SOCIAL SCIENCES ✓

MARCH, 1957
25¢

PUBLIC LIBRARY
MAR 18 1957
DETROIT

New World REVIEW

SOVIET TECHNICAL EDUCATION

J. G. Crowther

The Millionaire Who Loved Lenin

Cedric Belfrage

Peace and the Middle East

Jessica Smith

"Let Flowers of Many Kinds Blossom"

Murray Young

NEW WORLD REVIEW

MARCH 1957

JESSICA SMITH, *Editor*
FREDERICK V. FIELD, *Far Eastern Editor*
MURRAY YOUNG, *Managing Editor*

•

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

Vol. 25, No. 3. March, 1957. 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

EVERY READER PLEASE ACT QUICKLY!

The most decisive appeal we have ever sent you is now in your hands.

In it we have outlined our problems and our plans—and explained why we must raise a $10,000 fund at once.

Gratifying responses are beginning to come in—but not yet nearly enough.

If any among you have put the letter aside for future attention or failed to read it carefully, we ask most urgently that you turn to it again, and act upon it at once. If you have mislaid it, or failed to receive it, please let us know so we can send you another copy.

Please send as much as you can, either in a lump sum or on a monthly pledge basis.

It is urgent that *every single reader* respond!

Please fill out and mail today

— — — — — — — — — —

NEW WORLD REVIEW
23 West 26th Street, N. Y. 10, N. Y.

I enclose ..... for the NWR survival fund.

I pledge ..... monthly for the fund.

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY ..... ZONE ... STATE ....

"Let Flowers Of Many Kinds Blossom"

by MURRAY YOUNG

OVER two thousand years ago occurred the first great flowering of Chinese culture. This period has come to be thought of as China's "golden age" for it produced the philosophers Confucius, Laotze, Mencius, as well as famous poets, historians, astronomers and mathematicians. Sometimes known as the period of the "Hundred Schools," the diversity of ideas, the fruitful contention of opinion that marked the period gave birth to the slogan "Let flowers of many kinds blossom, diverse schools of thought contend!"

Today in China this two-thousand-year-old slogan has become the rallying cry in all fields of art, literature and science. The slogan was first announced last May by Chairman Mao Tse-tung and has since become the main point of discussion among writers, artists, scientists and the whole academic world.

With liberation achieved in 1949 and with the rapid collectivization of agriculture and the tremendous strides forward in establishing a modern, socialized industrial base, by the beginning of 1956 it was possible to propose a 12 year program which would bring China near to the most advanced world standards in science and technology. But to achieve this goal the whole creative life of the country must be stimulated, all obstacles standing in the way of a vigorous new cultural flowering must be removed. It was for this purpose that the ancient slogan from China's first great period of creativity was revived.

The period of the "Hundred Schools" arose at the time when slave society was becoming feudal society and the tremendous intellectual vitality that manifested itself was typical of all decisive periods of social change. Kuo Mo-jo, President of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, has pointed out in an article in *People's China*, Sept. 1956, that a similar burst of intellectual life marked the Renaissance in Europe when feudal society was becoming capitalist, and he goes on to point out that the tremendous awakening of Chinese intellectual life after the end of the First World War, known as the May 4th Movement, with its intense interest in Western democratic ideas, Western science, and in all varieties of socialist theories was indicative of a society ripe for profound change. But, Kuo Mo-jo declares, a Chinese Renaissance did not in the end come about because China was still bound by her old history. It was not until both the Kuomintang and its allies, the imperialist powers, were defeated in 1949, that the great social revolution could mature in China, changing a form of society that had endured for well over two millenniums.

Kuo Mo-jo makes an important

distinction between periods of transition in the past which for a limited time were marked by intense intellectual vigor and the present social change that has taken place in China. The period of the "Hundred Schools" lasted only some 200 years and the ferment of the European Renaissance began gradually to abate after the sixteenth century:

"That was because in class societies, once a new relationship between the governing class and the governed reached some sort of equilibrium, as often as not a sort of intellectual paralysis set in. Now we are building a socialist society—the first step toward a communist society. We are striving to eliminate classes. Our task is steadily and continuously to improve the material and spiritual well-being of the people. We serve the people, not the narrow interest of a ruling class. For that reason ever heavier demands will be made on our intelligentsia. In our country diverse schools of thought will vie with each other, not only today, but also tomorrow."

It is made clear in all speeches and articles that the freedom implicit in the slogan extends only to those people who are loyal to the present government; that is, to those people who love their country and support socialism. But within this basic agreement there are many points of difference and the intent of the slogan is to allow those differences to be expressed in order that what is valuable in them may be discovered and what is outmoded, harmful or merely trivial to be recognized and cast aside.

A commentator in the official paper *China Daily News* makes the question of disagreement more specific. He points out that the government stands for the philosophy of dialectical materialism and encourages everybody to study and apply its methods. But, he adds, the government proposes that people should be free to be sceptical of and to criticize dialectical materialism:

"If materialism were laid down as the foundation or yardstick for discussion, it would be tantamount to driving the idealist out of the area of contention."

Lu Ting-yi, Director of the Propaganda Department of the Chinese Communist Party, in the most extended discussion of the slogan yet available, uses the fields of natural science, art and literature to illustrate the process of disagreement and contention within the common acceptance of a socialist government founded on Marxist principles. He first takes up the subject of the natural sciences and makes some particularly significant remarks on the whole question of the class character of science and the importance of clarity on this point:

"As everyone knows, the natural sciences, including medicine, have no class character. They have their own laws of development. The only way they tie up with social institutions is that under a bad social system they make rather slow progress, and under a better one they progress fairly rapidly. The theoretical side of this question was settled long ago. It is, therefore, wrong to label a particular theory in medicine, biology or any other branch of natural science 'feudal,' 'capitalist,' 'socialist,' 'proletarian' or 'bourgeois.' It is wrong for

instance, to say that 'traditional Chinese doctors are feudal doctors' that 'doctors of the Western school are capitalist doctors,' that 'Pavlov's theory is socialist' or 'Michurin's theory is socialist,' or that 'Mandel's and Morgan's principles of heredity are capitalist' and so on. We must not believe such stuff. Some people make this sort of mistake because they are sectarian. Others do it unconsciously by trying to emphasize, but not in the proper way, that one ought to learn from the latest scientific achievements in the Soviet Union. These mistakes stem from different causes, so we must not lump them under one head, but deal with them in the light of specific circumstances.

"While pointing out such mistakes, we must also point out one of another kind: for instance, denial of the fact that Pavlov's or Michurin's theories are important. The jumping-off point of those who make this mistake is, again, not always the same. Some of them are politically opposed to the Soviet Union, and for that reason inclined to deny even the scientific achievements of the Soviet Union. Others, because they do not belong to the same school of thought, simply won't yield an inch. In the case of the former it is a question of political viewpoint. With the latter it is a question of academic thinking. So these mistakes too must be dealt with in the light of specific circumstances and not lumped together."

Lu Ting-yi then goes on to describe the Party's attitude to literature and art and, incidentally, makes an interesting remark about the official attitude to the method of "socialist realism."

"With regard to works of art and literature, the Party has only one point to make, that is, that they should 'serve the workers, peasants and soldiers' or, in terms of today, the working people as a whole, intellectuals included. Socialist realism, in our view, is the most faithful creative method, but it is not the only one. Provided he sets out to meet the needs of the workers, peasants and soldiers, the writer can choose whatever method he thinks will best enable him to write well, and he can vie with others. As to subject matter, the Party has never set limits to this. It is not right to lay down such dicta as: write only about workers, peasants and soldiers; write only about the new society; or write only about new types of people. If literature and art are to serve the workers, peasants and soldiers, it stands to reason that we must praise the new society and positive people. But at the same time we must also criticize the old society and negative elements; we must praise what is progressive and criticize what is backward. So the choice of subject matter in literature is extremely wide.

"Creative writing deals not only with things that really exist, or that once existed, but also with things that never existed—the gods in the heavens, animals and birds who talk, and so on. One can write about positive people and the new society, and also about negative elements and the old. Furthermore, it is difficult to show the new society to advantage if we fail to describe the old, hard to show the positive to advantage if we leave out what is negative. Taboos and commandments about choice of subject mat-

ter can only hamstring art and literature, and result in writing to formula and bad taste. They can only do harm. As for questions relating to the specific characteristics of art and literature, the creation of the typical, and so on, they must be the subject of free discussion among writers and artists, letting them freely hammer out differences of opinion till they gradually reach agreement.

"In the theater we have already had experience of applying the principle, 'let flowers of many kinds blossom side by side, weed through the old to let the new emerge.' That has been most valuable. What we must do now is to apply the same principle to all other branches of art and literature."

Lu Ting-yi then proceeds to discuss philosophy and the social sciences where he says great achievements have been made in China. But, he points out, it is just because these achievements have been so great that danger arises—the danger of mental stagnation. He says a tendency has arisen in academic studies in philosophy and the social sciences for Marxists to monopolize the whole field, claiming always to be right and failing to see the possible merits of other points of view, or of recognizing the progress made by others. Unless the attitude changes, he contends, progress in these fields will stop and all the vitality that has made the great achievements possible will disappear. To illustrate the significance of an undogmatic, varied approach he uses as an example the writing of a history of the Communist Party of China:

"I hear the people are expecting the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party to compile a textbook on the history of the Party, after which they propose to write books on modern history based on it. Please don't wait any longer. The Central Committee is not going to compile any such textbook. All it is going to do is publish a chronicle of events of the Party and collections of documents. Our scholars who specialize in modern history, should, therefore, get down to independent study of the various problems of modern history."

There had been a tendency in China arising largely from the general backwardness of the country and an understandable desire of many people to hasten development, to disdain most of its traditional arts and sciences. This attitude had led to a repudiation of traditional Chinese painting, to a neglect of ancient medical practices whose roots lie deep within China's past, and to a refusal to see any inheritable value in the rich treasury of classical writings. This attitude has for some years been combatted, first with the revival of traditional Chinese opera, then with the establishment of schools to teach traditional painting and the careful reexamination and adoption of many practices, once completely repudiated, in traditional medical practice. Also there has steadily gone on a reevaluation of the early poets and novelists in which many qualities once denied them were found to be a part of their very substance. The announcement of the slogan "Let every kind of flower bloom," gives official approval and encouragement to this creative sifting of China's own past for those accomplishments that have a con-

tribution to make to the new society in the process of creation.

In contrast to the disdain and devaluation of China's own cultural contribution there was the opposite tendency to an uncritical approval of all Western art, science and technique. Latterly, it appears, this was especially true of a widespread attitude towards the achievements of the USSR. Kuo Mo-jo gives as an example the excessively large number of books translated from the Russian in contrast to the number translated from the other Western languages. He characterizes this as much too one-sided. Methods and techniques peculiarly suited to conditions in the Soviet Union may on careful examination not at all serve the purpose of China—let diversity flourish in every field!

It is for the purpose of realizing this necessary diversity that inincreasingly research material is being brought in from all countries, more and more books are being translated from every language, publishing is going ahead on a scale unknown before. In the universities classes dealing directly with the philosophy of Kant, Hegel, Bertrand Russell, have already been set up, and other classes in classical Greek philosophy and in modern idealist schools like positivism and neo-positivism are being planned.

