



# **Eastern Europe – Fifty Years Ago**

## **A Press Review by a Hungarian Refugee**

### **'Underground' Wit Baffles Russia**

**16-31/12/1968**

- Iron Curtain No Bar To Students' Revolt**
- Europe: Iron Curtain Proves No Barrier to Student Revolt**
- Cross-Curtain Culture**
- Dubcek bends to Moscow's Pressure**
- 'Underground' Wit Baffles Russia**
- Czech TV Reviews Scenes Of Invasion**



S92 Dec. 17, 1968

## EUROPE IN FERMENT—3

# Iron Curtain No Bar To Students' Revolt

By SMITH HEMPSTONE

European Correspondent of The Star

PRAGUE — Slogan-shouting students barricaded themselves into the university buildings. Mini-skirted coeds furiously condemned the police for their "indescribable, brutal behavior" in breaking up the demonstrations and accused the press of "falsely reporting" what had happened.

Long-haired student leaders called for the resignations of top political leaders and demanded social, economic and political equality for all.

Paris? Berlin? Berkeley? Morningside Heights? No, Belgrade in June of 1968.

Student revolution is no respecter of political borders or ideological frontiers. Eastern European students from Bratislava to Kiev, like their peers in the West, have been strident in their demands for their visions of a better, more democratic society.

While every Eastern Euro-

Third of Six Articles

pean country has had its troubles with students this year, those of Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia have been most successful in bringing pressure to bear on the established order.

Here in Prague it was a student leader named Jiri Muller, a name still virtually unknown in the West, who had virtually as much to do with the overthrow of Antonin Novotny's Stalinist regime as did Alexander Dubcek, the reformist Communist party secretary.

In December 1965, while Novotny was still firmly in the saddle, Muller, an engineering student at Prague's 600-year-old Charles University, got up at a conference of the Communist-controlled Czechoslovak Union of Youth (CSM) to argue that the organization should "express

See EUROPE, Page A-10



Sge Dec 17, 1968

# Europe: Iron Curtain Proves No Barrier to Student Revolt

Continued From Page A-1  
and enforce the real opinions of young people about the method adopted by the (Communist) party to achieve its ends."

His reply was silence. But by late 1966, Muller and his supporters, still arguing the heretical view that the CSM should be something more than a rubber stamp, gained control of the union's Prague Council (it is interesting to note that in Eastern Europe, dissident youth attempts to change society by working through existing organizations, not, as in the West, by either opting out or trying to destroy these institutions).

The reaction of the Communist authorities, who tend to take a somewhat less tolerant attitude toward youthful peccadilloes than do their counterparts in the West, was to expel Muller from the CSM, kick him out of the university and draft him into the army.

In June of last year, Muller's friend and political supporter, Lubomir Holecsek, defended Muller and his ideas before the CSM and proposed a program of student reform. This program was rejected without discussion and ex-student Holecsek received his "greetings" from the Czechoslovak army.

The history of Czechoslovakia in fateful 1968 might have been far different had the authorities allowed matters to rest there. But on Oct. 31 of last year, Charles University students, in a spontaneous and completely peaceful demonstration against bad lighting, marched through downtown Prague carrying lighted candles.

They were set upon by truncheon-swinging police with a brutality which even the Czechoslovaks, inured by 20 years of Stalinism, were not prepared to endure.

## Mass Meetings

The rest is history. At a series of mass meetings, the students protested the brutality of the police and the economic and political conditions which had permitted these acts to take place; they established contact with dissident writers, Slovak nationalists and reformist Communists like Dubcek who used the students as a lever to pry Novotny from his pedestal of power.

There followed the "Prague spring" of liberalism, which triggered last August's Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia and the continuing erosion of these newly won freedoms.

Even in the face of Russian tanks and stiffening if reluctant opposition from their own government, Czechoslovakia's students are continuing their struggle for freedom, if necessarily in more muted tones.

