

✓ SOCIAL SCIENCES ✓

MARCH 1955

20¢

PUBLIC LIBRARY

✓ MAR - 51955

New World

REVIEW

FORMOSA

by Susan Warren

Man Masters Nature

A new series by Nikolai Mikhailov

The Moscow Changes

by Jessica Smith

**D. N. Pritt Visits Soviet Prisons • Chinese
Worker Tells of New Life • Khrushchev Out-
lines Soviet Agricultural Policy**

NEW WORLD *Review*

MARCH 1955

We Can Be Friends
Jessica Smith 3

Formosa
Susan Warren 10

Some Thoughts on Negro
History Week
Eslanda Robeson 20

Man Masters Nature
Nikolai Mikhailov 22

Chinese Worker-Inventor
Tells of New Life
Li Keng-yuan 28

Two Soviet Prisons
D. N. Pritt 32

Khrushchev on Agricultural
Policy 39

Soviet Youth's Visit in
England
Victor Khmara 44

JESSICA SMITH, *Editor*

FREDERICK V. FIELD, *For Eastern Editor*

ANDREW VOYNOW, *Managing Editor*

ESLANDA ROBESON

*Editorial Consultant on Negro and
Colonial Questions*

Vol. 23, No. 2, March, 1955. 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.

WOLF! WOLF!

One of our readers has written that she fears our constant appeals for help to keep the magazine alive are like the fable of the shepherd who kept calling "Wolf! Wolf!" as a joke, so when the wolf was really there no one came.

In case any others feel the same way, we must explain that we don't make jokes of that kind.

Our particular wolf, whose name is Bill (and he runs in packs), really is at the door every time we call for help, and it is only the wonderful response we receive from our readers that drives him away.

We've recently sent you a letter about our efforts to frighten him off, by using the axe on our budget. But that isn't enough without your help in sending funds to sustain what's left of it. Some of you have answered promptly and generously. But the Bills are still growling, and won't go away until the rest of you come to the rescue.

PLEASE NOTE THAT PRODUCTION DELAYS DUE TO STAFF ECONOMIES, MOVING INTO SMALLER QUARTERS, ETC., HAVE COMPELLED US TO SKIP THE FEBRUARY ISSUE. SUBSCRIPTIONS WILL BE EXTENDED AN EXTRA MONTH SO YOU WILL GET YOUR FULL QUOTA FOR THE YEAR.

But the cry must still be the same. Please send whatever you can today to drive the wolves away and keep NEW WORLD REVIEW alive.

NEW WORLD REVIEW

23 West 26th St., New York 10

I am enclosing \$ to help you
to continue to publish your magazine.

Name

Address

City

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

NEW WORLD REVIEW

WE CAN BE FRIENDS

**New moves of the USSR stress
need to preserve world peace**

by JESSICA SMITH

AN APPEAL to the parliaments of the world, including the Congress of the United States, to exchange delegations in order to help "preserve the peace of the world," was the final action of the meeting of the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union which concluded on February 10. The Soviet advocated a universal system of collective security, reduction of armaments, banning of atomic weapons and promotion of peaceful coexistence among states of different social systems. The appeal listed as the basis for peaceful coexistence the five principles on which agreements have already been reached between the Chinese and the Indian and Burmese governments, and which are the basis of Soviet-Chinese relations:

In our relations with all nations, the Soviet Union is motivated by the principles of friendly relations with all peoples, equality of nations, non-interference in internal affairs of other countries, non-aggression and respect for the sovereignty and national independence of all peoples.

This historic move, confirming the consistency and determination of the Soviet peace policy, has been played down by the political commentators, who have filled the press and air waves with a wild clamor of misinformation, speculation and hysterical prophesy about the meaning of the changes in the Soviet Government.

At this crucial moment in world

affairs it is important that the American people should not be swayed by this clamor, but make a sober and reasoned appraisal of the actual words and policies of the Soviet leaders and Government against the background of the realities of the world situation. This requires an understanding of how seriously the new tensions and heightened war danger arising from the situation in and around Formosa and from the plans for the rearming of Western Germany are taken by the USSR.

The Soviet Union has consistently sought to reduce tensions and to bring about big power negotiations and peaceful coexistence. Our Government has consistently rebuffed these efforts, refused negotiations, and plunged ahead with its policies of building up "situations of strength" and military alliances, and threats of an H-bomb war.

The first thing to be kept in mind is that the door to negotiations and peaceful settlements remains open. This has been made clear by both the Soviet and Chinese governments.

But the lengths to which the war advocates have gone in recent weeks in pushing forward aggressive policies, have compelled both these governments to give new attention to the needs of building up defensive strength even while strengthening their efforts for peace.

Further confirmation of the Soviet peace policy is to be found in the interview of William Randolph Hearst Jr. with the new Soviet Premier, Nikolai Bulganin. As reported by Kingsbury Smith in the Hearst papers of February 13, Bulganin told Hearst that "the Soviet Government's policy of seeking to improve relations with the United States remains unchanged despite the sharp attacks on America made at the meetings of the Supreme Soviet." Smith quoted Bulganin as saying:

Our assurances of our desire to have good normal relations with the United States Government are quite sincere.

According to a report in the *New York Times* the same day, Marshall MacDuffie, New York lawyer, on his return from a visit to Moscow, reported that Nikolai Khrushchev, First Secretary of the Communist Party, had told him in an interview:

We want more normal relations with the United States, but the first prerequisite is more normal trade.

It is most ardently to be hoped that President Eisenhower's moderate tone in his February 9 press conference in relation to the Soviet Government changes, presages the possibility of a new look at the question of negotiations, if sufficient pressure is brought by the American people.

Changes in Soviet Leadership

In assessing the meaning of the decisions of the Supreme Soviet, it must be borne in mind that both the internal needs and foreign policies of the Soviet Union require the soundest possible economy. Renewed

emphasis on heavy industry in recent weeks has not indicated any sudden or sharp change in policy. Heavy industry has at all times been recognized as the essential basis on which alone an abundance of consumers' goods can be built up. Recent discussions in the Soviet press have indicated that in some quarters there had been a tendency to build up light industries *at the expense* of heavy industry, rather than parallel to it, which had never been intended. Added to that, the necessity for greater attention to defense which was the direct result of the plans for rearming Western Germany, may call for a slightly slower tempo in the building up of consumers' goods than had been expected at a time when it looked as though the ending of the wars in Korea and Indo-China might be the beginning of a period of easing of international tensions.

This was reflected in the budget adopted by the Supreme Soviet before the changes in government took place. In the preceding two years, **the proportion** of Soviet defense expenditures had been reduced. The new budget provides for a 12 per cent increase in defense expenditures. At the same time, defense expenditures are only 20 per cent of the Soviet budget, in which cultural, educational and social insurance expenditures are also increased.

Agricultural production is a constant need for the well-being of the people as well as an essential factor in defense considerations. In his forthright, self-critical statement of his reason for requesting to be relieved of the post of Chairman of the Council of Ministers, Malenkov acknowledged that lack of experience in direct economic work had hampered him in carrying out the complicated and responsible duties of

his post. He specifically took responsibility for the unsatisfactory state of affairs in agriculture, and declared that large scale measures for correcting this lag were now being undertaken under the guidance of the Communist Party. This program, he said, was based on "the only correct foundation: The further development by every means of heavy industry, and only its implementation, will create the necessary conditions for a real upsurge in the production of all essential commodities for popular consumption."

Following the acceptance by the Supreme Soviet of Malenkov's resignation, Khrushchev proposed the appointment in his place of Nikolai Bulganin. He described him as "a great and talented organizer" with "great experience in political, state, economic and military activity," as evidenced by his work in the post of Chairman of the Moscow Soviet and Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars of the RSFSR, in important wartime duties, and in his latest posts as Deputy Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars and Minister of Defense of the USSR. He expressed confidence that Bulganin

... will successfully solve problems of further strengthening the might of our Socialist motherland, insure the development of heavy industry, and on that basis, will attain a new rise in the light and food industries, the development of agriculture, and a rise in the well-being and culture of the Soviet people.

While stressing the fact that the new Premier held the Ministry of Defense, U.S. press reports have pointed out that, as Clifton Daniels put it in the *New York Times* of February 9, "he is not a professional

soldier but an old revolutionary Communist politician and administrator," gaining his military rank as a member of military councils during World War II. According to biographical material published in the same issue of the *Times*, Bulganin gained useful experience in pre-war years in managing the most important Soviet electrical equipment factory, and later "was in the top rank of Government administrators, heading the State Bank and becoming a Deputy Premier." The *Times* biography quoted a Western businessman who had much contact with Bulganin at that time as saying: "No country can have many men of such outstanding intelligence and competence."

In his inaugural address after his unanimous election as Premier, Marshal Bulganin declared that "The whole activity of the Communist Party and the Soviet state is subordinated to the lofty task of constantly improving the life of the workers."

In the part of his address devoted to internal affairs, Bulganin asserted that "heavy industry has always been and remains the foundation for the further upsurge of our national economy." As evidence of the importance of heavy industry, now nearly three and a half times greater in output than in the pre-war year of 1940, he cited the fact that it was this economic base that had been responsible for the USSR triumphing over the enemy in the world war. At the same time, he emphasized:

Heavy industry insures the development of all branches of our national economy, agriculture, light and food industry, and therefore is the source of a constant rise in the prosperity of the Soviet people.

Bulganin outlined in detail the practical new plans of the Soviet Government for increasing grain and livestock production in the next five or six years, through the opening up of virgin lands, increasing the area under corn, and through improved machinery, technical and working methods. He affirmed that the development of heavy industry and agriculture would mean an increase in consumers' goods.

Outlining the specific goals for 1955, the decisive year of the current Five-Year Plan, he called for the further development of Soviet science and technology, an improvement in labor productivity, and better management, with the elimination of bureaucratic methods. He discussed frankly the shortcomings that would have to be overcome, and the justified criticisms by the deputies of the work of government ministries and departments, which he declared would be seriously studied, and acted upon.

The stability of the Soviet Government, despite all the speculations on deep internal rifts, is underlined by the fact that Malenkov has been made Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers, and head of the important Ministry of Electrical Power Industry in the cabinet of his successor.

Molotov on Soviet Foreign Policy

According to excerpts from the address of Viacheslav Molotov to the Supreme Soviet published in the *New York Times* of February 9, the Soviet Foreign Minister stressed the importance of the changes in the international situation since the end of World War II. He declared that the most important result was the formation parallel with the world capi-

talist camp, of a world camp of socialism and democracy headed by the Soviet Union and the Chinese People's Republic. Nearly half of the population of Europe and of Asia, he noted, have entered this camp. Furthermore:

Of great historic significance is the fact that at present there is no colonial India, but the Indian Republic exists. More and more rises the international authority of India, as a new and important factor in the cause of strengthening peace and friendship between peoples. Parallel with India, the colonial regime has been thrown off in Indonesia and Burma. Let us hope that Pakistan and Ceylon and the other peoples of Asia will find their road to a true national freedom and economic revival.

Referring to the policies of the United States and Britain, proclaiming as their main objectives the "liberation" of the countries where the workers and peasants have triumphed, Molotov counterposed to this the peaceable foreign policy of the Soviet Union, directed toward the easing of international tension.

He gave as examples the Berlin Conference, which took place at the insistence of the Soviet Union, and its results in bringing about the Geneva Conference with the participation of the Chinese People's Republic, which achieved the end of the war in Indo-China.

Molotov charged that the Manila conference was convened by Secretary Dulles with the obvious aim "to hamper the implementation of the decisions of the Geneva Conference," and to strangle the national liberation movements in Asia through the SEATO pact, aimed against the Chinese Republic.

Turning to current events in Taiwan (Formosa) and adjacent islands, Molotov stated:

The position of the Soviet Union on this question is clear and well known: We consider that the question of Taiwan is an internal affair of China, while the aggressive actions of the United States and its threats of war we consider as an aggression which must be unconditionally condemned by the United Nations, if it values its authority.

The situation that the Chinese People's Republic's lawful rights have not yet been restored in the United Nations because of the resistance of the United States can no longer be tolerated. The United States must withdraw from Taiwan and the Strait of Taiwan all its armed forces, including its forces in the air and at sea. Then military actions will cease in the Far East and peace will prevail.

Molotov asserted that events in Europe were of equal importance. He declared that while specific details of the Yalta and Potsdam agreements have become obsolete, the Soviet Union continues to stand by their basic principles of restoring the unity of Germany as a genuinely peace-loving and democratic state. The Paris pacts, like the EDC before them, violate these agreements in "opening the gates to the revival of German militarism in West Germany and the inclusion of a remilitarized West Germany in aggressive military groupings of the Western states."

Noting the widespread opposition to the Paris agreements in France and England and Western Germany itself, Molotov reiterated the Soviet position that their ratification "would render it impossible for a long period to re-establish Germany's unity."

At the same time, Mr. Molotov stated plainly that the Soviet Union is still ready to enter into four-power negotiations on German unification. He repeated the proposal made by the Soviet Union on January 15 for a new effort to reach agreement, which, he said:

would make it possible to hold, even this year, all-German elections for the purpose of restoring the unity of Germany on a peace-loving and democratic basis.

The January 15 offer had indicated a readiness on the part of the Soviet Union to reconsider the proposals made by the West regarding all-German elections.

