

✓ SOCIAL SCIENCES ✓

AUGUST, 1957

25¢

New World

LIBRARY
✓ REVIEW 1957

DETROIT

THE SOVIET CHANGES

JESSICA SMITH

Automation in the USSR

Dr. Samuel Lilley

Birth Control in China

Grace Liu

Tribute to Dr. Henry Sigerist

Julia Older

NEW WORLD REVIEW

AUGUST

1957

The Soviet Changes	Jessica Smith 3
Henry E. Sigerist—A Tribute	Julia Older 14
Peace Conference in Ceylon	Gordon Schaffer 19
Birth Control in China	Grace Liu 22
Automation in the USSR	Dr. Samuel Lilley 25
"Workers' Councils" in Hungary	Andrew Rothstein 33

BOOK REVIEWS

<i>The Truth About Hungary</i>	—Herbert Apetheker 35
<i>Automation and Social Progress</i>	—Dr. Samuel Lilley 37
<i>Soviet Pensions</i>	—N. Belyaev 38
<i>The Rosenbergs</i>	39

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

ESLANDA ROBESON
*Editorial Consultants on Negro and
Colonial Questions
and UN Correspondents*

Vol. 25, No. 8, August, 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., 34 West 15th Street, New York 11, N. Y. Indexed in Bulletin of the Public Affairs Information Service. Phone: CHelsea 3-0666.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

209

INCREASE NWR SUBS FOR LIBRARIES!

Generous reader response to our latest financial appeal has brought us within about \$1,000 of our Summer Survival Fund goal of \$10,000. We feel sure that we can count on you to make up the amount.

We suggest that the most constructive way to do this is to contribute to our Gift Library Sub fund, thereby both giving us the additional cash we need and increasing our number of readers.

We have a special library rate of \$1.25 a year for libraries who signify their desire for gift subscriptions. Since it is our practice to assign donor's subscriptions to specific libraries, we suggest that you send the names and addresses of any libraries to which you wish to donate subscriptions along with your contribution for this purpose.

Otherwise we shall assign the subscriptions to libraries on our list, and send the names to you for confirmation.

We feel sure you will want to take part in this project to help put New World Review in the hands of many more readers, and urge you to fill out the blank below and send it in with your contribution today.

PLEASE FILL OUT AND MAIL TODAY

NEW WORLD REVIEW

7th Floor,
34 West 15th Street, New York 11, N. Y.

I enclose..... for
gift subscriptions to libraries at the special rate of \$1.25 per year.

Name

Address

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

THE SOVIET CHANGES

by JESSICA SMITH

IS IT GOOD for peace? Is it good for the people? We believe that these are the two yardsticks that have to be applied in judging anything that happens in the world today, and that these are the main questions that must be answered in considering the recent changes in Communist Party and Government leadership in the Soviet Union.

We cannot provide all the answers that some of our readers expect of us. We cannot settle the doubts of those who fear that there were elements of a struggle for power in what happened, or of those who wonder why there was not wider public discussion of all the issues involved.

We can only present the facts available and try to see what answer they give to the two main questions posed above.

First, we must say that in all the barrage of anti-Soviet propaganda that has met this as every other event in the Soviet Union, it has been harder than ever before for enemies of the USSR to put what has happened in a negative light, to find in it anything that could serve to heighten international tensions and increase the war danger, to find any proof of a return to repressive methods of the past.

While official Washington welcomed the events as a sign of the "stresses and strains under which the Soviet system operates," Harry Schwartz of the *New York Times*

(July 7) saw in it a "demonstration of the stability of the Soviet state in the face of a profound political struggle." He said, "a major precedent has been set for the orderly resolution of political conflicts" and found the fact that Khrushchev took the issues to the people proof that "the country has come a long way since the death of Stalin."

On July 14, Mr. Schwartz wrote that today "instead of one man's whim dictating policy, the interests of different groups interact and clash"; that it was incorrect to assert that the Soviet people played no part in the fight—"On the contrary, the evidence suggests that the pressure of the people was very much on the minds of the actual contestants."

Walter Lippmann (*New York Herald Tribune*, July 9) said that in considering what the changes will mean in our relations with Russia, "We shall do best, I think, to regard the Khrushchev reforms as aimed at stabilization." "Almost surely," he said "the change makes it more than ever unlikely that the Soviet Union will undertake itself, or promote among its satellites, an overt military aggression." He saw the international effect as being the promotion of peaceful co-existence.

Let us look then at the actual issues that were victorious in the conflict, and see whether they are good for peace and good for the people.

The Policies That Won Out

• **On international questions,** strengthening of efforts to relax international tensions and strive for peaceful coexistence with countries of differing social systems.

New signposts in this direction were Nikolai Khrushchev's emphasis on the special importance of improved American-Soviet relations in his TV interview and recent Soviet initiatives in increasing cultural technical, and scientific exchanges with the U.S.; efforts toward normal relations with Japan stressed in Khrushchev's June 18 interview with a leading Japanese editor and recent trade negotiations, as well as continued efforts to strengthen relations with all Asian countries; current negotiations with representatives of the German Federal Republic.

• Unremitting efforts to achieve progress toward disarmament, prohibition of nuclear weapons and ending of A- and H-Bomb tests.

These have been demonstrated in the numerous concessions made to the Western point of view in the London negotiations and the expressed readiness to make further concessions on the question of the period of test suspensions and levels of armed forces.

