in some respects, but this was not true in Czechoslovakia.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What is the reason for this? Why is the economy going down and down?

Mr. MLADEK. First of all, I think the communist conceptions of economics is wrong. The economies of the socialist countries are subordinate to the interests of the Soviet Union. For that reason the structure of the economy in Czechoslovakia was destroyed after 1948.

There was a large, heavy industry built without local sources of raw materials. For that reason a lot of this heavy industry was working on the basis of Soviet raw materials and the finished products were sent to the Soviet Union. We can say that roughly three-quarters of the Czechoslovaks were working for the benefit of the Soviet Union. With the exploitation of a small country by such a huge one, the result was quite clear. The economy went down and down.

In 1960 they experienced very great difficulties. The members of the Presidium appealed to Moscow several times, and they were permitted to slow down the tempo of heavy industry a little. After 1960 they put more investment into light industry, the consumer goods industry.

Mr. SCHULTZ. If the economy of Czechoslovakia is directly tied to Russia, is this a political instrument to further the aims of international communism? Is the economy used as an instrument to further international communism?

Mr. MLADEK. Of course, I think everything is used for the final end—that is, first of all, to build up communism in all East European countries, and then to use every opportunity to extend communism in other world areas. That means that these socialist countries, the countries which are members of the Warsaw Pact Treaty, are obliged to support every moment in every country which has the aim of building communism.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What are the objectives of communism as you learned them and what are the practical aspects as you've observed?

Mr. MLADEK. The first priority is to complete the construction of a communist society in the countries where the Communist Party rules, and then to support all fraternal parties in other countries. That means the workers parties, the Communist parties of Eastern Europe, and then especially all people's movements in developing countries.

Just now the position of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries toward the developing countries is diversified. The socialist countries support only those developing countries which follow the

socialist line or which are prepared to do so. The developing countries which are merely paying lip service, but which have much more connection with capitalism, will not be supported.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Isn't this a drain on the countries that are trying to support, these developing countries? Doesn't this drain the economy of Czechoslovakia?

Mr. MLADEK. Yes, of course, it did and I think still does.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What do you foresee as a practical matter how this will work out? Can they continue to do this, drain the countries to support those countries who are becoming socialist in nature?

Mr. MLADEK. It weakened some of the socialist countries, but, as you know, there is a belief among them that they should all be put on the same level. I was told that when some Czechoslovak officials complained to Moscow about the state of the economy, they were told it doesn't matter, because Czechoslovakia should be put on the same level as Poland, Rumania, and Bulgaria; when they were all on the same level, they could then proceed forward, together.

Mr. SCHULTZ. We talked a little bit about the employment aspect, the freedom you had to move to a job, and some reference to the Constitution in human rights. I am wondering if there is freedom of religion in Czechoslovakia?

Mr. MLADEK. No, there isn't. You have freedom of religion expressed in the Constitution, but your use of this freedom is held to be against the interests of socialist society. That means a member of the party should not be a member of a religious society.

But also other people who were not members of the party were persecuted if they regularly attended church in the 1950's.

After the fifties, it was not so closely followed. There was some freedom, but after 12 years of persecution most people were not prepared to endanger themselves by visiting churches. But you can visit churches, especially in Prague, because in these churches there is a lot of nice music; some people, if they were asked by the party people or by their chief at work, simply replied, "We were present in the church, but only to hear the music."

Mr. SCHULTZ. Is there active propaganda against the church?

Mr. MLADEK. I think just now there isn't, but there was in the 1950's.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Membership in a church does not preclude membership in the Communist Party, does it?

Mr. MLADEK. No.

Mr. SCHULTZ. It does?

Mr. MLADEK. I'm sorry, I meant that one does preclude the other. If you are a member of the party, you should not be a churchgoer, because if you are a Marxist, it is impossible to believe in God.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Is there any attempt to create antagonism between the laity and the clergy?

Mr. MLADEK. Yes. As you know, first of all, the property of the church, in Czechoslovakia particularly the Catholic Church, was nationalized, was taken by the state. The priests were then paid by the state, but the salaries were very low—half of that of an unqualified worker. Then in the 1950's all the seminaries were closed. For that reason there were no new priests entering the church. During the liberation movement at the beginning of '68 there were some seminaries reopened.

4686

Mr. SCHULTZ. Does the government consider the church as a possible source of criticism to the government?

Mr. MLADEK. The church openly criticized the government during the first 5 or 7 years of the communist regime, and a lot of priests were put into prison. They were sentenced to about 20 years.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What criticism of the government is permitted?

Mr. MLADEK. Only constructive criticism. That means that you can say, "I agree with the government and with the aims of the government and the parliament and so on, only I think that this special sector should work more or should do this."

That means you can spend an hour praising the government and the party, and then 1 minute saying something small is not good. That is so-called constructive criticism, because you should have the aim of improving the policy of the party, of improving the economy.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Is there any dissent allowed by the college students and, if so, how is this infraction handled? Do college students get to dissent and demonstrate? Are they allowed to do that?

Mr. MLADEK. No, they are not allowed to do so. There was only one large dissent, which took place in the last year when Mr. Novotny was chief of the party and President of the republic. The students complained that there was no light or heat in their dormitories, and they were beaten by the police. They were not put into prison, but were detained for 3 days.

Mr. SCHULTZ. How would the dissent be handled by the party or government of an adult other than students? How was dissent handled if somebody dissented?

Mr. MLADEK. They are political crimes, all of these.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What does the Czechoslovakian man on the street think about this? What is his attitude toward the party?

Mr. MLADEK. You must imagine that the absolute majority, maybe 90 percent of these people, after 25 years of communism are accustomed to keeping their opinions to themselves. The only exception was during the last 2 years before the Soviet invasion.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Dr. Mladek, how do the people let off steam? How do they get rid of whatever question or feeling they might have of anxiety in this very controlled and repressive atmosphere?

Mr. MLADEK. Just now I didn't understand.

Mr. SCHULTZ. You say they can't dissent. If they do, they can be considered criminals against the state and committing a crime against the state. How do they let steam off and get rid of these frustrations, or do you just withhold it within?

Mr. MLADEK. No, they try to avoid this. They go to private parties with their friends, or stay by themselves after their work. You can see it in the factories and ministries. In my office the people were divided because in each group, in each department and division there were hardliners. The majority of the others avoid them and are very cautious in their presence, but after work the others visit among themselves, where they can express themselves more freely.

The minority, the hardliners, also remain among themselves. For that reason, the nation is very divided. If your chief at work has some higher party function, you avoid any outside contacts with him.

Mr. SCHULTZ. You mentioned that the country is divided between hardliners and those who may be not so indoctrinated?

Mr. MLADEK. It became especially clear in 1968 that the workers are against the regime. The demonstrations in Prague showed that not only were the students and the intelligentsia for liberation but the majority of the workers as well.

Mr. SCHULTZ. You are saying the majority of the workers are not, then, Communist Party members?

Mr. MLADEK. Yes. I think the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia had 1.8 million members last year. Just now the members are being evaluated, and their number is being reduced. The majority of members were state civil servants and not workers. It was obligatory that civil servants and higher employees in the national enterprises be members of the party, but the workers were not obliged to because they could not be dismissed.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Dr. Mladek, is it in vogue now not to be a member of the Communist Party? Is this the "thing of the day," not to join the party? I am talking about the younger people now. Do they see any benefit in joining?

Mr. MLADEK. No, in Czechoslovakia I think there's a special situation. After 1968 the absolute majority of young people refused to become members of the party. A lot of honest people now are not only prepared to be dismissed from the party, but are actually contributing to their dismissal by their open hostility and refusal to conform. This is also the case in the ministries and higher offices.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Is the party becoming more selective in their membership?

Mr. MLADEK. Yes. Following the policy of the Soviet Communist Party, the Czechoslovak Party has just announced its intention of reducing its size. Only hardliners will be retained, and they'll try to have a larger proportion of workers.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Isn't this inconsistent with their training and indoctrination at the lower levels through the youth groups and in the Czechoslovakian youth party? Isn't this an inconsistency? They are becoming more selective in the membership of the Communist Party, but the total indoctrination is on a broad scale in the schools. They exposed the high school students at an early age to the Marx-Lenin ideology, but then they become selective when it comes to party membership?

Mr. MLADEK. Yes, at the same time they are teaching that only the best of them can become members of the party because this is the greatest honor for a citizen.

Mr. SCHULTZ. I see they are looking for those with total commitment then.

Mr. MLADEK. Yes.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Dr. Mladek, we know that you came to the United States. Would you discuss for us a little bit the freedom of travel within Czechoslovakia?

Mr. MLADEK. There is such freedom. There never was the same kind of limitation as in the Soviet Union.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Did you have to have a passport to travel within Czechoslovakia?

Mr. MLADEK. No.

Mr. SCHULTZ. How about to leave Czechoslovakia?

Mr. MLADEK. That is more difficult, because nobody is entitled by right to have a passport. You can obtain a passport only for an individual trip. Before the trip, the state police make inquiries at your neighbors, in the party, in the trade union. If they think that you can travel, that there is no danger that you will stay abroad, then they will grant a passport.

In 1966 they started to proceed in a somewhat more liberal manner, but there was also a limitation as far as hard currency is concerned. For that reason the number of citizens that was permitted to travel abroad was limited and the number of days was quite short.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Could you expend your own money to go on a trip or did you have to have a guarantee of the money from outside of Czechoslovakia to travel?

Mr. MLADEK. In most cases, you needed some outside source of money. Because Czechoslovakian currency is not freely exchangeable. Only a small number of people was permitted to buy hard currency at the state bank, but it was most expensive.

For example, the official rate is \$1 equals 7 korunas, but if you bought these dollars at the state bank, the rate was 35 korunas for a dollar. The maximum was, I think, \$100 per person. But the number of persons was limited, I think, to 10,000 a year.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Dr. Mladek, are the borders of Czechoslovakia fortified?

Mr. MLADEK. Yes, the borders with the Federal Republic of Germany and Austria, no others.

Mr. SCHULTZ. For what reason, what is the purpose?

Mr. MLADEK. Because there is danger from the capitalist world.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What I was getting at, we were talking about travel and I was wondering if the fortification of the borders was to, in part, keep Czechoslovakians within Czechoslovakia. Could you cross these fortified borders into another country?

Mr. MLADEK. No, I think it would be very hard. The best possibility might be the border between Czechoslovakia and West Germany, where there are mountains and large woods. There were several attempts to cross the border. Some of them ended with the death of the persons involved.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Is contact with foreigners permitted openly in Czechoslovakia?

Mr. MLADEK. In the 1950's it was very dangerous to have any contact with foreigners from Western countries. After 1960 there was some relaxation, but you had to be prepared for a visit from some plainclothesmen soon after such a contact. They might ask you what you discussed with this person, what was the purpose of your contact, whether you got something for him, if you promised anything, and so on.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Dr. Mladek, what benefits accrue to the workers in Czechoslovakia? I am thinking of some benefits with regard to hospitalization.

Mr. MLADEK. In Czechoslovakia there is not such a sharp distinction between salary and benefits. You have your salary and then there is obligatory insurance as far as medical costs are concerned and your pension, and that is all.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Do you have a free medical service?

Mr. MLADEK. Yes. Every citizen who works has free medical care.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What is the quality of this medical care?