Mr. Molotov also made clear that the proposal of the Soviet Union for a conference on questions of an all-European collective security system remains open, and that the USSR is prepared to consider other proposals as well as its own. He expressed readiness to consider the question of the full restoration of the independence of a democratic Austria, and, indicating that the Soviet Government is prepared to make further concessions for the sake of reaching agreement, declared that the "withdrawal of the armed forces of the four powers from Austria can be achieved without awaiting the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany."

The rejection of Soviet proposals for negotiations, and the increased threat of war arising from the Paris agreements if ratified, had, however compelled the Soviet Union and the other Eastern European states against which they are directed "to undertake corresponding measures for further strengthening of the security and for insuring peace in Europe."

Molotov declared that the eight states which had participated in the Moscow conference were accordingly consulting on the conclusion of a treaty of friendship, collaboration and mutual aid, and on the creation of a unified military command in the event of the formation of a West European military grouping including a remilitarized Western Germany.

With regard to relations between the Soviet Union and the United States, Molotov said:

These relations leave room to wish for better ones. Is such an improvement possible between the USSR and the United States? Quite possible. However, it is necessary that not only the Government of the Soviet Union but also the Government of the United States strive for this.

Noting that the USSR had achieved such success in the production of hydrogen weapons "that it is not the Soviet Union but the United States which is the laggard," Molotov once again held out an offer of peace:

We propose to the United States to compete not in the manufacture of atomic weapons but in the utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

In the foreign policy section of the previously mentioned address of Bulganin, the new Premier expressed his agreement with Foreign Minister Molotov's analysis of the international situation and Soviet foreign policy.

Stressing the determination of the Soviet Government to pursue consistently its policy of peace and friendly relations with all nations, Bulganin said:

We stand for such negotiations and aim at such agreements with

foreign countries as would lead to a relaxation of tension in international relations.

He urged normalization of international trade and removal of barriers as important to the improvement of international relations and expressed the conviction that there are in capitalist countries sound forces which will find means to bring about such an improvement.

Charging that the United States is taking a dangerous course with relation to Taiwan, an inalienable part of Chinese territory, Bulganin expressed complete approval and support of the policy of the Chinese Government in this connection:

The Chinese People's Republic attracts the sympathy of the Soviet people and of all progressive mankind precisely because she is leading a struggle for a just cause, for the honor and independence of her country. In that noble cause, the Chinese people can reckon with the help of their faithful friend, the great Soviet people.

Referring to the positive results of the wartime cooperation between the Soviet Union, the United States, Britain, and France, Bulganin said it was not the fault of the Soviet Union that the situation has changed, and expressed the belief that such cooperation could continue now, in peacetime.

It is noteworthy that in the interview given by Khrushchev to William Randolph Hearst Jr. and Hearst correspondent Kingsbury Smith on February 7, Khrushchev dwelt at length on the consistent desire of the Soviet Union for peaceful coexistence with the United States, declaring "If we can coexist around this table, I should think we could coexist around the globe!"

Eisenhower and Zhukov

On February 8, Soviet Marshal Georgi Zhukov, now promoted from First Deputy Defense Minister to replace Bulganin as Defense Minister, received Mr. Hearst. According to the latter's report of the interview, Zhukov "emphasized that the Soviet people consider American military bases as a direct threat and added that the best proof of American friendship would be withdrawal from bases around Russia," and also expressed a desire for the prohibition of atomic weapons.

Recalling friendly meetings with Eisenhower during the war, Zhukov described the latter as "a very fine person," and said, Hearst reported:

In 1945, I had a talk with General Eisenhower before he left Germany for the United States.

We exchanged best wishes and General Eisenhower said the United States would never attack the Soviet Union.

I said the Soviet Union would never attack the United States. I consider I was not wrong in what I said and I hope General Eisenhower was right in what he said.

We spoke as soldiers and saw no grounds for war between our countries. My sincere wish is to see an improvement in the relations between our countries.

Zhukov expressed gratitude for invitations extended at that time by General Eisenhower that he visit the United States, adding that he still hoped to do so some day:

I fear that relations between our two countries presently are not quite suitable for such a visit, but I certainly hope to go some day. . . . I know our relations will get better. Then I hope to be able to visit the United States.

Asked about this interview at his press conference on February 9, President Eisenhower said that it was a remarkably accurate account of the 1945 conversation. He said he had great respect for Zhukov's abilities back in 1945.

The President recalled that they had been good friends, and that Zhukov and himself "developed personally a practice of getting along and seeing eye to eye on a number of local problems in Berlin, and so far as I was concerned—and I believe he was honest about it—we were trying to set up a pattern . . . to show that even (our) two nations could get along if they would both recognize the folly of not getting along." He said he would not hesitate to talk over with his advisers the possibility of renewing the invitation to Marshal Zhukov to visit this country.

We propose that the American people act as President Eisenhower's advisers, and that he listen to them instead of to Knowland and Radford and the rest of the war-now crowd.

Let the American people flood the President with letters and telegrams of advice to renew those efforts started at Berlin to show that the two nations can and must get along together, and accept the hand that the Soviet Union still offers in friendship.

Let the American people flood the President with messages advising him to use the great power now in his hands to cease military action in Formosa and reach a peaceful settlement with the Chinese People's Republic.

This could mean an end of world tensions, an end of the arms and atomic weapons race, and the beginning of a new bright era of peaceful coexistence among the nations.

FORMOSA

by SUSAN WARREN

THOUGHTFUL Americans who carefully examine President Eisenhower's message to Congress asking for power to "use the armed forces of the U.S. . . . to assure the security of Formosa and the Pescadores" cannot but feel that while the President employs the accents of peace, the program is unmistakably that of Knowland, Radford and McCarthy—the triumvirate of preventive war. Robert S. Allen reported in the *N. Y. Post* on January 25 that at a joint closed meeting of the Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees Senator Alben Barkley specifically asked Secretary of State Dulles whether the proposed joint resolution on Formosa might constitute a "pre-dated declaration of war," and that Dulles replied: "Yes, it would be construed in that way."

It should be remembered that the appearance of unanimity and feverish crusade built up around the President's action, was also given to the Korean "police action" which, for the American people became one

of the most bitterly regretted, unpopular and useless wars in its entire history. The present administration came to power largely on its promise to end the Korean war. When faced with a Democratic sweep in the 1954 Congressional elections, it partially recouped by a last minute claim to have ended one war in Korea and kept the country out of another in Indo-China. Yet in fact the Eisenhower Administration has always tended to move towards the position of the Knowland-Radford-McCarthy "war now" advocates within the Republican Party until checked by the people suddenly awakened to the fact that they have been brought to the brink of war.

The danger is once more acute that war may be touched off by some "incident" thousands of miles from anywhere remotely connected with the defense of our own country. The American people who have refused to continue to die for Syngman Rhee or to be plunged into war for Bao Dai are now calling for a halt to a new and terrible slaughter on behalf of Chiang Kai-shek. That this is not a position of refusing to fight for what is right but one of refusing to fight for what is wrong is clearly established by any examina-

SUSAN WARREN has long been a student and writer on Far Eastern affairs. She was formerly the editor of the "Far East Spotlight."

tion of the background of the present crisis in Formosa.

President Eisenhower's request of January 24 for a free hand not only to "defend Formosa and the Pescadores" but to use U.S. troops as protector of Chiang's forces on the off-shore islands and to bomb China's mainland if deemed necessary, is based on a number of assumptions. Primary among these is that Formosa is not Chinese but somewhere in limbo and that the United States has the exclusive right to dispose of it in whatever way it finds convenient at any given time. Second, and most important for the American people, is the assumption that intervention in Formosa is necessary for the security of the United States. Since these are the premises for a request for authority which Sen. Wayne Morse (Ind., Ore.) has said "could very well mean war" and Sen. Ralph E. Flanders (Rep., Vermont) summed up as "in plain English, this is preventive war"—they deserve sober consideration.

Historic Chinese Territory

Before there was an independent United States, before Columbus touched the shores of the American continent, Formosa was Chinese. Japan's conquest and occupation of the Island (initiated, incidentally, by Japanese aggression in Korea) from 1895 to 1945, was never conceded as justifiable in the eyes of the world. During this entire period the people of Formosa never ceased their struggle against the alien Japanese rule. In a memorandum dated April 18, 1947, recorded in the State Department's "U.S. Relations With China," U.S. Ambassador Leighton Stuart wrote that the Formosan people "After fifty years under Japanese control . . . welcomed a return to

China which they had idealized as the 'Mother Country.'"

Because Formosa is acknowledged as historic Chinese territory by the whole civilized world, it was restored to China by common agreement of all the Allies after World War II. On December 1, 1943, President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill and Chiang Kai-shek, then head of the Chinese state, meeting at Cairo, issued the following Declaration:

. . . all the territories Japan has stolen from the Chinese, such as Manchuria, Formosa and the Pescadores, shall be restored to the Republic of China.

This solemn international commitment was reaffirmed in the Potsdam Declaration signed July 26, 1945, by the United States, the United Kingdom and China, and subsequently adhered to by the USSR.

The Chinese Government accepted the surrender of the Japanese forces on Formosa, and during the five years from 1945 to June 27, 1950, Chinese sovereignty in Formosa was never questioned. With the victory of the People's Republic of China over the utterly repudiated Chiang Kai-shek in 1949, there were those who still could question which was the actual government of China; but the question of Chinese sovereignty in Formosa was established *de jure* and *de facto*.

Truman Started It

On June 27, 1950, President Truman, acting under cover of the fighting in Korea (the Chinese were not involved in Korea until six months later, after U.S. action on Formosa) ordered the U.S. Seventh Fleet to Formosa waters and declared "the determination of the future status

of Formosa must await the restoration of security in the Pacific, a peace settlement with Japan or consideration by the United Nations." Thus Truman unilaterally abrogated treaties jointly signed with America's wartime allies and nullified by ukase China's sovereignty over her own territory. The U.S. thereby proclaimed herself the sole arbiter of what constituted "security in the Pacific."

This move on the part of President Truman in June, 1950 was as much a surrender to the "China Lobby" war program as is the even more dangerous Eisenhower message of January, 1955. The utter cynicism and immorality of Truman's position can be gauged by quoting Truman and his Secretary of State Acheson six months before deploying the Seventh Fleet in the Formosa Straits. Answering the Knowland, MacArthur, Radford critics of the then Democratic Administration policy, Truman back in January, 1950, had referred approvingly to the Cairo and Potsdam declarations regarding restoration of Formosa to China, and declared:

The United States has no desire to obtain special rights or privileges or to establish military bases on Formosa at this time. Nor does it have any intention of utilizing its armed forces to interfere in the present situation. The United States Government will not pursue a course which will lead to involvement in the civil conflict in China. Similarly the United States Government will not provide military aid or advice to the Chinese forces on Formosa. . . .

Secretary of State Acheson elucidated the President's policy declaration the same day:

The world must believe that we

stand for principle and that we are honorable and decent people and that we do not put forward words, as propagandists do in other countries, only to throw them overboard when the change in events makes the position difficult for us. . . .

It is important that our position in regard to China should never be subject to the slightest doubt or the slightest question. . . . When Formosa was made a province of China, nobody raised any lawyer's doubts about that. That was regarded as in accordance with the commitments.

But within a short six months the pledges were thrown overboard and Truman, who had denounced MacArthur in January, adopted his position in June.

Knowland Was Elated

Similarly, today, President Eisenhower, while professing to be "embarrassed" by the belligerent demands of Knowland and Radford for the blockade and bombing of China's mainland in November, has now more than accommodated them. On December 2, 1954, William S. White, in the *New York Times*, quoted President Eisenhower's reply to Knowland's attack on Administration policy. The President had deplored Knowland's "truculent, publicly bold and almost insulting attitude toward the unending harassments of China Communists . . ." as "leading toward war." But by January 25, the same William S. White wrote in the same *N. Y. Times* of the Congressional reaction to the President's message:

The old leaders in advocating a much harder policy towards Communist China than the President had heretofore been willing to contemplate, such men as Sen. Knowland . . . were plainly elated.

Many among the Democratic Party had misgivings, however, and some of the most influential said in private that the "Knowland wing" of the Republican Party appeared at last to have won the President's confidence.

In both the Truman order of June 27, 1950, and the Eisenhower Message of January, 1955, Chiang Kai-shek's "Republic of China" is peremptorily ordered to let the U.S. take over its defense. This cavalier treatment of the bankrupt "friendly government" of Chiang underscores for the American people the well-known fact that Chiang Kai-shek, "leashed" or "unleashed," wouldn't last a day without U.S. support. None other than Senator Byrd, (Dem.-Va.), speaking on the Formosan resolution in the Senate January 28, said scornfully that "Chiang Kai-shek knows better than anyone else that he can never set foot on China again without American planes, troops and ships." The myth of "two Chinas" is here exposed for all who have eyes to see. Chiang is no more than a fast withering fig leaf to hide the nakedness of U.S. intervention.

The Chinese View

The Government of the People's Republic of China, which effectively controls and administers 99 per cent of the nation's territory and people, answered Truman's usurpation of Chinese sovereignty over its own territory in June, 1950, by declaring that armed aggression against China had taken place and the integrity of China's territory had been violated. No less firmly did they reply to Eisenhower's January Message. Premier Chou En-lai stated:

It should be pointed out that the Chinese people's exercise of their own sovereign rights in liberating

China's mainland and many coastal islands has never caused tension in the Far East. The present tension in the Taiwan [Formosa] area can only be attributed to the fact that the U.S. Government has occupied Taiwan, shielded the traitorous Chiang Kai-shek clique and incessantly directed subversive activities and war threats against the People's Republic of China. . . .