Only last month, 60,000 of them locked themselves into their university buildings for three days in silent protest against newly imposed curbs on foreign travel, freedom of

speech and assembly, and democratic rule.

More will be heard from them, if only because their contacts with important elements of the power structure remain good. The railway workers pledged that "not a single train would move out of Prague" if the government acted against the students.

Student disorders tend to be symbiotic and repetitive, feeding on each other both in form and in content. Hence it probably was not entirely coincidental that 200,000 Yugoslav students staged their rebellion at a time when the "Prague spring" was in full flower and French students were making a battleground of Paris.

On Sunday, June 2 (the previous day a Zagreb newspaper had carried several reports from Western European countries in which student riots were described as "a symptom of a great crisis in the capitalist system") fighting broke out in Belgrade between university students and youth brigade workers over inadequate seating at a "pop" concert.

The police, in the usual pattern, intervened with both force and brutality, leaving 134 students, 21 police and nine youth brigade workers injured after two days of clashes.

The Belgrade students, supported by many of their professors, promptly seized the university buildings. Unrest spread to Titograd, Sarajevo, Nis, Novi Sad, Zagreb, Ljubljana and other university towns.

In what cannot have been totally unconscious mimicry of their Sorbonne colleagues, the Belgrade students rechristened their university "The Red University of Karl Marx," held marathon talk-ins interspersed with poetry readings and impromptu jazz concerts, and began drafting demands.

In a letter to Marshal Josip Broz Tito, the students called for an end to the "enormous social and economic differences in our society."

They demanded university reform, elimination of excessively high salaries and unemployment, "self-management" in economic enterprises, "democratization" of the Communist party and its offshoots, and creation of enough jobs to make it unnecessary for Yugoslavs to emigrate to Western Europe in search of work.

In many cases, the demands of the students seem contradictory. As such, they mirror the fierce behind-the-scenes struggle which has been raging within the Yugoslav Communist party for months over the economic and political reforms instituted by Tito since the ouster in July 1966 of Aleksandar Rankovic, his neo-Stalinist heir-apparent.

These changes involve the decentralization of power and the rationalization of the economy to put it on a semimarket basis, leading ultimately to the full convertibility of the dinar.



Czech police arrest a student demonstrator.

Such reforms have been and are being bitterly contested by old-line Communists.

While many neo-Stalinists view the student protest in terms of an indictment on the pace if not the substance of these reforms, there is evidence to suggest that the mainstream of Yugoslav student thought is fundamentally liberal and reformist (within the Communist context) and that the academic rebellion was incited by powerful liberal Communists as a spur to step up the pace of reform and further isolate the neo-Stalinists.

Speaking at a Belgrade student rally less than two weeks before the June riots, Veljko Vlahovic, a top liberal ideologist, a member of the national party presidium and leader of the Belgrade party organization, told students that revolution "demands action," that a "certain unrest is positive, irrespective of the extremes which it bears within itself."

## Invitation to Riot

In what amounted to a virtual invitation to riot, Vlahovic called on students to speak in "their own language, the language of the new generation."

Zlatko Markus, one of the student leaders of the Yugoslav "New Left," maintains that "intellectuals, if they want to remain intellectuals in the full sense of the word, must be against all interest groups and dogmatic spirits."

Says Markus: "The young people of today are frequently requested to continue things other people have launched. They are requested to be loyal and devoted. But one forgets that loyalty and devotion presuppose conviction in the reasonableness of what should be done."

His implication clearly is that Communist youth, like young people in the West, lack this essential conviction.

Tito, faced with what could have developed into a full-blown challenge to his authority, came out squarely on the side of the students (and thus of the reformers within the presidium), promising to resign if he was "not able to solve this problem" of the distortions with Yugoslav society.

The students went quietly back to their books. With the Russian invasion of Czechoslo-

vakia, ferment over reform has subsided in the face of the larger and more immediate military threat to Yugoslavia's national existence. The problems posed by the students, however, remain to be solved.