Mr. MLADEK. The quality is poor because of an insufficiency of medicines and the small number of doctors. Since medical care is free, every citizen visits a doctor any time he wants. For that reason, each doctor in a clinic or medical center has an average of 120 patients a day. He is absolutely unable to consult with them for very long.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Is the quality of medical care the same for everyone?

Mr. MLADEK. No, there are exceptions. There is a state sanatorium for higher party and government functionaries, and I have heard that is very good. I never was there. There is one doctor for three or five patients.

All the medicines are from Switzerland, the United States, England, France, and the care is excellent.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Now you mentioned that in one place there is one doctor for 120 patients per day and another place a doctor for four or five patients. How do you become eligible to take advantage of the facility where they have a doctor for four or five patients?

Mr. MLADEK. The state sanatorium can be used only by members of the central committee of the party, high-ranking government officials, the chairman and the members of the National Assembly, and high-ranking police and military officers.

Lower ranking officers also receive special treatment in military hospitals where there are more competent doctors than in civilian clinics.

Mr. SCHULTZ. If the particular person involved falls in disfavor and loses his party position, does he also lose his benefits?

Mr. MLADEK. He almost immediately loses all these advantages and also must move out of his state-owned villa.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Dr. Mladek, could you tell us what is taught in Czechoslovakia concerning the probability of a revolution in the United States?

(At this point Mr. Ashbrook left the hearing room.)

Mr. MLADEK. I think it is not especially aimed against the United States. Revolution is predicted for all capitalist countries.

Communists believe that someday all the world will be under a communist regime.

Mr. SCHULTZ. How do communist leaders view these student disorders in the United States?

Mr. MLADEK. I think during this time I was here, but if you follow the press in communist countries, you can see that it reflects only so-called negative movements in the capitalist countries. They print everything regarding strikes and other disorders. I think that all these communist countries believe that every disorder contributes to the final end because it weakens the capitalist countries and makes the possibility of a revolution or other change more probable.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What do they consider the chief weakness?

Mr. MLADEK. I think it is in the social field, that the workers here are not receiving sufficient benefits in the sphere of social rights and for that reason will step by step become more revolutionary.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions.

Mr. PREYER (presiding). Thank you very much, Doctor, for your testimony. I wanted to ask one question about the economy to see if we

could take a specific example and see how it would work in Czechoslovakia as compared with the United States. Perhaps you are familiar with the area of Washington known as Georgetown, near where we are. Georgetown has many small shops and stores.

In Czechoslovakia if a group of young people decided that they wished to open a store which sold psychedelic clothes or psychedelic art or phonograph records of the kind that young people enjoy, how would they go about it?

First, they would have to have a store, a place to do business. How would they get that? Who owns the land in Czechoslovakia, say, in Prague, and if you wanted to open a store in Prague, from whom would you rent the store?

Mr. MLADEK. Mr. Chairman, I think first of all you would need permission from the so-called people's committee. That is something like city hall; the Czechoslovaks call it the people's committee.

Mr. PREYER. You could not go to a private citizen and lease your store from him?

Mr. MLADEK. You couldn't do so because in Czechoslovakia there are no private stores.

Mr. PREYER. All of the land, then, the buildings are owned by the government?

Mr. MLADEK. The land is owned by the government with the exception of land where there are one-family houses.

Mr. PREYER. To get the store, you would have to go to the government to get permission for the store. Then you would have to have some money to operate the store, some capital. Where would you get the capital? Could you go to a bank and borrow it? Or do you have to go to the government and have it put in the government's budget?

Mr. MLADEK. If you are permitted to have a store and to sell goods, you can go to the bank and borrow money.

Mr. PREYER. The bank is the government bank?

Mr. MLADEK. Yes.

Mr. PREYER. So the decision to allow you to operate this store automatically means the bank would give you the money?

Mr. MLADEK. Yes. I will tell you if an American citizen came to Prague and wanted to have a store and sell anything, he would go to the people's committee. The people's committee would be extremely surprised and would immediately send a letter to the central committee of the party, because this is something so exceptional that the mayor of Prague would have nothing to do with this permission. For this reason, I think the president of the party would have a session and decide if an American citizen should be permitted to have such a store in Prague.

Mr. PREYER. So the decisions, I take it, are made by the government or by the party on the basis of whether the store would contribute to the goals of the socialist republic, or something of that sort?

Mr. MLADEK. Yes, especially in this case where an American citizen wants to sell psychedelic goods, and so on, they would decide if it is not against the interests of the socialist community.

Mr. PREYER. So something like an art museum or the selling of psychedelic clothes or psychedelic posters would probably not be considered as something furthering the goals of the country?

Mr. MLADEK. No, I don't think so.

Mr. PREYER. Are there any such stores in Prague, as a matter of interest, that sell psychedelic clothes and posters?

Mr. MLADEK. I have heard that in 1968 and '69 there were some, not stores, but young people on the streets who sold such things, but I am not sure if it is permitted at this time.

Mr. PREYER. So it would be very difficult for young people there to start that kind of an operation, just because they wanted to do it and because they had the initiative and were able to get hold of property or able to raise the money from friends or from a bank as they could do here.

An underground newspaper, such as the *Quicksilver Times*, I suppose, in Czechoslovakia would really be underground, wouldn't it? It just would not be called "underground."

Mr. MLADEK. Yes.

Mr. PREYER. Is there any underground press, underground newspapers published in Czechoslovakia?

Mr. MLADEK. Just now I don't know.

Mr. PREYER. I have just one other question. On the freedom of religion points you mentioned, I was in Poland last summer and one of the impressive things about Warsaw is the number of churches there. There are something like 50 churches in Warsaw and these are big churches; some of them could really be described as cathedrals.

Poland is a very religious country. I think 90 percent of their people are Catholics and are devout in that country. There you find that there is not a real effort made to suppress religion because the realities of political life would make it impracticable; you would have a revolution on your hands.

But you find that it is undermined wherever possible. For example, in the monasteries and in the schools training priests the government regulates the number of people who can be trained, and they have cut the number way down from what it used to be to a quarter of what it used to be, so that they are not training the priests to take over to replace what they have now.

Is this kind of thing the way religion is dealt with in Czechoslovakia, rather than a direct attack on it which would stir up the people? Do they go at it indirectly by undermining the monasteries and the schools and the training grounds and downgrading in that fashion?

(At this point Mr. Ichord entered the hearing room.)

Mr. MLADEK. Mr. Chairman, it was done both ways. Starting in 1950 there was a direct attack on the church. Later on it was only indirect. That means that for some years the seminaries, the institutions educating priests were virtually closed and there was only a small number of persons admitted to attend them.

There is a basic difference between Poland and Czechoslovakia in that in Poland there was never such an attack on the church because the church was the strongest institution in the country. Another difference is that in Poland there are far more private farmers and fewer national farms.

Mr. PREYER. The farmers seem to be the happiest and the best off people in Poland.

Mr. MLADEK. But as far as churches are concerned, the cathedrals and churches in Prague, I think you can find more than a hundred churches in Prague and several cathedrals. Some of them are very



nice, gothics, baroques, and especially the Prague baroque style is famous.

Mr. PREYER. Your comment on contacting foreigners, that is, Czechoslovakians talking with Americans, you pointed out that this was difficult, not because of any flat prohibition on it, but simply because the Czechoslovakian citizen is apt to be visited by the plainclothesman after he makes contact, so that the idea gets around pretty quickly that you are not supposed to make contact.

This is something that is a real problem. While I didn't visit Czechoslovakia, I visited the other Eastern European countries and I find there that this is true, even with our Embassy people, that they want to know the people of the country. They want to make contact with them and so have a better understanding, but they find that it is very difficult to do.

Furthermore, they have to be extremely careful because they may be seriously penalizing their friends, say, a Hungarian native or a Polish native, if they invite them to their homes, if they make contact with them. As a result, they try to bridge the gap between people and try to bring about understanding, and it is a very difficult thing to do.

In Russia our people live in a compound and they might as well be living in New York City. And this is pretty much true in other areas, such as Poland, so that this is an extremely difficult problem to know how to deal with.

Our people don't feel they really understand the country, they can't really get to know the people. Is there any possibility of this breaking down or is the socialist government there taking a harder line on association with foreigners?

Mr. MLADEK. Mr. Chairman, in the first half of 1968 it was a little easier, but in general any contact with the American Embassy in Prague is very difficult because in front of the Embassy are two policemen. They are designated for protection of the American diplomats officially, but unofficially they take notice of every Czechoslovak citizen who visits the Embassy. You can visit the consulate to ask for a visa or something, but to visit the Embassy, you should be prepared to be noted by the police.

Mr. PREYER. The most dramatic example of that, I think, must be in Hungary, where outside of the entrance to the American Embassy in Budapest there are always on guard 24 hours a day Russian soldiers, and that is because of the house guest we have at the Embassy there, Cardinal Mindszenty, who has been there for what—15 years, or I don't know how long it is now. But they are waiting for the Cardinal to come out sometime.

When I went in the Embassy, I came out and I was waiting to get a cab and I noticed the Russian soldiers outside the entrance. One would stand by the post outside the car and one was in the car, and every car that would come to the curb, pull up, and let someone out, the man in the car would write down the license number of the taxi coming in. So they keep a pretty good check on who comes in and out of the Embassy.

Thank you very much, Doctor. Mr. Ichord, have you any questions?

The CHAIRMAN (presiding). Mr. Preyer, I have no questions since I did not hear the doctor's testimony, but, Doctor, I did want to

thank you for your appearance before the committee. I will read the transcript and I apologize for the fact that we were not able to hear you yesterday as originally planned. I hope we have not inconvenienced you too much.

Thank you very much.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I have just a few final questions, if I may.

Dr. Mladek, when you discussed the freedom which came temporarily in 1968, I am not sure that I understood what caused this temporary freedom to come. What eventually happened to it?

Mr. MLADEK. In 1967 there was great tension in Czechoslovakia and in the fall of 1967 there was sharp criticism in the central committee of the first secretary, Mr. Novotny. Then in January of '68 at another central committee meeting, Mr. Novotny was dismissed as first secretary and Mr. Dubcek was elected as the new first secretary.

At that time the intelligensia, especially the Writers Union, the universities, the majority of teachers, an absolute majority of students, began to discuss freely all the political and economic questions. That means that they, for the first time, publicly criticized the limitation of freedom in Czechoslovakia and the various conditions of the economy.

At that time Mr. Dubcek delivered a lot of public lectures. In them he pointed out that the whole structure of the Czechoslovak economy had been in bad shape since 1950 and that the central committee could not resolve all these difficult economic problems. Dubcek proposed a new economic policy, whose main features were that the market would be decisive for prices and the planning departments would be decentralized. This means that planning would not be the subjective product of the bureaucracies, but would reflect the objective needs of the population as expressed in the market. They made preparations to institute this new type of planning, the decentralization of the economy, more freedom of the individual consumer, and so on. All this was approved by the central committee because the hardliners were paralyzed. It's safe to say that two-thirds of the members of the central committee were prepared to follow this new line.

Everything was ended on the 21st of August of '68 by the Soviet invasion, and now everything is going backwards, perhaps not to '67, but I dare say to '58 or something like that.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Dr. Mladek, how would you assess the prospect of Czechoslovakia returning to a democratic form of government? Do you think there is any possibility?

