

# VI. THE SOVIET PEOPLE FIGHT BACK

"Wherever there is oppression, there is resistance." The entire history of the human race bears out this fundamental principle of Marxism-Leninism. From the dawn of class society, people have risen in revolt, striking mighty blows against their oppressors. These blows have always been a powerful force pushing history forward.

Today's Soviet people are the heirs to just such a rich history of resistance. Throughout the feudal period the Russian serfs rose continually in huge rebellions which shook tsarist rule. Great revolts led by men like Stenka Razin and Emilian Pugachev challenged the military might of the feudal autocracy, only to be drowned in rivers of blood. These movements, however, inspired millions of peasants who once again rose up, killing landlords and burning their estates in what Lenin called the "revolutionary situation" of 1861-63. This resistance forced the tsar in 1863 to grant the legal but not actual abolition of serfdom.

With the development of capitalism and the revolutionary proletariat in Russia, this resistance leaped forward. Representing the most advanced relations of production, the proletariat was able to play the leading role in the struggles of all oppressed people in the Russian empire, including the peasants and the oppressed nationalities. Beginning with the great textile strikes at Ivanovo-Voznesensk in 1885 and St. Petersburg in 1896, the Russian workers rapidly developed their economic and political struggle. Led by Lenin and the Bolsheviks, the multinational Russian proletariat gathered all the oppressed around its banner and in 1917 overthrew the moribund autocracy and then seized power from the old exploiting classes.

Today the restoration of capitalism by the Khrushchev-Brezhnev-Kosygin clique, representing the interests of a new bourgeois class, is a tremendous setback to the revolutionary struggle of the entire international proletariat and all oppressed peoples. Yet carrying on in their heroic tradition, the Soviet people are resisting the rule of their new oppressors. This struggle has caused severe difficulties for the Soviet rulers and is a constant source of embarrassment for them around the world. As was noted in a recent issue of *Peking Review*, "The Soviet Union today

is by no means 'stable' and 'harmonious' as Brezhnev and his types describe it. It is filled with sharp class antagonisms, national contradictions and social upheavals."

## 1) The Soviet Union: A Fascist State

The struggle being waged today by the Soviet people must and inevitably will develop into a revolutionary movement to overthrow imperialism and re-establish socialism. Only the working class can lead this struggle to final victory. The Soviet rulers know this and are trying to suppress this struggle by enforcing a rigid, fascist-type dictatorship against the Soviet people, especially the workers—that is, an open, terroristic dictatorship of the new Soviet bourgeoisie.

Fascism develops when the imperialist bourgeoisie cannot rule in the "democratic" way which it developed mainly during the epoch of "free market" capitalism. The democratic parliamentary form of government is suitable to the bourgeoisie because parliaments, elections, etc., provide mechanisms through which the bourgeoisie can peacefully resolve its internal disputes, the middle strata can be effectively tied to the bourgeoisie, and the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie can be disguised from the masses. Imperialism, however, means, as Lenin put it, reaction all along the line, and as it is increasingly challenged on all fronts, the imperialists often must resort to the establishment of an openly terroristic form of dictatorship.

There is, of course, a contradiction in this which the bourgeoisie must contend with. For under imperialism contradictions among competing capitalists increase, they do not disappear (as some would have us believe). Imperialism only intensifies the uneven development of capitalism. Thus, under fascism new forms of resolving contradictions even within the imperialist ruling class itself must be found, and in most cases these forms prove less effective and desirable for most imperialists than the older, historically tested methods of bourgeois democracy. In Nazi Germany, for instance, this took the form of *de facto* arbitration by the all-knowing *fuhrer*.

In the Soviet Union, however, *imperialism did*

not develop out of the competitive capitalist stage. Instead, it developed on the basis of turning the party of the proletariat into a bourgeois party, and utilizing the forms of state apparatus developed under the dictatorship of the proletariat for the purpose of re-imposing bourgeois dictatorship. Under socialism the proletariat has little use for bourgeois parliamentary forms, though socialism does mean true democracy for the masses of people for the first time in history.

Moreover, because it represents the interests of the vast majority of the people and seeks to involve the masses increasingly in the mastery of society, the proletariat can openly declare its rule in fact to be a *dictatorship*, but a dictatorship over the handful of old exploiting classes and not over the people. The socialist state is a highly centralized and powerful instrument of class rule, far more powerful than the traditional bourgeois forms, exactly because it rests and can only rest on the revolutionary unity of the working class, whose class interests are not marked by the conflicting profit drives of individuals or groups within the class, as is the case with the bourgeoisie.

Under Stalin the centralized state apparatus was an extremely effective weapon against all brands of counter-revolution, foreign and domestic. But it was only one such weapon. Marxist-Leninists have always held that the most effective weapon against counter-revolution is the armed masses themselves, mobilized around a correct political understanding. Under Stalin a secret political police force played an important role; corrective labor camps and penal institutions of varying types also existed. Although a number of excesses did occur, this apparatus was directed not at suppression of the broad masses but at corrupt party officials, managers, generals and other members of the officer corps, bureaucrats, foreign agents and even officials of the police agencies themselves. In short, the security and penal institutions of the socialist state under Stalin were instruments of proletarian rule and not of bourgeois repression.

With the seizure of power by the Khrushchev clique, however, the centralized state apparatus was taken from the people and placed in the hands of the people's enemies. The Soviet bourgeoisie was thus able to move toward a fascist dictatorship without many of the difficulties associated with the transition from a "democratic" bourgeois republic. A strong centralized state was already present, but the key question was which class would this state serve, the proletariat or the bourgeoisie? And even under fascism, the ruling bourgeoisie does not rely 100% on open terror, but also on deceiving the masses. In the Soviet Union, this takes the form of disguising fascism as socialism—which was done by Hitler as well, but is easier to do in the Soviet Union because genuine socialism really did exist there for decades.

Further, Khrushchev could not immediately turn

the repressive force of the proletarian dictatorship against the workers. His first step was to attack this force to destroy its effectiveness. This was the so-called period of liberalism of the late 50s and early 60s. At this time Khrushchev attacked the security forces as "arbitrary" and "lawless." By playing upon real weaknesses but also by manufacturing lies, he was able to confuse the issues and demoralize honest cadres. The power of the police and penal organs was drastically cut, a number of institutions abolished, and the green light was given to all sorts of counter-revolutionaries to come out of the woodwork as the prisons were emptied. Where the police apparatus was not broken up, tested, proletarian fighters were replaced by bourgeois elements.