This tension will be eliminated as a matter of course if the U.S. drops its intervention in China's internal affairs and withdraws all its armed forces from Taiwan and the Taiwan Straits.

Although President Truman claimed to be "neutralizing" Formosa by stationing the Seventh Fleet in Chinese waters during the Korean war, Chiang Kai-shek was permitted to stage guerrilla raids on the mainland using a generous supply of U.S. arms and aid. Under the U.S. Military Advisory Group stationed on Formosa, this program has been intensified since Eisenhower officially "unleashed" Chiang in January, 1953. The President's request for authority to use U.S. arms to intervene in Formosa cites a "series of provocative political and military actions establishing a pattern of aggressive purpose."

In a situation so serious it is important for the American people to hear the Chinese view of "provocative actions" in the China seas. China's position is given in an article in the November 1, 1954 issue of the publication *People's China*:

Since the Geneva Conference . . . Chiang Kai-shek's attacks on the mainland have become more frequent and rabid. These provocations have taken place in the air, along China's sea coast and on the high seas. Chiang's military aircraft have intensified their bombing, strafing and

reconnaissance activities over the coast of Fukien, Kwantung and Chekiang Provinces. They have flown inland as far as eastern Kiangsi province and have appeared over the outskirts of Shanghai. On September 7 alone, eighteen peaceful inhabitants were killed or wounded by them in the two counties of Chinchiang and Manan, in Fukien.

Chiang's forces on offshore islands as well as his navy are constantly shelling Chinese coastal points, including the important port of Amoy and vessels sailing along the coast. They have destroyed, seized or abducted many fishing craft, and killed or kidnapped their crews. They have attacked 67 merchant vessels, most of them British, in the past five years.

That the U.S. has continually assisted this piracy by flying planes over China's coastal waters was admitted by Admiral Stump when interviewed in the *U.S. News and World Report* of August 27, 1954. Asked "Is there anything to the Communist charge that American aircraft spot ships heading for Communist ports for the benefit of the Chinese Nationalists?" He replied: "We conduct patrols over seas of the ocean in which we have an interest."

If It Happened to Us . . .

So preposterous is the notion that a great power like China could continue to tolerate bombing and blockading by a small native faction backed by a foreign power, that former British Prime Minister, Clement Attlee, right wing labor leader said in a speech to Parliament in July, 1954:

Supposing General Burgoyne, instead of surrendering at Saratoga, had been thrown into Long Island,

and suppose some king of Europe, strongly objecting to Republicanism, had offered them arms and a fleet to prevent the Americans from getting at it? I do not think that Washington and his friends would have regarded that as a very friendly act. I suggest that the thing that stands in the way of a settlement is precisely this: Formosa and the seat at the United Nations.

World-Wide Condemnation

The Truman capitulation on Formosa before the MacArthur "spread-the-war" advocates of June, 1950, evoked a world-wide storm of condemnation. President Eisenhower's latest Formosa message is receiving the same troubled reception. While the British Government under the aegis of Conservative Anthony Eden is "playing it close" popular opposition is mounting.

Clement Attlee, leader of Britain's Labor Party, suggested that Chiang Kai-shek and his Nationalist officials should be exiled from Formosa. "I cannot see myself," the *New York Times*, January 31, 1955, reported his as saying, "that the island of Formosa is an essential part of the defense of America in this era of the hydrogen bomb. It is clear that the Peiping Government won the civil war against Chiang Kai-shek. It would then have occupied Formosa but for the U.S. fleet."

Anthony Greenwood, Labor Member of Parliament, declared that whatever Formosa's legal status "it certainly doesn't belong to America." He advised Secretary of State Dulles to withdraw support from "that discredited megalomaniac Chiang Kai-shek."

The Executive Council of the South Wales area of the National Union of Mine Workers declared in

a resolution that U.S. policy "can only lead to a world war ultimately leading to the use of nuclear weapons and engulfing the whole of mankind."

The *Manchester Guardian*, in an editorial entitled "A Blunder," described the ambiguities in the message as "deplorable" and so "clumsily constructed that it appears to contain a veiled threat of American attack on the Chinese mainland."

The Labor Weekly *Tribune* under an editorial headed "A War We Won't Fight" declared that the Government must assert that the British people were "strongly opposed" to President Eisenhower's message and "consequent military action."

The largest daily newspaper in Britain, the *Daily Mirror*, with a circulation of 4,500,000, ran a prominently displayed editorial, warning that . . . "America's present policy on China is wrong and perilous" and "If America involves herself in a major war because of this policy such a war would not command the sympathy of the British people. . . . The present crisis is the direct result of a historical blunder. The blunder was America's refusal to recognize the Communist Government of China."

In Asia the reaction was, if anything, stronger. Philip Deane in the *Herald Tribune* of Jan. 31, wrote:

President Eisenhower's Message to Congress . . . was interpreted at New Delhi as not merely a tactical error but a reversal of the 'reasonable trend' lately evident in official American policy. In particular, the Indians take the Message to mean that the U.S. would fight not only over Formosa but also over Matsu and Quemoy. This is thought to be so provocative that Peking cannot possibly be expected to compromise.

The *Straits Times* of Singapore editorialized that U.S.'s protection for the coastal islands would undoubtedly increase tension and "invite an incident" that could involve the U.S. in war. The English language daily, *The Singapore Standard*, declared, "Asian nations did not want to be saved from Communism or anything else by the U.S."

It remained for Max Lerner, columnist for the *New York Post*, to sum up Asian reaction as he found it on an extensive tour to the Far East:

I have found here a persistent conviction that America is responsible for the current Formosa crisis and has the bad side of the case . . . the fact is that if we get into war over Formosa we will have to go it alone. Even the SEATO (South east Asia Treaty Organization) countries do not feel the pact commits them to help defend Chiang's domain. . . . There is another current opinion here . . . I have heard the Chiang's troops will not fight and the Formosa people will not back him up . . . in many Asian eyes makes us seem to be the aggressor. And it brings into play again the deeply felt conviction all the way from Tokyo to Djakarta and from Singapore to Rangoon and Delhi that America has no business backing Chiang's cause and fostering the dream of some day returning to the mainland. (January 31)

In his Message to Congress the President claims to be acting in the interest of all the "free nations." However, any polling of world opinion quickly establishes the fact that the U.S. is the only nation which equates the cause of Chiang Kai-shek with that of the "free world." Administration publicists have sought to represent the President

ferences to the United Nations in his Message as something "new" and "conciliatory" in U.S. policy toward China. But liberal Americans to whom "United Nations consideration" under any circumstances constitutes an advance should be wary of the pitfalls. The United Nations could be a tremendous aid in settling the current crisis if the real and effective Government of China participates as an equal and sovereign power whose territorial integrity is considered inviolate. "UN consideration" under any other conditions could be mere camouflage behind which previous solemn international commitments to restore Formosa to China can be repudiated, and illegal acts of dismembering China and interfering in her internal affairs given the cloak of legitimacy. A revealing glimpse of the type of "UN consideration" proposed by the "U.S. and her allies" is afforded by the well-informed *New York Post* columnist Doris Fleeason (January 25):

What a cease-fire would *not mean* is that the Nationalists would have to give up any of their present activities short of war; to the extent that they were able they could continue their campaign against the Communist government of the mainland.

What could be plainer? This kind of "UN consideration" moreover, means an effort, through the U.S. controlled majority, to pin the label "aggressor" on the People's Republic of China and place her in the position of seeming to defy the United Nations if she acts to safeguard her own territory.

It was because the U.S.-supported New Zealand resolution, was presented on the kind of "consideration" described above that the invita-

tion extended to the Chinese People's Republic to send a representative was declined. The Chinese Government informed the United Nations it would send a representative for the purpose of discussing the resolution offered by the Soviet Union in the Security Council, but only when "the representative of the Chiang Kai-shek clique has been driven out . . . and the representative of the People's Republic of China is to attend in the name of China." The note concluded with the statement that the Chinese People's Government would support "all genuine international efforts to ease the tension," thus leaving the door open for negotiations.

The Soviet resolution, which has been placed on the agenda of the Security Council, calls for an end of U.S. aggression in China and an end of U.S. intervention in Chinese internal affairs, and for the withdrawal of U.S. naval, air and land forces from Formosa and other Chinese territories.

As this article goes to press, the UN has suspended consideration of the matter, leaving the way open for efforts initiated by the USSR and supported by India, to organize a Ten-Power Conference on Formosa, including People's China. The proposal has been rejected by the United States on the basis that Chiang Kai-shek would not be invited. While Peking and Moscow have consistently sought to keep the door open for negotiations, Washington has as consistently sought to freeze the status quo in Formosa. A further step in this process was the Treaty with Chiang Kai-shek approved by the U.S. Senate February 9, "granting" the U.S. the right to station land, air and sea forces in and near Formosa and the Pescadores.

Is U.S. Security Involved?

It has been stated above that one of the basic and most questionable assumptions of both the Truman and Eisenhower positions is that intervention in Formosa is necessary for Pacific security and U.S. defense. It should be noted that the United States is one of twelve nations (outside of Latin America) bounding the "Pacific area" and that it does not necessarily appear to the other eleven that "what is good for the United States is good for the Pacific." President Truman described his Formosan intervention order as a "temporary measure" intended to "safeguard security in the Pacific." Five years later, and a year and a half after the end of the Korean fighting, this policy is not only still in force but extended by President Eisenhower's call for intensified intervention for the "peace and security of that area."

Who has imperiled the peace and security of the Pacific area? Is it because the Chinese are in China, claim the use and right to their coastal waters and islands, or because the armed forces of the U.S. are 5,000 miles from their homeland claiming the right to patrol China's shores and intervene in her internal affairs that peace and security in the Pacific is disturbed?

Does the United States need Formosa for its military defense even in the broadest interpretation of that word? In the *New York Times*, February 1, 1955, Hanson Baldwin, military analyst, declared:

In a military sense it [Formosa] is more important to us negatively than positively. . . . Formosa's real importance is political and psychological. . . . It seems certain there-

fore that Formosa, while far from vital to the military defense of the United States is highly important . . . in a political sense. . . ." (Emphasis added).

MacArthur's New Tune

It is significant that General MacArthur, who in 1950 regarded Formosa as "the center" of the U.S. Pacific front, chose to make a speech two days after President Eisenhower's Message, in which he said:

War has become a Frankenstein to destroy both sides. If you win you stand only to lose . . . it contains . . . the germs of double suicide. . . . Each side so far as the masses are concerned is equally desirous of peace. For either side war with the other side would mean nothing but disaster. Both equally dread it. But the constant acceleration of preparation may well, without specific intent, ultimately produce a spontaneous combustion. . . . We should now proclaim our readiness to abolish war. . . .

Whatever the motivations of this speech, MacArthur is a man with a vast experience and knowledge on the subject of war—particularly war in the Far East. "Whatever be-tides, the ultimate fate of the Far East," he said further, ". . . will not be settled by force of arms."

In spite of the confidence which many Americans undoubtedly feel in the sincerity of President Eisenhower's personal desire to avoid war, the Formosa Message has aroused unprecedented anxiety in the country. The House vote of 409-3 and the Senate vote 85-3 in support of authorizing the President to use U.S. armed forces in and around Formosa bears little relation to the opinion of the large majority of the

American people or even the Congressmen themselves.

William S. White (*New York Times*, January 26) reported that "A good many in the House made it plain that they were voting for the resolution in a difficult frame of mind, but they felt it unthinkable to reject the President's program at this stage." Extreme haste, party machine pressure, and Eisenhower's personal reassurances were required to obtain these majorities. Rep. Siler (Rep., Kentucky), who voted "no," explained he had promised the mothers among his constituents that he would never help "engage their boys in war on foreign soil thousands of miles away from our American continent." In the Senate, Morse (Ind., Ore.) argued that the Administration's approach could not be reconciled with America's traditional unwillingness to strike first in any war. According to Senator Morse, what the resolution proposed was: "We threaten you [China] with aggression if you follow some course of action on your mainland that we think . . . may result in your making an attack on us." Senator Bricker of the extreme right described the resolution as an "ultimatum" involving a calculated risk of war. As such he supported it. Even Senator George, of Georgia, Democratic leader in the Senate and party whip in corraling recalcitrant Democratic votes, conceded that what the Senate was about to authorize might lead "to an evil to our country and to a horrible experience."

War Can Be Blocked

The essential continuity of U.S. foreign policy from Truman to Eisenhower is only one side of the story in relation to Formosa.

What is new and most significant remains to be said. *It is that what was possible for the war advocates to carry through in 1950 can be blocked in 1955.* There need be no more Koreas. Although President Eisenhower's Message greatly increases the war danger, in the intervening five years the people of the world and the United States have accumulated the strength to block war. The cause of peace is in their hands. This shift in power to the side of those who demand negotiations and peace has already been demonstrated and is reflected, even if somewhat dimly, in a *Wall Street Journal* editorial of January 24, 1955, which comments on the Formosan situation:

There is a case against Congressional haste in the matter. It has been almost an article of faith that if this country is going to intervene in a foreign war it must act fast. . . . But the result is that often we leap before looking as we did in Korea. In Indo-China last year, in contrast, we took a good look and did not leap; few will regret that decision.