Perhaps the most important point about the Yugoslav student rebellion, like that of the Czechoslovaks, is that the students were successful primarily because they were articulating genuine grievances felt by society as a whole, not in any true sense rebelling against society.

Although Tito darkly hinted that supporters of Milovan Djilas, Rankovic and Mao Tse-tung were to be found among the students, it is safe to say that the great majority of them do not want to destroy the Communist system but to reform it, to make it more responsive and humane.

It is probable that a 5 percent rise in the cost of living in the first quarter of 1968 and rising unemployment exacerbated by the growing number of newly qualified university graduates (particularly in the arts) had as much to do with Yugoslav discontent as political theory.

## Manipulation Cited

Gyorgy Lukacs, the 83-year-old Hungarian philosopher (who as a loyal Marxist asserts that he "deeply despises bourgeois democracy"), maintains that Eastern European students like those in the West, riot because "they are against being manipulated."

Lukacs places the blame in the East on Stalin, who he says was incapable of separating "theory from daily politics," thus suffocating Marxist theory.

"Socialist society," Lukacs maintains, "faces the problem of creating a new proletarian democracy, a completely new democracy, a thus far unknown type of democracy" which will narrow the gap between theory and practice.

But the effectiveness of the students in narrowing this gap clearly depends upon their ability to appeal to some major power factor in the existing structure of the Communist state, as they were able to do in Czechoslovakia (writers, Slovak nationalists, party reformists) and Yugoslavia (bureaucratic modernists, disgruntled workers).

This in turn appears to lend credence to an oft-repeated theory that revolt takes place not when conditions are intolerable but when people scent a little freedom in the air, when hope exists. The Yugoslavs, for instance, enjoyed the most open society in Eastern Europe for 20 years.

## The Polish Contrast

Poland is a good case in point of what happens when the students lack basic support within the power structure. In March, student dissent, triggered by the banning of the classic Polish play "Dziady" (which has anti-Russian overtones) and fanned by protests from the Polish Writers' Union, developed into full-scale street demonstrations.

But the demonstrations were premature and the students were unable to find any powerful political force willing to back them.

At least 73 were expelled from Warsaw University and 47 from Wroclaw (Krakow), and those not drafted into the army will face criminal charges. One such student dissenter, Josef Dojczewand, last month was sentenced to 2½ years imprisonment for "propagating revisionist and hostile views" of the Communist party.

In the future, past behavior and "political awareness" will be taken into account before Polish students are admitted to universities and annual grants will be renewed only if their attitude has been "correct."

In Russia, dissent has centered in Moscow and in the always restive Ukraine, where Ukrainian writers have been imprisoned this year on charges of nationalism.

## 'Werewolf' Critics

Pravda, the official Russian Communist party daily newspaper, has been sensitive enough about the activities of the "New Left" to condemn its followers as "werewolves" trying to bring about the "decommunization" of Marxism.

Another indication that the Soviets are having trouble with their young people came in June when S.P. Pavlov, first secretary of Komosol (the Communist youth organization) since 1959, was fired.

Y. N. Yelchenko, first secretary of Komosol's Ukrainian branch, also got the axe.

A.D. Skaba, Ukrainian Central Committee party secretary in charge of ideology, also has been purged (and replaced by an archconservative), yet another sign that the trouble is centered in the Ukraine.

## Goals Differ

In general, university students in Eastern Europe tend to be a little older and considerably more mature than their counterparts in the West. Because the penalty for dissent can be exile, imprisonment and a life at the blue-collar level, a student needs considerably more courage and conviction to stand up to the authorities than he does in the West.

And certainly the goals of the students are significantly different. Jan Kubes, a Czech who attended university in the United States and now works in Switzerland, puts it this way:

"While fighting for a better society, these American students are at the same time destroying many of the values that the Czech students would be most grateful for. Some of these (U.S.) activists should finally stop acting out their family or sexual frustration and become productive members of a society which, for all its shortcomings, still contains many characteristics for which Czechs, and for that matter most others, would be greatly appreciative."