Along with this development, however, and picking up speed after 1965, a new security apparatus was being formed. Unlike the old police, this apparatus was directed not against the bureaucrats and other exploiters but against the people. As a first measure, the State Security Committee (KGB), under the direct control of the Central Committee of the CPSU, was expanded and turned into a large secret service with a nationwide network of agents. Then, the Ministry of Social Security was formed in 1966. Two years later this was changed into the Ministry of the Interior and enlarged. In 1968 police power was also expanded, the number of police greatly increased and "professional security offices", "night-shift police stations", and "motorized police units" were set up.

Modern equipment for repressing crowds and spying on people was introduced. In 1970 a judicial department previously abolished by Khrushchev was re-established by Brezhnev and Kosygin. The old courts were extended and new ones built. Since the Party and State Control Commission was changed into the People's Control Commission in 1965, another extensive network for supervision has been formed.<sup>2</sup>

The social-imperialists have also greatly expanded the prison system in recent years. Labor camps are divided into "ordinary", "intensified", "rigid discipline", and "special." There are over 1,000 of these camps with over a million prisoners.<sup>3</sup>

The social-imperialists have also developed an infamous network of "mental hospitals" where political prisoners are incarcerated and sometimes tortured. According to a report by the civil libertarian group *Amnesty International*, conditions in these hospitals are "considerably more severe than those existing in today's prisons." Six "special" psychiatric institutions exist especially for the confinement of political dissenters. Among the most notorious of these is the infamous Serbsky Institute in Leningrad (see box). Here political prisoners are forced to share cells with criminal psychotics. They are "subject to physical torture on the pretext of treatment, to injections of large doses of 'aminozin' and

'sulfazin' which cause depressive shock reactions and serious physical disorders." At these hospitals orderlies are actually recruited from the security personnel and male nurses from the ranks of criminally psychotic patients. As a result, both truly sick patients and political prisoners are the victims of daily beatings and sadistic humiliation on the part of the supervisory personnel."<sup>5</sup>

### LIFE IN THE SERBSKY INSTITUTE

"The hospital regime was similar to any prison regime. One hour's exercise a day, locked cells, outside visitors once a month, one letter a month to relatives, one parcel a month. Exactly the same as in a prison. The doctors themselves realized that it was not a hospital but a prison and sometimes said so openly. If a patient misbehaved he could be punished.

"It was very easy to get into trouble in that hospital, and the punishments were very severe. There are three kinds of punishment which are most commonly applied there. The first form of punishment is carried out by medical means. I think people know about a preparation known as Sulfazine, which is used if one of the patients—prisoners—in the hospital committed some offense or gave a doctor a rude answer to some question or declared that a doctor in the hospital was really an executioner in a white smock. Such a remark would be sufficient to involve punishment. Sulfazine is a pretty painful form of punishment: it causes your temperature to rise to about 40 degrees centigrade, you feel you have a fever, can't get out of bed or move about, and it goes on for a day

or two. If the treatment is repeated, then the effects can last a whole week or ten days.

"A second form of punishment involves the use of the preparation called Aminozine, used in psychotherapy, also known, probably, in other countries. It causes the patient to feel drowsy, sleepy—he may sleep several days on end, and if such a treatment is given regularly he may go on sleeping as long as it is continued.

"The third form of punishment we used to call the 'roll-up'—it involved the use of wet canvas—long pieces of it—in which the patient is rolled up from head to foot, and so tightly that it was difficult for him to breathe, and as the canvas began to dry out it would get tighter and tighter and make the patient feel even worse. But that punishment was applied with some caution—there were medical men present while it was taking place who made sure that the patient did not lose consciousness, and if his pulse began to weaken then the canvas would be eased."

—From an interview with **Vladimir Bukovsky** by CBS Television News, reprinted in **Survey**, Autumn 1970

Such barbaric practices are not, however, a special feature of Soviet social-imperialism. In recent years the U.S. imperialists have adopted similar methods, largely in response to the many prisoners' rebellions. At the California state prison medical facility at Vacaville, Calif., for example, experimentation is now going on with all sorts of drugs and even with psychosurgery. These techniques are designed to "pacify" rebellious inmates under the guise of "modifying" and "adjusting" "aggressive, anti-social behavior." As in the Soviet Union, politically active prisoners are singled out for such treatment. A recent article in the *San Francisco Chronicle*, describing a visit by a U.S. medical delegation to the Serbsky Institute, makes it clear that the U.S. imperialists are eager to exchange experiences with their social-imperialist counterparts.

### 2) Forms of Resistance

It is hard for the Soviet people to fight back under such conditions. Moreover, the mask of socialism the new tsars wear and take great pains to preserve has not yet been ripped away and serves to confuse and demoralize many. Because the social-imperialists have a communications monopoly, information on resistance and struggle, especially among the workers, is scarce. Yet enough is known to recognize that resistance is on the rise.

The factories are the main area of struggle. The social-imperialists are having a tougher and tougher time meeting plan quotas because workers are refusing to submit to speedup and other abuses. As we have already explained, the developing crisis of the social-imperialist economy has forced the revisionist chiefs to place ever-growing burdens on the shoulders of the working class. As *Izvestia* noted on January 26, 1972, "labor productivity will become the main lever in the development of the national economy."

The workers are resisting this speedup through slowdowns and a marked decline in labor discipline—a source of constant complaint by managers and other officials. For example, the manager of the Novokuibyshev Petrochemical Combine wrote to *Pravda* complaining of high labor turnover due to worker dissatisfaction. He noted that in 1971, his plant hired 1,054 new workers while at the same time 825 quit. He demanded "strict labor legislation on the responsibility of persons with a lenient attitude toward violators of labor discipline, drunkards, self-seekers and dishonest people in general."<sup>7</sup> And another letter urged that labor booklets used to assign workers to jobs and keep the economy at full employment under socialism, should now be transformed into more effective disciplinary tools. Instead of recording just work time, job, etc., these books "should record everything: incentives, punishments, absenteeism." This, it was

declared, would enable personnel departments to weed out "slackers" and "troublemakers."<sup>8</sup>

An interesting development was reported by *The N.Y. Times* on May 21, 1972. *The Times* noted the rapidly growing popularity in Soviet managerial circles of a new book, *The Manager and the Subordinate*, now a standard text of Soviet "labor relations" literature. It deals with such topics as how to convince striking workers to return to their jobs, how to get workers to work harder without "undue friction", etc. And the author of the book openly acknowledges that his recommendations are based upon those of a similar U.S. work—Dale Carnegie's *How to Win Friends and Influence People!*<sup>9</sup>

Another graphic illustration of rising resistance is revealed by a unique survey, whose results were published last December in *Izvestia*. In this survey, 2,952

Another graphic illustration of rising resistance is revealed by a unique survey, whose results were published last December in *Izvestia*. In this survey, 2,952 workers between the ages of 18 and 25 at a large locomotive plant in the Ukraine were interviewed. Of these, 66% publicly declared that they were dissatisfied with their pay, 71% were dissatisfied with the condition and safety of plant equipment, and 70% were unhappy with factory sanitary conditions. In a similar poll taken five years earlier, 54% were unhappy about wages and in all three categories there was an average increase of 18% in the number of dissatisfied workers.