Mr. MLADEK. No, just now we must be very pessimistic, because now the Soviets are pressuring the governments in all the socialist countries to follow quite precisely every wish of Moscow. With their troops in Czechoslovakia, they won't allow any democratic institutions at this time.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What do the communists mean by the use of the term "socialism"?

Mr. MLADEK. Socialism is the first stage of communism, in which you are rewarded according to your labor. Under communism it is alleged there will be such a lot of goods that you will be rewarded according to your needs.

Mr. SCHULTZ. I want to ask you why you left Czechoslovakia and requested asylum in the United States. But first I want to ask you the question which might reflect on that. What is the greatest influence in causing persons such as you to flee their country? Is it material comforts or lack of intellectual freedom?

Mr. MLADEK. Lack of intellectual freedom, not material comforts.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Did this play an important part in your decision to request asylum in the United States?

Mr. MLADEK. Yes, especially after the invasion when I saw that every hope which I had of contributing to the liberalization movement was gone. I had made several liberalizing official proposals to Prague regarding the organization of government, the economy, and the new foreign policy. Then I saw that everything was lost and that only the hardliners were on top and that there was a movement to reestablish the conditions there were 10 years ago.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Dr. Mladek, thank you very much. Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you again.

(At this point Mr. Preyer left the hearing room.)

The CHAIRMAN. The next witness I have on the schedule is Dr. William Kintner, director, Foreign Policy Research Institute, University of Pennsylvania.

Dr. Kintner, it is a pleasure to welcome you to the committee. Will you first be sworn, sir.

Do you solemnly swear that you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Dr. KINTNER. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Please be seated, sir.

Dr. Kintner, in the interest of brevity and because of the impressiveness of your biographical statement—I am familiar with your background, your training—I will ask the reporter at this time to insert in the record a complete copy of your biographical statement. I think it shows that you are eminently qualified in this particular field. It won't be necessary to reiterate for the record.

(Mr. Kintner's biographical résumé follows:)

DR. WILLIAM R. KINTNER

*Date of Birth:*

April 21, 1915, Lock Haven, Pennsylvania

*Present Position:*

Director, Foreign Policy Research Institute, University of Pennsylvania  
 Professor of Political Science, Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania  
 Consultant to Stanford Research Institute, Palo Alto, California

*Education:*

Primary schools, Lock Haven and Mill Hall, Pa.  
 Grade and high school, Westmont, Johnstown, Pa.  
 Jr. College, Bryn Athyn, Pa.  
 B.S., U.S.M.A., West Point, N.Y.  
 M.A., Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.  
 Ph. D., Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.

*Experience:*

Twenty-one years of service with the U.S. Army ;  
 Special Assistant, Commanding General, U.S. Army, France ;  
 Chief of Long-Range Plans (Strategic Analysis Section Coordination Group,  
 Chief of Staff, U.S. Army) ;

4695

Member of planning staff of National Security Council;  
 Member of staff of Nelson A. Rockefeller, Special Assistant to the President;  
 Consultant to the President's Committee to study the United States Assistance Program (Draper Committee);  
 Senior Advisor, Operations Research Office, Johns Hopkins University.

## PUBLICATIONS

*The Front is Everywhere* (Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1950);  
*Atomic Weapons in Land Combat*, co-authored with Colonel George C. Reinhardt (Harrisburg, Pa.: The Stackpole Co., Military Service Division, 1953);  
*Forging a New Sword* in association with Joseph I. Coffey and Raymond J. Albright (New York: Harper, 1958);  
*The Haphazard Years*, co-authored with Colonel George C. Reinhardt (New York: Doubleday & Co., 1960);  
*Protracted Conflict*, co-authored with Drs. Robert Strausz-Hupé, James E. Dougherty and Alvin J. Cottrell (New York: Harper, 1959);  
*A Forward Strategy for America*, co-authored with Drs. Strausz-Hupé and Possony (New York: Harper, 1961);  
*The New Frontier of War*, co-authored with Joseph Z. Kornfeder (Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1962);  
*Building the Atlantic World*, co-authored with Drs. Strausz-Hupé and Dougherty (New York: Harper and Row, 1963);  
*Peace and the Strategy Conflict* (New York: Praeger, 1967);  
*The Nuclear Revolution in Soviet Military Affairs*, co-authored with Harriet Fast Scott (Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1969);  
*Safeguard: Why the ABM Makes Sense*, Editor and Contributor (New York: Hawthorne Press, 1969).

## ARTICLES AND BOOK REVIEWS

Numerous articles and reviews in prominent magazines, including:

*Annals of the American Academy of Political & Social Science*  
*Army*  
*Esquire*  
*Intercollegiate Review*  
*The New Leader*  
*Marine Corps Gazette*  
*Orbis*  
*Reader's Digest*  
*The Reporter*  
*Saturday Review*  
*Yale Review*  
*U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings*

*Major Areas of Competence:*

International Relations  
 National Security Policy  
 Political-Military Affairs  
 U.S. Foreign Policy and U.S. Governmental Machinery for Foreign Policy  
 The Impact of Technology on International Relations  
 Communist Ideology and Strategy  
 Communist Organization and Tactics

*Lecturer:*

Army War College  
 Air University  
 Emory University, Atlanta, Ga.  
 Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge  
 Inter-American Defense College  
 Kent State University, Ohio  
 National Defense College, Kingston, Ont., Canada  
 National War College  
 Navy War College  
 Town Hall Seminars, New York  
 Wabash College

4696

Westminster College  
 Wisconsin State University  
 University of Maryland  
 University of Miami

*Professional Associations:*

American Academy of Political and Social Science  
 Council on Foreign Relations  
 The Institute for Strategic Studies, London  
 Member of the Academic Board, Inter-American Defense College  
 Editorial Advisory Board, The Intercollegiate Review  
 National Planning Association, American Political Science Association  
 American Association for the Advancement of Science  
 Board of Trustees, Freedom House  
 Philadelphia Committee on Foreign Relations

The CHAIRMAN. I understand, sir, you have a prepared statement.

Mr. KINTNER. I do. I can just give it for insertion in the record and make a very brief comment on it.

**TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM R. KINTNER**

Mr. KINTNER. My primary area of interest is American foreign policy and in studying this field, of course, I have had to study in great detail the strategies and tactics and organizations of the Soviet Union, as well as some of the Communist parties throughout the world. My first book is entitled *The Front is Everywhere*, on the organization and structure and tactics of the Communist system.

Throughout the history of the Bolsheviks they had carried on the imperial power as the czarist regime, in a sense that part of the imperial tradition, but they added something new when they substituted the Marxist dialectic for the Pan-Slavism, which was the major rationale for the czarist expansion.

They have always combined the power of the state, in this case the Soviet Union, with groups that work with them in other countries. Now it is this management conflict in which I think they have displayed a great deal of ingenuity and talent which partially explains the tremendous increase in their influence since they acquired power in the Soviet Union in 1917.

My remarks will be in the record, but I think that it is sufficient to say my general approach to our dealing with the power and influence of the Soviet Union in world affairs is explained therein.

The CHAIRMAN. The statement will be placed in full in the record. (Mr. Kintner's prepared statement follows:)

After its Bolshevik birth, the Soviet Union has maintained the imperialist drives of ambition of its Czarist predecessor. The Russian people command a multinational empire which was largely forged by the three hundred years of military aggression and Byzantium diplomacy.

The Bolshevik takeover in 1917, however, introduced a new dimension into Russian imperialism. It was no longer undertaken on behalf of Pan-Slavism but on behalf of the Marxist-dialectic. Prior to their seizure of power, the Bolsheviks had become quite adept at subversion, propaganda, political warfare, and the selective use of violence and terror in the pursuit of political goals.

Consequently, once power was achieved, they created the Comintern whose primary purpose was to recruit adherence to potential fifth columns in many countries outside their sphere. Simultaneously, they began the development of their own military-industrial complex. In the last fifteen years, Soviet State power has perhaps been more important in the expansion of Soviet influence than those communist parties abroad, which are still basically oriented toward Moscow. On the other hand, the Kremlin is quite adroit at combining external

4697

threats and pressures with internal manipulation of societies still outside its control. It is in this context that one must view the assault of the Soviet Union on non-communist societies and, in particular, the United States, which remains the primary target of communist conflict managers.

The Soviet Union has long employed a variety of activities against other states. Amongst its most valuable instruments has been the local communist party. In the guise of national origins and working class solidarity, these parties have executed remarkably dexterous ideological maneuvers. The sum of these maneuvers is the party's capacity to take advantage of legitimate issues for its ulterior purposes.

The Soviet government understands well that its "discipline" may be of some advantage over a democratic society's natural fractiousness. Working through the "working class solidarity" which is the conceptual foundation for the unity of world communism, the local communist party represents a domestic lever without parallel elsewhere.

Recent splits amongst the major communist parties, chiefly the Sino-Soviet ideological squabble, and the Czechoslovakia invasion, have caused considerable trouble for Western communist parties. In their slavish adherence to the Soviet Union, these parties have suffered some loss of support. Indeed, the New Left and others with whom the American Communist Party profess to cooperate, consider this party "establishment" or "old hat." The Maoist Progressive Labor Movement and Trotskyite groups appear to be working more effectively with the more extreme factions in the SDS and the Black Power Movement than the Communist Party, USA. Nonetheless, the party is organized, and has money.

Furthermore, the Soviet government continues to exhibit a good understanding of political debates within the United States, especially those over foreign policy. In a remarkable recent example, G. A. Arbatov, director of the Institute of the U.S.A. of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences, wrote an article entitled "American Foreign Policy at the Threshold of the Seventies." (Economics, Politics, Ideology, No. 1, January 1970, pp. 21-34J, Moscow.) Amongst the factors Arbatov claims have undermined American foreign policy are: (1) waning of anti-communist fervor in the West; and (2) many Americans no longer believe in the "morality" of U.S. policy, especially what Arbatov calls "the very right of the U.S. to dictate its will to other peoples."

May I point out that the New Program of the Communist Party U.S.A. (Second Draft [revised], January 1969) is addressed especially to these points? Three of the six parts of this document (1) depict the U.S. as inherently against true worldwide working forces, seeking to postpone the ruin of capitalism by anti-communist hysteria; (2) proclaim solidarity with every legitimate domestic issue now agitating the United States; and (3) argue that U.S. foreign policy is based on the immoral concept of "the American Century."

By attempting to align the party with just domestic causes and by creating an atmosphere of moral revulsion against American foreign policy, the U.S. Communist Party will serve well the "international solidarity" it proclaims as the guide to its international relations. Furthermore, since the Soviet inspired Communist Party, USA, is linked with the Soviet Union—the main protagonist of the United States for global influence—it is likely to be with us long after some of the current revolutionary splinter groups have disappeared.

In May 1962, I wrote an article in *Reader's Digest* entitled "The Insidious Campaign to Silence Anti-Communists." It pointed out how the Soviets had planned a sophisticated propaganda campaign designed to weaken American perceptions of the Soviet challenge to the United States. Parts of this article, which are germane to today's discussion, follow:

"In late 1960, eighty-one communist chieftains huddled in Moscow for close to a month, then issued a startling manifesto which described the anti-communist movement as 'the principal ideological weapon' of communist opponents and called on communists around the world to participate in 'exposing anti-communism.'