But for the establishment, be it democratic or Communist, youth in 1968 meant the same thing: trouble and challenge.

Tomorrow: Troubles in Italy.



Pass Dec. 21, 1968

# Cross-Curtain Culture

By Peter Osnos

Washington Post Staff Writer

THIS IS a uniquely difficult time to be reading a basically optimistic appraisal of cultural life in Eastern Europe. Not since before 1956 have "things"—to use the suggestive parlance of Polish friends—seemed so abundantly gloomy. Culture's struggle with the dictatorship of the proletariat, the seesaw of which Yorick Blumenfeld writes, is for the moment heavily weighted on the side of the philistines.

"Seesaw" appears to have been conceived and written—except for some last-minute changes—before the invasion of Czechoslovakia in August. Few events in history have so dramatically demonstrated the weakness and fragility of cultural freedom as did the crushing influx of several hundred thousand Warsaw Pact soldiers. The context in which "Seesaw" has been presented is more hopeful than the present situation justifies.

But Blumenfeld's book, surely one of the first popular studies of cultural life in Eastern Europe, is not just about cultural freedom. It is primarily about the less tangible process of cultural awakening, a process Blumenfeld calls "the most meaningful development occurring in the Communist regimes of Eastern Europe in the mid-sixties."

IN A NOTABLY comprehensive introduction, the author describes the significance of this awakening in political terms. "Because the arts are the most effective media of protest exposing those abuses the party tries to cover up, the Communist leadership correctly recognizes the arts as one of the most dynamic oppositional factors to the dictatorship."

Perhaps the best illustration of this fundamental point is the unhappy case of Poland. At the vanguard of cultural life in Eastern Europe, only a few years ago, Poland is now among the most repressed. Wladyslaw Gomulka, who came to power as something of a liberal in 1956, has long since unleashed the forces of anti-intellectualism.

Many of Poland's best-known writers, film makers and playwrights have left the country or are on extended trips abroad. Roman Polanski, the director, is married to a Hollywood starlet and is making slick horror films; Slawomir Mrozek, who wrote "Tango," a devastating portrayal of despotism, is living in Italy; Jan Kott, acknowledged as a leading interpreter of Shakespeare, has been teaching in this country for two years and shows no inclination to leave; Leopold Tyrmand, a brilliant young author, lives in New York, where he was joined recently by Ida Kaminska, the great Yiddish actress known to the world through the Czech film, "The Shop on Main Street." And, of course, there are others.

## Book Review

### 'Seesaw: Cultural Life In Eastern Europe'

By Yorick Blumenfeld (Harcourt, Brace & World, 276 pp., \$5.95).

Within Poland itself, dozens of writers, journalists, dramatists and teachers have lost their jobs, many because they are Jewish, others—like the renowned philosopher, Leszek Kolakowski—because of their outspoken dismay over the demise of the reforms of 1956.

According to Blumenfeld, all that is left of the Polish *nouvelle vague* are a few painters and musicians. And most of these, one should add, can no longer be regarded as progressive.

In Poland, the process of cultural awakening has been stymied. But elsewhere in Eastern Europe, where the awakening was slower in coming and more cautious in its expression, it is still taking place. Blumenfeld's chapters on Poland and particularly Czechoslovakia seem politically dated, but he also writes of poetry and satire in Hungary, architecture and the philosophical "Praxis" in Yugoslavia, literature in Bulgaria, television in Rumania, opera in East Germany and what he calls the "cultural mini-revolution" in Albania.

ON BALANCE, Blumenfeld's assessment of these efforts is sympathetic, sometimes favorable. Hungarians, he tells us, "are the only artists who successfully manage to combine love and politics in their poetry." Blumenfeld sees Eastern European culture developing out of its own varied roots, relatively free of the mustiness of Soviet socialist realism and the vulgarity of Western commercialism.

