

SOCIAL SCIENCES

NEW WORLD

SEPTEMBER

1954

20¢

Review

PUBLIC LIBRARY

SEP 7 1954

DETROIT



GENEVA—AND AFTER
China's New Constitution

NEW WORLD *Review*

SEPTEMBER

1954

Geneva—And After <i>Jessica Smith</i>	3
China's New Constitution <i>Israel Epstein</i>	10
Children in Bulgaria, <i>photos</i>	16
Bulgaria's Economic Advance <i>Edgar P. Young</i>	18
American-Soviet Friend- ship Council Presents Its Case	22
U.S. Boy Is Mining Apprentice in Czechoslovakia <i>Eleanor Wheeler</i>	25
Dressing Up History for Rhee, <i>review</i> <i>Laurence Todd</i>	28
Literary Contacts—East and West, <i>review</i> <i>Margaret Schlauch</i>	29

OUR COVER: *A Bulgarian mother and child parade during a holiday demonstration in the city of Sofia.*

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. 9, September, 1954. Re-entered 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.

209

Can We Count On You?

LAST MONTH we sent a number of our readers an emergency appeal for funds. Their speedy and generous response enabled us to solve our immediate emergency.

Much as we dislike issuing these urgent appeals for funds, we were forced to make that one to guarantee our continued publication throughout the summer and into the fall.

We would like to eliminate these constant appeals to you even though the need for your support is a continuous one because of the enormous costs of present-day publishing.

One way to achieve this would be for each of our readers to pledge to send us a regular contribution each month. Many of our readers already do this. How about you?

Won't you please fill out the form below and let us know how much we can count on from you each month?

NEW WORLD REVIEW

23 West 26th St., New York 10

I am enclosing \$..... as a contribution and I pledge to send you \$..... each month.

Name.....

Address.....

City.....

Zone.....State.....

GENEVA—AND AFTER

by JESSICA SMITH

DEEP RELIEF fills the hearts of all who love peace and humanity now that a truce has been achieved in Indo-China as well as Korea, ending the main hot wars that have brought such agony to millions of people in the post-war years.

This mighty demonstration of the triumph of the principle of negotiations over armed force, along with the growing recognition in the most diverse circles that peaceful co-existence among the nations is the only guarantee against world atomic war, has created new opportunities to work for the further easing of international tensions.

For no one can now sit back and feel that the task of insuring peace is accomplished. Stable peace has not yet come to Korea or Indo-China, and while the way is open, there are forces at work attempting to block a final settlement, and to stir up new wars in Asia. In Africa, in the Middle East and in Latin America bloodshed and violence that can lead to larger wars continue. Over Europe looms the threat of a re-armed Western Germany. The warmakers continue their mad drive for new aggressive military pacts and blocs, new military bases, and a stepped up

race in armaments and atomic weapons.

The Lessons of Geneva

We must study well the lessons of Geneva, and what they demonstrated with regard to the possibilities of East-West agreement on all outstanding issues.

Many factors entered into the success of Geneva. At the top of the list we should place the peace efforts of the peoples of the world, bringing pressure on their own governments to help bring about a settlement and expressed through the World Peace Council which today represents a mighty united force of the most varied political views with which every country in the world must reckon in its policies. In this body of world public opinion, the voice of the American people, though not yet as powerful as it must become, had its place. The peace will of the American people was not reflected in the action of our Government in remaining aloof from the truce agreement at Geneva, but it did play a decisive part in staying the plans for direct U.S. military intervention in Indo-China, and the efforts first to prevent and then to destroy the conference.

To the influence of the world Peace Council must now be added that of the important group of 150 leading personalities of diverse political viewpoints from 30 countries who met in Stockholm June 19-23 for an exchange of views on all questions connected with the easing of international tensions, and will extend the work there begun to help pave the way for peaceful co-existence through the rejection of force in international affairs and the settlement of all conflicts by negotiation.

A prime factor in the success of the Geneva Conference was the role of the Soviet Union. That the conference took place at all was due to the insistence of the Soviet Union at Berlin that there must be a meeting on Far Eastern questions with the participation of the Chinese People's Republic. The successful conclusion of the conference was due in great part to the statesmanship of Soviet Foreign minister Molotov and Chinese Premier and Foreign Minister Chou En-lai. Anthony Eden, who himself played a conciliatory role at Geneva, paid tribute in the House of Commons to Mr. Molotov's contribution to the success of the conference. Hailing the cease-fire agreement at the concluding session on July 21, Mr. Molotov expressed the attitude of his government in these words:

The Geneva Conference has shown that the path of negotiations between interested states can under definite conditions produce results corresponding to the interests of the people, to the requirements of strengthening universal peace. The results of the Geneva Conference have confirmed the correctness of the principle upheld in the foreign policy of the Soviet Union that there are no disputed questions in the present-day international situation which

could not be settled through negotiations and agreements designed to strengthen peace.

Great credit is due to the new French Premier, Pierre Mendes-France, for heeding the will of the French people, and for the determined way he went about fulfilling his pledge to negotiate a truce within a month after his election.

Negotiations were carried on in the spirit of give and take, with neither side demanding the surrender of the other, the dignity of both maintained, and both sides making the compromises without which no negotiations are possible.

Here particular note should be made of the significance of the sacrifices and concessions that were made by the Viet-Minh side, through their representative, Pham van Dong, Foreign Minister of the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam. How much blood they have shed in the almost eight years of the war to free their country from colonial domination and return it to its own people! With the fall of Dienbienphu, advances in the Red River Delta and further military victories in sight, they might have reckoned on winning control of the whole of Viet Nam. But they put the interests of the world struggle for peace above their own national interests, did not take advantage of their strong military position to set a higher price for a cease-fire than could have been accepted by the other side, made initial reasonable proposals on which negotiations could proceed, and the further concessions necessary for the success of the negotiations. In all of this they were aided and supported by the Soviet and Chinese delegations.

The final agreement reached on July 21, with the participation of all

the nations represented at Geneva except the United States, provided for the ending of hostilities in all three Associated States of Indo-China—Cambodia, Laos and Viet Nam. The signatories of the agreement pledged "to respect the sovereignty, the independence, the unity and the territorial integrity of the above-mentioned states and to refrain from any interference in their internal affairs."

All three states are to be neutralized, agreeing not to join any military alliances nor to request foreign military aid except in self-defense. Liberation troops are to be withdrawn in Laos and Cambodia except in two small areas, and their present French-sponsored governments are to be recognized, pending the holding of new elections in 1955. The French government will withdraw its troops from all three states except in cases of agreement that a certain number will remain in specified places for a specified time.

In the main agreement, applying to Viet Nam, a temporary demarcation line was agreed on at the 17th Parallel, as a result of concessions by both sides, with an agreement on evacuation of any persons on either side preferring to go to the other zone.

Free elections are to be held in Viet Nam in 1956. The agreement to postpone the elections for two years, with all the risks involved of the maneuvers that might be carried on by the reactionary forces in that period, represents one of the greatest concessions made by the Viet Minh representatives. It is universally recognized that the support for Ho Chi Minh throughout the country is so great that immediate elections would undoubtedly result in an overwhelming victory for his regime.

The international commission to supervise the armistice is to be made up of Canada and Poland, with India as chairman. In this connection special mention must be made of the important role in helping to bring about the armistice played by India, though not a participant at Geneva; the resolution passed by the Colombo powers urging a peaceful solution in Indo-China and self-determination for Asia; and the agreement reached on the eve of the agreement by Premier Chou En-lai and Premier Nehru on mutual respect, non-aggression, non-interference in each other's internal affairs and peaceful co-existence with each other and the rest of the world, followed by a similar declaration between Chou En-lai and Premier U Nu of Burma.

It is a matter of the deepest regret that our government, though finally agreeing to send Under-Secretary of State Walter Bedell Smith back to the final sessions after his previous withdrawal from the conference, failed to associate itself with this great step forward toward lasting peace, that so many voices were raised in Washington deploring the end of the fighting instead of joining in the world-wide rejoicing, and that the whole policy of the Administration has been concentrated on intensifying the warlike policies that have so consistently failed.