Teaching the writings of these non-Marxist philosophers is not based upon an assumption that their ideas and concepts are true, but rather on the belief that a critical examination of their philosophic positions will deepen the understanding of Marxism and bring conceivably useful addition to the whole field of knowledge.

Along with the widest translation of foreign books and the inclusion of many differing schools of thought in the educational program, there is the greatest desire for contact with other countries in the form of cultural and scientific exchanges. Much has already gone forward in this direction in the past few years. With the exception of our own country, an impressive volume of cultural exchange has already taken place and proceeds with increasing momentum — delegations, theatrical tours and individual visits are constantly announced. Even in absentia America is looked to and honored: two years ago Walt Whitman's centenary was celebrated by a huge meeting in Peking to which a host of distinguished Americans were invited but not allowed by the State Department to go; last month we printed an account in *New World Review* of a celebration in honor of Benjamin Franklin held in Peking in December.

The long two thousand years of feudal stagnation are over in China. With the establishment of the People's government China's "great age begins anew." To bring the country near the level of the most advanced technical countries is a challenge of vast proportions, but there appears to be every intention of meeting it. Confident in the historic achievements already to their credit in the reorganization of society, in the conquest of illiteracy, and in the base so far achieved in collective farming and modern socialized production, the Chinese move forward, determined to examine every idea, every opinion, every form of scientific technique that will speed them on to the future.

Soviet Technical Education

by J. G. CROWTHER

Mr. J. G. Crowther *is the author of twenty-one books on the progress, history and social relations of science.*

In 1929-30 *he was consulted by the Director of Higher Technical Education of the Supreme Economic Council of the U.S.S.R. This was at the beginning of the First Five Year Plan, when the pattern of the Soviet scientific and engineering development was being laid down. He published* Industry and Education in the U.S.S.R. *in* 1932, *in which he described his early experiences in this work.*

In 1936 *he published* Soviet Science *which was for long the standard work on the subject in the English language.*

His most recent book, Nuclear Energy in Industry *based on his attendance at the U.N. Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, held in Geneva in* 1955, *is reviewed on p.* 37.

THE Soviet achievements of producing the first large-scale thermonuclear reaction and the first atomic power-station supplying electricity to the local grid, and the construction of the giant synchrophasotron with a 36,000-ton magnet, for atomic research, have proved that Soviet science and technology have not only caught up with science and technology in capitalist countries, but in certain directions are in advance of them. Everyone not blinded by prejudice knows that these concrete achievements imply the existence of an immense and efficient system of scientific and technical education. Consequently the wiser, though not necessarily friendlier, elements in both American and British official circles have begun to take a serious interest in the Soviet system of scientific and technical education. Under the auspices of the United States National Research Council, Mr. Nicholas de Witt has compiled a large monograph on *Soviet Professional Manpower, its Education, Training and Supply* (U.S. Government Printing Office, 1955). This volume runs to 400 closely printed pages. The method employed by the author resembles that of an intelligence organization which pieces together information learned about an enemy country, and derives conclusions of varying weight from incomplete data by the application of the technique of statistics. Even with this method, the author has arrived at the conclusion that Soviet data on educational and manpower statistics "mirror the real situation to a great extent."

In other words, the Soviet official reports on scientific and technical education mean what they say. The British Government in its recent White Paper on *Technical Education,* (February, 1956) has adopted a similar attitude, and has given various figures on the number of engineers being trained in the Soviet Union which are derived

from Mr. de Witt's work. In the White Paper it is stated that in 1955, "with a population of 214,000,000, the USSR claims to be producing per annum 60,000 professional engineers—280 per million of the population." But in the USA in 1954, with a population of 162,000,000, only 22,000 engineering graduates were produced, or 136 per million of the population. As for Britain in 1954, 2,800 graduated in engineering and the applied sciences, or about fifty-seven per million of the population.

The White Paper states further that in the USSR engineers who have secured a qualification of the middle grade, lower than a university degree, are produced at the rate of 70,000 per annum, or about 326 per million of the population. Comparable figures for the USA are not available but it is stated that not enough engineers of the middle grade are produced to provide the "three to five" engineering aides who should, on the average, assist each engineer with university or equivalent qualification.

For Britain, the Higher National Certificate, or equivalent qualification, is regarded as the qualification of the middle grade. Of these 8,100 are awarded yearly, or 164 per million of the population.

As the White Paper says, in the USSR "the number of engineers turned out is well ahead of any other country, both in absolute figures and per head of the population."

At the beginning of 1956, the colleges and universities of the USSR had 1,865,000 students, which is more than all those in Britain, France, Italy and other western European countries put together. More than 250,000 specialists in all branches of higher education graduated in 1955. The total number graduated during the fifth five-year plan exceeded 1,120,000, which was 72 per cent more than in the fourth five-year plan.

The program for the sixth five-year plan (1956-60) envisages a fifty per cent increase over the fifth five-year plan in the number of students graduating from colleges and universities and from technical institutions of the middle grade. In particular, the number of specialists for the heavy, building and transport industries and agriculture is to be increased by approximately 100 per cent. Thus the Soviet lead in relative and absolute numbers of scientists and technologists will increase rapidly in the immediate future. This immense number of technicians will enable the USSR not only to increase still more the rate of its own scientific and technical development, but will also provide still larger numbers of technical specialists for assisting in the development and training of the less-developed countries. The USSR will be the only country with sufficient technical personnel to give this kind of aid on a large scale to the huge nations of Asia, and also to countries in Africa and South America. The recent announcement of the establishment of a Joint Nuclear Research Institute in Moscow on behalf of eleven countries is an illustration of this development. Several of the Soviet Union's great atomic research institutes, including the Electro-Physical Laboratory of the Academy of Sciences, containing the 36,000-ton synchro-phasotron,

are being turned over to the new Joint Institute.

In his report to the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, N. S. Khrushchev has said that "while we can be fully satisfied with the quantitative aspect of the matter, serious attention must be paid to the quality of the training of specialists." He complained that the higher educational establishments were "divorced from practical work, from production, and lag behind the present-day level of technology." They did not, as yet, give the younger engineer sufficient knowledge of the concrete economics and organization of production. The practical training of the students had to be fundamentally improved. The work of educational establishments required reorganization so that while going through their course of studies the students were in touch with the realities of production in factories and on farms.

Khrushchev criticized the present concentration of higher educational establishments in the large cities, and said that the time had come for the revision of their geographical distribution in closer relation to the new centers of production. He quoted the case of research in oceanography, in which three of the main institutes are situated in Moscow: the Marine Hydro-Physical Institute, the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Oceanography, and the Institute of Oceanography of the Hydro-Meteorological Service. "Isn't that a bit too much for the Moscow Sea and the Vorobyovi Hills?" he asked.

One of the ways of providing higher education for personnel in distant and out-of-the-way places is by correspondence colleges. During the fifth five-year-plan these, together with advanced evening classes, were greatly extended. More than 260,000 higher specialists graduated by these means during the fifth five-year plan, an increase of 170 per cent over the number graduating in this way during the fourth.

Enrollment in technical institutions in the Urals, Siberia, the Far East and Kazakhstan is especially to be increased, in order to meet the growing requirements of these areas.

Such then are some of the facts with regard to the quantity and quality of scientists and engineers in the Soviet Union at the beginning of 1956. Their absolute magnitude is, however, only one of their important aspects. Even more significant are the conditions under which they have been produced, and their rates of growth.

When the Soviet Union launched her first five-year plan, the enrollment of industrial technical students for the session 1928-29 was:

Higher technical schools	12,690
Middle technical schools	
(day classes)	3,250
(evening classes)	460
	16,400

In 1955, 280,000 graduates from the Soviet higher and middle technical schools entered the national economy. Thus, by the end of the fifth five-year plan, more than seventeen times as many were graduating in industrial subjects as at the beginning of the first. By the end of 1955 there were more than 5,000,000 specialists in the Soviet

Union, whereas in Russia in 1913 there were only 200,000. Like many of the perspectives opened by the first five-year plan the proposed rapid increase in technical personnel was regarded with incredulity outside the Soviet Union, and also by not a few within it, at the time. How was this country, the heir of technically undeveloped Tsarist Russia, damaged by years of counter-revolution and more years of external hostility, to undertake a rapid technical expansion? The education of the youth had been interrupted, colleges had been destroyed, many of the older scientists and engineers had died, and some had fled.

The successful realization of the plans for increased numbers of technical personnel is one of the aspects which is more significant than the large actual number which now exists. It is a proof and demonstration of what is possible, and an inspiration to others, especially the technically backward countries.

Lenin had pointed out long before the Revolution that in order to establish communism the country must be industrialized, and one of his earliest acts after the Revolution was to call for a program of electrification and technical development, the Goelro Plan. Ten years after the Revolution it became clear that unless yet more comprehensive plans of industrialization and technical development were carried out immediately, the future of the Revolution itself would be in doubt. So the projects of the first five-year plan, which seem so modest now, but which appeared almost fantastically impossible then, were undertaken with heroic determination. In 1929 every engineer in the Soviet Union was required to undertake a proportion of technical teaching in addition to his normal technical work. Engineers from factories had to devote a percentage of their time to teaching, irrespective of whether they had had any previous experience as teachers. Administrators with technical qualifications were required to deliver lectures. In the lecture rooms of colleges, works managers and civil servants could be found lecturing beside the usual college staffs. In those intense days the technical colleges were organized as monotechnics, giving short courses directed entirely to one particular specialty. This was the quickest way of producing a large number of new technicians who would be of immediate, if limited, use in the new constructions and industry.

As the years went by and more and more technicians were produced, the courses of instruction were made longer and wider, so that the technical student received a broader training, both in his specialty and in his general education. Thus the character of the institutions of technical education has evolved in accordance with the needs and conditions.

While the Soviet Union had to adopt special measures at the beginning of the first five-year plan in order to extend technical education among the masses quickly, it would be a mistake to suppose that the wider principles of scientific and technical education were not appreciated. Higher technical education of the finest quality had in fact existed in Russia for a long time. In 1955, the Bauman Higher Technical School in Moscow celebrated

the 125th anniversary of its foundation. It had gradually evolved five-year courses of training in machine construction and chemical engineering which received world recognition. At the Paris Exhibition of 1900 it had received the Grand Prix for its methods of training engineers. The late S. I. Vavilov, who became president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, began his scientific career as a professor of physics there. Among the earlier professors were the physicist A. G. Stoletov and the aerodynamical engineer N. E. Zhukovsky. The noted aeroplane designer A. N. Tupolev was one of his pupils. At this institution, and a few others, there was a fine tradition of engineering education to draw upon. The problems and methods were known: the problem was to multiply the number of sufficiently trained technicians quickly.

In fact, the Soviet Union depended little on ideas of technical education collected from abroad. In 1920-30, it sent specialists to visit the leading technical institutions in the most technologically advanced countries, the United States, Germany, Britain and France. On the whole the most valuable result of these inquiries was not the introduction of methods novel to the Soviet Union but the confirmation, in the light of what had been seen abroad, of the conclusions that they had already derived from previous Soviet and Russian experience in technical education.