• Consolidation of relations with all socialist countries on the basis of more flexibility, equality and recognition of special problems.

Publication in *Pravda* of June 19 of the Mao Tse-tung speech on "Correct Handling of Contradictions among the People" demonstrated a sympathetic attitude toward China's "hundred flowers" policy of freedom for contending views; the

visit of Bulganin and Khrushchev to Czechoslovakia strengthened the close ties with that country; new discussions with Yugoslavian leaders and economic negotiations show the determination to eliminate new tensions that had arisen.

• **In internal policies,** continued emphasis on improved production and better methods of management in industry and agriculture and special stress on higher living standards and more housing.

Confidence in the economic results of the decentralization and reorganization of industry already effected and new agricultural measures was illustrated by the decree to ease conditions for collective farmers by ending obligatory deliveries from individual plots.

• Pledges to further strengthen democracy, end bureaucracy and increase popular initiative in all spheres.

Steps in this direction were the extensive nationwide discussions that preceded the Supreme Soviet's decision on decentralization of industry which has already meant the dissolution of an immense bureaucratic apparatus, opening the way for a new rise of local initiative; new planning initiatives given to the collective farms; revitalization of the local Soviets; the immediate reporting of the Central Committee decisions to meetings of the people.

• Extension of the rights of the Union Republics, improvements in National policy and new conditions for cultural development.

Measures in this direction had already been taken in the decision of the Supreme Soviet last February giving additional authority to the

Union Republics through the right to set up their own legal codes, and reorganize their internal systems and greater economic autonomy.

The same Supreme Soviet session restored the national autonomy of the Balkar, Chechen, Ingush, Kalmyk and Karachai people, which had been unjustly abolished during the war on the ground of alleged collaboration with the Germans.

On the Jewish question, a beginning has been made in rehabilitation of those unjustly condemned and rectification of injustices during the period of repressions, and some steps have been taken toward the revival of Jewish cultural activities. But it is not yet clear how far this will go, and many questions raised by sincere well-wishers of the Soviet Union remain unanswered.

- Intensified corrections of violations of legality that occurred in the Stalin era and firm establishment of conditions that would preclude their recurrence.

The method of handling the present opposition group in contrast to those of the Stalin era, is in itself evidence of this determination.

This final point in our list of "winning policies" requires a little further expansion. Shocking as were the revelations of the excesses of the Stalin era, friends of the Soviet Union found comfort in the frankness with which they had been acknowledged, the position of the Soviet leadership that they represented distortions of Soviet development and not its normal course, and the determined measures of correction undertaken. These included rehabilitation of those who had been unjustly executed or imprisoned; sweeping amnesties since Stal-

in's death affecting more than 70 per cent of the prisoners, and the closing of two-thirds of the Siberian labor camps; reform of the legal apparatus and abandonment of the method of forced confessions; the curbing of the illegal powers of the security police; the announced preparation of a new legal code; increased democracy and fuller and freer discussions in all spheres of life.

Then came disturbing signs of a slowing up of this process, of clamping down on the new freedoms that had developed. These trends could in part be attributed to new tensions arising in international relations, the events in Poland, the tragic upheaval in Hungary. It now appears from the Central Committee Resolution, that the main block came from resistance within on the part of a group which opposed the new course charted by the Twentieth Congress and wished to continue the old ways. The defeat of this group gives ground for confidence that the course of correction and of insuring against recurrence of the mistakes and crimes of the past is an irreversible one.

There should be no illusions that this course will be straight and smooth. Such cataclysms as the Soviet Union has gone through both internationally and internally leave deep wounds that are long in healing, complex problems for which there is no simple solution, a heritage of human beings set in the mould of old ways who cannot readily adjust to new. Mistakes and aberrations must still be expected. As long as the arms race continues, the economic pressures of keeping up with it will inevitably create

grave difficulties in realizing the measures determined on for increasing living standards. As long as the danger of war exists, and with it the constant external efforts probing for weak spots and encouraging dissidence, there will inevitably be severe limitations on the full flower-

ing of Soviet socialist democracy.

It is our belief that whatever mistakes have been made by the Soviet Union in the past and may still be made, the issues that have been victorious in the recent Soviet events, point in a direction that is good for peace and good for the people.

The Central Committee Resolution

THE RESOLUTION of the plenary session of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union held June 22-29 charged that an "anti-Party group of Malenkov, Kaganovich and Molotov" had formed within the Presidium of the Central Committee. It declared that this group, seeking to change the Party's political line, used "anti-Party fractional methods" in an attempt to change the leadership that had been elected by the Central Committee.

The resolution said that this group, in fact, during the past three or four years had been opposing the course approved by the Twentieth Congress toward greater democracy and higher living standards, that:

The group attempted in effect to oppose the Leninist policy of peaceful co-existence between states with different social systems, of relaxing international tension and establishing friendly relations between the USSR and all the peoples of the world. They were against the extension of the rights of the Union Republics in the sphere of economic and cultural development and in the sphere of legislation and against enhancing the role of the local Soviets in the fulfillment of this task. Thereby, the anti-Party group resisted the Party's firm course toward the more rapid development of the economy and culture in the

national republics, a course insuring the further promotion of Leninist friendship between all the peoples of our country. Far from understanding the Party's measures aimed at combating bureaucracy and reducing the inflated state apparatus, the anti-Party group opposed them. On all these points it came out against the Leninist principle of democratic centralism* being implemented by the Party.