But he also points out that much of the work that seems courageous and imaginative within the framework of a Communist dictatorship might seem flat and stale in a society where restrictions are minimal. Blumenfeld, who is a Newsweek feature editor and former Eastern European correspondent, confesses that paintings imbued with a romantic message in Prague and Warsaw looked somber on the walls of his New York apartment, where they are stripped of the esthetic symbolism the painters sought to attain.

But what is finally most important is not the quality of the work being done in Eastern Europe, but the fact that it is being done at all. People who create are not easy people to suppress.



*Times Dec. 23, 1968*

## Dubcek Bends to Moscow's Pressure

By HARRY SCHWARTZ

Are the terrible days of secret police terror and purges about to return to Czechoslovakia? Will Alexander Dubcek, whose ascent to power almost a year ago ushered in the "Czechoslovak spring," be the helpless puppet used by Moscow to restore the worst wintry political weather of the Novotny and Gottwald eras?

These dark possibilities have been raised by Mr. Dubcek himself in his Bratislava speech this weekend, an address that marks his deepest capitulation thus far to Moscow pressure. In that speech, Mr. Dubcek declared his political platform to be last month's Czechoslovak Communist party Central Committee resolution, which represents an almost complete ideological surrender to Russia.

Then, after assailing the great majority of the Czechoslovak people who still refuse complete surrender to the Soviet occupiers, Mr. Dubcek declared:

"If these tendencies hindering our way should continue, unavoidable measures would become necessary, measures appearing undemocratic, but serving democracy to chase anarchist elements back."

The significance of this clear threat to purge journalists, trade union officials and others who have kept up Czechoslovakia's resistance is particu-

larly great because it was made by Mr. Dubcek. Those he now assails as "anarchist elements" are precisely the people who were his most devoted supporters before last August's Soviet invasion—those who have used Dubcek's name as a symbol of continued democratic sympathies even in the four months since the massive violation of Czechoslovak sovereignty by Soviet troops.

A month ago a similar threat was made by Lubomir Strougal, the politician who has risen most rapidly in the Czechoslovak Communist party hierarchy since the invasion.

"It is impossible to tolerate any longer the direct expression of non-Marxist opinions by Communists," Mr. Strougal declared, adding, "A policy of defiance and resistance which makes use of national emotions only leads people into adventurism. Unfortunately, this policy finds too much space at present in our communications media."

### Threat of Force

What should be done about these problems? Mr. Strougal was frank enough in his reply: "Where normal political methods are of no help, it is necessary to use force. This is in the interest of the party and the society."

These threats undoubtedly reflect Moscow's deep dissatis-

faction with the continued defiance of its will in Czechoslovakia.

Four months after the invasion, Czechoslovakia still has far more freedom and democracy than any other country in the Soviet bloc. Only last weekend, members of the Czechoslovak National Assembly dared publicly denounce Hungary and Bulgaria for their participation in the invasion.

The Czechoslovak press is now only a pale shadow of its free-wheeling, free-speaking, exuberant past last spring and summer. Nevertheless, it is still the most informative, most honest and most heretical press in any nation occupied by Soviet troops.

Mr. Dubcek, who seems a tragic figure indeed these days, was undoubtedly forced to voice his latest threats by Kremlin pressure of the harshest sort. His reference to "unforeseeable consequences" if the nation does not fully capitulate is very evidently a reminder that if Moscow's patience runs out completely it can sweep away Prague's present Government and install a captive dictatorship based on nothing more than Soviet tanks and bayonets.

The vague agreement for Soviet economic aid signed in Prague yesterday is undoubtedly aimed at sugar-coating the

bitter pill Moscow wants Czechoslovakia to swallow.

Mr. Strougal's threat of "force" a month ago proved completely ineffective in forcing the Czechoslovak people's moral and political surrender. If anything it stimulated the unity of intellectuals and workers in resisting such pressure. Moscow was warned of mass strikes as the answer to any purges of journalists or other resistance leaders.