As the resources of the Soviet Union in specialists and materials have increased the system of technical education has been strengthened in more and more directions. Basic to the extension of higher education is the extension of primary and secondary education. It has been laid down in the sixth five-year plan that all young people shall receive a secondary education. This is to consist in general of a ten-year course, and also of specialized courses. It will be established both in urban and in rural districts. It will be polytechnical in character, the aim being to acquaint pupils with major branches of modern industry and agriculture. Theoretical studies are to be closely related to practical work. Schools are to be given more equipment, and relations between them and local factories and farms are to be developed. The original idea of polytechnicalization may be found in Marx's statement that the factory system "is the embryonic form of the educational system of days to come, when, for all children above a certain age, productive labor will be combined not only as a means of increasing social production, but also as the only method of bringing about a many-sided development." (*Capital,* I, p. 489).

The polytechnicalization of secondary schools is being assisted by promoting relations between factories and schools. In Moscow, about 1,000 factories have adopted schools, and are providing them with extra tools and equipment. About 1000 engineers from these factories have undertaken to do some teaching in these schools. One of the aims is to relate the teaching of mathematics, physics and chemistry to problems illustrated from the engineer's own experience of contemporary industry. Similarly, the teaching of biology is being related more closely to agriculture,

and more stress is being laid on the cultivation of school plots and gardens, and the supply of suitable equipment for the purpose.

Together with these trends of universal secondary education and polytechnicalization, secondary education has now been made free. Tuition fees in the senior classes of secondary schools, specialized secondary schools and higher educational establishments have been abolished.

The adoption of these measures has greatly increased the orientation of the youth to scientific and technical subjects. These are brought to their notice, often by working engineers, while they are still under school discipline. They are not left to discover the fascinations of the technical life several years after they have left school, when they have lost the habit of study and, in many cases, the power to begin to learn advanced science and higher technology in an orderly way.

In 1954, 37.2 per cent of all college students in the USSR were enrolled in technical schools. The different kinds of technical school have been broadly classified by A. F. Shavin (*Yearbook of Education*) as follows.

Polytechnical and industrial engineering schools. These train engineers for machine construction, railway maintenance, motor transport, mineral prospecting, the technology of the petroleum industry, chemical technology, and so on.

Heavy and light electrical engineering schools. These train engineers in the manufacture and construction of electric power plants, the electrification of factories and the construction of turbines and boilers. Under light electrical engineering these schools deal with the making of electrical equipment and instruments, remote control and electric meters, automatic plants, electronic equipment and so on.

Mechanical engineering, shipbuilding and aeronautical engineering schools. In these, engineers are trained for the automobile and tractor industries, the making of internal combustion engines, the construction of agricultural and transport machinery, hot and cold metal working, foundry technology, the construction of lathes and other machine tools and cranes, the technique of welding, shipbuilding and repairing, and the construction of printing machinery.

Technical high schools for geology, petroleum engineering, peat, ore reduction and metallurgical industries. These schools deal with the training of engineers for the raw-material industries, geologists, mining engineers, specialists in various branches of the production side of the coal and oil industries, the construction of mines, and the treatment of metals and materials under high pressure.

Chemical engineering schools. These train engineers for the various branches of chemical industry, the making of heavy chemical equipment and machinery, and technologists for controlling the numerous different processes, such as pulp and paper making, and so on.

High schools for the food industry. These train specialists in the technology of bread-making, the production of confectionery, the storage and processing of grain, the

technology of the various methods of food processing, and the refrigeration and preservation of food. There are schools for training specialists in the technology of fish-smoking, commercial fishing, and the various methods of canning.

Higher schools for light industry. These train specialists in the technology of fibres, skin and fur dressing, garment and leather industries, and so on.

Civil engineering schools. These deal with the training of engineers in the construction of industrial and domestic structures, dams, canals and hydroelectric plants, cities, roads, mining plants, and so on.

Transport and communications schools. These train engineers in the various branches of railway engineering, tunnel and bridge construction, the repair of rolling stock, the maintenance of permanent way and the electrification of railways, and for marine and river transport, ship repair and port maintenance, and train specialists in telegraph and telephone construction, radio communication, broadcasting, and so on.

The numbers of middle technical school graduates are planned so as to produce two to four for each university or college graduate in the same specialty.

The general trend in Soviet technical education at present is to widen its basis, and insist on students acquiring a wider general knowledge of scientific progress. To assist this development the traditional technical courses are being carefully examined in order to remove all out-of-date material, and make room for the new knowledge. Nevertheless, parallel with this general development, when necessary, new short-course technical trade schools are being established in areas where there is a serious shortage of engineers with particular skills, especially in Siberia and the Far East. For instance, ten such schools have recently been opened in Vladivostok, Uralsk and Tambov. They give students who have completed their secondary school course one or two years' training in a particular trade. Altogether there were 250 such schools in the Soviet Union at the beginning of 1955, with an enrollment of 58,000 youths and girls. During the year 200 more schools of this character were opened, covering 150 different trades.

The Soviet policy in technical education is flexible. The kind of school and the character of the courses are designed to meet the country's needs. Some of these needs are of a short-term, pressing nature, and must be met by special measures; other needs are long-term, and for these training must be based on the greatest possible width and depth. All students in the higher technical schools have practical experience in industry during their course of instruction. Great emphasis is laid on the contact between science and production, or the unity of theory and practice. Particular factories and mills, railways, constructions, and so on, are chosen for the practical training of students. Care is taken to see that their technological standards are high. In these enterprises the students are called upon to perform on their own responsibility the functions corresponding to their specific knowledge and training. Their practical work is supervised by pro-

fessors and lecturers and the best specialists on the factory staffs. The chief engineers of the enterprises are personally responsible for the organization of the practical work of students in the various factories and constructions and at the machine and tractor stations serving the State farms.

The undergraduate of a higher technical school is expected to prepare during his course three or four annual projects and three theses. He prepares a final project for his graduation examination. This is conducted by a State examination commission appointed by the Ministry of Higher Education, consisting of eminent engineers and specialists. If the commission is satisfied with the student and the project, he is awarded an engineer's diploma.

While the higher technical schools are conducted by the Ministry of Higher Education, the middle technical schools training technicians are conducted by the ministry appropriate to the particular industry. The ministry for a particular industry has the best general knowledge of the personnel in that industry, and can select the most appropriate instructors for the middle technical schools. The ministry provides workshop equipment of the kind used in its industry, and is in the best position to relate the technical training given in the school to the process of its industry, thus bringing education and practice into the closest relation.

Technical students may or may not be engaged in industry while they are studying. Those who take evening classes are generally expected to attend on four evenings a week.

Much attention has been given to the development of correspondence courses. They are carefully organized under the supervision of professors in the technical high schools and institutes. The correspondence students must sit for an annual examination, and submit projects for graduation, in the same manner as students in the ordinary technical institutions.

A worker who takes a course of evening classes or a correspondence course is entitled to an extra paid holiday from work in order to take his examination and submit to his oral on his graduation project.

Undergraduate students receive textbooks and dormitory accommodation free, and a stipend, the amount of which depends on their progress in their studies.

The courses in the higher technical schools take from five to five and a half years. After the student has graduated he is given an appointment in an appropriate line. Evening class and correspondence course students are usually promoted after graduation in the enterprises where they are employed. If they desire, they may be transferred to a higher position in another enterprise.

Students who have graduated successfully in day courses receive a paid holiday of one month after their graduation, before they take up their first appointment. The funds are provided by the enterprise in which they are to begin work.

One of the most striking features of the immense expansion of scientific and technical education in the Soviet Union is its effect on the status of women. The production of

the very large number of persons with higher technical education has been achieved only by drawing fully upon the reservoir of talent among Soviet women. In fact today more than fifty per cent of the persons graduating with higher qualifications are women. About three-quarters of the medical doctors in the Soviet Union are women, and about one-quarter of the graduate engineers are women. Nothing approaching this exists in capitalist countries. In the United States, for example, de Witt states that the number of women graduating in engineering, agriculture and medicine is virtually insignificant.

The large number of women holding high qualifications and positions in engineering, medicine and agriculture has had a profound effect on the general status of women in the Soviet Union. As long as women do not actually hold responsible professional jobs, formal laws guaranteeing the social equality of women do not have much effect. But when women are actually carrying out a large part of the responsible professional work of the country, in such fields as engineering, their social equality becomes a real thing. It is for this reason that the status of women is altogether higher and more satisfactory than in any of the capitalist countries. Nor does the influence of the large amount of engineering work done in the Soviet Union by women end only in the question of social equality, and all that that means for happiness and the full expression of life. Most of these Soviet professional women—engineers, doctors and agriculturists—are also wives and mothers. A mother who is also a responsible engineer is, from the point of view of western Europe and North America, a virtually new social type. Such mothers combine both the professional and the domestic virtues. Further, they can interest their children in science and technology in a unique way. Very large numbers of Soviet children no longer have to wait until they begin to go to school to learn about science and technology: they take them in almost with their mothers' milk. Their mothers can arouse their interest and give them informed and expert guidance in science and technology from an early age.

As there are now large numbers of Soviet married women who are also engineers, there is nothing odd in this situation. It is a perfectly normal situation. Consequently, there is a complete absence of the kind of psychological tension or peculiarity common among the occasional married women in the United States or Britain who do achieve success in science or engineering.

During the last twenty-six years, the industrial output of the Soviet Union has increased by twenty times, whereas in the same period the industrial output of the whole capitalist world has only doubled. The Soviet development of scientific and technical education will ensure that a similar disparity in these two rates of development will continue in the future. With its wealth of technical personnel, the Soviet Union is planning for immense developments in many directions.

N. S. Krushchev in his report to the Twentieth Party Congress stated that the production of coal has increased from 261,000,000 tons in

1950 to 391,000,000 tons in 1955. According to the sixth five-year plan, the output of coal in 1960 will be 593,000,000 tons. For steel the respective figures are 27,000,000 tons in 1950, 45,000,000 in 1955, 68,300,000 in 1960. Thus by 1960 the Soviet Union will be approaching equality with the United States in the production of these basic materials.

According to the sixth five-year plan there are to be large-scale developments in the automatization of industry, which requires a large and varied technical staff but fewer unskilled workers. Among installations specifically cited for automation are power systems and oil fields, open-hearth furnaces for producing steel, mills for the rolling of steel bars and sections, apparatus for extracting the by-products of coke production, and blast furnaces. Forty bar and pipe rolling mills are to be automatized. All-round automation is to be introduced in plants for concentrating minerals.

The furnaces in the copper industry are to be automatized, as are many of the processes of non-ferrous metallurgy, such as crusting and pulverizing, the separation of ores by flotation, etc.

Within two or three years the main hydro-electric power stations in the Soviet Union are to go over to telecontrol, the control of operations from a distant control center. All heat power stations are to be automatized during the plan.

In the electrical industry, the assembly of motors and the production of cables is to be automatized.

In the chemical industry the production of sulphuric acid, nitric acid, soda and other products is to be automatized.

The number of automatic looms in the textile industry is to be increased to sixty per cent of the total.

At least 600 automatic lines are to be established in the fish-processing industry. Four hundred automatic and semi-automatic lines are to be set up in the bakery and confectionary industry. Four hundred production lines are to be set up in the meat-packing industry, and 1,500 in the butter-making industry.