It said that the group had tried to block the reorganization of industrial management and its decentralization by setting up regional councils in economic areas, which had been approved by the whole people in countrywide discussions, and had continued their active opposition even after the enactment of this measure into law.

In agriculture the group had opposed the new system of planning giving more initiative to the collective farms, and measures to increase material incentives for collective farmers such as the abolition of compulsory deliveries of farm products from their individual

*The principle of "democratic centralism" includes the right of full and democratic inner-Party discussion on disputed issues, while imposing the obligation on all Party members to adhere to any decision once adopted by the majority.

plots; they carried on a struggle against the Party's appeal "to overtake the United States in the next few years in per capita output of milk, butter and meat." The resolution charged Molotov specifically with resisting the program to open up the virgin lands to cultivation.

All three members of the group, it said, had "put up stubborn resistance to measures being carried out by the whole Party and the whole people, in accordance with decisions of the Twentieth Congress," to do away with the consequences of the personality cult, to eliminate the violations of revolutionary law that had been committed, and provide such conditions as would preclude their recurrence.

In the sphere of foreign policy, the group, and "in particular Comrade Molotov," were declared to have hampered in every way "the implementation of new pressing measures intended to ease international tension and promote universal peace. "Molotov was charged with having opposed measures to improve relations between the USSR and Yugoslavia while he was Foreign Minister (for which he had been condemned at a Central Committee Plenary meeting in July, 1955), with attempting to block the treaty with Austria and the improvement of relations with that country, opposing normalization of relations with Japan, and denying the advisability of personal contacts between Soviet leaders and statesmen of other countries. Further, "He opposed the fundamental propositions worked out by the Party on the possibility of different ways of transition to socialism in different countries, on the necessity

of strengthening contacts between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and progressive parties abroad."

"On many of the above points," the resolution stated, "Comrade Molotov's opinion was supported by Comrade Kaganovich and in a number of cases by Comrade Malenkov."

The resolution indicated that there had been intense discussion on all these issues within the Central Committee; which had "patiently sought" to convince the group of the incorrectness of their views.

The attitude of the three was attributed to the fact that they were "sectarian and dogmatic" in both internal and foreign policy, that

... they were and still are shackled by old notions and methods, that they have drifted away from the life of the Party and the country, failed to see the new conditions, the new situation, take a conservative attitude, stubbornly cling to obsolete forms and methods of work. . . .

The resolution then charged that, having been rebuffed in their views in the Presidium, "Comrades Malenkov, Kaganovich and Molotov, as well as Comrade Shepilov, who joined them" had "resorted to methods of intrigue and formed a collusion against the Central Committee" and embarked on the path of factional struggle, through which they tried to change the policy of the Party, and tried to restore "the erroneous methods of leadership condemned by the 20th Congress."

The resolution continued that not a single member of the CC supported the group, and that faced with unanimous condemnation of

their activities and the demand for their removal from the Central Committee and their expulsion from the Party, "they admitted the existence of a collusion and the harmful nature of their anti-Party activities and committed themselves to complying with the Party decisions." The resolution then recorded the following decision:

1. To condemn as incompatible with the Leninist principles of our Party the fractionary activities of the anti-Party group of Malenkov, Kaganovich and Molotov and of Shepilov, who joined them.

2. To exclude Comrades Malenkov, Kaganovich and Molotov from the membership of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and from the Central Committee; to remove Comrade Shepilov from the post of Secretary of the Central Committee and to exclude him from the alternate membership of the Presidium of the Central Committee and from membership of the Central Committee.

The resolution was adopted on June 29, by unanimous vote with the exception of Molotov, who abstained. It was published in the Soviet press July 4.

Party and Government Changes

Simultaneously with the above resolution, the Central Committee of the Communist Party published the names of the Presidium it had elected at the plenary session:

Members of the Presidium: A. B. Aristov, N. I. Belyayev, L. I. Brezhnev, N. A. Bulganin, K. Y. Voroshilov, G. K. Zhukov, N. G. Ignatov, A. I. Kirichenko, F. R. Kozlov, O. V. Kuusinen, A. I. Mikoyan, M. A. Suslov, Y. A. Furtseva, N. S. Khrushchev and N. M. Shvernik.

Alternate Members of the Presidium: D. S. Korotchenko, J. E. Kalnberzin, N. A. Mukhitdinov, P. N. Pospelov, A. P. Kirilenko, A. N. Kosygin, K. T. Mazurov, V. P. Mzhavanadze, M. G. Pervukhin.

O. V. Kuusinen was elected as a Secretary of the Central Committee.

It will be seen that the number of full members of the Presidium was increased from eleven to fifteen, and that in addition to Malenkov, Kaganovich and Molotov, Maxim Z. Saburov was dropped and Mikhail G. Pervukhin demoted from a full to an alternate member. New members were Aristov, Belyayev, Ignatov and Kuusinen. Promoted from alternate member to full member were Brezhnev, Furtseva, Kozlov and Zhukov. Shepilov, as noted above, was dropped as an alternate member. New alternate members are Kosygin, Mazurov, Pospelov and Mzhavanadze.

