

NEW WORLD

MAY
1954
20¢

Review



**Geneva and Peace • Democracy in Czechoslovakia
Shostakovich and Khachaturian on Soviet Music**

NEW WORLD *Review*

MAY

1954

Geneva and Peace	
<i>Jessica Smith</i>	3
Priority to the Consumer, the Soviet Economic Policy	
<i>Maurice Dobb</i>	11
Malenkov and World Peace	17
Howard Fast Receives Stalin Peace Prize	21
Democracy in Action in Czechoslovakia	
<i>Eleanor Wheeler</i>	27
Bulgaria in World War II	
<i>Edgar P. Young</i>	31
We Want Peace for Europe	
<i>Speech by Edouard Daladier</i>	37
Shostakovich and Khachaturian Discuss Soviet Music	39
The Children Pay, review	
<i>Elizabeth Moos</i>	45

OUR COVER: Young Polish women in traditional holiday dress. For other photos, see pp. 24, 25 and 26. These pictures by Eastfoto.

JESSICA SMITH, *Editor*
FREDERICK V. FIELD, *Far Eastern Editor*
ANDREW VOYNOW, *Managing Editor*
DONALD SCHOOLMAN, *Business Manager*

ESLANDA ROBESON
Editorial Consultant on Negro and Colonial Questions

Vol. 22, No. 5, May, 1954. Registered as second class matter June 27, 1951, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Subscription \$2.00 per year. \$1.00 for 6 months (Canadian, \$2.50; foreign \$3.00 a year. Draw money orders or checks payable in New York). Published monthly by the S.R.T. Publications, Inc., 23 West 26th Street, New York 10, N. Y. Indexed in Bulletin of the Public Affairs Information Service. Phone: MUrray Hill 3-3855.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.



JUST A REMINDER!

Have you . . .

. . . Renewed your subscription and thus made sure that it will not lapse? If not, be sure to renew today!

. . . Pledged to obtain at least one subscription from a friend or an acquaintance? If not, now's the time to resolve to get that extra sub!

Won't you take this reminder to heart? Help us keep our subscriptions growing!

NEW WORLD REVIEW renew your sub to

America's Window on the New World

\$2 for one year

\$1 for six months

PLEASE

NEW WORLD REVIEW
23 West 26th Street, New York 10

I enclose \$_____ for ☐ new

☐ renewal subscription to New World Review.

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

GENEVA AND PEACE

by JESSICA SMITH

UNITED ACTION for war has proved itself a bankrupt policy. United action for peace, among all nations and all peoples, is on the order of the day.

On May first, in its "Heard in Washington" column, summing up the views of the Washington Scripps-Howard staff, the *World Telegram* wrote:

We've all but lost another conference, possibly much more. Europe may be slipping from us, as well as Asia. Secretary Dulles' plans for Geneva have collapsed. Performance there so far has been a rout for the West. Unless it miraculously recoups, it may be the beginning of the end of the West's position in Asia. Failure of the West to deal effectively with Asiatic problems seems forerunner of worsening situation in Europe. European army project is just about dead. . . .

This appraisal has been echoed in the entire press, by responsible commentators and government officials throughout the world.

In the face of this shambles of the blustering "instant, massive retaliation policy," of the efforts to achieve "united action" to extend the war in Indo-China or of unilateral United States intervention if that should fail, the Emperor stands naked before the world—he has no clothes on at all. The most powerful nation in the world has, at the moment, no policy acceptable to its allies or its own people.

In our last issue, summing up the

efforts of the Administration to halt the march of the people's liberation movements in Asia even at the risk of World War III and the atomic holocaust it would mean, we said that only the united action of the people could save humanity at this moment of supreme danger.

The realities of history are operating to accomplish this end. The time is past when outside powers can impose an outworn colonialism on the more than half of the world's people who live in Asia.

These realities, pointed up by the H-bomb explosions and the ugly spectacle of the McCarthy-Army hearings which have exposed to the whole American people where the McCarthyite policies of the Administration are leading our country, pierced the fog of poisonous propaganda which for so long has paralyzed the America people into an acceptance of a war policy which ran counter to their deepest needs and aspirations. Letters flooded Washington opposing United States intervention in the war in Indo-China as the trigger which could set off an H-bomb war. Congressional leaders responded to this pressure and let the Administration know it could not muster the necessary support at home for the policy the United States was attempting to impose upon its allies.

Does this mean that the fight for peace is won, that the danger of war has ended?

No. It only means that the opportunity is now here to raise the struggle for peace to new and more effective levels. There is no guarantee that the arrogant aspirants to world domination are ready to give up their plans, or what new and dangerous plans they may still be able to hatch. Secretary of State Dulles, in his broadcast on "The Issue of Geneva" after his ignominious return from the scene of his great defeat, declared that the question of United States participation in the fighting in Indo-China still "has to be considered," he emphasized that despite all the difficulties his plan for a Far Eastern NATO was encountering, he intended to pursue it.

As Ned Russell, Washington correspondent of the *New York Herald Tribune*, wrote in that paper on May 9, the "agonizing reappraisal" of American foreign policy with which Secretary Dulles threatened France six months ago, if it failed to ratify the European Defense Community Treaty, is now going on, but in a far broader and more complicated context than he then had in mind, centering now on the probability of 'losing' Indo-China.

Just what this agonizing reappraisal may entail, no one at the moment seems in a position to say. The dangerous aspect of the situation is, however, that the makers of policy seem to be thinking only in terms of trying to build up new situations of strength, preparing new military adventures, rather than the fundamental reappraisal required for American security and world peace.

The Geneva Conference offers the opportunities for such a reappraisal—and it need not be agonizing. It offers the opportunity for a peaceful and permanent solution in Korea, for the restoration of peace in Indo-

China, for steps toward real collective security for all Asia, for moves in the direction of arms reduction and prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons which are being called for by people around the world. In a word, while final solutions cannot yet be expected, here, with the five great world powers sitting around the table together for the first time, is an opportunity for a great step forward to be made toward the easing of international tensions, and toward the peaceful co-existence among the great powers which is the only basis for the future security and well-being of all the peoples of the world, in fact for any future at all, when the alternative is continuing cold war leading to an atomic holocaust.

The United States could regain its lost prestige, could win again the friendship and respect of the world's people, and take an honorable place in world leadership by reappraising its policies along such lines. It is for this the American people must now press.

It is too early to attempt to predict what the outcome at Geneva can be. But that the opportunity exists for agreement there are many signs.

The presence of the representative of the People's Republic of China at Geneva makes this the most important conference since the end of the war. Despite all the comments to the contrary, and the ridiculous Dulles pretense that Chou En-lai, Chinese Premier and Foreign Minister, just isn't there, he happens to be very much there, and the conference is, in fact, a five-power conference.

What was prophesied in Administration circles to be the roadblock which would stall, if not break up the conference, the question of the rotation of chairmen, was very

sin
qu
ch
Th
vie
wa
Sta

in
to
Ind
wa
Fr
had
fro
to
NA
Du
sub
Am
clea
out
pro
E
for
fail
A
Am
oper
save
Brit
such
ter
of
prep
on m
adv
On
Trib
that
plan
Cong
can
In
ferer
desir
peace
resto
and
May,

simply solved. The USSR agreed quite readily to a solution that the chairmanship should rotate between Thailand, Great Britain and the Soviet Union. So, while People's China was omitted, so was the United States.

Attempts to wreck the conference in advance by issuing an ultimatum to People's China with regard to Indo-China, failed when Mr. Dulles was unable to get either Britain or France to go along with him and had to be satisfied with a statement from both countries that they agreed to "examine the possibility" of a NATO-like Pact for the Pacific. Mr. Dulles' efforts to give this some substance in advance also failed, America's allies making it quite clear that they wished to await the outcome of the conference before proceeding with such plans.

Efforts to achieve united action for intervention in Indo-China also failed.

An appeal by France for direct American air aid as the conference opened, in a last moment effort to save Dienbienphu, failed when the British cabinet declined to join in such action, and when Prime Minister Churchill announced in the House of Commons that Britain was not prepared to make any commitments on military action in Indo-China, in advance of the results at Geneva. On May 2, in the *New York Herald Tribune*, the Alsop Brothers revealed that only this refusal prevented a plan of the Administration to ask Congress to approve direct American intervention in Indo-China.

In his opening address to the Conference, Chou En-lai made clear his desire to reach agreement on the peaceful unification of Korea and the restoration of peace in Indo-China, and declared that the countries of

Asia should consult among themselves to seek common measures for peace and security in Asia, a position that was strongly supported by Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov.

In the preliminary discussions on the Korean question General Nam II, Foreign Minister of the Korean Democratic Republic, proposed a solution through all-Korean elections under the supervision of a commission composed of representatives chosen by the republics of both North and South Korea, and the withdrawal of all foreign troops.

Pyun Yeng Tai, Republic of Korea foreign minister, called for elections in North Korea only, for deputies to be added to the South Korean assembly, which would mean the establishment of the authority of Syngman Rhee over all Korea, and for the withdrawal of Chinese troops only.

This proposal, backed by the United States, proved so unpopular that none of the major countries would speak in support of it, and the South Korean representative was then asked to withdraw it.

The great lesson of these recent weeks has been the demonstration that the will of the people can prevail. A new wind is blowing in world affairs.

On April 30, Prime Minister Churchill, proposed that

... we should establish with Russia links which, in spite of all distractions, perils and contradictions, would convince the Russian people and the Soviet Government that we wish them peace, happiness and ever increasing prosperity and enrichment of life in their own mighty land, and that we long to see them play a proud and splendid part in the guidance of the human race.

The Soviet Government, through

a Tass statement issued May 8, welcomed this statement and declared that it had evoked a favorable response in leading circles of the Soviet Union. It expressed a desire for improved relations with Great Britain as of benefit not only to these two countries but to all countries interested in peace, and expressed the importance of extending co-operation and mutually advantageous economic relations between states, even with differing social systems.

It is certain that any friendly approach from the United States Gov-

ernment would likewise be welcomed by the Soviet Union.

The time has come for a new look at relations of the United States with the Soviet Union, for normalization of relations with the Chinese People's Republic, and its entry into the United Nations, for an agreement on the banning of atomic and hydrogen weapons, and a new course toward peaceful co-existence and trade with all the nations of the world.

The place to start is at the Geneva Conference.

The United States and Indo-China

THE COLONIAL nature of the war in Indo-China cannot be hidden. It has been brought forward on the floor of the Senate by Senator John Kennedy (D.-Mon.). Senator Mike Mansfield, (D.-Mont.) and others, but most sharply of all by Senator Edwin Johnson (D.-Col.) On April 19, following the Nixon speech about the necessity of sending American troops to Indo-China, Senator Johnson declared "I am against sending American G-I's into the mud and muck of Indo-China on a blood-letting spree to perpetuate colonialism and white man's exploitation in Asia."

In his April 26 statement, Senator Johnson called the crusade to send troops to Indo-China "The most foolhardy venture in all American history." He declared :

I am unable to support the belief that the conflict between the French-supported Viet Nam and the rebel Viet Minh is, in truth, a war of the forces of freedom, on the one hand, and the forces of communism on the other.

Noting that as recently as five months ago the Viet Minh forces were not identified as Communists, even by the French, he went on :

At what point, and to what degree, has this war, which every record shows to have been a war for freedom and independence, a war against imperialism, at what point did it suddenly become a war of Communist aggression? . . . Asia is in revolution—revolution against colonialism. The promulgation of what we in America believe are the inalienable rights of every man, and the right to walk as equals with dignity in the world community is sweeping Asia. . . . Nationalism, inspired originally by America, is being thwarted by America, with the aggregate effect of driving independence movements to Moscow. . . .

Senator Johnson declared that our European and Asian allies understand the real situation :

. . . They know that the war in Indo-China is not a war of Communist aggression. They know that the forces

opposing France's colonial rule in Indo-China are just.

In an informal interview over NBC television on April 27, Senator Johnson again declared that we should not go into Indo-China because it is a colonial war. The interviewer asked: "Do you mean to say that the Communists are right and we are wrong?" The Senator answered:

I didn't say that. All I say is that there is a right and a wrong in Indo-China. The Communists, as a third party, are helping the right side, and we, as a fourth party, are helping the wrong side.

What Americans must understand in assessing the role of our government, is that American policy has been increasingly directed not so much toward backing up the French colonial position, as toward actually taking it over.