In a statement published in *Pravda* on July 23, the Soviet Government hailed the settlement at Geneva both for its immediate effect in restoring peace in Indo-China and in opening the way for further peaceful solutions. It called for a renewal of efforts to reach agreements on the Korean problem, and emphasized the need for recognition of the importance of the participation of the Chi-

nese People's Republic in the solution of international problems.

European Security or German Rearmament?

On July 24 the Soviet Government sent notes to the Governments of the United States, Great Britain and France renewing its March 31 proposals on the question of collective security in Europe, which had previously been rejected by the Western Governments.

The note points out that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, as at present constituted, can only serve aggressive purposes, as it fails to make any guarantees against the revival of German militarism, while the efforts to create a European Defense Community specifically point toward a resurgence of German militarism. The Soviet Government calls attention to its previous suggestion that it would be willing to consider membership in NATO under conditions that would ensure its fully defensive character and eliminate the plans to rearm Germany.

The Soviet note, reaffirming its belief in the possibility of peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems, reiterates its proposal for "a general European treaty on collective security in Europe." This treaty would provide for the adherence of all European states, regardless of their social systems. Pending the establishment of a united Germany, both the German Federal Republic and the German Democratic Republic could belong. The adherence of the United States had been proposed in the Soviet note of March 31, to meet the objections raised at the Berlin Conference against its exclusion.

The Soviet Government declared

that the replacement of the present system of two hostile blocs by such a united system would in itself create more favorable conditions for German unification, along with the Soviet proposal for the withdrawal of all occupation troops from Germany and limitation of police forces.

The note also emphasized the readiness of the Soviet Government to negotiate an international agreement on prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons and reduction of armaments and armed forces and an interim pledge by all governments concerned not to use atomic and hydrogen weapons.

The Soviet Government suggested the addition of a new provision to the treaty for economic cooperation, under which the parties to the treaty would undertake measures for developing trade.

The note made clear that the Soviet Government had no inflexible ideas regarding the provisions of the treaty. It suggested that a conference be called within the next few months to consider other proposals as well as their own and that it be attended by all European countries wishing to take part as well as the United States, with the Chinese People's Republic present as an observer.

On August 5 the Soviet Government followed up this note with a proposal for a preliminary meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the United States, the USSR, Great Britain and France, to consider the desirability of such a conference and to continue examination of the German question.

The United States Administration lost no time in expressing its intention to reject this new peace move of the Soviet Union.

At this writing, it appears that

French Premier Mendes-France is seeking a formula for a conciliatory reply to Moscow which would hold the door open to agreement on German unification as a possible way to avoid the rearmament of Western Germany under EDC.

The British attitude is not yet clear. While credit is due to the British Government for withstanding U.S. pressure to extend instead of ending the war in Indo-China, she is still playing a dangerous role in her continued support of the rearmament of Germany through EDC or some other means, and in postponing the issue of China's entry into the United Nations.

The Soviet proposals have had a very positive reception throughout Europe. Even before the USSR July 24 note renewing this proposal, the influential Paris paper *Le Monde* reflected French public opinion in an editorial advocating a new four-power conference on Germany, which noted that "Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov's plan for a European collective security system could be the basis for new discussions." On August 11, a group of non-Communist French deputies issued a declaration calling for further efforts for peaceful co-existence between East and West before going ahead with German rearmament. On August 12, Vincent Auriol, former President of the Republic, came out flatly against German rearmament in an article in *France Soir* declaring that "Free and peaceful unification of Germany can only be obtained in a general system of European security." In the British House of Commons 17 Labor M.P.'s presented a resolution demanding new talks to settle the German problem amid "mounting popular clamor for four-power negotiations to unite and neutralize Ger-

many." (*New York Times*, July 24.)

Further British efforts for a new big power conference are suggested as a possible result of the cordial interchanges in Moscow between the China-bound British Labor M.P. delegation, and Malenkov and other high Soviet officials, as well as the acceptance by both houses of British Parliament of an invitation from the Supreme Soviet for an all-party parliamentary delegation to visit the USSR this Fall.

Within Western Germany itself there is a mounting demand for the replacement of the Adenauer policy on EDC and integration with the West by one of closer relations and increased trade with the Soviet Union. These circles include an increasing number of industrial leaders and three former chancellors.

At the recent conference of the West German Social Democratic Party its leader, Erich Ollenhauer, deplored the failure of the West to give serious consideration to the Soviet proposal for an all-European collective security system. The conference adopted a resolution urging the big powers to negotiate an agreement on Germany and European security.

The July Evangelical Church Congress in Leipzig, East Germany, attended by 10,000 West German Protestants, including nine members of the Bonn parliament, called for German unification without war.

All Germany has been stirred by the defection of Dr. Otto John, West German security chief (a position similar to that of F.B.I. head J. Edgar Hoover in the United States) to the German Democratic Republic. In statements broadcast over the East German radio and in his press conference of August 11 attended by several hundred world correspon-

dents, Dr. John declared that he hoped by this "demonstrative act" to stir all Germans to press for the unification of their country. Warning against the real purposes of the European Defense Community, he charged that it contained secret codicils dealing with plans for a new war. He charged that the Nazis are now in key positions in the Bonn Government, in industry and in the universities, and would control a rearmend Germany.

At this press conference, Dr. John declared that while United States policy is primarily designed to recruit German soldiers for the anti-Communist crusade, the German militarists have other ideas. He continued:

Dr. Adenauer and those militarists still in the background see the EDC as an instrument to create a strong German army. This army would sooner or later absorb the other EDC contingents, including the French army, through sheer physical preponderance. France and West Europe would again be taken over by German militarists.

(This, it should be noted, is exactly the same position on EDC that has been taken by former French Premier Herriot and other leading French and European personages.)

The consternation caused by Dr. John's action in those circles seeking West German rearmament is evidenced by the frantic attempts in Washington and the U.S. press to build up a case for Dr. John having been "lured in a trap" and "brain washed," although no evidence whatever has been adduced to support this silly theory. West German officials and press as well as U.S. officials in Bonn have acknowledged that the defection was voluntary, as Dr. John has repeatedly asserted.

America As a Good Partner

Failures of American foreign policy were highlighted by President Eisenhower's statement at his August 4 press conference that it "just isn't good business" for the United States to be shouting about world leadership all the time, and that the approach should be that of a "good partner."

That is a very fine idea. But it is not enough to say that we are a good partner. We must be one.

The United States did not play the role of a good partner at Geneva. It was not a good partner (except to Chiang Kai-shek) when it risked war with People's China by dispatching aircraft carriers, destroyers and fighter planes into Chinese waters and air space, shot down two Chinese planes and ordered U.S. airmen to be "quick on the trigger" following the unfortunate incident of a British transport plane being shot down by Chinese planes with the loss of six British and three American passengers. The incident would never have occurred had it not been for the recent intensified sorties of Chiang Kai-shek's American supplied war planes on Formosa against the Chinese mainland, for one of which the British plane was mistaken. China apologized, expressed regret over the accident, and offered compensation for loss of life and property, Britain accepted the apology, but the United States did not, and the wild men in Congress called for war.

It was not being a good partner to the rest of the world to shower honors on Syngman Rhee, to give him a forum in Congress and public platforms across the land from which to utter his maniacal calls for a world destroying atomic war.

It is not being a good partner in

Europe to press for the re-arming of Germany, nor in Asia to press for the Southeast Asia military pact opposed by the overwhelming majority of the Asian people. It is not being a good partner in the world comity of nations to continue to deny People's China its rightful place in the United Nations, or to continue all the other measures being taken to extend the cold war and create new areas of conflict instead of extending the areas of peace.

Even the conservative group of business, education, labor leaders and foreign policy specialists composing the American Assembly, were constrained at their meeting at Harri-man to warn against the effect on our Allies of the inflexibility of current U.S. foreign policy. The statement issued by this group on August 2 noted that the promotion of self-determination and self-government in Asia and Africa would serve the security interests of the United States itself, urged that the United States make the United Nations a cornerstone of its foreign policy, supported universality of membership, and came out against a "rigid policy of permanent opposition to China in the United Nations."

Dag Hammarskjold, United Nations General Secretary, in the introduction to his report to the General Assembly published August 8, declared that at present "the organization is severely handicapped by the fact that it has to function in a world where the necessity of co-existence is not as yet fully recognized," and called for the strengthening of the United Nations by further steps toward universality of membership.