It was not the Administration but the American people who "took a good look" at Indo-China. What did they find? A civil war in which the whole people supported the Viet-minh liberation movement, deep division among America's allies, the resentment and hostility of all Asia and most of the world. The American people took a good look and came to the inescapable conclusion that *this was a war we could not win.* They let their Congressmen know in great numbers that they wanted no part in it.

Are not these essentially the same conditions which would prevail in

China? They are, and that is why Justice William O. Douglas, who has traveled extensively in Asia, warned on January 3, 1955, that "invasion of Red China would be the most disastrous adventure possible for America."

It should be understood that the President's Message to Congress requesting the authority which he claimed in that same Message he already possessed as Commander-in-Chief of the U.S. armed forces, was at least partly motivated by the desire to forestall criticism of warlike measures the Administration was contemplating in Formosa by creating the appearance of national unity and popular support for its program. Senator Morse, speaking on the resolution on Formosa before the U.S. Senate, warned on January 27 that "There are various reasons for wanting an early disposition of this resolution . . . one of the reasons on the part of Administration leaders is that *they would like to get the matter settled before the people learn too much about it.*"

Let the People Be Heard

The lesson the Administration learned from Korea was to stifle criticism. The lesson the American people learned was "no more Koreans." It is the ordinary men and women of America who can and must influence Congress on the issue of peace. The influence they exerted to bring the Korean war to an end and prevent involvement of American armed forces in Indo-China proves how powerful they can be when vocal and active in behalf of peace.

The millions strong trade union movement composed of the men who would have to do the fighting and

dying in a war which Senator Morse says would not "end in a day or in a year or in ten years . . .", are now called upon to give life to the warning embodied in the last C.I.O. Convention Resolution on foreign policy. This resolution denounced Senator Knowland as "the loudest of these voices" who are pressing for a policy of "immoral, so-called preventive war" and promised that "If the Administration should compromise with the Knowlands, it should meet our instant and forthright opposition."

The question of Formosa is inseparable from the larger problem of China as a whole. Military intervention in Formosa with its danger of World War is the logical consequence of a refusal to accept the irrefutable fact that the People's Republic of China is firmly established as the effective government of China. Chiang Kai-shek has lost the civil war. This is an irreversible historic fact.

Millions of Americans, regardless of political beliefs, are coming to regard recognition of the People's Republic of China as synonymous with recognition of the facts of life. Millions more oppose intervention in Formosa as unjustified and creating the danger of war with China. To speak out now against any rash act that can lead to World War III; to speak for negotiations among the sovereign powers with the People's Republic of China participating as an equal, whether through the UN or by other arrangements conducive to peaceful settlements; to speak for permanent peace in the Far East through recognition of the People's Republic of China and her admission to the United Nations, is to speak with the voice of genuine American patriotism.

SOME THOUGHTS ON NEGRO HISTORY WEEK

by ESLANDA ROBESON

MANY OF USE are accustomed to think of Negro history in terms of slavery, emancipation, and progress of the Negro people from then till now.

Every year a sort of summary is made, noting the rights which Negro American citizens have been belatedly and reluctantly accorded after years of monumental patience, sacrifice and struggle on the part of the Negro people and the all-too small group of progressive democratic white fellow citizens. Rights, mind you, which all citizens are accorded anyway by law as inalienable in our Constitution.

This summary during Negro history Week each February has become more and more embarrassing and more revealing of what has been illegally and arbitrarily denied to the Negro People. This year the Supreme Court decision to abolish segregation in the public schools will be hailed, but we will also have to note that the decision is being flouted and openly resisted by some un-American citizens and officials in some of the very un-American areas of our land.

We Negro people have borne this un-American, undemocratic activity for years—always working and fighting to put an end to it. But nowadays, when we listen to and read all the high-powered propaganda about “de-

mocracy and freedom,” “free nations in a free world” which the Administration broadcasts all over the face of the earth, we Negroes find this undemocratic behavior at home all the more contradictory and harder to bear, and we are becoming more impatient and disgusted.

Freedom and democracy, like charity, begin at home. It is just not good enough to *talk* like democrats; Americans must *act* like democrats, if they want to be accepted as members-in-good-standing of the world community.

We Negroes are becoming all the more impatient as we learn about what is going on among the colored peoples elsewhere in this great wide wonderful world. Our hearts beat faster when we learn that Africans in the Gold Coast are governing themselves, and that Africans in Nigeria will soon be doing likewise.

We hold our breath with anxiety and sympathy for Africans in South Africa who have organized with Indians and colored people there to resist Malan's vicious policy of Apartheid.

We worry about Africans in Kenya who are undergoing genocide. We rejoice with Africans in Buganda who persistently demanded, and finally secured, the restoration of their Kabaka.

This year, during Negro History

Week, we are profoundly excited and greatly intrigued by the projected Asian-African Conference in Indonesia, the last week in April.

This is really something!

The Colombo Powers—Burma, Ceylon, India, Indonesia and Pakistan—so called because the Prime Ministers of these five nations originally met in Colombo, Ceylon—have sponsored this forthcoming conference of thirty Asian and African nations.

These nations comprise a population of one and a quarter billion people, more than half the population of the earth—the vast majority of them non-white.

And nearly all of these people have been under the domination of the white colonial Western "democratic" nations for generations, and so they know the facts of life, and have a very practical concrete conception of freedom, self-government and democracy which no theory, ideology, elegant conversations, double-talk and promises can confuse.

The Prime Ministers of the Colombo Powers sponsoring the Conference—Mr. U Nu (Burma), Sir John Kotelawala (Ceylon), Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru (India), Dr. Ali Sastroamidjojo (Indonesia), and Mr. Mohammed Ali (Pakistan)—issued a communique defining the purposes of the Conference:

To promote goodwill and cooperation among the African and Asian nations, explore and advance mutual interests, and enhance friendly and neighborly relations. . . .

To consider problems of special interest to African and Asian peoples, such as national sovereignty, racialism and colonialism.

To review the position of the African and Asian peoples in the world today, and the contribution they can

make to the promotion of world peace and cooperation.

The potentialities of this Conference are enormous, especially considering that the giants of Asia, New China and India, will be there. Certainly its aims and purposes are statesmanlike, constructive and unifying—far more so than the destructive dividing aims and purposes enunciated by the West.

However technical know-how confident, military-security obsessed, power-bloc drunk, and white-supremacy arrogant the Western Powers may be, they cannot fail to be enormously impressed and profoundly influenced by the spectacle of more than half the world's people lining up together for the purpose of friendly, neighborly partnership for constructive negotiation, cooperation and development, and for widening the areas of peace in the world.

It may well be that representatives of these one and a quarter billion people may prove to be the modern Wise Men of the East, who will bring the world calm, goodwill and peace.

It may well be that from this historic meeting next April on the other side of the world will come the initiative, imagination and humanity, the moral strength, courage and will, and the practical down-to-earth common sense which the West seems to have lost while wandering in the dangerous never-never land of futile power pacts.

And it may well be that next year when we celebrate Negro History Week, our whole world may have changed for the better, and we will be taking note of the real and happy progress not only for the Negro People, but for all non-white and white people—that is to say for human beings everywhere.

MAN MASTERS NATURE

Harnessing Soviet Rivers

With this article we are proud to begin a series by the distinguished Soviet geographer describing the great hydro-technical projects already built and now under construction in the Soviet Union

by NIKOLAI MIKHAILOV

EVERY TIME I look at the map I am struck by the geographical similarity between the United States and the Soviet Union. Both are continuous massive expanses in the northern hemisphere stretching from sea to sea. Both possess vast natural resources. Both boast an amazing variety of climatic and plant zones. Both are endowed with endless fertile plains, extensive stretches of pasture land, dense forests and mighty rivers.

In general surface structure, the United States and the Soviet Union are like each other's reflection in a mirror: in both, one-half is flat country and the other half mountainous, with this difference: in the USA the mountainous half is in the West, and in the USSR, in the East. In each, along the meridian in the

flat country, passes an ancient, eroded mountain range, not high but rich in useful minerals: the Appalachian Range in the USA and the Ural Range in the USSR. Each country has a series of great lakes in the northern part of the flat lands. The Mississippi may be likened to the Russian Volga—it too carries its abundant waters from north to south, intersecting the entire country. Beyond the Mississippi, just as beyond the Volga, are arid steppes and deserts. And fertile sub-tropical Florida in many ways resembles the climate of the western part of the Georgian Republic.

And even in the historical and geographical development of our two countries, great though the differences have been, there are similarities—again reflected as in a mirror:

the settling of America was from the East, and of Russia from the West. The West in America and the East in the Soviet Union are, therefore, with respect to settlement, relatively young territories.

The mastery of nature in both countries has presented and still presents similar problems. The way to plough up virgin lands, methods of combatting soil erosion in the agricultural plains, utilization of the sub-tropics, conquest of the deserts, the way to reconstruct rivers—these and similar problems interest both the USA and the USSR.

I want to tell the American reader how the work of mastering and re-making nature is at present being developed in the Soviet Union. As people familiar with such tasks, I believe that Americans will appreciate the importance and scale of these undertakings and the difficulties involved.

At the present level of technical development a major form of influencing the natural scene is regulation of the flow of surface waters. Drainage plays a great role in the life of the landscape: it shapes the relief, supplies moisture to vegetation and carries nutritious matter from one place to another. Drainage yields to man's influence more easily than many other components of nature, and therefore the regulating role of man with respect to drainage is especially great. It is expressed primarily in the regulation of rivers.

The economic result of regulating rivers can be comprehensive, including not only the supplying of electric power, but improved transportation and irrigation of arid fields. Hydro-technical development, therefore, occupies an important place in present day economy, particularly in those countries having vast water-power

THE AUTHOR

Nikolai Mikhailov is a well known Soviet geographer and writer. He is a member of the editorial board of the magazine *Soviet Union*, and his books are known throughout Europe and to American readers. He is extremely popular in the Soviet Union and has been awarded the Stalin Prize for his works. Among his books published in the United States are *Land of the Soviets*, *The Russian Story*, *Soviet Russia*, and *The Sixteen Republics of the USSR*.

resources and extensive farming areas requiring more moisture, and where because of great distances river transportation can play an important part. The USSR and the USA are countries of this kind.

As a geographer and writer I travel a good deal, and in recent years have had occasion to see many large construction developments in the USSR. I have seen the huge hydroelectric stations going up on the Volga, the immense irrigation canals being dug in the deserts of Central Asia and the boundless Russian steppes being covered with a network of forest shelter belts. It is of the meaning of these undertakings, which are changing nature in the Soviet Union and which primarily have to do with regulating the flow of waters, that I want to tell.

THE SOVIET UNION, the largest country in the world, has the largest river network and the greatest water power resources. There are at least 100,000 rivers in the USSR which have basins with an area of 39 square miles or more each. Ac-

cording to Prof. E. V. Bliznyak, potential water-power resources, including those of small rivers and sloping drainage, exceed 400 million kilowatts.

Rivers flow with a great head over the vast Russian plain, over Siberia's expanses, and from mountains in the Caucasus and Central Asia rush rivers, moving stones and grinding off rocks.

Before the 1917 Revolution, however, Russia had practically no hydroelectric stations. Her rivers were used to grind grain, to carry rafts of timber and to turn the heavy water wheels of the old Ural factories.

It is only in the last three decades that many large hydroelectric stations have been built in the USSR, in every part of the country—in the extreme south on the Kura and Rion rivers in the Caucasus, where it is so warm that the rivers never freeze; and in the Far North on the Niva and Tuloma rivers, where in summer the builders sank in the bogs, and in winter the frozen ground blunted the tools, and the ice at the bottom of the rivers clung to the blades of the turbines. Hydroelectric stations have been built on the flat Volga plains, where the rivers flow quietly, and in the gorges of the Pamir, where the rivers drop precipitously, foaming around the rocks. They were built not only in different areas but under different geological conditions—on foundations of rock as well as on soft ground. The one built on the clayey ground of the banks of the Svir River east of Leningrad was purposely made to lean, and when the bottom settled the building straightened. The Tsymlyanskaya Hydroelectric Station was built on fine sand.

One of the first large hydroelectric

stations built in the USSR was on the Dnieper, the Dnieproges. On its way to the sea, the Dnieper flows over on old crystalline bed. For a distance of 60 miles rocks block its channel, forming rapids which only skilful pilots in small boats could navigate. The rapids thus divided the river into two separate navigable segments.

In the 'thirties the dam of the Dnieper Hydroelectric Station partitioned the river with a ribbed concrete arc, raising the water level more than 120 feet, forming a vast lake. The rapids disappeared. The Dnieper became navigable throughout, intersected by a water rung—a lock. At the same time it was the largest hydroelectric station in Europe.

I shall never forget my feeling as I walked along the high dam and heard the mighty roar of the Dnieper, clad in reinforced concrete. It was a feeling of genuine admiration of the power of man. When I walked into the control room of the station, I was struck by the perfect quiet—one man, the engineer on duty, was managing the submissive Dnieper all alone.

During World War II the station was demolished. But in 1943, when fighting was still at its height, a new and reborn Dnieproges was being designed. And when the Hitlerites were driven from the banks of the Dnieper the restoration of the station began. In the spring of 1947 the first of the new and more powerful turbines yielded current, and later the whole station began to operate at full capacity.