"On January 6, 1961, Khrushchev summoned before him the elite of communism's psychological-warfare experts. He told them that the rising anti-communist movement had to be destroyed and stressed the 'necessity of establishing contacts with those circles of the bourgeoisie which gravitate toward pacifism.' His most revealing words:

*"We must use 'prudent' representatives of the bourgeoisie."*

"Khrushchev was confident that his international brainwashing apparatus could carry out these orders. . . . Search was made for political leaders of our

extreme left who might fall for a made-in-Moscow line, for ultra-liberal newsmen who would innocently echo communist-inspired interpretations. Finally, the Kremlin experts on America screened conservatives, singling out extremists whose intemperance could be counted on to discredit all anti-communists.

"Such communist use of legitimate liberals, conservatives and pacifists should be a matter of concern, not blame. They are equally victims of the devious mechanism which 60 years of communist experience have perfected for moving the Party's ideas deep into free societies. This transmission system functions through four rings, which are 'like ripples from a stone dropped in water,' as one expert puts it. Ring One consists of actual communist fronts linked closely to the Kremlin. Ring Two is made up of blind pacifists and fuzzy intellectuals who occasionally aid Red aims. Ring Three nears the mark that Moscow wishes to hit, the 'innocents': respected citizens who have influential connections but who are often professional protesters and crusaders, career 'cause' people whose idealism is both genuine and naive. Ring Four is composed of opinion-makers: editorial writers, news analysts, commentators, preachers, editors, educators. The ultimate objective of all this attention is the general public.

"By the time the ripples from a counterfeit idea dropped in the middle of Ring One finally lap up on the shores of public opinion, it becomes virtually impossible to separate the innocent carriers from the knowing purveyors. The public at best is confused, at worst actually hostile to anti-communism. In either case, Moscow scores a clear gain.

"The primary target is the Pentagon. For, as Senator Frank Lausche, a Democrat from Ohio, has explained: 'If I had to advance communism in the world, I would urge the destruction of U.S. public confidence in our military men.'"

By now, we are all familiar with attacks on the military-industrial complex, the ROTC, and university research conducted in behalf of national security.

I do not wish to imply that the communists are solely responsible for the attacks on the military-industrial complex and the campaign against the ROTC, although it is quite true that anti-militarism has been part of the standard communist attack against opposing societies before and since the Bolshevik Revolution. As you know, the very phrase—military-industrial complex—appeared in President Eisenhower's Farewell Address.

The communists have always been adept at exploiting, for their own purposes, indigenous forces within a target country. Perhaps one way of looking at this is to examine the SDS. On the surface, the common threads which run through campus unrest at many universities could point to some kind of organized international sponsor, whether Moscow, Peking, or Havana—but this cannot be proved. The SDS does not, in fact, have a single international sponsor. The Doctrinaire Communist Party, USA, was one of the last dissident groups to recognize the potential impact of the New Left student revolt. In many instances, the Socialist Working Party (the Trotskyite wing of communism) and its affiliated Young Socialist Alliance and the Progressive Labor Party appear to have played a stronger role in the SDS.

As Gene Bradley pointed out in an article which appeared in the *Harvard Business Review*, September-October 1968, entitled "What businessmen need to know about the Student Left:"

Nothing is simple about SDS. On the one hand, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover reported in October 1966 that SDS is "a militant youth group which receives support from the Communist Party and in turn supports Communist objectives and tactics." On the other hand, the SDS "Port Huron Statement" asserts, "As democrats we are in basic opposition to the Communist system. The Soviet Union, as a system, rests on the total suppression of organized opposition. . . . Communist parties throughout the rest of the world are generally undemocratic in internal structure and mode of action."

Both of the above statements are true. Even as SDS denounces communism as a "system," it acknowledges and welcomes Communist doctrine and members, as reported in the October 7, 1966, issue of its official newspaper, *New Left Notes*:

"Well, for once, J. Edgar Hoover is right. There are some Communists in SDS. . . . SDS is an open organization which welcomes all who seek for solutions to the problems of our day."

My primary field is the study of American foreign policy. As part of my studies I have examined efforts made by the Soviet Union to frustrate American objectives, including the Soviet-inspired Cuban Missile Crisis; the subsequent build-up of Soviet strategic forces; the Soviet supported conflict in the Middle East; and the very substantial support which Moscow has given to Hanoi over the past five years. While the Soviet Union engages in these enterprises, the internal propa-

4699

ganda line of the Communist Party, USA, is designed to undermine the support of the American people for the policies of their government by depleting the U.S. as a rapacious imperialist power seeking to exploit the rest of the world and, in the process, keeping the entire earth at the edge of nuclear disaster.

Consequently, I will conclude this statement by summarizing some present propaganda positions which have appeared in communist publications, including *Political Affairs* and the *Daily World*. According to leaders of the Communist Party, USA, U.S. imperialism is the most aggressive force in the world; the U.S. is a dangerous global policeman, directed by capitalist madmen who are responsible for every world crisis; the U.S. engages in peace talks but is not seriously seeking peace; the U.S. major alliance, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, is a war pact; and American efforts to stabilize the situation in the Far East and Southeast Asia are part of our imperialist policy. In Europe we are accused of Hitlerizing West Germany, a nation preparing for nuclear war; in Latin America we are accused of exploiting the masses, while at the same time urged to again become friends with our good neighbor Castro in Cuba. Naturally it is we who are responsible for the Middle East crisis. Finally, we are told that our capacity to threaten world peace will soon disappear as the power of U.S. imperialism goes into decline. The sources of these quotations are appended to this statement.

It should be obvious that the above summary of the communist line on certain foreign policy issues, which can be seen even more graphically in the appended sources, parallel statements issued by various leftist factions who oppose most U.S. foreign and security policies. It is impossible to tell whether these positions were originated initially in some communist propaganda factory or were picked up from other sources and adapted to communist use. Wherever they came from, the four ring analogy which I described in my *Reader's Digest* article appears to describe the process by which these positions are disseminated and gain some support in the body politic.

I will close my remarks by thanking you for the opportunity to testify before this Committee. I will be happy to respond to any questions.

SUPPORTING QUOTATIONS SETTING FORTH CPUSA PROPAGANDA POSITIONS WITH REGARD TO CERTAIN FOREIGN POLICY ISSUES

1. *United States Imperialism Most Aggressive Force in the World*

"... U.S. imperialism remains the most aggressive, war-like force in the world. It continues its bloody aggression against the people of Vietnam. It continues its policies of aggression against the people of socialist Cuba. It is the main force of military, political and economic aggression in Latin America, Asia, and Africa."—Gus Hall, "Toward Unity Against World Imperialism," *Political Affairs*, August, 1969, p. 4.

"That U.S. imperialists are prone to behave as though they owned the universe is a fact of life to which the Soviet negotiators in Helsinki have long since faced up . . ."—Richard Greenleaf, "International," *Daily World*, December 9, 1969, p. 6.

2. *United States Position of Global Policeman a Dangerous One*

"... this noble and edifying mission of U.S. spies and warships is futile. Neither the North Koreans nor the people in South Korea will be intimidated. . . .

"The peace forces in the U.S. have the responsibility of forcing the government to scrap this futile and dangerous policy of policing the globe and gambling with the country's very existence."—*Daily World*, April 22, 1969, p. 7.

"... U.S. imperialism has stuck its swinish snout into every corner of the earth. It is today the main police force trying to keep colonized people and former colonized people in bondage to imperialism."—Claude Lightfoot, "National Liberation," *Daily World*, December 5, 1969, p. 6.

3. *Capitalist Madmen Provoke Crisis After Crisis*

"What will it be tomorrow?

"We can be sure it will be something else to heat up the atmosphere, increase tensions, spread insecurity, and create the kind of psychological situation favorable to the grandiose designs of the corporate elite and Pentagon militarists."—*Daily World*, April 16, 1969, p. 7.

"Hardly a single day goes by without the discovery somewhere in the world of underground operations by some subsidiary organization of the American Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) : plans for putsches in Latin America, provoca-



tive espionage flights in the Far East, counter-revolutionary conspiracies in Europe, political corruption in Africa. The myriad intercontinental army of CIA agents disguises itself behind a thousand different masks."—Dr. Harold Lange, "Lift Up Almost Any Rock . . .," *Daily World*, December 4, 1969, p. 8.

#### 4. *Aroused Americans Can Change Foreign Policy*

"The dumping of Lyndon Johnson has showed what power lies in an aroused and active people.

"That power today can frustrate Nixon's fascist-smelling plans; can call quits to the slaughter in Vietnam, scuttle the perilous ABM adventure, and compel serious steps to peaceful coexistence of the capitalist and socialist sectors of the world."—*Daily World*, June 7, 1969, p. 7.

" . . . A meaningful change in foreign policy will come only when the organized people of the United States demand and impose it."—*Daily World*, July 2, 1969, p. 7.

"If we the people are to demand decent living for ourselves, we must first demand an end to the killing of Asian victims of U.S. aggression. The cry for decent prices and the cry for peace are the same cry. The plotters of the two assaults are the same. The monopolies are the enemy, and the people's elected representatives in Congress must feel the just and indignant demands of the people to clamp down on the monopolists."—*Daily World*, September 16, 1969, p. 7.

#### 5. *Monopolists and Imperialists Grinding Their Axes in the Peace Talks*

"The decision of the White House, of Laird, of the Pentagon is: the killing must go on, till 'victory.'

"That decision reveals the way in which the Paris peace talks are being carried on by the U.S. and its puppets."—*Daily World*, April 3, 1969, p. 7.

" . . . The Paris negotiations are going to remain deadlocked as long as the policy of U.S. aggression continues . . ."—"Make No Mistake About It! People Have Power to End War," *Daily World*, November 13, 1969, p. 10.

#### 6. *North Atlantic Treaty Organization Lights the Fires of War*

"The Nixon administration is consciously adding fuel to the fires of West-East dissension in Europe, to give NATO a new lease on life when the treaty expires next month, and to prevent member states from giving notice, as they have a right to do, of quitting the war pact. Such incendiary activity increases the perils to the peace of Europe and of our own nation."—*Daily World*, March 22, 1969, p. 7.

"Instead of renouncing force or the threat of using force, NATO militarists, with U.S. encouragement, are pushing ahead to complete at their December meeting the most rabid threat of force they can devise."—William J. Pomeroy, "U.S. Stalls at Helsinki, Speeds NATO A-plans," *Daily World*, November 20, 1969, p. 10.

#### 7. *United States Spreads War Umbrella Over Far East*

" . . . the President vowed to defend the current corrupt establishment in Thailand against both internal and external dangers, while he stood squarely behind the corrupt and inhuman establishment in Saigon . . .

"Simultaneously, however, Nixon's hatchetman in the State Department, the frozen-faced Secretary of State William P. Rogers, goes to Tokyo, Seoul, Taipei, Canberra and Wellington to assure these U.S. satellites and allies that State and the Pentagon will defend their freedom to the last Japanese, Korean, Taiwanese, Australian and New Zealander."—*Daily World*, August 2, 1969, p. 7.

"The U.S. military in South Vietnam has always claimed that the National Liberation Front is using Cambodian territory to launch attacks on the U.S.-Saigon forces, and to rest and regroup after these 'invasions.' The U.S. and Saigon have used this pretext to justify their attacks, probes, border violations and provocations. They have put forward a doctrine of 'hot pursuit' (which does not exist in international law) to give a semblance of legality to current incursions and a possible future invasion of Cambodia. . . ."—Tom Foley, "U.S.-Saigon Aggression in Cambodia," *Daily World*, November 1, 1969, p. M-3.