Following the Party resolution, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet announced the removal of Molotov as First Deputy and Minister of State Control, Kaganovich as First Deputy Premier and Malenkov as Deputy Premier and Minister of Electric Power Stations (in the latter post Malenkov was replaced by Alexei Sergeyevich Pavlenko.) The next day it announced the removal of Pervukhin and Saburov as First Deputy Premiers. Kosygin was made a Deputy Premier.

No reason was given for the changed status of Pervukhin and Saburov, both of whom formerly held high posts in the planning apparatus. (As we go to press, it is announced that Pervukhin has been appointed Chairman of a new State Committee for Foreign Economic

Relations, equivalent to a Ministry, and replaced as Minister of Medium Machine Building Industry by Yefim Slavsky, former chief of the organization concerned with the peaceful uses of atomic energy.)

First Result of Resolution

Among the immediate concrete results for the people of the Party decisions was a decree cancelling all obligatory deliveries to the government at set prices of agricultural products from the individual plots of collective farm workers and others, issued July 5 by the Central Committee of the Communist Party and the USSR Council of Ministers.

The decree summed up recent agricultural successes that had made this step possible. Industrial production in 1957 has grown more than thirty fold over pre-revolutionary times, and almost four times over 1940, as a result of which it had been possible to supply agriculture with over 1,500,000 tractors, about 380,000 combines and millions of other agricultural machines. With most of the collective farms now having all-round economies, big successes had been achieved in socialized production, and collective farm incomes had almost doubled since 1953. The decree emphasized that the great potentialities of collective farming had developed particularly after the Party and the Government had taken measures to strengthen the collective farms with experienced leaders and specialists, to increase material incentives and productivity, to open up the virgin lands, to raise the prices paid by the government and to change the planning system so that the collective farms themselves

would have more initiative. As a result of all these measures, the decree continued, last fall's grain harvest had been the biggest ever gathered, and there had been a big increase in the number of cattle and their productivity. Thousands of collective and state farms had doubled, and a great many had tripled, their meat and milk production.

All this, concluded the decree, made it possible to cancel all procurements from the individual plots of collective farmers and all others having such plots as of January 1, 1958. The decree endorsed as entirely possible the movement to match per capita production of meat and milk with that of the United States within a few years.

What Preceded the Resolution?

We are not in a position to give any authoritative account of the events that led to the calling of the plenary session of the Central Committee and what there took place. The best we can do is to piece together, what seems to be the most reliable version, as far as it goes. The three sources we are using for this are a *United Press* report from Rome quoting a story by Giuseppe Boffa, Moscow correspondent of the Italian Communist paper, *L'Unita*, (*New York World Telegram*, July 8), a column by Stewart Alsop in the *New York Herald Tribune*, July 14, based on reports received in Washington, and a dispatch from Sam Russell, London *Daily Worker* correspondent in Moscow, published in the *N. Y. Daily Worker*, July 12.

First we would like to say on our own account that it has been clear for some time that there have been

divisions among the Soviet leaders on a number of questions of both internal and foreign policy and that sharp and serious discussions have been going on around these questions ever since the Twentieth Congress. For a long time correspondents of the conservative press and Washington Soviet "experts" have insisted that there was real collective leadership and that issues were being decided by majority vote. It is also known that many of the policies upheld in the Central Committee Resolution had been widely discussed by the people throughout the Soviet Union and had their approval. This was certainly true, for example, of the move to reorganize and decentralize industrial management and many of the agricultural measures.

Setting aside the speculative aspects of the Alsop column referred to above, on the basis of information received from such people as former U.S. Ambassadors Kennan and Bohlen, he refutes any idea that Malenkov, Kaganovich and Molotov were ousted as the result of an elaborately rigged plot, as some commentators had suggested, declaring that "all the evidence points in exactly the opposite direction"—in other words, that any plotting was on the part of these three—and that what happened came as a "genuine surprise" to Khrushchev. Alsop continued:

Bohlen repeatedly reported from Moscow that the "collective system" was real, that issues were heatedly debated in the Kremlin, and decided by majority vote. The Khrushchev faction maintained the upper hand simply because Khrushchev commanded a majority.

This, he said, was the situation when Khrushchev and Bulganin left

on their trip for Finland. What happened next we repeat from the Boffa and Russell stories, which give similar accounts of efforts of Malenkov, Kaganovich and Molotov to remove the present Party leadership. It seems that as soon as Khrushchev and Bulganin returned from Finland, the three demanded a special meeting of the Party Presidium to discuss who would speak at the Leningrad 250th anniversary celebration. The request was accepted, although it seemed "rather strange," since three important members were then absent from Moscow. As Khrushchev was about to take his usual place in the chair, the group insisted that someone else must preside, since what they really wanted to discuss was the question of removing him as First Secretary of the Party. Apparently a hot debate ensued during several days, while Malenkov, Kaganovich, Molotov and Shepilov carried on a strong attack against recent policies and urged drastic changes in Party and Government leadership, to be replaced by candidates of their own. The Khrushchev supporters insisted that under the Party Constitution this matter must be decided by the Central Committee as a whole, and not the Presidium alone. Meantime, the absent members of the Presidium returned to Moscow, and as news of what was going on reached Central Committee members in Moscow, a delegation of 18 or 20 of them arrived at the building where the meeting was held and demanded to be received. At their request, a full meeting of the Central Committee was called, where the opposition group hotly defended its views, with the results reported above.