Finally, a long-term plan is to be drawn up for the introduction of automation into the production processes in all industries, so that work for this purpose can be conducted in a planned way and industrial enterprises can be supplied with the instruments and equipment which are required for automation.

The great fund of trained technical personnel in the Soviet Union, and the achievements of the past generation, are a guarantee that these plans will be successfully carried out.

Reprinted by courtesy of the Anglo-Soviet Journal (Summer, 1956), published at 14 Kensington Square, London W. 8, England.

U.S. NUCLEAR PHYSICIST ON SOVIET SCIENCE

"TODAY our leadership in science is being challenged by Russia . . . ten years from now the best scientists in the world will be found in Russia. I am not saying that this will happen unless we take this or that measure. I am simply saying that it is going to happen."

Dr. Edward Teller, quoted in New York Times, Feb. 10, 1957

The Millionaire Who Loved Lenin

by CEDRIC BELFRAGE

WITH the appearance in England and the USA of two recent books recalling the American, Col. Raymond Robins, we have had a new demonstration of the oblivion or distortion bestowed by the "free world" upon the lives of its great sons who made peace and friendship their cause.

When *Raymond and I* (Macmillan Co., 1956)—a posthumous work by Robin's sister Elizabeth about his adventures in the Alaska "Gold Rush" of 1897-1900—was published last September, even the leading English critic Raymond Mortimer showed his ignorance of Robins' later life. Describing both the author, a famous London actress of half a century ago, and her brother as "creatures far above the common run," Mortimer wrote in the *Sunday Times*: "We long to know what happened to Raymond afterwards."

George Kennan, the former U.S. State Department officially credited with blueprinting his country's "containment policy" toward the USSR, knows this very well; but in his *Russia Leaves the War,* (Princeton University Press, 1956), an account of the Bolshevik revolution until 1921, he draws a methodical caricature of Robins. Reviewing this book in the London *New Statesman & Nation,* the better-informed critic A. J. P. Taylor describes Robins as "the adventurous idealist" who went to Russia in 1917, officially as head of the American Red Cross mission, unofficially as a U.S. intelligence agent who infuriated his Washington masters by reporting that the Bolshevik revolution was overwhelmingly popular and should be recognized. In Kennan's book, writes Taylor, Robins "never appears without a word of condemnation" from the author; yet "the moment that he steps on to the stage, the others [concerned with western policy] all seem puny and uninspired. . . . What in fact we feel is how much better things would have worked out if Raymond Robins had had his way. . . . Unwittingly and unwillingly Mr. Kennan has composed a tribute to a great American, who did honor to his people and his age."

Taylor does not exaggerate Robins' historical stature: he was indeed, as Mortimer perceived merely from reading about his "Gold Rush", a "creature far above the common run." Strikingly handsome, he possessed an extraordinary combination of physical and mental energy and eloquence. The under-

---

CEDRIC BELFRAGE, exiled editor of the National Guardian, now lives in England where his latest book about America, "The Frightened Giant" has just been published.

standing friendship toward the USSR of this millionaire philanthropist—a deeply religious man, and a defender of capitalism for America—is a useful reminder that humanity has infinite variations and paradoxes.

This friendship was rooted precisely in Robins' religious belief, in his patriotic pride in his country's democratic advances based on its own revolution, and in his own experience of the shortcomings of American bourgeois democracy (which, however, he believed could be corrected within the capitalist framework). His life had been an "American success story" but he realized how much it was a matter of luck and how increasingly difficult success had become, no matter how hard a man worked. A barefoot Florida farm boy toiling from dawn to dusk at the age of 10, he had set his heart on making money and "being somebody"; and after striking gold in Alaska, he had by the age of 30 made a reality of his boyhood dream of owning the big mansion and estate near that farm, Chinsegut Hill. But before this his "outdoor mind," as he called it—his insistence on getting at facts and not deluding himself about the conclusions to be drawn from them—had taught him many lessons. He had worked as a miner on a 12-hour day and seven-day week, seen that only a union could end this slavery and proceeded to help organize one. When a strike was called and broken by violence, he had been blacklisted from further work and from then on he knew the simplest and most basic truth about the class struggle. He had studied and set himself up as a lawyer in San Francisco, and plunged with youthful enthusiasm into political battles—and discovered the corruption of both political party machines and that he could only succeed professionally by "wearing the collar" of one or the other of them.

"No man," he was told in San Francisco by the popular Presidential candidate William Jennings Bryan whose cause he espoused, "can make a million dollars honestly." Robins dug $250,000 in gold out of Alaska's icy wastes where thousands less tough than he found nothing but frustration or a horrible death. He returned a lifelong convert to the Christian faith to which, he said, he owed his survival; with an insight into the workings of human nature under the most frightful conditions; and with a new understanding of the meaning of comradeship and leadership. He never forgot the experience of crossing a glacier as one of five men roped to a leader who slipped and fell—and how at the brink of death the leader and followers realized their dependence on each other, and of each individual on the united strength of all.

Scornful as he always remained of those who merely "talk" Christian brotherhood, Robins dedicated his life and his fortune, which he turned into $3,000,000 by skilful investment, to his fellow-men. He became what hard-boiled American businessmen scornfully called a "do-gooder." Going to his Florida estate once a year for a holiday, he lived in a Chicago tenement with the millionaire's daughter he married, and there organized the feeding, clothing and housing of a multitude of destitute people. On a visit to Europe,

he mingled with British aristocracy and learned to despise their snobbery while reluctantly admiring the cleverness with which they maintained their privileges. Over tea on the terrace of the House of Commons he argued with the Great British Socialist leader, Keir Hardie, that religion could not be excluded from his movement.

For Robins — who apparently never read Marx—the texts and slogans for the fight for social justice were in the Bible; and probably it was the anti-religious aspects of the movement which kept him from becoming a socialist. But he saw it as his plain Christian duty to incur the hatred of the "respectable" by publicly defending the socialist miners' leader Bill Haywood, who was framed up on a murder charge in 1906, and the union leaders John and Jim McNamara who were imprisoned for life on a dynamiting charge in 1911. A brilliant orator, he was recognized even by his worst enemies as an influence with and spokesman for labor. The workers came to know him as a man of fearless integrity, in contrast with other "leaders" who purported to be socialists but deserted the cause when it seemed expedient to do so. Campaigning again in 1908 for Bryan, he began to see this man he had once idolized as the silver-tongued mountebank that he was. Bryan, no longer poor and with a new brand of social arithmetic, told Robins after one triumphant political meeting: "No man can make three million dollars honestly. . . ."

Robins learned the realistic side of American politics in dealings with all sorts of shady characters in Chicago, which were necessary for his democratic objectives. On a round-the-world trip before the 1914 world war he was appalled by the decadence of the European imperialist regimes, and in the Far East and South Africa (where he visited—in jail—a young lawyer named Gandhi), by the ruthless exploitation of colored peoples. Back home, he introduced these themes into the speeches which he was in demand to make everywhere, in which he attacked capitalist injustices but never questioned that system's rightness for America. After making a university graduation speech a student came and asked him: "Are you a socialist? I am, and you sounded like one." Robins told him that capitalism's failure was in fair distribution of its products, and the problem was to improve that without breaking down the good production system. The student's name was Wendell Willkie—in 1940 the Presidential candidate for the Republican Party.

In 1917 the government sent Robins to Russia on the "Red Cross mission" which was, in reality, an intelligence mission. His tasks were to work behind the scenes to bolster the Kerensky regime and keep Russia in the war against Germany; and to report on the activities of the Bolsheviks, who were causing Washington anxiety although its bibulous ambassador in Russia had dismissed them as an insignificant group of "anarchists" and "German agents." (U.S. Ambassador Francis had cabled to Washington that he was "designedly giving leeway" to Lenin and would "deport him opportunely.")

As an astute British diplomat in Russia was to observe, Francis

"didn't know a Social Revolutionary from a potato"; but Robins with his open-air mind soon learned from trips all over Russia, on Red Cross work, that Lenin was a great and beloved man and the Soviets were the only effective power. His attempts to convince Washington—and the British and French ambassadors in Petrograd—of this, were sterile. He told the ambassadors that capitalism had after all not solved the problem of slums and mass hunger, and that "if Lenin has a plan to stop them he deserves a chance to try. I don't know if it will work but I do know the people are for it." He did not want "Lenin's plan" to spread to America, but "we in America have got to think about what these people are saying and doing. America's frontier economy gave me my chance but it isn't there any more, and the problem of distributing wealth so that every man has a chance is our problem too."

British ambassador Sir George Buchanan replied helplessly:

"You know, Robins, whenever you talk about conditions in Russia you convince me, but my people tell me a completely opposite story."

In frequent private meetings with Lenin, whom he had first seen and heard proclaiming the birth of the workers' state at the Smolny, Robins was more and more impressed with his genius for leadership. Interspersed with their talk about more pressing matters, a discussion on religion developed between the two men. As Robins told it later, he pressed Lenin to realize that the attempt to change society on to a higher plane than personal cupidity was essentially religious.

"Do you really think I need religion?" Lenin asked with a friendly smile. Robins replied: "You already have it without knowing it. If a Galilean carpenter had not stood up long ago to proclaim the dignity of every individual man, and been crucified for it, you wouldn't be here now doing what you are doing."

Lenin listened carefully and, in their last meeting after Robins had been recalled home in 1918, put his arm around him. "I am not converted," said Lenin, "but you have talked to me about religion as no one else ever has. I shall remember what you have said." Next day Robins left by train for Vladivostok across a Russia in the throes and agonies of the foreign intervention. Westerners in Petrograd had warned him of the journey's dangers, but he was confident that a piece of paper he carried would see him through safely. It did. It was a note scrawled by Lenin asking anyone and everyone to assist Robins.

The American millionaire who had tried to make the great revolutionary leader declare himself a Christian brought home a program for developing American-Russian trade, which he had got Lenin to draw up. He was not even able to get an interview with President Wilson or any other top official in order to present it. The press either ignored his message or wilfully distorted it. The fact that he was devoutly religious and a wealthy champion of "the American way of life," and his many connections in high places, did not save him from the fury of the political witch-hunt which had just begun and has never stopped since. A Congressional committee "investigated" him and denounced him as a would-be over-

thrower of the government because he insisted, not that he agreed with the Bolsheviks but that they had the Russian people's support. Ex-ambassador Francis, who by now was pressing Wilson to send him back to Russia at the head of 50,000 troops to "eradicate this foul monster Bolshevism branch, trunk and root," testified with a tissue of lies against Robins. Recalling that day years later, Robins—a strict teetotaller ever since his Alaska "conversion"—said: "Francis was fairly mild in the morning but let loose after lunch, with which he had drunk too much whiskey."

During the years that followed, Robins' millionaire acquaintances—uneasy about the future of capitalism and aware of Robins' influence with the workers—did not give up hope of making him drop his "subversive" idea of friendship with the socialist state. Once at a country week-end gathering, after a poker game in which $10,000 bets were freely wagered on the turn of a card, the Morgan bank partner Thomas Lamont offered to put Robins on a special favored investors' list. "Friends" on this Morgan list were sent confidential information about stocks on which a quick rise could be guaranteed. Recalling this episode, Robins said he "went to bed having said almost nothing, just listened." On the next day he told his millionaire host: "I guess Lamont was trying to buy me." The host laughed and said: "I guess that's just what old Tom was trying to do."