The workers also sharply criticized a number of management practices. They vehemently attacked the common revisionist practice of "storming" to meet quotas at the end of each month, quarter or year. They said this was just speedup resulting from managerial incompetence. And the much-vaunted "socialist emulation" campaigns run by the revisionists were sharply denounced as "just fiction." According to one lathe worker, "It exists only on paper. Many people do not even know with whom they are competing." An electrician added that "On our crew there is no emulation, there is simply a quota that you have to meet." Of course, according to *Izvestia*, all these complaints represent little more than "the frustration of workers at not having enough attractive goods to buy."<sup>10</sup>

Another significant way the Soviet people reveal their dissatisfaction and opposition is through the great respect and admiration they still have for Stalin. According to several different reports, a strong and spontaneous undercurrent of affection emerges in all sorts of situations. For example, when Stalin appeared in a recent documentary film on WW 2, audiences often burst into applause. (Several Western observers witnessed this.) Despite Khrushchev's vicious campaign of slander, Stalin clearly remains the most popular and beloved of all Soviet leaders since Lenin. As even the Moscow correspondent of *The New York Times*, Hedrick Smith, was forced

to admit, "Stalin enjoys great latent prestige among the Soviet people and a much more favorable popular reputation than Nikita S. Khrushchev."<sup>11</sup>

The U.S. bourgeoisie has often defiled Stalin as an oppressor of the peasants and the national minorities. Yet, according to Smith, feeling for Stalin is particularly strong in the countryside and among the oppressed nationalities, especially in the Central Asian Republics and in the Republic of Georgia, Stalin's birthplace. And although older workers are naturally more fond of Stalin than the young who have no memory of life under socialism, many younger people, too, have recognized the great accomplishments under Stalin's leadership. Recently the decadent revisionist "poet", Yevgeny Yevtushenko, one of Khrushchev's henchmen in the anti-Stalin movement and now a leading lackey of the Brezhnev regime, was "shocked" to find Komsomol (Young Communist League) members toasting Stalin's memory at a recent picnic. And a schoolteacher in her late 20s reported that she liked Stalin "in spite of the fact that he was a hard man. Maybe he had to be a hard man at that time, maybe it was necessary", she said.<sup>12</sup>

At parties and social gatherings, toasts to Stalin are common. Recently, one West European diplomat found himself at a party where middle-aged, middle-level cadres toasted Stalin at least half a dozen times during the course of the evening. The "excuse" for this was that the wine being drunk was from Georgia. And in Georgia itself an older man emphasized that "Our first and last toast at any gathering in Georgia is always to Stalin. This has been our custom for many years and we haven't changed it."<sup>13</sup>

At Gori, a town in Georgia and Stalin's birthplace, the Stalin Museum remains open due to popular demand. Its director says, "The people who come here do so because they love Stalin." When asked why a portrait of Stalin was displayed prominently in their living room, her husband, a collective farmer, replied, "I can't see how I can be without it. This portrait has always been in my house. I am happy to be born in the place where Stalin was born, and I'll keep his image in my house forever."<sup>14</sup>

Even the so-called "dissident" intellectuals, whose attacks on Stalin rival Khrushchev's and Trotsky's, must admit that on this question in particular they stand completely isolated from the Soviet people. One "dissident", a writer in his 60s, noted that "Stalin has a real hold on the people. They feel that he built the country and he won the war. Now they see disorder in agriculture, disorder in industry, disorder everywhere in the economy and they see no end to it."<sup>15</sup>

This "disorder" has met with more than just the kind of passive resistance we have described so far. Although the social-imperialists keep a tight lid on any news of mass rebellion, a number of incidents have come to light. We have already

noted the wave of protests which greeted the price hikes of 1962, particularly the major riots in Novocherkassk and Temir-Tau. While these events marked a high tide of popular resistance, they were not the end of revolt. In June 1967, workers in Chimkent in Soviet Central Asia demonstrated after police beat a taxi driver to death. The demonstrators attacked and burned down the police headquarters and a nearby police station. Tanks were sent in to suppress the uprising and dozens of workers were killed.<sup>16</sup> In addition to this well-documented struggle, *Peking Review* reports that "thousands of workers in the Kharkov Tractor Plant staged a strike in November of the same year." *Peking Review* also reports that in September 1972, thousands of workers went on strike and demonstrated in the city of Dnepropetrovsk.<sup>17</sup>

One incident in particular seems typical of the many militant struggles waged by workers throughout the Soviet Union.<sup>18</sup> It is also significant because a detailed account written by the workers themselves has been smuggled out. In 1969, workers at the Kiev Hydro-electric station construction project (one of the largest building projects in the Ukraine) rebelled against deteriorating housing conditions and officials' callousness.

The workers lived in temporary dwellings in several villages near the construction site. Though decent living conditions had been promised, roofs were leaking, walls cracking and "some of the dwellings have become uninhabitable, that is, in a state of total disrepair."

According to their own testimony, the workers "more than once applied for repairs to the deputy director of the construction project, comrade Abramov, but he did only one thing: he threw people out of his office." No meetings were ever held at which complaints could be expressed.