The mounting American and world reaction against U.S. war policies was reflected in the statement made

by President Eisenhower at his August 11 press conference when he repudiated the support by General Mark Clark before a Congressional Committee of proposals for a diplomatic break with Russia and his ideas for reorganizing the United Nations as an instrument for opposing the Soviet Union. President Eisenhower declared that the UN must be retained as a world forum, that preventive war is unthinkable in this age of nuclear fission and that the outlook for peace has improved in the past year.

The American people can only welcome such statements. Now there must be an overwhelming demand that our President act on these views, and take steps to make our America a good partner in fact. This requires an end to the cold war, full support for the United Nations and representation therein of People's China and its 600,000,000 people. It means an end of the divisions in Europe and Asia, the banning of atom and hydrogen bombs, the reduction of armaments, peaceful trade and cultural and human interchange among all peoples. This is the only road to a secure America and peaceful co-existence among the nations.

Finally, if our government is to be a good partner abroad, it must begin by being a good partner at home, with its own people. This means an end of McCarthyism in all its forms, and a mighty united effort for the repeal of the savage new fascist legislation to strangle the democratic liberties of all Americans, as well as the Smith and McCarran Acts which are already being used for the same purpose. This is the only road to an America safe for its own people as well as the people of the world.

(Aug. 16th)

China's New Constitution

by ISRAEL EPSTEIN

IMAGINE yourself a citizen of the United States, with the Revolution still fresh in your mind, when the Bill of Rights was adopted. Add the feeling of the Negro people and of all Americans who loved justice and freedom when, close on the heels of victory in the Civil War, slavery was abolished and full citizenship for former slaves proclaimed. Then imagine that, at the same time, all the landless, Negroes and poor whites, had been given their own debt-free farms, with tools and loans to develop them. Add the emotions of women when they finally won the vote. Picture the feelings of workers if the right to jobs and paid vacations were written into national law.

Enter into the feelings of minorities if segregation and discrimination were made a federal crime, and proper representation in Congress guaranteed. Think of the relief of

small and medium businessmen if monopolies were truly curbed. Imagine a depression-proof economy and a government constitutionally committed to a policy of peace and the constant expansion of living standards and educational opportunities. Conceive of all these things happening at the same time, and you will have some idea of the pride and joy of the Chinese people in their new Draft Constitution, published for nationwide discussion on June 15, 1954.

All these comparisons are justifiable in trying to convey the distance actually travelled by the New China, politically and socially in the last four and a half years, which the new Constitution codifies. But the people of the United States have had no experience with which to compare the vast outpouring of the dammed up energies of a 400-million strong peasantry freed from 2,500 years of feudal oppression and famine. Or the national feelings of a proud and ancient people subjected for a hundred years to every variety of foreign invasion, domination and insult who at last, in Mao Tse-tung's ringing phrase, "have stood up" and taken their due place in the world.

The Constitution comes to the people of China amid the busy sounds of construction, the first notes of a

ISRAEL EPSTEIN spent many years in Old China as correspondent for the United Press, "New York Times" and other U.S. newspapers. He is the author of "The Unfinished Revolution in China" and other books and has lectured in many American cities. He returned to China from New York in 1951 and has been living and working in Peking since then.

great symphony of hope turning into fact. In 1949, modern industry (in value of output) occupied only 10 per cent of the nation's economy. By the end of 1953, the proportion had increased to 31 per cent. Agriculture used to get along entirely without modern technical aids; now science is making it more productive. Gigantic new river-control and irrigation schemes have banished flood and drought over large areas. Geologists have discovered hitherto unknown iron, coal and oil reserves. Railways are being pushed into great hinterland regions that never knew them before. There is an atmosphere like that of the opening of the American West—without the Robber Barons. Promise of prosperity already has a material basis. Its first instalments have arrived in terms of wages averaging 60 per cent above pre-liberation, lower prices, more consumer goods, more housing, a sharp decline in infant mortality. Such is the situation in China after three years of rehabilitation and reform of her war-torn economy; followed by one and a half years of work under her first Five-Year Plan. It is hard to exaggerate the significance for all mankind of this mighty forward movement of a country of 600,000,000 people.

China's Draft Constitution not only lays down the principles and procedures of popular rule politically but makes what Americans call "the greatest good of the greatest number" the supreme rule in economic matters. The citizen is seen as a builder of prosperity for his country and himself. The people's state assumes the obligation to create conditions under which abundance for all can be attained. The preamble declares that China, on the basis of her present system,

"can in a peaceful way wipe out exploitation and poverty and build a prosperous and happy socialist society." It works out the basis for the continuing unity, under the leadership of the Communists, "of all democratic classes, parties and groups" and of all nationalities in the country on the basis of equality, friendship and mutual help. It reaffirms the international friendship of China with the Soviet Union and People's Democracies, and with peace-loving people throughout the world. China's readiness to establish normal relations with all countries is specifically stated, as is her "firm and consistent policy . . . to work for the noble cause of world peace and the progress of humanity." The fundamental law of the land, in short, is the building of socialism within the country and peaceful co-existence outside.

Before the liberation in 1949, there were no political or civil rights in China. Now the right to elect and be elected is secured by the Constitution to men and women over 18, regardless of nationality, occupation, social origin, educational level, property status or length of residence (in fact it has already been exercised in local elections all over the country.) The one exception, apart from the insane and those whom the courts deprive of civil rights on conviction of crime, is for former feudal landlords and bureaucratic capitalists (Kuomintang officials who used their government posts to create monopolies in coordination with imperialist capital) comprising some 5 per cent of the population. But this exception lapses when the persons concerned have earned their livelihood for some time by their own labor, which the state, under the Constitution, provides them with opportunities of do-

ing. Thus the suffrage will very soon become completely universal.

The personal freedom of citizens is declared inviolable. They may not be arrested except for legal crime. Immunity of the home and privacy of correspondence are guaranteed. There is freedom of religious belief and observance. The freedom of speech, press and assembly is not only stated but guaranteed by provision of the necessary material facilities (meeting halls, public address systems, paper and printing, access to the streets for demonstrations, and so on).

People's congresses elected by the voters (who can also recall their members) are the organs of state power at every level (national, provincial, municipal, county or rural district). These in turn elect people's councils (governments) which are accountable to them. The National People's Congress is the supreme organ of state power, both legislative and executive. It can remove the Chairman of the Republic or any other national official, whether elected or appointed. As for the judiciary, all judges and prosecuting attorneys from the Supreme Court and Procurator-General down are also elected by the people or their chosen representatives for a definite term. In the exercise of their duties, they are constitutionally independent and subject only to the law.

The Chinese Constitution, like others of the socialist type, speaks of social classes explicitly. It declares that China is a "people's democratic state, led by the working class and based on the alliance of workers and peasants." These two groups comprise the vast majority of the people and all the wealth of the nation stems from their labor.

But the Chinese Constitution also

differs from that of the USSR and the European People's Democracies at the present stage, because the building of a socialist society in China is only commencing. It therefore states that ownership of means of production today falls into four categories: by the state, that is, the whole people; by cooperatives; by individual working people; and by capitalists.

The state-owned, socialist, sector is destined to expand. It is described as the "leading force in the national economy and the material basis on which the state carries out socialist transformation." This material basis is already considerable. In China's modern industry, by the end of 1952 socialist enterprises accounted for 50.7 per cent of total output-value and in 1953 it expanded further. In the same period, the role of the state and cooperatives in internal trade grew to over half of the total turnover. The state controls foreign trade.

The cooperative sector (especially in farming and handicrafts) is an expanding one also. Cooperatives may be socialist in nature, with land and other means of production jointly owned and members benefiting to the extent of their labor. Or they may be of a transitional semi-socialist form (as in the type of agricultural producers' cooperative now prevailing) in which land, for instance, is still individually owned and members receive dividends on the amount they have invested as well as for work. Some half of the farm households in China are now organized into mutual-aid teams or agricultural producers' co-ops, the latter having grown in number from 14,000 to 95,000 in the last five months of 1953 alone. The first collective farms, largely experimental, are showing

good results. The fully socialist co-ops and collectives represent the future of Chinese agriculture. They make it possible to combine the advantages of planned, large-scale, scientific agriculture in easing farm labor and increasing production with the elimination of all exploitation.

