

SOCIAL SCIENCES

APRIL, 1956

25¢

PUBLIC LIBRARY

APR 12 1956

✓ DETROIT

New World

REVIEW



A scientist uses latest Soviet supersonic microscope

**Khrushchev's Report to 20th Party
Congress • The Role of Stalin •
New Developments in People's China**

New World

REVIEW

APRIL

1956

Soviet People View 20th Party Congress	
<i>Ralph Parker</i>	4
Khrushchev on State of the Union	
<i>Anna Louise Strong</i>	7
The UN Secretary-General	
<i>Eslanda Robeson</i>	12
Soviet Doctors in America	17
British-Soviet Friendship	
<i>Pat Sloan</i>	20
American-Chinese Talks	
<i>Susan Warren</i>	25
Two Letters from Tientsin	
<i>Grace Liu, Betty C. Chang</i>	29
Khrushchev Reports on Soviet Union and Peace	37
On the Reappraisal of Stalin's Role	
<i>Jessica Smith</i>	48
Field Work for Peace	
<i>Richard Morford</i>	53
Night Coach, a story	
<i>Konstantine Paustovsky</i>	56
Shakespeare in Russian	
<i>Murray Young</i>	63
Book Reviews	65

JESSICA SMITH, *Editor*
 FREDERICK V. FIELD, *Far Eastern Editor*
 ANDREW VOYNOW, *Managing Editor*

ESLANDA ROBESON
Editorial Consultant on Negro and Colonial Questions and UN Correspondent

Vol. 24, No. 4, April, 1956. 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 \$2.50 per year. \$1.25 for 6 months (Canadian, \$3.00 foreign \$3.50 a year. Draw money orders or checks payable in New York). Published monthly by the S.R.T. Publications, Inc., 23 West 26th Street, New York 10, N. Y. Indexed in Bulletin of the Public Affairs Information Service. Phone: MUrray Hill 3-3855.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

209

HOW TO GET YOUR GIFT

See opposite page ▶

Tell your friends and acquaintances about our special introductory offer of a five-months subscription (5 issues of New World Review) for only one dollar.

Get them to take advantage of this special offer — or you present them with this offer as a nice gift.

On a separate sheet of paper, send us a list of the names and addresses of the new readers you have obtained, together with your choice of the gift you want us to send you. Enclose \$1 for each new reader on your list, and mail it in TODAY.

Be sure you enclose your own name and address and your own gift choice.

Act now, before our limited supply of gifts is exhausted.

NEW WORLD REVIEW
23 W. 26 St., N. Y. 10

A GIFT FOR YOU

AND FOR THE NEW READER, TOO

New World Review has promised you greater on-the-spot coverage, a more exciting magazine. To achieve this we need more readers. For this we are asking your help, and we are making it easy for you. You can now have your friends take advantage of our special introductory offer of five months for only \$1. Or make them a gift of this special offer. And remember, you receive a special gift, too, and so do they!

YOUR GIFT

Any of the following books for each new reader or gift sub

Rose and Crown by Sean O'Casey. A great book by a great writer in the finest prose of our time.

The Philosophy of Peace by John Somerville. Courageous treatment of the vital question of our day.

Golden Horn by Basil Davidson. A novel of adventure and intrigue and insight into world politics.

Eyes of Reason by Stefan Heym. A vivid and dramatic novel about Czechoslovakia in transition.

We Can Be Friends by Carl Marzani. A valuable and richly documented study of US-USSR relations.

The Dead Stay Young by Anna Seghers. Stirring novel of the Germans during the rise of fascism.

THE NEW READER'S GIFT

Free copy of **The American People Want Peace: A Survey of American Opinion** by Jessica Smith plus 5 exciting issues of New World Review

FOR 5 new readers or gift subs YOU GET

A magnificent album of 10 large engravings by the distinguished Mexican artist, Leopoldo Mendez. Each one is suitable for framing (13¾x18½) See p. 24

or

Two great novels: Maxim Gorky's classic **The Artamonovs** and Martha Dodd's present-day **The Searching Light**

FOR 10 new readers or gift subs YOU GET

A 12-in., LP record by either Emil Gilels (piano) or David Oistrakh (violin), both Soviet virtuosos who won acclaim in concert tours in this country

◀◀ How to get your gift—See opposite page

How the Soviet People View The 20th Party Congress

by RALPH PARKER

IN AN essay he wrote nearly thirty years ago Maxim Gorky recalls a scene he witnessed on the streets of Petrograd in 1917.

A soldier standing outside the *Moderne* circus says: "... As for you over there, you with the hat on, I'm telling you straight: we're going to take this land out of your hands—you can be sure of that. And then we'll build everything anew."

"Oh yeah, round houses, I suppose. Like water-melons?" a scoffer in a peaked cap said.

"Yes, we'll do that," said the soldier.

"Blow up mountains too, I suppose?"

"We sure will. If they're in the way we'll blow 'em up."

"And make rivers flow uphill?"

"Yes, that too. Just the way we want them. What's the joke, you?" A stout, round-faced man with a heavy dark moustache was laughing scornfully.

The soldier gripped the fellow's shoulder, shook him, and said, with

his face right up against the other's: "Give us time and the people will come to their senses and show fools like you things that'll make you bow down to the ground in gratitude!"

The 20th Party Congress has been described in many ways, some unnecessarily grandiloquent, others absurdly derogatory. To call it the dawn of the age of plenty is as misleading as to argue that it was convened mainly to debunk Stalin. No doubt it indicates that Soviet leaders have during the past two or three years formed in their own minds quite a new picture of the world, including their own country, and that on the basis of ascertained facts have reached new opinions about the probable course of political developments. No doubt, too, that they have decisively rejected the errors committed over the past twenty years and thus firmly re-established not only the political but the moral authority of the Communist Party. But to the Soviet people the main characteristic of the Congress was that it showed their leaders have recognized the people's maturity, their coming of age.

And it was that summing-up of the Congress that reminded me of the words of Gorky's soldier. The passage of time has transformed the

RALPH PARKER, NWR correspondent in Moscow, has lived in the Soviet capital, where he formerly represented the "New York Times" for 15 years, and travelled widely in the USSR.

Soviet people. And Soviet man can now look forward to the day when the rest of mankind will watch his efforts not with amazement or apprehension, but with gratitude.

Hence the note of impatience in so many of the speeches at the congress. Away with anachronisms! With obsolescent methods of production, with the worn-out machines purchased from abroad at the cost of so much blood, sweat and tears twenty-five years ago, with those lazy, ignorant bureaucrats whose continued presence in the pages of *Krokodil*—and in life—arouse feelings of fury among the young technicians of today, with stupid “directives” which bind local initiative hand-and-foot, with those over-zealous citizens who like nothing better than to rubber-stamp documents as Secret.

Away, too, with fear. With an underestimation of the strength of the socialist camp which made some people go on thinking in terms of “capitalist encirclement” when, in fact, the socialist camp, winning ever-increasing support among uncommitted lands, has become strong enough not only to defend itself but to prevent world wars.

Away with outworn doctrine that has ossified into dogma. Look at the facts! Examine the new structure of society that you have created. And, above all, look at the people, the new people. The things that Gorky's soldier has done since he slipped his rifle off his shoulder and took up the tools of peace have revolutionized the content of Soviet life. Immense and enormously complicated collective organizations have been created, organizations in which men of technical professions and specialized jobs make decisions of vital importance. A complex society has been built in the place of the former rela-

tively simple and primitive society.

The 20th Party Congress recognized these changes, particularly in its call for the strict application of the principle of collective leadership. It is a mistake to think this applies only to the leading organs of the Party itself. The leaders were clear that they wanted the practice of frank and fierce discussion that has been restored in the Central Committee and its Presidium to serve as an example for local organs, including those local soviets (councils) in which over one and a half million people, a large proportion of them with higher education, run local affairs.

The Congress recognized these changes when it unanimously supported Nikolai Bulganin's proposals to turn over far more authority to the Union and Autonomous Republics which, henceforth, will have greater freedom in handling their economic affairs—and no one has any doubt that still wider political rights will follow. Already 11,000 industrial organizations have been handed over from central to local control.

People have been quick to grasp that in two or three respects the Congress adopted an entirely new approach to the question of their contribution to and reward from the state. For the first time, in presenting their plans for greater production, Soviet leaders have laid the emphasis not on working harder or more but on working more skilfully.

Thus the spotlight was turned onto the technology of production, onto the four-million-strong army of young specialists who will be trained at state expense during the current five-year period. The bulk of the increase in production will be brought about by re-equipping existing factories with new plants and by making more efficient use of pres-

ent plants. There is no mysterious quality in the socialist method of production that can overcome the shortcomings of obsolescent plants.

There was a new approach, too, to rewards and incentives. Perhaps it is their close contact with the people, the way they travel around and mix with common folk, that has directed the attention of Soviet leaders to those fields where improvement is most required—to housing conditions, still in a state of acute crisis, to the plight of pensioners and the unsupported old, to the problems of working mothers and of fatherless children, to the condition of the low category wage earner in general.

The role of science in the Sixth Five-Year Plan, about which much was spoken at the Congress, has excited the imagination of youth. Needless to say young Soviet people are profoundly interested in the prospects modern science holds out of still more remarkable conquests of nature. A very high proportion of them are scientifically educated. Take any group of students, boys or girls, and you will find some 70 or 80 per cent of them are studying in technical faculties. To them the plans to build up an entirely new metallurgical and engineering center in Eastern Siberia, powered by the harnessed waters of the Angara, open up a prospect of a new world of latest techniques. They are thrilled by the idea of atomic-powered automobiles racing along a new Moscow-Peking highway, of the atomic ice-breaker now in the designing stage forcing its way to the North Pole.

It is among such people that the Soviet Union's expanding contacts with the rest of the world are so popular. There has been much advance in this direction and people

were glad to see that the Congress promised more. The powers of the censor have been clipped. The reading rooms and libraries of universities, scientific institutions, and elsewhere now have copies of *N.Y. Times*, *Collier's*, *Newsweek*, etc., available among masses of foreign technical literature. People are no longer required to give "special reasons" why they should read William Saroyan or Graham Greene. They are being encouraged to travel abroad.

The Sixth Five-Year Plan has been introduced without the usual fanfare. Many of the words, many of the habits of thought, which we have used in the past when referring to the Soviet Union's achievements are today as obsolescent as the machines installed under the First Five-Year Plan. But there is one word which has never been debased or misused. That word is peace.

Khrushchev stated that in the actual situation there is no fatal inevitability of war and pointed out that today the forces who fight for peace have both moral and material means to prevent aggression.

Soviet people do not need to be told that the effectiveness of the means of keeping the peace depend very largely on their own efforts. They know their government has made mistakes in the past and the fact that the present leaders admit it gives the public greater confidence in their abilities to avoid making further mistakes. They do not oversimplify the situation to the extent of thinking that a strong Soviet Union is a factor in itself sufficient to preserve peace. But they know that there is a direct relationship between the strength and stability of the Soviet Union and the strength and stability of world peace.

Khrushchev Reports On the State of the Union

by ANNA LOUISE STRONG

THE first thing an American notes in Khrushchev's report to the Twentieth Party Congress in Moscow February 14 is its length and solidity. It took seven hours to deliver; it took me three days to read, with pauses for needed rest. Despite some pointed anecdotes, it is tough going: a textbook of economics, statistics, world affairs. We Americans are spoiled by the pre-digested stuff in our press. The nearest thing we have to a Khrushchev report is the President's January report to Congress on the state of the union. Though this is only one fifth as long as Khrushchev's and jazzed up by publicity experts, I doubt whether many Americans read more than the summaries. To most of us it is "just politics"; we couldn't do much to change it, anyway.

Most Russian adults among that 200,000,000 population, and even many secondary school pupils, I know from experience, have already read Khrushchev's speech from beginning

to end. They will read it many times; they will study it in thousands of study circles for a year. Are Russians then more literate than we? In a way, yes. A generation has grown up knowing that their country—its soil, natural resources, factories, railways—are common property. This has turned a people who thirty years ago were mostly illiterate into a people that lives by statistics. They read Khrushchev as a majority stockholder of Standard Oil reads his chairman's annual report: to know how their property has done and what are its future chances. They read him also for guidance. They know he will list a lot of things that have to be done to make their property flourish. Down in the list each person will find something he himself is expected to act on. So they read it both to know and to act.

All commentators agree that Khrushchev speaks with easy confidence in the future, a confidence that permits the disclosure of any number of mistakes, because these are seen as details to be corrected in a pattern whose basic lines ring with success. Paul Wohl, the *Christian Science Monitor* newscaster, calls it "the new Communist business spirit," and says it expresses "the firm be-

ANNA LOUISE STRONG, renowned world correspondent and lecturer, is editor of a newsletter, *TODAY*, and author of numerous books on the USSR, China and our own country.

liever . . . who sees Communism as a law of history as fixed as the stars," who thus "feels no need of theoretical justification" but deals rather with tactics and practical problems. Khrushchev himself calls the Soviet people "a people of builders," a sharp contrast to the way they are displayed in the propaganda of the West. The *Manchester Guardian* is furious at "the obituary of capitalism" implied in this speech. For Khrushchev is not even interested in "overthrowing capitalism"; to him it is already moribund. He discussed rather how to make socialism work more smoothly, how to get maximum living standards quickly, what new developments are possible to the growing industrial strength of the USSR.

In industry he reports terrific progress: total output grew 85 per cent in the past five years, an average of 13 per cent per year. In the five years from 1950 to 1955, coal production grew from 261 million tons to 391 million, steel from 27 million to 45 million, electric power from 91 billion kilowatt hrs. to 170 billion. He claims that this rate of growth is "over three times that of the USA." Americans will protest this, and it depends on how you use statistics. An interesting comparison is given by Alexander Werth in *The Nation* of February 18.

The fairest comparison, Werth says, comes from taking Russian gains for a ten-year period, and seeing how long it took the USA to make precisely those same gains. By 1960, according to the sixth Five-Year Plan, the USSR will have gone in ten years from 260 million tons of coal in 1950 to 590 million tons in 1960. The USA made this same advance from 1900 to 1918, a period of eighteen years. In steel the USSR will more than double its output, ris-

ing in ten years from 27 to 69 million annual tons; the USA did this from 1910 to 1940, a thirty year stretch. Thus, any way you compare them, Russia's rate is far faster than America's was.

From the standpoint of world strength, the figures that count are those that show that the USSR has already surpassed West Europe in industrial output. . . . (Comparison from Isaac Deutscher in *The Reporter*, Feb. 23). Last year Britain and West Germany together produced 41 million tons of steel to the USSR's 45 million; 352 million tons of coal to the USSR's 392 million; 135 billion kilowatt hours to the USSR's 166 billion. These figures show national weight but not individual comfort; in per capita consumption the USSR is still only about half as high as Western Europe, and a quarter as high as the USA. . . . But by 1960 it should equal Western Europe also in per capita consumption.

The figures that count most with the Soviet people—and with the watching people of Asia—show how fast they have risen from their own past. Twenty five years ago the USSR produced only 35 million tons of coal annually, no steel worth noting, and had few large power stations. When Khrushchev notes that today the USSR has 34 times as much electric power as in 1928 when the first Five Year Plan began, you may be sure that the under-developed nations of Asia listen, marvel and yearn to imitate.

In agriculture the picture is much less rosy. Both grain and livestock fell far short of what was expected by the just finished Five Year Plan. How far below, Khrushchev does not state. He does note the shocking fact that, due to a variety of causes,

grain acreage fell off in many areas so that "in 1953 the area under grain was almost the same as in 1913," though the demand for grain had much increased. Livestock was in equal difficulties. This failure, however, brings to light a vivid account of the way the USSR acts to retrieve a mistake.

In January 1954, the Central Committee of the Communist Party, noting that grain acreage had not increased in three years, declared an emergency and called on "Soviet patriots" to go forth into the virgin wilds of Siberia and Kazakhstan to plough 75 million acres within two years. Some 350,000 such patriots volunteered and the whole 75 million acres were ploughed by 1955. The total grain crop of the country rose 29 per cent in those two years. The increase of wheat from virgin lands made it possible to divert some wheat lands in the North Caucasus and Ukraine to corn for livestock. So corn acreage in 1955 was 45 million acres, almost three times what was sown in 1954. This raised the amount of silage and this in turn the milk. Khrushchev announced in triumph that "in the past four months from October 1, 1955 to February 1, 1956," milk production over the whole USSR was 65 per cent higher than a year ago! . . . Khrushchev frankly admits that some Soviet specialists oppose ploughing up the drought-prone areas of Siberia and Kazakhstan. They may be taking chances of a dust-bowl. But for the present emergency the results were good. Sale of meat products more than doubled from 1950 to 1955.

Changes promised by the next Five Year Plan are far too many to be more than briefly summarized. Industrial production is to rise 65 per

cent; real wages of workers 30 per cent, of farmers 40 per cent. Workers are to get the seven hour day, (in some cases the 40 hour week) without reduction of wages. The pension system is to be improved, its unjust inequalities ironed out. A tremendous housing program is scheduled. Schools are to multiply to make secondary school "universal," as elementary schooling is now. Tuition fees which have marked some secondary schools and colleges are to be abolished. New incentives for women are offered, more chances to rise to the highest posts. Most important of all to many people is the promise of wider democratization, an era of legality in which the Security Police are controlled by law, and in which victims of past injustice are restored to their rights. More home rule is to come in the National Republics. Such is the glowing promise of the Sixth Five Year Plan.

It is a trifle disconcerting after reading Khrushchev's speech to turn again to Eisenhower's report on the state of the union. I was stunned by the resemblances I found. Not only in the generalizations: both leaders boasted of "building a better, stronger country." (Eisenhower's words) and rejoiced that their land was "at peace" and took to themselves some credit for this. . . . But at least a score of details that followed showed that governments all over the world have today certain common problems. It is strange how much the two giant nations are alike.