In response to this situation, the workers themselves called a meeting. What happened next was reported in the *Chronicle of Current Events*, an underground journal produced by "dissident" Soviet intellectuals and suppressed last year. Breaking with its usual callous neglect of working class struggles, this journal gave the following account of the incident:

*"In mid-May 1969, workers at the Kiev Hydro-electric station in the village of Beryozka met to discuss the housing problem: many of them are still living in prefabricated huts and railway coaches despite the authorities' promises to provide housing. The workers declared that they no longer believed the local authorities and decided to write to the Central Committee of the Communist Party. After their meeting, the workers marched off with banners carrying such slogans as **All Power to the Soviets!** KGB men drove up in veterinary vans and were greeted with shouts of 'What d'you think we are? Dogs?!' Remonstrating with the crowd, the KGB men tried to whip up feelings of 'class hatred' towards one of the active participants in the affair,*

*retired Major Ivan Oleksandrovich Hryshchuk, by pointing out that he was on a good pension, so what had he got to kick up a fuss about? Hryshchuk agreed that his pension really was undeservedly large—indeed he had already been donating it to a children's home for two years. Moreover, he earned his living by honest labor, unlike the KGB men. The next day there was an official meeting at which some of the speakers tried to blacken Hryshchuk, but by the time they left the platform they had been literally spat upon by the workers. The workers sent a delegation to Moscow with a letter signed by about six hundred people on their housing problem. At the end of June Ivan Hryshchuk was arrested in Moscow. The workers wrote a new letter, this time demanding his release as well."*

This second letter has been published in the West. In it the workers tell how even before the delegation returned, officials of all kinds descended on the settlement—for the first time ever!—to push through the election of a new house committee. (This committee was the group which officially sponsored the delegation to Moscow.) By doing this the authorities hoped to declare the delegation self-appointed and illegitimate. But, in the workers' words, "that ploy did not work."

The management, however, refused to be deterred. "In spite of having been refused by all the residents, they, nevertheless, collected about 30 unauthorized persons in the civic centre and 'elected' a new house committee . . . They then began a constant terrorization of everyone who had actively participated in the above-mentioned meeting, or actively taken part in the work of the old house committee."

On June 10 another meeting was held. It was "stormy." The workers spoke out about all their grievances. They won an agreement from a local Party official, Col. Lavrenchuk (also a police officer), that "all shortcomings would be corrected" and that upon its return the delegation would be permitted to report to the people at a similar meeting. According to the workers, "We believed Col. Lavrenchuk, believed him as a man, but we were bitterly disappointed."

On June 13, after the delegates had returned from Moscow, a third meeting was held. The workers described it as follows:

*"... at this meeting the leaders outdid even themselves. It began with them giving a short ring and those who managed to jump into the hall got into the meeting; the rest were locked out . . . appointing himself to conduct the meeting, the construction project party organizer, Velychko, stated that no one had sent any delegation to Moscow and no one was going to get a hearing that day . . . those who had been locked out in the street, began pounding on the door, while the audience began demanding that these people be admitted. With some trouble, people managed to enter the meeting*

hall and it was filled to the rafters. People asked to be allowed to speak, but Velychko did not recognize anyone's right to do so; to the questions directed from all sides, he replied that they were not 'pertinent'. Later, when in his opinion, all the 'pertinent' questions had been exhausted, he adjourned the meeting. But the people did not leave the meeting hall; they demanded that Hryshchuk and the rest of the delegation speak. But when the delegates, who had been encouraged and supported by the entire audience, began to ascend the stage to the podium, the party organizer of the construction project, Velychko, behaved like a vile hooligan. He shoved a woman holding a child, grabbed the microphone from Hryshchuk and ripped it out of its socket. Col. Lavrenchuk, the same 'good colonel' who had promised to allow the delegation to speak, ordered a detachment of militia officers into the meeting hall to arrest our delegates. Comrades! What is this??? Who ever saw the like? One gets the impression that these puffed-up and presumptuous so-called leaders were provoking a riot."

It was following this meeting that Hryshchuk was arrested and the workers drew up their Appeal to the Central Committee from which we have been quoting. They also vowed to remain on strike until their demands were met and the local officials removed.

During this struggle, the workers retained their faith in the Communist Party leadership. Although the local Party officials, like Col. Lavrenchuk, were exposed as double-dealing backstabbers, the workers were convinced that if only the higher officials in Moscow knew the situation all would be rectified. In concluding their Appeal, the workers stated that "We do not believe that this arrest was made with the knowledge of those above, and we earnestly ask that you take under your protection the delegation which has come to you with this letter . . . We will await your reply peacefully. And in the event that our letter does not reach you, we will send people to you with this same letter, again and again, until you receive this letter."

It is not known what finally happened to the Appeal, but we are reminded here of the St. Petersburg (Leningrad) workers in 1905. Although the St. Petersburg workers had been engaged in many violent struggles against their employers throughout the 1890s and early 1900s, many were still under the illusion that the tsar himself remained their friend. When the communists would agitate for overthrow of the autocracy, many of the more backward workers shouted them down with cries of "no politics!" According to these workers, the tsar was good, only the local officials and capitalists were bad. The tsar, they said, had to be told of the evil things done in his name.

The workers were encouraged in this attitude by a police agent, a priest named Gapon. He organized a mass march to the Winter Palace to

present a petition to the tsar. It was formulated in the most humble of tones.

The communists and advanced workers fought against this tactic but were defeated. They marched along with the masses anyway. Over 200,000 marched, many with children and a number carrying religious icons and portraits of the tsar. When the crowd reached the Palace Square, Cossacks charged them from all sides, swords flying and guns blasting. Hundreds died that "Bloody Sunday" and the illusion of a just but ill-informed tsar was drowned in the flood of proletarian blood. This was the beginning of the Revolution of 1905, the great "dress rehearsal" for the even greater revolutions of 1917.

It is clear from the events described at Kiev that today, similar illusions about the new tsars exist among some Soviet workers. But as the struggle of the workers develops, these illusions will also be swept away. And like Col. Lavrenchuk in Beryozka Village and Tsar Nicholas II in St. Petersburg, Tsar Leonid Brezhnev will soon stand fully exposed for all to see—a bloody criminal and a bourgeois exploiter doomed to the "dustbin of history."