The individual peasant is protected by the Constitution in the ownership of his land and tools. The path of the Chinese peasants from individual farming to cooperation and collectivization is required by the Constitution to be voluntary, on the basis of the demonstrated advantages of the latter. The state throws its weight against the alternative path, leading to capitalist farming with hired labor, in which some can enrich themselves only on the condition of others losing their land and falling back to the status of hired laborers. But the family-type farmer is subject to no pressure at all, other than the force of example.

Apart from the peasants, China has millions of individual producers in the handicrafts who still supply some 80 per cent of manufactured goods used by the peasants—the mass of China's population. Handicraftsmen are protected in their ownership of tools, buildings, materials, etc. Unlike the situation in countries which industrialized in a capitalist way, however, the growth of factory industry will not ruin and doom them to starvation (as the English and Indian weavers were once doomed). The state helps them to form co-operatives voluntarily, acquire machines, increase output, and sell through state and co-op trading channels to eliminate exploitation by the merchant and usurer. Large numbers of such cooperatives have been formed.

Capitalist property, whether in

means of production or commercial establishment, enjoys constitutional protection. It is still capable of playing a useful productive role in the development of the Chinese economy; its right to a reasonable profit is recognized. But abuse to the detriment of either worker or consumer is prohibited and actually prevented by several factors: direct administrative control, the superior weight of the socialist sector which can set price and quality standards for the market as a whole, and direct supervision by the workers through their trade unions. The Constitution states that the capitalist economy will gradually become state-capitalist and then socialist. In practice, this is already happening through linkage of many private industries to the over-all economic plan by way of sub-contracts of various types and joint ownership. Such arrangements benefit the operation of capitalist industry in many ways—such as guaranteeing raw material supplies and the markets for everything produced at a fair rate of profit. On the other hand, along with the much higher rate of investment in state-owned industry, they make it impossible for private capitalism ever to assume a dominant place in the economy as a whole. For the law-abiding capitalist as an individual, the future is assured. He enjoys full civil rights, his children have access to education and advancement, and he himself expects to stay on as an industrial or commercial specialist even after capitalism itself has gradually disappeared.

Though private capital still plays a considerable part in Chinese economy, any abuse of private economic power is made unconstitutional. All persons may own and inherit property; but the state forbids anyone "to use his property to undermine

the public interest." Furthermore, if the public interest requires, the state has the right to buy, requisition or nationalize land and other means of production.

Irrespective of property status, all citizens have the *constitutional* right to work (to a job). All working people have the *constitutional* right to rest (paid vacation); to health facilities; to material assistance in old age, illness or disability and to education. In fact, since the liberation in 1949, China has acquired a constantly expanding industrial health and social security system, the expenses of which are borne exclusively by the state and employers (the worker pays nothing). The network of schools has grown tremendously, with state-paid tuition and in many cases support right through the universities—enabling workers and peasants for whom education was in the past economically impossible to have access to it at all levels.

China is a multi-national country, and many of its minority peoples experienced centuries of oppression, exploitation and contempt. The Constitution declares the equality of all nationalities and prohibits all forms of discrimination and incitement to national strife. It gives every nationality freedom to develop its own language and culture. Minority areas enjoy autonomy within the People's Republic of China in any form they prefer, carrying on government functions in their own languages and organizing their own local security forces as part of the national military system. Tibet, the Inner Mongolian Autonomous Region (which several former Chinese provinces were actually abolished to create), and several other areas are examples. Under the election law, national minorities are given a representation of 14 per cent

of deputies in the National People's Congress, the supreme assembly of all China. This is somewhat in excess of their proportion to the entire population, of which they form some 10 per cent. If a similar system were followed in the United States, the Negro people alone would have 14 Senators and some 60 Representatives. In legal cases anywhere in the country, members of any national minority can testify, if they prefer, in their own language. Courts are obligated to provide interpreters to translate the entire proceedings.

The Constitution establishes equal rights for women not only politically but in economic, social and domestic affairs. They receive equal pay for equal work, cannot be restrained from activities outside the home by husbands or families and cannot be discriminated against with regard to any job or position for which they are qualified. Marriage, the family and mother and child receive special protection. The Marriage Law in force since 1950 has outlawed forced betrothal and other abuses, medical maternity services are free, women workers get 56 days' fully paid maternity leave, and nurseries have been organized on a huge scale for the convenience of working mothers.

Space, unfortunately, forbids any detailed treatment here of the actual structure of the state. Its essence is what is called democratic centralism. This means that every level of government is accountable to and controlled by the electors, while at the same time enjoying the authority and powers necessary to its work, all lower organs being subordinate to higher ones. The Constitution specifically requires all state organs to "rely on the masses of the people, constantly maintain contact with them, heed their opinions and accept

VITO MARCANTONIO

A GREAT and beloved people's leader, unique and irreplaceable, has been taken from us. In the sudden tragic death of Vito Marcantonio, America and the world mourn the loss of a champion of the rights of labor, of the full equality of all members of the human family, of the brotherhood of people and nations, of human decency and peace.

In his fourteen years in Congress as a true representative of the American people, never was there an internal issue in which Marcantonio's vote failed to reflect the best interests of the people, never was there an issue in foreign affairs in which he was not on the side of peace and the freedom of peoples. How we needed him there again!

In Congress and out, Marcantonio worked unceasingly to help solve the day-to-day problems of his own constituents and the national problems affecting our country's welfare. He consistently opposed the cold war

policies and advocated American-Soviet friendship and peaceful co-existence with the socialist world as the only road to a secure and bright future.

His was the lone, heroic voice that rang out in Congress in June, 1950, against American intervention in the Korean war. He said then:

"... You live only once, and it is best to live one's life with one's conscience, rather than to temporize and accept with silence those things which one believes to be against the interests of one's people and one's nation."

So, indeed, he lived. There is no other Marc, no one to take his place—so thousands of us, together, must do it. His rock-like devotion to principle, his flame-like passion for human progress and happiness and peace, his tireless attention to the needs of the American people, as individuals and as a nation, will be our enduring guide and inspiration.

their supervision." It also gives any citizen the right to "make written or oral charges against any state organ ... or government worker for breach of law or negligence of duty," providing that "persons who sustain loss by reason of infringement of their rights as citizens by government workers have the right to compensation."

The Draft Constitution is not a program for the distant future. It reflects things the Chinese people have already achieved or are actually in the process of building. It ex-

plains their determination and ability to defend their gains. Reading it, one understands why the original electrifying effect of China's liberation on colonial and semi-colonial peoples everywhere has deepened with each year, why the international significance of the People's Republic of China has burst through all barriers of wilful pretense and blindness, why the Chinese people—with their tremendous contribution to the advance of peace, democracy and socialism—inspire such hope and admiration all over the world.

CHILDREN OF PEOPLE'S BULGARIA



Soup starts off a hearty dinner at this kindergarten in Sofia

It's fun at this Pioneer summer camp on the Black Sea coast



As everywhere and
Below: Story in F
the great P Palace





where a sandbox is a favorite.
Story in Fairy Tale Hall of
the Pioneer Palace in the capital



In the past many children of Bulgaria were
deprived of education. Today all go to school.
Above: Third grade class in a school in Sofia



Their own reading room in a library just for them

The Pioneer Palace in Sofia holds ballet classes



Bulgaria's Economic Advance

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

THE problems which confronted the Fatherland Front coalition government in Bulgaria were not merely political, they were also economic. Experience after the first World War had shown that political democracy could be real and durable only in association with economic democracy, and that neither could be secure except in association with economic independence (not to be confused with economic "self-sufficiency").

The fundamental problem, in a country like Bulgaria, was that of peasant poverty. Past experience had proven that "agrarian" measures, like those tried so hopefully by Stamboliski, could only mitigate it temporarily. The solution called for industrialization, such as would be possible, it was generally recognized, only within the framework of a socialist system.

Bulgaria's remarkable progress towards success on the revised lines

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 sixth article of a series.

pursued by the Fatherland Front Government since September 9, 1944, may be regarded as containing lessons of great value, particularly for dependent and colonial peoples all over the world.