It must be remembered that after the French rulers surrendered Indo-China to the Japanese in 1940, it was Ho Chi-Minh who organized the resistance movement that was America's ally, and was in de facto control of a great part of Indo-China at the end of the war. Britain and the United States thereafter gave assistance to the French in recovering their colony. Later, under free elections, Ho Chi-Minh became the President of the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam, proclaimed by the Viet Minh, a democratic coalition party. The French recognized the Ho Chi-Minh regime, only to break their agreement and take up arms against it. American aid to France has continued at an accelerated pace until it reached 78 per cent of the cost of the war which recently the United States has tried to make its own.

(For more detailed background material, see article by Kumar Goshal, p. 13, October N.W.R.)

But there are other facts which the American people should know. April 24-26 the Chinese News Agency, Hsinhua, issued a chronological account of certain events in relation to the role of the United States, based on a monitored broadcast by the Viet Minh. According to this account, on September 22, 1947, William Bullitt, former American Ambassador to France, arrived in Indo-China and conferred with the French authorities there, and then went on to have a talk with former Emperor Bao Dai, who was then in Hong Kong, to urge him to take over in Viet Nam. At that time Bao Dai, playing hard to get, was reluctant. A year later, Mr. Bullitt again met Bao Dai, this time in Geneva, and again urged Bao Dai to come to terms with the French, promising United States aid if he did so. This time Bao Dai agreed, and soon thereafter he again became Emperor, heading a regime marked by venality and corruption, and exercising his rule mainly from his luxurious villa on the Riviera.

Now let us jump to the present. The French well know the unpopularity of the Bao Dai regime and the weakness of their position in continuing to back it. During the recent period when the French government was carrying on talks with Bao Dai on the question of independence for Viet Nam it became evident that they were searching for someone amenable to French pressure rather than American to replace him. On May 1st of this year, the London *New Statesman and Nation* carried a dispatch from their Paris correspondent reporting that Bao Dai had been demanding a greater degree of

control. The dispatch then went on:

M. Bidault decided to sabotage the talks . . . the object was to jettison Bao Dai, form a new regime, and a new treaty, at one and the same time, and produce both out of the bag immediately before Geneva.

But Bao Dai blocked this effort and "patched up a hasty agreement with the ultra nationalists [of Indo-China]."

Then, the report continued, John Foster Dulles suddenly arrived in France on April 13, and "M. Bidault decided . . . the two should be prevented from meeting, and the Emperor . . . was held in Nice—practically by force—until Mr. Dulles left for Washington. . . . Last week end, [that is, the week end previous to May 1] the relentless Mr. Dulles returned to Paris and this time the meeting [with Bao Dai] could not be avoided. Bao Dai came out from the interview wreathed in smiles and calmly announced that the treaty [with France] was unacceptable."

Another part of the picture was filled in by the *New Statesman and Nation* for April 17, in an editorial article summing up the Indo-China story. This article reviews what happened after the surrender of Japan in 1945 and the establishment of the provisional Ho Chi Minh Government. The Ho Chi Minh forces, as is known, saved the lives of many American O.S.S. men who were parachuted into Northern Indo-China during the war. At that time, the article continues:

American O.S.S. men, led by Major Patti, roamed over Tonkin, assuring the Vietnamese that as the French had not taken part in the Potsdam talks, no agreement existed that her sovereignty should be restored. Later,

in October, when Ho Chi Minh was offered economic advantages in exchange for a guarantee that the concessions for railways, roads and air-dromes should be exploited solely by American interests, he refused.

Thus it is clear that the United States at one time would have been quite willing to back Ho Chi Minh had he been willing to grant the economic concessions later secured from the French and Bao Dai.

On April 24, the *New Statesman and Nation* commented editorially:

The Vietnamese delegation to Geneva will be accompanied by Mr. Heath, the United States Consul General at Saigon, whose role, it is suspected in Paris, will be to insure that Viet Nam plays the part of an "independent" state at the conference under American tutelage.

This is the picture of the political intervention in Indo-Chinese affairs whereby, along with military aid and the plans for direct military intervention, the United States has sought to win control of the economy of Indo-China and its rich rubber tin and oil resources and at the same time secure a strategic position for the war against the Chinese People's Republic in which powerful U.S. circles are interested. The French Government, trying to salvage something for itself out of this situation, while at the same time dependent on the United States for aid, tried to make a last desperate attempt to do so by getting rid of Bao Dai, but in the end had to accept him.

Thus it was that on April 28, French and Viet Nam signed a joint declaration of agreement for what was called the "total independence" of Viet Nam; relations are to be based on two treaties, one providing

for "independence," the other providing for French-Vietnamese association within the French Union.

A commentary on the nature of the Bao Dai Government is to be found in the report of a Congressional group led by Representative Walter H. Judd (R-Minn.) that went to Indo-China a short time ago. Even this group was obliged to admit:

The present government has been handicapped by Bao Dai. Some of its members not only have no popular support, but have been associated with anti-popular movements.

(I. F. Stone's Weekly, April 5)

As for the Ho Chi Minh Government, it should be remembered that the National Assembly which chose him as President of the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam, was elected by over 80 per cent of the people in the free elections of January 1946. His government has been recognized by 20 other governments since the recognition by France, later repudiated, in 1946. Despite the eight years of civil war, he has achieved a stable government, which administers the overwhelming part of the territory of Viet Nam and its 23,000,000 people. Under him land reform has been carried out, 14 million people have become literate, a vast program of road railway construction has been accomplished.

Peggy Durdin, writing from Saigon in the *New York Times Magazine* of May 9, says Ho Chi Minh is "a household word to millions of Vietnamese." She reports that at the end of the war "he was not only the idol of his own people, but was acknowledged the foremost Vietnamese spokesman and leader by France"; that Jean Sainteny, who negotiated with him on behalf of France in those days:

... describes the Vietnamese as an Asian leader of the first magnitude, a man of great intellect and unbelievable energy, an ascetic who cares nothing for his own comfort, prestige or safety. With many others, Sainteny was impressed by the extent of Ho's learning and culture.

To the Vietnamese, she writes, he became a great national hero . . . "the living symbol of a tradition deeply rooted in centuries of Vietnamese history—the fight for national independence." This veneration, she writes is not confined to the Viet Minh side:

Many Vietnamese who would willingly work against China-aided communism are reluctant to take a stand against Ho Chi Minh. . . .

The May 1st issue of the *Information Service* published by the National Council of the Churches of Christ also testified that the Bao Dai Government has no popular support at all and that even the Roman Catholics support Ho Chi Minh because his government's "program of reduced rents, cheap credit, and grants to the poorer peasants of the lands confiscated from the French or those believed to be pro-French, created a large measure of support for Ho Chi Minh."

Dienbienphu

Much is being written about the heroism of the French forces at Dienbienphu. Certainly the needless death of so many is to be deplored—especially since it is now known that they were sent to their death on a senseless adventure, when they were parachuted into the midst of Viet Minh held territory last fall as part of the Navarre Plan to crush the people of Viet Nam.

But when they are referred to as the "flower of the French expeditionary force" certain facts should be kept in mind. The major part of the army at Dienbienphu was the French Foreign Legion, and 80 per cent of the legionnaires are former German and Austrian Nazis and Spanish fascists.

Referring to the fact that everyone was talking about the gallantry of the French forces at Dienbienphu, the *New Statesman and Nation* for May 1st declared that everybody forgets

... to say anything of the reckless courage of the Viet Minh in their long struggle for freedom.

That mercenary soldiers have shown heroism is quite true, but this should not be equated with the kind of heroism that is being displayed by a people fighting with inferior equipment, sometimes equipped with only picks and shovels, for their own freedom, their own land. Theirs is the courage that will be recorded by history in more tranquil times.

It should be remembered too, that after Dienbienphu had been completely surrounded by Viet Minh troops but while the French could still land their airplanes, it was already evident that the troops at Dienbienphu were completely useless as far as any French offensive was concerned. From that time until their collapse, their sole effort had been to get out of the ring surrounding them. Why, it may be asked, did not the French evacuate them by plane while it was still possible? The only conclusion possible is that it was the French and not the Viet Minh that wanted to sacrifice the lives of their soldiers to impress the Geneva Conference.

With the sessions on Indo-China only just getting under way as we go to press, it is far too early to speculate as to what the outcome may be.

Ho Chi Minh has repeatedly expressed his desire to negotiate for a cease fire. On May 9, answering questions submitted to him by *Antara*, Indonesian News Agency, he declared his government's intention to negotiate with France "on the basis of unity and democratic freedom for a cease-fire, armistice and the restoration of peace in Indo-China."

The French have indicated their readiness to discuss the proposals made at Geneva by Viet Minh delegate Pham Van Dong for a cease-fire, despite their rejection by the United States.

The Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China have both made clear their support for an agreement to end the hostilities on terms guaranteeing democratic solutions.

Five Asian prime ministers—of India, Pakistan, Indonesia, Burma, and Ceylon—meeting at Colombo on April 28 called on the Geneva conferees for a cease-fire in Indo-China through direct negotiations with Viet Minh, for an agreement to prevent a recurrence of the fighting there, and for the independence of Viet Nam as well as for the entry of China into the United Nations and outlawry of the atomic weapon.

This is what concerns the people of Asia—not a NATO-like anti-Communist military alliance for Asia engineered by non-Asian nations.

Let the American people demand that our government's reappraisal of its foreign policies be responsive to will of the overwhelming majority of the world's people for independence and for peace.

Priority to the Consumer

Is the Soviet Economic Policy

by MAURICE DOBB

IT HAS for some time been fashionable among professional denigrators of the USSR to assert that the progress made in building up heavy industry has been purchased at the expense of the living standards of the Soviet people. The impressive record of achievement in increasing fourfold the output of coal and iron and steel in the pre-war twelve years and doubling it again since then can be denied no longer. Instead it is asserted that the Soviet consumer has received no benefit from all this, and was not intended to do so. Some, indeed, of the more extreme anti-Soviet propagandists even try to make out that consumption per head has *fallen* since the years before the First Five-Year Plan.

And now we get some economists in my country writing that the real "threat" of the USSR to the West is that, according to present signs, her standard of life looks like catching-

MAURICE DOBB is a well-known British economist. Among his works are "Soviet Economy and the War," "Soviet Planning and Labor in Peace and War," and "Soviet Economic Development Since 1917." He is a Lecturer in Economics at the University of Cambridge.

up and surpassing that of Western Europe within the next decade!

What the anti-Soviet propagandists fail to point out is that already in the *Second* Five-Year Plan, after the successes of the first quinquennium in the sphere of heavy industry, the intention was to give pride of place to the consumption-goods industries. It was provided in the original Plan that these should show an expansion of output of 133 per cent, as against only 97 per cent for the capital goods industries.

What frustrated this intention, and forced priority to be given once more to heavy industry, was the growing war danger in the West with the rise of Hitler, the growing aggressiveness of the Nazi regime and the formation of the Anti-Comintern Pact. After Munich the insistent demand of rearmament focussed even further attention upon the growth of steel production and non-ferrous metals, on fuel and power and transport.

Thus it was that in the pre-war decade heavy industry expanded two or three times as fast as did light industry supplying consumer goods for the market. While it is true that the Soviet theory of development has always held that expansion of capi-

tal goods production must take the lead, in order to lay the basis for expansion elsewhere, the exceptional concentration of these years upon heavy industry was due to the danger of attack from the capitalist world and not because a socialist state had too little thought for the needs of the consumer.

Now once again, as soon as the wounds of war that had lain so deep upon Soviet economy have been healed, pride of place is being given to the consumer.

This was already foreshadowed in the important pronouncement by Stalin in 1952, shortly before his death, that "the essential features and requirements of the basic law of socialism" could be summed up as consisting in "the securing of the maximum satisfaction of the constantly rising material and cultural

requirements of the whole of society."

The Fifth Five-Year Plan (covering the period 1950 to 1955), when its full details were announced in 1952, was seen to provide for a much closer approximation between the rates of growth of the two main branches of industry (producing capital goods and consumer goods): namely a growth over the period of 65 per cent and 80 per cent respectively.

The changes announced during the past year have gone further than this, and, in striking contrast with what occurred in the pre-war decade, have provided for revised targets for light industry in 1954 and 1955 which amount to the carrying-out of the Five-Year Plan for consumer goods output in *four years*.

The recent shifts of agricultural

TABLE 1
Percentage Increases Over 1950 in the Marketable Stocks of Certain Commodities

	1955 Target as given in Fifth Five-Year Plan (percentage increase over 1950)	Revised Target for 1955 (percentage increase over 1950)
Meat Products	90	130
Fish Products	70	110
Butter	70	90
Cheese	100	120
Vegetable Oil	100	160
Sugar	100	130
Wines	100	140
Clothing	80	140
Textiles	70	80
Hosiery	100	120
Knitted Goods	120	170
Furniture	200	300
Hardware	150	390
Bicycles	250	450
Sewing Machines	140	410
Radio and Television Sets	100	340
Clocks and Watches	120	160

policy (tax revisions and reduction in produce delivery quotas imposed upon farms) aimed particularly at livestock production and vegetables, and the still more recent decision (in early March of this year) to extend the cultivated area within the next two years by 32 million acres (equal to the whole cultivated area of Brazil) in order to raise grain production by some 16 to 20 million tons, all point in the same direction.