### New Terror Looms

Will Mr. Dubcek's plea prove any more effective in winning the voluntary, final and complete capitulation of the Czechoslovak people? The answer is likely to be negative.

If Moscow wants to end the present remaining freedom and heresy in Czechoslovakia, it must—either directly or indirectly—use tactics of force and terror. Those tactics are almost certain to be resisted—and perhaps not always nonviolently.

A new, difficult chapter in the tragic yet inspiring story of Czechoslovakia's aborted drive for freedom seems about to begin, a chapter that may well claim many more victims than anything that has yet happened since the Dubcek era began.

HARRY SCHWARTZ is a member of the editorial board of *The Times*.



Pass Dec. 29, 1968

# 'Underground' Wit Baffles Russians

By Karl E. Meyer

Washington Post Foreign Service

**P**RAQUE—If, as the cliché holds, Czechoslovakia is the heart of Europe, then quite arguably the heartbeat itself can be found in a tiny cabaret theater called the Semafor, where two very popular comedians confect a bit-tersweet humor that could only be made in Prague.

Like most of the city's 20-odd theaters, Semafor is reached through an interminable arcade and its stage is below the pavement—an underground forum for the kind of underground wit that baffles and exasperates the Soviet Union.

Performances are always standing-room-only, even though the two comedians—Jiri Suchy and Jiri Slitr—have been putting on similar programs for a decade. It is astonishing to see usually staid Czechs at these performances; the audience joins in songs and in the animated repartee with the stars that ends the show. Encores last half an hour.

Slitr is a fortyish man who slouches around the stage wearing a bowler hat and an expression of deadpan sadness. In contrast, Suchy is small and puckish and bounces around like a marionette whose responses are controlled by his audience.

The show last week at the Semafor was "The Devil of Vihohrad," a ragbag of skits, songs and tricks with lights interspersed with poker-faced lectures on what to do in the case of fire, flood, earthquake or military disasters like an invasion. Midway, two pretty girls burst onto the stage and insist on singing.

Slitr patiently explains that not everyone can get into the act; after all, there are 14 million Czechoslovaks, "counting only those who really belong here." Later, there is difficulty with

stage lights. Slitr remarks that there are 13 lights, of which 12 are made in the West and work. The other light, which emphatically doesn't work, was made in a socialist country, and, "of course, we love that most of all." The audience roars.

The Semafor's other show is a brilliant satire called "The Last Stop," which is about a sanitarium where all the patients die. Their despairing doctors admit a healthy young man as a patient in the hope of giving the place a better name—but even the newcomer perishes. The political point is not lost on citizens of a once-healthy country who are forced to live in a socialist sanitarium.

This allusive and elliptical wit forms a grace note to songs and pantomime that could be enjoyed anywhere, even in Moscow. The Semafor has performed in France and Germany, but I was surprised to hear from Slitr that the troupe has not received an invitation to play in America or Britain, an oversight that surely must be corrected.

## Unczeched Procreation

**C**ZECHS WERE diverted last week by a "30-year plan of normalization" presented by Jan Prohazka, an eminent liberal author. Writing in the literary weekly Listy, Prohazka suggests that the bed is Czechoslovakia's ultimate secret weapon.

He quotes a fictitious opinion poll which claims to show that 51 per cent of the citizens like "the activities preceding the conception of a baby," another 12 per cent express no objection, 18 per cent are indifferent and only 11 per cent have reservations. So with a little purposeful love-making, he calculates, three million families could have ten children each in a decade.

By 1978, there would be 44 million Czechoslovaks. And by 1998, even allowing a ten-year rest pause, there would be 129 million Czechoslovaks. He concludes:

"At that stage, the majority of other

countries would have to treat us decently. We would be free and even sovereign, and nothing could prevent us from carrying out the reform which was drawn up so fortunately for us in the historic spring of 1968 by dreamer Ota Sik."

(Dr. Sik, of course, is the economic planner now living in Basel, Switzerland.)