The reconstruction of the Dnieper, however, was not confined to Dnieproges. Not all of the power of the river was being taken. And so today another hydroelectric station—the



Construction of the spillway (above) of the Kakhovka Hydroelectric Station on the Dnieper. Below: Builders of the station spend Sunday in the park of the new town, Novaya Kakhovka. Open air theater is seen in background.





Construction site of the Angara Hydroelectric Station near Irkutsk, in Siberia. This is only one of several stations to be built on that river.

Kakhovka Hydroelectric Station—is being erected on it nearer to the Black Sea. Soon it will intercept the water which passes through the turbines and ports of the Dnieproges dam and will produce additional power and help irrigate the arid steppes of the Southern Ukraine. In time stations will appear on the river above the Dnieproges too.

Especially large hydroelectric developments have been launched in the USSR since the war, with the upswing of peacetime economy. Commissioned recently, for instance was the Mingechaur Hydroelectric Station in Transcaucasia, one of the country's largest. At the point where the Kura River cuts through the Boz Dag Ridge to the plain via a narrow gorge, two million carloads of sand and gravel went to make the highest dam in Europe or Asia. The station produces much electricity and makes it possible to irrigate arid lands in Azerbaidzhan.

A unique cascade of hydroelectric stations is being built on Lake Sevan in Soviet Armenia. The lake lies in a bowl of petrified lava more than a mile above sea level. Covering some 580 square miles, it is one of the largest mountain lakes in the world.

Only one river flows from it, namely, the Razdan (Zangu) River, which drains only one and three quarters billion cubic feet of water from the lake's 2,053 billion cubic feet. The rest of the lake's inflow used to evaporate from its surface.

Before it falls into the Aras River, the Razdan flows for 93 miles, dropping more than half a mile in that stretch. On the Razdan seven hydroelectric stations will be strung out. The water will drop from station to station via an open channel, derivation canals and tunnels. Besides getting tens of thousands of additional acres of new orchards and fields as a result of irrigation, Armenia will also get much electricity—more than is generated by Dnieproges. Of the cascade's large stations, the Ozer-naya, Gyumush and Kanaker are already up and operating, and the Arzni station is under construction.

The cheap abundant electric power obtained from the Sevan cascade is already transforming Armenia's economy. Yerevan, the capital, has become a large center of industries using much electric power. And when the cascade is working at full capacity, Armenia's industry will flourish still more.

Lake Sevan is being slowly poured off via a tunnel dug at the source of the Razdan. The lake is already several yards lower. In half a century, it will drop 160 feet. And then it will drop no more. The thing is that the lake consists of two parts which are connected by a sound: one is wide but shallow, and the other comparatively small but deep. The wide but shallow part is now running out, and in 50 years will disappear. As the surface of the lake diminishes, the evaporation gradually subsides. It will be reduced six times. And the time will come when as a result of the reduction in evaporation so much water will be saved that despite the greater drainage of the Razdan the lake's surface will cease diminishing. Outgo will equal intake. The cascade's hydroelectric stations will continue working with their former force.

The USSR is beginning to utilize its main, heretofore untouched, water resources. With the postwar years has come the turn of Siberia's great rivers.

On the Irtysh, a tributary of the Ob River, the Ust-Kamenogorsk Hydroelectric Station, which supplies power to industry in the Altai mountains, has been built. And up the river, near the mouth of the mountain river Bukhtarma, the Bukhtarma Station, an even larger one, is going up. Its high dam will close in the narrow valley, creating an artificial lake almost the size of Lake Baikal [13,200 square miles in area, almost double that of Lake Ontario]. Lake Zaisan, which rises 30 feet in the upper reaches of the Irtysh, will overflow its banks and change its contours.

Not far from Novosibirsk the first of the hydroelectric stations on the

Ob is going up. It will supply electricity to the industry, railways and agriculture of Siberia, and improve navigation. A start has already been made in mastering the Angara River, a tributary of the Yenisei.

The Angara, which like the St. Lawrence in the United States has its source in a lake, is exceptionally alluring for hydroelectric projects. Deep and rapid, it can set in motion several stations one after another and produce as much electric power as the Volga, the Dnieper and the Don combined. Its rocky shores are convenient for building dams. But the main thing is that nowhere else in the country can electric power be produced more cheaply. The stations will work evenly without ups and downs, without spilling even a drop of water over the crest of the dam; the Angara's flow is maintained uniformly by the water resources of Lake Baikal.

That is not all: all around are immense riches that are only waiting for man to take them. There is the Cheremkhov coal which can be mined cheaper than anywhere else in the country. There are also the iron ore deposits on the banks of the Angara. And salt at Usolye-Sibirskoye. And raw material for aluminum. And rare metals. And the boundless, stately forests of pine. All will constitute a colossal enterprise. In the future, not too distant, Eastern Siberia will be among the top industrial centers.

The first of the Angara hydroelectric stations is already under construction near Irkutsk. It will be one of the largest in the USSR, generating considerably more electric power than Dnieproges.

The next article will tell of the power, irrigation and navigation developments on the great Volga.

CHINESE WORKER-INVENTOR DESCRIBES NEW LIFE

by LI KENG-YUAN

IN 1924, when I was just 17 years old, I became an apprentice. For the next twenty years I kept working in a machine repair workshop in Northeast China, and I can tell you it wasn't pleasant. To avoid trouble, and often even to keep our jobs, we workers were expected to give presents to foremen, flatter everyone in authority and keep our mouths shut about everything else. I always liked machinery and was good at my job. Just the same I was always in trouble, mainly because I was considered too blunt and outspoken.

During the Japanese occupation, things were very tough indeed. I was thrown out of my job several times. Once I was jailed for a year on a trumped-up charge of damaging equipment.

When Japan surrendered, we workers were naturally overjoyed, thinking it meant an end to our slavery. But we didn't know the Kuomintang troops. They no sooner came than

they began to go around looting like a bunch of bandits. They even raided my poor home and took away everything they could carry. After this I abandoned all hope of any change for the better, in my lifetime anyhow.

In 1948, the Kuomintang was driven out by the People's Liberation Army. Factories began to re-open and most of the workers went back. Not me. I'd had enough. "Then it was 'victory over Japan,' now it's 'liberation,'" I thought to myself. "How do I know the one will be any different from the other."

I lived on the outskirts of the town and had a small plot of land, so I decided to stay home, grow my own food, and be independent.

As a farmer, I was a flop. Machines were no mystery to me but with a hoe I was as clumsy as a duck trying to climb a ladder. Soon I took to repairing agricultural implements for a living. I studied them and got interested in designing improvements, but didn't have the money to finish building my models. Then I began to worry. Where would I end up? Imagine my surprise when the head of the district people's government dropped in and said he thought my work useful, had heard

LI KENG-YUAN is a skilled worker in the machine repair shop of the Anshan Steel Wire Factory, famous for the improvements he introduced in various pieces of machinery. This article first appeared in the November-December issue of the English language magazine, China Reconstructs.

I was in difficulties and wanted to help. The result was that I got a loan and succeeded in making a new type of weeder and a small two-row seeder.

These implements became quite popular and the head of the county government came to congratulate me. First the district, then the county! This time I was really shaken, because in the old days a worker rarely saw a county head, and you'd have had to be crazy to expect being visited by one. I began to wonder if there wasn't something in the words one heard so often: that life had really changed.

Soon afterwards my brother and cousin, both workers, spent their day off with me. Naturally our talk turned to the factories. "You can't imagine what they're like now," said my brother. "We have democratic management. If you have anything against the authorities, you can speak up. Your grievance will be looked into and there will be no reprisals." My cousin said, "We workers are masters now." From his lips it didn't sound like just another slogan. I was still suspicious. But after all they were my own brother and cousin, and there was no reason for them to lie to me. So I decided to go back and see for myself.

In February 1952, after an absence of several years, I reported for work at my old factory. No doubt about it. Big changes had taken place. Instead of being dressed in rags and looking oppressed, the workers all had good clothes, and I saw they were smiling and laughing. The youngsters especially were in high spirits, going at their work just like a lot of tiger cubs. But the biggest change of all was that the factory director often came into the shops to consult the workers instead

of just passing down orders. "These are things that never happened before. How fine it is," I thought suddenly. And I, who had never wept in all these years, felt tears gather in my eyes.

One day our trade union group leader came up to me. "Old Li," he said, "the winding machine in the steel cable workshop is really a headache. The wires have to be guided along the spool by hand and this leads to fatigue and sometimes to injuries. Can you think of another way?"

We went to the shop. I saw that the cables did not wind evenly and the workers were having a lot of trouble handling them. Their hands were busy. They had to use a lot of strength, and at the same time they had to look sharp to jump on the footbrake if anything went wrong. The whole process seemed so primitive and tiring, it made me furious to see it. "What kind of masters are we if we let the machines wear us out like this?" I thought. "Even if we haven't got better equipment yet, there's no need for us to toil under these conditions."

For the next few days I racked my brains to find some easily contrived solution—in vain. Then one day I was unfolding a clean shirt to put on, and seeing the seams I thought of sewing machines and the way the bobbin guides the thread to the needle. Like a flash I thought, why not try something like that for guiding the steel wire onto the pool? The more I turned the idea over in my mind, the more excited I got. I didn't even wait to eat my supper but immediately sat down to work it out. A few days later I showed my sketches to the head of our group. He took it up with the management at once, and I was given the neces-

sary material to make the attachment. With the help of other workers who volunteered to help me on Sundays, it was finished in a few weeks.

We then arranged for a test and the factory director, the chairman of our trade union and the secretary of the factory's Communist Party group all came to watch. After fixing the attachment in place, I turned on the electricity. The steel wire guided by the reciprocal motion of a new peach-shaped wheel snaked from side to side of the spool with an even motion. "Hurray! The wind-er does the whole job now," the workers cried. We were all overjoyed and clapped loudly.

A few days later I paid another visit to the cable shop to see if the new gadget was working properly. When the workers saw me, they shouted: "It's good you're here, Old Li. We're in trouble again. The wire twists and breaks sometimes before we have time to stop the machine. You're a smart fellow. What do you suggest?"

"Better give the machine a human mind and it will stop by itself," I joked. But at the same time I started thinking the matter over and the problem weighed on my mind all day. In fact, it occupied me so much that when I was bicycling home that evening, I ran off the road and fell in a ditch. I wrenched my back and cursed myself for not seeing where I was going and not putting on my brake. A brake! An automatic one! That was what the wire-winding machine needed! I was sure I was on the right track, and began a rough design as soon as I got home. After a while I realized that a coupling would be better than a brake. When the steel wire got twisted, the coupling would loosen and the machine would stop. The whole thing was

very easy to set up. The workers were delighted and called it the "automatic stopper."

Afterwards there was still another problem. The wire had to be wound to a specified length and the workers had to watch the machine very closely in order to cut it at the right time. If they missed the correct moment for any reason, a lot of wire was wasted. I designed a 20-toothed gearwheel, equipped with steel shears to do the job. The time taken by the gearwheel to revolve was the same as that needed to reel the right length of wire. A self-acting brake then stopped the machine and the shears cut the wire.

The workers were as delighted with the "automatic cutter" as they had been with the other innovations. "Old Li," they said, "it's really good we have you." When I heard these words, my heart felt like an opened window, comfortable and cool.

But being an inventor had its problems. Everybody began coming and asking me to fix this or figure out that. Although I had acquired a reputation for being able to solve difficulties, some of the things asked were beyond me. I didn't want to lose my good name by failure. The thought bothered me so much, I decided to go to another factory where I wouldn't be expected to know the answer to every problem.

Hearing of my request for a transfer, the director called me in and asked what was the matter. I told him. "Don't worry," he said. "If you have any difficulties you can always call on the engineers and technicians, and the factory will supply you with any books that you need."

Soon afterwards, the trade union found a nearby room for me to stay in when I was working on new designs, so that I would not have to

travel the long distance home. But what had the deepest effect on me were several conversations with the secretary of the Communist Party in the factory. He asked me to reflect that we were all working to help the country forward, not for personal name or ease. This made me see myself more objectively and I felt ashamed. Hadn't I already received a lot of help? Didn't the factory belong to the workers, to me too? I kicked myself for having thought of leaving. When I cancelled my request for a transfer I said frankly that I had been wrong.

Since then I have spent all my spare moments in the workshops. I have repaired and improved various machines and consulted with others without any false pride when I got stuck.

One day there was a real emergency. A 200-horsepower motor had burned out. I rushed down to take a look at it and found a worker called Liu standing sorrowfully by the machine. "Why don't you look after your motors so they don't get overheated?" I said angrily.

"It's not so easy," Liu replied, "even a tiger gets caught napping sometimes." It was a poor answer but pointed to a real question: Why should a machine depend on a worker for something it could do for itself?"

"If the motor were to call you when it got hot, it would solve the problem, wouldn't it?" I asked.

"I've never heard of a talking motor," Liu laughed.

We were only joking, but I couldn't help thinking what a loss a burned-out motor could cause. Why not use mercury, which rises and falls with temperature in a thermometer, to set off a signal when motors got hot? I designed an iron box filled with mercury for this purpose. As the motor heated, the mercury would expand, and at a certain point it would push a plate into contact with a spring which in turn would push a switch and stop the current.