Of course, these big increases in consumption that are now in contemplation have only been made possible by the spectacular progress of heavy industry in the previous 20 years. The latter laid the basis for the former; and it is because steel capacity and engineering capacity have been so enlarged, that the possibility now exists for a rapid increase in consumption once the output capacity of the metal industry can be turned to the equipment of new textile and clothing mills, to the output of motor cars, refrigerators, washing machines and television sets.

As Mr. Malenkov said in a speech last year (August 8), during the period of the Five-Year Plans hitherto more than eight times as much has been invested in heavy industry as in light industry; and as a result more than two-thirds of all industrial workers are today employed in the former.

Thus the country is now equipped with a sufficiently powerful industrial base to enable both the base itself to be enlarged at a steady rate and a 'boom' rate of expansion in light industry as well. For example, the impressive extension of the cultivated area over the next two years is made possible by the ability of industry to supply agriculture yearly

with 120,000 or more tractors (measured in 15-horse-power units), and some 40,000 combine-harvesters (the figure for last year).

The results of plan fulfillment of 1953, which were officially announced last month, are particularly illuminating. The output of steel, at 38 million tons, and of coal, at 320 million, stood at a level twice as large as the pre-war year of 1940; the output of oil was 70 per cent larger and that of electricity between two and a half and three times larger than 1940. In the course of the year total industrial output increased by 12 per cent, and was nearly half as large again as it had been in 1950, the closing year of the previous (post-war) Five-Year Plan.

As regards light industry, producing consumer goods: its output grew in the course of the year by as much as industry in general. In other words, it had caught up on its previous lag behind the rate of growth of heavy industry; and during the second half of the year it registered an increase of 14 per cent over the same period of the previous year. Thus the output of industrial consumer goods stood in 1953 at 72 per cent above the pre-war (1940) level.

It was further announced in the report that during 1953 about 300 new industrial enterprises producing consumer goods were brought into operation, some 6,000 new stores opened and that sales of goods to the population through state and co-operative stores were 21 per cent greater than in the previous year.

For the current year, 1954, the retail trade turnover (excluding the collective farm markets) is planned to reach a level more than 70 per cent higher than in 1950 (measured in comparable prices), and in 1955

TABLE 2

New and Old Output Targets for Certain Consumer Goods and
Actual Output for 1953

Product	Unit	Output 1953	New Target 1954	New Target 1955	Old Target for 1955 as in 5-Yr. Plan
Cotton Textiles	Million Meters	5179	5549	6267	6142
Woolen Textiles	" "	222	242	271	257
Silk Textiles	" "	414	504	573	...
Linen Textiles	" "	...	295	406	...
Leather Shoes	Million Pairs	260	267	318	318
Felt Footwear	" "	...	29	33	...
Sugar	Million Tons	3.5	5.6	6.3	4.3
Margarine	Thousand Tons	289	390	450	350
Bicycles	Million Units	...	2.5	3.4	...
Motorcycles	Thousand Units	...	190	225	...
Clocks and Watches	Million Units	...	16.8	22.0	...
Radio and Tele- vision Sets	" "	...	3.1	4.5	...
Refrigerators	Thousand Units	...	207	330	...

a level approximately double that of 1950. This is to be compared with the target laid down for 1955 in the original (Fifth) Five-Year Plan, which was for a 70 per cent increase in retail turnover—a target which it is now intended should be reached in the course of the present year.

As regards the important matter of housing, Mr. Molotov in a pre-election speech on March 11th has given the total figure for housebuilding since the war as being over 183 million square meters of floor space "in towns and workers' housing estates" and over 4 million houses in the countryside. This figure of floor space for urban building is roughly equivalent to the provision of 3 million small-apartment dwellings (of two rooms plus kitchen and bathroom); thus giving a total of something approaching 7 million dwell-

ings in town and country since the war.

Nevertheless, Mr. Molotov frankly added: "Despite this we are short of houses and cannot be satisfied with what has been achieved." Another pre-election speech (Mr. Khrushchev's) gave a figure of 106 million square meters of floor space as the achievement of urban building during the last four years; and it is interesting to note that this is as large as the figure laid down in the Five-Year Plan for the whole quinquennium (namely 105 million square meters).

Speaking of progress over the past four years, Mr. Malenkov has made the striking claim (in a speech of March 12) that the standard of life in town and country has already risen by 60 per cent. At the same time he spoke of 2,500 new industrial

establishments being built during those four years, and industrial output as a whole having increased by 80 per cent (or by more than the current Five-Year Plan provided for the whole of the present quinquennium).

One of the weakest points in the economy, as revealed by the much-quoted report of Mr. Khrushchev last September, was livestock. This report showed that not only the number of livestock failed to increase as planned, but that the number of horned cattle, and in particular cows, had actually fallen, and still remained (at the time of the previous agricultural census, presumably) below the 1928 level (and cows even below the 1940 level).

It was to overcome this lag that the changes were introduced which have been referred to above: changes in tax policy and price policy and in the amount of the delivery quotas imposed on collective farms and individual farmers. The most recent figures, however, based on the agricultural census of last October, show that the corner has already been turned: that the numbers of cattle have increased again, and that even the figure of cows has risen halfway back to the pre-war level. The following table (3) compares figures for the last few years (and also pre-war) with the targets set for the

current year (as laid down in the resolution following the Khrushchev report of last September).

It is to be noted that these are figures of *total* livestock, whether in the ownership of collective and state farms or in the ownership of individual collective farmers (who are allowed to have up to a certain number of livestock on their individual household plots). In the case of cattle over a third, and of cows more than a half, are in individual ownership. On the other hand, the overwhelming majority of the sheep and goats are in the possession of state or collective farms. The increase in the number of pigs between the censuses of 1952 and 1953 is so surprising as to make one look for some special explanation (which the present writer does not pretend to be able to supply). Since the official Report on the Results for 1953 says that the number of pigs on collective and state farms increased by 10 and 8 per cent respectively over the year, the major part of the increase must have come from those in the ownership of individual collective farmers, and would represent an increase of the latter by nearly three times.

Some idea of the revised targets for consumer goods, mentioned above, can be gained from the tables shown. The first, Table 1, gives the old and new targets for 1955 in

TABLE 3

(Million Head)	1940	1950	1951	1952 (Oct.)	1953 (Oct.)	Plan for Oct. 1954
Cattle	54.5	57.2	58.8	56.6	63	65.9
of which:						
Cows	27.8	24.2	24.9	24.3	26	29.2
Pigs	27.5	24.1	26.7	28.5	47.6	34.5
Sheep and Goats	91.6	99	107.5	109.9	135.8	144.4

TABLE 4
Revised Production Targets for Certain Foodstuffs, etc.

Product	Unit	New Target 1954	New Target 1955	1954 as percentage increase over 1950	1955 as percentage increase over 1950
Vegetable Oils	Thousand Tons	1300	1500	67	92
Soap	" "	1000	1200	25	50
Beer	Million Gallons	462	510	63	81
Mineral Waters	Million Bottles	220	260	100	140
Meat	Thousand Tons	2180	2550	74	100
Tinned Meats	Million Tins	380	480	47	86
Fish	Million Cwt.	54	62	56	83
Butter	Thousand Tons	476	560	49	76
Cheese	" "	97	135	100	180
Condensed Milk	Million Tins	220	275	170	240
Margarine	Thousand Tons	390	450	100	130

the case of "marketable stocks of goods," as stated in the Decree of the Council of Ministers on Measures for the Further Development of Soviet Trade, of last October (published in *Pravda* for Oct. 23).

Table 2 gives the new production targets for a series of consumption goods, as stated in the Decree of the Council of Ministers on the Expansion of Production of Manufactured Consumer Goods (published

in *Pravda* for Oct. 28), and compares them with the old targets for 1955 and with last year's output where there are available.

Table 4 gives the revised targets for 1954 and 1955, both in absolute quantities and as percentage increases over 1950, as stated in the Decree on the Expansion of the Production of Foodstuffs and Improvement of their Quality (published in *Pravda* for Oct. 30).

MOSCOW'S FOREIGN LANGUAGE LIBRARY

THE All-Union State Library of Foreign Literature in Moscow contains more than a million and a half books, magazines and newspapers in 58 languages. In addition to the people of Moscow, it serves, by mail, some 600 libraries in 200 towns throughout the USSR.

In addition to a fine collection of American and British classics and contemporary works, the library has recently received the following: Ernest Hemingway's *The Old Man and the Sea*, Pearl Buck's *Come, My Beloved*, Eugene O'Neil's *A Moon for the Misbegotten*, A. J. Cronin's *Beyond This Place*, and Erskine Caldwell's *A Lamp for the Nightfall*. In great demand are works by Howard Fast, Albert Maltz, Ira Wolfert, Langston Hughes, Michael Gold, V. J. Jerome, Philip Bonovsky, and others.

MALENKOV AND WORLD PEACE

Premier George Malenkov spoke before the Council of Nationalities of the Supreme Soviet during the discussion of the budget, on April 26. The first part of the address was concerned with internal matters, the economic achievements of the past year, and the shortcomings to be eliminated to insure the well-being of the people. One point of special interest in this section of his speech was his stress on the ever growing utilization of atomic energy in the Soviet Union for "peaceful industrial purposes," as well as for "safeguarding the security of our homeland." We give below, in part, the section of Malenkov's address devoted to international affairs.

Mr. Malenkov noted particularly that a "certain relaxation of tension" has recently taken place, as a result of the active struggle of peace-loving forces and the important role in the strengthening of peace of the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China and the People's Democracies. He continued:

THE SOVIET UNION attaches great importance to the development of foreign trade and economic relations. Last year our country traded with over fifty states, with twenty-five of them on the basis of annual or long-term trade agreements. The volume of the Soviet Union's foreign trade increased by almost 125 per cent between 1948 and 1953. Our trade with the People's Democracies rose considerably. As for trade with the capitalist coun-

tries, its development is hampered by the policy of discrimination pursued under the pressure of the U.S. ruling circles. Experience has shown that the policy of discrimination is unwise and shortsighted, and that it has done considerable harm to the states that submitted to American dictation. The failure of the discrimination policy is obvious. And if, despite this, certain American quarters still cling to it, ignoring the object lessons of experience, the United States alone stands to lose as a result. The Soviet Union plans a further wide extension of its foreign trade with all those countries displaying a corresponding reciprocal interest. . . .

The Soviet people are distinguished by a sober approach in evaluating the international situation. And today they give warning against overrating the significance of the lessening of international tension so far achieved, since the adversaries of strengthening peace have not relinquished their aggressive designs, are continuing the arms drive, inciting an extension of the war in Indo-China, establishing more military bases and military blocs. The West German militarists are beginning to feel themselves in the saddle once more and, increasingly, act not as a potentially aggressive force, but as a real threat to European security. At the same time Japan is speedily being groomed for its role as a shock force for new imperialist aggression in Asia.

The aggressive circles artificially

maintain a climate of war hysteria, threatening the world with the hydrogen bomb, openly proclaiming the policy of positions of strength and prolonged cold war and resorts to methods of threats and intimidation. What can be said on that score?

First of all this. It is known that an atmosphere of optimism, confidence and peaceful creative labor reigns in the Soviet Union. But in the United States, on the other hand, and this is admitted in official American quarters, the social atmosphere is poisoned by a feeling of fear, dread and despondency. Such, it follows, are the results of the policy of threats and intimidation.

Further, the Soviet Government has adhered in the past and adheres now to the view that the capitalist and the socialist systems can fully co-exist peacefully, competing with one another economically. Guided by this consideration we are consistently pursuing a policy of peace and of strengthening international co-operation. Should, however, the aggressive circles, with their hopes placed on atomic weapons, be crazy enough to test the strength and might of the Soviet Union, then there can be no doubt that the aggressor would be crushed by the self-same weapon, and that such a venture would lead to the disintegration of the capitalist social system. Do not the lessons of history, as evidenced by the first and second world wars which left capitalism with a substantially reduced sphere of dominance, provide clear testimony to this? It is common knowledge that already, as a result of the two world wars, over one-third of mankind has forever broken with capitalism. . . .