Robins continued, as he had done in Russia, to read his well-worn Bible and see in the Russian revolution a fulfilment of the Old Testament prophesy of "the desert blossoming as the rose," an implementation of the New Testament's standard for judging human conduct—feeding the hungry and clothing the naked. He resumed his work for the destitute in the Chicago slums, and his fight for justice for labor; and he never ceased to exert all the influence he had—which despite all that had happened was still considerable—to bring about U.S. recognition of the Soviet state. Presidents Harding, Coolidge and Hoover all in turn promised to look into the matter seriously, and all broke their promise after Robins had supported them for election. When Roosevelt went into the White House, Robins decided in discussion with four friends who were in the Cabinet that before approaching the new President he should bring himself up-to-date on developments in the USSR.

In 1933—by which time he had given away most of his money, and made the government a present of his estate as an agricultural experiment center and of his house after his death—he returned to the USSR and traveled all over it with his open-air mind. He got the first-hand answers to the questions raised by American propaganda about the state of Soviet industry, agriculture and education. In Moscow he sought an interview with Stalin in vain until he produced a battered piece of paper—the note scribbled by Lenin in 1918. A few hours later he was closeted with Stalin in the Kremlin. He told Stalin how especially impressed he had been by Magnitogorsk, and how he had remarked to a Russian who accompanied him: "Lenin ought to be here"—and the Russian replied: "He is." Stalin

talked of the difficulties still to be overcome domestically and in foreign relations, and they discussed the advantages for both countries in increased U.S.-Soviet trade. Robins returned to tell America in a radio broadcast about the workings of Soviet democracy and the solidity of the regime despite the "terrible cost in freedom and life to the Russian people during these 15 years." He did not think the Soviet system "would be tolerated for 24 hours in our America," but "of course we should recognize Russia" because it was in America's clear interest to do so. He gave a detailed report to Roosevelt and before the year was out the U.S. government extended formal recognition. Nobody welcomed it more than Thomas Lamont, who by now understood the fruitful possibilities of trade with the USSR; he was a chief speaker, at the New York banquet celebrating the event.

In 1935 Robins was the victim of a terrible accident at Chinsegut Hill, when he fell from a tree and was completely paralyzed from his feet to above the waist. Not long afterwards came the death of his beloved wife, who had stood by him in all he did and said. Robins' iron will to live preserved him through many more lonely years, suffering constant pain and only occasionally getting out of bed into a wheelchair. Propelling himself in this chair, he would expound to progressive Americans who came to visit him about "the four vistas" between the trees surrounding the mansion which he had bought, developed and given away. There was the "Jefferson Vista" representing the President-author of the Declaration of Independence who formulated the right to revolution. The "Jackson Vista" represented the "frontier President" identified with the State of Florida who made the first assault on the power of the bankers. A tree in the centre of the "Lincoln Vista" threw at sunrise a gaunt shadow on the house, recalling the great, humble President who saved the American Union and re-stated and fought for the principle of human equality. The "Roosevelt Vista" was named for the President who championed the "common man" and recognized the Soviet Union. Near it was the "Lenin Oak" which Mrs. Robins, inspired by Raymond's letters during his first visit to Russia, had planted without his knowledge as a seedling on May Day, 1918.

The intensified witch-hunt which held America in the grip of fear during Robins' last years only deepened his convictions—and perhaps finally made a socialist of him, although he does not appear ever to have so described himself. (It might be said that if Lenin was a Christian without knowing it, Robins was a socialist without knowing it.) Most of what he had left to give in the way of moral and financial support, he gave to the Progressive Party founded in 1948, the last effort to bring together a broad left coalition in America. From his bed and wheelchair he continued to write letters of warm encouragement and wise counsel to embattled progressives throughout the land he loved.

When he showed me the Chinsegut Hill "vistas" in 1951, he said: "Although I talk so much about Russia and feel so strongly about it, I suppose I am nothing more than

old-fashioned American." He could have paid no higher tribute to America, which had rewarded him with a public obloquy, followed by such oblivion that a generation ignorant of his very name had grown up. After falling into a more and more comatose state, his open-air mind slowing down except for flashes of the old lucidity, he died in November of 1954 at the age of 81. The same Bible in which he had written marginal notes in Petrograd in 1917 was by his bedside, now almost falling apart from his constant handling of it. He was, as his nurse-companion wrote to me, "game to the last and insisting that he 'felt fine'."

During those last tormented years he must have done much thinking about all he had seen and experienced. In his last letter to me, at the height of the Korean and cold wars, he wrote. "These are mighty days. The outcome of the world struggle that is now going on will condition human life on this earth for many generations to come. With the passage of time it may very well be that association with the USSR will be as great an advantage for an American as today it is a handicap. Much of the brutal and bloody hatred of the USSR will pass as a lurid drama in the night—and the economic and social freedom and opportunity in the message of Lenin-the-Great will take Russia and the world in eternal possession."

These were some of the things that "happened to Raymond afterwards." These were the days—which millions will not forget, despite some of his own countrymen's efforts to suppress the noble record—in which he "did honor to his people and his age."

ON "USSR"—SOVIET ILLUSTRATED MONTHLY

THE SIXTH issue of "USSR", published by reciprocal agreement between the governments of the United States and the Soviet Union, which also provides for the circulation of the magazine "Amerika" in the USSR, is now on the newsstands. This lavishly illustrated monthly becomes more interesting with each issue. True, it shows only the bright side of Soviet life and little of its problems and difficulties, but no doubt "Amerika" does the same thing. Prepared for popular consumption, and abjuring political articles and documents, the magazine illuminates many sides of Soviet life unknown to Americans and has many informative and readable articles.

Among the particularly interesting articles in issue No. 6 is one that deals with the question of inheritance laws in the USSR, and one that tells of the use of the atom in the battle against cancer. A visit of U.S. businessmen to Russia, and what they saw, is described. Sport enthusiasts will be interested in the articles on winter sports, Soviet champions and the big Summer Sports festival that will be held in Moscow in July. Other articles deal with questions of science, planning, music, a Soviet stage and screen star, life on a collective farm, and various cities and sections of the Soviet Union such as Leningrad, the Baltic Republic Estonia and the mountainous area of Kabarda in the North Caucasus.

Some of the USSR's leading writers are among the contributors, including Leonid Leonov and the noted satirist, Mikhail Zoshchenko.

FORGOTTEN HEROES

by RALPH PARKER

In the following article Ralph Parker supplies some interesting details about the background of the Soviet movie "The Immortal Garrison," written by Konstantin Simonov, currently being shown in this country. The historical reassessment, of which this movie is an example, now rapidly going forward is a part of the whole complex process of re-evaluation in many fields in the USSR.

IN THE SUMMER of 1946, motoring from Warsaw to Moscow, I joined a column of Soviet Army trucks slowly traversing the forests of East Poland. Two years had passed since the armies of liberation had swept across this region from the East, five since the Germans had used it as a springboard for their sudden attack on the Soviet Union. Towns and villages are infrequent along the narrow old coach-road that runs between the Vistula and the Bug and there were few direct traces of war to be seen. Occasionally the whole string of lorries would grind to a halt and men in faded dusty uniforms would spill out and stretch out on the grass. Their spirits were high as they approached the frontier, demobilization, home. . . .

At one of these halts I asked three of the soldiers to ride with me and it was in their company that I reached the Bug and the approaches to Brest. The river was low with broad patches of white shingle and stretches of reed. Across the valley rose a series of piles of rubble connected by what appeared to be the remains of a battlemented wall.

"The fortress," said one of my companions, his voice low and strained. "Brest fortress," said his companion, leaning across him to see better.

But there was not much to be seen. The shells and bombs that began to rain on the frontier fortress the morning of June 22, 1941—the first day of Hitler's attack on the Soviet Union—and which continued to fall on the stoutly defended outpost long after the main body of the Red Army had been driven far back across Byelorussia, had done their work effectively.

To my companions, as to most Soviet people, the heroic defense of the Brest fortress lay at the remotest depths of their memories of the war. To them it was an incident in that tragic, desperate, confused period of retreat about which few were in a mood to think in the years immediately after the war. Soviet war literature, and the unwritten tales

---

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

told by the demobilized army the length and breadth of the land, tended to begin with the Battle of Moscow, when the Red Army first showed its capacity for fighting back on a big scale. For a time, something like a veil was drawn over the first six months of the war. In their hearts Soviet people honored the countless dead of that period but psychologically they were not prepared for the stories of those who had survived its battles, but spent the rest of the war in German prisoner-of-war or forced labor camps, or living in danger and humiliation in occupied territory.

Naturally, the passage of time brought about a change. But it is more than the healing of wounds and the drying of tears that has turned minds to the events of the war's early days. There is a new *official* attitude. Historians, writers, dramatists, script-writers are being encouraged to dig into the facts about the period of retreat and to analyze events with a fearless regard for truth. No less important is the removal of those disabilities laid—unfairly, it is now held—on many brave, innocent people unfortunate enough to fall into enemy hands or to be cut off by the advancing Wehrmacht. We are today witnessing the moral rehabilitation of the ex-prisoner-of-war, of Soviet citizens who for too long suffered the humiliation of having a stamp in their passports to the effect that they had been in occupied territory during the war.

Only now are the feats performed by Soviet servicemen and others in the difficult conditions of captivity or occupation being brought out of obscurity. And only now is the truth being learned about such splendid pages in the history of the war as the defense of Brest Fortress.

For three years the writer Sergei Smirnov dedicated himself to the quest of reconstructing the well-nigh legendary story of the Brest garrison's heroic stand during the first weeks of the war.

When Smirnov looked for material in the war archives he found no documents directly related to the defense of Brest. He noticed however one curious fact. Writers and historians had hardly taken up at all the search for survivors from the fortress. Smirnov decided to set to work on those lines.

In the archives of the Central Soviet Army Museum his eye was caught by the letters of a certain Alexander Fil describing in detail how on the first morning of the war the fortress awoke amidst bomb and shell explosions. Fil went on to describe how the Regimental Communist Youth League Bureau Secretary, Metevosyan, took charge of the defense during a moment of panic and rallied the men to counterattack a troop of German tommy-gunners. Fil observed that Matevosyan, seriously wounded, had perished with the others in the fortress cellars.

Smirnov at once wrote to Fil whose address was given as Yakutia in Siberia. It was the first of hundreds of letters he was to write during the search. However, he drew a blank, for a reason that the writer did not know at the time. Later he discovered that Fil had been unlawfully repressed and lived in embittered misery—the one survivor of the Brest garrison whom Smirnov could trace remained silent.

But Smirnov found another clue. In 1948 the magazine *Ogonyok* had published an article on the ruins of Brest Fortress by the journalist Mikhail Zlatogorov. Soon afterwards the editor of *Ogonyok* had received a letter written from a prospectors' camp high in the mountains of Armenia. The letter was signed Samvel Matevosyan.

Smirnov at once wrote to Armenia. And again he thought he had drawn a blank, for no reply came for a long time. Matevosyan's mountain camp was, in fact, beyond the reach of mail during the winter. But the following spring Smirnov received a reply, and its nature was such as to take him straight down to Armenia.