The Kiev incident is also significant because about a year before, three workers from the same construction project were arrested for opposing the social-imperialist policy on the national question. The three were picked up for distributing leaflets at Kiev University and at the Agricultural Academy protesting forceful Russification of the Ukraine. In response, the authorities instituted a rigid pass system, with visitors to the university having to carry three official stamps to enter the campus.<sup>19</sup>

In fact, open resistance is most widespread among the oppressed nationalities. In 1968, 300 Crimean Tatars in the town of Chirchik were arrested for defying a ban on public assembly in honor of Lenin's birthday. Police surrounded the demonstrators and sprayed them with a "poisonous liquid" before beginning mass arrests. According to some reports, several of the Tatars broke through the circle and went to Party headquarters to protest the police attack. Here, too, they were detained.<sup>20</sup>

The Tatars were moved to Central Asia from their homeland in the Crimea during World War 2 because a number of Tatars from the feudal ruling class had conspired with the advancing Nazi army at a time of great peril to the Soviet government and people. While we are in no position to determine whether such a drastic action was justified at the time, it is certainly clear that the danger has long since passed. In recent years deteriorating conditions have produced a growing movement among the Tatars to return to the Crimea, and they have raised the just demand for full restoration of their national democratic rights. The Chirchik incident took place in the context of this growing movement.

In 1972 the resistance of the oppressed peoples reached a new peak. The most celebrat-

ed incident took place in Kaunas, Lithuania. Here, a 20 year-old Lithuanian, Roman Talanta, burned himself to death to protest political domination by Great Russian officials and for full democratic rights for Lithuanians. His funeral procession touched off two full days of rebellion in which thousands of Lithuanians took to the streets shouting "Freedom for Lithuania!" They attacked the office of the city Party committee and the police station and were met by a force of military police and paratroopers. Two policemen were reported killed.<sup>21</sup>

In addition to this, *Peking Review* reports that "in Dneprodzerzhinsk, the Ukraine, over 10,000 demonstrators attacked the regional Soviet, Party and government buildings and the State Security Committee building and tore up portraits of Brezhnev and others."<sup>22</sup>

Of course, this kind of mass rebellion is still relatively rare in the Soviet Union. And these struggles, including the revolts of the oppressed nationalities, have often been led by bourgeois and reactionary elements who do not have the interests of the masses at heart. In Lithuania, for example, the Catholic church played an important role in the revolt. Nevertheless, these actions do reveal the anger of the masses and, despite their misleadership, have struck powerful blows against the social-imperialists. Rebellions like those at Novocherkassk, Chimkent, Chirchik and Kaunas are but a small taste of what the Soviet people have in store for their new tsars.

### 3) The Phony "Dissidents"

One brand of resistance widely publicized in the U.S. media is that of the so-called "dissident" intellectuals such as Alexander Solzhenitsyn, Andrei Sakharov, Roy and Zhores Medvedev and Andrei Amalrik. These "dissidents" have been hailed as the real internal opposition to the Soviet rulers. An alliance of blatant reactionaries, cold war liberals, Social Democrats and Trotskyites has celebrated them as representatives of "all that is finest in the Russian character." They are portrayed as heroes in the struggle for civil rights, fighters for the cause of humanity, and even, in the words of the Trotskyites, "the socialist opposition."

But who are these people? What do they stand for? What social forces do they really represent? The "dissidents" are, by and large, members of a "phony opposition" which has extremely marginal ties to the Soviet people and virtually no support among the working class. A disorganized and fragmented movement, the "dissident" forces represent a broad variety of reactionary, liberal and Social Democratic political viewpoints. They are united, however, by their opposition to Marxism-Leninism, their fear of the masses, hostility to China and to Stalin, and by their desire for an idealistically conceived form of capitalism without its most obvious outrages and abuses—especially those directed against the in-

telligentsia and other petty bourgeois strata.

At times members of this group do end up on the progressive side of things—for example, many criticized the social imperialists' criminal invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968. It is important to recognize, however that these "dissidents" do *not* represent the revolutionary interests of the Soviet masses, and that the "dissident" movement offers only a dead end for the Soviet people. Only the complete restoration of rule by the working class through proletarian revolution can solve the problems facing the working class, the oppressed nationalities and other oppressed people of various strata in the Soviet Union.

This in fact is why the repression directed against the "dissidents" has been, despite all that is written in the U.S. bourgeois press, remarkably mild. Though some members of the "dissident" movement have suffered at the hands of the social-imperialists' police thugs, many more have gotten off quite lightly. While labor camps and prisons are filled with revolutionary workers, students and members of the oppressed nationalities, celebrated "dissidents" have been relatively free to speak out. When the social-imperialists finally cracked down on Solzhenitsyn, for example, his "fate" was merely to be forced to leave the country and retire to a Swiss villa on the over six million dollars in royalties his counter-revolutionary books have earned him in the West.

In a certain sense, the Soviet leaders need the "dissident" intellectuals. Isolated from the masses, advocating all sorts of reactionary policies hated by the vast majority of workers, the "dissident" movement offers a convenient scapegoat through which the social-imperialists can discredit all resistance. The "dissidents" have become the "official opposition" in fact if not in name.

The social base of the "dissident" movement is the intelligentsia. The intelligentsia is not a class in and of itself, occupying a position between the workers on the one hand and the Soviet bourgeoisie on the other. Though a majority of these intellectuals—at least in the Soviet Union—may *formally* work for wages, their isolation from production, the extremely individualized nature of their work, and their relatively privileged position in society make it clear that this is a petty bourgeois group.

Because of their peculiar social position, the intellectuals as a group tend to be suspicious of both the regime and the people. Though they often realize that only the masses have the power to really change things—in the words of one Soviet intellectual, "they have built this country with their backs and their hands."<sup>23</sup>—they are, at the same time, fearful of the people, afraid of losing their own privileges. As one U.S. commentator noted, "It is probably legitimate to conclude that the intelligentsia knows little of the immediate problems facing the workers and peasants."

Since they are members of the petty bourgeoisie and since there is no strong workers' movement led by Communists, the intellectuals develop various forms of bourgeois ideology to guide their opposition.

Andrei Amalrik, author of the "dissident" manifesto, *Will the Soviet Union Survive Until 1984?* has stated that "over the course of the last fifteen years at least three ideological viewpoints on which opposition is founded have begun to crystallize. They are 'genuine Marxism-Leninism', 'Christian ideology' and 'liberal ideology.'" <sup>24</sup>

Amalrik offers no concrete evidence supporting the real existence of a "genuine Marxist-Leninist" opposition, and as he himself is certainly no Marxist, it is doubtful whether his views on this matter are credible. From our research, the one man generally mentioned as part of this group, General Peter Grigorenko, is more a progressive left-liberal whose political philosophy bears little resemblance to revolutionary Marxism-Leninism. (Though Grigorenko, like many Soviet liberals, is forced to disguise his politics with Marxist-Leninist phraseology.) We know that genuine Marxist-Leninists do exist in the Soviet Union and that these comrades are waging a difficult struggle in a complex and dangerous situation. But we seriously doubt the appropriateness of classifying such heroic fighters as a trend within the "dissident" movement.