The great mission of all champions of peace is to thwart the plans of

aggressive circles, achieve a further lessening of international tension and promote to the utmost peaceful co-operation between the nations.

The vital interests of mankind call for the solution of the problem of banning atomic weapons. The task is to render impossible the utilization of atomic energy, this great discovery of human genius, for purposes of wholesale annihilation of the civilian population, for the destruction of large cities—centers of industry, learning and science. The Soviet Government is working to secure an effective solution of this problem. At the same time the Soviet Government has always stood and stands now for a general and substantial reduction in armaments and of armed forces.

It is clear that no further relaxation of international tension can be achieved unless the normalization of relations between the Great Powers is insured. This implies, first and foremost, abandonment of the policy of discrimination with regard to the People's Republic of China. The line pursued by the aggressive circles in relation to the great Chinese people is a challenge to all the peoples of Asia. This line is linked with the desire of the aggressive circles to suppress the powerful national liberation movement of the peoples of the East. But is it not time to understand that in the East great solidarity is growing more and more among the freedom-loving peoples fighting against the attempts of the aggressive forces to convert Asia into a zone of eternal colonial oppression and slavery? Facts have convinced progressive mankind that the People's Republic of China is headed by genuine champions of national progress, world peace and friendship between the peoples. The restoration

FIGURES ON THE 1954 SOVIET BUDGET

THE STATE BUDGET for 1954, presented for approval to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR last month by the Minister of Finance A. G. Zverev, projected revenues totalling 571.8 billion rubles and expenditures of 562.7 billion.

Defense expenditures were scheduled as 100.3 billion rubles, or 17.8 per cent of the total budget expenditures. This is 10 per cent less than last year's defense expenditures.

The sum designated for the national economy is 326.7 billion rubles, including 216.3 billion from the state budget and 110.4 billion from the funds of economic organizations. State expenditures on national economy is 19.8 per cent more than in 1953. Capital investments and circulating funds will receive 184.9 billion rubles, including 121.1 billion from the budget.

Expenditures from the budget and other sources on the development of agriculture amounts to 74.4 billion rubles, an increase of 42.4 per cent compared with 1953. Capital investments in agriculture amount to 21 billion rubles, or nearly 80 per cent more than in 1953.

Ten per cent more is allocated to social and cultural undertakings this year than last. Thus, 67.1 billion rubles is allocated to education and science; 29.3 billion for health services and physical culture; and 44.9 billion for social insurance, pensions etc.

to the People's Republic of China of all its lawful rights is an urgent international task at this juncture.

in effect, command over the proposed six-nation military bloc of Western Europe. He continued:

The other vital condition for peace stressed by Malenkov is firm guarantees for the security of Europe whose people will no longer permit it to become an arena of bloodshed and destruction every twenty years. Charging that it had become fashionable in certain circles across the Atlantic to consider that Europe is mortally sick and that the era of sovereign states has departed, he asserted that on the contrary the era of the sovereign state "is in full bloom," and that European security can become a reality only "as the collective security of the sovereign states of Europe." This could not come about under a policy of reviving German militarism and giving it,

IT IS a deliberate deception to say that under cover of the "European Defense Community" German militarism can live at peace with France which is to be deprived of its national armed forces. In reality, the intention is to hand over France completely to the West German revenge seekers. What did the German fascists start with when they launched the second world war in the West? They invaded Denmark, the Netherlands, Belgium and France. And today the sponsors of EDC are steering the West German militarists along the same route. German militarism failed to seal the enslavement of France by force of arms. Today, the builders of EDC intend to ensure

victory over France for the German revenge-mongers without a war.

The cornerstone of a postwar European security was laid as a result of the Anglo-Soviet treaty of 1942 and the Franco-Soviet treaty of 1944. These documents have been sealed with the blood of the finest sons of the Soviet, British and French peoples. Now the sponsors of EDC want to undermine the real significance of the Anglo-Soviet and Franco-Soviet treaties.

In the light of the above, is not all the talk about the "European Defense Community" being formed for peaceful and not aggressive aims sheer hypocrisy? Those who are reviving German militarism have in mind not the strengthening of peace but, on the contrary, the undermining of European security and the preparing of another war.

The Soviet Government is profoundly convinced that the proposal advanced by it at the Berlin Conference for a General European Treaty on Collective Security in Europe can serve as the basis for a real solution of the problem of European security. The adoption of the Soviet proposal would be in accord with the fundamental interests of strengthening peace in Europe and with the national interests of the European peoples. This applies in equal measure to the German people. . . . While the aggressive circles seek to perpetuate the dismemberment of Germany and to convert Western Germany into a new center of war, the General European Treaty on Collective Security would contribute to reestablishing the national unity of the German people, to transforming Germany into a peace-loving, democratic state.

We have no intention of isolating the United States from Europe. We

see no obstacles to a General European Treaty on Collective Security in Europe bearing the signature of the Government of the United States as well. In its turn, the Soviet Government has expressed readiness to enter into negotiations for joining the "North Atlantic Treaty Organization," given certain conditions.

The foreign policy of the Soviet Union is consistent and unchangeable. Before all mankind the Soviet Government has advanced and upholds proposals, the realization of which would create guarantees of lasting peace and security for the peoples.

The Soviet policy of peace proceeds from the fact that in present circumstances it is peaceful co-operation between the nations, irrespective of their social systems, that can and must determine the development of international relations, that can and must insure the further progressive easing of international tension.

What then is needed for the successful realization of peaceful co-operation? For this there is needed on the part of the respective states, above all, the mutual desire to co-operate on the basis of observance of the principles of equality and non-interference in the internal affairs of other states, and unconditional fulfillment of commitments.

We adhere to the view that in the present circumstances, given the good will of the parties concerned and their readiness to take mutual interests into consideration, controversial and unresolved international issues can and must be settled in the interests of strengthening peace.

All friends and champions of peace can rest assured that the Soviet Union will continue to pursue the policy of strengthening peace and friendship between the peoples.

HOWARD FAST RECEIVES STALIN PEACE PRIZE

AT INSPIRING ceremonies attended by a large number of ardent supporters of peace, Howard Fast, eminent American writer, was presented the International Stalin Prize for Strengthening Peace on April 22. The ceremonies had to be held in the Crystal Room of the Hotel McAlpin, in New York, because the State Department refused Mr. Fast a passport, thus preventing him from receiving the award in Moscow.

Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois, outstanding Negro scholar and leader and winner last year of another peace award—the International Peace Prize of the World Peace Council—was authorized to give the medal and certificate to Mr. Fast on their behalf by the International Stalin Prize Committee. Dr. Du Bois quoted from a cable from Academician Skobel'syn, Chairman of the Committee, as follows:

By awarding you with the prize, we wanted to express our friendly sentiments to the great American people. Between our peoples there are no contentious questions, nor can there be. We can live in peace and harmony. We shall always keep in our hearts the names of those who, like you, are indefatigably working for the cause of securing a lasting peace and a friendly cooperation between the peoples.

Howard Fast, who is known not only throughout the United States but throughout the world, for his nineteen volumes have been read by millions in nearly every land and language on earth, upon receiving the award said:

"There have been people, all too many, who have been crying out that we stand at the brink of the destruction of mankind and of the rich and beautiful civilization which mankind has created; and still others that say that this destruction is inevitable. I do not deny that these are grim and frightening times; but I cannot say that without adding that these are bright and splendid times. If we stand at the brink of destruction, we also stand at the brink of something else, at the brink of a new dawn, in which the human race, in all of its complex and fascinating difference, will come to the conclusion that it must live in a peaceful brotherhood that will include this multitude of difference. And it is my thought that we will choose to live together rather than to die together—my hope and the hope of all mankind.

"I am not here today to argue these questions, to formulate foreign policy, to criticize foreign policy. I am here simply to receive a prize which is a peace prize. This

THE STALIN PEACE PRIZE

THE inauguration of the Stalin Peace Prize was in connection with the 70th birthday of Joseph Stalin, in December, 1949. At that time, an international committee of leading democratic figures from 10 countries was established to decide each year on the award "to citizens of any country, irrespective of their political, religious or race distinctions, for outstanding services in the struggle against the warmongers and for the strengthening of peace." The award consists of a peace diploma, a gold medal, and a money prize of 100,000 rubles (\$25,000).

peace prize, awarded to me and to many others by an international jury, originates in the Soviet Union. If I had no other cause for honoring the Soviet Union, I would honor it greatly and profoundly for giving prizes for peace.

"I do not understand those people who say that a prize for peace is not a prize for peace. For such people, there is no beginning; and where there is no beginning, how can there be a conclusion in understanding? Yet we must have understanding. The burning question of the times in which we live is peaceful co-existence between our world and the socialist world, and that co-existence, if it is to be at all, must be based on understanding.

"And there is ground for such co-existence—much ground. For all the threat implicit in atomic power, there is also implicit in it the realization that we have hardly scraped at the riches of our planet. There is

not only enough for all; there is enough for untold thousands of generations to come. And what a power, what an incredible and mighty power these two separate worlds of ours would be if they were joined together in peaceful intercourse among nations.

"Yes, there would be wars to be fought, but wars that we would win, that mankind would win. We would war against disease, and wipe it from the face of the earth. We would war against old age and hunger and poverty. We would war against the desert and turn it into a garden. Yes, and we would war against time and space itself, for we are on the threshold of that ancient dream of man—that he will go out among the stars and touch them with his own hands.

"We are not fools, we people, whatever land we live in; and I have never known people who were not in their great majority good and honest and hard-working. For a hundred generations, we have dreamed a great and beautiful dream—and now we are on the threshold of its realization. Of course, it is hard; but could anything so splendid, large, yes, so heroic, not be hard?

"We are people with children, and concerned for our children, for human life owes as great a debt to the future as it does to the past. Shall we tell our children that because the way toward peace was hard, we gave up the struggle and left them ashes for their inheritance?

"I think not. I think we will fight for peace, and I think we will win peace—because when we win peace, we win all that mankind ever longed for."

Rev. William Howard Melish,

Minister of the Church of the Holy Trinity, in Brooklyn, New York, co-chaired the ceremonies with Dr. Du Bois. In his opening remarks, Rev. Melish declared :

For us Americans it is important that a great segment of the contemporary world should continue to recognize the will to peace in our living American democratic tradition.

In this award to an American, there is surely an appeal to all of us who share this living tradition to make it more vocal and articulate in this day when it is submerged in Washington and in its place the spirit of antagonism and reliance on force is rampant.

In consequence, we meet today in this gathering as Americans who are burdened with a sense of responsibility towards a tradition that needs to be discharged afresh. May the

award of this Peace Prize to one of our fellows be a challenge to each and every one of us.

Paul Robeson, who was awarded the 1952 Stalin Peace Prize, paid tribute to Howard Fast and declared:

We know that there is an honest America—an America of the tens of millions dedicated to the principle of the rights of all to equality and freedom. Together with Howard Fast, we of progressive and liberal America shall do all in our power to help arouse these millions to find their voices once more. There are low rumblings—there must be and *soon*, a mighty bursting forth of our will to help impose the peace, an over-powering surge to insure that we and those to follow live in friendship with all peoples upon this potentially all-providing earth.

INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC INSPECTION—AND THE USSR

WRITING in the *Foreign Policy Bulletin* (the April 15 issue), Eugene Rabinowitch, Editor of the *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists*, gives the lie to the oft-repeated statement that the USSR has refused to admit international inspection as part of atomic energy control.

"This is incorrect," says Mr. Rabinowitch, "as the following excerpts from Soviet proposals show:

"There shall be established . . . an International Control Commission. [It] shall have its own machinery for inspection. . . . The personnel of the . . . Commission shall be selected on an international basis. The . . . Commission shall periodically [subsequently, the USSR agreed to make inspection 'continuous'] carry out inspection of facilities for the mining of atomic raw materials and the production of atomic materials and atomic energy. . . . The . . . Commission . . . shall have . . . access to all facilities for mining, production and stockpiling of atomic raw materials and atomic materials, and facilities for the exploitation of atomic energy.'

"The Soviet Union recommended 'affording the . . . representatives of the international control agency unimpeded . . . ingress, egress and access for the performance of their . . . duties, into, from, and within the territory of every participating nation.' It also agreed that 'the control organs . . . should . . . act on the basis of their own rules, which should provide for the adoption of decisions, in appropriate cases, by a majority vote.'"