Subsequent Developments

During the days following publication of the resolution, the Soviet press was filled with reports of thousands of meetings of Party groups and mass meetings of the people all over the country who endorsed the policies of the Central Committee and the expulsion of the group charged with opposing them. At some of the Party meetings the demand was raised for the expulsion of the group from the Party. In editorials in leading newspapers and in speeches of Party leaders addressing various meetings, graver accusations were made against members of the group than had been made in the resolution.

According to the *New York Post*, July 5, *Red Star*, official newspaper of the Soviet Defense Ministry headed by Marshal Zhukov, said that the four's factional activity had been aimed at "undermining the basis of the Soviet Union's defensive capacity, to shake the unity of the people and the army, which would have been of benefit to the enemies of our state," and spoke of the group's "treacherous activities."

Nikifor T. Kalchenko, Premier of the Ukrainian Republic, was reported to have charged Kaganovich with having leveled grave, unfounded accusations against leading Ukrainian executives and intellectual leaders, which would have caused great damage if he had not been removed as Party leader there in time.

In an editorial, *Izvestia* assailed Molotov for believing that war is inevitable under present world conditions, and charged that Malenkov and Kaganovich shared these dangerous views. It asserted that the

group also refused to accept the idea promulgated at the Twentieth Congress regarding the possibility of peaceful transition to socialism, and the avoidance of armed revolution and civil war.

The Speeches at Leningrad

The most serious charges were leveled by a number of the Party leaders in speeches made at the Elektrosila factory on July 6 in connection with the celebration of Leningrad's 250th anniversary. Here both Khrushchev and Shvernik accused Malenkov of having played the main organizing role in the "Leningrad case." (This was the 1949 case, subsequently found to have been falsified, when Nikolai A. Voznesensky, then principal state planner, Mikhail I. Rodionov, Premier of the RSFSR, Mayor Petr S. Popkov of Leningrad, A. A. Kuznetsov, Leningrad Party leader and a Secretary of the Central Committee, were executed for supposed treasonable activities. In December of 1954 it was announced that Abakumov, former assistant to Beria, executed the year before, had been tried with five associates for aiding Beria in the rigging of the case and exacting false confessions by "impermissible means" and that Abakumov and three others were condemned and executed.)

Khrushchev charged in his speech that it was the question of what leaders should attend the Leningrad anniversary that had been used as a pretext by Malenkov, Kaganovich and Molotov to take direct action against the collective leadership of the Party's Central Committee. The reason for this, he said, was "that all the members of this group were

especially responsible for those terrible mistakes and errors which took place in the past, and Malenkov, who was one of the main organizers of the so-called 'Leningrad case' was simply afraid to come here to you in Leningrad."

Premier Bulganin in his speech at the meeting, repeated the same ideas in more general terms. After charging that the three had opposed the political line of the Party, he said:

They also stubbornly opposed the measures which our party was carrying on in liquidating the consequences of the cult of personality, in eliminating the violations of revolutionary legality that had occurred at that time, and creating conditions which would exclude the possibility of their repetition in the future.

During his speech at the same meeting, Shvernik, after repeating the charge regarding Malenkov's role in the Leningrad case, referred to "breaches of revolutionary legality committed by Malenkov, Kaganovich and Molotov during the period of mass repressions," and said that in the process of rectifying these breaches the Party Control Commission had in 1957 examined "a great number of personal cases of former members of the Party, who had been rehabilitated by the judicial bodies," and that the majority of them had been reinstated in the Party. Shvernik said the group had held secret meetings, stationed its followers in Party organizations, intending "to seize power in the Party and the country" and wanted to force a return to the incorrect methods of Stalin's time.

Khrushchev emphasized particularly in his July 6 speech the ne-

cessity of better living standards for the people and of peace:

We want the Soviet people to have plenty of meat, butter, milk and fruit, we want the stores to have plenty of cheap and attractive materials and clothes, everything that makes the life of the people more beautiful.

He stated that through the better organization of industry the USSR could in the near future catch up with the United States in production per capita of industrial goods, as well as of meat, butter and milk, that while there were many problems it could be done, "depending on our ability to mobilize the activity and initiative of the masses," he declared:

The successes of the Soviet Union in the development of industry and agriculture, in the uninterrupted growth of the living standards of the Soviet people—that is stronger than any atomic or hydrogen bombs. That will be the great moral and political victory of socialism over the system of capitalism that has outlived its time.

He charged that Malenkov, Kaganovich and Molotov, "who had become separated from the life of the country, from the people" had actively opposed all important measures of the Party directed toward the improvement of the well-being of the people and that the three, and especially Molotov, had hindered in every way measures for easing international tensions and strengthening peace throughout the world, adding that the latter had been in favor "of tightening all the screws." He called Shepilov "a shameful double dealer."

On the question of peace, Khrushchev said:

We shall still more insistently strive for a weakening of tensions in relations between states, for establishing confidence among them, extending trade and cultural relations, eliminating all the obstacles that hinder the peoples from living together in peace and friendship.

The problem of disarmament, of prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons, is the most important international problem. Some imperialist powers, standing on the "positions of strength" policy, are continuing an unrestrained armaments race whose heavy burden is on the shoulders of the workers. . . .

The Soviet Union will not weaken its efforts to bring an end to the arms race, to reach mutual agreements on the question of prohibiting the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons, on all questions relating to disarmament. Our government has made proposals on all these questions that provide a sound basis for moving the question of disarmament, which agitates all humanity, off of dead center.