"Our farm people are not sharing as they should in the general prosperity" confesses Eisenhower. The problem is Khrushchev's too, though it comes in a different form. One notes the irony whereby Washington, hailing free enterprise, turns

to government regulation to help the farms, while Moscow, hailing collective enterprise, calls on the initiative of 350,000 private patriots to help the nation. The world is a bit more complex than one thought!

Both nations have been cutting dead-wood from the federal payroll. Eisenhower fired 350,000 federal employees and thus saved taxes; he does not mention what the men he fired were going to do. Khrushchev got rid of 750,000; he had a bigger bureaucracy to start with and he says people are more needed in productive work on farm and in factory than in so much administrative work. Both reports note the "deficit in housing"; the words are Eisenhower's but also fit the USSR. And again it is free-enterpriser Eisenhower who says: "a firm program of public housing is essential," while Communist Khrushchev elaborates three methods by which farmers can build their own homes, partly from personal savings and partly on loans from collective farms.

Both leaders find the pension plan uneven and want this regularized. Both admit that civil rights leave something to be desired but think the situation improving. Both are concerned over working conditions, hours and wages. But it is Khrushchev, not Eisenhower, who thinks the trade unions should be "more militant" in fighting for their members' rights, who says that this "harmony" between trade unions and executives is not quite healthy, and "at times a good wrangle is useful." Will Mr. Meany please note. And will all those who claim the trade unions are rubber stamps of the Soviet government note that it is Khrushchev himself who is opposing the natural tendency of union officials to stick in a groove.

It is Khrushchev, rather than Eisenhower, who is concerned with "the development of democracy," by which he means not merely voting but "the development of increased creative effort of broad masses of the people." He notes two forms of people's control over government that have grown in recent years: the representative conferences of leading workers, farmers and intellectuals to advise with the government on particular problems; and the widening share taken by personnel in enterprises in the details of making up the Five Year Plan. He also notes the move in the USSR towards decentralization of power.

Justice William O. Douglas in a recent article accused the USSR of "Russianizing" the national minorities; he said Moscow dictated the smallest details in every local factory and farm. Khrushchev seems rather concerned to scatter control as widely as it can be scattered to the ends of the USSR. Formerly, he says, there were very few trained technicians among the minor nationalities, so most enterprises were run by the All-Union Ministries. But in the past fifteen years college graduates and trained technicians among minor nationalities have doubled, tripled and even quadrupled. So the process of transfer of ownership and control has begun. The Ukraine has now a Ukrainian Ministry for Coal and Steel; Azerbaidzhan has a Ministry for Oil. As a result, 67 per cent of *all* industry in the Ukraine is *owned* by the Ukraine and not by the All Union government; while, 80 per cent of all industry in Azerbaidzhan is *owned* by Azerbaidzhan. This is a new, amazing decentralization. Will Justice Douglas please note? Will he also note that while Moscow hands over ownership to national republics,

Standard Oil of California takes over Saudi Arabia's oil. . . . Just where is "free enterprise" now?

The most amazing similarity between Khrushchev's report and Eisenhower's is the declaration by Eisenhower that material prosperity demands "a growth in the spiritual strength of our nation," a "single-minded devotion to the good of America," which is matched by Khrushchev's statement that a "powerful material base" for Communism is "not enough," but one must "also create the spiritual requisites." Both find hope to produce these spiritual qualities in education and both find their present schools inadequate for this.

It would be easy to show how Khrushchev's solutions differ from Eisenhower's, that he has certain facilities for planning and building that capitalism does not possess. But perhaps that is not the point today. Perhaps it is important now to note not the differences that divide

but the similarities that unite us, and to see that these leaders are dealing, not just with a Soviet problem or an American problem but with a problem which is universal in our age. It is the problem of the human race adjusting its social forms to its swiftly advancing technology . . . seeking to combine individual initiative with collective planning, seeking the fine balance between centralization and decentralization . . . a balance that is always changing and will never be finally fixed.

The whole world, it seems, is in the same transition, part of it consciously, part of it not knowing where or why. . . . But one thing at least becomes clearer to all of us in this age of the atom: that the precise forms of our solution are less important than just keeping our human race alive while we find our way. This is the meaning of the "competitive co-existence" through which the forms of the future will appear.

FLORIDA UNIVERSITY GETS COL. ROBINS' BOOKS

CHINSEGUT HILL in Brooksville, Florida, the home of Colonel and Mrs. Raymond Robins, has been given to the University of Florida as a Branch Library. At the official ceremony in February the house was rededicated to the ideals for which its owners had stood during their lifetime—their unceasing search for truth and their tireless efforts on behalf of human welfare.

The 8,000 volumes of Colonel Robins' library, given by Miss Lisa Von Borowsky, will be used as the basis for a research collection in the fields of labor, religion, and international relations, Colonel Robins' main interests.

Head of the American Red Cross in Russia in the early days of the Revolution, Colonel Robins had the rare opportunity of repeated conferences with Lenin. Acting as an unofficial intermediary between our government and the leaders of the Revolution, he early saw the importance of U.S. recognition of the new Soviet Government. First proposing recognition to President Wilson, he was unremitting in his fight until it was won under President Roosevelt in 1933.

Until his death in 1954, Colonel Robins was a member of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship and an active supporter of *New World Review*.

The UN's Active Secretary-General

by **ESLANDA ROBESON**

ONE of the most encouraging and interesting developments in the United Nations over the past two years has been the increasingly active and effective participation of Secretary General Dag Hammarskjöld in all the various aspects of the work of this world organization.

The youthful, quietly dynamic, modest Secretary General holds regular press conferences twice a month for the benefit of UN correspondents, to give them his interpretation of what is happening, and to answer their many questions. These press conferences are always very well attended. The last three, were especially interesting and rewarding.

At the press conference on December 22, following the close of the 10th session of the General Assembly, when asked what he considered to be the most significant happenings during the Assembly, the Secretary General said there was one major, positive decision . . . the one concerning the admission of 16 members. Mr. Hammarskjöld went on to say:

If I look at the General Assembly as a whole, I think of the slow back-stage negotiations which finally led up to the major decisions on atomic energy. I must say that I person-

ally regard these decisions as most promising, extremely valuable as a basis for our future efforts, and a very fine result.

Mr. Hammarskjöld was referring here, of course, to the three resolutions unanimously approved on Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, the establishment of an International Atomic Energy Agency, and of a Committee to Study the Effects of Atomic Radiation.

Mr. Hammarskjöld also gave his views on the very controversial subject, the attainment of self-determination by non-self-governing territories, which was so hotly debated during this and previous sessions:

. . . There is no question that self determination is one of the major aims of the Charter, the ideology expressed in the Charter. On the other hand, everybody should know . . . that self determination is not something that is reached overnight. It is the result of an organic process, an organic process not only in the development of people, but also in diplomacy as we work it out here; that is to say, I stick firmly to the aim as defined in the Charter . . . but I plead for respect for the organic growth . . . of constitutional, political and historical processes. It does not mean that I will accept a turtle

ost
s a
l a

ing
lu-
ce-
es-
nal
a
of

his
ub-
mi-
ri-
ted

self
for
ex-
her
ne-
It
ess,
the
in
re;
the
...
nic
iti-
oes
rtle
EW



—United Nations

Secretary-General of the UN Dag Hammarskjöld (on the left) with Prime Minister Chou En-lai of the Chinese People's Republic last year in Peking.

pace, but it does mean that I do not believe in rushing developments of this kind. . . . There is another aspect which is very much in the front of everyone's mind, and that is what constitutional and legal means are most appropriate when it comes to the question of furthering self determination. . . . I felt that a Declaration of Self Determination would have been a better approach than an attempt to legalize it. . . .

(However admirable Mr. Hammarskjöld's activities have been in many spheres, I, for one, profoundly disagree with him on this crucial point. Who's rushing? Never mind the "turtle pace"—some reasonable concrete progress would be welcomed by millions of people in Africa—and in Alabama and Mississippi for that matter. But concrete progress requires more than promises, statements, declarations.)

In answer to a question concerning the reduction of the "package deal" from 18 to 16 new members and the dramatic overnight victory for their admission, the Secretary

General, who has consistently advocated universality of membership, commented:

I think that we really have to go back to San Francisco (the Commemorative 10th Anniversary Session of the Assembly at San Francisco last June) . . . there, Lester Pearson (Canada) came out with his strong appeal for a wider membership on the basis of universality, as he defined it: "all countries not divided." He crystallized in that statement what was very much in the air at San Francisco. So there was a solid build-up of an atmosphere where something could be done if some governments or some men had the wisdom to find the right formulas and the courage and the guts to carry them out.

Q: What fundamental changes, if any, are you expecting from the increased membership with respect to the activities, the evolution and the climate of the UN?

A: . . . The UN has, I think, never been, in a sense, in such a state of flux as it is at present. The very uncertainty, the very complications in the Assembly, indicated not re-group-

ings, not new leaderships, nothing of the kind, but a beginning of a thawing of fixed patterns which had existed for years, with a groping towards a new orientation on a more strict national basis, with less of the overriding ideological considerations.

The Secretary General left New York January 15 to attend the 12th session of ECAFE (Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East) at Bangalore, India. On the way to Bangalore he visited very briefly Britain, Greece, Turkey, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Iran, Syria, Iraq, and Pakistan; on the way back he visited Burma, Thailand, Indonesia, Australia and New Zealand. Just before he left, he held a press conference, to tell us what he hoped to accomplish on the trip. He had been studying the problems of the areas for so long from this end, now he wanted, however briefly, to have some contact with as many peoples and places as possible in the very short time at his disposal.

On his return from the trip, on February 27, Mr. Hammarskjöld told his most recent press conference:

I have been away for 6 weeks, six rather interesting and rewarding weeks. . . . First of all, this trip was a very great emotional experience . . . because it brought me in contact with people in very many Member countries in a way which added considerably to my understanding of the human element in the problems which we are handling here.

I remember very many personalities and very many situations. I remember the enthusiasm, the pure enthusiasm, of the young people in the Collectives in Israel. I remember an old woman quite alone in a refugee camp in Beirut, scared of people, tired. I remember the young workers

in an Indian village at the end of a long day breaking out in a dance with a zest for life going far beyond anything I have ever seen. I remember the old women in the peace pagoda at Rangoon, praying for peace with flowers in their hands . . . poor, poor people who did not know much about the ways of this world, but knew that short of peace there was no future for them. . . . That is the human side. . . .

Close to the human side is what I would call the economic and social aspects of life in these various Member countries. . . . There are the very progressive, the very fine plans for economic development which one finds in several countries, plans tackled with wisdom, energy and very great courage. . . . I had the privilege of visiting some community projects in India, Indian villages under reform. I had the privilege of visiting a similar project in Burma. These are the places where one sees an economic revolution from the grass roots. . . .

We in the UN are doing what we can, with somewhat modest means, to keep these projects going, to assist the governments in what they are doing. Our contribution is even more inadequate than I had realized before. I do feel strongly that, for us in the UN and for all governments with a feeling for the future of this world, it is an imperative challenge to live up to the economic needs of the vast majority of mankind. . . .

Mr. Hammarskjöld then discussed the very dangerous situation in the Middle East. Asked whether he felt the Middle East is on the brink of war, the Secretary General said that he was reluctant to use a phrase "understood in so many different ways" and then continued:

If you come down to the hot facts of the day, I do not think we are, in the sense you possibly give the

words, on the brink of war. I simply and flatly refuse to believe it. After all, there is a recognition, a new recognition, that war is never inevitable. At the very moment that recognition is shown, and I think it is shown, I think we have moved away from the brink.

Mr. Hammarskjold cautiously suggested that he felt hopeful that with continuing intense effort on both sides, fighting could be avoided and some minimum ground found for negotiations. He made clear his feeling that a settlement is not the concern of the Western powers alone. He gave his view of what the role of the UN might be in the following colloquy:

Q: . . . Let us suppose that . . . as many fear . . . war does break out [in the Middle East]. In the light of your knowledge of UN history, do you think that a nation can depend on the UN coming to its aid in time?

A: My own view is that the influence of the UN in situations of this

kind is mainly preventive and prophylactic.

Q: Would you mind telling us exactly what kind of preventive action the UN might be able to take in an area where war threatens or is right on the verge of breaking out?

A: An obviously necessary preventive action is to take all possible steps to stop such developments, to eliminate the source of continuous friction. . . . I think that the preventive action is mainly what I might call midwifery. . . . It is a matter of continuous and intense study of the problems on both sides, of canalizing the tension and always finding the greatest common denominator. I personally believe that, just as negotiation keeps people from shooting, in the same way reasonable progress toward a goal keeps people from rushing into a conflict because they cannot get everything at once or cannot get it in just the form they would like.

In other words, the two lines of preventive action which I think are obviously indicated are, first, to stabilize the situation in the field on a day-to-day basis and to avoid the in-

At a recent bi-monthly press conference with the Secretary-General. NWR correspondent, Eslanda Robeson, is second from the left, top tier.

—United Nations



cidents which may lead to major frictions, and secondly, to be . . . quietly helpful by being a third party with which the two conflicting parties can discuss matters, and which may help them to bridge the gulf not by formal mediation but by working out a maximum understanding, an understanding which, I think, will increase as time goes on if the operation is wisely run.

From the beginning of his secretaryship, Mr. Hammarskjold has sought to contribute to an ending of East-West divisions and tensions. His deep sense of responsibility to the Charter principle of maintaining peace was shown in his support of the armistice in Korea, and his declaration at the time that it should be followed by a "peace without vengeance." Also, his personal role will be remembered in helping to make arrangements for the release of the American flyers imprisoned in China and in paving the way for U.S.-Chinese negotiations on this and other issues through his visit to Peking in early 1955 and his continued contacts with Chinese Foreign Minister Chou En-lai.

In his annual report to the UN last August 7, Mr. Hammarskjold hailed the new trend toward lessening tension in world affairs, stressing the importance of the Heads

of State Conference at Geneva, and the Bandung Conference of Asian and African nations.

He suggested that progress toward greater international cooperation could be made through more extensive use of the United Nations rather than regional arrangements, and that the new relationships with the West toward which the peoples of Asia and Africa are moving could "most creatively be forged" through the world organization. He proposed supplementing conference diplomacy with "more quiet diplomacy within the United Nations." He expressed the hope for strengthening the influence of law in international affairs, declaring:

It is surely in the interest of all member states to restrict as much as possible the sphere where sheer strength is an argument, and to extend as widely as possible the area ruled by considerations of law and justice.

As we, the United Nations correspondents, listen and talk with the patient, friendly and resourceful Captain of the Good Ship UN, our respect and admiration continue to grow for his wide grasp of the problems involved and the firm and quiet diplomacy with which he conducts the extremely complex but vitally important job which is his.

POLAND TO REBUILD MIDDLE EAST RAIROAD

A POLISH engineering organization, Cekop, has been awarded the contract to plan the rebuilding of the 500-mile Hejaz railway line between Damascus in Syria and Medina in Saudi Arabia. Bids were submitted by fifteen countries.

The Polish bid was accepted by a commission in Jedda made up of representatives from Jordan, Saudi Arabia and Syria. The Poles who surveyed the line, most of which is across desert terrain, include several who have spent many years in Africa and Afghanistan.

Soviet Doctors Visit America

THE SALK vaccine against poliomyelitis is one of the greatest contributions of American medical science to the conquest of disease. The recognition of the importance of this contribution was hailed throughout the world, not only as a triumph against the specific virus that produces poliomyelitis in human beings, but as another step in the struggle against virus infection generally, now carried on in many countries. The sordid details of the earlier distribution of the vaccine in this country seem to have passed, thanks to public pressure, into the not very happy record of other attempts on our part to face problems of public health.

Scientists from many countries, recognizing the real worth of the vaccine, have eagerly sought data and information to add to their own research in related fields. Among scientists and researchers from other countries who have come here for direct investigation of the method and results of the Salk experiment were four leading scientists and researchers from the Soviet Union, who arrived in this country late in January for a month's visit.

Professor Mikhail P. Chumakov, Director of the Institute of Poliomyelitis Research of the Academy of Medical Science in Moscow, headed the Russian group. With him were Professor Anotoli A. Smorodintsev, Head of the Virology De-

partment of the Institute of Experimental Medicine, the Academy of Medical Science in Leningrad; Dr. Marina K. Voroshilova, Chief Research worker at the Institute of Poliomyelitis Research, and the wife of Professor Chumakov; and Lev I. Lukin, also a research worker of the Institute.

The invitation to the Russians came through the State Department and the arrangements for the details of the visit were made by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. In the course of their itinerary the group visited the National Institute of Health at Bethesda, Maryland; Johns Hopkins University of Baltimore; the Boston Children's Hospital; Yale University Medical School at New Haven; the Children's Hospital Research Foundation in Cincinnati; the University of Minnesota Medical School in Minneapolis; and Dr. Salk's laboratories at the University of Pittsburgh. There were as well brief visits to the Kenny Institute and the Mayo Clinic while they were in Minneapolis; and they had the experience of observing Dr. Salk administer booster shots of his vaccine to 200 children in Pittsburgh.

At the conclusion of their month's visit, Dr. Chumakov in an informal conversation with members of the staff of the *New World Review* and others, summed up his impressions:

"I am convinced that the sci-

entists on both sides, especially scientists and workers in the medical field, are eager to have contact with representatives of their field in the other country. I also believe that the whole American people as well as the people of the Soviet Union understand the importance of such contacts, and want peaceful, fruitful interchange."

The group, Dr. Chumakov explained, had hoped to spend more time in this country, to visit more places, and to make a more thorough study of the research work of some of the laboratories than they were given the opportunity to do. However, Dr. Chumakov felt sure that as new possibilities for interchange open up, a more thorough exchange of experience and knowledge will become possible with great advantages to both sides resulting.

Dr. Chumakov was very much impressed by the friendliness with which they were met by the scientists and medical workers with whom they came in contact. He felt this indicated a very happy prospect for the growth of direct ties between scientists, and that it gave reason for optimism as to the possibilities of developing really fruitful exchanges.