Matevoysan, it turned out, had been wounded thrice in the fortress and was captured while unconscious. He escaped, joined a guerrilla unit, then commanded a storm company, and ended the war by signing his name on the walls of the Reichstag.

Smirnov not only questioned Matevosyan in detail; he also helped him to obtain leave to go to Brest. Together they roamed around the overgrown ruins. They picked up rusty cartridge cases, bullet-pierced skulls, shreds of military standards hidden under rubble in the cellars.

Pointing to the green tops of the trees growing at the site of a concentration camp for Soviet POW's, Matevosyan softly said: "They had not a single leaf then; the prisoners ate them all. . . ."

With the help of Matevosyan Smirnov was able to reconstruct many episodes in the defense of the Brest Fortress and to trace other survivors. He obtained a quick reexamination of Fil's case as a result of which this hero of Brest was fully rehabilitated. He got in touch with Petya Klypa, the fourteen-year-old drummer boy who, with four other lads, escaped after the fortress had fallen and wandered hundreds of miles through the forests of Byelorussia to regain the main forces of the army. Petya now works as a turner.

At her work as hospital matron in a country town on the main Moscow-Simferopol highway, Smirnov found the lone woman survivor, Raissa Abakumova. Raissa had been listed among the dead in Zlatagorov's report which had paid tribute to this girl's selfless work among the wounded in the fortress cellars. And she had been too shy to correct the mistake. By then she had already returned from four years' imprisonment in Germany to her native Orel, finished the medical education interrupted when she joined the army in 1939, and, not without having to break down prejudice in some quarters against exprisoners of war, had regained her health and her place in peaceful Soviet life. Why should she, looking after casualties of the highways and the farms, claim the honor that was hers by right?

On the fifteenth anniversary of the defense of the Brest Fortress a group of survivors gathered in Moscow. Matevosyan was there, and Petya Klypa, and Raissa. Smirnov spoke of them and their deeds on Moscow Radio. He described his three years quest, as a result of which he succeeded in tracing fifteen of the survivors. This broadcast led to the finding of others.

A bare recital of the present jobs

and addresses of some of these ex-servicemen is striking evidence of the way the heroes of yesterday's battles are today working at peaceful construction. Book-keeper at a factory in the Urals, clerk at a state farm, Kuzbas brick-layer, Voronezh power-station engineer, Omsk school-teacher, major of militia in North Kazakhstan, truck-driver at Stalingrad. But not all are working. From Lvov came this letter:

I am Reshetniak Konstantin Mikhailovich, former private of the 84th rifle regiment which took the first blows of the enemy on June 22, 1941. . . .

After six days heavy fighting I was wounded and fell into the hands of the Germans. I underwent a serious operation and lost both my legs. I longed impatiently for the day of liberation. I survived, but liberation brought me further unhappiness: the fascists set fire to the house where I lay when they retreated and I was blinded. I believed myself to be the last survivor of the defenders of the Brest Fortress. And now I am happy beyond all measure to hear that some of our comrades are still alive. And though I cannot write myself (one of my comrades is writing this for me) I want to help you reconstruct some of the episodes of the fighting.

The Soviet public has been quick to recognize the great merits of Smirnov's lengthy quest. The story of the defense of Brest Fortress makes painful reading, for it is the struggle against overwhelming odds of men psychologically unprepared for war at a moment when the Kremlin had been given clear warnings of Hitler's intentions. But in his quest Smirnov has bestowed honor where honor is due, helped those who were undeservedly abused or who made human mistakes and written a page of history too long missing from the annals of the war.

NEW RECORDINGS

A NEW American record company, Monitor, has issued a long-playing disk containing two Soviet-recorded performances. On one side the pianist Sviatoslav Richter performs Bach's *D Minor Concerto* with a fiery, yet controlled virtuosity, and in the heart-breaking slow movement, a depth of feeling that cry out the presence of a master. On the other side the violinist Leonid Kogan, thirty-two years old, plays Prokofiev's lyrical and engaging *Violin Concerto No. 2, in G Minor,* as well as I have ever heard it done (Monitor MC-2002).

Another company, Westminster, offers two records devoted wholly to Kogan. On one he sweeps through the Vieuxtemps *Fifth Concerto,* Sarasate's *Carmen Fantasy,* and the *Introduction and Rondo Capriccioso* of Saint-Saens, in the grand manner (XWN 18228). The other is made up of "Violin Encores"; unusually substantial ones, among them two rarely heard Paganini pieces, *I Palpiti* and *Variations on a Rossini Theme,* which display every violinistic trick, including the eerie double harmonics which made listeners in Paganini's time think that the violinist was in league with the Devil (WXN 18229).

Monitor offers "David Oistrakh Plays from Albeniz to Zarycki," (Monitor MC 2003), made up of 11 pleasant, difficult and light-weight pieces, which enables us to compare the two violinists. Oistrakh, I would say, clothes his great strength in a silken sheath of the utmost delicacy and refinement. Kogan hides his warm heart behind a brusque, fiery, dashing air.

Finally another Monitor record MC 2001), presents the sonorous bass voice of Ivan Skobtsov, in nine Russian folk songs, including the internationally famous *Volga Boatmen* and *Along the Peterskaya Road,* as well as the beautiful *In the Valley.* This is very good, but I for one am no longer content with cultural exchange through phonograph records. Let us hear Kogan, Richter and Skobtsov in person.

SIDNEY FINKELSTEIN

CORRECTION

In our February issue through no fault of the translator the Italian magazine VIE NUOVE was incorrectly translated. The correct translation is NEW ROADS.

REVIEW AND COMMENT

by JESSICA SMITH

The Search for Disarmament—Eisenhower Doctrine and Soviet Mideast Proposals—New Opportunities for Peaceful Solutions

WHEN will our government return to that "decent respect for the opinions of mankind" which inspired our forefathers in writing the Declaration of Independence? When will it recognize that of the unalienable rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness the greatest of these, in this atomic age, is life? This above all is what mankind longs for today, knowing that in the total destruction of atomic war no room is left for the treasures of liberty and happiness.

The majority of mankind today wants above all else to be freed from the dangers of atomic contamination and atomic annihilation, and from policies which bring these dangers closer.

Disarmament is the one great central issue on which men's hopes depend, and this means an end of the military blocs and military policies that can only mean an ever mounting arms race.

Can anyone point today to a single policy of our government that nourishes this hope?

Can anyone deny that a whole series of proposals from the Soviet Union offer concrete opportunities for exploring a new course, opening the way toward a beginning in disarmament agreements and security arrangements replacing divisive military blocs?

The contrast between American and Soviet proposals is having a profound effect on the people of the world. Whatever may be the views of governments and peoples on Soviet domestic policies, relations among Socialist states, events in Hungary and Poland, the fact remains that Soviet proposals in the sphere of international relations, whether in the Middle East, Europe or Asia, correspond to the desires of the overwhelming majority of mankind, and those of the United States do not.

Disarmament—the Main Need

It is true that in the recent disarmament discussions in the United Nations there were certain concessions in the new U.S. program which seemed to offer new possibilities for agreement. Yet there was no concrete step toward implementing those points on which the two sides had come closer together. On the contrary, U.S. official moves increasing the military budget and nuclear weapons allocations, and providing for military intervention in the Middle East, placed new obstacles in the way of agreement, and the stalemate in the UN continued.

A new round of arms talks will be opened on March 18 in London, when the five members of the UN Disarmament Subcommittee meet,

with instructions from the UN General Assembly to discuss both U.S. and Soviet proposals.

On the question of reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments the positions of both sides seem close enough for agreement to be reached. The Soviet Government proposes that the armed forces of the big powers be reduced substantially in two stages: in the course of the first year to reduce the armed forces of the USSR, the USA and China to 2,500,000 men, and of Britain and France to 750,000 men each; in the course of the second year to reduce the armed forces of these powers correspondingly to 1,000,000-1,500,000 and 650,000, the armies of all remaining states not to exceed 150,000-200,000. The United States, while not including China, proposes figures corresponding to the Soviet first stage, while not yet accepting the figures for the second stage (although these were its own figures until the USSR accepted them). Yet the fact of agreement on the levels for the first stage suggests that a start could be made here.

On the all-important question of the ending of nuclear weapons tests as the first step toward ultimate prohibition, the USSR has maintained an unequivocal position. Stating the position of his government on January 23, Soviet UN representative V. V. Kuznetsov said that the banning of nuclear weapons "is the most pressing of all international problems," and urged immediate cessation of tests.

The American position has gone no further than a proposal for advance registration of tests. Yet almost every day brings new evidence from scientists of the mounting dangers to mankind of atomic radiation from the tests and particularly of the deadly poison of Strontium-90. At its February meeting the national Council of the Federation of American Scientists urged our Government to seek a world-wide halt of nuclear weapons tests without tying such a ban to other disarmament agreements. The Council declared:

> All available evidence assures us that this constructive step would handicap the military preparations of our competitors at least as much as our own, and that a test ban could be adequately monitored by a United Nations monitoring agency without requiring free access for inspectors within national boundaries.

President Eisenhower's implication (Jan. 23 news conference) that atomic weapons would be used in any war developing out of the new Middle Eastern policy, his budget message statement that atomic support commands would be established abroad, and newspaper reports that U.S. atomic army units armed with atomic weapons would be stationed in the territories of Western Europe (including Western Germany), Turkey, Iran, Japan and Okinawa, have sent a new wave of alarm around the world.

On January 24 Moscow papers published a Tass statement expressing the Soviet Government's view that this step "increases the threat of the outbreak of an atomic war" and could only serve to place the countries where such atomic units were stationed in jeopardy of any retaliatory action that would necessarily follow any use of such weapons. The State Department dismissed these Soviet pronouncements "as futile attempts to intimidate smaller

ations with propaganda" (*New York Times,* Jan. 25). But Walter Lippmann soberly commented in the *Herald Tribune* the same day:

> There is no use underestimating the diplomatic force of the warning against allowing bases for nuclear weapons, which was issued in Moscow this week. This warning is addressed to the key countries in the great semi-circle which extends from Japan to Okinawa through Iran and Turkey to Western Europe. The warning consists of a reminder to these exposed countries that in case of war, unless they are military neutrals, they will be defenseless targets for Soviet missiles. This is a powerful argument for neutralism, and it is not easy to see how the Administration proposes to deal with that argument.
>
> Yet it is no exaggeration to say that the issue of neutralism is the paramount issue in the whole world that lies close to the Soviet Union.

Opposition to Eisenhower Doctrine Grows

Congressional and public opposition to the Eisenhower-Dulles Mideast Resolution (outlined in our last issue and still under debate in the Senate as we go to press) has continued to mount. While it may not succeed in blocking its passage, it has already resulted in certain modifications and in airing the widespread dissatisfaction with Administration foreign policies.

The false premise of any danger of overt armed aggression "from any nation controlled by international Communism" against which American armed forces and dollars are supposed to protect Middle Eastern nations under the Eisenhower doctrine, continues to be exposed in every quarter. Joseph Alsop wrote in the *New York Herald Tribune,* Jan. 25, from Moscow:

> . . . In fact there is not the slightest evidence here to suggest that the Soviets have any intention of using their armed might in the Middle East, either now or for years to come. Indeed all the evidence indicates that the Soviet leaders never had any real intention of resorting to force at any time during the Suez crisis, even at the moment when Premier Bulganin sent his threatening note to London and Paris and something unpleasantly like panic reigned in Washington.