New Jobs for Opposition Group

Following the direct charges regarding Malenkov's responsibility in the Leningrad case, I. N. Turko, Vice Chairman of the Leningrad Planning Commission was quoted in the Leningrad *Pravda* as saying that Malenkov had tried to force him to sign a "notorious forgery."

The gravity of the charges and the sharpness of the attacks led to considerable speculation in the press here about the possibility of members of the group being brought to trial. However, after a few days Moscow correspondents reported that the sharpness of the campaign against the group seemed to be abating.

On July 10 the Moscow radio announced that Malenkov had been appointed head of the large hydroelectric station at Ust-Kamenogorsk

in Eastern Kazakhstan and that the other three had been assigned to new posts. The announcer declared that there was no basis for reports that members of the group were being persecuted. Later a Foreign Ministry spokesman in Moscow told foreign correspondents that negotiations were under way to give Molotov, Kaganovich and Shepilov new positions "according to their professional ability," and a representative of the State Committee for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries denied that the men would be tried on criminal charges or even dropped from the ranks of the party. In Prague, July 11, Leonid F. Ilyichev of the Foreign Ministry's Press Department, asked by a correspondent whether there would be further information about the "hostile attitude of the group, answered "They were anti-party, not hostile. There's a difference."

In subsequent speeches by Party leaders and Soviet press comments on these events, it is interesting to note that the importance of close ties with the people is constantly emphasized. In an article in the *New York Times*, July 11, William Jorden quoted *Pravda* as saying that the leaders who had been removed had been "incapable and unwilling to understand the needs and aspirations of the people's masses," and that it was isolation from the masses that had caused their downfall.

To the American people, the main importance of these events is their promise of intensified efforts for peace. To insure that our government's policies are good for peace, there must be ever stronger pressure to end nuclear weapons tests as the first step toward wider agreements.

HENRY E. SIGERIST

An Appreciation

by JULIA OLDER

It was a great and rare privilege to have known and been associated with Dr. Henry E. Sigerist. Over many years he was a faithful contributor to the pages of NWR's predecessor, Soviet Russia Today, writing detailed and informative articles on Soviet medicine as he saw it in practice, emphasizing always the necessity to humanity of sharing of the knowledge of all steps taken to increase its well-being. To his concern for interchange in his own special field was added his deep concern for mutual understanding of peoples in the interests of peace and human progress. He was a leading participant in the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship held in 1942, and chairman of its panel on Public Health and Wartime Medicine, thus contributing both to the establishment of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, which grew out of the Congress, and to the founding of the American-Soviet Medical Society and its publication, which grew out of the panel. He took a leading part in the formation of Russian War Relief, which played such an important role in cementing the wartime alliance of our country and the Soviet Union in the war against fascism.

*In these activities and others mentioned in the article below, Dr. Sigerist generously and unstintingly gave wise leadership and active participation in addition to carrying on his own professional activities. In working with him one always felt his extraordinary sensitivity and compassion, his gentleness and nobility, the moral and intellectual strength which have made his services to humanity immortal. We are privileged to publish the following appreciation of Dr. Sigerist's rich and many-sided life and work by Julia Older, who collaborated with him in his book *Medicine and Health in the Soviet Union*.*

JESSICA SMITH

HENRY ERNEST SIGERIST, who died recently in the little Swiss village to which he had retired a decade ago to complete a monumental study of world medicine, was generally regarded as the leading medical historian of this era. His greatness, recognized by the lay citizen of the world as well as by its medical and social scientists, was many-sided.

Sigerist the historian was remarkable not only for his creative scholarship in medicine but also for his

enlightened sociological approach to its study and practice. More than 400 items, many of them titles of important books, comprise the bibliography of his works. He wrote in several different languages, and in an engaging literary style free of pedantry—the true expression of the individual himself.

Sigerist the professor spent twenty-six years teaching and lecturing at great universities. Fifteen of those years found him in Baltimore—Professor and Director of the In-

stitute of the History of Medicine at Johns Hopkins University. Thousands of students there and elsewhere came under the influence of his stimulating ideas and captivating personality. Scholars everywhere are indebted to him, in the words of Dr. John F. Fulton, Sterling Professor of the History of Medicine at Yale University, for the "modern concept of humanism."

Sigerist the humanist did not hesitate to express, through both the spoken and written word, his conviction that medical care must ultimately become a public service, much as he witnessed it being provided in the USSR. He advocated the removal of present barriers between curative and preventive medicine.

Linked with his concept of medicine as a social service was Dr. Sigerist's abiding faith in people. "The people's health is the concern of the people themselves," he wrote. "They must struggle and plan for it. Physicians are merely experts whose advice is sought in drawing up plans and whose cooperation is needed in carrying them out. . . . The war against disease and for health cannot be fought by physicians alone. It is a people's war, in which the entire population must be mobilized permanently."

His desire to be of service to mankind turned Henry Sigerist as a young man from an academic career in philology to one in medicine. Born in Paris in 1891 of Swiss parents, he studied Oriental languages at University and Kings College, London, before obtaining his medical degree in 1917 from the University of Zurich. His love of languages, and extraordinary facility

in their use, remained with him throughout his life. He studied fourteen languages and made a point of consulting only original sources in his research activities. English scholars were reported to have envied him his command of the language and the phenomenal range of his English vocabulary. He maintained a regular correspondence with colleagues in all parts of the world in Chinese, Hebrew, Sanskrit, Greek and other languages. What he himself did for more than 50 years—devote at least half an hour each day to learning new words in some strange language—he often urged his students to do. Without knowledge of the language, he would say, one cannot understand a people.