All of his group, Dr. Chumakov said, were impressed by the modern equipment and appliances in the laboratories they visited and they saw in them the possibilities of the most important scientific and technical advances.

He then stressed what he thought was the crucial importance of the progress that has been made here in the utilization of the tissue culture method of growing virus. It was this great discovery of Dr. Enders and his staff in Boston which led to the development of the Salk vaccine and

that holds such great possibilities for the future.

Professor Chumakov pointed out that parallel lines of research were being carried out in the Poliomyelitis Institute in Moscow. He said, however, that the scope of the work in the Soviet Union has been much more limited because of the comparative lack of incidence of polio there. Only since 1946, in the new industrial centers where people from all over the Soviet Union came together for the first time have there been many cases, and even in these areas the incidence has not reached anything like epidemic proportions. In the United States, life itself had created the demand that the most serious attention be given to polio and hence the years of study and the success that has crowned the work of American scientists.

Considerable surprise was expressed by Professor Chumakov that there was not more information available in this country about the anti-influenza vaccine developed in the USSR and already administered with success to some 10,000,000 people. This vaccine was also a result of utilization of tissue culture and marks another advance in the benefits of this method of growing virus.

Professor Chumakov pointed out that one strain of polio virus, isolated in the USSR, which his group had brought with them, had been studied in laboratories here and the Soviet data confirmed. He thought this especially fruitful, and indicated a way in which further exchange of materials should take place.

Speaking for all four visitors, Professor Chumakov felt particularly grateful to Dr. Sabin of the Children's Hospital Research Foundation for showing them not only his laboratories but the city of Cincinnati

as well. He also mentioned their gratitude to Dr. John Paul of the Medical School of Yale University, Dr. Syvertson of the University of Minnesota, and Dr. Karl Meyer of the University of California; for Dr. Salk with whom they spent the longest period allowed, he expressed their warmest appreciation.

The visit of the group to the Pittman-Moore Company in Indianapolis, one of the leading producers of the vaccine in this country, limited as it was to a single day, proved unsatisfactory to the Russians, as it did to the personnel at the plant, who informed them that a minimum of at least three days was required for a proper understanding of the process.

Indeed, the limitations placed upon the visitors in a variety of ways proved in every case irksome both to them and to their American hosts, for these limitations meant a genuine loss to both sides. In the end, these obstacles only served the purpose of preventing that free exchange of ideas and opinion which alone provides the atmosphere in

which science can most richly grow.

Nevertheless the impression was so keen among the Russians of the real desire for communication between the two countries that they felt that in the not too distant future it would be possible for the freest and most fruitful exchange of ideas, materials, and experiments to take place with results of the greatest significance for man's struggle against disease, sickness and death.

Professor Chumakov expressed great satisfaction that just as they were completing their visit, five American scientists were leaving for a reciprocal visit to the USSR. All are physicians who are specialists in the field of research and the purpose of their visit is to study Soviet medical methods and facilities. The group is composed of Dr. Michael Shimkin of the United States Public Health Service, Dr. Richard E. Shope of the Rockefeller Foundation, Dr. John Paul of Yale University, Dr. Karl Meyer of the University of California and Dr. Colin Macleod of New York University.

SHAKESPEARE AND SHAW IN BUDAPEST

THERE HAVE been two outstanding successes in the Budapest theater this winter: Shakespeare's *Richard III* and Shaw's *St. Joan*. Comments by critics in the Budapest papers on the two performances offer an interesting insight into the interpretations.

The critic in the paper *Szabad Nep* says of *Richard III* that Shakespeare's basic humanism "finds expression not in the mouths of Richard's political enemies . . . his aristocratic sacrifices, but in the small 'episodic' scenes," and this the director has brought out . . . "in the scenes of the citizens who await the calamitous developments, afraid for their own necks; in the bitter commentary of the scrivener, who reads sentence on the whole rotting regime; and here and there in the remorse of the assassins."

In the same paper a critic writes of the performance of the eminent Hungarian actress, Elma Bulla, in *St. Joan*: "Her portrayal is perfection itself. Her pure and tender, yet soldierly determined Joan, is through and through a popular figure who becomes a hero, without ever thinking of heroism."

BRITISH-SOVIET FRIENDSHIP

1917-1956

by PAT SLOAN

THE atmosphere in Britain today is more friendly to the USSR than at any time save during the wartime anti-fascist alliance.

Despite the years of "cold war" propaganda, the British people have shown in numerous ways their warm feelings for the Soviet people.

Perhaps the most striking incident that marked the change in atmosphere was at the time of the Coronation in 1953. The propaganda of the "cold war" had been continuous since 1946. But when the Soviet battleship, the *Sverdlov*, arrived at Portsmouth for the Coronation Naval Review, it literally "stole the show" as the very conservative *Time & Tide* described it. Moreover, when the sailors from the *Sverdlov* went sightseeing in London they were welcomed warmly by the crowds that stand and stare outside Buckingham Palace—hardly a hotbed of Communist or Socialist sympathies.

Just look back for a moment to the situation following the October Revolution in 1917. At that time the young Soviet Republic was fierce-

ly attacked by all but the militant working class and a few traders who saw the potential market that lay behind the new Soviet frontier.

In those days to be a "friend of the Soviet Union" was more or less identical with being a Socialist, and a militant one at that.

Came the armed intervention. This was stopped by the organized workers in their historic "Hands Off Russia" campaign of 1920.

Came the first Labor Government, which, on the basis of working class pressure, accorded diplomatic recognition to the USSR.

In 1928, the First Five-Year Plan was launched. This was treated in the main organs of the press as "Bolshevik bluff," as pure propaganda. In 1932, the *Daily Telegraph* wrote of the Plan: "As a practical test of 'planned economics' the scheme has quite clearly failed."

In the '30's, after Hitler's advent to power, a change came over Europe. In France and Czechoslovakia, the ruling groups decided it was expedient to sign Pacts of Mutual Assistance with the USSR. In Britain a movement for such a pact began to develop widely, with support from such Conservative M.P.'s as Winston Churchill, the Duchess of Atholl and Robert Boothby. But the movement

PAT SLOAN is General Secretary of the British-Soviet Friendship Society and the author of a number of books and pamphlets on the Soviet Union.

was not strong enough to force the Chamberlain Government to abandon its policy of poorly concealed support for Hitler.

From 1939 to 1941, once again, only the militant section of the working class stood for friendship with the USSR. As in the 1918-1920 period, or in the worst years of the cold war, 1947-1952, friendship with the USSR was regarded as impossible, almost as treachery.

Then, with the Nazi invasion of Russia the atmosphere was transformed overnight by Churchill's famous speech promising aid to the Russians. We came to the period of the Grand Alliance, and committees sprang up all over Britain uniting people of every political view but fascist, in a nation-wide movement of friendship for Russia. Whether it was workers chalking "Tanks for Joe" in the workshop or Mrs. Churchill's "Aid for Russia Fund," there was a real national unity on the issue of British-Soviet friendship.

At least, on the surface. We now know that in 1942 Churchill was already circulating his inner-cabinet memorandum on the need to prepare for conflict with Russia as soon as Hitler was defeated. We know, as well, of his later infamous telegram to Montgomery to use Nazi troops against the Russians if the Russians violated the agreed demarcation lines in Germany while, at the same time, he urged the Americans to violate these same demarcation lines.

No sooner was Hitler defeated than the anti-Soviet policy of Churchill began to come to light. The "cold war" already came into the open in the deliberate attempt to conceal the enormous role of the USSR in defeating Japan behind the explosion of two atom bombs. The

declaration of the atom bomb as an "Anglo-American secret" was the declaration of cold war against the USSR.

This time it was a British Labor Government that took upon itself the task of waging the cold war. Whereas in 1918-1920 the Labor movement had officially opposed armed intervention, we now had the official Labor movement conducting the cold war against the USSR.

Once again friendship for the Soviet Union became a minority movement, not respectable, almost traitorous. The broad Anglo-Soviet friendship committees of the war years fell apart.

And so, from 1946 to 1952 we lived through a period once again when only the militant section of the working class, with a small group of supporters from other walks of life, continued the work for British-Soviet friendship.

But underneath the cold war propaganda a change was taking place, rather like the famous New Deal Roosevelt election, with the people moving against the line dictated by the press.

The Russians were quick to note the change, and readily responded to proposals for expanding cultural relations.

In November, 1951, the first Soviet artists in the post-war period came to Britain as the guests of the British-Soviet Friendship Society for British-Soviet Friendship Month. Nadezhda Kazantseva, the coloratura soprano, and her accompanist, Nahum Walter, were the first to break the ice. They got a wonderful reception.

The following November a whole group of artists came, including Emil Gilels, Igor Bezrodny and Mark Raizen. And so, each November since

then we have seen a small "invasion" of Soviet artists to Britain.

In the spring of 1954 the British-Soviet Friendship Society brought its first Soviet ensemble to Britain, the Beryozka, which performed for four weeks at one of London's largest theaters with resounding success. And, finally, last November we had the Moiseyev Ensemble, which played to nearly 100,000 people in a month at London's Empress Hall.

In 1954, the Society for Cultural Relations brought over Sergei Obraztsov's State Puppet Theater, and at the end of last year the first British Shakespearean company performed in Moscow and Leningrad.

Noting these developments, and not wanting to leave the Society for Cultural Relations or the British-Soviet Friendship Society with a monopoly of artistic visits, the Government has set up its own committee on Anglo-Soviet relations under the official British council. This committee is now planning further major exchanges between the two countries which can only further help to break down the remnants of the so-called "iron curtain" and to dispel the cold war mentality. As the guest of this committee the Soviet Minister of Culture, Mr. Mikhailov, has just visited Britain, to discuss official exchanges between the two countries.

In sports a parallel development has taken place. First chess and then, of course, football. Then athletics, boxing, ice-hockey, and rowing. Not only have the Russians invaded that aristocratic paradise, the Henley Regatta, but now they are even threatening to compete in yachting at Cowes!

Always, without exception, their sporting play makes a deep impression.

In the trade union field the number of delegations to and from the Soviet Union has increased remarkably. In 1949 there were nine trade union *delegates* that visited the USSR from Britain. Last year there were five official trade union *delegations*.

And exchanges between the religious communities of the two countries have started. The Quakers blazed the trail, followed by the Baptists and the Church of England. Soviet religious leaders have visited Britain.

One of the most striking changes is the press treatment of such exchanges. Now they are all reasonably objectively reported.

It is also now recognized that Soviet guests are popular. How else can one explain the fact that Blackpool Corporation in 1955 invited the Soviet Ambassador to "switch on the lights," a ceremony previously conducted by outstanding film and TV stars, or that Harrogate (no center of "Communist infiltration") should have asked him to open their Flower and Horse Show?

Municipal exchanges between our countries are now becoming a regular occurrence. The Lord Mayor of London has exchanged visits with the Mayor of Moscow. Birmingham has sent an official delegation to Sverdlovsk and is to receive an official return visit this April. Other cities like Liverpool, Manchester and Sheffield are planning exchanges with Odessa, Leningrad and Stalino respectively. The City of Bristol has decided to send delegations to both a Soviet and an American city. Greenwich and Gorky Trades Councils are exchanging visits.

It is this steady growth of friendly feelings (first publicly manifest at the time of the Sverdlov visit in 1953—a possible parallel to the 1955

situation in the USA with the visit of the Soviet agriculturalists to the Midwest) that has swept our country so that now, in general, the atmosphere is more like that of the wartime alliance than at any time between 1917 and 1941 or 1946 to 1952.

At the same time respect for the Soviet economic system has shown a healthy improvement. The *Daily Telegraph*, as we have shown, sneered at the First Five-Year Plan, while in relation to the Sixth Plan there are no sneers, but sober references to "massive Soviet targets . . . milk output is planned to rise by 80 per cent . . . housing construction will proceed at twice the rate attained during the last Five-Year Plan."

The comments of both Eisenhower and Churchill on the advance of Soviet technical education have received very wide publicity. If this stimulates an advance in education in the USA and Britain it may well prove the first concrete example of the "peaceful competition" so often called for by Khrushchev, Molotov and Mikoyan—to the benefit of the Western peoples.

This respect for Soviet technical education has gone hand-in-hand with a marked increase of technical delegations and groups of specialists in both directions; and on both sides there is a recognition that they can learn something from the other. *The Times* in a recent leading article on the Five-Year Plan said that the Western democracies "can and should" learn some lessons from "industrial development in Russia."

True, at the very top this new outlook has only partially had effect. It had effect in compelling the British Government (before the General Election) to come out openly for the Geneva Summit talks, and to press the U.S. Government to agree to

such talks. True, it inspired Eden at those talks to invite Bulganin and Khrushchev to visit Britain this April. But the ideas of the cold war are far from dead, and the Washington declaration following the Eisenhower-Eden talks this February could well have been issued before the Geneva Summit conference took place.

But most encouraging of all: no attempt to restore the atmosphere of the cold war is having any effect on British public opinion. Since 1953, public opinion has been taking its own course. The ideas of peaceful co-existence, of peaceful competition in raising living standards, of banning nuclear weapons, of disarmament, of unrestricted East-West trade—all these ideas are gaining ground despite all opposition.

In April, Premier Bulganin and Nikita Khrushchev are due to visit Britain as the guests of the British Government. While some opposition to the visit is appearing in the press from ultra-Conservative and certain Catholic circles, the general feeling seems to be that public opinion would not tolerate the Government's breaking off its invitation. The visit can be relied upon to arouse the most widespread enthusiasm, and while the British people will not demonstrate in such numbers as the Indians, the event will be a major landmark in the improvement of British-Soviet relations. There is also deep interest in the visit of former Premier Malenkov and a group to inspect power stations.

It is to be hoped that the atmosphere in the USA, which is also clearly—to our view—moving slowly but surely in the direction of greater friendship, will also indirectly benefit from the visit to Britain of Bulganin and Khrushchev.



The Cart



Left: Memories of Youth

Right: Carnival



The American-Chinese Talks

by SUSAN WARREN

IN THE long-drawn-out U.S.-Chinese talks at Geneva, the attempt is being made to place the blame for the stalemate on the Chinese. The *U.S. News and World Report*, (Feb. 17) for example, charges the Chinese with not wanting the talks to succeed, stalling them by "trying to change the subject, talking off the point, raising new issues," and so on.

With sharp criticisms of "brink of war" and "positions of strength" foreign policy, now being heard increasingly even from America's own allies, the concern of the American people must be for a policy of sincere negotiations on the part of our own government. The fact is that wherever differences or areas of tension exist, whether in Germany, the Middle East or Taiwan, (Formosa) U.S. policy has one monotonous demand — unconditional surrender! These are terms traditionally offered to an opponent on the point of collapse. But those nations which U.S. policy to its own detriment persists in regarding as adversaries rather

than coexistents are growing stronger, not weaker; therefore the demand for surrender can only be interpreted as a method of avoiding real negotiations.

Nowhere has this been more clearly illustrated than in the case of Taiwan. It should be remembered that when the Chinese proposed at Bandung that China and the United States sit down and negotiate to ease tensions in the Taiwan area, the State Department turned a cool ear. This rejection so aroused world opinion that Mr. Dulles hastened home from a week-end of duck shooting to offer the nation his first version of the by now notorious "I only know what I read in the papers," and reversed the State Department's rejection. But the record indicates that the question then became one of how to obstruct any genuine negotiations and make them ineffective.

The Chinese released the first group of imprisoned U.S. air men on the eve of the conference, and the others were released soon after.

After agreement was reached on September 10 on the question of the return of civilians to both sides, still in process of implementation, the Chinese proposed discussion of the American embargo against China

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

and negotiations between the two countries on the foreign ministers level as item two. Confronted with major substantive issues, Ambassador U. Alexis Johnson delayed for a month and then offered the idea that China and the United States should first make a joint declaration on the renunciation of the use of force. While making the point that the consistent initiative taken by the Chinese in urging negotiations was precisely for the purpose of realizing the non-use of force, the Chinese Ambassador nevertheless submitted a draft declaration. It was based on paragraph 4 of Article II of the UN Charter, which says: "All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state. . . ." The declaration as proposed by Ambassador Wang also added the provision that the "People's Republic of China and the United States of America decide to hold a conference of foreign ministers to settle through negotiations the question of relaxing and eliminating tension in the Taiwan area."

Whether for reasons of sensitivity to the phrase "refrain . . . from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity . . . of any state" or whatever, the United States was unwilling to have particular stipulations of the UN Charter specifically mentioned and opposed higher level meetings, though it was clear that so central a question as the tension around Taiwan could only be genuinely negotiated at the highest policy making level. The irony of China, excluded from her seat in the United Nations proposing that U.S.-Chinese behavior be regulated by the UN Charter only to be turned down by the U.S., a leading member

and engineer of her exclusion, is heightened by the fact that not many months later President Eisenhower rejected Soviet Premier Bulganin's offer of a Treaty of Peace and Friendship with the Soviet Union on the basis that it was all covered in the UN Charter!

Taking into account U.S. objections, Ambassador Wang offered a second draft announcement. Omitting the objectionable reference to the United Nations, the draft provided that both countries should declare that they "are determined that they should settle disputes between their countries through peaceful negotiations without resorting to the threat of force" and that the two ambassadors should continue their talks to seek practical and feasible means for the realization of this common desire. He explained that the People's Republic of China could not accept a statement recognizing the right of the United States to "self defense" in the Taiwan area, since this is a "domestic matter between the Chinese Government and the Chiang Kai-shek clique." Ambassador Wang declared in his statement of January 18, summarizing the Chinese position:

Taiwan is China's territory. There can be no question of defense, so far as the United States is concerned. The United States has already used force and the threat of force against China in the Taiwan area. Therefore, should one speak of defense, it is precisely China which should exercise its right of defense to expel such force and threat. Yet the United States has demanded the right of defense in the Taiwan area. Is this not precisely a demand that China accept continued United States occupation of Taiwan and that the tension in the Taiwan area be maintained forever?