However, Amalrik's categorization of the other two tendencies does seem substantially correct. These are the two main trends of thought characterizing the "dissident" movement today. The essence of the "liberal" program was first expounded in 1970 by Andrei Sakharov, V.F. Turchin and Roy Medvedev in their "Appeal of Soviet Scientists to the Party-Government Leaders of the USSR." <sup>25</sup> This work was a manifesto of the liberal movement offering a developed critique of Soviet society and a program calling for "gradual democratization."

The program is typical of liberal programs everywhere. The authors call for the gradual establishment of a political system patterned along bourgeois parliamentary lines. They call for the institution of greater facilities for "qualified experts" to exchange ideas and competitively innovate. They firmly oppose all mass involvement not controlled or guided by experts. Specifically demanded are measures for the "wide-scale organization of complex production combines (firms) endowed with a large measure of independence in questions of production planning, technological processes, sales and supplies, financial and personnel matters", (in other words, a little more competitive capitalism, please); the establishment of a "public opinion research institute" (to better manipulate the masses); and "improvement of the training of leaders in the art of management... Improvement in the information available to leaders at all levels, their rights to

autonomy, to experiment, to defend and test their opinions in practice." (Unshackle the managers—full democracy for the lower level bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie!) <sup>26</sup>

The reformist and elitist bias of the liberal program was further emphasized by Sakharov, who has become the outstanding spokesman for this trend, in an autobiographical essay dated December 31, 1973 and published in *The New York Review of Books*. In this piece Sakharov summed up political philosophy: "What we need is the systematic defense of human rights and ideals and not a political struggle, which would inevitably incite people to violence, sectarianism and frenzy. I am convinced that only in this way, provided there is the broadest possible public disclosures, will the West be able to recognize the nature of our society; and that then this struggle will become part of a world-wide movement for the salvation of all mankind." <sup>27</sup>

In foreign relations, the liberal position generally supports social-imperialist policy. Though many drew the line at the military invasion of a supposedly friendly "socialist" ally, Czechoslovakia, the liberals continue to argue that "Soviet foreign policy is at base one of peace and cooperation." <sup>28</sup> They are encouraged by talk of "detente", though Sakharov warns against "the hidden dangers of a false detente, a collusive detente, or a capitulation detente." In their 1970 Appeal, the liberals echo Khrushchev in stating that "the only realistic policy in the age of thermonuclear weapons is one leading towards greater international cooperation, the obstinate search for lines of possible convergence in the scientific, technological, economic, cultural and ideological fields..."

"Dissidents" of all varieties are most strongly in agreement with Brezhnev & Co. on the question of China. One British observer of the "dissident" scene has remarked that "otherwise sane and rational Russian intellectuals tend to grow vague and emotional on the subject of China and to indulge in extravagant flights of imagination." He described one encounter he had with a young artist who demanded to know what the West would do about China. "Don't you know they're going to overrun Siberia?" the artist said. "And when they've done that they'll advance on Europe? It will be the Dark Ages all over again. Surely the West will be on our side? Surely they will come to the defense of the white race against the yellow? The white race must stick together." <sup>29</sup>

Certainly not all the "dissidents" see the conflict in such stridently racist terms, though such an attitude is definitely cultivated by the official Soviet press. Nevertheless, the 1970 liberal Appeal notes that "It is especially vital to shore up the moral and material positions of the USSR vis-a-vis China." The liberals argue that "the danger from Chinese totalitarian nationalism, though it



can be seen as only temporary in its historical context, will nevertheless be very serious in the coming years. We can counter this danger only by increasing or, at least, maintaining the present technological and economic gap between our country and China, by increasing the number of our friends throughout the world, and by offering the Chinese people the alternative of cooperation and aid." <sup>30</sup> We can only ask what kind of "cooperation and aid" will serve to increase the technological and economic gap between the Soviet Union and China?

According to Amalrik, "Supporters of 'Christian Ideology' maintain that the life of society must return to Christian moral principles, which are interpreted in a somewhat Slavophile spirit, with a claim for a special role for Russia." <sup>31</sup> More a political doctrine than a religious philosophy, this trend was the inspiration behind the pseudo-fascist All-Russian Social-Christian Union, a semi-underground group. Though Solzhenitsyn can, in some respects, be categorized as a follower of this ideology, in its purest form the new Christian Slavophilism (a racist philosophy of Great Russian ethnic pride first formulated by extreme reactionaries in the 19th century) is a secondary trend in the "dissident" movement. It manifests itself principally in silly appeals for universal "salvation" and spiritual regeneration, often along "racial" or national lines.

However, this type of thinking—particularly in its more mystical and nationalistic forms—is openly encouraged by the social-imperialists and its influence is growing in both the "dissident" movement and the state bureaucracy. According to many sources, followers of this trend can be found high in the ranks of the security police. In the legal press the Slavophiles are influential in the magazines *Ogonyok* and *Molodaia Gvardiia* and in the literary weekly *Literaturnaia Rossiia*. These intellectuals were firm supporters of the Czechoslovak invasion. As one put it, "They (the Czechs) just had to be taught a lesson and shown that they couldn't get away with it." <sup>32</sup>

The most extreme forms of Christian Slavophilism, however, still appear only in the illegal "dissident" press, but even this is actually encouraged by the regime to make the social-imperialists' phony "internationalism" look good by comparison, while also creating public opinion for Great Russian chauvinism. Though most liberal and nearly all underground revolutionary papers are quickly suppressed by the authorities, the recent Christian journal *Veche* has already printed more than five issues containing all sorts of mystical, racist and anti-semitic trash with only token interference. <sup>33</sup>

One widely circulated underground document, "A Nation Speaks", takes the cake for neofascist vulgarity. This manifesto declares the nation the basis of all things. It is "a special spiritual community whose distinctiveness has a deep mystical sense" and whose determining factor is "a racial type." The document calls on the U.S. and USSR

to cooperate "to save the white race from the onslaught of the yellow." In doing this the basis of unity must be spiritual because "a schism exists between the servants of God and of Satan." Satan, the document says, carries on "his corrupting activity...preaching egalitarianism and cosmopolitanism—an ideology of the Jewish diaspora—thereby aggravating the process of universal blood-mixing and degradation." <sup>34</sup>

Reading this and knowing that its publication is passively encouraged by the Soviet leadership as a kind of "opposition press", all genuine communists and progressive forces are moved to even deeper hatred for the traitorous Soviet rulers, who are spitting on the memory of the more than 20 million heroic Soviet citizens who gave their lives fighting under the leadership of Stalin against just such Hitlerite racist scum.