An object lesson can be drawn in the contrast between Bulgaria and Yugoslavia, two countries very similar, and adjacent, to each other. This is made the more striking by the fact that Bulgaria, as an enemy country, did not qualify as did Yugoslavia for UNRRA aid*; that she has not enjoyed, as has Yugoslavia, the "benefit" of Marshall aid; that she has paid, not received, war reparations; and that she has worked with, not against, the Soviet Union and the other East European People's Democracies, who are alleged to have intended to keep her "backward" for their own purposes of exploitation.

In the short period of 10 years, the first a war year, Bulgaria has emerged almost completely from her semi-colonial status, due to her former agrarian economy. Her produc-

* In the autumn of 1946, I saw at the Bulgarian port of Bourgas shiploads of foodstuffs, industrial raw materials, motor vehicles, railway and factory equipment, supplied by the U.S. and Britain through UNRRA, being landed for transport by rail to Yugoslavia, while Bulgaria was denied even the right to buy these to meet urgent post-war needs.

tion, and the productivity of her people, has advanced enormously in agriculture no less than in industry, and there has been a corresponding advancement in general living standards; her currency has been revalued upwards; she is economically viable for the first time in her history. In Yugoslavia, on the other hand, grandiose schemes of industrialization have stumbled to a halt; standards of living remain at their former pitifully low level; the currency has had to be devalued downwards. The Tito government has gone cap in hand repeatedly to beg money from Western creditors, on terms which clearly mean the perpetuation of a semi-colonial economy for Yugoslavia.

Some idea of the magnitude of the task which had to be undertaken will be gathered from the following estimated figures (for 1937) for the surplus population in agriculture in Bulgaria:

Total population—6,319,000; agricultural population—4,070,000; agricultural surplus population—1,145,000; per cent of agricultural population which was surplus—28 per cent.

There were at least 1,145,000 peasants who could leave the land without reducing agricultural production, and whose departure would obviously increase the amount of agricultural produce those remaining, after meeting their own needs, would have for disposal. This "concealed unemployment" was at the root of the unbalanced economies of countries like Bulgaria in the period between the wars, and of the growing poverty of their peoples. Methods of farming remained primitive, because the peasants were too poor to buy the best seed and fertilizers or to invest in machinery and livestock, and of necessity kept most of their

land under grain to grow their own food. For these reasons, and because of the small size of the average peasant holding, the average Bulgarian farm produced about one-third as much as a peasant farm in Western Europe, yet each acre had to employ and feed twice as many people.

The whole farming system wasted land and labor by being too extensive. The obvious remedy would have been industrialization, but the obstacles to this were shortage of capital and the lack of an internal market due to the poverty of the peasants. Foreign capital was not forthcoming since it was interested only in the production of raw materials needed by the West, such as Rumanian oil and Yugoslav minerals, of which no equivalent had then been found in Bulgaria, and it had a vested interest in keeping Bulgaria otherwise unindustrialized, as a market for Western manufactures.

This evil inheritance from the past was made worse by the fact that for some years before the war, and increasingly during the war, the whole economy of Bulgaria had been ruthlessly distorted to meet Germany's war needs by the Nazis' chief planner, Dr. Hjalmar Schacht and was completely run-down as the result. Agricultural production had been directed to meet Germany's needs in foodstuffs and raw materials only, and had been paid for at low rates and in paper currency for which goods required in exchange were increasingly unavailable. A very large proportion to her livestock had been slaughtered to feed the Wehrmacht. Industrial plants producing goods not required for the German war effort had been closed; the remainder had been worked to something approaching destruction, as were also the railways. Industrial power was in

very short supply because Bulgaria was largely dependent on foreign coal, which had not been imported. Raw materials were completely lacking for her main industry, the textile industry, and all others.

The Government of the Fatherland Front faced up to this situation boldly and realistically. The first necessity was food for the people, and to secure this it was essential to get every possible acre of land under cultivation and to increase its yield to the utmost. The shortest cut to this was, of course, by land reform—transferring the land to the peasants who worked it.

Very soon after the liberation a law was passed whereby all estates above the fixed maximum of 50 acres were expropriated, and their land transferred to the ownership of landless peasants and small-holders. In Bulgaria, however, owing to the fact that the effects of the drastic land reform carried out under Stamboliski after the first World War had very largely persisted, this affected not more than about 10 per cent of the total farm land. The result was therefore less considerable than it was, for instance, in Rumania or in Hungary. It involved, nevertheless, the transfer of about 1,125,000 acres of farmland and forest to some 150,000 families and, more important, meant "good-bye forever!" to the landlord system.

Leaving as it did, some 80,000 peasants still without land—simply because Bulgaria is not big enough to provide it—this measure did not solve Bulgaria's peasant problem. On the contrary, it threw into still higher relief the already existing problem of the large number of farms too small for mechanization and too poor for intensification, and re-emphasized the need for the development

of industry. It did, however, alleviate the situation of that section of the peasantry which stood most in need of it, for just as half a loaf is, proverbially, better than no bread, so seven acres, even of the most arid land, are better than none, particularly when those in charge of the new Bulgaria, whether Communist or Agrarian, made it quite clear that they did not imagine that this measure would provide a complete cure for peasant poverty.

As described by Miss Doreen Wariner, of the School of Slavonic and East European Studies at the University of London, in her book *Revolution in Eastern Europe*:

The attitude of the new leaders is no longer sentimental or abstract; on the contrary, it is factual and realistic . . . they speak and think in the peasants' own terms more than the demagogic leaders of the old style ever did. But, unlike the peasants, and unlike the political leaders of the past, the new men believe that the new society has the power to conquer peasant poverty, by reshaping the economy and creating new employment and new types of peasant farming. The root problem, too much labor on the land, cannot be solved only in terms of redistribution of property.

Bulgaria was peculiarly fortunate in a complete unity of outlook among the heterogeneous elements composing her Fatherland Front on this fundamental issue and in a peasantry politically advanced enough to understand and cooperate intelligently in the execution of its plans.

In the field of industry, too, the policy of the Fatherland Front government was essentially realistic and practical. It was most important to get the wheels turning again quickly, so as to avoid unemployment in the towns, provide manufactured com-

modities to meet the urgent needs of the people, and to give the peasants something concrete in exchange for their produce. Nationalization was limited, to begin with, to mining (the railways were already nationalized), banking and insurance, and to those industrial enterprises which were the property of Germans or Bulgars whose conduct qualified them as "enemies of the people."

Legislative measures were enacted to restore and strengthen the influence of the trade unions, to limit profits to a reasonable figure (about 10 per cent), and to relate wage rates to production in such a way as to ensure tolerable minimum standards for the workers and to provide them with adequate incentive for increased efforts.

The greatest problem was the securing of raw materials such as cotton, wool and hide, formerly bought in Western markets. It was found impossible to resume purchasing, whether against payment or on credit, in these markets due to the obstructive policy of Western governments. The British government, for instance, calmly ignoring Bulgaria's creditable record as a "co-belligerent," under the new regime, expressed its disapproval of that regime by subjecting it to the restric-

tions of its "Trading with the Enemy" Act!

Bulgaria was spared, however, from the worst effects of such attempts at interference in her internal affairs by improper economic pressure, by the Soviet Union. Soviet cotton, wool and hides, replacing those which could not be procured from various sources under British control, enabled the Bulgarian Government to restore production in their country's main industries of that time and to pursue its plans for the economic rehabilitation and eventual transformation of Bulgaria. Payment for these Soviet goods was made possible, moreover, not in the form of concessions and debt-enslavement, but through such commodities as Bulgaria was in a position to export immediately—such as tobacco and attar of roses—or, less frequently, by reasonable proportion of the goods manufactured from the raw materials provided.

This was the beginning of a new kind of cooperation between an economically powerful state and a weak one, on terms of equality and of mutual consideration and advantage, which gives the lie to allegations of so-called "Soviet imperialism" and of the so-called "exploitation" by the Soviet Union of Eastern Europe.

CLOSER PATIENT-DOCTOR CONTACTS IN USSR

DR. KARL EVANG, director general of Norway's public health service, reporting on a three-weeks study trip he made in the USSR, declared that in comparison with the 1 to 1.3 personnel and patient ratio found in most Western hospitals, those in the Soviet Union often have a ratio of 1 to 1.6 and 1.7. This, according to the *New York Times* account of Dr. Evang's report, he declared was an "extravagant" use of medical personnel by Western standards. He said that in the USSR great emphasis is placed on direct patient-physician contact, many physicians often performing duties relegated to lesser personnel in Western hospitals. Many subordinate physicians, he said, spent much time in the wards with the patients.