But my first and second experiments were failures. The iron box split open and the mercury spilled all over the floor. The trouble was that I did not know how to calculate its expansion. So I went to the engineers who helped me, and suggested an iron tube instead of a box as a container. When the mercury rose to 50° C. it made an electric bell ring and when it reached 60° C. it pushed the switch to stop the motor. "That's the way!" the workers said. "Now the motor can talk to us and even if we don't hear it, it knows what to do."

During the eighteen months that I have been back at work I have made seven improvements on the machines. The first one, on the wire-winder, took the longest because I tried to figure everything out by myself. On the others I collected opinions from other workers and asked help from the technicians when necessary.

Now I understand the full strength of one of our new principles: "Don't stand alone, rely on collective effort."

MORE LIVESTOCK IN INNER MONGOLIA

SEVENTEEN new livestock farms were established last year in the Sulunbel grasslands in Inner Mongolia, bringing the total number of state livestock farms in that autonomous Chinese region to 34.

TWO SOVIET PRISONS

Eminent British attorney reports on his visit to Soviet corrective labor colonies, one for adults, the other for juveniles

by D. N. PRITT, Q. C.

PRACTICALLY every person convicted of a crime in the USSR today and sentenced to imprisonment goes to what is officially called a "Corrective Labor Colony" (and no one goes there, or to prison, unless he is so convicted and sentenced). To the old-fashioned closed prison go only incorrigibly difficult convicts, who would make life unbearable for others in a colony. Those who study problems of imprisonment in Western Europe are familiar with the controversy as to the superiority of "open prisons" over "closed" or cellular prisons; and they are familiar too, with the great practical difficulties involved in finding work for prisoners to do which will fit them better to earn their living on release, without creating difficulties by competition in the market with the products of free labor.

The Soviet Union has long ago decided—and few will disagree with it—in favor of the open (as I will show, the wide open) institution;

D. N. PRITT, Q. C., former British Labor M.P., is Chairman of the Society for Cultural Relations Between the Peoples of Britain and the USSR and is a foremost trial lawyer in Europe.

and it has of course no difficulty whatever in finding work for its convicts in the production of normal salable goods by normal factory methods; the absence of unemployment and the steadily increasing public demand for consumer goods removes all these problems.

With that background, my eight professional colleagues and myself, who formed a lawyers' delegation to the Soviet Union in September, 1954, were very interested to visit two of these "colonies"; one an ordinary colony for adults and the other a special colony for juveniles.

(It is not all fun to make a serious study of a country through a lawyer's eye: you see courts, and government departments, and mental hospitals and prisons. As one of our hosts remarked, there is a Russian saying that one lets only one's very best friend see one's kitchen, and we are showing you our sculleries! It may be more pleasant to make a serious study of the USSR through the eyes of an actor, a musician, a student of folk-lore, or even a tourist agent; but we are lawyers, and we did our task as lawyers, and we learned much of very great value).

The colony for adults lies on the edge of a village called Kruikovo,

some 25 miles from Moscow. It covers perhaps 15 acres, has a barbed-wire perimeter—no walls—and consists of a range of buildings comprising dormitories, canteens, kitchens, and factories, with the addition of a library, reading rooms, a small theater, and a small sports ground. There is plenty of ground to spare, and a view of the countryside in most directions.

Here there live and work between 600 and 800 male convicts (there used to be women here, too, but the rapid diminution in crime, and the effects of the general amnesties of 1951 and 1953 in releasing nearly all women then imprisoned, has closed down all women's prisons in the Moscow region) guarded by no more than 15 guards (i.e. five guards on duty at any one moment) not even armed during the day but only at night.

The men sleep in dormitories, in bunks holding as few as seven or eight or as many as thirty, in two-tier metal bedsteads, rather close together (better than British Army bunks), and not as good as British hostels); the rooms are clean, and do not smell; they have light walls and look fairly cheerful, with a few pots of flowers and a table and locker or two. The men eat in the equivalent of a factory canteen, but with tables for four people with blue oilcloth tablecloths; the food is ample, nourishing and tasty, better than that in most factory canteens in Britain.

They work, two shifts a day, in the production of a wide variety of aluminum goods, cast, and spun and pressed, with machinery some of which is old-fashioned and some up-to-date. The factory has all the arrangements that are usual in the Soviet Union such as "tables of honor" with photographs of the best work-

ers, and banners for the best workshops. Not quite all the prisoners work in the factory; a few are on miscellaneous work, such as road-making inside the colony, and a few work on jobs outside. Of these latter, some are not even guarded, but go off to work unaccompanied, and return at the proper time. And a few free workers, girls, from the village come in to do certain jobs—checking up on the articles manufactured and so on—side-by-side with the prisoners.

Pay, which as usual in the USSR is calculated by piecework basis wherever possible, is 20 per cent less than the normal pay of the free worker for equivalent work; their hours at the time of our visit were nine hours a day in place of the normal eight, but were to be reduced to eight on October 1, 1954.

Their leisure—the period when they are off shift, and neither eating or sleeping—can be spent as they wish. They are encouraged to catch up with their education, if they are behindhand, by attending classes in the colony or by correspondence courses. They are encouraged to acquire technical education by the same methods, so that they may have higher industrial qualifications when they leave. (When some of them wanted to learn tractor-driving, a tractor was imported, and the spare ground was just sufficient for them to learn). They may take part in "circles" for acting, music (orchestral or individual), photography or radio work, chess, checkers and various sports. They may read, drawing books from a library which contains 4,000 books and many newspapers and periodicals, and organizes discussions among the prisoners on books they have read. The librarian at Kruikovo is a prisoner serving a

7-year sentence for theft. They may go to the colony cinema or watch television.

That, in outline, is their day. But no human being wants days in captivity, however much good it may do him! So let me consider how they can shorten their total days of imprisonment—what is labelled generally, remission. Some of them have sentences of as much as ten years; few less than one year. How do they get remission?

There is no automatic remission, but there are several more generous methods. To begin with, the factory norms are so reasonably set that, at the time of our visit, no one was failing to reach the norm, and the worker who reaches his norm has his day counted as one and a half days of sentence. The worker who exceeds it by 20 per cent, as many of them do, has his day counted as three days. (So, a consistently good worker, working the usual six days and resting on Sunday, will count 19 days a week, about 27 months a year).

Further, a general review of prisoners' conduct and sentences takes place every 12 months, and on such reviews as much as a year may be lopped off.

We were thus not surprised to see the men working pretty hard in the workshops. In this way, a prisoner determined to pull himself together and make good may easily find himself free after less than half his sentence in terms of time has been served.

There is, finally, one further method. If the view is taken by the colony authorities that a prisoner has really reformed and should be discharged, but he has still some more time to serve, application may be made to the court which sentenced him to grant a conditional release.

This is a release without any form of supervision or reporting, subject only to the probability that if he is convicted again during the unexpired period of his sentence, he will have to serve that period as well as the further sentence imposed for his subsequent offense.

This is the picture of a convict who behaves well.

Some of them, of course, do not. How are they punished?

There is a range of treatment. They will probably begin—unless their misconduct is really serious—with what the English schoolboys call a "pie jaw" from the "council of actives." (This is a council of the most active and intelligent prisoners elected by a general meeting of the whole body of prisoners to deal with all sorts of problems on behalf of the prisoners). If this is not enough the refractory prisoner may go before a "comradely court," a long-standing Soviet institution, in which a group of one's equals argues with one, without formality, the why and wherefore of one's misbehavior and has power to inflict a small penalty. Such comradely courts are just being established in this colony.

These mild sanctions may not be enough; and the next stage may be a public reprimand, delivered orally before a general meeting of prisoners, by the council of "actives" or the prison authorities, or a similarly written reprimand.

Of course, even the reprimand may not suffice; and it is possible for the authorities to put a prisoner under arrest, which means imprisonment in a solitary cell—the equivalent of ordinary prison life in many countries—during the hours when he is not actually working in the factory (This, I was told, happens very rarely indeed). There may also,

course, be curtailment of visits and correspondence; and loss of remission is almost inevitable, inasmuch as their conduct falls to be considered on the periodical reviews.

Three visits a week are allowed to every prisoner, and unlimited correspondence. A prisoner with a good record of behavior may be allowed a "personal private visit;" this means in practice that his wife may visit him for a day or a weekend, and that they are given a room in which they may stay together. We actually saw on our visit, one of the prisoner's wives; she worked in a school in Tashkent, and a second visit had been allowed in her case rather soon after the first, because she was only able to be in Moscow during her annual holiday.

The money side of the prisoners' lives is interesting. There is deducted from their factory earnings a sum to cover their food, and they are left with 150 to 200 rubles a month with which they can do what they like; they can save it against their release, they can send it home, or they can spend it in the colony shop—a well-stocked shop of two departments, one for all kinds of foodstuffs, and one for miscellaneous goods. The prisoners spend in a month about 120,000 rubles, and send home about 10,000 rubles. (Many of them are young and may not have dependent families.)

The right to make complaints is important. They may complain to the director, to whom they have the right of access; or they may make written complaints to the Home Ministry, the procurator, or any other organization. Their complaint is sent in sealed, and must be answered in writing within a short (fixed) period.

Finally, of course, the prisoner's

time is up, and he leaves, with a free new suit of clothes and a free railway pass, and whatever money he has to his credit. (The earlier system of compulsory deduction of a percentage from the pay, to build up a "liberation fund," has been dropped as no longer necessary. They do not need the elaborate—and too often ineffectual—after care of some countries, because they have no difficulty in getting work. They are normally more skilled than they were when they were sentenced; a certificate from their colony of their competence is actually helpful, and the social organizations—trade unions, the Communist Party, and other bodies—are under a duty to help them to rehabilitate themselves if necessary.)

Should they find any particular difficulty of any kind at home, they can apply for financial help either to the Home Ministry or to the nearest *collective labor colony*! Quite a number of discharged prisoners keep in touch with the colony in which they have served, and report to it how they are getting on. Some of them do, of course, turn to crime again; but this is very rare. (The colony head-cook, a professional cook who had "fiddled" with the finances of a canteen, was asked if this was his first term of imprisonment; he answered: "No, but it is my last!")

One of the remarkable features of the colony is that it is not unusual for discharged prisoners to make a home in the village outside, and to continue to work in the colony factory, coming in every day to work his shift and then going home! (This is striking enough to anyone; but to those with knowledge of the black-marketing, the petty rackets, and the innumerable attempts to communicate with friends outside to

arrange escapes, which form part of the prison system of most countries, it is almost incredible).

So much for a factual, if brief, account of life in the colony. When one comes to general comment, one feels that the facts almost make their own comment.

But it is worth emphasizing the wholesome mixture of plain humanity and plain common sense that inspires the system. Nothing is done to degrade or dehumanize the prisoners; nor is there any sentimental coddling. "You have offended against the interests of society, a society which does its best to make life fine for you, and even finer. Now, please, put yourselves right with society, and do it by plain hard work. Cooperate with us; don't alarm or spite us. Work well and you shall have every encouragement we can give you, not only to get out with better qualifications to make good, but also to get out quickly."

One could see, as we went around among the men, both at work and at leisure, and talked to some of them, out of range of the "director," that they were on good terms with one another, and with him. They treated him with respect, but no fear. He treated them as human beings entitled to proper courtesy; he did not call them "comrade" for they had lost their civil rights, but he did call them "citizen," and not "Here, you," or "Here, 17935." And the Home Office official who came with us talked to them in a most friendly fashion, asking after their particular problems or anxieties, and encouraging them in many ways. We really had to remind ourselves that the inmates *were* people who had committed substantial crimes; they seemed at first sight merely to be people a bit below average intelli-

gence, which the authorities said they were.

What we also had to remind ourselves—and this wasn't so easy—was: "This is a corrective labor colony; this is what the slanderers of the Soviet Union call a concentration camp, where—they tell us—a man may not call his soul his own, nor indeed his body, since—they tell us—most of them die in confinement."

I HAVE TO WRITE, too, about the corrective labor colony for juveniles, which I have already mentioned. I have written, of set purpose, of the adult colony first, so that I could describe the normal general "penal establishment" and then turn to the juvenile one, which should naturally be easier and even more hopeful.

It is indeed remarkable. If Krui-kovo, which I have just described, is about as hopeful as anything yet devised for trying to cure, in any society, those who have committed serious crimes against that society, that is still a job for the "scullery." But juvenile crime, which can be vicious enough in some economies, can also be more hopeful; and here we move from the "scullery" to the school-room, with the exit door pretty easy to open.

This juvenile colony is at Iksha, nearly 40 miles from Moscow, pleasantly situated on a forested hillside, with views all around. As it has to be largely self-supporting, producing its own bread, vegetables and meat, and is some way from any village, it constitutes in effect a large village by itself, more than half of which consists of free citizens working directly or indirectly for the colony.

The colony itself holds 380 juveniles who have been sentenced by courts for crimes, generally theft or "hooliganism" — a phrase which

means no more than violence, and does not necessarily imply any element of ganging together. They must be between 15 and 18 at the time of entry, and cannot stay after reaching 21. (Generally they will be released, one way or another, before then, but if not they must transfer to an adult colony like Kruikovo).

They are sentenced by ordinary courts; at present there are no special juvenile courts, but the courts when dealing with juveniles draw their two assessors* from among school-teachers, instead of from the regular panel. Sentences, of course, on juveniles are much lighter; and pretty nearly every juvenile was released in the general amnesties of 1951 and 1953.