This bag-piper, in embroidered vest, is from Wielkopolska, Western Poland

Young peasants dressed for a harvest festival in Szczecin, Western Poland



Women of Kurpie Region, famous for their crafts, from Wolka-Przekory village; women create (right)

Mother teaches daughter applique work. They live in Lowicz in Central Poland



Traditional Dress

are d of their colorful national
onal
me exquisitely decorated with
admired the world over.



for i the crafts. Woman embroidering (left) is
n cro (right) are from the village of Talary

ork. Highlanders from the Tatra Mountains
and supply the music at a regional dance



Elaborate head dress is part of this
Dozynki villager's festive costume

Villagers of Naglowice, Kielce Region,
gather around a book stall at a fair





A touch of beautiful and colorful pageantry marks this parade in Warsaw of art ensembles from various districts and regions of Poland



The outfit above is the typical traditional attire of married women in Opoczno, Lods District

Though 78, she still occupies herself with needle work. Her great grandchild proudly displays granny's crochet work

Democracy in Action In Czechoslovakia

by ELEANOR WHEELER

A VIVID example of democracy in action, of the role of the people in forming their own laws and their own administration, is provided by events that took place recently in the Czechoslovak Republic.

At the beginning of January, the Czechoslovak Government proposed laws making more precise the functions and methods of electing the national committees. These are the organs of government on the local, district and regional level. After publishing the proposed laws, the Government asked for nationwide discussions, urging that suggestions, amendments and additions to the projected laws be freely given.

For a month and a half meetings were held in factories, villages, collective farms, military units, offices, neighborhood groups and institutions of learning. For some six weeks Czechs and Slovaks of all walks of life spoke up on the proposed laws and made their suggestions.

By the time the Czechoslovak Na-

tional Assembly (legislature) was to convene its spring session, on March 2, the results of the discussions could be studied and the laws amended for presentation to the legislature.

The vast sweep of the discussions, and therefore their truly popular character, is indicated by figures on their participation that were presented to the National Assembly by the Premier, Viliam Siroky. More than two million people (more than one-sixth the population) attended such meetings, and 451,000 spoke. Some 60,000 changes or additions to the laws were proposed, 132,000 comments on the work of national committees were sent in, and some 110,000 other comments and suggestions were advanced, most of them dealing with ways of improving the administrative work of the national committees.

At this point it is relevant to ask what are these national committees which were being so thoroughly discussed? The answer depends upon the point of time in question.

National committees were elected in 1918 when the Czechs and Slovaks, influenced by the Revolution in Russia, wanted to take their government into their own hands and have really democratic local government.

ELEANOR WHEELER, an American, has been living and working in Czechoslovakia since 1947 when she and her husband and children left Berlin, where her husband was working in the U.S. military government.

The bourgeoisie, however, got the upper hand and soon suppressed the national committees and instituted a system of mayors completely under the thumb of the all-powerful district commissioners or hetmans.

Later, in 1941 and the years that followed, national committees were again set up as organs of national resistance during the war. Even at that time these bodies were not considered as temporary partisan groups by the Communist Party, but as the basis for genuinely democratic elected organs in a post-victory government.

The late President Klement Gottwald declared in 1944:

"The national committees, democratically elected and given the proper powers, can be not only the representatives of national unity and the national will, but also organs by means of which the broadest groups of people of town and country can participate in the administration of public affairs, and in this way make their will felt."

The democratic and mass character of the national committees in Czechoslovakia frightened the bourgeoisie after 1945. Therefore, in order to bring the country to the pre-Munich *status quo*, the reactionaries tried to discredit and weaken them. The February victories (in 1948, in which the attempted reactionary coup was defeated) guaranteed that the national committees would remain in the hands of the working people.

The Constitution of May 9, 1948, explicitly stated in Article 10: "The state power in local communities, districts and regions is vested in and carried into effect and the rights and liberties of the people are safeguarded by the national committees."

Since that time the national committees have been a school in admin-

istration for the workers, farmers and working intelligentsia who have served in them, and this includes huge numbers of volunteers as well as those elected as members. The national committees have brought the administration close to the people, reduced bureaucracy, helped raise the cultural level of the people and to bring town and country closer together. They have been instrumental in the advance of agriculture and aided significantly in the building of socialism.

But Czechoslovakia today is going through the exciting and surging period analogous to the pre-war period in the Soviet Union, when socialist industrialization is being pushed, the private sector being reduced to the minimum, and agriculture advancing to a large-scale, collectivized basis as the advance toward socialism is being made. Tasks have therefore sped ahead of the national committees.

Because of these new demands, the national committees had to be modified to fit the tasks and be made more efficient. That is why the Government drafted the proposed laws and submitted them for nationwide discussion.

In essence, the laws provide for even closer contact between elected and electorate. They require the elected to account to their administrative district on work accomplished and be under constant check by the electorate. They provide that the national committees may issue decrees in their sphere of jurisdiction, and under the principle of democratic centralism, these decrees are reviewed by the higher national committees, while the regional national committees are under review by the central government.

Under the proposed laws the legislative and executive functions of the national committees are to be made more distinct. Until now, elected members headed various departments—such as health, finance, education, etc.—and often had to make decisions which were in fact policy decisions. Sometimes paid civil service employees held these posts and made these decisions. Under the proposed laws, the heads of departments and the civil service employees may make administrative decisions, while policy decisions can be made only by the elected national committee acting collectively as a policy-making body. The presidium or council of the national committee will be elected from among the members of the committee and will function for the committee between its meetings; it is to be answerable to the committee and to the next higher national committee's presidium.

The vast scope of activity of the national committees is shown by the tasks listed in one of the paragraphs of the proposed law. The basic task is set forth as follows: "to build and strengthen the socialist order and attend in every way to the good of the people . . . to raise the cultural level of the people by a constant improvement in their living conditions. . . ."

Among specific tasks listed are: to organize, direct, plan and control the local economy, improve local manufactures and consumer services; to ensure full employment to the inhabitants in their jurisdiction; to maintain public facilities in good repair; to see to the health services; to develop agricultural production and strengthen the cooperative farms and help small farmers; to see that food supplies and trade networks are con-

stantly improved; to maintain cultural services; to encourage socialist competition and help carry out the state plan; to train citizens to respect socialist property and observe socialist discipline; to help in the fight for peace and the building of socialism.

It should be of interest to the American reader that when discussions turn on the contributions of a local or district national committee to the cultural life of the Czechs and Slovaks, the concept of culture is far broader than that of just art and literature.

The Protestant Church paper *Sparks of Constance* (the name refers to the saying that the sparks from John Huss' burning stake in Constance started flames of revolt in Bohemia against oppression by the clergy and Catholic nobility) commented in its February 3 issue:

Socialist culture includes much more (than art, literature and the theater), even to rather disdained fields which according to the esthetes did not belong in the concept of culture, for instance sports. We see how socialist culture is concerned, in a planned way, with such things as how people are living, what the education is in the schools, how people dress, the minor spheres such as variety shows and radio serials, then book publishing and art and science exhibitions, theater and films, sport and amateur art and dramatic groups, as well as housing construction. This broad and diverse sphere of activity has one aim, one common denominator—Man."

In other words, the cultural level of the people is to be raised, as the proposed law states, "by a constant improvement in their living conditions."

In raising the standard of living, great emphasis is naturally put on agricultural production. Thus, during a discussion of a particularly successful district national committee in South Bohemia, timely and completed agricultural deliveries were mentioned first as a case in point. Following that, there were mentioned the installation of a water system, the construction of a swimming pool, the setting up of a health center in the school and the electrification of a village.

Again, when the accomplishments of two North Bohemian cooperative farms were compared, the success of the better was attributed to the fact that the local national committee in Ostasov had helped the farm's governing board to draw up the plan for the year and had seen to it that the plan was carried out. The other national committee, in Janovice, had been inactive and had not stepped in to aid the less successful farm when proper agronomical principles were disregarded.

The discussions of the proposed laws were thorough and vigorous. It is interesting that hardly a single meeting went by without the people recalling how, under the old-time mayor, there was preoccupation with the eviction of tax delinquents or the withholding of relief from those whose politics were not liked. Speaker after speaker declared that though they were now striving to improve the work of the national committees, local government has come a long, long way since the old days.

The numerous suggestions made

covered every field of local governmental work. Some suggested that a time limit be established for answering complaints, others dealt with the number of members to be elected, others declared that the responsibility of the national committees for the success of cooperative farms should also be extended to state farms. There were suggestions that though the proposed laws delineate the responsibilities of national committee members, they do not deal with the rights of the members and these should be set forth. There were suggestions for lowering the age at which a citizen can hold office to 18, and others for raising it to 24.

Generally the comments showed that by and large the laws as proposed correspond to the needs of the people and that the people agreed with them. At the same time, they provided the Government commission on the laws and the Government itself with a wealth of material for re-examination and amendment of the laws.

These discussions, this vigorous democracy in action, has made the citizens of Czechoslovakia demand more of their national committees and, in turn, has awakened many committees to greater activity. Another significant result of the discussions was the closer contact between the people and the members of the national committees. It is believed that this is only the beginning of a continuous process of discussion, check-up and control of the people's government, more thorough-going than ever before.

ECCLES URGES RECOGNITION OF CHINA

ADDRESSING the National Association of University Presidents in Salt Lake City May 3, Marriner S. Eccles, former chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, urged U.S. recognition of People's China.

Bulgaria in World War II

Resistance and Liberation

by Commander EDGAR P. YOUNG, R.N., Retired

WRITING in England during World War II, Dr. Hubert Ripka, a well-known Czech publicist who later became a politician and, as often happens in such cases, a traitor to the truth, wrote a book *East and West*, in which he said:

Pre-war Central Europe, with its undemocratic semi-feudal, or semi- or wholly fascist regimes, is dead, and cannot be resurrected. The peoples of Central and Southeastern Europe, as a result of the torments, suffering, hardships and struggles through which they are passing, are themselves coming to realize that they must base their future on new, healthy regimes—free, popular, and democratic. The desire for far-reaching political and social changes of a fundamental character springs from their own experience. It would therefore be a cardinal error to imagine that these radical changes in Central and Southeastern Europe are, or will be, the result of the wishes,

pressure or intervention of the Soviet Union. They are simply the result of this war, and of the bloody experiences through which the peoples of that region are living. Radical reform of the political regimes and social structures of these countries will be the inevitable consequence of the wishes, the aspirations, the endeavors and the struggles of the peoples themselves, and their inclination to the Soviet Union or to any other allied Great Power will be greater or less according to the degree of sympathy or antipathy which they find in those countries for their own aims and interests.

Nothing more true could have been written about Bulgaria. The great majority of Bulgars wanted a radical change of regime: not back to anything tried before, such as an imitation of parliamentary democracy on Western lines, because they had already found it wanting; but on, to something new, in which many among them felt the Soviet Union could provide a helpful example.

It is important to recall that they were encouraged to think and to plan along such revolutionary lines by the radio broadcasts of that war period, not only from Moscow, but also from London and other Western stations.

The initiation of any organized

EDGAR P. YOUNG, Commander, Royal Navy (Retired), is Chairman and one of the founders of the British Society for Friendship with Bulgaria. Since the war he has visited that country, as well as other countries of Eastern Europe, several times. This is the third article of a series.

movement to bring about the desired change was complicated by the fact that, since the bloody suppression of the Agrarian regime in 1923, the country lacked any kind of democracy. Since 1934, the Constitution had been suspended and no political parties had been allowed to exist legally. Although disapproval of the quasi-fascist dictatorship was strong in almost all circles (as the writer found on his visit in 1936), the only organized opposition to it was the illegal Workers' (Communist) Party, working underground at the cost of great risk and sacrifice to its members. It was difficult, moreover, to rouse any large-scale feeling in favor of active resistance against the government and its policy of collaboration with Hitler and Mussolini, as long as the latter permitted the maintenance of non-belligerency.

Toward the end of 1940, however, as the result of the conclusion of a secret treaty between Bulgaria and Germany, German military and other agents began to infiltrate Bulgaria in increasing numbers, and the Workers' Party found it possible to move the industrial workers to strike action in protest against this incipient occupation. The Bulgarian Government's adherence to the Three-Power Pact, in March, 1941, followed by the passage through Bulgaria of German armies which attacked Yugoslavia and Greece, produced still wider popular reaction against the government.

The decisive turn came when Hitler attacked the Soviet Union on June 21, 1941. Almost every Bulgarian turned against Germany, and against their government's policy of collaboration with Germany for, as explained in an earlier article, few

Bulgars were forgetful that they owed their liberation from the Turks to Russia.

The Central Committee of the Workers' Party* met promptly to concert measures to prevent Bulgaria from being brought into the war against the Soviet Union, and to avail themselves of the favorable situation to create a mass resistance movement which would overthrow the fascist regime, establish democracy, and bring Bulgaria into the war on the side of the Allies.