"Sato's bosses, already in second place in the capitalist world, want guarantees of protection under the U.S. nuclear umbrella over their aggressions in the Far East, want the assurance that if they falter the U.S. will pull their chestnuts out of the fire."—*Daily World*, November 21, 1969, p. 7.

8. *Yankee, Get Out of Vietnam!*

"... agony or not, the mandate of events and mankind is clear: the war must end, U. S. forces must pull out, and Vietnam must be Vietnamese, free from foreign interference."—*Daily World*, May 14, 1969, p. 7.

"... No official in the United States—elected or appointed—should escape hearing the people's demand for withdrawing our military forces from Vietnam NOW!"—*Daily World*, December 9, 1969, p. 7.

9. *United States Policy in Vietnam Is Brutal*

"It is hypocrisy bordering on rank obscenity when Pentagon and State Department pundits babble about "humaneness," while simultaneously manufacturing arguments for continuing the aggression against the Vietnamese, machine-gunning their women and old people, incinerating their children with napalm and destroying their food with poison chemicals."—*Daily World*, September 20, 1969, p. 7.

"... Songmy is American bourgeois morality in action—it is American bourgeois morality exported. That murderous morality has become an export commodity."—William L. Patterson, "Public Affairs," *Daily World*, December 9, 1969, p. 6.

10. *Revival of West German Imperialism Threatens Mankind*

"The interests of the people of the U. S., like those of the people of Europe, lie in abandonment of the insane dream of restoring capitalism where socialism exists, of sustaining a Hitlerite regime in West Germany, of preparing for nuclear war, and of paying untold billions for this mad course, which enriches only the warmakers and imperils mankind."—*Daily World*, April 11, 1969, p. 7.

"The sinister power of the new cartels and conglomerates of the reactionary mass media such as the Springer monopoly, of the Bundeswehr generals and militarists, of the several revenge-seeking organizations—this power is still intact . . ."—*Daily World*, October 8, 1969, p. 7.

11. *Corporate Domination of Latin America Building Socialist Resentment*

"U.S. corporations extract a huge toll annually from the toil of these millions; Latin American industry is restricted to extractive processes mainly and is deprived of the most advanced technology; exports languish; and the gap between industrial growth and the continent's needs grows ever wider."

"... The independent, socialist course charted by Cuba is seen increasingly as a viable alternative to U.S. corporate domination."—*Daily World*, May 13, 1969, p. 7.

"... the rising anti-imperialist tide in the rest of Latin America, increasingly threatens the domination of U.S. monopoly capital in that area, which it has long looked upon as its private preserve. . . ."—Hyman Lumer, "Lenin on the General Crisis of Capitalism," *Political Affairs*, December, 1969, p. 11.

12. *Let's Be Friends with Our Cuban Neighbor*

"Confronting the necessity for heightened struggles to defend their elementary rights from an even more reactionary government, our Party and the masses of our working people struggle for progress and fight for our country to pursue a policy of peaceful relations and friendship with Cuba and all countries abroad. We are greatly heartened by the grand achievements of the socialist revolution in Cuba."—U.S. Communists Hail Cuba," *Daily World*, January 3, 1969, p. 2.

"What good purpose can be served by the U.S. economic blockade of Cuba? . . . the people of our country could benefit by trade with our socialist neighbor. Certainly, world peace would be strengthened. To compel Washington to end the blockade is a prime job for peace-loving Americans."—*Daily World*, September 6, 1969, p. 7.

13. *United States Imperialism Inflames Middle East Crisis*

"Nixon is no friend of Israel. The Pentagon does not have the interests of the Israeli people at heart. Israel's hawks will be used to further U.S. interests in the Mideast just as long as they are useful and then—"—*Daily World*, July 11, 1969, p. 7.

"... Saudi Arabia represents the single biggest foreign investment American capitalism has, and the U.S. is giving full backing to King Faisal's attempt to beat back the tidal wave of revolution in the Arab world. Faisal's kingdom has done a lot to earn its Arab nickname of 'Saudi America.'"—Tom Foley, "International," *Daily World*, December 6, 1969, p. 6.

14. *United States-Japan, Imperialist Plunderbund, Zeroes in on Asia*

"Japanese imperialism's return to South Korea is well under way. So is the consolidation of the U.S.-Japanese arm of the international imperialist plunderbund. . . ."—John Pittman, "Another Pearl Harbor on Way, Koreans Warn," *Daily World*, September 20, 1969, p. 11.

". . . Japanese public opinion is outraged by Japanese imperialism's acceptance of the role of junior partner—for the time being—in an alliance with U.S. imperialism directed against other Asian peoples. The attempt to carry out this role will . . . spell the end of Japan's pacifist and neutralist pretensions . . . and aggravate the war danger in Asia."—*Daily World*, December 5, 1969, p. 7.

15. *United States Imperialism Has Passed the Peak of Its Power*

". . . the essential fact is that U.S. imperialism has already passed the peak of its power, of its relative world position."—Victor Perlo, "Book Reviews," *Political Affairs*, December, 1969, p. 62.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Counsel, how do you choose to proceed?

Mr. SCHULTZ. I have some questions to ask Dr. Kintner.

The CHAIRMAN. Let's proceed in that manner.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Dr. Kintner, on May 3, 1969, the Communist Party, U.S.A., adopted its main political resolution at its 19th National Convention in New York City. Subsequently the resolution was published in a pamphlet entitled "The United States in Crisis; The Communist Solution."

On June 17, 1969, the Communist Party, U.S.A., and 74 other Communist parties who attended the International Conference of Communist and Workers Parties in Moscow, sponsored by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, adopted that body's main resolution.

I would like to address a series of questions to you based upon the selected passages and marked similarity taken from the main resolutions adopted by the Communist Party, U.S.A., in New York City and the 74 Communist Parties in Moscow and also some quotes from Mr. Gus Hall's speech at the latter meeting.

There are two or three different areas. The first one is on Vietnam from the Moscow resolution:

*A primary objective of united action is to give all-around support to the heroic Vietnamese people. The conference calls on all who cherish peace and national independence to intensify the struggle in order to compel U.S. imperialism to withdraw its interventionist troops from Vietnam. The final victory of the Vietnamese patriots is of fundamental importance. [Italics in original.]*

Now from the Communist Party, U.S.A., resolution, we see some similar wording:

Vietnam shows that, given unity of action of these forces, so powerful a state as the United States can be brought to heel and forced to retreat.

This is on page 11 and on page 28 they say:

The focus of the fight for peace continues to be the fight to drive the forces of U.S. imperialism out of Vietnam.

Would you please evaluate, as you see it, the purposes of the Communists at the Paris peace talks in light of these two passages selected from their officially adopted policies, whereby peace is equated with increased warfare?

Mr. KINTNER. This is nothing particularly new. If you go back to the Sixth World Congress of the Communist Party, meeting in Moscow in 1928, they did discuss the strategy of peace. They said, in a sense, that peace under certain circumstances is a more advantageous way of fighting capitalism than actual conflict.

So the concepts of using peace as an instrument of expansion is, of course, well established. On the other hand, being dialecticians, it is very easy for them to work both sides of the street simultaneously and it is not incompatible for them to be waging war, on one hand, while waging peace as a means of undermining the power of their opponents, on the other.

A typical example of this was in the Korean war when, after having launched it through North Korea and finding the going a little bit difficult, they began the Stockholm Peace Appeal in Europe, which you may recall received over 5 million signatures. And the fact that they are able always to present themselves as the primary advocates of peace while supporting aggression or supporting one side of the conflict, which they are doing in the Middle East currently, is a standard technique which the people in the West should by this time be somewhat familiar with.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What, in your opinion, would be the military and psychological effect of a U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam?

Mr. KINTNER. Precipitous withdrawal would be disastrous. It would undermine the confidence of many peoples in the U.S. commitment. It would also have a feedback effect in this country. Even those who are opposed to the war might wake up and find that such an action would seriously degrade the United States capacity to conduct a foreign policy of any kind. But, on the other hand, a phased withdrawal, such as that proposed by President Nixon—the Vietnamization—if conducted in such a way that our single objective there is maintained, namely, the right of the people of South Vietnam to choose their own form of government, that in the long run would have a very salutary effect on world stability.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Thank you. Turning our attention just a minute to Europe, again I would like to quote from the Moscow resolution:

The Conference emphatically condemns the provocative attempts of the imperialist powers, particularly the USA, the Federal Republic of Germany and Britain, to step up the activity of NATO. The disbandment of NATO would be a decisive step towards the dissolution of all bloc \* \* \*.

It goes on. Then from the Communist Party, U.S.A., resolution:

In Europe, NATO's aggressive might is being built up to serve the ambitions of the Washington-Bonn partnership.

\* \* \* \* \*  
The fight . . . for the withdrawal of U.S. troops from West Europe is an important part of the fight for peace.

Dr. Kintner, what was the purpose in creating the North American [Atlantic] Treaty Organization and has this purpose been fulfilled?

Mr. KINTNER. NATO was created as a means of forestalling any Soviet-inspired aggression against Western Europe. It followed the organization of the treaty on Western European Union and also followed the first takeover of Czechoslovakia in 1947 and the Berlin airlift in 1948. It was realized that unless there could be placed a security mantle around Western Europe, the aim of rebuilding Europe economically as in the Marshall Plan would be barred.

Up to the present time it has achieved its mission. There has been no overt aggression in Western Europe, one of the few areas in the world where there has been this freedom from external aggression of one kind or another.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What would you anticipate would be the result if the NATO Pact were dissolved? Would the U.S.S.R. disband the Warsaw Pact?

Mr. KINTNER. It might do so as a diplomatic tactic, but it would not really affect the situation very much. As a matter of fact the comments about increased activity in NATO are rather ridiculous, because, if anything, we will find it very difficult to maintain what cohesion there has been in NATO in the past. There has been a reduction in forces; there is currently before the Senate the Mansfield resolution for serious withdrawal of American forces, and the European forces of NATO are carrying on their own commitments to that organization. But the aim of the strategy has been the dissolution of NATO, the quid pro quo which they have offered in various resolutions. The Bucharest resolution in 1966, for example, is to have a simultaneous elimination of the pacts, but there is a fundamental difference. NATO is an organization of solvent, independent states. The Warsaw Pact is an organization created by fiat in Moscow, to which the East European countries have had to adhere.

If the pacts were dissolved, the Soviet Union would still be in a dominant position over the Eastern European countries, but even more important, the Soviet Union is itself the primary challenge to Western Europe, whether it uses its military power or not, and no single combination or no single nation or combination of nations in Western Europe could withstand the influence of Soviet power if NATO were dissolved and the U.S. presence eliminated from Western Europe, at least for the foreseeable future.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Is it your feeling that even if the pact were dissolved, the armies would remain intact?

Mr. KINTNER. There is no evidence to indicate that they would be eliminated. The Soviet system from its beginning has placed a good deal of emphasis on the buildup and maintenance of its military powers. Stalin in '46 referred to the Red Army as the apple of his eye. If one looks at the level of appropriations for Soviet military forces for the past 15 years, the allocations have always matched increases in the gross national product in the Soviet system.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Dr. Kintner, turning your attention now to the United States, again from the resolution from Moscow:

We call on all peace-loving forces to mount a struggle for a radical cutback in military budgets. . . . so as to switch resources now absorbed by the arms race to improving the working peoples' life, promoting the health services and education . . .