It was logical for one who believed in medicine as a living social science to become involved in the struggle for economic and social progress. If Henry Sigerist had large audiences of students, physicians and various groups of intellectuals, he had still larger ones among consumer groups, labor organizations and societies deeply concerned with international affairs and the maintenance of peace. And this unassuming great scholar, who enjoyed the prestige of important academic titles, awards, offices in a dozen or more learned societies, three Doctorate degrees and numerous honorary degrees, was proud to be known, too, as a member of the Medical Advisory Committee of a labor union's Health Institute—that of the United Automobile workers, CIO.

It also followed in the pattern of the man that his evaluation of social forces compelled him to speak

out in defense of convictions which were at least unpopular and, in certain instances, highly controversial. As Henry Sigerist once said of himself, he was not the "ivory-tower type of scholar."

In 1947, in responding to the tributes of colleagues and former students at a farewell dinner in New York shortly before his return to Europe, Henry Sigerist reviewed significant activities of his past and revealed his plans for the new period of history-writing on which he was about to embark. Among the subjects referred to was his interest in Soviet medicine, which he called "perhaps the most controversial and most misunderstood aspect of my work, one that is very dear to me." No medical historian could be expected to be also a practitioner of medicine, in Dr. Sigerist's opinion, but he had an obligation to keep in touch with medical developments as best he could. This he himself did in the field in which he was particularly interested—that is, social medicine—and where the acquisition of historical knowledge would be most helpful.

"Whenever I had a chance, I enjoyed doing field work in a number of European countries, in South Africa, Canada, India, all over the United States," he continued. "And how could I have overlooked the Soviet Union, the country which was not talking about but practicing social medicine on one-sixth of the inhabited earth? The studies I made during three summers in the USSR were perhaps the most inspiring of my whole career. Without the war, I would have returned to that country every two or three years. I frankly admit that I was deeply im-

pressed by all I saw, by the honest endeavor of an entire nation to bring health services to all the people irrespective of race, color, creed, sex, income, irrespective of whether the people lived in town or country. What we were talking about in America, the Russians were practicing as a matter of course. . . . All of us who really know Soviet medicine will continue studying it, no matter whether this is a popular venture or not, because we are convinced that the Soviet system of medical care is one that makes use of the present technology of medicine and brings the greatest number of services to the largest number of people."

When Dr. Sigerist decided, in 1932, that he must undertake a survey of Soviet medicine, he prepared for the task in his customarily thorough manner. No information was to be obtained second-hand, no translations to be relied on. He devoted three years to a study of the Russian language and also to the literature, not only on medicine in the USSR, but also on its history, institutions, social and economic structure. During the three extended field trips which followed, the organization and functioning of the Soviet system of medical care were investigated in Moscow and throughout the Ukraine, the Caucasus and Armenia. He was gathering knowledge and material for a book which is now regarded as a major contribution to the literature of medicine. (First published in 1937, it was brought up to date and reissued in 1947 under the title, *Medicine and Health in the Soviet Union*).

Convinced that American and

Soviet medical organizations and centers of medical research in each country could communicate much of significant value to the other, Dr. Sigerist gave leadership and inspiration to the founding of the American-Soviet Medical Society and to the launching of the *American Review of Soviet Medicine*, of which he served as consulting editor, in 1943. This at a time when, because of the pressures of war, he actually was carrying the burden of three jobs and an assortment of voluntary assignments, and was also continuing his writing late at night. During those arduous war years, he travelled frequently between Baltimore and New York to attend meetings, to select articles from available Russian publications, and to assist in the many other time-consuming tasks associated with the publication of the *Review*, such as translating, abstracting and editing articles or preparing book reviews. Until its suspension in 1948, the journal constituted a bridge between American and Soviet medical workers.

In 1944, the government of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation of Saskatchewan, Canada, invited him to conduct a health survey of the province and recommend a medical care program. His final report, still cited as an outstanding example of planning for organized rural medical services, has been consulted with the organization of similar services in the United States. Later that same year he was one of two Americans invited by the government of India to serve on the committee which carried out a health survey in that country.

During those years when his fame

as an advocate of socialized medicine was spreading, Henry Sigerist was also enhancing his stature as a scholar. Yale University invited him to deliver the Terry Foundation Lectures; from the series came the volume *Medicine and Human Welfare* in 1941. The Messenger Lectures which he delivered at Cornell were published in 1943 in the book *Civilization and Disease*. His remarkable series of essays on the social and economic factors which brought on two world wars in a generation appeared in 1946 in the volume entitled, *The University at the Crossroads*. The program it outlines for a new type of medical school that would train physicians as social servants as well as technologists aroused considerable general comment, as did his assessment of the failures of our civilization.

"We cannot spend years destroying material and cultural values," wrote Henry Sigerist, "and then expect the world to be normal. . . . We cannot industrialize the world and expect to live as our ancestors did, and we cannot spread education and expect the colonial and semi-colonial peoples to accept political or economic servitude without rebellion. I foresee a better world with more love, more beauty, more justice, more happiness and a better sense of values."