American-Soviet Friendship Council Presents Its Case

AN extraordinary spectacle has been taking place in recent weeks in the Immigration Building in New York City, where the Subversive Activities Control Board, represented by Hearing Officer David J. Coddaira, has been hearing witnesses of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. The Attorney-General has demanded that this organization, along with a group of others, register as a "Communist-front" organization, "dominated and controlled by the Communist Party." Under the unconstitutional ruling already handed down by the board in the case of the Communist Party, this would make the NCASF part of an alleged world-wide conspiracy which under the instigation of a foreign power is supposed to be plotting the violent overthrow of government.

The National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, established in 1943 to promote the friendly relations that were essential to Allied victory over Hitler and devoted since then to the continuation of such relations, has, in fact, carried on activities that offer the best guarantees of the preservation of our government. Attorney David Rein, in opening the Council's case, noted that this function was recognized by President Eisenhower when, in a message to

the Council on November 2, 1945, he declared:

Friendship between the United States and the Soviet Union is one of the cornerstones upon which the edifice of peace should be built. To achieve this friendship, nothing is more important than mutual understanding on the part of each of the institutions, traditions and customs of the other.

An outstanding group of witnesses associated with the organization over the years as officers and members testified to the democratic way in which, making its own decisions without any outside control or domination, the Council has sought to carry out these objectives.

After they had presented their own testimony, these distinguished American citizens were badgered by a couple of incessantly gum-chewing young government attorneys who, drawing on the words of the parade of paid informers on whose "testimony" the government has based its case, sought to link the Council witnesses with all sorts of treasonous and conspiratorial activities.

The witnesses for the Council were Dr. John A. Kingsbury, National Chairman of the NCASF; Reverend William Howard Melish, former Chairman and presently an active

Board member; Mrs. Virginia W. Epstein, Co-Chairman of the Council's Committee of Women; the Reverend William B. Spofford, Board member; Professors E. W. Burgess and Robert Morss Lovett, professors emeritus of the University of Chicago; Professor Arthur Upham Pope, former Chancellor of the Asia Institute; and Professor Ralph Barton Perry of Harvard University.

All of these witnesses denied under oath that they were members of the Communist Party. Since seven of them had been named as members by government witness Louis Budenz, this gave the direct lie to the perjured testimony on which the government had built its case.

Rev. William Howard Melish, acting minister of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Holy Trinity in Brooklyn, was the first witness for the National Council. With calm dignity and strength Mr. Melish remained under oath for nine days, answering questions patiently for some thirty-five hours.

Later, in a press statement, he declared:

The arraignment of our Council is a political act. The Government appears determined to put out of business an organization of citizens who criticized foreign policy, petitioned for the change of such policy, and appealed to public opinion. At stake is the right of the American people to scrutinize, criticize and, if need be, change foreign policy. There is not one thing that our Council, or any of us, has done that is illegal or not clearly permissible under the First Amendment of the Constitution. . . . In a profound sense, it is not our Council that is on trial in this hearing but the American Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

In a statement before the SACB when the case was first opened in

Washington, D.C., Dr. Kingsbury, as Council Chairman, declared in part:

I would have you know, sir, that I speak not for any foreign power nor for any organization that seeks the overthrow of this Government by force and violence. I speak as an American of old stock, as a direct descendant of Henry Adams who gave to this country two presidents . . . as a descendant of founders of this great nation, I feel a certain dedication to defend the principles laid down in the Declaration of Independence and embodied in the Bill of Rights.

The fundamental issue involved in this case is whether individuals and groups in our country shall continue to have the right freely to discuss the foreign policies of the United States and, on occasion, to express their dissent when, in their judgment, a policy appears not to serve the best interests of the nation. And further, a fundamental issue is whether freedom of speech and association and the right of petition, as guaranteed by the Constitution, are to be maintained. . . .

In respect to relations between the United States and the Soviet Union, the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship has always advanced negotiations for the settlement of differences, rather than threat of war, as conforming to the highest interests of our country and the safeguarding of world peace. In consistently advocating the restoration of cooperation, cultural interchange and expanded trade between the two great powers, we firmly believe we have performed a patriotic service and have advanced the cause of world peace. . . .

I am proud of the record of patriotic service of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. As its Chairman, together with my colleagues, I shall do my best to vindicate that record before this Board and before the people of my

ATOMIC ELECTRIC STATION OPERATES IN USSR

AN INDUSTRIAL electric power station that operates on atomic energy has been put into operation in the Soviet Union, *Pravda* reports in its July 1 issue. According to the newspaper, this is the first time that an industrial turbine operates on atomic energy. The brief report follows:

"Work on the design and construction of the first industrial electric power station run on atomic energy with a useful capacity of 5,000 kilowatts has been successfully completed in the Soviet Union through the efforts of Soviet scientists and engineers.

"On July 27, 1954, an atomic-driven power station was put into operation and generated electricity for use in industry and agriculture in adjoining districts.

"This is the first time that an industrial turbine is working not on coal or other fuel but on atomic energy—the product of fission of the atomic nucleus of uranium.

"By commissioning the atomic-driven electric power station, a real step has been taken toward the utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

"Soviet scientists and engineers are working on the creation of atomic-driven industrial electric power stations with a capacity of 50,000 to 100,000 kilowatts."

native land in the interests of peace and as a contribution to the maintenance of the Bill of Rights.

That record was indeed vindicated before the Board. By any decent standard of truth and justice and patriotism the Council has won its case. This will probably make no difference to the members of the SACB who earn their salaries by making the "findings" the government expects them to in the application of an Act which finds guilty in advance the defenders of peace and human decency against whom it is directed. It may make a difference by the time the case reaches the Supreme Court.

The current and projected hearings affecting the National Council

of American-Soviet Friendship and many other organizations, are part of the efforts of reaction to silence all voices for peace and establish an American brand of fascism. The best defense against these efforts is an intensified drive for the repeal of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, generally known as the McCarran Act.

The witnesses for the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, in submitting themselves with nobility and composure and a firm sense of the rightness of their cause to the indignities heaped upon them by the gum-chewing attorneys, played a noble and heroic role in defense of the democratic rights of all Americans, in defense of the cause of peaceful co-existence.

U. S. Boy Is Mining Apprentice In Czechoslovakia

by ELEANOR WHEELER

"**W**ITHOUT the mud it all looks a lot better," my son Thomas said anxiously, and then he beamed when I assured him it seemed only natural to a Westerner born in Alaska. We were plodding through the sticky Ostrava-region mud to an imposing new bloc of buildings where Thomas' *internat* stood in Sumbark, Silesia. The *internat* in question is a boarding school for miner apprentices where the Czechoslovak Ministry of Manpower gives free education, board, room and outfits for boys who at 15 decide to train as miners or mining engineers.

Ever since Thomas had visited the mines and had read up on the possibilities of mechanization, this was the field he wanted to work in, but I had not felt the same fine romantic enthusiasm. And now on my very first visit, when he wanted to show off everything at its best, this rain and mud had to dim the outlook!

As we slithered up the main, unfinished sidewalkless street with that

bleak "new town" look familiar to Westerners, Thomas declared: "Those apartment houses weren't here when we came in September. And this *avenue* will be a tree-shaded thoroughfare, green belt down the middle and one-way traffic each side."

The raw new buildings contrasted with the surrounding picturesque old villages with their white onion-steeple churches, ancient trees and little streams. But the new had a flamboyant optimism which had already begun to infect me.

The *internat* was the largest building in the new mining settlement, a huge structure housing two schools, No. 7 for drillers and No. 6 for miners. The first thing that met our eyes in the large dining hall was the dancing class for the older students where black-uniformed boys were whirling dressmaking apprentices around in the traditional polkas and waltzes of this Silesian region. As the dancing master went around adjusting awkward elbows and smoothing jerky steps, the young instructor explained, "We think it is important for the boys to learn good social behavior, too."