According to the State Department's own summary of the Geneva talks issued on January 21, the second Chinese draft proposal on renunciation of force "represented an advance over their previous proposal in that it dropped the provision for talks on the Foreign Ministers level . . . but still pointedly omitted any reference to the Taiwan area and to recognition of the right of self-defense"—and hence was unacceptable.

With the United States Seventh Fleet in Chinese territorial waters, with Mr. Dulles assuring the world that he had no doubt that President Eisenhower would reply to a Chinese effort to occupy their ancestral islands of Quemoy and Matsu (four and ten miles respectively from the Chinese mainland) with all weapons including atomic bombs, with Chiang Kai-shek himself on Taiwan by grace of American military and naval power, the United States calls on China to "renounce the use of force" and agree to allow the U.S. to defend itself in Taiwan. Merely to suggest the reverse, namely that the Chinese arrogate to themselves the "right of self defense" in American waters in order to sustain a repudiated American faction holed up in an offshore island from which it bombed, blockaded and conducted intelligence against the American mainland, is to expose the absurdity of this position.

The State Department bases its "lawful presence in the area" on its Mutual Defense Treaty with Chiang. A few words are in order on this treaty. It is not necessary to belabor the reader with how much "mutuality" there is in it. In their able and courageous fight in the U.S. Senate against the Taiwan war powers resolution and the Chiang Treaty, Sena-

tors Lehman and Morse pointed out that this pact was meant to block all genuine negotiation with its built-in position of long-term commitment to Chiang and the semblance of legality it gives to U.S. military bases on Taiwan. Sanctified by "treaty," the presence of U.S. military and naval power becomes "non-negotiable" in the eyes of U.S. strategists. This pact was conceived and executed for the purpose of preventing a peaceful settlement of the dangerous Taiwan situation. Its purpose was and is to freeze U.S. military control of Taiwan. It strikes directly at China's sovereignty and territorial integrity and that is why the Chinese say that this they "absolutely cannot accept."

Amid the increasing world wide demands for an end of reliance on military pacts as the main instrument of national policy, the State Department and Mr. Dulles continue to act as though nothing could be so dangerous as the threat of a peaceful settlement. Today, the imminent danger of the peaceful liberation of Taiwan by the Chinese is stirring the State Department to new belligerence. While U.S. policy remains boxed in by rigid adherence to non-negotiation and an empty military pact, Chinese policy shows a remarkable and characteristic flexibility. Considering the liberation of Taiwan as a purely internal affair the Chinese are acting on Premier Chou En-lai's words of last July:

If possible, the Chinese Government is willing to enter into negotiations with the responsible local authorities of Formosa to map out concrete steps for Taiwan's peaceful liberation.

Peking's campaign to that effect

appears to have moved into high gear. A speech on January 30 which the *New York Times* shortsightedly headlined "Chou Asks Vietnam Talks; Threatens War For Taiwan," the *Christian Science Monitor* more astutely titled "Chou Sweetens Formosa Bait." According to the latter paper:

A careful reading of Mr. Chou's January 30 speech shows that contrary to a number of early reports it was remarkable much more for its tone of forgiveness to the Nationalists than for its belligerence toward the U.S.

Recalling that historically a unity of the entire Chinese nation against its external enemies had been developed, and that twice the Chinese Communist Party and the Kuomintang had cooperated against imperialism, Chou En-lai proposed that:

If the Kuomintang military and political authorities come to see the inevitable trend of developments and are willing to liberate Taiwan by peaceful means . . . no matter whom they may be or how serious their crimes were, they will be treated leniently by the Chinese people, without questioning their past. All those who perform meritorious service in the liberation of Taiwan will be duly rewarded by the Chinese people in accordance with the degree of their merits. All those who come back to the motherland peacefully will be provided with appropriate jobs by the Chinese people.

The persuasive voices of former major nationalist figures such as Generals Fu Tso-yi, Huang Chi-siang, as well as non-Communist democratic personalities such as Li

Chi-shen and Chieng Chien have been beamed to Formosa by Radio Peking.

While it is difficult to estimate the effectiveness of this appeal, Mao Tse-tung's old military dictum of never getting into a battle you're not prepared to win, seems to be fully observed by the Chinese on the diplomatic field as well. There are many factors which are favorable. Most Chinese, irrespective of political convictions, have great national pride which has been stirred by Chinese military successes in Korea and her emergence as a great world power. Chiang looks less like a winner with each passing year and it is no secret that neither he nor his army are getting any younger. World war, to which he looked for salvation at the cost of millions of American lives, is a receding hope. Asian unity for freedom, peace and economic growth is advancing with giant steps and Chiang is regarded with contempt and hostility by the Asian world. The Americans who "leash" and "unleash" him at will are not partners but masters who will not hesitate to discard a useless "running dog" if it is to their advantage. It may be that the Chinese on Taiwan will reject this future for the more honorable one of heeding Premier Chou En-lai's appeal to "liberate Taiwan by peaceful means, help their great motherland to eliminate the tension and bring about her complete unification. . . ."

Our own policy on Taiwan must take into account the new realities in Asia and the world. It is fitting that we say to Mr. Dulles as he continues to lead us along that tortuous path to the brink: "Don't look now—but nobody's following you."

Two Letters from Tientsin

These two letters are of exceptional interest because both are from American women married to Chinese citizens, living and bringing up their children in the new China. Their letters give a first hand view of what happened in their own community when, as part of the process of transition to socialism, local capitalists took part in the change over from private to joint state-private enterprise. In our next issue Israel Epstein will describe how this change came about and what it means for People's China as a whole.

by GRACE LIU

THESE are remarkable days in China. The country's socialist transformation is proceeding with such speed that everyone is tremendously excited. Everywhere it is the main topic of conversation — the school children are talking eagerly and happily about "how fast we are going" and the old folks are saying, "Well, maybe at this rate we'll also get to see socialism." And the capitalists are as happy about it as everyone else. This is something that has never happened before in the world — thousands of capitalists quite jubilantly and eagerly discarding their private ownership!

One morning about two weeks ago, I heard such sounds of celebration as one doesn't hear even on New Year's Eve. Giant fire crackers that sounded like cannon, long strings of small fire crackers that hang from roof to ground, keeping up a constant banging, popping and crackling; gongs, drums, cymbals, singing, shouting and clapping—all this excitement made me very impatient

with the bad cold that kept me from going out to see what it was all about.

I couldn't see from my windows and the children were all in school; so I had to wait until my son, Wei Han, came home for lunch. He began shouting before he had the door half open, "Ma, Ma, do you hear all the noise? You ought to go out and see. The shops are fixed up with flowers and lanterns and red and gold characters. People are marching in the streets and dancing the Yangko and everybody is laughing and shaking hands. You know why? Now all the stores and shops around here are 'kung tse ho ying!'"

Wei Han doesn't know this term in English. It means "joint state-private enterprise." I had been reading for several days in the newspapers that the overwhelming majority of private industrial and commercial enterprises in Tientsin and Peking had put in their applications to become joint state-private concerns and that most had already been

accepted. But reading about it in the newspaper gave me no idea that the move would be greeted with such enthusiasm.

I heard more about that day's celebrations—in another part of the city this time — when my older daughter Shu-lien, came home from school late that afternoon. All along the way from her school to the bus station she saw shop owners with their wives and children, all dressed as for a wedding, standing in front of their gaily decorated shops receiving congratulations. Laughing shouting customers, passersby and shop workers were shaking hands with the smiling capitalists and their families and making the streets ring with shouts of "kung hsi, kung hsi!" (Congratulations!)

Shu-lien was so intrigued with these amazing sights that she would have missed her bus if the bus had been on time. The smiling bus conductor explained being behind schedule with four words "kung tse ho ying." And everyone understood that the bus had come through streets crowded with people celebrating their change-over into the joint state-private status.

The movement progressed so swiftly and smoothly that whole trades at a time made the change-over and within these last two weeks not only Peking and Tientsin, but Shanghai and all the principle cities of China have completed the transformation of all their private industry, commerce and handicraft into joint enterprises! Besides the transformation of Tientsin's private industry and commerce and handicrafts, 90 per cent of her peasant households have now joined collective farms and all of Tientsin's 112 private cinemas, theaters, tea houses have become state cultural enterprises.

Yesterday (Sunday) there was a gigantic city-wide celebration and all of Tientsin turned out into the streets to play and dance and sing. There were nearly a million paraders and dancers and what looked like another million jamming the sidewalks and playing games in the streets where there were no parades.

In the morning I watched from my balcony a parade of students, workers and capitalists and their families. It was a dazzling sight with national minority costumes, old Chinese opera costumes, dragon dancers and Yangko dancers, and waving above all of it, huge thin silk banners in many colors—pink, blue, yellow, lavender, pale green, jade green, turquoise, and red.

When Shu-lien and I went out at one o'clock to see something of the activities in other parts of the city, paraders and dancers were still going down our street and before we had gone three blocks we were stopped by another huge parade. Crowds in the side streets were playing games like "blindman's bluff" and "drop the handkerchief," dancing in groups or shooting fire crackers. It looked like a whole city without a care in the world.

Last night after the festivities were over, an old friend came to see us. He had just taken his doctor wife to the government hospital where she was on night duty, and he had dropped in here on his way home to talk over the great day. He was so excited over the developments of these last two weeks and so full of gay and eager enthusiasm that he seemed much younger than his actual sixty years.

For nearly thirty years he has been a very successful export-import businessman in Tientsin, and his firm has just become "joint state-

private." He is a good example of the way China's patriotic national capitalists have wholeheartedly followed the policy of the People's Government and have helped to bring about their own transformation toward socialism.

The first thing he said to me when he came in was—"You must write to your friends in America and tell them about our peaceful socialist revolution and how our capitalists have welcomed it. This is a great historic happening with an important meaning for the rest of the world."

"I used to think," he said a little later, "that I had to make and save a great deal of money in order to get my eight children educated, get them married off—such an expense in the old days—and perhaps have to support some of them and their families. How I used to worry. But now the government is educating my children and giving them jobs—two doctors already working and two engineers out on jobs. The two in university and the two still in middle school say, 'Please don't send us any money. We don't need it.' I am very, very happy about my children. They are wonderful young people whose whole hearts are set on being of real service to the country and the people. My wife is happy doing her own important and much needed work. So what on earth do I need with money! Just as soon as our business became joint state-private, my partners and I put our 'spoils' back into the new company." And he added with pride that this had brought letters of warm approval from his children.

We asked him what he and his partners would do now. He said that they have quite important positions in the new company and they will get their old salaries in addition to

dividends on their shares. All their employees will have jobs and the three foreigners who have worked for them for years will have yearly contracts.

In all the new joint state-private concerns, the capitalists will be given appropriate jobs and be helped to raise their managerial or technical skill, so that they can live by their own labor when the country is all socialist.

China's experience shows the great importance of educating the people to understand socialism. China's national capitalists know what socialism is, they know how it works and they are not afraid of it. They were oppressed and humiliated under the Kuomintang and the imperialists and they are proud of the strength and world prestige of this new China. They have seen that every word Chairman Mao has said has been lived up to, and that by taking the road to socialism the country has achieved successes far beyond the wildest dreams of any pre-liberation capitalist.

Mao Tse-tung reported to the Supreme State Conference on January 25, that:

Our method of carrying out the socialist revolution was a peaceful one. There were many people, both within and without the Communist Party, who doubted this in the past. But since last summer with the upsurge of the cooperative movement in the rural area and in the past few months with the upsurge of socialist transformation in the cities their doubts have, in the main, been dispelled.

Under conditions in China, it was not only possible by using peaceful methods, methods of persuasion and education, to change individual ownership by peasants and handi-

craftsmen into socialist collective ownership, but it was also possible to change capitalist ownership to socialist ownership. The speed of socialist transformation in the past few months has been far beyond what people expected. There were people who in the past had worried that it would not be easy to get through the 'difficult pass' to socialism. As things now stand, this 'difficult pass' will be easy to get through. (*Hsinhua News*)

In a newspaper interview the other day, one of Shanghai's biggest national capitalists whose family owned

24 large textile and flour mills and machine-building plants in eight major cities, had this to say when he was asked what he gained and what he lost through the transformation of capitalism:

What I lose is the private profit which comes from exploitation. In exchange I gain a richer, more prosperous and stronger country. What I lose is the cheating and mistrust common among those who exploit others, and I gain the friendship and trust of the working people, which cannot be bought with money.

by BETTY CHANDLER CHANG

WE'VE been celebrating our seventh Spring Festival since the establishment of the Chinese People's Republic, and I'm sure I speak for hundreds of millions of people here as well as our own family when I say it was the brightest and best Spring Festival yet. But since my interest and activity center largely about home and community and our five children, I'll tell you a bit about the past year in our family.

Traffic Safety

Many breath-taking changes in China's march to socialism have been initiated and these have also affected us. One is the putting into effect of the Traffic Safety Movement. Traffic in China had always been a muddled process. With pedestrians scurrying among vehicles of every speed and description it had always been a marvel to me that accidents weren't frequent. Actually a traffic mishap was a rare thing. However, with the

fleets of new trucks and fast cars continually making their appearance on our city streets, new traffic regulations had to be worked out to insure people's safety. And this has been done, not as rules laid down for people to obey, but, like all changes here, as an educational program. Drivers of vehicles met together as groups to study the new regulations. At the end of a month's intensive study, they were given both written and practical examinations which they must pass before being eligible to drive. Since my husband drives his own car (not many doctors do this here), he met each evening for two hours with the professional drivers of our community and was chosen their group leader. He felt that this gave him quite a responsibility to lead in the traffic safety movement; and in fact he has greatly improved his driving. There were films illustrating the new mode for traffic too, and these were attended by the drivers as a group. I slipped

in on one showing, and almost *felt* the attention paid to the film; one could have heard a pin drop. There was also a film for education of the general public. This was non-technical and entertaining as well as instructive. Literally almost every adult and school child saw this film. Attendance was in groups with one's organization. We housewives could go with our neighbors or on our own as we liked.

Really very artistic posters were used where large numbers of people could absorb the new method while waiting for a bus or in public waiting rooms. Radio and newspapers concentrated on the movement during the month of preliminary education. Lanes for faster and slower-moving vehicles and for pedestrians were marked off. New traffic lights were put up. Then gradually, street by street, the method was put into practice. Within a few days the system was operating over the whole city. Tientsin truly had a new look! Traffic police who had likewise undergone an intensive training course were "armed" with red and white striped batons with which they direct traffic. And how smart they look! They stand at attention as they keep traffic flowing smoothly. But they're always ready to direct pedestrians and answer questions too. And more than once I have seen the traffic policeman pocket his baton and lead a straying child or old person to safety. Needless to say, these new regulations safeguard our family materially. We've three children riding bicycles, one at the tricycle stage, and one toddling.

Moving Toward Socialism

On January 18, Tientsin took a long step toward socialism. All private shops joined in partnership

with the State. This move included the few remaining private hospitals which became public institutions. My husband is now wholly a people's doctor, and how proud the family is of that! He's happy too; for now, without the scramble of private practice, he can fully display his skill as a thoracic surgeon. He now has leisure for teaching and research. With a high, state-paid salary and wide social benefits, he has security for his family. During Spring Festival the hospital workers and doctors joined in the many parades and celebrations marking this step toward socialism for all of China.

Shops and small enterprises are infused with new life by the help that joint ownership gives them. Our small neighborhood market is one example. On the day its petition for joint ownership was accepted, the market area was decorated with colored lights, festoons, and bunting; and fireworks were shot off in celebration. Immediately, cooperation among the sellers was obvious. Now, instead of being divided into small stalls, the market is sectioned into vegetable, poultry, fish, meat, condiments, etc., departments. All clerks in each department wait on all customers, or one may wrap up your meat for you (in a lotus leaf!) while another makes change. The clerks appeared in new white gowns and caps, which they would never have afforded for themselves. The old man I usually purchase vegetables from used to be so rushed that he had to rely on a grown son to help out. Now with the cooperation of the others, his son is released and has taken another job, thus doubling the family's earnings. My butcher's wife is also relieved of the strenuous work she had helping her hus-

(Continued on page 36)



Shanghai: Crowds applauding before the Hsintahsian department store as its new "joint ownership" signboard is displayed for first time.

Canton: Meeting at the Yueh Hsiu Shan People's Stadium. Businessmen and families shout slogans to greet joint state-private ownership.



Shanghai: Jung Yi-jen (4th from right), leading Chinese capitalists talks with other businessmen on questions of the new stage of transition.



China Celebrates An Historic Step

Organizing most business concerns as joint state-private enterprises, in January, marks yet another stage in China's peaceful transition to a full socialist economy. (Eastphotos)

Shanghai: Wives of businessmen (below) make large slogans to welcome the new system of state-private joint ownership.



Shanghai: Wung Hsiu-chen (above) invests her mother's legacy in a joint ownership factory, managed by her father.



Canton: Daughters of local businessmen dance in celebration of the new step toward the peaceful socialist transformation of society.



(Continued from page 33)

band and can give better care to her four little ones. The family income is not diminished. There is no more jumping at each other's throats for business. The boy who sells fish and was always hoarse from shouting that his wares were better and cheaper than anyone else's (which they of course weren't) has his voice back. There is no longer loss of a day's income in case one seller should be sick and no one to substitute for him. But the advantages of cooperation are not all to the market people. As a consumer I find marketing much more satisfactory because I can select from the entire department instead of having only one man's display to choose from. Weights are full, and prices are lower and standardized.

Language Made Easier

The language simplification program claims our attention too. We're now learning the first 500 simplified characters, and within the next two years we will have learned the new simple forms for half of the 7,000 characters now in common use. The new characters are much easier to recognize and write than the old complicated ones from which they are derived. Meanwhile, popularization of the standard spoken Chinese (Peking dialect) is proceeding with the long range aim of using a pho-

netic form of writing. Such an exciting change this! The facility it will afford in filing, etc., goes hand in hand with China's position as a leading world power and her swift advance toward industrialization.