From the Communist Party, U.S.A., resolution:

Emphasis must also be given to . . . the slashing to the military budget . . .  
\* \* \* . . . the fight against militarism directly relates to the fight for the urgent domestic needs of the people . . .

Is this an example of the amalgam technique, that is, the juxtaposition of two concepts, one desirable and the other undesirable?

Mr. KINTNER. It is a very interesting example of that technique. There are, of course, many people who are not communists in this country who favor retrenchment of our military spending for the very purposes stated, to deal with urgent domestic problems.

Last summer I testified before the Proxmire committee, which had as one of its purposes an effort to cut down on military spending. But,

of course, the communist point of view is somewhat different. They would like to have us reduce our military posture so our capacity to stand up against various threats of the Soviet Union would be seriously reduced.

Of course, they figure that by riding this bandwagon, which has a legitimate basis in this country, some diversion of resources to internal problems, they naturally have an appealing readymade campaign slogan and are, of course, trying to exploit it to the fullest extent possible.

I think the key we have here is the ordering of priorities between our responsibilities in the world scene and our own internal issues. This is a very difficult and very complex problem. The general point of view I have is we have to have the country in order to solve some of its internal problems.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Would you say this particular arrangement of concepts would put communist adversaries in the worst light? In other words, if you are not for slashing the budget, you are also not for providing for the domestic need?

Mr. KINTNER. Not necessarily. There are, undoubtedly, in a budget as large as ours, things that could be cut. I think the President has indicated that and the Secretary of Defense has indicated that. The question is the old story, when do you start chomping on the bone after taking off the fat. So I think a person can legitimately hold to let's try to make our defense establishment as strong as need be and not on as astute a basis as possible.

The CHAIRMAN. Doctor, at this point, of course, we are in a field here which is not directly within the jurisdiction of the committee, but the Chair happens to serve on the Armed Services Committee, and I do firmly believe that there are many places in our defense spending that we can cut and should cut without deprecating our defense.

But the thing that bothers me, whenever the hue and cry goes up for cutting back on our military expenditures, we often cut out whole defense programs in response to that rather than really digging into the details of the problems and taking out the fat in the military budget, which is always there, which of course is in any budget dealing with Government spending.

Mr. KINTNER. I think your observation is a sound one. It is a lot more simple bureaucratically to slash the program than to go into the guts of the program and say, "Let's stop this or that particular aspect of it."

The CHAIRMAN. This is what I have watched come about time and time again when the Congress does start moving into the area to save money. We cut out the entire program without digging in and taking out the fat.

Dr. KINTNER. It is a difficult problem.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Dr. Kintner, drawing your attention to the Soviet Union as a "peace and power base" for the world Communist movement, I would like to quote from the Moscow resolution and also from Mr. Gus Hall's Moscow speech. During this speech he informed the delegates that his party, meaning the Communist Party, U.S.A.—

without a dissenting vote, endorsed the line, the political issues and the spirit of the main draft document presented by the Preparatory Committee to the conference.

The resolution from Moscow says:

It has been possible to prevent the outbreak of a world war thanks to the growing economic, political and military might, and the peace-loving foreign policy of the Soviet Union . . .

From Mr. Hall's Moscow speech:

The U.S. . . . [is] being driven—slowly but steadily—from foreign bases in one country after another. Contributing to this is . . . especially the growing economic, military and political might of the Soviet Union.

From the Communist Party, U.S.A., resolution:

The Socialist countries and in the first place, the mighty working class state, the Soviet Union, are the revolutionary dynamos propelling . . . worldwide revolutionary process.

Since the vast majority of the world's Communist parties, including the Communist Party, U.S.A., continues to recognize the Soviet Union as its leader in the cold war, is the polycentrist or heterogeneous movement concept of the communist leadership valid?

Mr. KINTNER. To a certain extent it is. Communism is not quite as monolithic as it was 15 years ago. You have the Sino-Soviet split on the one hand; you have Tito's revisionism on the other; and Castro is sort of a maverick in the group. The parties in Eastern Europe, I think, are in a very subservient position, although Rumania occasionally makes noises of somewhat an independent character. But the essence of the thing is that the major threats to the free world position do emanate from the Soviet Union, and the growing power of the Soviet Union certainly plays a role in it. I doubt very much, for example, that we would have had the coup in Libya last year, which has led to the closing of the U.S. Air Force base, if the Soviet fleet was not present in some strength in the Eastern Mediterranean, acting as a restraint on whatever alternatives we had.

I don't know what was even considered at the time inside of our own Government. So the essence of what he is saying is that the tremendous Soviet buildup in military power—particularly in the strategic field where their investments for the past 5 years have been roughly twice as much as ours in round figures, roughly around \$15 billion on their side to \$7, \$8, and \$9 on our side—has produced a condition of at least psychological parity, which certainly is quite different from the situation that has existed in 1962 during the Cuban missile crisis. There has been a major upgrading of Soviet military power which, whether used or not, does influence the behavior of other states.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Contrasting then the power base of the world communist movement within the Soviet Union, the resolutions also point to the U.S. as a base of world imperialism:

Moreover, the depth of this crisis in the capitalist world is also strikingly revealed . . . in the United States itself, that main pillar of world imperialism.

From the Communist Party, U.S.A., resolution:

U.S. imperialism remains the center of world imperialism and the fountain-head of world reaction.

Then from Mr. Hall's Moscow speech:

The U.S. is not only the economic and military citadel of world imperialism. It is also its political and ideological center.

Dr. Kintner, in communism's "good guy-bad guy" context, why has the United States, among the so-called imperialist nations, been

singled out as the U.S.S.R.'s mortal enemy after coming to her rescue during the famine of the twenties and providing her with technical know-how and military aid in the thirties and forties?

Mr. KINTNER. You have to go back to the basic philosophical position of the Communist Party in the Soviet Union, and that is that a system based on the type of economic organization we have, centering around the right to own private property and the exercise of it, which is the major means of production outside of the control of the state regulated by that system, is completely and fundamentally antagonistic to the basic economic and political organizations of the Soviet Union.

If you read their credos, as I have done many times, there can be no peace, as they define peace, as long as there are centers which operate on the general basis as we do. Of course, having now become the strongest nation on earth, we are obviously the target of their imaginations.

We have not always been that. In the early twenties it was France and Great Britain that were the major capitalist powers, and Mr. Hitler's Germany took over the task of being the main imperialist power. And now the United States in all communist propaganda, and of course, anyone allied with us, whether it is the West German Government or the Japanese Government, are also described as in the imperialist camp.

It is a very attractive propaganda line, it is very simplistic and it is very useful, particularly in the "third world" countries where many of the leaders have been trained in one form or another of Marxism. It is very easy to explain the blacklist of their own economies by saying their economies are in the state they are because they have been subject to imperialistic and capitalistic exploitation for hundreds of years. It is a good line from their point of view.

It obviously has no basis in fact, because, if anything, the data from our whole position in Vietnam would indicate that we have no heart for being an imperialistic power.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Would you have any comments on the term "peaceful coexistence" and what that means to the communists?

Mr. KINTNER. "Peaceful coexistence" means carrying on the struggle without necessarily resorting to armed overt violence. You even have elements of that as it is taking place in the Soviet support of Hanoi, on the one hand, or their very considerable support to the Egyptians and Iraqis and Syrians, on the other. But it means the absence of a conflict in which the Soviet Union is participating with its own forces. It does not mean, as they frequently say, a cessation of the ideological battle against us because this goes on. You might describe it as a very carefully regulated form of conflict in which, from their point of view for their own reasons and for their own timing, they do not believe that the resort to their employment of the military force would be advantageous.

Mr. SCHULTZ. I would like to again quote from the Moscow resolution with regard to communism's three component forces:

*The present situation demands greater militant solidarity of the peoples of the socialist countries, of all contingents of the international working-class movement and national liberation in the struggle against imperialism. [Italics in original.]*



From the Communist Party, U.S.A., resolution :

Vietnam highlights the new world reality—that the determining factor in world politics is . . . the power of the forces of socialism, peace, democracy and national liberation. \* \* \*

Our party, situated in the very heart of world imperialism, must be the most active, the most advanced, the most unrelenting of all anti-imperialist forces.

Then from Mr. Hall's Moscow speech :

We represent the most advanced forces of the working class, that class which history has assigned the task of guiding human society through this, the most profound revolutionary turning point in mankind's existence. \* \* \*

This turning point has given rise to, and is propelled by a worldwide, three-pronged revolutionary development that now converges into a single process.

Dr. Kintner, specifically are the "three prongs" of the international Communist movement composed of the 14 countries currently controlled by an equal number of Communist governments and, two, the remaining out-of-power Communist and so-called Workers' parties scattered in scores of countries throughout the free world and, three, the communist led or supported national liberation movements generally found in certain Asian and African and Latin American countries?

Mr. KINTNER. Those are certainly three components of it. That is, in a sense, the political order of battle. They do play a generally concerted role, even when there are differences between them. They still want to appear united on one common basis, if they could neutralize the power influence of the United States then their respective chances for advancing their own power or maintaining their own power position would be increased.

On the other hand, they believe that the tremendous increase in Soviet military power has to be recognized as a force which plays a considerable role in their planning. And, also, I believe the lack of clarity of understanding of many people in the Western democracies, including the United States, as to the nature of the confrontation in which we find ourselves contributes considerably also to their own advancements.

Of course, one of their major endeavors is not to necessarily create the situation, but to exploit divisive situations in any given country that they do not control for their own purposes. I do not necessarily believe that they are successful in doing this at all times, but they continue to make the try.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Has this approach been taken with regard to Vietnam?

Mr. KINTNER. In Vietnam they have, of course, played a very considerable role there. The Soviet Union has supported Vietnam with the most advanced and sophisticated equipment that the North has in its possession to the tune of about \$1 billion a year for the past 5 years, as have the Eastern European countries, East Germany, Czechoslovakia. In particular, the shipping of coal is very prominent in the harbor of Haiphong, as well as the Soviet Union. So from that point of view, the resources available to both the European bloc countries and the Soviet Union have been used to carry it on.

Of course, in the propaganda arena the Communist parties throughout the world and those national liberation movements, whether they are officially labeled as communism or not, have taken up the cudgels in support of North Vietnamese against the so-called American im-

4709

perialism. This has made it difficult for us to sustain the operations we are now engaged in in Southeast Asia.

Mr. SCHULTZ. A minute ago I mentioned peaceful coexistence. I would like to quote from the Moscow resolution :

The policy of peaceful coexistence does not contradict the right of any people to fight for its liberation by any means it considers necessary—armed or peaceful. This policy in no ways signifies support for reactionary regimes.

From the Communist Party, U.S.A., resolution :

The struggle for peaceful coexistence is a powerful tool in the world class struggle, for the defeat of the policies of imperialism. \* \* \*

The concept arises out of the existence of two systems of states and of the international class struggle between them. Peaceful coexistence is a form of this class struggle.

Now you mentioned that this may not be clear in everyone's mind what they mean and it could, I am sure, be a form of political tranquilizer. Has this policy been used as a propaganda device?