Success in the achievement of these broad aims required united action of all the patriotic and democratic forces in Bulgaria, and necessitated, as the disaster of September 23, 1923 proved, the winning over of an important part of the armed forces.

In July, 1941, therefore, the leaders of the Workers' Party embarked on discussions with leading representatives of the other democratic parties—though these parties had ceased to exist as effective organizations—and of the Army, as the result of which the Fatherland Front was formed. This broad front comprised, in addition to the Workers' Party, which constituted its hard core, the Agrarian Union,** the Social-Democratic Party, and a group of progressive conservatives known as Zveno, which was able to win over

* Two surviving members of this Central Committee, Anton Yugov and Tsola Draggicheva (a woman), hold important Ministries in the present Government of Bulgaria.

** Some of the Agrarian leaders refused to participate in the Fatherland Front, and later emerged as open opponents. Others, such as Nikola Petkov (who changed his attitude later and was executed for high treason in 1947), gave their nominal support, though refusing to sacrifice their comfort and risk their skins by joining the partisans. They attempted to re-insure against the possibility of its failure by negotiating simultaneously with the fascist dictatorship for some kind of "palace revolution" whereby they might join with it to form a pseudo-democratic coalition.

many officers of the Army, including some of general's rank.

Early in 1942, the Fatherland Front announced a program upon which its varied elements had reached unanimous agreement, as follows:

- 1) To prevent Bulgaria's involvement in Hitler's war, as that would lead to fatal disaster for the Bulgarian people;
- 2) To withdraw immediately Bulgarian troops sent to crush the Yugoslav people's struggle against subjection to Germany and Italy;
- 3) To break off Bulgaria's alliance with Germany and the other Axis powers, and free the Bulgarian army from the grip of the Nazi Gestapo;
- 4) To discontinue export of food and raw materials to Germany and the other Axis powers, reserving them instead for the Bulgarian army and for the Bulgarian people at low prices;
- 5) To guarantee, in accordance with the Atlantic Charter, the national interests of the Bulgarian people, by the conclusion of agreements with the other Balkan countries, and by the pursuit of a policy of close friendship and cooperation with the Soviet Union, the United States, Britain, and other freedom-loving nations;
- 6) To liberate immediately all civilian and military prisoners prosecuted for struggle against fascism and against Hitlerite Germany;
- 7) To restore the political rights of the Bulgarian people, especially freedom of the press, of association, and of assembly, and to repeal all unconstitutional, anti-national and fascist legislation;
- 8) To rescue the Bulgarian army from the Monarcho-Fascist clique; to take decisive measures to ensure that it should not be used for anti-national purposes, and to guarantee to all those serving in it

their complete rights as citizens;

- 9) To disband all fascist organizations (as specified), and to render impotent and to punish those members guilty of murder and criminal brutality;
- 10) To deny the wealth and labor of Bulgaria to foreign usurpers, and to create conditions for the proper economic development of the country as a free and independent state;
- 11) To guarantee the livelihood of the Bulgarian people, securing full employment under good conditions of pay and social amenities for the working people of the towns and of the countryside;
- 12) To eradicate fascist reaction, racial hatred, and the debasement of the national honor of the Bulgarian people.

The mere publication of this program so frightened the Bulgarian Government that it dared not declare war on the Soviet Union, as Hitler desired, or send Bulgarian troops into action on any front at all.

And very soon, as the organization of the Fatherland Front developed, and as public opinion in its favor became stronger, it became possible to organize sabotage on a very large scale, in the factories, at the docks, on the railways, and elsewhere, which seriously impeded the sending of supplies to the Germans.

The fascist government reacted to this, as might be expected, with terror. This was countered to a large extent by the Fatherland Front's organization among its more militant elements of "Fighting Groups" to protect its more timid supporters and to encourage them to persist in their passive resistance and sabotage. These "Fighting Groups" effectively undermined the morale of the fascist organs of repression, especially dur-

ing the closing stages of the struggle, when they cleared the way for the ultimate successful uprising.

In the meanwhile, development of armed resistance by partisan groups was slow because of Bulgaria's isolated position, which made it difficult for the partisans to receive arms either from the Soviet Union or from the British in the Mediterranean. By the beginning of 1944, however, armed resistance had achieved proportions which commanded the interest of the British in Cairo, already in liaison with the Yugoslav and Greek resistance movements, and a mission was parachuted into Yugoslav Macedonia to establish liaison with the Bulgarian resistance movement.

It would appear, however, that this action was not altogether with friendly intention, for it was not followed by the dispatch of supplies and armaments, as had been the case—and this is, I think, most significant—with Tito's partisans in Yugoslavia. Major Frank Thompson, who was in charge of this British mission, made it clear in letters published after his death (he was captured and brutally put to death by the Bulgarian fascists in June, 1944) in a book entitled *There Is a Spirit in Europe . . .* that he often felt embarrassed at the way in which his chiefs in Cairo let him down by failing to send the material assistance which he himself felt they were entitled to expect.

When I was in Bulgaria in 1946, I spoke with a Bulgarian army officer who had been with Major Thompson. He said that when Thompson radioed Cairo begging for arms, the reply would come back: "Very sorry. You're just out of range for our aircraft. They can't get be-

yond 'X' and come back." Then the partisans would fight their way hopefully to "X," only to find that still there was nothing forthcoming.

It seems probable that it was by deliberate intention that the Bulgarian partisans were thus starved of supplies which would have enabled them to cooperate more effectively with the countries engaged in the war against Hitlerite Germany. It was probably hoped by the British that they would be wiped out before the end of the war, so that the Fatherland Front (and its program) could be disregarded by the "liberators" of Bulgaria.

Evidence pointing in this direction is accumulating, and is to be found, notably, in Sir Winston Churchill's own memoirs of World War II. It is no secret that Mr. Churchill (at that time) was thinking in terms of barring the influence of the USSR and those friendly to it from postwar Europe, even while the Soviet Union was playing the major part in winning World War II for his side, and even though he must have realized that, if he had his way, his own side's victory would be delayed, and might even be made less complete.

It is known that, in pursuit of this policy, he tried his best to persuade General Eisenhower, Supreme Allied Commander, to depart from the war plan agreed upon by President Roosevelt, Marshal Stalin and himself (Churchill), and to organize the opening of the long-delayed second front in the Balkans, instead of in France. Churchill was frustrated in this by General Eisenhower, with the firm backing of President Roosevelt, but he persisted, nevertheless, along the same line of policy.

Churchill seems to have thought

that he might get away with this as the result of the fact that Bulgaria had not declared war on the Soviet Union and was therefore technically at war only with the Western participants in the alliance against Hitler. This circumstance would, he hoped, make it possible for Bulgaria to capitulate, at an appropriate moment, to the Western powers alone, after which she would be "liberated" and occupied by British forces. When told that he must not divert British forces for this purpose, he tried to arrange for the "liberation" of Bulgaria to be effected by Turkey—of all countries—who was to become a belligerent ally against Hitler at the eleventh hour for that purpose.*

The "appropriate moment" for the enactment of this Churchillian farce seems to have come at the end of August, 1944, but events thereafter moved in an unexpected manner and too fast for the players.

On August 26, when the Soviet army had made it possible for the democratic forces in Rumania to overthrow the fascist distatorship and to bring their country over to the side of the democracies, the Bulgarian Government declared its "neutrality."

Four days later the Soviet Tass Agency published a statement that a declaration of "neutrality" by Bulgaria could not be accepted in the circumstances. On the following day, September 1, there was a

"palace revolution" in Sofia, as the result of which a new government, headed by the British stooge Muraviev, came to power.

But on September 5, the Soviet Union sent a note saying that since "neutrality" meant, in effect, giving positive help to the Germans, the Soviet Union must regard it as an attitude of hostility and would therefore forthwith break off diplomatic relations with Bulgaria and consider a state of war to exist between itself and Bulgaria. This was followed promptly by a Soviet advance across the Danube into Bulgaria.

Taking prompt advantage of this situation, the Bulgarian workers went on strike all over the country, and on September 9, the Fatherland Front, helped by an important part of the Bulgarian army, overthrew the pseudo-democratic government and established itself in power, with Kimon Georgiev, leader of the progressive conservative group Zveno, as Premier. This new government, in accordance with its published program, immediately negotiated an armistice with the Soviet Union, and shortly afterwards joined actively with the Soviet Union (and with the United States, Britain and the rest of the allied democracies) in the prosecution of the war against Germany.**

Britain's subsequent efforts to reverse this situation, even to the detriment of the war effort of the Allies, will be dealt with in a future article, as will also those of the United States which came slightly later. It may be useful, however, at this stage, since it is often argued

* What was intended to happen thereafter, to the Bulgarian partisans and to the Fatherland Front, was what happened a little while later in Greece. There Churchill arranged for the disarming of the Greek Resistance fighters (ELAS) who had liberated Greece before the British could get there, and who had welcomed the British with flowers and songs. Then Greek fascist troops were brought in from Egypt and Italy, and, with British military support, were able to destroy the new democratic regime.

** It may be noted that, despite this, Bulgaria was persistently refused recognition by the Western Powers as a "co-belligerent," as Italy had been recognized.

that such intervention was "justified"* by the fact that this was a "communist" government imposed on the people of Bulgaria against their will by the use of force (or by the threat of its use), to point out that it was far from being communist.

Bulgaria's Premier, as mentioned earlier, was a conservative, as were also the Ministers of Foreign Affairs and of War and four other Ministers, making seven in all, as compared with the six ministries, including those of Justice and of the Interior, held by the Communists. Of the remaining ministries, four were held by the Agrarian Union; two by the Social-Democratic Party; and two by Independents.

The Fatherland Front program, moreover, was rather less "revolutionary" than that publicly adopted in London by the emigre Government of Czechoslovakia, under President Benes, and was no more so than that for which the British Labor Party secured very large majority support from the British people in the general election of 1945.

One is forced, thus, to conclude that Churchill's hostility to the Fatherland Front was due to other causes, among which were its ultimate triumph despite his efforts to prevent it. What, doubtless, really riled him, however, was the fact that this new government of the Fatherland Front, very soon after it came into power, opened the first trial of war criminals** to be held outside of the Soviet Union. That this was precisely in accordance with the terms of the Yalta Agreement, in which "liberated" countries were adjured to root out fascism, was apparently not appreciated by Churchill.

What upset Churchill was the fact that, as remarked by the London liberal daily *News Chronicle* on February 3, 1945, "the trial seems to show that the new Bulgarian Government, in carrying out its armistice obligations and making a clear sweep of Bulgaria's political sewers, is really directing the country in an entirely new direction which gives hope for the future."

For among the sewer rats who met with their deserts were two of his favorite stooges, Muraviev, mentioned earlier, who was sentenced to life imprisonment, and Bagrianov, who was sentenced to death, in both cases for the crime of "having involved Bulgaria in the World War against the United Nations and committed various misdeeds connected with that policy."

Bulgaria's war criminals were given a fair trial—such as they had denied to their numerous victims—before People's Courts advised by honest democratic lawyers. The elimination of the war criminals from Bulgarian society was deplored only by those, chiefly outside of Bulgaria, who regretted the fact that it made it impossible for them to hope for any reversion to "the good old days" which had been such bad days for Bulgaria and for peace.

* The word "justified" is somewhat incongruous in this context, of course, because the Western democracies were fighting against Hitlerite Germany and her associates, who were fighting against communism, and had the communist USSR and all the world's communists as their allies.

** It was pointed out by a Bulgarian in a letter published in the *London Times* of February 8, 1945 that during the tenure of office of those condemned at this trial "29,480 Bulgarians were killed by the gendarmerie and police forces and execution squads, 9,000 of these being partisans, killed in battle or executed after capture, while the remainder were, for the most part, peaceful peasants and workers, executed, or to be more exact, murdered for "anti-State" activities."

We Want Peace for Europe

A Speech by EDOUARD DALADIER

An International Conference of Countries Affected by the European Defense Community, was convened by a number of French Members of Parliament and other prominent Frenchmen, in Paris in March. Among those participating were representatives from the six proposed EDC countries (France, Italy, the German Federal Republic [West Germany], Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg), and from Great Britain. Among the French political parties represented were Christian Democrats, Communists, French Radical Socialists, Gaulists and Social Democrats, all united in their opposition to EDC. The conference called for reopening the Four-Power Conference with a view to solving the problem of German reunification. It called for a system of collective security and disarmament for all European states which would respect the United Nations Charter and treaties now in force.