Here the "we" means the government and the government means the miners and the rest of the people. And this was the clue to all that I

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.

saw later. The running of an *internat* is closely checked on by the people and if it is poorly run they take steps, for "these are our boys you're mistreating and this is our money you are wasting." But Thomas' *internat* is excellently run by an old-time Ostrava miner, Vilem Levinsky, who says, "We give these boys everything we can and all we ask of them is that they respect state property and train conscientiously for their profession."

As I went through the *internat* I saw what Levinsky meant by "giving them everything we can." Complete medical care right in the building, and of course, free. "Except for major operations we have everything we need here," said the doctor in charge. Regular medical examinations, preventive diagnosis, hygienic supervision of the premises and health instruction—all this is handled by the medical department. The periodic medical examination includes blood tests and x-ray. There was a special dining room for the sick list and a night sanatorium for boys who could attend classes or go to work but still needed to be under medical supervision.

The dentist had just completed his regular check-up on school No. 6 and found that one-fourth needed no treatment, nearly three-fourths routine work and only 43 extensive dental work—and for this they received everything free, even bridges and teeth-straightening devices.

Right after the early breakfast the kitchen staff—mostly miners' wives themselves—prepare to meet the noontime onslaught on their supplies as the main meal of the day. Cartwheel "schnitzels" are pounded and breaded ready for deep fat frying in vats, mountains of potatoes go into the automatic machinery for peeling, boiling and mashing, vats of soup,

vats of fruit compotes, thousands of rolls and slices of nourishing black bread, milk by the gallon. Fresh fruits and vegetables are served in season, stewed fruits and vegetables in winter.

Although the most spectacular liquidation of food stocks comes at noon, the boys get five meals a day. They have meat twice a day and sometimes a third time in the sandwich spread of the mid-morning and mid-afternoon lunch. The day I ate at the *internat* the noon meal was schnitzel, stewed fruit, potatoes and pudding, supper was fish, boiled egg, black bread with butter, milk. It was quite a typical day, judging by the menus I saw, which are drawn up by a committee of eight pupils, the doctor, the head cook and the secretary of the youth organization.

The head cook, also an old miner, explained to me, "We try to put the chief grumblers on the menu committee in rotation and that way most of them are satisfied."

The huge, spotless kitchen had many labor-saving automatic devices, though not as efficiently laid out as similar American kitchens usually are. It is regularly inspected not only by the head doctor of the *internat*, but also by State and local health control committees. In addition, mothers' committees also look in to see that the service and health standards are up to snuff.

Many of those who showed me the establishment with such pride had themselves started in the mining profession. They had had to fight to learn what they could about the trade, for the miners feared unemployment and resented any newcomers. Most of them could not dream of butter on their black bread (and, said counselor Josef Stolarik, "My mother denied herself to give me even that

black bread in my lunch bucket"), let alone the huge schnitzel which today's apprentice considers his due. No wonder they took such pleasure in pointing out every small evidence of comfort and culture: the shower rooms, the reading corners, the athletic equipment, the art clubs, trips to theater and museums.

An old-time miner apprentice would indeed have scarcely believed his ears if he had heard, as I did, an announcement coming over the loud-speaker that he was to be ready that afternoon to go, free of charge, to see Rimsky-Korsakov's *Scheherazade*: "Eight boys from each wing as follows. . . . Wear best black uniforms and see that shoes are well brushed and white shirts are clean. Bus leaves for Ostrava at five." Each boy's turn at theater comes once a month or so.

The journalism and reading clubs develop "worker correspondents" and budding writers. One member of the art club showed so much talent that he is being sent to an art academy instead of being encouraged to continue in mining. So, in the process of developing well-rounded citizens, talents are discovered and students are shifted into fields where they will do best.

The curriculum itself is not a narrow technical course but includes history, literature, mathematics, chemistry, physics, Russian (with text-

books especially designed for mining engineering vocabulary), Czech composition, technology and drafting.

Only those with relatively good marks are accepted in the mining apprentice schools; it is engineers that are needed in the mines these days. So, strange at it may seem, the saying is, "If you get good marks and behave yourself you can be a mining apprentice."

Startling as are the physical differences in the life of mining apprentices, in the old system and the new, the real and basic difference is the attitude toward them, the principle on which it is based. Formerly the apprentice had to force his way into a trade from necessity to earn a living. Now he is a human being who is developed and trained for a profession. The training is not narrow, to make "machine fodder" of the boy, but a well-rounded cultural program to make a good citizen of him.

We were happy to read in the paper the other day that the *internat* director Levinsky had said our son Thomas had rapidly become a good member of the collective, showed an interest in his work and got excellent marks. But we were even happier to read that our son realized what the opportunities which had been offered him meant and had in turn pledged to "study well and become a good mining combine operator."

QUARTER MILLION NEW SOVIET SPECIALISTS

WITH this month starting a new academic year, it is interesting to note what was achieved in the Soviet Union in the past year which ended June 30. More than 230,000 young specialists were graduated from higher educational institutions. The universities and colleges in Moscow alone trained some 37,000 engineers, agronomists, teachers, doctors, livestock experts, lawyers and students who will work in the arts. Upon graduation all these specialists are employed in their chosen fields.

Dressing Up History for Rhee

A review by LAURENCE TODD

SYNGMAN RHEE, *The Man Behind the Myth*. Robert T. Oliver. Dodd Mead. New York, 380 pp. \$5.

MR. DOOLEY once suggested that Rough Rider Teddy Roosevelt's history of the Spanish-American War would be entitled "Alone in Cuba." Syngman Rhee's registered agent, Robert T. Oliver, in his current biography of his principal, has consulted Rhee's writings and Rhee's present friends, and has come out with a similar finding: Rhee has always been right and has freed Korea all by himself; all other Korean leaders have been wrong—and that's why they have been eliminated. The Rhee who in recent weeks has shocked even Congress by his monstrous proposal that the United States deliberately start a world war of atomic and hydrogen bombs by attacking the Chinese people, is here pictured as a political saint. The terrorist dictator who swam to power through a sea of the blood of his countrymen is now offered to American readers as an exemplary Christian, an idealist who has had only the good of his fellow-men at heart. His victims' corpses are not permitted to appear—though there persists a death-house odor in the pages that speak of the man's triumphs.

In the process of fabricating this false history of the despot, Oliver ignores many of the essential points of Rhee's record. He does not mention

James Cromwell, who headed the Korean-American Council which Rhee promoted when Korean-Americans refused longer to tolerate his irresponsible course during World War II. Nor does he speak of the wealthy Mrs. Stotesbury, social dictator, mother of Cromwell and former mother-in-law of General MacArthur. Yet Mrs. Stotesbury sponsored Rhee in powerful anti-Roosevelt circles in war-time. He was the darling of Washington's China Lobby set in the Truman years that followed, but Oliver chooses to emphasize, instead, the support given Rhee by the Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, chaplain of the Senate. MacArthur appears in a minor role—he merely arranged a hero's welcome for Rhee when the latter was brought to Seoul after the war.

One may search Oliver's pages in vain, too, for acknowledgement that the Korean patriots removed Rhee in 1923 from the post of president of the Provisional Korean Republic, to which he had been chosen in 1919. He was never reinstated in that position; he had been found guilty of persistent factionalism.

A chapter in his hero's life which Oliver eagerly retouches is that of Rhee's attempt to get the Soviet Union to pull his personal chestnuts out of the fire by starting a war against Japan in 1933. He has Rhee pleading to the League of Nations in Geneva for help against the Japanese, and only when the British and French have rebuffed him does Rhee think of appealing to Moscow. The fact is that Rhee had made efforts five or six months earlier, in Washington, to secure a Soviet visa in order that he might go to Moscow to propose a "grand alliance" between himself, the Soviet Union and Chiang Kai-shek. Oliver leads his readers

LAURENCE TODD was formerly Washington correspondent of the *Federated Press* and later of *Tass News Agency*. After nearly 40 years of news-writing in the capital, he is now retired, and is writing his memoirs.

through a maze of impossible tales of Rhee's alleged contacts and influence in 1933 with Soviet and Chinese envoys in Vienna, and sighs at the Soviet refusal to consider the scheme—which he says might have prevented Japan's conquest of Manchuria, a conquest that took place in 1931!