During these busy holidays, which have fallen during the school winter vacation, we've been having many friends and relatives dropping in on us. Each has thrilling news to tell about progress in his particular part of the country.

A recent American guest was the Negro baritone, Aubrey Pankey, who appeared on Tientsin's concert stage last month. He was warmly received; and his songs, especially the Negro folk songs, were enthusiastically applauded.

For the children there is an abundance of wholesome holiday activity. Special film shows at reduced rates, skating, games and contests—something every day. And frequently they have a day at school, with a program of games together with their classmates. Our eleven- and thirteen-year-olds, Judy and Buddy, have appeared in an ice skating exhibition; and Buddy has already earned a medal in a speed skating contest.

This is a pretty sketchy review of some of the things our family is doing, but there's much too much happening all around to pack into a letter, be it ever so long.

SOVIET ORNITHOLOGICAL CONFERENCE HELD

OVER 200 scientists took part in the All-Union Ornithological Conference in Leningrad, early this year. Among the guests were Professor Erwin Stresemann, of the German Ornithological Society; Guy Mountfort, of the British Ornithologists' Union; Professor Hans Johanson, of Copenhagen University; and well-known ornithologists from Finland, Hungary, Poland and Iceland. Bird life is widely studied in the USSR, from the Arctic to the subtropical regions.

THE SOVIET UNION AND PEACE

Summary of Khrushchev's report to the 20th Congress of the Communist Party on the international position of the Soviet Union.

OPENING his report on the international position of the USSR, Khrushchev declared that the emergence of socialism beyond the bounds of a single state and its transformation into a world system is the main feature of the present era, in which two opposite world economic systems, the capitalist and socialist, exist simultaneously, "developing according to different laws and in opposite directions."

He cited statistics showing the great expansion of the national economy of the USSR since 1929, declaring:

These statistics show that in a quarter of a century, or, to be more exact, in 26 years, the Soviet Union increased its industrial output more than 20-fold, despite the tremendous damage done to its national economy by the war. Meanwhile, the United States, which enjoyed exceptionally favorable conditions, was only able to slightly more than double its production, while industry in the capitalist world as a whole failed to register even that growth.

Khrushchev also gave figures showing that in recent years the rate of growth of industrial production in the People's Democracies and the Chinese People's Republic has surpassed that of capitalist countries. He emphasized the peaceful trend of the development of the economies

of all the socialist countries. In the Soviet Union, he said, peaceful application of atomic energy and other achievements of modern science and technology, greater utilization of mineral wealth, taming of mighty rivers and development of vast new tracts of land, opened prospects of insuring an abundance of foodstuffs and other consumer goods in the not far distant future, while China would become industrialized within a brief historical period. He spoke of the very great mutual advantages accruing from the close economic co-operation of the socialist countries. This cooperation takes into consideration on a planned basis both the special needs and the special resources of the various countries. The USSR is providing extensive technical aid and long term credits on favorable terms in the building of important industrial enterprises, and helping friendly countries in the production and peacetime use of atomic energy. In return it receives the type of materials and consumer goods which it is normal and expedient for the countries involved to export.

Analyzing the situation in capitalist countries, Khrushchev noted that while industrial production on the whole has increased, capitalist world economy "is developing extremely unevenly and has become still more un-

stable." Among the main factors accounting for increased capitalist production, Khrushchev mentioned the militarization of the economy and the arms drive in the United States, Great Britain and France.

However, he said, the favorable situation previously created by the falling out of the capitalist world market after the war of Germany, Japan and Italy has now become aggravated with the reappearance of Western Germany and Japan. These two countries have now practically regained their prewar positions, causing a sharpened economic struggle, with Anglo-American antagonism remaining, as before, the main conflict.

Military Blocs and the Cold War

Khrushchev then described the worsening of the international situation following the end of World War II, which he ascribed to the influence of reactionary and militarist groups on the policies of the United States, Great Britain and France:

The international atmosphere was poisoned by war psychosis. The arms race began to assume more and more monstrous dimensions. Many big U.S. military bases aimed against the USSR and the People's Democracies were built in countries thousands of miles from the borders of the United States. So-called "cold war" was begun against the socialist camp. International distrust was artificially kindled, and nations were set against one another. A bloody war was launched in Korea; the war in Indo-China dragged on for years.

The inspirers of the "cold war" began to establish military blocs, and many countries found themselves, against the will of their peoples, involved in restricted aggressive alignments—the North Atlantic

bloc, Western European Union, SEATO (military bloc for Southeast Asia) and the Baghdad Pact.

Khrushchev termed as "sheer hypocrisy" the allegations that all this was necessary defense against the "communist threat," and pointed out the fallacy of assertions that the "positions of strength" policy makes another war impossible:

Can peace be promoted by an arms race? It would seem that the very presentation of the question is absurd. Yet the adherents of the "positions of strength" policy offer the arms race as their main recipe for—the preservation of peace! It is perfectly obvious that when nations compete to increase their military might, the danger of war becomes greater, not less.

Khrushchev counterposed to these trends "the steady consolidation of the forces of socialism, democracy and peace, and of the forces of the national-liberation movement" as of decisive significance. He noted the growing influence in world affairs of the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China and the other socialist countries, adding:

The forces of peace have been considerably augmented by the emergence in the world arena of a group of peace-loving European and Asian states which have proclaimed non-participation in blocs as the principle of their foreign policy. The leading political circles of these states rightly hold that to participate in restricted military imperialist alignments would merely increase the danger of their countries being involved in the military gambles of the aggressive forces and draw them into the maelstrom of the arms drive.

As a result, a vast Zone of Peace embracing peace-loving states, both socialist and non-socialist, of Europe

and Asia, has emerged in the world. This zone embraces vast areas inhabited by nearly 1,500,000,000 people, that is, the majority of the population of our planet.

The vigorous efforts for peace of the broadest masses have greatly influenced international events. For the scale and organization of the struggle against the war danger waged by the masses, the present period has no comparison in history.

The activities of such groups within the capitalist countries would be more effective, however, he went on, if the various forces working for peace would overcome a certain disunity, especially within the working class, its trade unions and its political parties:

Life has put on the agenda many questions which not only demand rapprochement and cooperation between all workers' parties but also create real possibilities for this cooperation. The most important of these problems is that of preventing a new war. If the working class comes out as a united, organized force and acts with firm resolution, there will be no war.

All this places an historic responsibility upon all leaders of the labor movement. The interests of the struggle for peace make it imperative to find points of contact and on these grounds to lay the foundations for cooperation, sweeping aside mutual recriminations. Here cooperation with those circles of the socialist movement who have views on the transition to socialism differing from ours is also possible and essential. Among them are not a few people who are honestly mistaken on this question, but this is no obstacle to cooperation. Today many Social Democrats stand for active struggle against the war danger and militarism, for closer relations with the socialist countries, for unity of the labor movement. We sincerely greet

these Social-Democrats and are willing to do everything necessary to unite our efforts in the struggle for the noble cause of peace and the interests of the working people.

Khrushchev concluded this section of his report by noting that not only has the overwhelming majority of mankind rejected the "positions of strength" policy, but that the more far sighted representatives of influential Western circles are beginning to admit that this policy has failed, and are realizing "what a dangerous gamble war against the socialist countries might prove for the destinies of capitalism."

Disintegration of Colonialism

Khrushchev then turned to the disintegration of the imperialist colonial system as a post-war development of "world historic significance."

He spoke of the powerful impact on the national liberation struggles of the October Socialist Revolution, the defeat of fascist Germany and imperialist Japan, the victorious revolution in China, the winning of independence by India, Burma, Indonesia, Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, the Sudan and other former colonial countries. Hailing the freeing of nearly half the world's population from dependence during the last ten years, he continued:

Peoples who for centuries were kept away by the colonialists from the highroad of progress followed by human society are now going through a great process of regeneration. People's China and the independent Indian Republic have joined the ranks of the Great Powers. We are the witnesses of a political and economic upsurge of the peoples of

Southeast Asia and the Arab East. The awakening of the peoples of Africa has begun. The national-liberation movement has gained in strength in Brazil, Chile and other Latin American countries. The outcome of the wars in Korea, Indo-China and Indonesia has demonstrated that the imperialists are unable, even with the help of armed intervention, to crush the peoples who are resolutely fighting for a life of freedom and independence. The complete abolition of the infamous system of colonialism has now been put on the agenda as one of the most acute and pressing problems.

He declared that most Asian countries were now acting in the world arena as sovereign states, and that international relations have spread beyond the bounds of countries chiefly inhabited by white people and are "beginning to acquire the character of genuinely world-wide relations."

Following their political independence, these liberated countries have now embarked on a course of developing their own industries, raising the living standards of their people, developing their age-old national culture; in this, said Khrushchev, they are able to draw on the aid of the socialist countries, "free of any political or military obligations."

Nevertheless, in many areas, there are countries remaining in colonial or semi-colonial dependence, kept as agrarian raw-material appendages of imperialist countries, whose rivalries in their exploitation are growing. In addition to methods of suppressing colonial people by force of arms, the colonial powers, Khrushchev declared, now have recourse to "new forms of colonial enslavement under the guise of so-called 'aid' to underdeveloped countries."

He gave as an example deliveries of American weapons which means that the countries receiving them fall into dependence, increase their armies which in turn leads to higher taxes for their people and a decline in living standards. This, he asserted, was why the monopolists were interested in continuing the "positions of strength" policy and against ending the cold war, because the fanning of war hysteria is necessary to them to justify the higher taxes for the American people which go to pay for war orders—"Thus, the 'cold war' is a means for maintaining the war industry at a high level and for extracting colossal profits." He went on:

Naturally, "aid" to underdeveloped countries is granted on definite political terms, terms providing for their integration into aggressive military blocs, the conclusion of joint military pacts, and support for American foreign policy aimed at world domination, or "world leadership" as the American imperialists themselves call it.

SEATO and the Baghdad pact are not only aggressive military and political alignments, but also instruments of enslavement, a new form of exploitation, colonial in nature, of the underdeveloped countries. It is obvious that SEATO policy is determined neither by Pakistan nor Thailand, nor that of the Baghdad pact by Iraq, Iran or Turkey.

Khrushchev further noted that the attempt to pit certain countries against others through such blocs was simply a continuation of the long established "divide and rule" colonial policy, and that it was not fortuitous that most of the countries of Southeast Asia and the Middle East were resisting these efforts and strengthening their own friendship

and cooperation, as exemplified in the Bandung Conference of 29 Asian and African countries. Khrushchev also stressed the growing friendship and cooperation between Eastern peoples and the socialist countries:

This was graphically revealed by the visits of the representatives of India and Burma to the Soviet Union and by the visit of the Soviet representatives to India, Burma and Afghanistan. These visits confirmed the identity of views existing between the Soviet Union and the Republic of India, one of the great powers of the world, and between the Soviet Union, Burma and Afghanistan, on the fundamental international issue of today; the preservation and consolidation of universal peace and the national independence of all states.

The reasons for the confidence of Eastern countries in the Soviet Union, said Khrushchev, were summed up in the Egyptian paper, *Al Akhbar*, which he quoted as follows:

"Russia does not try to buy the conscience of the peoples, their rights and liberty. Russia has extended a hand to the peoples and said that they themselves should decide their destiny, that she recognizes their rights and aspirations and does not demand their adherence to military pacts or blocs."

The Soviet Struggle for Peace

Khrushchev outlined as follows the main directions in which the USSR's peace initiative has developed:

First, an improvement in relations between the Great Powers.

Second, elimination of the breeding grounds of war that existed in the East and the prevention of the development of new breeding grounds

of war and conflict in Europe and Asia.

Third, the adjustment of relations with a number of countries in order to ease tension in Europe (normalization of relations with fraternal Yugoslavia, conclusion of the State Treaty with Austria, the establishment of diplomatic relations between the USSR and the German Federal Republic, etc.)

Fourth, the exploration of new ways to settle such questions as the establishment of a collective security system in Europe, disarmament, prohibition of atomic weapons, the German problem, etc.

Fifth, resolute measures to develop closer relations with all countries desiring to preserve peace.

Sixth, the expansion in every way of international contacts; personal contacts between Soviet statesmen and those of other countries; contacts between representatives of our Party and workers' parties of other countries and between trade unions; greater exchange of parliamentary, social and other delegations; the development of trade and other economic ties; and the expansion of tourist travel and increased student exchange.

Khrushchev paid special tribute to the role of the People's Republic of China in helping to end the bloodshed in Korea and Indo-China, and in its proposal for a collective peace pact in Asia. "The great Indian Republic," he declared, "has made a big contribution to strengthening peace in Asia and the whole world." He continued:

The efforts of the peace-loving states and peoples have not been in vain. For the first time since the war a certain relaxation in international tension has set in. In this atmosphere the Geneva Conference of the Heads of Government of the Four Powers became possible. The Conference

demonstrated the vitality and correctness of the method of negotiation between countries. It confirmed the Soviet view that the most intricate international issues can be settled through negotiation, given a mutual desire for cooperation and agreement.

Khrushchev said efforts in some circles to bury the Geneva spirit and to wrest unilateral concessions from the Soviet Union were unrealistic, that the USSR had done much to bring the Great Powers closer together, and now it was up to the United States, Britain and France. At the same time, the USSR would strive "even more persistently" to establish confidence and cooperation, believing that "The method of cooperation must become the sole method of solving international problems," and that:

The achievement of collective security in Europe, the achievement of collective security in Asia, disarmament—these are the three cardinal problems, the solution of which can lay the foundations for lasting and enduring peace.

The policy of reviving German militarism would, he said, benefit mainly the imperialist forces of Western Germany, while threatening to reduce France to the status of a third-rate power. Resistance to German militarism on the part of the Soviet Union, the countries of Southeast Europe, neutral Austria, and the peace forces in Western Europe and Germany itself, pointed the way to a different solution:

A collective security system in Europe, renunciation of the Paris Agreements, rapprochement and cooperation between the two German states—this is the right way to settle the German question.

The ending of the arms race, asserted Khrushchev, remains one of mankind's most vital tasks. He referred to the Soviet efforts in this direction, its May 10th proposal, reduction of Soviet armed forces, its acceptance of the proposals of Britain, France and the United States on two stages for disarmament and maximum levels for armed forces—disowned by the West subsequently.

Khrushchev explained that the Warsaw Treaty had been formed as a result of Western policies, but that the states involved "are fully resolved to protect the peaceful life of their peoples and to prevent the outbreak of another conflagration in Europe." He said the USSR would spare no effort to solve the question of disarmament:

We will continue to work to end the arms drive and ban atomic and hydrogen weapons. Prior to agreement on the most important aspects of disarmament we are willing to agree to certain partial steps, for example to discontinue thermonuclear weapon tests, to see that the troops stationed in Germany should have no atomic weapons, and to cut military budgets. The nations' implementation of such measures could pave the way to understanding on other, more intricate aspects of disarmament.

On American-Soviet Relations

Khrushchev placed special emphasis on the need of improving American-Soviet relations:

The establishment of firm friendly relations between the two biggest powers in the world, the Soviet Union and the United States of America, would be of great significance for the strengthening of world peace.

We think that if the well-known Five Principles of peaceful coexistence were to underlie the relations between the USSR and the United States, that would be of truly great importance for all mankind and would, of course, be no less useful to the people of the United States than to the Soviet peoples and all other peoples. These principles—mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty, non-aggression, non-interference in each other's domestic affairs, equality and mutual advantage, peaceful coexistence and economic cooperation—are now subscribed to and supported by a score of states.

We have recently taken new important steps with a view to achieving a fundamental improvement in Soviet-American relations. I have in mind the proposal for the conclusion of a Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation between the USSR and the United States, contained in the letter of Comrade N. A. Bulganin to President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

We want to be friends with the United States and to cooperate with it for peace and international security and also in the economic and cultural spheres. We propose this with good intentions, without holding a knife behind our back. We have put our proposal forward not because the Soviet Union cannot live without such a treaty with the United States. The Soviet state existed and developed successfully even when it had no normal diplomatic relations with the United States. We have proposed a treaty to the United States because the conclusion of such a treaty would meet the profoundest aspirations of the peoples of both countries to live in peace and friendship.

If good relations between the Soviet Union and the United States are not established and mutual distrust continues, it will lead to an arms race on a still bigger scale and to a still more dangerous build-up of strength on both sides. Is this what

the people of the Soviet Union and the United States want? Of course not.

So far our initiative has not met with due understanding and support in the United States, a fact which shows that those who support the method of settling the outstanding issues by war are still holding strong positions in the U.S.A. and that they are still exerting strong pressure on the President and the Government. But we hope that this peaceful aspiration of ours will be more correctly appraised in the United States and that matters will take a turn for the better.

Khrushchev affirmed the intention of his government to continue to work for further improvement in relations, trade and all-round ties with Britain and France, who have many common interests with the USSR, and other European countries. He said the USSR would continue to strive for strengthening friendship and cooperation with the countries of the East; is confident that its relations with India have a great future; acclaims the national independence desires of the Arab peoples; believes that Iran, Turkey and Pakistan "will realize that normal relations with the USSR are in their vital interest"; and that his country will continue to operate on the immutable principle "to develop and strengthen friendly relations with all countries which, like us, desire to preserve peace."

Khrushchev stated that even under present military alignments, the USSR is prepared to conclude non-aggression and friendship treaties to help remove mistrust, as well as to expand business, trade union, cultural and other contacts. He mentioned wide contacts already established by the Soviet Union with

Britain, France, Sweden, Norway and other countries, and continued:

Last year delegations were also exchanged with the United States, in particular the Soviet agricultural delegation was well received there. Delegations of Soviet journalists, builders and medical workers also visited the United States. The development of contacts with the United States, however, is still insignificant. Many noted American statesmen, public figures, and private citizens came to the Soviet Union during this time. American citizens had every opportunity to visit the Soviet Union and were well received here. But at the same time many Soviet engineers, scientists, writers and artists unfortunately could not avail themselves of invitations received from American firms and organizations because they were not given the necessary permission by American authorities. It is clear that this does not promote contact between our countries. Let us hope that the situation will improve for the better.