## Kremlin Loses Friend

**A**N INTERESTING man to see in Prague is Dr. Josef Hromadka, the country's most distinguished Protestant theologian, who since 1948 has argued for friendship with the Soviet Union, so much so that some Czechs called him a Quisling. In 1956, he defended the Soviet suppression of the Hungarian revolt, and two years later he received the Lenin Peace Prize, the ultimate accolade of the Kremlin.

His views have undergone a profound change. On Aug. 22, he was among the first prominent Czechs to denounce the invasion of this country by five Warsaw Pact armies. In an open letter to the Soviet ambassador in Prague, he said, "My deepest feeling is of disillusionment, sorrow and shame. Something has happened which cannot be rectified, a loss of love and respect for the Soviet Union which will not be overcome for many decades."

Dr. Hromadka is president of the Christian Peace Conference, an international organization which held a meeting in Paris in October. He was asked by prelates of the Russian Orthodox Church not to go to Paris or, if he did, not to allow the invasion to be discussed.

He refused, sending a confidential memorandum to the council describing his anguish, observing, among other things: "In my mind, Aug. 21 is engraved with much darker colors than March 15, 1939 (the Hitler occupation). The Nazis were our chief enemies . . . but on Aug. 21 it was our friends and allies who invaded our country."

A warm-hearted man of 79, he now

lives in retirement in a small Prague apartment. For decades he was dean of Comenius Seminary, and his pupils include nearly every Protestant pastor in the country. His English is eloquent: from 1939 to 1947, he taught at Princeton Theological Seminary.

Nearly four months after the invasion, what does Dr. Hromadka think?

"I believe we won on Aug. 21. We were not defeated morally or politically, only militarily. Now that we can look back, people have started to ask whether nonviolence is more potent than the arrogance of power. We didn't have any theories about pacifism—we didn't have time to think about theories. But I have a feeling that we have done something that will be important to pacifist doctrine."

Dr. Hromadka's church, the Evangelical Church of Czech Brethren, has a pacifist tradition, but not a particularly strong one. Curiously, in this nation of passive resisters, the law makes scant allowance for conscientious objectors. Beginning in 1952, some provision was made—partly as a result of Dr. Hromadka's personal intervention—for purely religious objectors. But the cases have been few and have mainly involved theological students.

For Dr. Hromadka, the most troubling aspect of Soviet policy has been the tendency to anti-Semitism. "I am baffled by it," he says, "and I am deeply distressed by the use of the phrase 'Jewish extraction' in a pejorative sense."

While talking, Dr. Hromadka sat on a small wood stool—his "chair of moral atonement." In his book-lined study, one saw pictures of Pope John, Lenin, Thomas Masaryk and Jan Hus—an ecumenical pantheon that one may perhaps find only in Prague.

## Pointed Humor

**B**EST JOKE heard last week.

Question: What is the luckiest country in the world?

Answer: Israel. It is surrounded by 40 million enemies.





Times Dec. 31, 1968

## CZECH TV REVIEWS SCENES OF INVASION

Special to The New York Times

PRAGUE, Dec. 30 — Czechoslovaks watched on television tonight a dramatic review of the Soviet-led invasion of their country Aug. 20-21, including films of the Soviet tanks and a blood-spotted flag.

The invasion scenes were part of an hour-long program reviewing news events around the world, including the assassination of Senator Robert F. Kennedy, the United States election campaign and scenes of the Vietnam war.

Then the program took about 10 minutes to review events here, showing film of the rise to power of Alexander Dubcek, First Secretary of the Communist party, the negotiations with the Warsaw Pact countries over the liberalization program and then the invasion by the Soviet Union, Poland, East Germany, Hungary and Bulgaria.

"The price Czechoslovakia paid for looking into itself to solve the urgent problems was great, too great," the commentator said.

The scenes showed the faces of Prague's citizens as the tanks rolled in. Mr. McCord did not say which two of the three sets of allegations he had in mind. "names public."