One man who has come to stand above all tendencies in the "dissident" movement is Solzhenitsyn, easily the most famous of all the "dissident" intellectuals. Solzhenitsyn has been portrayed in the bourgeois media as one of the great champions of human freedom in the world today. The Trotskyite Socialist Workers Party has even hailed his "firm commitment to socialism." But of all the more well known "dissidents", Solzhenitsyn is probably one of the most reactionary. As we put it in the April 1974 issue of *Revolution*, he is merely a lover of the old tsars who has failed to make his peace with the new.

Solzhenitsyn's "literary" career began with publication of his reactionary novel, *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich*. This book was touted as an "exposé" of the labor camp system of the 1930s and 1940s. A blatant attack on proletarian power as well as on Stalin's leadership, *Ivan Denisovich* is the only Solzhenitsyn work published legally in the Soviet Union because it won Khrushchev's personal endorsement as a weapon in the social-imperialists' vicious anti-Stalin campaign.

There is much confusion about the labor camps. To some, the mere existence of such camps is a sure sign that the workers' state is "degenerate" or "totalitarian." But socialism has never and will never be built under "ideal" conditions. The socialist state will always be faced with enemies, internal as well as foreign. The old exploiting classes never give up without a fight, and new bourgeois forces arise within the proletarian party and state themselves. And while it is certainly preferable to remold enemies where possible, the workers cannot, must not and do not flinch from the most severe application of punishment where such punishment is called for.

The camps of the 30s and 40s combined elements of rehabilitation and punishment. Prisoners sentenced to terms in the camps came mainly from the privileged sections of society. Solzhenitsyn himself, for example, was an army officer who had fomented "dissent" among the troops at the height of the Nazi invasion. In a classically petty bourgeois individualist fashion,

he put his own private "disillusionment" above the pressing need to defeat the Nazi horde.

Life in the camps was certainly harsh, but not much more so than the life of the average peasant in Siberia at the time. And during the war, the period about which Solzhenitsyn wrote, conditions in the camps were certainly better than at the front where millions of heroic young soldiers were giving their lives in defense of socialism. In the camps inmates worked at essential productive labor, building up backward areas of the country and supplying the troops. The work was demanding and sacrifice was called for. But we ask: In those trying and difficult times, what Soviet worker was not called on to sacrifice for the good of all? As one irate Soviet citizen wrote to Solzhenitsyn about *Ivan Denisovich*, "Millions of Soviet people labor at felling timber and sing the praises of this form of toil, but the heroes of this story regard it with fear."<sup>35</sup>

Were there excesses and unnecessary brutality associated with the camps? Yes. Were guards often poorly chosen and sadistic? Sometimes. Were some innocent people sentenced? Yes. But these excesses, many of which were recognized at the time, do not change the fact that these camps were a necessary measure taken by the workers' state in its own defense. Communists must certainly learn from the mistakes made—and this has been done—but we will not opportunistically dissociate ourselves from what was a correct and necessary policy.

And here we should distinguish the attitude of Solzhenitsyn from that of the *truly* innocent people who were sentenced. As one former camp official pointed out in a letter to Solzhenitsyn, "Not one of those who were unjustly punished ever blamed comrade Stalin for his misfortunes—the thought did not even occur to them. This is the watershed dividing those who suffered while innocent and the real criminals. The latter, as a rule, abused both Soviet power and Stalin."

On this score, too, we should contrast the behavior of Solzhenitsyn with that of Anna Louise Strong. Until her death in Peking in 1970, Anna Louise Strong was a dedicated fighter for the working class and the cause of socialism. Born and raised in the U.S., she spent many years in the Soviet Union and China during the 20s, 30s and 40s, after joining the communist movement. Her writings were an important contribution to bringing the truth about Soviet power to the American people and the people of the world.

Yet, in 1949 Anna Louise Strong was unjustly expelled from the Soviet Union as a spy. For six years she was treated as a traitor and scab by communists everywhere. Friends of decades would no longer speak to her. Yet she steadfastly refused to abandon the revolutionary stand of the proletariat. Though given many opportunities to speak out against the Soviet Union and socialism by the bourgeoisie—who surely would

have paid well for such a "confession"—she would not be swayed. She was thus forced to bear the brunt of bourgeois repression, too, for this was the McCarthy era when the U.S. rulers were viciously attacking communists and the people's movement.

Finally, in 1955, Anna Louise Strong was cleared of the phony charges against her and shortly thereafter Khrushchev launched his attack on Stalin. It would have been easy for her to join in the chorus of anti-Stalin voices at the time. No doubt the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union would have rewarded her amply had she blamed her own suffering on the "evils" of Stalin. But displaying that "largeness of mind" which befits a true communist, Anna Louise Strong instead responded to Khrushchev with a book, *The Stalin Era*, which countered Khrushchev's charges and defended Stalin's leadership. This book made an important contribution to the development of a real communist position on the question of Stalin and it remains valuable to this day.

Solzhenitsyn's behavior is, of course, in no way comparable.

After the ousting of Khrushchev by Brezhnev and Kosygin, the social-imperialists decided to tone down their anti-Stalin campaign. Solzhenitsyn's writings were no longer useful to them. Some of the revisionist hacks associated with the attacks on Stalin—Yevtushenko, for example—quietly changed their tune and were rewarded with fat salaries.

Solzhenitsyn, however, remained unsatisfied, and for the past ten years he has continued to produce works attacking the former workers' state. Not limiting himself to slinging mud at Stalin, he has most recently, in his counter-revolutionary "magnum opus", *The Gulag Archipelago, 1918-1956*, turned his attacks on Lenin as well. According to Solzhenitsyn, it was a bad thing that the October Revolution even took place! In his *August 1914*, he openly mourns for the "cultured" high life of pre-revolutionary days. And in *The Gulag Archipelago*, his "heroes" include men such as Vlasov, a Soviet officer who defected to the Nazis; and two army officers "unjustly" imprisoned for the "petty" crime of rape.<sup>36</sup>

But Solzhenitsyn is not just a man obsessed with the past. If he was, he could never have become the kind of figure he is today. For the U.S. bourgeoisie, Solzhenitsyn can be used to represent "proof" that "communism does not work." And the social-imperialists use him to teach that opposition to their rule can only be "reactionary."