Trade should play a big part in extending the basis for business-like cooperation between our countries. In contrast to the "Let's arm!" slogan of the North Atlantic bloc, we put forward the slogan: "Let's trade!"

On Co-Existence, Peaceful Transition and Possibility of Preventing War

The Leninist principle of peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems has always been and remains the general line of our country's foreign policy.

Reaffirming this policy, Khrushchev refuted allegations that it is advanced for reasons of tactics or expediency. He declared there is no single reason why a socialist state would want to unleash aggressive

war—the USSR has no classes or groups interested in war as a means of enrichment; has sufficient territory, natural wealth, sources of raw material and markets, and to spare:

Why then should we want war? We do not want it, as a matter of principle we renounce any policy that might lead to millions of people being plunged into war for the sake of the selfish interests of a handful of multimillionaires.

Answering those who claim that the USSR is out to overthrow capitalism in other countries by "exporting" revolution, and that there can be no peaceful co-existence with the Soviet Union because its leaders consider that communism is bound to win, Khrushchev affirmed: "It goes without saying that among us Communists there are no supporters of capitalism. But this does not mean that we have interfered or plan to interfere in the internal affairs of countries where capitalism still exists." He went on:

When we say that the socialist system will win in the competition between the two systems—the capitalist and the socialist—this by no means signifies that its victory will be achieved through armed interference by the socialist countries in the internal affairs of the capitalist countries. Our certainty of the victory of communism is based on the fact that the socialist mode of production possesses decisive advantages over the capitalist mode of production. . . . Building communism in our country we are resolutely against war. We have always held and continue to hold that the establishment of a new social system in one or another country is the internal affair of the peoples of the countries concerned. This is our attitude, based on the great Marxist-Leninist teaching.

Khrushchev said it is natural that the principle of peaceful coexistence should be gaining ever wider recognition and has become the cornerstone of the foreign policy of the Chinese People's Republic, the People's Democracies, as well as being actively implemented by India, Burma and other countries, for there is no other way out in present day conditions:

Indeed, there are only two ways; either peaceful coexistence or the most destructive war in history. There is no third way.

He added that more is necessary than simply existing side by side, and proposed that the famous five principles (referred to above) offered the best basis for relations between countries of differing social systems and might well be adopted by all countries.

On the question of the possibility of preventing war in the present era, Khrushchev said the epoch-making changes of the last decades had to be taken into consideration. He explained that the Marxist-Leninist precept that wars are inevitable as long as imperialism exists was correct at the time it was evolved, when "1) imperialism was an all-embracing world system, and 2) the social and political forces which did not want war were weak, poorly organized and hence unable to compel the imperialists to renounce war."

He stated it was not enough to examine only the economic basis of wars;

Whether there is to be a war or not depends in a large measure on the correlation of class, political forces, the degree of organization and the awareness and resolve of the people.

Counterposing the situation today to that before the first and second world wars, Khrushchev declared:

At the present time, however, the situation has changed radically. Now there is the world camp of socialism, which has become a mighty force. In this camp the peace forces find not only the moral but also the material means to prevent aggression. Moreover, there is a large group of other countries with a population running into many hundreds of millions which are actively working to avert war. The labor movement in the capitalist countries has today become a tremendous force. The movement of peace supporters has sprung up and developed into a powerful factor.

The danger of war of course remains, he continued:

... As long as capitalism exists in the world the reactionary forces representing the interests of the capitalist monopolies will continue their drive towards military gambles and aggression, and may try to unleash war. But war is not fatalistically inevitable. Today there are mighty social and political forces possessing formidable means to prevent the imperialists from unleashing war, and if they actually try to start it, to give a smashing rebuff to the aggressors and frustrate their adventurist plans. To be able to do this all anti-war forces must be vigilant and prepared, they must act as a united front and never relax their efforts in the battle for peace. The more actively the peoples defend peace, the greater the guarantees that there will be no new war.

Khrushchev made a strong point of the variety of forms the transition to socialism can take, and of the possibilities of peaceful transition.

He said that Lenin's statement on

the eve of the October Revolution that not all countries would arrive at socialism in exactly the same way had been fully borne out in life. As examples he pointed to the form of People's Democracy, which differed from the Soviet form of reconstructing society, and to special peculiarities of the Chinese People's Republic. In the Federative People's Republic of Yugoslavia, he said:

... where state power belongs to the working people, and society is founded on the public ownership of means of production, specific concrete forms of economic management and organization of the state apparatus are arising in the process of socialist construction.

He stressed the probability of forms of transition to socialism becoming more and more diversified:

Moreover, the implementation of these forms need not be associated with civil war under all circumstances. Our enemies like to depict us Leninists as advocates of violence always and everywhere. True, we recognize the need for the revolutionary transformation of capitalist society into socialist society. It is this that distinguishes the revolutionary Marxists from the reformists, the opportunists. There is no doubt that in a number of capitalist countries the violent overthrow of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the sharp aggravation of the class struggle connected with this are inevitable. But the forms of social revolution vary. It is not true that we regard violence and civil war as the only way to remake society.

He recalled that in April 1917 Lenin had granted the possibility that the Russian Revolution might develop peacefully, and said that the workers and peasants had later taken

up arms only as a result of organized counterrevolution and armed intervention, whereas there had been no civil war in the European People's Democracies. Referring to Lenin's teaching that the use of violence in the transition to socialism depends on whether the exploiting class resorts to violence rather than on the workers, he said this raised the question of the use of parliamentary means. This course was not open to the Russian Party. But the great changes in the historical situation, he maintained, now make possible a new approach, with 800,000,000 people now in the camp of socialism, and the working class in a number of capitalist countries capable of uniting the overwhelming majority of people under its leadership, winning a stable majority in parliament:

In such an event this institution, traditional in many capitalist countries, may become an organ of genuine democracy, democracy for the working people. The winning of a stable parliamentary majority backed by a mass revolutionary movement of the proletariat and of all the working people could create for the working class of a number of countries the conditions needed to secure fundamental social changes.

Khrushchev concluded this section of his report with the following summary of the tasks confronting the Party in the sphere of foreign policy:

1. To pursue steadfastly the Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence between different states irrespective of their social systems. To work vigorously for the cause of peace and the security of the peoples, for the establishment of confidence between states, with a view of trans-

forming the relaxation of international tension achieved to date into a stable peace.

2. To strengthen in every way our fraternal relations with the People's Republic of China, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, Albania, the German Democratic Republic, the Korean People's Democratic Republic, the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, and the Mongolian People's Republic, bearing in mind that the greater the unity and might of the socialist countries the more secure is the cause of peace.

To strengthen in every way friendship and cooperation with the fraternal peoples of the Federative People's Republic of Yugoslavia.

3. To consolidate untiringly the bonds of friendship and cooperation with the Republic of India, Burma, Indonesia, Afghanistan, Egypt, Syria, and other countries which stand for peace; to support countries which refuse to be involved in military blocs; to cooperate with all forces

which are seeking to preserve peace.

To develop and strengthen friendly relations with Finland, Austria and other neutral countries.

4. To pursue a vigorous policy of further improving relations with the United States of America, Britain, France, Western Germany, Japan, Italy, Turkey, Iran, Pakistan and other countries with a view to strengthening mutual confidence, extending trade, and expanding contacts and cooperation in the sphere of culture and science.

5. To follow vigilantly the intrigues of circles that do not want a relaxation of international tension; to expose in good time the subversive activities of the enemies of peace and the people's security; to take all measures necessary to further strengthen the defense potential of our socialist state; to maintain our defenses at the level demanded by present day armaments and science, and to ensure the security of our socialist country.

REVIEW OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY URGED

A HUNDRED prominent Americans, including 46 educators and clergymen, made public an open letter urging Congress to review U.S. foreign policies toward reducing cold war tensions, in February.

The letter termed the alternative to peaceful competition "too horrible to contemplate." It deplored the failure of the major powers to respond to the Pope's Christmas appeal for a ban on the testing and use of nuclear weapons, and "recent unfortunate references by Secretary Dulles to 'brink of war' diplomacy."

The signers ask members of the Senate and the House, the President, Secretary Dulles, and Harold Stassen to support a four point program. The points included a search for solution to international differences; revision of restrictive immigration; a generous program for assistance to underdeveloped nations; an opportunity for "fullest free expression of public opinion before Senate sub-committee on disarmament" and "constructive and workable" new disarmament proposals.

Initiators of the letter were Dr. Henry F. Grady, former Assistant Secretary of State and former Ambassador to India; Dr. Mordecai W. Johnson, President of Howard University; Prof. Emily Greene Balch, Nobel peace prize winner; and E. Raymond Wilson, executive director of the Friends Committee on National Legislation.

On the Reappraisal of Stalin's Role

by JESSICA SMITH

WE FULLY appreciate and share the deep concern expressed by many of our readers about the reappraisal of the role of Stalin at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Yet we shall have to disappoint those who look to us for any attempt at complete analysis at this time. While there are some things that can and must be said now, too often in the past we have sought to give answers which, based on insufficient facts, later proved to be misleading or utterly wrong. The new situation requires deep thought and study not only of all the speeches at the Congress but of other material not yet available. It requires not only a sober re-evaluation of developments in the Soviet Union but of our own attitudes toward past events, whether questioned at the time or too uncritically accepted. This will take time. We shall do everything possible to throw more light on this question as more material becomes available.

We feel that our greatest service to our readers in this issue is to publish a summary of the section of Khrushchev's report dealing with the international position of the Soviet Union and peace, as of the greatest immediacy to the American people. This condensation can of course be no substitute for a careful

reading of the entire Khrushchev speech, as well as Premier Bulganin's report on the Sixth Five-Year Plan and the rest of the Congress proceedings.

We are also publishing a preliminary report by our correspondent Ralph Parker on what the Congress decisions mean to the Soviet people, and a commentary on the part of Khrushchev's report dealing with the internal situation, by Anna Louise Strong, herself once a victim of the type of policies now in process of correction.

One thing above all is clear. All the Congress speeches and discussions breathe confidence and strength. They show a frank facing up to mistakes of the past, and record vigorous measures already taken to correct them and a determination to avoid their repetition. Unquestionably such a sharp re-evaluation of Stalin's leadership could not take place without deep repercussions, without bringing in its wake confusion, disorientation and doubts on the part of many people, there and here. But this very process of bringing boldly out into the light of day many problems that have long festered beneath the surface, is in itself a tremendous testimonial to the health and strength of Soviet socialist society.

The central question in the re-evaluation of past policies at the 20th Congress was that of violations of the principle of collective leadership through the development of the "cult of the individual" around Stalin. The direct attacks on Stalin's leadership have come as a shock to the outside world as they have indubitably to the Soviet people. But it must be kept in mind that the process of re-evaluation began almost immediately after Stalin's death, when the importance of collective leadership was put forward with a new urgency, and has been implicit in many new policies that have since been inaugurated and in the new freedom of discussion in many fields. The Congress discussions, therefore, represent not a sudden new turn, but the sharpening of a process which has been going on for the last three years.

Khrushchev, in reporting on the consideration given to this question in the period since the 19th Party Congress, put it this way:

The Central Committee was concerned to develop the creative activity of Party members and all the working people, and to this end it took steps to explain widely the Marxist-Leninist conception of the role of the individual in history. It vigorously condemned the cult of the individual as being alien to the spirit of Marxism-Leninism, a cult which tends to make a particular leader a hero and miracle worker and at the same time belittles the role of the Party and the masses and tends to reduce their creative effort. Currency of the cult of the individual tended to minimize the role of the collective leadership of the Party, and at times resulted in serious drawbacks in our work.

The full extent of those draw-

backs we do not yet know. Undoubtedly we shall in time have a more rounded picture of the Stalin period assessing the great accomplishments which laid the basis of the strength of today, as well as giving a clearer picture of the negative sides. It is understandable that the main Congress reports should have dwelt more on positive steps taken to overcome shortcomings and on plans for the future than on the details of past mistakes.

It is reported in the press that a full picture of those mistakes was given the delegates by Khrushchev in a closed session, and is now being reported to the Soviet people. No doubt much of this material will in time become available to us. The press has been indulging in the usual wild orgy of speculation. This should be understood for what it is, and conclusions withheld until we know the real facts. Meanwhile, we can only point out some of the aspects of the re-evaluation which are already clear.

The effects of one-man leadership, giving rise to bureaucratic planning from the center and individual rather than collective decisions, produced a certain stagnation and dampening of individual initiative that had adverse effects in practically every sphere of Soviet life, chiefly internal, but also had certain bad effects on international relations as well.

It must be borne in mind that the peace policy of the USSR, the principle of peaceful co-existence, has remained a constant of Soviet policy from the beginning. There is no question as to the positive contribution of Stalin to the development of this policy to a point where it received world-wide recognition as the essential basis for relations between states of differing social systems.

But it is now clear that while actively advocating and seeking peaceful co-existence, too much dependence was placed on appeals to the Western powers to change policies which were in fact the main obstacle to international cooperation, too little on active pursuit by the Soviet Union of new and bold means to further it. At the same time it is now acknowledged that in some instances the Soviet Union has itself been responsible for the aggravation of tensions. The main example given of this was the unjustified break with Yugoslavia. This, it is now clear, cannot just be laid to the door of Beria, but was the result of failure to give sufficient respect to the sovereign right of each country to work out its own particular forms of transition to socialism. The role of neutral nations was to some extent considered hostile to co-existence rather than a positive force to aid in bringing it about as it is regarded today. These and other mistakes were frankly admitted in the speeches of Khrushchev, Foreign Minister Molotov and even more sharply by Mikoyan, a First Deputy Premier of the Council of Ministers.

Molotov declared that in the Ministry for Foreign Affairs the persistence of old habits had interfered to some extent with the development of bolder and more active forms of struggle against war in the post-war period, that there had been an underestimation of the potentialities of the whole socialist sphere and the peace forces everywhere in the defense of peace, and especially of the peace role of such countries as India, Burma, Indonesia, Egypt and other countries refusing to ally themselves with any military bloc.

Mikoyan made a point of the necessity of casting aside some of the

"hidebound" forms of activity in the relations of foreign trade and economic bodies with other states and their citizens. He said that the former isolation of Soviet state and public organizations has been overcome, and contacts extended on every level.

Among the examples given of the recent more active pursuit of the policy of peaceful co-existence were the relinquishment of military bases in China and Finland, the liquidation of the mixed companies in which the USSR participated in the People's Democracies, the peace treaty with Austria, the closer relations with the neutral nations, the intensified program of economic aid to the less developed countries.

The greatest emphasis by all the speakers was on the determination to pursue the consistent Soviet foreign policy of peace with more boldness and flexibility than ever before, and on the fact that war cannot be considered inevitable and can be avoided if the peace forces everywhere are sufficiently vigilant and active.

Pending knowledge of more facts, certain of the evil effects of the emphasis on individual leadership in internal affairs in the USSR are clear from what we already know.

First of all, it must be recognized that while all the facts of the Beria situation are not known, it is clear that he sought to make the security organs he controlled the main source of Soviet power, placing them above both the Party and the Government, and that after Stalin's death he attempted to seize supreme power for himself. It is a logical assumption that such a danger could not have arisen had the principle of collective leadership been firmly established under Stalin.

It also seems clear that the cult of the individual hindered the development of full Soviet democracy in many of the republics and localities of the Soviet Union, that Republic and local leaders often maintained bureaucratic control solely on the basis of expressed loyalty to Stalin which was not challenged by others for fear of themselves being considered disloyal. Vigorous measures have been taken to correct this in both Republics and localities.

An important point that has been largely overlooked in the assessments made here of the Congress results is the extent to which the basic question of the alliance between the workers and peasants had been distorted. A big disproportion between agriculture and industry had been allowed to grow up, which not only had an adverse effect on the economy as a whole, but meant that the collective farmers were not receiving their proportionate share of the national income, while at the same time too great a disproportion had been allowed to develop in the income of different categories of workers. Vigorous measures are being taken to correct all this, to increase grain and livestock production and to bring the standard of living of the countryside closer to that of the city.

The system of economic planning, which had become too centralized, has been reorganized so that the workers and collective farmers can again play the direct part in planning from below that they were always intended to do. Greater attention is also being played to planning for better production and distribution of consumers' goods on the basis of the continued necessary emphasis on heavy industry.

The work of scientists, economists, historians, philosophers, jurists, was

sharply criticized by Mikoyan, and the extent to which dogmatism had become enthroned in place of creative scientific activity. "Most of our theoreticians," he said "are engaged in repeating and chewing over old quotations, formulae and propositions." He said it was time economists had access to statistics too long classified as secret. He and others called for a new look at historical material in which frequently events had been explained not on the basis of actual relation of forces but "by alleged subversive activity of individual Party leaders at the time who many years after these events were incorrectly proclaimed enemies of the people."

Most serious of all, are the revelations of repressive measures taken far beyond what was necessary for the security of the Soviet state. No final judgement can be made on the extent to which this occurred until more facts are known. Without condoning whatever excesses were committed, any balanced and fair judgement must take into account the extent to which the hostility of the outside world has been responsible for this. We must never forget the attempts that have been made to destroy the Soviet Union, through one method or another, until this very day. That there have been real plots to overthrow the Soviet Government and murder its leaders is a part of the incontrovertible history of our times. And if there have been far too many cases where the line has been blurred between actual treason and honest dissent, with tragic results, let us be honest in our own assessment of where the responsibility has lain. And let us look in the mirror and see what is happening in our America. The Soviet Union is doing this, is laying

bare its own mistakes before its own people and the whole world, and is very vigorously engaged in setting its own house in order. Measures to insure a much wider degree of civil liberties have been taken. A new criminal code has been completed, the judiciary reorganized. Malenkov is reported to have declared in England that not only is collective leadership firmly established, but the right to dissent outside of the collective leadership without being branded a traitor.