Mr. KINTNER. It certainly has. I have already commented on the use of peace as another form of the conflict, and if they can project to the minds of people, particularly those who haven't the time or effort or training to understand the semantics of the Soviet approach, it can be quite appealing.

You may recall Khrushchev in his 6 January 1961 speech talked about the National Liberation Movement, in which he said it was the sacred duty of the Communists to support it. This again has a long root in Soviet general strategy, the basic strategy that Lenin laid down in the form of a common term, namely, that we must withdraw the rear of imperialism, that is, the underdeveloped areas of Africa and Latin America, from the capitalism camp.

It is much the same concept as expressed by Mao Tse-tung in the people's war concept, where the cities of the world are the major Western industrialized powers and their strategy is the people's war, which doesn't differ a great deal from the national liberation concept enunciated from Moscow, which is to, if possible, detach these areas where there is vast population and considerable natural resources from any association with the Western industrial powers. This does give a rationale for the use of peaceful coexistence and, in a sense, gives a rationale for the conduct of their efforts in these regions.

Mr. SCHULTZ. I would again like to quote from the Moscow resolution. This relates to communist internationalism and nationalism :

The national and international responsibilities of each Communist and Workers' Party are indivisible. Marxist-Leninists are both patriots and internationalists; they reject both national narrow-mindedness and the . . . underestimation of national interests . . .

From the Communist Party, U.S.A., resolution :

The primary issue is the role of the working class in the struggle against the evils of monopoly capitalism, and in the struggle for its overthrow. To this end it is necessary to combat all theories which deny this historic role, which . . . incite narrow nationalism in opposition to proletarianism internationalism.

From Mr. Hall's speech in Moscow, he stated :

We place a high priority on our working class concept of internationalism. We do not view internationalism as a burden, a concession, or a cross to bear.

Dr. Kintner, has the average American's concept of international relations differed from that of the communists?

4710

Mr. KINTNER. It differs fundamentally. We believe in international relations, our relations between nation states, and one should conduct one's foreign policy with the heads of government.

Now that does not mean that there are not a lot of collateral undertakings. For example, international incorporations, trade unions, and so forth, do have ties across national frontiers. But the concept that they have with the nation state has no empathy in itself with the so-called international working class, which is a euphemism for the Communist Party can have a higher loyalty.

There is another side to the coin that the conflict between nationalism and internationalism has always been a very profound one, both in the socialist movements and the communist movement.

The split, at least as far as the recording between Trotsky and Stalin, was an internationalist—and Stalin was a Russian, in this case a Georgian Russian nationalist. And he wanted to build up socialism in one country and ignore, for a while, the expansions until the Soviet Union achieved its power.

So it was essentially that most of the Communist parties outside, at least those identified with Moscow, still are actually subservient agents for the Russian brand of national communism rather than advocating their own.

This, of course, is a generalization which is subject to qualification. The French Communist Party, I think, does have some strong French nationalist elements and would not always do the bidding of Moscow, and the same is true to an extent also for the Italian Communist Party.

But from that point of view, I think the record demonstrates that the Communist Party, U.S.A., has always played an extremely subservient role to the Soviet Union. Of course, there are leaders who have objected to it like [Jay] Lovestone and [Benjamin] Gitlow and others, but the present organization headed by Mr. Hall, as your statements indicate, echoes with almost slavish adherence the line developed in Moscow.

Mr. SCHULTZ. How can a member of the Communist Party, U.S.A., then, in view of what you have just said, which desires to overthrow the U.S. Government and reconstruct American society claim to be patriotic?

Mr. KINTNER. Their claim, of course, is based on their philosophy that communism is a higher purpose; that mankind as a whole is much more important than one people or a one-nation state. And this, of course, is the utopian delusion which many people who adhere to some of these beliefs hold.

Marx himself was not a great believer in mankind, but he had very little use for human beings. I think this does characterize the members of Communist parties who say, "My judgment of the world is superior to that of these poor misguided people who would like to consider themselves Frenchmen or Canadians or Japanese or Americans or what-have-you."

Mr. SCHULTZ. Dr. Kintner, for the last 2 days we have been hearing testimony from people who have defected and requested asylum in the United States to get away, for the most part, from repression. You mention that there is a direct connection between Moscow and the Communist Party, U.S.A., though in some areas they disavow this. Is this current today?

4711

We know we have heard testimony why these people have left and what they find here. Is this the current situation today, the admitted world-domination desire of Moscow and the carrying out of their activities through the Communist Party, U.S.A.? Is that true today?

Mr. KINTNER. I am not sure that I get the essence of your question. Would you focus it a little bit more for me?

Mr. SCHULTZ. We have had indications of connection between the United States Communist Party with the Communist Party of Russia, both by resolution here and the meeting of last June. We believe that there is a connection, and I am asking if this is true, if you have some evidence to show that there is a connection and that the Communist Party, U.S.A., is in fact taking orders from Russia?

Mr. KINTNER. I have no immediate proof because I am not in the inner circles of the Communist Party, U.S.A. By analogy I have known many former members of the Communist Party, U.S.A.—Mr. Jay Lovestone, for example; Mr. Joseph Kornfeder, who helped organize the Communist Party in Venezuela and Colombia, and a student in the Lenin School in 1929 and 1931 and the coauthor with me of a book entitled *The New Frontier of War*, which is an examination of the political warfare.

I also know Mr. John Gates, who was former editor of the *Daily Worker* in New York until he left the party after the Hungarian situation in 1956. From what they have told me, when they were in the movement, if you didn't toe the Moscow line, you didn't stay up in the hierarchy very long. In fact, in a short period of time, you were expelled. Mr. Gates, for example, when he finally became very disillusioned as to what their real goals were, published Khrushchev's speech, the denunciation of Stalin, in the *Daily Worker*, and that was the beginning of the end of him in the Communist Party of the United States.

You can also, by reason of analogy, know their general position on issues. As you are reading jointly from the 1969 statement of the American Communist Party and the subsequent statements of the so-called Workers' parties in the Communist Party meeting in Moscow a few months later, one does not have to be an expert at content analysis to see a great deal of similarities.

If one talks the same and one has the capacity to act the same in normal human understanding and activities, one would assume there would be somewhat identity of purpose and whether it came about accidentally or whether there was some connection back and forth of a financial nature and an organizational nature, one can only conjecture.

I don't have any specific proof that would hold up before a court of law on that. But I think that, as a person who has studied the phenomena for some time, I could reasonably reach a conclusion that there was more than a coincidental nexus between the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of the United States.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Thank you, Dr. Kintner. In a book which you co-authored, *Protracted Conflict*, your opening paragraph, chapter 1, states:

Protracted conflict is a historical phenomenon. \* \* \* Its strategy derives a superior understanding of a total historical situation; the spectrum of revolutionary conflict techniques is as wide as the scale of social change. Within that spectrum a central intelligence organizes and phases the instruments of conflict—political, economic, psychological, and military.

Your book was published in 1959. A decade later in June of 1969 in Mr. Gus Hall's address before the 75 Communist parties in Moscow, he made a rather not dissimilar remark, which would tend to confirm your statement:

The transition from capitalism to socialism is history's greatest happening. \* \* \* "It is both a historical process and a current event, precisely because it is a total shift in the way of life." \* \* \* "This process is explosive—it is revolutionary. It is a many-sided process—economic, political, military and ideological."

Are the remarks from chapter 1 of *Protracted Conflict* valid today?

Mr. KINTNER. Oh, I think they are. As a matter of fact, we revised the book in 1963, I believe, and in that 4-year lapse there were a few things that we would change, but not the essential analysis that the world is going through a systematic revolution. There is a major re-ordering of what is going to be in the year 2000.

It is very difficult to perceive, it is very much like the Greek city-states which collapsed into what later became the Roman Empire and the Roman Empire collapsed to the feudal system and out of the feudal system came the modern state system.

We are living in a revolutionary age. Now what the Communists have done, they didn't create this situation. It is a result of many factors, technology, communications, the greater contact of peoples with each other. But having a professed revolutionary goal, they seek to exploit it and try to shape this development in their own interests and they have always used all of the instruments of persuasion and power, force, propaganda, subversion, espionage, the many activities which are orchestrated by them into a comprehensive plan of campaign.

I would say that Mr. Hall's statement is reasonably precise as to how they are trying to advance the cause to which he adheres.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Is the United States, in your opinion, conducting counterconflict techniques in a protracted campaign commensurate with the spectrum of revolutionary conflict faced by the free world?

Mr. KINTNER. I would not say that it is. For many, many years I have argued that we should see things in the round. I don't mean we should in any way emulate many of the Communist tactics and so forth, but in this day and age there is no such thing as a military strategy, per se, or a political strategy, per se, or an economic activity which does not have security and a political consequence. In the conflict thus far the fact that the Kremlin conflict managers do perceive the organic relation of these various instruments does, in my opinion, give them a rather major advantage.

Now I think there have been efforts on the part of the United States, and some of them very successful, to try to approach things in a more systematic way. The National Security Council, for example, in its various forms in evolutions—I am not talking about the present one or some of the past examples of it—has been an attempt to tie together our diplomacy and our security policies and our fiscal policies, balance of payment problems, and so forth, in a more coherent fashion. I think we are groping and have been groping for these past 20 years to achieve better coordination of the utilization of the instruments of influence that this Government has. But I personally believe that we have some way to go.

I think, for example, in Vietnam we have the overutilization of military force, per se, and not enough understanding of the psychological and cultural aspects of the struggle, which has been a deficiency. I just only regret that, despite my own rather small individual efforts, there are not enough Americans in positions to influence policy who do visualize the inner connection of these forces.

Mr. SCHULTZ. What do you think we can do to correct this situation?

Mr. KINTNER. Understanding is the beginning of wisdom, and I think the more people who will do their homework, just as your committee is doing here, to really study the activities, the doctrines, the strategic concepts of our opponents would be very, very useful.

I have been engaged for a number of years, for example, in a study of the strategic interrelation between ourselves and the Soviet Union, and I must confess that the Soviet strategy, in my opinion, is more rational than what we moved into under Secretary McNamara's regime, the so-called mutual suicide pact.

Their concept is to preserve the Soviet Union as a national entity. I hope we will never get into a nuclear war, but the capacity to have a more rounded position may give the Soviet Union the edge in a crisis situation, which would be unfortunate.

I am not derogating Mr. McNamara in any way. I am certain he is very intelligent and a very committed individual, but his strategic concept is what I am getting to. It seems to me to have been inadequate, because he failed to understand the mental processes of the opponent.

We have so many people in the United States who talk about the mirror image, that the Soviet Union is operating on the same concepts and ideas that we are. I don't think that is the case. They have a different approach. The only way you can find out what it is, is to study it intensively and then see how they apply what appears to be their doctrine in actual practices.

If you do that, I would go on record as saying they approach matters in many ways on a fundamentally different basis than we do. And because of the nature of the world in which we are, we would, I think, make an error if we failed to try to understand the differences that exist between their world view and their operational principles for dealing with the world as they perceive it, which is different than we do.

Mr. SCHULTZ. Dr. Kintner, would you comment on the relationship of the party and the government? We notice in some of the official treaties that these are signed not only by government officials, but also by party officials.