Edouard Daladier, who was the Premier of France twice, in 1933 and in 1938, spoke on March 21. A slight condensation of his speech follows:

WHY AM I FIGHTING EDC with such passion? I am not fighting it in the name of outmoded nationalism. I am fighting it because for me it represents the biggest obstacle to reconciliation of the peoples. The real crime of the men who are wanting to force EDC on us is that of making impossible that union of the peoples which is the basis on which everything must be built. If you do not build upon it you are building upon nothing at all.

I am putting forward my idea in a simple way, without wishing to offend anyone, nor to make any attack on the convictions of each of you. But when people come and tell you that Germany is going to be rearmed and in such a way as to make her the possible vanguard in a coalition

which a chance incident could plunge into war, we are in duty bound to fight such a danger.

They want to rearm this Germany, while beyond her rather vague frontiers many great countries are living according to other rules, with other forms of civilization. They are ignoring a country which occupies one-sixth of the earth's surface, refusing to recognize the sacrifice it has made. They have the pretention to settle the fate of Europe while treating with contempt the preoccupations of a people without whom the aggression of the Nazis could not have been checked. . . .

We are accused of being Communists, or crypto-Communists, or Progressives. I don't know what are the next labels they will invent. I have

never been a Communist, as Frenchmen know; I have even had with them a certain number of arguments. Of which enough said: all that belongs to the past.

But let us reflect. Read through the factual accounts of the Berlin Conference. Read through Mr. Molotov's speeches. You will discover first of all that, in several countries of Europe, especially my own, the precaution was taken to withhold from us the exact text of Mr. Molotov's proposals.

I am not going to carry out a critique of texts. . . . But I reason as the peasants in my own province do. And I say that when people organize a Conference they do so with the idea of ending with mutual concessions. Unfortunately this is something different. It is the pretention that I branded two years ago, the pretention to ask a people—I mean the Russian peoples, who had 17 million dead in the last war and thousands of whose towns and villages were destroyed—to ask them what? They were told at the Berlin Conference: "If you don't mind, gentlemen, elections to begin with, elections for a reunified Germany."

And where does this Germany stop? Where is the frontier of this reunified Germany to be? You won't even agree to discuss it and you ask Russia to agree to free elections, to agree to go back three hundred kilometers to the East without offering anything in exchange.

Where is the basis for compromise? Where is the basis for negotiation? There is none.

I am no admirer of old-style diplomacy. But when I see all that, I say to myself that perhaps after all it has its good points. With the method of carrying on with formulas strongly

resembling ultimatums in not very civil terms and no effort at compromise, we could be sure beforehand that the Berlin Conference would not get anywhere. . . .

What is it we want? We want peace for Europe; we want to restore German unity. Believe me, I say to the Germans listening, in our fight against EDC there is no survival in our minds of the old Westphalia treaties or of any kind of nationalism or militarism. We understood long ago that there can be no peace without reconciliation between the two peoples.

But we say to the Germans, in agreement with those whom we know, with those who have fought for the real Germany, that the Berlin Conference was sidetracked.

What are we to conclude from our debate? . . . Today's meeting must not be left without a morrow.

We should go from country to country and capital to capital to oppose a false doctrine which would engender a third world war. In every article of the Bonn agreements and of the Paris treaty [EDC] war is lying in wait. . . .

Not long ago in my country when we were fighting against the war in Indo-China we were, as today, called defeatists, traitors, Communists and other names I do not remember. Yet the drive of the French people has been such, that the very people who stood accusing us three months ago are looking today as if they wanted the peace we have been calling for for years.

And so it will be with EDC.

. . . Pardon me for having spoken with perhaps too much passion. But how can one avoid passion when he sees appearing in the soil of this ravaged Europe a new seed of death?

Shostakovich and Khachaturian

Discuss Soviet Music

In view of the widespread interest in the discussions in the Soviet Union on the creative arts, we are publishing the translation of articles by two prominent Soviet composers, Dmitri Shostakovich and Aram Khachaturian. Both articles appeared in the form of New Year's statements in the January issue of *Sovetskaya Muzika*, monthly publication of the Union of Soviet Composers, which we only recently received. Because of space, the articles are slightly condensed.

by DMITRI SHOSTAKOVICH

SOVIET composers face this year with a number of creative achievements. The past year has enriched the music theaters with several new historic operas: *Decembrists* by Yuri Shaporin; *Bogdan Khmel'nitsky*, by Dankevich; *Aikhyln*, a Bashkirian opera by Peiko; *At the Seashore*, a ballet by a young Lithuanian composer, Uzelunas. The Bolshoy Theater has prepared a new production of Sergei Prokofiev's ballet, *Tale of the Stone Flower*.

In symphonic and oratorio music there appeared such distinguished works as Salmanov's symphony, Chimakadze's and Chistiakov's cantatas, Balakashin's symphonic poem *Pavlik Morozov*, and Balanchivadze's concerto.

In chamber, instrumental and vocal music, I could point to Babadzhanian's Trio, Levitan's Seventh Quartet, and Sviridov's remarkable vocal poem *My Native Land*.

And the Seventh Plenum of the

Union of Soviet Composers acquainted us with a number of new mass songs.

Nevertheless all that has been done in the past year by no means satisfies the ever-growing esthetic demands of the Soviet people.

Our young composers have not worked with sufficient intensity. All roads are open to them, they are given every opportunity for ceaseless creative search and for the mastery of their craft. But some, after their first success, have been satisfied to rest on their achievement. This same approach can be levelled at some of the masters of the older generation who like to coast along without deep creative involvement or true intensive feeling. It is not justifiable for a composer to write one or two songs a year and then consider his mission accomplished. Creative passivity inevitably leads to a diminution of talent and dilettantism.

Let us recall how the classical composers worked. The great Tchaikovsky, for example, often stressed that the artist must know how to "tune himself up creatively" and work unceasingly.

"Sometimes inspiration slips away, is illusive," Tchaikovsky said. "But I consider it the duty of an artist never to give in, for laziness is a very strong force in people. . . . Inspiration is the kind of guest that doesn't like to visit the lazy. It only comes to those who summon it. It is necessary, it is of the utmost importance to be the master of one's self in order to avoid falling prey to dilletantism."

Examples of high professionalism in art were demonstrated to us by the great Soviet composers Prokofiev and Myaskovsky who always worked with the greatest creative intensity. Having created many works in various genres, they continued their intensive work to the last days of their lives. Gliere, the greatest master of the older generation of Soviet composers, is an indefatigable worker. When he is about to complete one work he already commences another, unwaveringly fulfilling his vast "production plan."

This is precisely the way we must all work, both composers of the older generation, and our talented youth.

New fine operas, ballets, symphonies, oratorios, instrumental works, choral music and songs must resound in 1954. We want to hear new exciting songs, witty and bright light music.

Let us hope that this year will bring improvement in the work of the Union of Soviet Composers, which still suffers from the evils of red tape. Unnecessary procedural wrangling which flourishes in the

Union frequently serves as a substitute for vital theoretical discussion around interesting if controversial works. Theoretical discussion must be courageously brought out in the pages of our magazine (*Soviet Music*), which should become the forerunner and the inspirer of such exchange; it must become an arena for the lively battle of opinions.

I find a recent article in *Pravda*, on the production of *Storm* at the Moscow Drama Theater, exceedingly important. It ardently supports the right of an artist to dare in his search for the new.

"One of the most terrible evils for art," the article declares, "is leveling, trimming everything according to one pattern, even if it is the best pattern. Such approach to creative work obliterates all individuality, gives rise to clichés, imitations, deters the development of creative thought, deprives art of the joy of searching."

"Socialist realism opens up unparalleled scope for the artist's concepts, gives the greatest freedom for the expression of creative individuality, for the development of the most varied genres, directions and styles. That is why it is so important sometimes to support an artist in his daring, to examine closer his creative 'handwriting' and, judging the faults and the merits of a certain artistic solution, to consider the right of the artist to independence, courage and daring."*

These profound words cannot go unnoticed even in the Union of Soviet Composers. In the solution of any creative task the major factors that determine its success are cor-

* *Pravda*, November 27, 1953.

rect ideological direction, talent, and mastery of technique. This must not be lost sight of in evaluating and analyzing any creative phenomenon. In our discussions, the most weighty argument should be, first and foremost, the work's high ideological artistic quality, and not the adherence of its composer to this or that creative trend.

It seems to me that the Union must not be concerned with "protecting" our composers from their search for the new, from following their own independent, untrodden paths. We should be afraid not of daring creative search, but of self-

satisfied gliding on the surface, dull uniformity and cliches.

The attempt to smooth out all sharp corners in art represents one of the peculiar expressions of the false theory of "conflictlessness." The sooner we rid ourselves of this tendency to standardize, the better it will be for the development of Soviet art.

I ardently believe in the glorious future of Soviet music. It is strong in vivid talents, great realistic traditions, and close ties with the people and their aspirations and interests. Before us, Soviet composers, a vast field of activity is open.

by ARAM KHACHATURIAN

IT IS NATURAL for us musicians to be deeply concerned with the problems of the development of Soviet music, especially the development of opera.

I have frequent contact with our listeners, people of the most varied professions who are simply lovers of music, and I am always stirred by the realization of how deeply involved they are with the fate of our art. In their comments they persistently raise the question: Where is our new Soviet opera which sings of our people, of the great revolutionary struggle for the reconstruction of life on this earth, which sings the glory of a new hero—the man of the epoch of the construction of communism? This is a fair question, and I must confess it isn't easy or simple to answer.

It would be quite wrong to say that the creation of Soviet opera has not made any advances. If we glance back, we will convince ourselves

that during the last twenty years quite a great deal has been accomplished, that the development of Soviet opera, overcoming many difficulties, unwaveringly moves ahead.

When, eventually, the history of Soviet music is written, there, undoubtedly, will be found proper evaluation of the talented works of Dzerzhinsky, especially his opera *Quiet Don*, which retains its artistic significance, and there will be noted as significant achievements of our art such operas as Khrennikov's *In the Storm*, Kabalevsky's *Taras Family*, Kappa's *Singer of Freedom*, Meitus' *The Young Guard*. In these works, with creative daring and artistic conviction, the composers solve certain complex problems in the creation of contemporary opera and the creation of the image of the hero of our times.

It seems to me that the difficulties experienced by our operatic art can partially be explained by the condi-

tions under which the Soviet opera began to emerge. I have in mind the fact that the line of succession in the development of Russian opera was broken and there was a hiatus of nearly a quarter of a century between the death of Rimsky-Korsakov and the appearance of *The Quiet Don*. In symphonic and chamber music there was no comparable interruption. The lofty traditions of the Russian symphony school of the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century, as represented by Tchaikovsky, Rimsky-Korsakov, Glazounov, Taneev, Scriabin, and Rachmaninov, were at once embraced and continued by our older colleagues and teachers, Gliere, Vasilenko, Miaskovsky and Prokofiev.

Returning to the contemporary stage in the development of Soviet opera, I am especially happy to note the outstanding success of Y. Shaporin and K. Dankevich, who, in their *Decembrists* and *Bogdan Khmel'nitsky*, created ideologically significant works based on historical subjects.

Shaporin's *Decembrists*, performed by our best opera theaters, the Moscow Bolshoy Theater and the Leningrad Kirov Theatre, is undoubtedly a major event in Soviet music. Despite certain objections which I might have to individual sections, I cannot but rejoice deeply over Shaporin's great creative victory in creating a vivid engrossing work of major scope and lofty, artistic level. It is possible that some of our colleagues are correct in considering that the composer did not succeed in developing completely the characters of the individual Decembrists. But there is no doubt that Shaporin fully succeeded in depicting, with the power of artistic truth, the undaunted spirit of the Decem-

brists as a strongly welded, single-minded group of fighters for a just cause.

The music of this opera has a number of outstanding virtues, among them lively, natural melodiousness; warmth and sincerity of the musical characterizations; and true poetic pathos.

I have not yet had the opportunity of hearing Dankevich's *Bogdan Khmel'nitsky* in its new version. In justly criticizing its old treatment, the Soviet public pointed out that there was much to indicate that the young composer and his librettists Vasilevskaya and Korneichuk, would create a new, historically truthful and esthetically valid version of the opera.

Judging by the response to the new version of *Bogdan Khmel'nitsky* at the Shevchenko Theater of Opera and Ballet in Kiev, the authors have justified these expectations. From the bottom of my heart I want to congratulate Dankevich, Vasilevskaya and Korneichuk, who were able to draw an important lesson from the severe but just criticism and to create a work of art that is an asset to our opera, especially during the days of the great peoples' celebration that marks a significant historic date, the 300th anniversary of the union of the Russian and Ukrainian peoples.