We believe that the question is quite justifiably being raised as to where the present Soviet leaders were when all these things happened, and why there was not more criticism of themselves. To a very great extent the Congress proceedings do contain such criticisms. They speak of "our" mistakes, not only the mistakes of Stalin. We can hope in time they will be more explicit about how it was possible for all these things to have come about. Meantime, there is a lesson to those of us here whose over-idealizations and over-simplified and often incorrect explanations of Soviet events have not proved helpful to American-Soviet understanding. Thoroughgoing criticism of ourselves is in order, too.

The main concern of Americans of course, must be with the policies of our own country. Since these policies in recent years have been built on an obsessive "anti-communism" and the long-exploded myth of Soviet aggression, rather than on a principled consideration of America's own interests and peace, our first need in determining our own policy is a clear understanding of Soviet foreign policy and what it means to us.

No one, of course, as James Reston of the *New York Times* and other

commentators points out, believed Secretary Dulles' statement that the 20th Congress proved the "failure" and "weakness" of Soviet policies, and the correctness of our own. In the first place, the Soviet leaders proclaimed not a new foreign policy, but a more vigorous pursuit than ever of peaceful co-existence. In the second, one has only to look at what is happening as a result of the policies of America and its allies in the Middle and Far East and in North Africa, to see whose policies are failing. Everywhere the U.S. policy of building military blocs is falling apart and causing increasing resentment. Mr. Dulles' trip to Asia has only served to point this up more vividly. Both French and Italian leaders have openly voiced criticism of a policy toward the Soviet Union based on military considerations alone. Premier Nehru of India has repeatedly attacked the system of military alliances as a threat to peace. Even if the change in Soviet foreign policy were as great as Dulles insists, the only logical conclusion must be a change in U.S. foreign policy, long over-due, and increasingly demanded on all sides.

The testimony of the 20th Congress speeches to the strength and determination of the Soviet peace policy, the emphasis on the desire for friendly peaceful relations with the United States and other Western nations, the readiness expressed for immediate agreement on ending H-bomb tests pending agreement on effective disarmament measures—all these point the way to new possibilities for fruitful international negotiations. It is to be hoped the more flexible attitude recently expressed by the Administration on disarmament points the way to constructive results in this vital field.

FIELD WORK FOR PEACE AND FRIENDSHIP

by RICHARD MORFORD

HERE ARE a few observations on a recent trip during which I visited 38 cities, towns and rural communities in 14 states, all east of the Mississippi River. I met groups of people to talk about peace, problems of our foreign policy, and the arms race; but particularly to discuss American-Soviet relations as the key to peace.

I went out from New York City sharing in common with all those concerned for peace this conviction: To arrest a desperate, suicidal and unavailing arms race, the voice of our people must be raised as it has not been in the past. In the demand for a positive foreign policy, a policy that puts aside all reliance upon the threat of force, the people's action for peace can be decisive in this year of national elections.

Did I find the situation promising? I say "yes." The people are breaking the bonds of cold war intimidation. There is a fresh determination to speak up for peace among

many quite middle-of-the-road persons as well as those more liberal and progressive.

But people hesitate to act alone. Where is the local peace committee that will organize widespread action? In most communities there isn't one. Local peace education these days often stems from a chapter of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, from a small group of Friends, or members of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, groups which always take peace seriously but have limited outreach. The churches are not, unfortunately, in the vanguard of community leadership in peace education as they ought to be. As a minister, I never cease to hope that they will move up front on the peace issue and I continue personal efforts toward this end.

I speak of "peace education." This is important. Yet too often the education is not implemented by action. The local peace conference approves a resolution to be sent to Government leadership but does not map a program of specific local action nor institute a campaign to mobilize broad sections of the people for the action they have taken as a group.

It is the deep conviction of the National Council of American-Soviet

REV. RICHARD MORFORD is Executive Director of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. He is a Presbyterian Minister.

Friendship that the central problem of peace in practical terms is American-Soviet relations. Organized effort on this central problem at the local level in recent years has been at a minimum. However, occasional meetings have been held in various cities. By direct mail, our national office has sent its many publications to many thousands across the country. So a considerable number of people in hundreds of communities have been constantly fortified with a true picture of life and activities in the Soviet Union and with recommendations of specific action aimed at bringing about an improvement in American-Soviet relations.

On my trip I addressed some three dozen meetings. The majority were held in homes, although one-third were held in public halls, in churches or the Y.W.C.A. Audiences varied much in size, but there was always real interest in our program. In speaking I stressed three lines of peace action of great urgency.

First, a call for action to re-enforce the position that our nation has come to so reluctantly, namely, that the instrument of policy in international relations should be negotiation of agreements by fair bargaining at the conference table rather than threat of force. Since this requires the shaping of a flexible and constructive foreign policy, people were urged to express to leaders in Washington their view on a correct policy and to urge resumption of American-Soviet negotiations in order that the best interests of our nation be served whether on the stalemated issue of European security, Germany, or any other. It was urged that in this election year peace action be organized on a congressional district basis, in order to confront candidates with questions on

foreign policy and make known to them a people's platform for peace.

Second, was stressed the challenges to action on disarmament, also stalemated; again a problem on which a start can be made only when the USA and the USSR find basis for agreement. It was necessary to note how the Soviet Union's over-all disarmament plan of May, 1955, moved a long way in the direction of agreement with proposals made earlier by Western powers and how this move had produced a new reluctance on our part to negotiate the issues. Was this, I asked, because the barriers to agreement had been in considerable measure removed? With the peoples of the world and their leaders demanding prohibition of the whole array of bombs, was not the U.S. at a point where, as my fisherman father used to say, it was necessary to "fish or cut bait"?

People were urged to direct letters to Washington in support of the Pope's proposal in his Christmas message, also urged by Nehru of India and leaders in many nations; namely, the postponement of further tests of atomic and thermonuclear weapons pending renewed efforts to reach an agreement for the banning of bombs. Our nation is clearly embarrassed before the world in this regard, since the Soviet Union has declared willingness to halt its tests if we halt ours. The Women's International League, among other national organizations, has called for the cessation of bomb tests and in the field of disarmament is doing an effective educational job, nationally and locally.

Third, there was discussion about cultural and trade exchange between the USA and the USSR as the way to understanding between our nations. Many practical suggestions

for local participation were offered: An exchange between libraries, each sending the other an exhibit of books and pictures of the history and present life of the home city. Or an exchange between schools, or industries; an exchange of greetings between city officials, or better, exchange visits. We explored the possibility of local clergymen joining one of the several tours of the Soviet Union being arranged by American church leaders for this summer. We discussed how local workers and their wives might go on a summer holiday to the Soviet Union, perhaps through the assistance of fellow-workers; how steel workers, for instance, might get to a steel town in the Soviet Union to see its mills, visit workers in their homes, enjoy a week-end in the country with the family, or make a trip to one of the many workers' seaside resorts.

On this trip I talked with students, professors, college pastors, etc., in some dozen colleges and universities, making suggestions for student and teacher exchange. Several student bodies are this spring electing students for whom they will provide money for a year's study in the Soviet Union, trusting that shortly Soviet students will come to campuses here. My visit to many campuses these past few weeks, I believe, was helpful in promoting this program.

Interviews with individuals, both conservative and progressive, brought me again, as in past trips, to editors, businessmen, doctors, librarians, Negro leaders, trade unionists and, naturally, to many parish ministers and other church leaders.

There appears to be less prejudice now than formerly, much more openness of mind, more concern to do something specifically to reduce the danger of thermonuclear war,

a readier acceptance of the necessity of negotiations, an almost unanimous support for cultural exchange. Everybody in the Middlewest, it seemed, had followed closely in the newspapers the extensive accounts of the visits of the Soviet farmers with great satisfaction.

In most cities visited we showed films: a sampling of three or four of the extensive documentary motion pictures which the National Council has been circulating throughout the country for some time. These pictures of life and activities in the USSR are 16mm. size, in color, with sound, musical accompaniment and English commentary. How they were enjoyed!

I came back with renewed hope. The people of countryside, town and city believe there can be peaceful coexistence between the United States and the Soviet Union. A growing number are prepared to put aside fears, to shake off the repressions and work for peace. For example, I found that the decision of the SACB directing the National Council to register as a "Communist Front organization" under the terms of the McCarran Act, does not upset local friends. They believe that the charges against us are not justified, that in the end our work for peace will be vindicated, that the McCarran Act is unconstitutional and should be declared so by the Supreme Court.

We of the National Council believe we can help local people in their work for peace based upon the restoration of American-Soviet cooperation. We believe that people of the South, North and West are equally ready with those of the East and Midwest to participate actively in a program aimed toward American-Soviet friendship and world peace.

NIGHT COACH



A Soviet short story, by KONSTANTINE PAUSTOVSKY

THE FIRST DROPS of rain were falling when the coach set off from Venice. Night was descending on the marshy plain. The coachman was grumbling that only Satan himself could have thought of sending coaches from Venice to Verona at night.

The passengers took no notice of his mutterings, so, after a silence, he spat angrily and announced that there were no candles—only the little stump that was left in the tin lantern.

This, too, evoked no comment, and the coachman speculated aloud about the brains of people who made journeys to a god-forsaken hole like Verona, a place that no decent man would touch with a barge-pole.

The passengers did not share this low opinion of Verona, but they did not argue.

There were three—Hans Christian Andersen, a middle-aged, dismal-looking priest and a lady wrapped in a dark cloak.

To Andersen she seemed now old, now young, now beautiful, now ugly. It all depended on the passing mood

of the flickering candle-stump that kept throwing different lights on her.

"Shouldn't we put the light out?" suggested Andersen. "We don't need it just now. We may need it later."

"That thought would never have entered the head of an Italian," commented the priest.

"Why not?"

"Italians never look ahead. They start shouting only when it's too late to do anything."

"It would seem," said Andersen quietly, "that Your Reverence does not belong to this feckless race."

"I am an Austrian." The priest's brusque reply brought an end to the conversation.

Andersen put out the candle. After a silence the lady said: "Yes, it is wiser to travel without lights in this part of Italy."

"Even so, the creaking of the wheels betrays us," said the priest, and added: "Ladies should not travel unaccompanied. They should have a relative, or at least a servant, with them."

"I am not unaccompanied," laughed

the lady gaily, indicating Andersen, who was sitting at her side.

Andersen doffed his hat and thanked the lady for her words.

With the candle extinguished, the noises and smells began to assert themselves as if encouraged by the departure of their rival. The clatter of hoofs, the crunching of wheels on gravel, the complaining of the springs, the rattle of the raindrops on the coach roof became louder; the smell of wet grass and marshland that poured through the window became stronger.

"Strange!" remarked Andersen, "in Italy I expected the smell of wild orange, but this is the air of my own northern country."

"It will be different soon," said the lady. "We are going up a hill. The air will be warmer."

The horses were now going at a walk. Evidently they were on a slight incline. But the darkness did not lessen. Along both sides of the road stretched old elm trees under whose wide-flung branches the darkness reigned, exchanging faint whispers with the leaves and the raindrops.

Andersen lowered the window. Twigs of elm peeped into the coach and brushed against his face and he snatched a handful of the leaves. Like many people with lively imagination, he had a passion for collecting all manner of odd trifles as souvenirs of his travels. For him these trifles had a magic quality. They could recreate the past, could bring back to him the feelings he had at the moment when he had collected a chip of mosaic or a little donkey's shoe or an elm leaf.

Now it was night. Andersen greeted it as a friend. Darkness was pleasanter than sunshine. It allowed him to examine all sorts of problems

and, when that tired him, it would help him to invent all sorts of stories in which he was the main character.

In these stories Andersen saw himself always as a handsome, high-spirited young man, never at a loss for those intoxicating words that sentimental critics describe as "pearls of poetry."

In fact Andersen, as he well knew, was ugly, lanky and shy. His arms and legs flapped like the arms and legs of the wood-and-string mannikins that the children of his native Denmark loved.

With these qualifications he had no hope of finding favor in the eyes of women, but he felt a twinge of pain in his heart each time they passed him as though he were a lamp-post.

He dozed off. When he awakened, what first caught his eye was a large green star floating low over the horizon. Evidently the night was far advanced.

The coach was at rest. He could hear voices outside. The driver was bargaining with some girls who had stopped the coach. Their voices were so persuasive and so ringing that the melodious bargaining reminded him of a recitative from an old opera.

The coachman was insisting that the money they offered to be taken to some little town was not enough; the girls were chorusing that they had pooled their money and that was all they had.

"Enough of that, you skinflint," cut in Andersen. "I'll make up the difference. And a bit over if you can keep a civil, sensible tongue in your head."

"Get in then, my beauties,"

grumbled the coachman, "and thank the Madonna for sending this foreign prince who throws his money about. But don't flatter yourselves; he doesn't want the coach held up; he has no more use for you than for last year's macaroni."

"Mother of God!" complained the priest.

"Sit down here by me, girls," said the lady. "The more, the warmer."

The girls, speaking in hushed tones and passing luggage from one to another, climbed in, thanked Andersen, took their seats, and became quiet.

From the bundles they carried the smell of goat cheese and mint filled the coach. Despite the darkness, Andersen caught the gleam of glass in the cheap ear-rings of the girls.

The coach started again. Again the wheels crunched on the gravelled road. The girls began whispering.

"They want to know who you are," said the lady, and Andersen guessed that she was smiling in the darkness. "Are you really a foreign prince, or just one of those travelling forest-rangers?"

"I am a prophet," answered Andersen without hesitation. "I can see into the future and see in the dark. But I'm not a charlatan, dear lady—simply a poet and, perhaps, a poor little prince of some kind from the land where Hamlet once lived."

"What can you see in this darkness, then?" asked one of the girls in surprise.

"You, for example. And so clearly that my heart is full of admiration for your charms." As he spoke his face went cold, a sign that he was getting into that peculiar state in which his fairy-tales came to his mind. Its symptoms were a slight anxiety, a turbulent flow of words

from some unknown source, a sudden feeling of power—power of poetic expression and power over human hearts.

It was like something from one of his own stories—as if the lid of an old chest had swung open with a clang, a chest full of unspoken thoughts and sleeping fancies, a chest in which were hidden all the charms of the earth, its flowers, its colors, its sounds, the scent-laden winds and the spaces of the sea caressing your heart, the whisper of forests, the tortures of love, the carefree babbling of children.

Andersen had no name for this state. Some might call it inspiration, others ecstasy, still others the gift of improvisation.

"I awoke and your voices came to me from out of the night," said Andersen quietly after a pause. "That was enough for me to know you and, more than that, to love you as my sisters. Yes, I see you perfectly. Now you—you over there with the silky, fluffy hair. You love to laugh, and your love for everything living is so strong that even the thrushes come and sit on your shoulder when you work in your garden."

"That must be you, Nicolina," said one of the girls in a penetrating whisper.

"Your heart is warm and tender," Andersen went on in the same quiet voice. "If anything happened to your beloved you would set off without a thought across thousands of leagues of snow-covered mountains and waterless deserts to reach him and to save him. Isn't that so?"

"Well, of course, I would—seeing you say so," murmured Nicolina.

"Last year," broke in another girl, "the snow on the Alps melted so

fast that our river burst its banks and there were wide floods. A little calf was marooned on a higher bit of ground. Up to its knees in water it was, and crying its heart out. And Nicolina went out and saved him, wading right up to her neck in water, too. And the current was terrible."

"Well, it was a calf, wasn't it?" muttered Nicolina.

"What are your names, girls?" asked Andersen.

"Nicolina and Maria and Anna," eagerly answered one of them.

"Well, Maria, I hesitate to speak about your beauty, for my Italian is so poor. But in my youth I swore before the god of poetry that I would glorify beauty wherever I saw it."

"God save us," muttered the priest. "He's crazy. Must have been bitten by a tarantula."

"There are women who possess really disturbing beauty," went on Andersen. "They nearly always live inside themselves—live on the passions that consume them. It burns their faces, as if from inside. You are one of them, Maria. The destiny of such women is usually one of two extremes, either very sad or very happy."

"Have you ever met a woman of that kind, Signor?" asked the lady.

"Even in this coach. My words refer not only to Maria, but to you too."

"Perhaps you say things like that to lessen the tedium of a long night journey," ventured the lady with a quaver in her voice. "That would be too cruel to this lovely girl—" And she added in an undertone: "And to me."

"I have never been so serious in my life, my dear lady," declared Andersen.

"But which will it be?" asked Ma-

ria. "Happiness . . . or sadness?"

"For a simple country maid you ask too much of life, and happiness won't come to you easily. But you will meet a man who will be worthy of your exacting demands. A remarkable man he must be, of course. Perhaps a painter or a poet or a fighter for the freedom of your country. Or he could be a simple shepherd or sailor, but in any case a man with a great heart."

"Signor," Maria spoke quietly, but there was a firm note in her voice. "I can't see you, so I am not ashamed to ask you this: What if I am already in love with a man like that? I have seen him only a few times. I do not know even where he is now."

"Search for him," declared Andersen. "Find him, and you will see that he is in love with you."

"Maria!" exclaimed Anna, "It must be that young painter from Verona, who lived—"

"Hush!" ordered Maria. "And in any case how do you know he was from Verona?"

"Verona is not such a big place," said the lady. "You should be able to find him there. Remember my name, Elena Guiccioli. I live in Verona. Anyone will direct you to my house. Come to Verona, Maria, and live with me until the happy encounter that has been forecast by our good friend here."

In the dark Maria found Elena Guiccioli's hand, stroked it and then pressed the cold fingers to her hot cheek.

Everyone fell silent. Andersen noticed that the green star had gone down below the horizon; half the night had passed.

"But have you nothing to tell about me?" at last demanded Anna,

the most talkative one of the three.