At Iksha—as, indeed, at Kruikovo, too—we were told that most of the crimes still committed by youths or youngish people are attributed to the effects of the war, in the sense that the absence of fathers at the front and the preoccupation of many mothers with war work left youngsters to run wild and get into bad habits. Of the 380 juveniles now at Iksha, some 60 per cent had lost their fathers, and quite a number had lost their mothers, too.

One can describe much of the life by stating the contrasts to the adult colony. The bedrooms are more spacious, the beds single and not in tiers. The work, instead of being factory work with a little education, is primarily educational with some factory work. The education is run by the Ministry of Education, on exactly the same lines as schools outside. Those who, outside, would be receiving education whole time, re-

ceive it here. Those who, outside, would have four hours a day of schooling and four hours a day of industrial training, have that system here too, and are thus very well equipped to go to skilled work when they leave. They are supplied with two sets of clothing, one for school and work, and one for leisure; and now that school uniforms have been introduced throughout the Soviet Union, they are encouraged to wear that uniform also.

Much attention, naturally, is given to leisure activities. They have better sports grounds than the adults, a gymnasium, a swimming pool. They have a really good club house, and a large theater; they have a number of dramatic, choral, orchestral, and other musical circles, as well as film, radio, engineering and other technical groups. They mix freely in their spare time with both the adult members and the children of the large free population, and shop in the same large shop.

Remission is, naturally, more in the picture. Every case is reviewed by the courts every six months, and as much as a year may be cut off at each review. In the five months preceding our visit, 60 boys had thus been released, and 40 more had been given reductions. And the last amnesty in 1953 released every juvenile.

Punishments are similar to those in the adult colonies; but the maximum stay in a "punishment room" is five days. Offenders may also be put to the more dreary jobs that must be done around the colony.

Visits and correspondence, including parcels, are wholly unrestricted. They, too, have their own elected boys' council for organizing colony activities and for disciplining recalcitrant members.

They are paid for the factory work

* Soviet People's Courts consist of a judge and two assessors. The latter serve only 10 days a year of their three-year term. Decision of guilt, the sentence and other questions are decided by a majority vote of the three.

D. N. PRITT AMONG STALIN PEACE PRIZE WINNERS

D. N. Pritt, distinguished British attorney whose article on Soviet prisons appears here, was one of nine recipients of the International Stalin Peace Prize for 1954. The awards were made by an international committee to eminent citizens of nine different countries in recognition of their outstanding services in the struggle for the preservation and consolidation of peace. In addition to Mr. Pritt, the others so honored are Alain Le Leap (France), Thakin Kodaw Hmaing (Burma), Berthold Brecht (Germany), Felix Iversen (Finland), Andre Bonnard (Switzerland), Baldomero Sanin Gano (Colombia), Prijono (Indonesia), and Nicolas Guillen (Cuba).

they do, when their education gets so far as doing this work, at the full outside rates. There are deductions for their keep, and they have free disposal of the balance.

Their rights to make complaints are the same as those of adults, with the same safeguards.

Very few of them escape, although escape is particularly easy; most of those who escape return of their own accord, on the advice of their relatives.

They, naturally, need more help than adults when they are discharged, for they are mostly scarcely established in life. The administrator of the colony has to see that they get both work to do and somewhere to live; and a fund is available to buy them clothes and linen and to give

them some money to start with; and if it takes them a while to get well on their feet there is power to give them a further grant. Few of them commit further crimes; and one of the most remarkable possessions of the colony is a huge "old boys' book," with many letters and photographs from inmates who have made good—often in very important posts—after leaving.

Truly, as life improves in the Soviet Union, there is less reason to commit crimes, and fewer crimes are committed. But every crime creates a problem, and every criminal calls for treatment. The Home Ministry does not claim that the treatment is perfect; it says merely that it is the best that it can do so far. And I agree with that statement.

THEATERS FOR ALL IN THE USSR

THE USSR today has 513 theaters with permanent troupes. This includes 222 theaters in the various Union republics, excluding the RSFSR (the Russian republic). Young spectators, from 6 to 17 years of age have 31 dramatic and 68 puppet theaters.

KHRUSHCHEV EXPLAINS AGRICULTURAL POLICY

In view of the general misunderstanding abroad concerning Soviet policy on agriculture, we believe our readers will be interested in the full text of an interview that was given back on September 25, 1954, to Professor J. D. Bernal, eminent British scientist, by N. S. Khrushchev, First Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The full interview follows:

QUESTION: The new agricultural policy of the Soviet Union has given rise to much speculation abroad. It is often represented as reflecting a new agricultural crisis and as the failure of the collectivization system. The very marked attention given to agriculture, the numerous new directives issued, and even the Agricultural Exhibition itself are cited as supporting this view. In particular, the rapid plowing up of new lands in Siberia and Kazakhstan is taken to indicate a serious situation. It is for that reason that I wished to hear from you, who have been largely responsible for the new drive, an explanation of the basic policies involved.

ANSWER: You have, of course, read the press materials of the Plenary Meetings of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on problems relating to the further development of agriculture in the USSR. Those decisions have aroused much comment abroad. Enemies of the Soviet Union are trying to use our criticism of shortcomings in the sphere of agriculture for their own ends, to put their own meaning into the criticism.

Indeed, we sharply criticize our shortcomings in agriculture. However, this is not a kind of self-flagellation prompted by morbid repentance. We do it because stern criticism helps all our workers to understand and realize our shortcomings more deeply in order to work better and to eliminate the shortcomings more rapidly.

Basing itself on the achievements in industrializing the country, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has set the task of achieving a steep advance in the output of articles of popular consumption within two or three years. It is clear that an increase in the output of articles of general consumption requires faster rates of agricultural development, and especially a sharp increase in grain production.

There was a lot of talk abroad about a seeming contradiction between the statements made by J. V. Stalin at the 18th Party Congress and by G. M. Malenkov at the 19th Party Congress about the grain problem in our country having been solved, and the decisions of the latest Plenary Meetings of the Central Committee of the CPSU which point to the need for increasing grain pro-

duction and expanding the grain areas in virgin lands. Actually there is no contradiction here. J. V. Stalin and G. M. Malenkov were quite right when they said we had enough grain to assure bread for the population. Our country was satisfying its bread requirements. We have enough of it now, too, and we have the necessary reserves. But man does not live by bread alone. It is precisely other requirements of man that indirectly demand an increase in grain production.

The Soviet Union's development, its economic strengthening and the improvement of the material position of the people on this foundation, have led in the past few years to a big increase in the demands for all kinds of commodities of which we did not have a large quantity before. Every year in our country the prices of commodities are reduced, the real earnings of factory and office workers are rising, and the purchasing power of the population is increasing. Naturally, the demand for lower-quality commodities is dropping and, conversely, the demand for commodities of high quality is greatly increasing. More and more people are demanding delicacies in the shops. After the war, when there were high prices, the population's supply of consumer goods seemed satisfactory. Now, when prices have been substantially reduced over a number of years, a certain shortage of some goods is to be observed, despite the fact that actually the output of all these types of goods has greatly increased. The demand for goods of the best quality has spread to broad masses of the population. Our task is to satisfy that demand.

Under capitalism such a situation, that is, an increased demand for goods, with demand exceeding sup-

ply, would provide brilliant opportunities for making profit. In our country, however, the matter stands differently. The socialist way is to develop production, and continue the policy of reducing prices. And it is in this light that we should regard the seeming shortage of grain. It is not a question of a crisis. Our position is not worse, but better, than ever before. The point is that at a higher stage in our development the demand for articles of popular consumption increases substantially.

Our Party is consistently and persistently following a policy of utmost expansion of consumer goods output and maximum satisfaction of the people's growing requirements. To increase the production of commodities we have to increase the production of grain, because in the final analysis grain is the basis of all other foodstuffs, and, moreover, the basis for the production of many items of general consumption. To obtain more grain we decided to make use of the virgin lands of Kazakhstan and Siberia—broad fertile plains suitable for the cultivation of grain crops.

The new lands give us the cheapest grain. The virgin land development areas are unbroken plains stretching for many miles. It is not much of an exaggeration to say that the plowman starts his furrow after breakfast, has his dinner at the turn, and comes back by suppertime. The cost of producing grain there is minimal, and that is why it is advantageous for us to produce it in those districts.

In two years this task will have been accomplished. Originally we planned to turn up 13,000,000 hectares of virgin land. [A hectare is 2.471 acres.] That program is being carried out successfully: in 1954 crops were sowed on more than 3,-

500,000 hectares of virgin land, and all in all a total of more than 17,000,000 hectares of virgin land has been plowed for next year's crop. The Central Committee of the CPSU and the Council of Ministers of the USSR have revised the original plans and, taking the possibilities into account, have adopted a decision to bring the grain area in the virgin lands up to between 28,000,000 and 30,000,000 hectares in 1956. If we obtain a yield of at least 10 centners per hectare, that will mean approximately 300,000,000 centners of grain. [A centner is 100 kilograms, or 220 pounds.] That is the minimum, for not infrequently the yield per hectare obtained on those lands is three times as high.

When it has developed the virgin lands, our country will receive the quantity of grain needed to cover all the requirements of the population, and also for developing livestock breeding, for export, and for setting up the necessary reserves. We shall be able to give more help to friendly countries, for example, to Czechoslovakia and the German Democratic Republic, which are unable to produce a sufficient quantity of grain on their lands; and to Rumania, Hungary and Bulgaria, which are unable fully to satisfy their requirements in poor crop years.

When we have increased the production of grain, we shall also be able to use larger quantities of it as livestock fodder, which will permit us to increase the number of hogs and other stock, and to improve their fattening, that is, to convert grain into meat. There is a Ukrainian saying: "No bird in the whole world is lovelier than pork sausage." By increasing grain production we want to have more of that "bird." Development of the new lands will help us

to increase the production for the cultivation of fodder crops. That will enable us to raise the productivity of dairy farming, and to increase the number of sheep and the wool output.

Moreover, an increase in the production of grain in the virgin lands will enable us to free part of the grain area in other districts of the country for the cultivation of other important crops.

We now need, as I have already said, lots of other produce besides grain, and we can obtain that produce by increasing the areas sown to other crops in the districts already developed.

Let us take sugar as an example. We need more of it and we can receive it by allocating about 300,000 hectares of land to sugar beets in the Ukraine in addition to what we already possess. Such is the position also with cotton, vegetables and other crops requiring much water and much attention. Today, the area sown to industrial crops can be extended by somewhat reducing the area sown to grain in the more populated areas.

The task, therefore, consists in the utilization of new grain resources for improving supplies of food products to the country's population.

You can, of course, ask: if all this wealth, i.e. the virgin lands, lay at our threshold all the time, why did not we think of them earlier? The people thought of them long ago, in the old, prerevolutionary times. Even the tsars intended to use these magnificent lands. But this was not within their power. Neither was it within our power in the first decades of Soviet power when we did not possess a sufficiently developed agricultural machine-building industry. The area of new lands that will be plowed in two years will equal the

entire sown area of the Ukraine and will exceed one and a half times the area sown to grain crops in the Ukraine. Dozens of millions of peasants would have been required to develop these lands, but it was impossible to find them.

Only today when a socialist industry has emerged, when Soviet machine-building attained its present scale, it became possible to develop such vast lands with the aid of a comparatively small number of people. In 1954 we are sending 120,000 tractors (in terms of 15 horsepower units), 10,000 combine harvesters and many other machines to the lands that are being developed. It should be stated that these machines have been allocated without increasing the program of agricultural machine-building. When the decisions were being adopted on this plan, we issued a call for volunteers; several dozens of thousands of people were required to develop the virgin lands, but from the very beginning the call of the Party was answered by many more people than we were able to use. Granted the requisite machinery and manpower, nothing can prevent our obtaining as much grain as we want.

Nor have we forgotten our well-developed territories. You have seen the Agricultural Exhibition, and it has been opened not for entertainment. There we show the achievements of the best collective farms in each region. The visiting peasants acquaint themselves with these achievements and begin to realize that they too can attain similar results.

Our task consists in consolidating the collective farms to a maximum as a firm foundation of socialist agriculture. We want to raise the ordinary collective farms to the level of the most advanced.

The exhibition is a real people's university.

QUESTION. A marked feature of the Exhibition was the emphasis on the development of rural power plants. These are relatively small and, it seems to me, essentially uneconomical, as they involve higher capital costs per unit than the giant plants that you are building. Why are you doing that?

ANSWER. You are quite right in that the power of small electric stations is much more expensive than that obtained from big stations. But in spite of this it is advantageous for collective farms to build small electric stations. It should be borne in mind that despite the extensive construction of electric stations in the postwar years there is a shortage of electricity in the country. Industry consumes almost all the power produced by the big electric stations. It is clear that the requirements of industry for electricity must be satisfied first and foremost. Owing to this, agriculture so far receives little power from the big electric stations.

The collective farms build small stations because their electricity is, after all, cheaper than that received from ordinary engines used in agriculture. By building electric stations, though small ones, the collective farms increase the level of mechanization and electrification of agriculture and use electricity not only for their personal requirements but especially for the agricultural machines run on electricity. Consequently, construction of small stations is justifying itself because they satisfy the immediate requirements of the collective farms.

In the future, with the increased electrification of the country, the big electric stations will produce

more power for agriculture, which is beginning to take place already.