I see the task of creating Soviet opera as a mighty river into which flow ever new rivulets. It is not a "campaign" for two or three years; it is a great and complex task demanding the utmost application of creative forces, where mistakes and failures are inevitable, but where the stream resolutely and successfully advances and grows. I am deeply convinced that in 1954 this

stream will be enriched by new rivulets, and that our operatic art will advance with great strides.

The Soviet audience has great hopes for new operas that are now being created by Kabalevsky (*Nikita Vershinin*), Khrennikov (*Mother*), Muradelli (*October*), Molchanov (*Dawn*), and by the composers of our brother republics. If Kabalevsky succeeds in creating a convincing and strong character of a positive hero, there will be no ground for doubting the success of his future opera for he is a truly talented artist and a thoughtful and exacting craftsman possessing considerable experience in the operatic genre.

Many exciting and inspiring pages of Khrennikov's opera, *In the Storm*, convince us that he will produce a fine realistic opera of great emotional force. Muradelli's great gift for melody, his mastery of symphonic principles and understanding of the laws of musical dramaturgy, allow us to hope that he will successfully complete his new opera *October*. I have heard some excerpts from Molchanov's new opera and judging by them, the new work of this young composer promises to be more significant and vivid than his previous work.

We expect much from our gifted young composers. I wish them new creative achievements and urge them never to forget the necessity of fortifying their first successes, not to rest upon their laurels, but to work persistently, to study the life around them thoroughly, and to perfect their craft. Without this, success cannot be permanent and lasting.

I attach great importance to those new refreshing principles in the approach to art which are determined by the ever-developing life of Soviet society. I have in mind the natural

desire of the Soviet audience for original works of profound thought and emotion, to feel in each work the composer's own unique contributions. Socialist realism in art cannot tolerate leveling, dull uniformity and clichés. It presupposes the free expression of creative individuals who, in different ways, but always truthfully and excitingly, solve great artistic tasks. Let there be in our family of composers rich and varied creative personalities. And let them freely and daringly compete in the creation of the art of our day.

As an Armenian composer I am concerned with vital problems in the development of Soviet Armenian music.

In recent years an outstanding group of young composers has emerged in Soviet Armenia—for example, such highly gifted musicians as Arutunian and Badazharian, whose best works have received wide recognition. Then there are the gifted young composers Mirzhoian, Oganessian, Khachatrian, and others who have created numerous interesting works in various genres. This is very gratifying. At the same time, I must make certain criticisms of the young Armenian composers. They are not sufficiently active, they do not study the life around them deeply enough. Frequently the freshness of their work is due, not so much to their own conception as to the originality and beauty of the folk material that they draw upon (in passing, I should say that this applies to the composers of other national republics as well). They do not always set themselves truly creative tasks, nor fully realize their responsibility to the people.

The Armenian people have an ancient musical culture. The Armenian

folk song is an inexhaustible well-spring for the enrichment of the composer's art. The composer who thoughtfully listens to the native songs is able to penetrate into the very depths of his people's souls, to fathom the simple beauty of folk ways and the lofty flight of the people's spirit.

Is it necessary again to stress the importance of profound study of folk music? It is most useful for each self-respecting composer to work systematically on the harmonization of folk melodies in order to develop his own attitude toward folk songs. I am referring not to complex treatment, but specifically to harmonization. As splendid examples of this we can cite the remarkable collections of folk songs by Balakirev, Rimsky-Korsakov, Liadov and Komitas.

We Armenian composers are faced with the tremendous task of creating a school of Armenian musical composition. We have all the possibilities for it, supplied by our wonderful Soviet reality. This is an historic task, and it can only be solved by the mutual and friendly, and I stress friendly, efforts of the entire composers' collective.

In calling upon the young Armenian composers for more active and friendly creative effort, I cannot help remembering the outstanding composers of the older generation. Among them there are very interesting artists who have their own creative style. They are Aro Stepanian, Yegiazarian and Khodzha-Einatov.

I am especially concerned with the creative fate of Stepanian, composer of several operas and symphonies and a number of chamber, instrumental and vocal works marked

by undoubted talent and mastery. Some Armenian musicians, it seems to me, feel as though Stepanian has already spoken his piece. Respecting him for his past achievements, they are not inclined to expect any new brilliant work from him.

I am deeply convinced that this is a mistaken point of view which hinders the development of a serious artist. Stepanian, who has raised Armenian vocal-instrumental music to new heights, who has set forth a number of new problems in the area of the national musical language, is a demanding craftsman who can contribute a great deal to the native art. He is full of creative force and his talent "has not a single grey hair."

I want to wish Aro Stepanian, my old friend and comrade in the struggle for the development of Armenian Soviet music, new and ever new creative successes. At the same time, I hope that he may be able to overcome a certain detachment, to emerge from his study into the vastness of life and to listen more closely to what the people of today are thinking and singing. I have deep confidence that we will have new creative achievements from Stepanian.

In conclusion I would like to express still another wish: that we produce serious works dealing with the problems of the new Armenian music, works of an esthetic nature analyzing the writings of Armenian composers that would sum up the experience gained in the development of native socialist musical culture. Until now, little work of this nature has been done. Such work would direct us toward new creative search, and open for us a clear perspective for future development.

The Children Pay

A review by ELIZABETH MOOS

THE GAME OF DEATH: Effects of the Cold War on Our Children, by Albert E. Kahn, Published by Cameron & Kahn, New York, 1935, 256 pp., \$3.00.

AS THE FOUL miasma of cold war spreads over the land penetrating every aspect of our lives insidiously, we are in danger of becoming callous, unaware of what is happening around us. In his book *The Game of Death* Albert Kahn has assembled an impressive array of documented material which presents an over-all picture of what is being done to the children in the United States today. "The children," he writes in the foreword, "are paying most heavily for the cold war."

The picture he presents is a frightening one, painful, unrelieved. This is not a book to be read through at a sitting but rather a source book for peace fighters. It is an invaluable mine of information, full of useful quotations and data, with many poignant "case histories." It would be a hardened man or woman who could read the book and not be moved to anger and determination to act to protect our children from wars hot or cold!

We may know in general that our children are deprived of a proper education, that money needed for schools and teachers' salaries is diverted to war, that teachers are being hounded and persecuted and that subject matter and quality of teaching is adversely affected by the war hysteria. We note items in the press now and then like the story of the children in the Carolina schools who faint at their desks from hunger now that the cut in federal funds deprives them of schools lunches.

Here these tragic facts are gathered together and placed in the perspective of war.

Some of the problems discussed are of long standing, like the treatment of the Indian children, the Negro children and the children of migratory workers. They are presented under the fitting title the "Infamy of the Nation" and it is well to have the horrifying facts assembled.

Other situations are more directly an outgrowth of the war atmosphere and the war planning. Tragic as the story of physical and intellectual deprivation of the children is, the moral evils are worse and more far-reaching.

The cynical use of atom bomb drills to frighten children, the spate of brutality, cruelty and prejudice loosened upon our young through the "comics" the TV radio and movies is part of the planned indoctrination for killing. "Niagara of Horror" the author calls it and his documentation, with photostats, should be conclusive even for the "experts" who try to rationalize the cult of violence.

Sensational stories of delinquency and narcotic addicts reach us in the press. Here in *The Game of Death* the human tragedies are poignantly described and, even more necessary, the little realized truth about the almost complete lack of proper facilities for the care and treatment of young "criminals" or "addicts." Of course the cold war plays its part here too not only in the psychological field. Funds required for decent care are going to making bombs.

Another aspect of this tragedy of our children that is too little realized is described in moving terms in the

TWO RECENT NOVELS FROM THE USSR

HEART AND SOUL

by Elizar Maltsev

Dramatic story of young people on a collective farm in Siberia during and after World War II.

In portraying the life, work and problems of Grunya, and her husband, Rodion, the author reveals the qualities that typify the Soviet citizen today, and probes into the basic problems of marital relations.

\$1.75

510 pages

ALITET GOES TO THE HILLS

by Tikhon Syomushkin

Taking his characters from real life, Syomushkin, who lived and worked with the Chukchki people in the Arctic for many years, weaves an unusual and fascinating tale of how a few Soviet pioneers helped bring a new life to the great but backward Chukotsk Peninsula. The setting is in the early 1920's.

\$1.75

595 pages

Order Now—Supply Limited

NEW WORLD REVIEW

23 West 26th St., New York 10

I am enclosing \$_____ for

- ☐ Heart and Soul
☐ Alitet Goes to the Hills

Name

Address

City

Zone State

chapter called "Vengeance on the Young." Children hounded by the FBI, even to nursery school, because of the political ideas of their parents, children torn from their mothers—as in the case of Jean Field, children questioned and followed, all this is a part of the war on the young.

The book is almost unrelieved tragedy. Perhaps this is as it should be so that the impact will be shocking and awakening; perhaps it would have been well to include more material about what is being done to alleviate the evils, about the work of the people who are struggling to bring the truth to the people and unite them for peace. It is in any event a book to be widely used, distributed through the country. It is already a basis for discussion among parents and teachers, trade unions and clubs. If parents everywhere could but know what is being done to their children in the name of defending them, if they could but read the story of the impact of the cold war and learn how their own children are being conditioned—as the Hitler Jugend were conditioned—to kill, to have a contempt for humanity and culture they would surely be aroused and angered, angered enough perhaps to unite for action on the common ground of the well-being of the children. For the children are the bond around which the peace fighters from right to left can unite. *The Game of Death* is therefore a valuable contribution, a powerful weapon in this struggle for the children.

Have you joined the NWR Sustaining Fund? You can help us by sending in your monthly pledge today.

NWR SAMPLES FOR FREE DISTRIBUTION

We have a limited number of copies of recent issues of New World Review for free distribution. Your friends and acquaintances might like to see a copy. Just let us know how many you can use; we shall be happy to send them along.

NEW WORLD REVIEW



VACATION PLUS™

at World Fellowship

In White Mts. (Conway) New Hampshire. For ALL faiths, races, colors, convictions.

Season Opens June 9th
SWIMMING, FISHING, BOATING,
FOLK-DANCING, EXCURSIONS

Speakers, discussions - optional
Children's program relieves parents.
Generous family-style meals.
Room and board \$4 to \$7 daily.

WORLD FELLOWSHIP
Conway, New Hampshire

EAST HOOK

Where you meet people you like

SWIMMING BOATING FISHING
HIKING IN BEAUTIFUL COUNTRY
FOR CHILDREN, TOO

Special rates for NWR readers

LOUIS LERMAN, R.D. 2
Hopewell Junction, N. Y.
Beacon 9-4156

NEW SOVIET FILMS

All in Spectacular Sovcolor

THE INSPECTOR
GENERAL

ATTACK FROM THE SEA

RIMSKY-KORSAKOV

SADKO

Coming

STARS OF THE RUSSIAN

BALLET

ALEKO

Artkino Pictures, Inc.

723 SEVENTH AVE., NEW YORK 19
Telephone: Circle 5-6570

Basic Pamphlet on Current Issues No. 8

by CORLISS LAMONT

The Congressional Inquisition

25 evils perpetrated by the McCarthy, Jenner and Velde Committees

Dr. Corliss Lamont presents twenty-five points showing how Congressional investigating committees violate the Constitution and Bill of Rights, break the rules of Congress, reverse the legal concepts of American justice and divert the attention of the people from vital national and international problems. He asserts that the uncontrolled behavior of the committees has convincingly demonstrated that civil liberties are indivisible.

Other BASIC PAMPHLETS

- No. 3 The Humanist Tradition
- No. 4 Effects of American Foreign Policy
- No. 5 Back to the Bill of Rights
- No. 6 The Myth of Soviet Aggression
- No. 7 Challenge to McCarthy

5c per copy from BASIC PAMPHLETS, Box 42, Cathedral Station, New York 25

Bulk prices: 12 copies—50s, 30 copies—\$1.00, 100 copies—\$2.75

NEGOTIATIONS

THE WAY TO PEACE

THE BERLIN CONFERENCE
AND WHAT IT MEANS TO YOU

by JESSICA SMITH

Did the press give you clear coverage of the Berlin Conference? The exact proposals offered? The concessions made by both sides? What the people of Europe were saying?

This pamphlet will fill the gap, for it contains a full report and evaluation of the proposals, discussions and decisions of the four powers on the main issues affecting world peace.

The proceedings—opening the way to further conferences—deeply concern you, for they affect the welfare of our country, our children, and the peace of the world.

Here are facts you need to know if you are to play your part in the determination of American foreign policy.

25¢ a copy

Get extra copies for your friends

5 for \$1

NEW WORLD REVIEW • 23 W. 26th St. • NYC 10

Please send me copies of "Negotiations: The Way to Peace," by Jessica Smith, for which I enclose \$.....

Name

Address

City Zone.....State.....