Thus it is from the doctrine itself that the only real danger is seen. The *New York Times* of February 1 carried a dispatch from Washington reporting that "the mail of Senators on the Foreign Relations Committee is running 8 or 9 to 1 against the Eisenhower Doctrine." It said the criticisms were unorganized, coming from all over the country and expressing many different viewpoints, such as the war danger arising from the policy, its "smell of oil" and indignation over paying taxes to support it.

Senator Wayne Morse (D., Ore.), charged on the Senate floor that this was an "oil resolution," but that even oil could cost too much if it means the sacrificing of thousands of American lives in the Middle East. He said that any such unilateral policy, raising the danger of speeding up the arms race and of military struggle in the Middle East would mean that we are "headed for a great disaster." He called on the American people to make themselves heard and said that if the doctrine were presented to the people he was confident "it would be overwhelmingly defeated."

While most of the Senatorial opposition to the plan came from Democrats, it was also clear that many Republicans were not at all

happy, although perforce going along with the Administration. The Democratic opposition became largely an attack on Secretary Dulles' competence and good faith. Doris Fleeson wrote in the *New York Post* January 25:

> What Sens. Fullbright (D., Ark.), Russell (D., Ga.), Mansfield (D., Mont.) and others are really trying to impress upon President Eisenhower these days is their utter lack of confidence in his Secretary of State. If the President dismisses what is going on as merely politics, he is only asking for more trouble.

James Reston wrote in the *New York Times* (Jan. 28):

> Secretary of State Dulles has won the votes of the Congress for his Middle East policy, but he has not won what is more important for the conduct of his office, namely the confidence of the Senate, and particularly of its Foreign Relations Committee.

In the light of this criticism and the mounting implications that John Foster Dulles should resign as Secretary of State, the Administration was forced to agree to Senator Fullbright's demand for an official White Paper and thorough airing of the Administration's whole Middle Eastern policy following the passage of the Eisenhower resolution.

The Administration was compelled to put the best face possible on the change made in the Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committee substitute to the resolution, striking out the "authorization" to the President to commit American armed forces in the Middle East. The amended text reads:

> If the President determines the necessity thereof, the United States is prepared to use armed forces to assist any nation or group of nations requesting assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism: provided that such employment shall be consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States and with the Charter of the United Nations.

While the changes are legalistic rather than substantive, they seem to place responsibility on Congress to determine whether the conditions exist under which armed forces can be used in the Middle East. This indicates that continued and unrelenting pressure of the people may still be effective in blocking the implementation of this disastrous policy even though the resolution was passed by the House of Representatives by a vote of 335 to 61, and is generally expected to pass the Senate in some form.

The fact that the opposition was able to force changes in the wording insisted upon by the Administration as essential and the unusual length of the hearings on this Administration foreign policy measure indicate the importance of such continued pressure.

Soviet Middle East Proposal

It is in the light of the widespread opposition of the American people and people throughout the world to the Eisenhower Doctrine, that the Soviet proposal for a Middle Eastern solution should be considered.

The proposal was contained in a Soviet Government note presented to the United States on February 13, and similar notes to Britain and France.

The note opened by stating that

the tense situation in the Middle East, after improving with the end of the aggressive actions against Egypt, had become acute again due to the steps taken by "certain powers" with the intention, by-passing the United Nations, of "using the armed forces of one of the great powers in the region and economic aid with political conditions." It declared that the plan was "a continuation of a policy of isolated aggressive military blocs such as NATO, SEATO and the Baghdad Pact and the setting up of artificial economic and political barriers between states," and that its carrying out would represent a threat to peace within the region and throughout the world.

Reiterating the principle of peaceful co-existence as the basis of Soviet policy, its concern for peace in the area of the Near and Middle East directly on its borders, and for the national independence and economic prosperity of the countries in this area the statement said:

> The Soviet Union does not possess, and does not wish to possess, military bases or any kind of concessions in countries of the Near and Middle East for the purpose of making profits, nor does it seek to obtain any kind of privileges in that area, because all that is incompatible with the principles of Soviet foreign policy.

The note proposed that the USSR, the USA, Britain and France should seek a lasting and stable peace in the Near and Middle East, basing themselves on respect for the Bandung principles, and disinterested economic aid and trade, " proceeding from the fact that the natural wealth of the underdeveloped countries is the inalienable national property of the peoples of these countries, which have the full right to dispose of it and use it in the interests of their national economy and progress." It proposed that either by a joint declaration, or by separate declarations, these four nations, and any others that wished to join them, pledge themselves to the following principles:

1. The preservation of peace in the Near and Middle East by settling questions at issue exclusively by peaceful means, on the basis of the method of negotiations.
2. Non-interference in the internal affairs of the countries of the Near and Middle East. Respect for the sovereignty and independence of these countries.
3. Refusal to undertake any attempts to draw these countries into military alignments with the participation of the great powers.
4. The liquidation of foreign bases and the withdrawal of foreign troops from the territories of countries of the Near and Middle East.
5. Joint refusal to supply arms to the countries of the Near and Middle East.
6. Assistance in the economic development of countries of the Near and Middle East, without putting forward any political, military or other conditions incompatible with the dignity and sovereignty of these countries.

The proposals outlined in the Soviet note were also presented to the session of the Supreme Soviet held Feb. 5-12 in Moscow, by Foreign Minister Dmitri Shepilov. Despite all the speculation about the reasons for Mr. Shepilov's being succeeded in this post by Andrei Gromyko (announced February 15), the consensus of sober opinion is that the change does not signify any sharp new turn in Soviet foreign policy. Indeed Soviet spokesmen were quick to make clear that the policies outlined by

Mr. Shepilov would be carried through.

Reporting from Moscow on the foreign policy address to the Supreme Soviet William J. Jorden (*New York Times,* Feb. 13), wrote that while Mr. Shepilov had sharply attacked certain U.S. policies, the tone of his address was conciliatory, and he said "the Soviet Union was sincerely interested in promoting friendship with the United States." The dispatch continued: "Mr. Shepilov defended the Soviet Union's program of peaceful co-existence with special reference to the United States. He recalled the 'decades of friendship' between the two countries. He said they had fought against each other only once, during the intervention period after the Bolshevik revolution. . . ." Mr. Shepilov also called for increased trade and scientific and cultural relations with the United States and other Western countries and renewed the Soviet proposal that a World Economic Conference be convened to discuss the creation of an international trade agency under the United Nations, and stressed the need for disarmament.

The importance attributed by the Soviet Government to the question of disarmament was highlighted by the reduction in defense expenditures in the 1957 budget presented to the Supreme Soviet. Minister of Finance A. G. Zverev announced that in connection with the reduction in Soviet armed forces during the past year, defense expenditures would be 96.7 billion rubles in 1957 as against 102.5 billion rubles in 1956. This item makes up 16 per cent of the budget as against 18 per cent last year and is the lowest appropriation for military purposes since the end of World War II.

The fact that Andrei Gromyko knows our country well from his years as Ambassador here, as well as his experience as Ambassador to England, and Soviet UN representative, would indicate a firm intention on the part of the Soviet Government to pursue its policy of improving relations with the West and peaceful co-existence with all countries.

As might have been expected in the light of the quite different aims of the Eisenhower Doctrine, the Soviet proposal for the Middle East was quickly rejected by the Administration. According to Russell Baker (*New York Times,* Feb. 13), the proposal was "generally dismissed in Washington today as a self-serving device armed with a propaganda warhead. " After quoting several other adverse comments, Mr. Baker concluded his dispatch:

> Thus, under attack from every quarter, the proposal was rejected before most of the critics had seen more of it than the news teletype reports. Diplomatic officials do not expect that it will be so quickly rejected in the Arab world.

From a number of sources proposals very similar to those of the Soviet Union have been made. In her column in the *New York Post,* February 12, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt commented on the agreement with King Saud of Saudi Arabia at the close of his recent visit in which U.S. military aid was promised in return for a new five-year lease for the U.S. strategic base at Dharan and his rather cautious approbation of the Eisenhower Doctrine. Mrs. Roosevelt wrote:

> I am not sure that the strengthening of the armed forces of any country in the Middle East has much value. I would rather see an agreement reached between the Soviet Union and the U.S. against supplying military equipment to any country. . . . Undoubtedly the agreement for the use of the Dharan air base in Saudi Arabia is an advantage for the U.S. But I wonder if we would not be at greater advantage by reaching an agreement whereby the Soviet Union and the U.S. would not provide any military power, or possess any, in this area. This actually would be a greater pledge of peaceful security. We are looking for ways to start disarmament and perhaps an agreement of some kind between the USSR and the U.S. on disarmament in the Middle East would be helpful.

It should be evident that there can be no solution to the crucial Arab-Israeli conflict, highlighted by the present UN impasse over Israel's withdrawal from the area of Aqaba and the Gaza strip, under a Middle Eastern policy which can only mean an increased arms race and heightened tensions in the Area. The elimination of foreign military power and mutual agreement not to supply arms, as proposed by Mrs. Roosevelt, and also included in the Soviet program, would create the conditions for the solution of this and other problems of the area.

Germany and European Security

In Europe, Germany is still the key question. The menace of German re-armament is brought home anew by the Bonn Government's nomination of Lieut. Gen. Hans Speidel as commander of NATO ground forces in Central Europe. His confirmation in this post would bring U.S., British and French soldiers under a former Nazi general who was their enemy in both World Wars. In World War II he was Chief of Staff to the Nazi military Commander in occupied France, General Staff Chief under Rommel, and also active on the Eastern front against Russia.

An increasing number of people in the U.S. and Western Europe see the only solution for a peaceful Europe in an all-European security pact as proposed repeatedly by the Soviet Union, with the withdrawing of all foreign troops, both East and West from European countries, and a neutral, unified Germany.

Support of this program has grown constantly in Western Germany. A similar program is backed by the Social Democrats, who expect to defeat the Adenauer Government in the September elections. Their leader, Erich Ollenhauer, declared at a Foreign Policy Association luncheon in New York on February 12, during his visit to this country, "that it was unbearable for West Germany to be linked to the Atlantic Alliance while East Germany was allied with the Soviet-sponsored Warsaw military grouping" and that "Germans should be freed from both existing military entanglements."

A new note to Adenauer from Bulganin was made public on February 11, in which the Soviet Premier stressed Moscow's sympathetic understanding of the German desire for unity, declared it could be achieved by negotiations between the two German regimes, called for "trust and friendship" between West Germany and the Soviet Union, and proposed increased trade to contribute to better relations. M. S. Handler reported from Bonn (*New York Times,* Feb. 12) that "in a broadcast over the Bavarian radio

Dr. Adenauer said, "Marshal Bulganin's message contained several points that might lead to fruitful discussions."

Alsop Interviews Khrushchev

It is clear that despite the many troubled areas in world affairs and he deterioration in American-Soviet relations in recent months, current Soviet proposals open up concrete prospects for the improvement of these relations, which at many points correspond with proposals arising from important groups among the American people.