Indeed, Solzhenitsyn *has* allied himself with the most openly reactionary forces in the world. In his speech nominating Sakharov for the Nobel Peace Prize, Solzhenitsyn attacked the National Liberation Front for "bestial mass killings" which have been "reliably proved", while speaking not a word against the genocidal attacks and unspeakable atrocities committed by the U.S. im-

perialists against the heroic Vietnamese people.<sup>37</sup>

In this same statement, Solzhenitsyn lashed out at progressive forces throughout the world for not paying enough attention to the Soviet "dissidents." "Could, say, the Republic of South Africa," he asks, "without being penalized ever be expected to detain and torture a black leader for four years as General Grigorenko has been! The storm of world-wide rage would have long ago swept the roof from that prison."<sup>38</sup>

In response to this incredible statement, the Black writer Lloyd Brown points out that "Liberal outcry has made Solzhenitsyn's name a household word in our country, where the name and plight of Alex La Guma, the repressed Black South African writer, is quite unknown." Brown goes on to note that the same issue of *The N.Y. Times* which prominently carried a report of Solzhenitsyn's speech on page three, buried on the back pages the story of eleven Black miners murdered by troops in South Africa.<sup>39</sup>

Of course, as a *de facto* foreign agent openly representing the interests of U.S. and West European imperialism within the borders of the Soviet Union, Solzhenitsyn was a kind of threat to the social-imperialists and that is why they expelled him. But to claim, as does the Trotskyite Socialist Workers Party, that the "overall impact of Solzhenitsyn's works is entirely on the side of human progress because they are such a powerful reflection of the resistance to Stalinism",<sup>40</sup> is like hailing such former "anti-Stalinists" as Franco, Mussolini and Hitler as friends of "progress." This shows clearly how the Trotskyites' hatred for socialism and for the dictatorship of the proletariat is far greater than their supposed hatred for the bourgeoisie. Solzhenitsyn may be an enemy of the social-imperialists but, like the U.S. imperialists, this hardly makes him a friend of the Soviet people.

#### 4) Toward a New October

Behind all the publicity given the big name "dissidents" like Solzhenitsyn stand a growing number of genuinely revolutionary intellectuals and others who have picked up the banner of

Lenin, Stalin and the Bolsheviks, and who have come to see that without a mass revolutionary workers' movement and revolutionary Party, no real change can occur in the Soviet Union. These intellectuals have joined with real communists, workers and revolutionary cadres in taking the path of struggle.

Of course, given the fascist nature of social-imperialist rule, and given the fact that the U.S. and West European bourgeoisies are not about to give publicity to them the way they give it to the likes of Solzhenitsyn, it is hard to find out anything very specific about these individuals and groups. And at the same time, the transformation of the CPSU from proletarian vanguard into a fascist party of the Soviet bourgeoisie means that these revolutionary individuals and groups are operating under extremely difficult circumstances and do not have the freedom of the "dissidents" to speak out and make their views known.

Still, enough information has leaked out so that there is no question about the existence of a genuine Marxist-Leninist opposition. Among their ranks are militant workers who have come forward to fight for their class and all the oppressed Soviet people. Others are former cadres and officials who have remained loyal to the proletariat. In the late 1960s, one group, The League of Revolutionary Soviet Communists (Bolsheviks), issued an 80-page manifesto calling on all honest Soviet communists to take the path of revolution and, from scattered collectives, rebuild a new, revolutionary Bolshevik Party. We don't know much about this group, beyond its manifesto, nor what its fate has been since then. But it is clear that despite all the dangers and difficulties, genuine Marxist-Leninist forces are developing in the Soviet Union and have declared a class war to the end against the social-imperialists.

The Russian people have a long and glorious history of struggle against all oppressors, and these new revolutionary groups, while small now, are bound to grow and a new revolutionary Communist Party will surely be created. The Soviet people will overthrow their new tsars. A new October Revolution is inevitable!

1. *Peking Review*, January 25, 1974.

2. *Peking Review*, January 25, 1974.

3. *Peking Review*, January 25, 1974.

4. *New York Times*, April 21, 1970.

5. *New York Times*, April 21, 1970.

6. *Izvestia*, January 26, 1972.

7. *Pravda*, March 29, 1972.

8. *Pravda*, August 19, 1971.

9. *New York Times*, May 21, 1972.

10. *Izvestia*, December 2, 1973.

11. *New York Times*, March 5, 1973.

12. *New York Times*, March 5, 1973.

13. *New York Times*, April 9, 1967.

14. *New York Times*, April 6, 1969.

15. *New York Times*, March 5, 1973.

16. *Peking Review*, January 25, 1974.

17. *Peking Review*, January 25, 1974.

18. The following account is taken from the journal *Critique*, #2 which published the Kiev workers' protest in full.

19. Peter Reddaway, ed., *Uncensored Russia*, London, 1972, pp. 211-213.

20. *New York Times*, May 4, 1968.

21. *New York Times*, May 22, 1972.

22. *Peking Review*, January 25, 1974.

23. Quoted in J. Harris, "The Dilemma of Dissidence", *Survey*, Winter 1971, p. 108.

24. Andrei Amalrik, *Will the Soviet Union Survive Until 1984?*, p. 11.

25. Published in *Survey*, Summer, 1970.

26. Same Source, p. 166-7.

27. *New York Review of Books*, January 1974.

28. *Survey*, Summer 1970, p. 168.

29. Michael Scammell, "Soviet Intellectuals Soldier On", *Survey*, Winter 1971, p. 99.

30. *Survey*, Summer 1970.

31. Amalrik, p. 12.

32. Harris, "The Dilemma of Dissidence"

33. For an extensive excerpt from Vech's platform see Dimitry Pospelovsky, "The Resurgence of Russian Nationalism in *Samizdat*", *Survey*, Winter 1973.
34. Quoted in Pospelovsky.
35. "Soviet Readers Respond to *Ivan Denisovich*", *Survey*, Autumn 1968.
36. Alexander Solzhenitsyn, *The Gulag Archipelago*.
37. *New York Times*, September 17, 1973.
38. Same Source.
39. *New York Times*, September 19, 1973.
40. Quoted by Irwin Silber in the *Guardian*, October 3, 1973.



*Soviet social – imperialists invading Czechoslovakia in 1968*