QUESTION. The emphasis on opening up the new lands has naturally given rise to the question as to whether this means the abandonment or at least curtailment of the great irrigation and other projects designed to combat drought in the southeastern regions of the Union. Indeed, the development of Asia seems now to take precedence over that of Europe. How far is this the case and what are the reasons for it?

ANSWER. That is quite a legitimate question, the answer to which is simple. We envisage the development not only of one or another area of the country but also the development of the Soviet Union as a whole depending upon our present requirements and resources. For instance, we want to increase output of agricultural produce. This can be done both by more intensive use of the existing cultivated areas as well as by the development of new lands. We are doing everything possible to raise the yield on all the areas. In order to attain a sharp rise in the yield, we need large quantities of fertilizers, and for this purpose we have to build many new factories. All this requires time and we cannot wait. At the present time, as I have already stated, the greatest advantage, economically, lies in the utilization of new lands. The development of these lands is the best means for rapidly increasing the production of grain. However, we shall not only extend the sown areas but shall strive for more intensive farming.

Does this mean that we are terminating or curtailing the irrigation projects? By no means. Irrigation work will be and is being conducted where it is most useful for the pro-

duction of valuable crops — vegetables, cotton and grapes. But we are not concentrating on this as yet.

We must, in the meantime, concentrate our forces where we shall receive the biggest harvest. The question here is of purely economic advantage and possibilities. Where is it better for us to send a new tractor today? To the old lands where it can plow ten hectares a day, or to the new lands where this tractor will plow several times more land and from which we can receive in addition a large quantity of grain?

I know, it is said abroad that the new measures undertaken in the field of agriculture supposedly constitute a radical change in entire Soviet economic policy. These assertions do not conform to reality. We do not relax our attention to the development of industry, we do not sacrifice industry for agriculture. The development of all branches of industry will continue in the future as well according to a set plan, and our chief attention will continue to be paid to the development of heavy industry. The caterpillar tractors, plows, seeders and certain other agricultural machines turned out this year and in 1955 will be sent chiefly to the new lands. Consequently, the number of caterpillar tractors this year and next on the old cultivated lands will not be increased; to these lands will be sent inter-row tractors, cultivators and other implements to cultivate the soil, as well as spare parts for the existing tractors. In the meantime production of grain will grow in the country and we will be able to return to a more equal distribution of the agricultural machines produced.

—Translated from *Pravda*
of Dec. 24, 1954

SOVIET YOUTH TELLS OF VISIT WITH QUAKERS IN ENGLAND

by VICTOR KHMARA

Victor Khmara, one of the six young Russians who were the guests of Young Friends in England last summer, wrote this article for *Komsomolskaya Pravda*, a Soviet youth paper. It appeared under the title, "A Visit of Friendship" in the issue of October 12. Frank Lees, leader of the Young Friends' team which accompanied the young Russians while in England, has made the translation, which was published in *The Friend*, British Quaker weekly journal.

RECENTLY, at the invitation of the Young Friends Central Committee in England (as the Quakers' youth group is called), six representatives of Soviet youth visited Great Britain. It was the first visit of envoys from the Soviet Union to young Quakers.

It is well known that the Society of Friends (a Christian, Protestant sect which arose in the middle of the seventeenth century in England and then spread mainly to the USA and Canada) takes a pacifist stand: that is, it rejects all war whatsoever. Quakers called for the termination of the war in Korea. At the present moment they are conducting a campaign for the banning of atomic and hydrogen weapons.

Soviet youth, like the whole Soviet people, is occupied with the work of peaceful construction, and is concerned for the safeguarding of peace. The young men and women of our socialist country are, therefore, constantly widening and strengthen-

ing the ties with all who sincerely seek this goal and who contribute to its realization. They are deeply convinced that, by the united efforts of all peoples and of all young people, it is possible to preserve and strengthen peace.

Quakers declare that they are against war. People in the Soviet Union, who have known the full horror of the occupation under Hitler, and who defended the freedom and independence of their country in bitter struggles, hate war, but equally they hate those who are trying to unleash it again. Consequently, Quakers, who reflect the frame of mind of a particular section of British society, and the Soviet people, and its young people, have a common aim: to defend peace on earth.

It is undeniable that Young Friends and Soviet young people have different views on life and on social phenomena. That is what we should expect. We live in countries with different social systems. The

historical development of the two peoples occurred in different ways. Neither Soviet young people nor Young Friends, as we learned from our conversations together, would wish to deny this or to shut their eyes to it. But anyone who sincerely desires peace will understand that such divergence of views cannot be an obstacle to cooperation on the main question which is troubling all peoples, Soviet and British young people and Young Friends in particular: the question of peace.

This was, no doubt, the point from which the Young Friends Central Committee started, when they wrote to the Anti-Fascist Committee of Soviet Youth with an invitation to send to their country a delegation of Soviet young people, for the exchange of opinions on questions connected with the lessening of international tension and with the strengthening of peace. The Anti-Fascist Committee of Soviet Youth, in its turn, in accepting the invitation assumed this very point: that the joint action of the youth organizations of the Soviet Union and Britain, in the name of strengthening peace, is possible and opportune. The step which the Young Friends of Britain have taken in this direction deserves from this point of view unqualified approval.

In the company of a group of Young Friends, including several members of the Central Committee, we toured England, covering about 1,500 miles. The delegation visited the industrial centers of the country—London, Birmingham, Manchester, Sheffield, Leeds, Leicester, Coventry and Bolton; spent some time in the towns of Oxford and Cambridge and at the home-town of Shakespeare, Stratford-on-Avon; passed through the Lake District, a favorite British

holiday area; paid a short visit to the spa town of Bath; stopped in a number of other towns and villages.

The delegation had the chance to find out about conditions of work and wages of the workers in a pit near Leeds, at a weaving-mill in Bolton, at Walker and Hall's factory in Sheffield, at a chocolate factory in Bournville, and on the railway at Leicester.

Young Friends made a considerable effort to give the Soviet delegates the chance to becoming acquainted within such a short period with the historical and cultural monuments and with the art of England. We visited the Houses of Parliament, Westminster Abbey, the British Museum, the National Gallery, the Festival Hall, Manchester public library, the house in which the great English playwright, William Shakespeare, is supposed to have been born, the ancient Universities of Oxford and Cambridge and the magnificent cathedral of Salisbury. In the Memorial Theater at Stratford we watched with deep emotion a performance of *Romeo and Juliet*; we went to a concert at the Albert Hall, where works by the German composers Brahms and Mendelssohn were included in the program; we met the famous English conductor, John Barbiroli.

The delegates were given the chance to learn about the activities of the Society of Friends, and about the organization of Young Friends in particular. We visited a number of Meeting Houses, as well as schools and camps run by Quakers. As a result of daily discussions in the village of Charney, near Oxford, where we spent a week, we got some idea of the views of Young Friends and of the forms and methods of their work. Our friends expressed their

point of view on the question of measures which could contribute to the strengthening of peace and of cooperation between peoples.

The strongest Young Friends' groups are in London, Oxford, Cambridge and Manchester. At their meetings Young Friends mainly discuss religious questions; and they sometimes sing and dance. One of the forms of Quaker activity is philanthropic work in hospitals and private families. Some Quakers, as the Young Friends said, take part in the building of houses. During our stay in England, however, we did not have occasion to see such activities. Evidently this work has for Quakers a symbolic character. Quakers express great interest in the foreign policies of other governments and in the activities of the United Nations.

The delegation was warmly received by those taking part in the Young Friends' National Conference, which took place in the small village of Sidcot, near Bristol, and we joined in several discussions, which were included in the program of the conference.

Meeting every day with people in very different walks of life and with different views, we were convinced that the ordinary Englishman has a burning desire for peace and for friendship between peoples. Living often in families, visiting Meeting Houses, meeting Englishmen at the works and factories, in towns or villages, we felt everywhere warmth and a considerate attitude to us, people from the Soviet Union; and a desire to know more about Soviet life, to come to a deeper understanding of the different sides of the activity of our people.

Dozens of questions which were asked us bore evidence of the enorm-

ous interest of British people in the Soviet Union and in its achievements in all walks of life. But many of the questions and statements about our country also bore witness to the fact that a number of English people have a confused and sometimes quite incorrect idea of the Soviet Union. While we were in England we were not able to find in the big middle-class newspapers, which enjoy a wide circulation in the country, a single objective article about the life of the Soviet people. Many newspapers simply omit to mention the successes of the Soviet Union in the realm of culture, art, sport or economics. So we were not surprised when a school teacher in Sheffield said to us: "I have learned much more about your country from talking with you than from many years of reading English newspapers."

It is understandable that some Englishmen were surprised and were reluctant to believe what they heard from us. At times our accounts of the life of the Soviet people were to them a real revelation, although we were talking about the most ordinary facts, occurrences and events of our Soviet life.

In the opinion of many Englishmen with whom we talked, the visits of the dancing team Berezka, of the Moscow State Puppet Theater, of Soviet chess players and oarsmen, have obliged people to take quite a different view of the Soviet man and his culture. Cultural exchange between the two countries, as the young English men and women stressed more than once, will contribute to the better mutual understanding of the two peoples.

English people in their turn expressed great interest in how we had imagined their country previously, before we came, and what were now

our impressions from what we have seen. "Have your views changed?" they asked.

In this connection the idea, which someone has assiduously spread throughout the country, that people in the Soviet Union are supposed to judge contemporary England by the works of Dickens, could not but call forth in us a smile and at the same time a feeling of pity. Our friends, by talking with us, were able to convince themselves that Soviet young people have a correct and quite varied knowledge of present-day England, of its culture, art, sport, its foreign and domestic politics.

The meetings with Young Friends have played without doubt an im-

portant role, for they have laid the foundation for contact between Soviet youth and yet another group of young English people. The sincere desire of Young Friends for the establishment of links with Soviet youth in the name of peace and friendship will always find wide support among the young people of our socialist country. And the wider these links become, the better will the young people of both countries be able to understand each other, to enjoy together the achievements of the culture, art and sport of the two great peoples; and this will clearly contribute to their drawing closer, to friendship and, ultimately, to strengthening peace.

A Record of Chinese Folk Melodies

MUSIC LOVERS interested in the folk melodies of foreign lands will welcome an interesting record, "Folk Songs and Dances of China," recently put out by Folkways.*

It consists of eight songs and dances representative of areas that are separated by thousands of miles.

One side of the record consists of four songs by vocalists. Of the four, the Western ear will readily appreciate Flowers on a Hillside with its marked, almost familiar melody carried alternately by a male and female voice.

The other three may seem a bit strange at first playing, but soon the haunting beauty comes through. This is especially true of North Shensi Folk Song, a delicate lament.

The song Food and Clothing is like a recitative accompanied by music. According to the descriptive folder in English by Julian Schuman, it tells how clothing for both winter and summer is made at home, on the spinning wheel and on the loom.

The other side of the record consists of four dances of various regions played by the traditional instruments of each area. Thus, we are able to enjoy quite a variety of instruments and melodies.

All the songs and dances were recorded in China, and hi-fi bugs will be glad to know that the fidelity is quite good.

A. V.

* Folk Songs and Dances of China, Folkways Records, No. FP 802, 10", 33 1/3 RPM, \$4.75.

FAR EAST REPORTER announces the publication of the complete text of the new Constitution of the People's Republic of China together with an editorial introduction. Available for 20¢ by writing to FAR EAST REPORTER, 103 W. 93rd Street, New York 25, N. Y.

SONGS & DANCES OF CHINA

A collection of 8 songs and dances popular in China today and representative of many areas

- Flowers on a Hillside
- Er Lan Mountain
- Food and Clothing
- North Shensi Folk Song

and four instrumental pieces recorded by the Greater China Cantonese Orchestra, Peking Art & Drama Academy, Inner Mongolian Cultural Troupe, and the Yun Ho Music Conservatory Orchestra of Chinese Turkestan.

One 10-inch 33 1/3 RPM long-play record
List Price \$4.75

**FOLKWAYS RECORDS
& SERVICE CORP.**

117 West 46th Street, New York

NEW SOVIET FILMS

All in Spectacular Sovcolor

VARIETY STARS

PROBLEM CHILD

ALEKO

TRUE FRIENDS

THE ANNA CROSS

STARS OF THE RUSSIAN
BALLET

SKANDERBEG

Artkino Pictures, Inc.

723 SEVENTH AVE., NEW YORK 19

Telephone: Circle 5-6570

PEACE PAMPHLETS

**WHAT REARMING
GERMANY MEANS**

by Jessica Smith
24 pp., 10¢

**NEGOTIATIONS—THE WAY
TO PEACE**

**The Berlin Conference and
What It Means to You**
by Jessica Smith

64 pp., 25¢, 5 for \$1

**EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM
OF THE SOVIET UNION**

by Elizabeth Moos

64 pages, illustrated, 25¢

WE SAW FOR OURSELVES
**Americans report first-hand
impression of USSR**

100 pp., 25¢

WHERE MINERS ARE HONORED
Report of a Scottish miners' delegation to the USSR on living and working conditions of Soviet miners.

32 pp.; 5¢

CONSTITUTION OF THE USSR
20¢

For single items, add 3¢ postage and handling charge, 1¢ more for each additional item ordered.

Order from:

NEW WORLD REVIEW
23 West 26th St., New York 10