Such prospects were held out in Joseph Alsop's interview with Nikita Khrushchev (*N. Y. Herald Tribune*, Feb. 20), in which he quoted the Soviet leaders main proposals as follows:

> "Soviet troops would be withdrawn to the national territory of the Soviet Union from all the countries in Europe where they are now stationed in accordance with existing treaties and agreements. Meanwhile, Western European countries would also withdraw their troops stationed in the territories of other Western European countries. The United States would also withdraw its troops to American territory from Europe and Asia, and along with that would go the liquidation of all foreign military bases."

Khrushchev opened the interview with the statement that "we all live together on one planet and must find the way to live together in conditions of peaceful co-existence." He urged high level meetings as the best way to achieve this, through agreements that would "relieve the peoples of the world of uunproductive expenditures, which also holds danger of a third world war with all its untold suffering," and opening all kinds of trade and cultural contacts. Mr. Khrushchev indicated that concessions on both sides would be necessay in the remark that such negotiations would be "unfruitful if each side comes to the meeting with its own arguments and goes on repeating them, as it did at Geneva."

While frankly criticizing those U.S. policies the USSR considers aggressive, Mr. Khrushchev laid particular stress on the importance of normal relations with the United States as a "truly great power." Mr. Alsop said the discussion left him with an impression of Khrushchev's "strong, clear, practical intellect," and astute grasp of foreign affairs.

Increasing pressure from the people is required, urging our government to grasp these opportunities for better relations.

Side by side with the question of American-Soviet relations, that of a new attitude toward the Chinese People's Republic and the necessity for representation in the United Nations of the fourth of the world's people living in that great nation, come to the fore with increasing insistence. The widespread indignation being expressed against the Administration's efforts to keep American newsmen out of China and new calls for recognition and trade, are evidence of a growing body of public opinion which should make itself increasingly heard.

Above all, there must be no let-up in the demand for an end of nuclear weapons testing, a vital first step which will pave the way for further disarmament measures and facilitate the solution of all other questions, through a new top level conference.

Book Reviews

A SCIENTIFIC REVOLUTION

NUCLEAR ENERGY IN INDUSTRY, by J. G. Crowther. *Pitman. New York.* 1956. 164 pp. $3.95.

J. G. CROWTHER, whose study of Soviet technical education we are privileged to present in this issue of *New World Review,* is the author of some twenty books on the progress, history and social relations of science, three of which have to do primarily with science and technology in the USSR. It is unfortunate that his early books are out of print, and that several recent works have not appeared in American editions.

Nuclear Energy in Industry, now available here, is the outcome of the author's attendance at the 1955 Geneva Conference on the peaceful uses of atomic energy, and represents in summary the achievements and prospects of the participating countries, both East and West. The stated aim is "to give some impression of what is afoot, of the innumerable directions in which industry is affected and will be remodelled in a new industrial revolution."

This imminent revolution in industry will be based on new sources of energy, with energy from nuclear processes playing a dominant role. Crowther traces the problems with a wealth of detail, but the scientific aspects are sufficiently simplified to be comprehensible to the non-scientist reader. The central subject is the generation of nuclear power, but the final chapters are devoted to other industrial applications of nuclear science.

It is interesting to note that the total saving in industrial production as a result of using isotopes was estimated at more than 100 millions pounds sterling as of August 1955, and that the rise in the future was expected to be much more rapid. The use of isotopes includes the detection of wear, the tracing of chemical reactions, the investigation of mixing, autoradiography, and many others.

The story of prospecting and mining of nuclear fuels is a fascinating story, as is also the preparation and treatment of metallic fuels. Mr. Crowther's account of both makes for absorbing reading and has the widest general interest. The book is generously illustrated with photographs and line drawings.

Mr. J. D. Bernal has called this second industrial revolution a "scientific revolution" with the most profound consequences for the not so distant future. Mr. Crowther's book is a great help in understanding the significance of the scientific-industrial period through which we are now living. —M. P.

QUAKERS IN CHINA

QUAKERS VISIT CHINA, by Members of the British Quaker Mission to the People's Republic of China. *Society of Friends, East-West Relations Committee. London.* 1956. 73 *pp.* 50 *cents.*

THIS IS a record of a visit by a group of English Quakers to China late in 1955. Following the Quaker tradition of concern and action on matters of peace among the peoples, the group regarded its visit to China as of possible use in the healing of differences between the East and the West.

Received with the greatest consideration everywhere, they talked with many officials in the government, including a two-hour interview with Prime Minister Chou En-lai. They were, of course, particularly concerned with the situation of the Christion churches established in China during the missionary era, and a good portion of their report is taken up with a description of how the various denominational groups have fared since the establishment of the present government. With their own background of Quaker dissent they found the relation between the churches and the government not altogether understandable: the independence of the churches was clear, but the demand of the government that

every church member must be a patriot who fully supports the government left them with many unanswered questions.

Some members of the group had lived for long periods in China formerly and so brought to their observation of present-day conditions a knowledge of what had been typical of conditions in the past. As a result the report is a combination of serious questions raised as to the ultimate results of many of the reforms instituted by the government with, at the same time, frank admiration for many aspects of the New China revealed to them in their limited visit.

They see the Chinese revolution not only as a part of the East-West power struggle, but also as "an important episode in a far more vital struggle of our times, the fight of the under-privileged peoples of the world against poverty and hunger, ignorance and disease, indignity and inferiority of status." Seen thus, many of the questions they raise about government policy are in part answered by themselves in terms of the ancient heritage of poverty and insecurity, and the more recent chaos created by the former government of Chiang Kai-shek which the present government has set itself so resolutely to overcome.

Even though they were unconvinced of the validity of many of the reforms now in progress in China, they nevertheless make clear their belief that it is of the first importance that China's isolation from the West be brought to an end. Speaking specifically of the crucial American-Chinese relationship they say: "The greatest single asset that the United States held in China was the friendship of the Chinese people. This asset has not been confiscated; it has been frozen. Both the American people and the State Department must ask themselves how long a frost friendship can survive. What applies to the United States applies in varying degrees to all other parts of the Western world. The question is not how long we can manage to keep our present attitude of aloofness towards China; but rather how long we can afford to go on doing so. In our view time is not on the Western side."

This is a serious, critical report and should be read with close attention by everyone interested not only in China but in the whole problem of world peace.

THE RUSSIAN BALLET

BALLET IN MOSCOW TODAY, *by Hélène Bellew. New York Graphic Society, Greenwich, Conn.* 1956. 203 *pp.* $7.00.

TO MOST people the word "ballet" is automatically associated with the word "Russian." That other countries have a remarkable ballet tradition is, of course, conceded, but it is the "Russian Ballet" that springs first to mind and is the standard by which all others are judged.

Hélène Bellew points out in her introduction to this handsome book that it was the appearance just before the first World War of the brilliant group of Russian dancers in Western Europe under the direction of Serge Diaghilev that established this position. This group, trained in the rich tradition of the great official ballet companies in Moscow and Leningrad, brought a new meaning to theatrical dancing, and after their dispersal in the twenties, individual members of the group added their special contribution of superb training and exciting style to many other ballet organizations both in Europe and America.

Important as this contribution was, there always remained the question—what of the ballet in Russia, the source, after all, of the qualities for which the Diaghilev group was so justly celebrated? Reports of gala performances of "Swan Lake" on great occasions at the Bolshoi only whetted the curiosity more intensely, and the dazzled accounts of travelers fortunate to see for themselves stimulated without in any way satisfying this increasing curiosity.

In the past few years a number of films displaying in a somewhat hodgepodge fashion certain aspects of Soviet ballet have been widely shown in this country, but it was not until the full-length version of "Romeo and Juliet" with the legendary Ulanova that we were able to see in any satisfactory way what had been happening to the Soviet ballet during the last four decades.

Hélène Bellew, had the great advantage of going herself both to Moscow and Leningrad and receiving the fullest cooperation from leading cultural officials and ballet teachers in both cities. The result is a book which gives an enlightening description of the achievements of the Soviet ballet,

details the differences between the style and approach of the Soviet ballet and that which has developed in the intervening years in Western Europe and America, and provides a most useful summary of the fifteen ballets at present in the repertory of the Bolshoi Ballet company, each one illustrated by carefully selected photographs taken during performance.

The author also includes a brief account of the leading dancers of the Bolshoi ballet company, giving a precise description of their individual styles and the roles in which they are most applauded.

This book goes a long way to help us understand what the Soviet ballet has achieved: how the purity of the great classical tradition of the past has been wonderfully cherished and at the same time how new elements have developed, reflecting the values of a wholly different society. Anyone interested in ballet should find this an invaluable book.

MURRAY YOUNG

COMING SOON IN NWR!

Soviet Scientific Achievements, by J. D. Bernal; Why Chinese Capitalists Accept Socialism, by Michael Shapiro; Nuclear Weapons or Mankind's Survival, by Holland Roberts; More on Soviet Cultural Ferment, by Ralph Parker; What's Happening in Poland, by Margaret Schlauch and others.

In order not to miss these and other important articles, use the blank below

FOR NEW SUBS OR RENEWALS

NEW WORLD REVIEW
23 W. 26th Street, New York 10, N. Y.

I enclose $2.50 (Canadian $3.00, foreign $4.00) for a new subscription.....; for a renewal.....

Name .....

Address .....

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

BACK ISSUES

Copies of our special NOVEMBER issue with important articles by G. D. H. COLE, W. E. B. DU BOIS, HARRY F. WARD, D. N. PRITT

25c each — 5 for $1.00

Copies of our DECEMBER issue with the important article HUNGARY IN TRAVAIL and other material.

25c each — 5 for $1.00

Reprints

HUNGARY IN TRAVAIL

By JESSICA SMITH

10c each—6 for 50c—12 for $1.00

22 pages

LAND REFORM IN NEW CHINA

By D. N. PRITT

10c each—6 for 50c—12 for $1.00

22 pp.

BOUND VOLUMES

Of 1954-5 New World Review Indexed

$4.00 each

Indexes alone, 35c each

ORDER ALL THE ABOVE THROUGH

NEW WORLD REVIEW

23 West 26 Street, New York 10

THE SELECTED WORKS
of
LU HSUN
Founder of modern Chinese writing.
Translated and published in Peking.
Superbly bound in silk.
440 pp. $2.00 (including postage)
Send for listing of Chinese
and Russian books in English
Imported Publications & Products
4 West 16 St., New York 11, N. Y.

Soviet Artists on LP's
IVAN SKOBTSOV: 9 Russian folk songs
SVIATOSLAV RICHTER: Bach's D Minor Concerto
LEONID KOGAN: "Violin Encores"
DAVID OISTRAKH plays, from Albeniz to Zarycki
SEND FOR CATALOGUE
Order through
NEW WORLD REVIEW

NEW SOVIET FILMS
THE IMMORTAL GARRISON
BORIS GODUNOV
THE GADFLY
THE MEXICAN
PRIVATE IVAN
Watch for:
THE FORTY-FIRST
Artkino Pictures, Inc.
723 SEVENTH AVE., NEW YORK 19
Telephone: Circle 5-6570

PAMPHLETS ON THE USSR

HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE USSR
by Elizabeth Moos
32 pp., 25¢

EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM OF THE SOVIET UNION
by Elizabeth Moos
64 pp., illustrated. 25¢

WE SAW FOR OURSELVES
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¢

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