Mr. KINTNER. When the Soviet state was set up, the Communist Party was the dominant political force and still is. The key people in the party essentially are the policymakers. You might make an analogy if our National Security Council at the top was a government and actually set the policy for the departmental heads, then you would have the situation that they have there. For example, Gromyko is the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, and yet the policies he executes are determined by the Politburo and he is not a member of the Politburo. On the other hand, as the years have gone by, the clean separation of the party and the first secretary from the governmental apparatus no longer exists.

Kosygin is essentially the economic manager of the Soviet Union,

even though he is a member of the Politburo, and he is a member with Brezhnev and the party hierarchy. I think the lines are not quite as distinct in some of the European countries as they used to be. Essentially the mechanism that the party is all dominant, that is permeates and pervades all aspects of government as well as economy, cultural matters, and so forth, is still maintained in the sense then that you have a one-party system, which has the monopoly of power, and the membership of the party is, as you know, not universal. It is a relatively small number of people compared to the population as a whole. It still is the unique contributions which the communists have made to the political organizations.

Mr. SCHULTZ. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Dr. Kintner. In that respect I was very interested in your comments about developments within the governing hierarchy of the Soviet Union. Of course, one of the many differences between our system of government and that governing the Soviet Union is that the Soviets have worked out no orderly system of succession.

Here we have an orderly system, and every time the term of an administration approaches, we find parties and people beginning to crank up the operation of trying to win friends and influence people by the use of public relations firms, news media, creating images which the people would accept.

There it seems to be a matter of mustering sufficient muscle to obtain power. We are 50 years from the Bolshevik revolution, and up to this point it appears that of the old Bolsheviks who maintained pretty stringent control of party machinery, Kosygin and Brezhnev are among the last of the old Bolsheviks. Where do we go from here?

Would you care to speculate on what the developments will be?

Mr. KINTNER. Well, they have, as you know, created something called the Higher Party School, and there is generally about 100 to 150 of what you might call middle-level bureaucrats as well as party members in it. They are given a very rigorous course, about 3 years, on all aspects of the dialectic and their concept of state organization, concept of economic planning, and matters of that kind.

From this rank, from this group rather, you get the candidates for the Politburo. And I would assume, after Brezhnev and Kosygin go, that the group that I just mentioned will provide new members for the Politburo and will get continuity in the evolution.

It seems to me it would be very difficult for a person who aspires to political power in the Soviet Union, which is up through the whole communist hierarchy, the Komsomol and the Young Communist League and so forth and so on, that he is not going to deviate in any considerable way from the heritage that he has been inured to and also that he has committed himself to.

Frequently, we use the analogy it would be very difficult, for example, for a leader in the Soviet Union to get up one day before the Politburo and say, "I have been reading this Marx and Leninism for a long time and I think it is really an archaic hangover from the 19th century and I think we ought to try something else."

It is almost impossible for that to take place. It does not mean that there are not forces at work in the Soviet Union who are very opposed to it, like [Andrei] Amalrik, the man who recently prophesied

a revolution about 1980. I think over the long run the system, based on a very sophisticated type of coercion now, a monopoly of power by a very small group, will probably run into serious difficulties.

The CHAIRMAN. In such a situation where you have no orderly system of succession, it would appear to be an ideal situation where the military could move in. Is the party machinery keeping firm discipline over the military?

Mr. KINTNER. As far as I gather, it is. You must remember that certain senior members of the military have been part of the central committee. I think there are about 10 of them in there at the present moment. The military has not adopted an independent role. Essentially they work out their general defense planning and so forth in very close concert with the Politburo, and I would say that they have a reasonably happy role. Their Minister of Defense, now Marshal Grechko, for example, is equivalent to our Secretary of Defense in this country, I do not see that as a problem.

I do think your first point though, that there is no legitimate means for the transfer of power, can lead to serious battles for succession. We had that, of course, after Stalin died, when you had the Beria execution in his conflict with Malenkov. This may occur again.

The other thing which I think is worth bearing in mind is when Khrushchev denounced Stalin, he denounced essentially the whole communist system, because Stalin always acted in the all-seeing and all-knowing eyes of the Politburo in the Communist Party. Then to have the leader denounced as a criminal and a person who placed himself above any normal human restraint, I think, did have a very disruptive effect on the movement in the Eastern European countries and also inside the Soviet Union itself.

It is interesting and you are probably aware that there is a campaign to rehabilitate Stalin going on there now, because otherwise you would have a break in history, what happened after Lenin died and until Mr. Khrushchev took over.

I think they do have serious problems of this type, because they commit themselves to the ideology and they also commit themselves to this belief in the omniscience of the party. And if the party is such a remarkable instrument, how can you occasionally find a leader who had the obvious deficiencies which Stalin demonstrated?

So I think it may well be, and nothing in politics, as you know, is predictable, that in one of these necessities of transfer of power that there may again become a real struggle within the ruling group itself for leadership, which could create opposing factions and might bring about a time of very serious political trouble inside the Soviet Union.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen, it is now 20 minutes after 12. I want to thank you again. Dr. Kintner, you made a very valuable contribution to our record.

With that, the committee will be in adjournment until further call of the Chair.

(Whereupon, at 12:20 p.m., Thursday, June 25, 1970, the committee adjourned, to reconvene at the call of the Chair.)



# INDEX

## INDIVIDUALS

A	Page
Albright, Raymond J.....	4695
Amalrik, Andrei.....	4714
Arbatov, G. A.....	4697
B	
Bradley, Gene.....	4698
Brezhnev (Leonid).....	4662, 4714
C	
Callejo, Emilio C.....	4648-4655 (testimony)
Castro, Fidel.....	4651, 4654, 4699
Coffey, Joseph I.....	4695
Cottrell, Alvin J.....	4695
D	
Daniel (Yuli M.).....	4668
Dougherty, James B.....	4695
Dubcek (Alexander).....	4698
E	
Eisenhower (Dwight D.).....	4698
F	
Faisal.....	4701
Flihr, Monika.....	4632-4648 (testimony)
Foley, Tom.....	4700, 4701
G	
Gates, John.....	4711
Gitlow, Benjamin.....	4710
Grechko.....	4715
Greenleaf, Richard.....	4699
Gromyko (Andrei A.).....	4713
H	
Hall, Gus.....	4699, 4702, 4705, 4706, 4708-4710, 4712
Hoover, J. Edgar.....	4698
J	
Johnson, Lyndon.....	4700
K	
Kandinsky.....	4670
Khrushchev, Nikita.....	4669, 4697, 4709, 4711, 4715
Kintner, William R.....	4677, 4694-4696, 4696-4715 (testimony)
Kornfeder, Joseph Z.....	4695, 4711
Kosygin (Aleksai N.).....	4667, 4676, 4713, 4714

(i)

## ii

## L

	Page
Lange, Harold-----	4700
Lausche, Frank-----	4698
Lenin, V. I.-----	4669, 4680, 4701, 4709, 4715
Levin, Alexey Vasilyevich-----	4657-4677 (testimony)
Lightfoot, Claude-----	4699
Lovestone, Jay-----	4710, 4711
Lumer, Hyman-----	4701

## M

Malenkov (Georgi M.)-----	4715
Mansfield (Mike)-----	4704
Mao Tse-tung-----	4709
Marx (Karl)-----	4669, 4680
Masaryk (Thomas G.)-----	4681
McNamara (Robert S.)-----	4713
Mladek, Jiri-----	4679-4694 (testimony)

## N

Nixon (Richard)-----	4703
Novotny (Antonin)-----	4686, 4693

## P

Patterson, William L.-----	4701
Perlo, Victor-----	4702
Pittman, John-----	4702
Pomeroy, William J.-----	4700
Portell-Vila-----	4648-4655
Possony (Stefan T.)-----	4695
Proxmire (William)-----	4704

## R

Reinhardt, George C.-----	4695
Rockefeller, Nelson A.-----	4695

## S

Scott, Harriet Fast-----	4695
Serov (Vladimir)-----	4671
Sinyavskiy (Andrei D.)-----	4668
Stalin (Josef)-----	4710, 4711, 4715
Strausz-Hupe, Robert-----	4696

## T

Tito (alias for Josip Brozovich; also known as Josip Broz)-----	4706
Trotsky (Lev, Leon)-----	4710

## ORGANIZATIONS

## A

Academy of Arts (U.S.S.R.)-----	4671
Academy of Sciences (U.S.S.R.)-----	4697

## C

Communist Party, Cuba-----	4651, 4653
Communist Party, Czechoslovakia-----	4637, 4643, 4680, 4687
Communist Party, France-----	4710
Communist Party, Italy-----	4710
Communist Party of the United States of America-----	4675, 4697, 4698, 4703, 4705, 4706, 4708-4711
Nineteenth National Convention, April 30-May 4, 1969, New York City-----	4702
Communist Party, Soviet Union-----	4658, 4659, 4669, 4673-4675, 4687, 4707, 4711
Politburo-----	4713-4715

	Page
Czechoslovakia, Government of	4682
Legal Advice Bureau (Prague).....	4682, 4683
Ministry of Finance, Foreign Division.....	4682, 4683
Czechoslovakian Youth Party.....	4639

## I

International, III (Communist) (also known as Comintern and International Workers' Association)	
Sixth World Congress, July 17 to September 1, 1928, Moscow.....	4702
International Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties, June 5-17, 1969, Moscow.....	4702

## K

Komsomol. (*See* Young Communist League, Soviet Union.)

## M

Moscow Institute of Physical Engineering.....	4658
---	------

## N

NATO. ( <i>See</i> North Atlantic Treaty Organization.)	
National Front for the Liberation of South Vietnam (NFL).....	4700
North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).....	4703, 4704

## P

Progressive Labor Movement (PLM) (or Party (PLP).) <sup>1</sup> .....	4697, 4698
Progressive Labor Party (PLP). ( <i>See</i> Progressive Labor Movement.)	

## R

Red Army (Russian). (*See* Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Government of, Ministry of Defense, Army.)

## S

SDS. ( <i>See</i> Students for a Democratic Society.)	
Sixth World Congress of Communist Parties. ( <i>See</i> entry under International, III (Communist).)	
Socialist Workers Party.....	4698 <sup>2</sup>
Young Socialist Alliance.....	4698
Sparkle.....	4639
Stockholm Peace Appeal. ( <i>See</i> World Peace Appeal.)	
Students for a Democratic Society (SDS).....	4698

## U

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Government of	
Defense (War), Ministry of	
Army.....	4704
United Nations	
Czechoslovakian Mission.....	4679
United States Government	
National Security Council.....	4712, 4713

<sup>1</sup> At its national convention held in New York City, April 15-18, 1965, the Progressive Labor Movement changed its name to Progressive Labor Party.

<sup>2</sup> Appears as Socialist Working Party.

iv

v

Venceremos Brigade----- Page  
4652

w

World Peace Appeal (also known as the Stockholm Peace Appeal or  
Petition) ----- 4703

y

Young Communist League, Soviet Union (Komsomol)----- 4658, 4714  
Young Pioneers (Czechoslovakia)----- 4639  
Young Socialist Alliance. (See entry under Socialist Workers Party.)

PUBLICATIONS

Front is Everywhere, The (Kintner)----- 4696  
New Frontier of War, The (Kintner & Kornfeder)----- 4711  
Protracted Conflict (Kintner, Strausz-Hupe, Dougherty & Cottrell)--- 4711, 4712

○