This collection of myths concerning Korea's dominant executioner was pub-

lished on the eve of the despot's arrival in Washington as a guest of the Eisenhower administration. The liberal Korean leaders who sought peace and conciliation among their people in the first years after 1945 will raise no voice of protest against this cynical distortion of history. They cannot speak. They are dead. Rhee's gunmen have seen to that.

Literary Contacts—East and West

A review by MARGARET SCHLAUCH

In *East-West Passage: A Study in Literary Relationships*,* by Dorothy Brewster, the literary relationships in question are the ones between Russia and England and America. With learned authority and also—glory be!—a delightful sense of humor, Professor Brewster gives us the story of contacts which began in vast ignorance on the Anglo-Saxon side, progressed through a period of half-knowledge, distortion and sentimentality, on to the beginnings of healthy respect and literary indebtedness. The story ends, as we all know, in a period of new provincialism and gratuitous misunderstanding, as far as most English-speaking intellectuals are concerned. The chief difference is that the new ignorance is far more dangerous and less forgivable than the old.

Here in People's Poland, literary historians are much interested in problems such as Miss Brewster handles. They are revising the traditional ideas about how questions of influence should be studied. Too often, the critics here say, conventional university studies have been content to make a catalog of sources and imitations, merely assembling the dry facts without interpret-

ing them. For such formal, scholastic studies, Polish philologists have invented a satirical word: "influence-ology."

Miss Brewster's book is a fine example of the opposite type, for it constantly puts before us the meaning of the influences involved, and their relation to broad cultural developments occurring in both east and west. The author is obviously steeped in American progressive traditions, her native heritage, and at the same time she has mastered the language and traditions of the Russia about which she writes—a feat rare among its friends, unfortunately, and all but unknown among its foes.

It is fascinating to see how past literary appreciation has been conditioned by politics. In the middle 19th century, when imperialist England was backing Turkey to check an imperialist Russia on the Black Sea, there was much talk of tsarist tyranny and barbarism. This was the period of the Crimean War. Later, when England with some embarrassment found herself

MARGARET SCHLAUCH, former Professor at New York University and Johns Hopkins, is now Director of the English Department at Warsaw University. DOROTHY BREWSTER, author of the book under review, retired recently as Associate Professor of English at Columbia University.

* *East-West Passage: A Study in Literary Relationships*, by Dorothy Brewster, Allen and Unwin (Ruskin House, Museum Street), London, 1954. 328 pp. Available in this country at the British Book Center, 122 East 55th Street, N.Y.C., and at other book shops.

allied with that same tsarist tyranny in a war against Germany, the talk of barbarism lapsed and was replaced by a cult of the Russian Soul. A lot of mystical nonsense was written on this subject, precisely to cover up the unsavory political alliance. An exaggerated admiration for Dostoevsky contributed material for the cult. Rarely, it appears, did readers stop to inquire realistically into the specific social conditions which might explain the power and the contradictions inherent in Russian literature.

Provincial misconceptions of the west about Russia 150 years ago were comically like some of the journalistic fantasies of today. The index of an American magazine for 1822 has items like: "Russia—danger of, to Europe;" "Russia, real objects of;" and so on. (This was the period when the United States government was deciding that it must somehow obtain control of Alaska.) In 1839, a French marquis wrote a popular book which made "the Kremlin" responsible for anything which went wrong in any part of the world: risings in Ireland, disturbances in Paris, the arming of the Chinese. It is a curious comment on our times that the diatribes of this aristocratic Russophobe were recently (1951) retranslated into English with an introduction, Miss Brewster tells us, written by an American general who is also an ex-ambassador to the Soviet Union.

In the midst of the ill-natured lies, past and present, it is pleasant to learn about the pioneers of serious study, the advocates of cultural interchange, who manfully strove to supply good texts and authentic information. Among the early ones we meet such observers as Lewis Carroll (yes, the creator of *Alice in Wonderland*) and Charles Turner, the American translator and lecturer Isabel Hapgood, and creative writers such as William Dean Howells. Speaking of the prejudices of her own day, Miss Hapgood remarked dryly: "I am told that I must abuse Russia if I am to be popular in America." Does that sound familiar? Yet well-informed per-

sons admitted even then that they could learn something from the vast and "mysterious" country popularly supposed to contain nothing but snow, wolves and drunken muzhiks.

An English reviewer in 1837 realized with astonishment that Russia was already in possession of some kind of national educational system, while his own country had none so organized. The emancipation of the serfs (without a civil war) encouraged American progressives and caused well-founded consternation among the Southern bourgeois. An English commentator of the early period wondered whether it was not the civilization of Russia which was to be feared, rather than its "barbarism"!

The reading of this chapter in literary history ought to have a chastening effect on today's ignoramuses—if they would but read it. When a recent (1950) critic insists on speaking of the Russian scene as "some obscure travail taking place in a darkened corner," Miss Brewster remarks with justified asperity, "The darkened corner on this subject, it may seem to some of us, is the Western mind." She vigorously and with reason supports the statement made by A. L. Rowse in 1929: "The pretense that it is impossible to get reliable information about Russia is itself a propaganda move. . . ." There never has been any excuse for ignorance of Russian language and culture among Western intellectuals, least of all now.

One warning should perhaps be expressed here which the book implies rather than states in so many words. Observing the striking parallels in language between today's blindly hateful charges against the USSR and those leveled against Russia a century ago, we may be tempted to forget the deep-going historical change that separates the two eras. The enemies in both periods have talked about barbarism, inscrutable oriental mentality, tyranny and oppression. Contemporary reactionaries would like to have us believe that, as the language of invective has re-

mained the same, so has the essential reality. In our more enlightened amusement at the likeness of denunciation, we must not allow ourselves to forget the diametric difference between the old regime of corrupt absolutism—and the Soviet regime of our times, where the people are masters in their own house, have put an end to exploitation and all its attendant evils, and are marching forward unitedly to new victories in the arts of peace. Remembering this day-and-night contrast, we can be the better judge and condemn the sinister malice behind those who now mechanically repeat the slogans of ill-will launched over a century ago.

RECOGNITION OF CHINA

Latest Bulletin of Series
Facts for Peace

Pertinent information essential to all who want peace on what U.S. recognition of People's China and its admission to the UN would mean in over-all lessening of international tensions and in trade and jobs for U.S. industry and American workers.

Order from American Peace Crusade,
35 West 26th St., New York 10, N. Y.
10¢ single copy, 6¢ for orders of ten
or more. \$1 a year for six issues of
"Facts for Peace."

LINDEN TREE HEALTH REST

P. O. Box 388
Spring Valley, New York

For rest, relaxation, recuperation and permanent residence for retired men and women. The food is the best! Vegetarian, dairy, fruit, in good taste . . . moderate prices . . . two licensed physicians in charge.

OUR SPECIAL ISSUE ON PEOPLE'S CHINA

Additional copies of our enlarged issue on the New China may be obtained at the rate of 7 for \$1.00.

NEW SOVIET FILMS

All in Spectacular Sovcolor
BRIDE WITH A DOWRY

SKANDERBEG

ADVENTURE IN ODESSA

THE MISTRESS

THE INSPECTOR
GENERAL

ATTACK FROM THE SEA

Coming

STARS OF THE RUSSIAN
BALLET

ALEKO

Artkino Pictures, Inc.

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

EYEWITNESS IN INDO-CHINA

by Joseph R. Starobin

Revealing journey of the only American newspaperman to travel behind the Viet Minh lines, to interview Ho Chi Minh, and to report directly from that battlefield where crucial issues between the East and the West have been dramatically joined.

\$2.50 hard cover \$1.00 paper cover

order through

NEW WORLD REVIEW

NEW WORLD REVIEW
PROUDLY ANNOUNCES

A Dinner Honoring
Eslanda and Paul Robeson

*For their matchless contributions to
a better America and a peaceful world*

Manhattan Towers Hotel
Broadway and 76th St., NYC

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 14, 6:30 P.M.

*You are invited to attend this notable
evening of tribute and entertainment*

We urge all our readers in New York and environs to make
their reservations early to insure accommodations. Reservations
at \$7.50 a plate; tables seat ten persons.

NEW WORLD REVIEW • 23 W. 26th St. • New York 10

Please make reservations for me at the dinner
honoring Eslanda and Paul Robeson. I am enclosing ☐ cash
☐ check ☐ money order

Name

Address

City Zone State