"You will have many children," Andersen said confidently. "They will form a little line for their mugs of milk. It will take you a lot of time every morning washing them and brushing their hair. Your husband will help you—"

"Not Pietro, surely?" blurted out Anna. "Not that yokel Pietro, please. I've no use for him."

"—And you will spend a lot of time every day kissing all these tiny boys and tiny girls with their shining, curious eyes, kissing them many times a day."

"To hear all this craziness in the land of His Holiness—unthinkable!" grunted the priest, but no one took any notice of him.

The girls began whispering again among themselves, their whispers punctuated with laughter. At last Maria said: "And now, please, Signor, who are you? You know we can't see in the dark."

"I am a wandering poet," answered Andersen. "I am young, have thick, wavy hair and a sun-tanned face. My blue eyes are always laughing because I haven't a care in the world, not even the cares of love, for I have not yet fallen in love. My only occupation is to make little presents or to do little things for those around me—even silly little things if they bring joy."

"What kind of things?" asked Elena Guiccioli.

"Well, this, for instance: Last summer I was living with a friend, a forester in Jutland. One day, when walking through the forest, I came upon a little glade with lots of mushrooms. I went back to it later and hid under each mushroom a sweet in silver paper, or a date, or a little bouquet of wax flowers, or a thimble,

or a silk ribbon. Next morning I went back to the glade with the forester's little girl. She was seven years old. She found wonderful things under each mushroom. Only the date was missing. It had probably been stolen by a crow. If you could have seen the joy that shone in her eyes! I told her that all the things had been put there by gnomes."

"Deceiving an innocent creature!" protested the priest. "A grave sin!"

"No, I did not deceive her. She will remember that day all her life, and I assure you that her heart will not grow hard so easily as with those who have never 'lived' a fairy-tale like that. . . . And let me add, Your Reverence, that it is not my habit to accept uninvited admonitions."

The coach stopped. The girls sat without moving, as if entranced. Elena Guiccioli remained silent, her head bent low.

"Hey, my beauties," shouted the driver. "Wake up, we're here."

The girls again whispered among themselves, seemed to reach a decision and got to their feet.

Suddenly in the darkness a pair of strong, slender arms encircled Andersen's neck, and warm lips were pressed against his own.

"Thank you!" the lips whispered, and Andersen recognized Maria's voice.

Nicolina, too, thanked him, and kissed him gently and tenderly, a strand of her hair brushing his cheek. Anna kissed him, firmly and noisily.

The girls got out. The coach rolled on, over the paved surface of a town street. Andersen looked through the window but he could see nothing but the black tree-tops against the green tinge of dawn.

Verona surprised Andersen. Each building seemed to vie with its neighbor in magnificence. The harmony of the architecture should have comforted him, but his heart was not at ease.

That evening he knocked at the door of Elena Guiccioli's ancient house in a narrow street leading up to the citadel.

The door was opened by Elena Guiccioli herself. Her slim figure was enclosed in a dress of green velvet, and the green of the velvet was repeated in her eyes, eyes as green as the Valkyries' and inexpressibly beautiful. She stretched out both her arms, pressed his broad hands with her slim, cold fingers, and led him into a little hall.

"I am glad you came. Even in this short time I have missed you," she said simply and with a shamefaced smile.

Andersen went pale. The whole day he had been thinking of her with a brooding disquiet. He knew that one could love, with a love that hurt, every word that a woman said, every eyelash, every speck of dust that fell on her dress. But if he let a love like that kindle inside him it could be too much for his heart to hold. It could bring such tortures and ecstasies, tears and laughter, flowers and thorns that he would have no strength to bear all its changes and surprises.

And perhaps, too, if this love seized him, all the motley cavalcade of fairy-tales that passed through his mind would grow dim and vanish never to return. What would be left of him then?

And he had felt, too, that a love of this kind would be unrequited. How many times that had happened

before in his life. It was caprice that possessed women like Elena Guiccioli. One sad day she would become aware of his ugliness. Even to himself, he was revolting. How often he had felt sneering glances directed at him behind his back. His walk would become wooden; he would stumble as if ready to fall through the ground.

It was only in imagination, he had told himself, that love could live forever, forever surrounded with the shining nimbus of poetry. Strange that he could invoke love in his writings better than he could live it in reality.

Because of that, he had come to Elena Guiccioli in the firm determination only to see her, then to go away, never to return. He could not tell her that. There had been no declaration of love between them. They had met only the previous night on that coach journey and had exchanged only a few words.

Andersen paused at the entrance to the hall and looked around him. In one corner, with the lights from a candelabra falling upon it, a marble head of Diana shone whitely as if pale from the excitement of contemplating her own beauty.

"Who immortalized your face in this Diana?" he asked.

"Canova," answered Elena Guiccioli, lowering her eyes. It seemed that she had guessed all that was going on inside his head.

"I came to say goodbye," said Andersen in a strained voice. "I am running away from Verona."

"I have learned who you are," she said, looking straight into his eyes. "You are Hans Christian Andersen, the famous writer of fairy stories. But it seems to me that in life you are frightened of fairy stories. You

do not have the strength or the courage to love."

"That is the cross I must bear," admitted Andersen.

"Well, then, my dear wandering poet," she said wistfully, putting a hand on his shoulder, "run away and escape the danger. There must always be a smile in your eyes. Do not think about me; but if suffering ever comes to you, from old age, or poverty, or illness, you need only say one word and I shall come to you like Nicolina, on foot over thousands of leagues of snow-covered mountains and waterless deserts to comfort you."

She sank into an armchair and covered her face with her hands. In the candelabra the candle-wicks crackled.

Andersen saw a shining tear trickle between her slender fingers and roll slowly down the velvet of her dress.

He rushed to her side, knelt down and kissed her feet. Without opening her eyes she bent down, took his head in her hands and pressed a kiss on his lips. A hot tear fell on his face. He tasted its saltiness on his lips.

"Go," she said softly, "and may your god of poetry forgive you."

He rose to his feet, and hurried from the house.

The bells of Verona's many churches were ringing for vespers.

They never met again, but they never forgot.

Perhaps that is why Andersen, shortly before he died, told a young writer: "I paid a high price, a price beyond all measure, for my fairy stories. For their sake I gave up my happiness; I missed the time when imagination, for all its force and sparkle, should give way to reality. Try, my friend, to use imagination so that it brings people happiness, not sorrow."

Translated by Natalia Lukoshkova.



AN INTERESTING NEW FRIENDSHIP PUBLICATION

FRIENDSHIP. *Monthly Bulletin of Chicago Council of American-Soviet Friendship*, 189 W. Madison St., Chicago., Ill. \$1 a year, 10 cents a copy.

An interesting recently inaugurated project. The February issue gives useful material on forthcoming tours and a number of interesting items on American-Soviet cultural interchange including the text of a radio broadcast on this subject by the renowned Soviet ballerina Ulanova. There is a sermon by Charles Boss, Executive Secretary of the Board of World Peace, given in Baptist churches in Moscow and Leningrad. The Bulletin is illustrated with photos and cartoons. The Chicago Council offers free samples on request.

Shakespeare in Russian

by MURRAY YOUNG

SHAKESPEARE in Russian? How many times have we incredulously asked ourselves—what do they make of *our* Shakespeare? Not that we, in terms of very frequent or memorable productions, make very much ourselves, content these days with every now and then an over-elaborate staging that tends to leave the poetry out and very much bring the stage designer in. But all over the Soviet Union, we read, there is a constant staging of Shakespeare's plays to the evident delight and demand of the audiences. What can the plays be like in a language that seems so remote from ours—what happens in translation to the "native woodnotes wild," to the great surging soliloquies of Lear and Hamlet, to the impassioned cries of youthful love in *Romeo and Juliet*? What must a character, drenched in the whole tumultuous life of the Elizabethan period as Falstaff is, be like through Russian eyes? What must the wistful and witty young girls in the comedies disguised as boys become, and what happens to their opposites, the melancholy and poetic youths?

TWELFTH NIGHT, by William Shakespeare. Screenplay and direction by Y. Fried; camera by E. Shapiro; sets by S. Malkin; music by A. Zhivotov. Viola, played by Katya Luchko; Olivia, by Anna Larionova; Duke Orsino, by V. Medvediev; Sir Toby Belch, by M. Yanshin; Sir Andrew Aguecheek, by G. Vipin; Malvolio, by V. Merkuriev; Sebastian, by Katya Luchko; Antonio, by S. Lukyanov; A Clown, by B. Freindlich; Maria, by A. Lisyanskaya; Fabian, by S. Filipov; Sea Captain, by A. Antonov.

How little we have believed in our easy boast of Shakespeare's "universality," and how provincial has been our assessment of the great tradition of the Russian theater! A visit to the new production of *Twelfth Night*, just imported from the Soviet Union and now showing in this country, proves the shallowness of our judgment on both points.

This Russian *Twelfth Night* is at once both "Shakespearean" and "Elizabethan," and at the same time wonderfully "Russian"; therefore it is, as we have always boasted, "universal."

Filmed along what appears to be a lovely seacoast location in the Crimea, we are reminded immediately that the play purportedly takes place in "Illyria," identifiable as present Yugoslavia on the Adriatic coast. Cleverly the director has used folk music of the general region for the charming songs of the play as a means of tying the action more closely to the locale of mountain and colonnaded houses and great flights of steps descending against the pale blue sky to the darker blue of the summer sea.

But the remembered characters, as each comes before us in Elizabethan dress against the exotic background, are at once recognizable, and for all that the Russian words they speak are unfamiliar to us, the brief captions, quoted directly from the play, make us comfortably aware that this is the play we know, these are the speeches we love, and these are the characters Shakespeare set before us.

Twelfth Night is, of course, from the period of the serene comedies, when Shakespeare seems to have wanted to give us only a kind of pastoral enchantment, just broken here and there



Sir Toby Belch, played by Mikhail Yanshin, and Maria, played by Anna Lisianskaya, in a droll moment from the Soviet color production of Shakespeare's comedy "Twelfth Night."

by passing hints of the harsher world that lies beyond the Arcadian calm. In Malvolio we get a glimpse of the growing challenge of Puritanism, in Sir Andrew Aguecheek we see held up for ridicule some of the absurd manners of the period, and in the mild melancholy of the Duke of Orsino further affectations of the time are good-naturedly exposed. And of course the play opens with a storm at sea, a shipwreck, and the severing of Viola and her twin brother Sebastian. But the real action of the play is concerned with those happy journeys that "end in lover's meetings," spiced by the drolleries of the bibulous Sir Toby Belch and his fellow-conspirator, the lively, robust Maria.

How well these Russian actors understand the tone and style of this romantic comedy! With what natural vigor, combined with what professional skill do they enter into their parts! Rarely on our own stage do we have the opportunity of seeing acting of this quality, particularly by a whole cast imbued with equal skill.

Let it be clearly understood that this is no mammoth "production." The director has rightly felt that it is enough to catch the mood of dreamy happiness and youthful disquiet in the early experiences of love, framed by the roistering humors of the comic characters. Working with talented actors, he has

let them move freely and speak with that wonderful authority really fine actors can contribute. Having written the admirable script himself, which is notable for its clarity, and having found a lovely situation along the Crimean coast for his background, he has been content.

Perhaps he has not been ambitious enough; for the fact is that the one serious short-coming of the movie arises from the failure of the director to use with much invention the facilities of the camera, and the movie remains therefore largely a photograph of a stage production. This gives to the whole production a somewhat artificial look and accounts for a regrettable thinness in the use of the possibilities that the evocative land and seascapes provide. However, so fine is the acting, so clear and immediate the story, and so continuous the happy chuckles of the audience that such short-comings seem on the whole made up for.

Such a movie is cultural exchange at its very best: our great heritage of Shakespeare's poetry combined with the brilliant heritage of the Russian theatre. What unlimited possibilities of cultural combinations for the future come before our mind's eye as, still chuckling with delight we leave the theatre, the clown's last song ringing in our ears.

Two Soviet Popular Science Books

The Social Life of the Bee

BEES, I. Khalifman, *Foreign Language Publishing House, Moscow, 1955. 366 pp. Illustrated.*

THIS is not a book on bee-keeping as the title might lead one to suspect, but a study of the social life of the bee. It is written with much skill in which grace of style and poetic feeling are blended with exact scientific fact and observation.

Writing about the bee, both scientifically and philosophically, is an unusually rich tradition and the author gives us an amusing and enlightening survey of this material, demonstrating how each historic epoch has seen the industrious life of the bee as an image of its own relationships. With this revealing survey as an introduction, he proceeds to describe the life of the bee colony in which the individual bee's life

is inseparably a part of the whole life of the colony and cannot have existence independently of it.

The remarkable experiments that have been carried on in the apiaries of the Soviet Union are described with admirable simplicity. Step by step the reader is led into the whole "secret" life of the bee—the roles of the worker, the nurse, the drone, the queen are revealed in all the amazing interrelationships that are the condition of their existence.

Not only is their life described within the exquisitely modeled cells which they construct, but we are shown as well the vital importance of the bee in the pollenization of flower, fruit and grain. Thus the final reward for the reader is a deeper insight into the interpenetration of all organic life that is both instructive and memorable. M. Y.

The Physics of Light

THE EYE AND THE SUN, by S. Vavilov. *Foreign Language Publishing House, Moscow, 1955. 136 pp. Illustrated.*

THIS little volume for the non-scientist by the late President of the USSR Academy of Sciences is popular science writing at its most charming and most literate. After an introduction in which the relation between the eye and the sun are traced through the poetry and folklore of all ages, there are chapters on the nature of light, the sun, and the eye. The growth and interrelations of scientific concepts are outlined, although strict historical development of ideas is subordinated to achieving clarity and presenting illustrations of the ideas themselves.

Literary allusions abound; for example, Tolstoy was able to distinguish polarized light visually (about one person in four possesses this ability), as proved by a quotation from *Youth*, pub-

lished in 1855. The transmutation of mass to radiant energy in the sun gives new meaning to ancient Egyptian hymns to the sun, for, as Vavilov puts it, we know now that "light is not an immaterial messenger from the Sun, but the Sun itself, a part of it. . . ."

The chapter on the eye comprehends not only the physiological and psychological aspects of vision, but also the development of the eye as a sense organ in response to solar light as received on earth. Because of its breadth and diversity of scientific information this delightful volume should appeal to the professional scientist as well as to the non-scientist. M. P.

Khrushchev's Report
To 20th Congress

Full Text . . . 5 copies: \$1.00

Soviet Books in Translation

Send for catalogues:

Imported Publications & Products
4 West 16th St., New York 11, N. Y.

**An Excellent Reference
Exciting Source Material
On the Soviet Union
After 38 Years
OUR NOVEMBER ISSUE
Copies still available at the
special rate of 10 for \$1.00**

TODAY
Anna Louise Strong's newsletter,
of which she writes:
"TODAY is a personal letter on how
things look to me. It appears about
once a month. If you want it, send in
your name. If you want to pay your
way, send in \$1. We send TODAY
to anyone who asks, whether they can
pay or not."
The address is:
Box 87, Altadena, California

The American People Want Peace

A SURVEY OF PUBLIC OPINION

by Jessica Smith

A comprehensive survey of the peace expressions and actions of every section of the American people from the beginning of the crisis in the Formosa Strait to and including the Geneva Conference. It shows the power of public opinion for peace

25c 5 for \$1

order through
NEW WORLD REVIEW

Don't Miss This Chance

We are now able to offer outstanding recordings by the great Soviet violin and piano virtuosos

DAVID OISTRAKH and EMIL GILELS

All are authorized recordings made from fine tapes on 12-in., 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ RPM long-playing records

\$3.95 each postpaid

(New York City buyers add 3% sales tax)

**Other recordings by Soviet
musicians also available**

Write for Free Catalog

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

Announcing a major work

on civil liberties by

CORLISS LAMONT

Freedom Is As Freedom Does

**With an introduction by H. H. Wilson,
Princeton University, who says:**

"Corliss Lamont has achieved an honored position as one who dares to differ with majority opinion in politics, economics and philosophy. . . . His approach is fundamentally both conservative and constructive. . . . As a challenge to apathy and fatalism, Corliss Lamont has written this book."

Other advance opinions:

"The first comprehensive account of the attacks upon civil liberties in the United States in the decade following the war. . . . It deserves to be widely read and its challenge dispassionately, though perhaps painfully, considered."

Prof. Thomas I. Emerson, Yale Law School

"Exciting and significant. . . . Lamont is unusually well equipped to say something which we need to hear and to think about."

Prof. Alexander Meiklejohn,
Former President, Amherst College

Contents:

The Ideal of Civil Liberties
Clash With the Un-American Activities Committee
My Challenge to McCarthy
The Congressional Inquisition
Suppression Through Law
The Loyalty-Security Program
Police State in the Making
The States on the Trail of Subversion
The Drive Against Cultural Freedom
The Assault on Academic Freedom
Conform—Or Lose Your Job
The Decline of the Civil Liberties Union
Is the Tide Turning?

\$3.95 at your bookseller or from

**HORIZON PRESS, Dept. W
220 W. 42 St., New York 36, N. Y.**

BOUND VOLUMES

Of 1953 New World Review

Indexed

\$4.00

Index alone, 35c

NWR SAMPLES FOR FREE DISTRIBUTION

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

NEW WORLD REVIEW

NEW SOVIET FILMS

All in Spectacular Sovcolor

BORIS GODUNOV

**SHAKESPEARE'S
TWELFTH NIGHT**

CHEKHOV'S GRASSHOPPER

THE GADFLY

CONFLICT

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¢

**EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM
OF THE SOVIET UNION**

by Elizabeth Moos
64 pages, illustrated, 25¢

CONSTITUTION OF THE USSR

20¢

**WE SAW FOR OURSELVES
Americans report first-hand
impressions 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¢

**NEGOTIATIONS—THE WAY
TO PEACE**

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

64 pp., 25¢, 5 for \$1

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