The strains and stresses brought on by the war increased the gravity of a cardiovascular condition, and impelled Dr. Sigerist to resign his post at Johns Hopkins in 1947. However, this was not to be the prelude to the life of retirement and well-earned leisure. He returned to Switzerland, the country in which his family had lived for 400 years,

to concentrate at last on his most ambitious literary undertaking—a definitive history of world medicine, long-postponed because of other pressures. Yale University considered this project important enough to tender him an appointment as Research Associate, attached to the Historical Library of its School of Medicine but free to work wherever he wished.

He established himself in the picturesque hamlet of Pura, Ticino, on the Swiss slopes of the Italian Alps. In a cottage surrounded by vineyards, he devoted himself to what he had long regarded as his "ultimate goal" as a scholar—the preparation of a global study of the mutual interactions of medicine and society through 5,000 years of time—a new pattern in medical historiography.

Although Dr. Sigerist was fifty-six years old—six years behind his schedule—and handicapped physically when he began applying himself uninterruptedly to this work, he hoped that peace and quiet and especially time, which he called the scholar's greatest treasure, would be granted him to complete it. The first volume, an introduction to the entire work and a study of primitive and archaic medicine, was published by the Oxford University Press in 1951, and has since been reprinted.

During 1955 Henry Sigerist suffered a serious attack of cerebral embolism; as a result, he became

partially paralyzed and lost the faculty of speech. Undaunted, he actually learned how to speak once again with the aid of a speech trainer and made what he said was a "pretty good" recovery.

In February of this year, in a letter to an American friend, he reported that all that was left of this illness was "a certain rigidity in leg and arm." In cheerful vein he continued, "I am still working although at a slower pace. . . . I hope to complete the second volume of my *History of Medicine* in the course of the year. In the last ten years I have produced three books and about forty essays."

Less than a month later he suffered a second stroke. He died in his home on March 17, 1957.

Henry Sigerist regarded the physician as a natural ambassador of good will, and the historian as a man who utilizes historical knowledge to help people understand the world in which they live and to help in creating an atmosphere of confidence. That was the spirit in which he lived out his richly productive life.

He knew that he would not live to enjoy the better world which he expected to develop from the present historical process. Nevertheless, he took great satisfaction in the knowledge that he had helped to prepare it, and was leaving former students behind him to carry on the Sigerist tradition of social service through medicine.

HUNGARIAN ATHLETES RETURN

TWO OF HUNGARY'S outstanding athletes have recently returned: Sandor Iharos, the middle-distance runner, who left Hungary last October, and Laszlo Magyar, the backstroke swimming champion, who remained abroad after the Olympic games and lived for a while in the United States. They both expressed great happiness in being able to return.

Peace Conference in Ceylon

by GORDON SCHAFFER

Almost totally unnoticed by our press, 402 representatives of the World Peace Council from 70 countries met in Colombo, Ceylon, June 10 to 16. We are fortunate to have an account of the deliberations of this meeting by Gordon Schaffer, Chairman of the British Peace Committee and well-known journalist who frequently contributes to New World Review.

WE HAVE grown accustomed at meetings of the World Council of Peace to the colorful mixture of East and West—the multi-colored robes of India, the magnificent costumes of Africa, the traditional dresses of priests from many lands and various religious communities. We have created a unity in the cause of peace between races and continents, never previously achieved in human history. But until the world conference in Ceylon, most of us instinctively concentrated on Western problems and looked more to the West than the East for solutions. Perhaps it was because our drab Western clothes have always been in the majority. Here the bright orange robes and shaven heads of Buddhist priests are less out of keeping than my Strand cut suit.

Here we see Asia, Africa, South America in action to a greater degree than ever before. In these lands live the majority of the human race. They are poor. Some have at last after long struggles achieved national freedom. Others are still oppressed by colonial overlords. Many

are threatened by the new colonialism serving the financial and economic interests mainly set in Washington. These people are demanding independence as part of the struggle for peace. With bitter, unrelenting determination, they are resisting any policies which would draw them into the military alliances of the Western powers.

After the conference I had an hour's talk with Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike, Prime Minister of Ceylon, who welcomed the conference in an official message and both in the country itself and through his consultants abroad gave the delegates every possible assistance. He told me how firmly the people of his country are resisting every attempt to draw them into the SEATO alliance and he expressed the hope that after the British Government fulfills its pledge to evacuate the naval and air bases in the island this autumn, the friendship between our two countries will deepen. He explained that a barter deal exchanging rice for rubber between China and Ceylon had saved the situation when Ceylon could not get rice elsewhere. Trade agreements, he said, have been concluded with the Soviet Union, Hungary, Poland and Czechoslovakia, but Ceylon values just as highly the assistance from the Commonwealth under the Colombo plan and it is anxious to extend its trade with the United States.

"That," he said, "is Pancha Shila—the five principles of co-existence in action. We are the friends of all and the enemies of none. We seek friendship, trade, cultural exchanges with all countries. But we are not going to sell our souls to anyone for any help from anywhere. Never, never, will we go back to colonial rule."

Again and again at the conference, the Asian spokesmen returned to Pancha Shila. Those principles first concluded between Nehru of India and Chou En-lai of China and later endorsed by the Bandung Conference are the contribution of the peoples of Asia to the cause of peace. Already they command the allegiance of hundreds of millions. The Colombo meeting of the World Council of Peace proclaimed them as the guiding principle for all humanity.

One of the tasks of the peace movement after Colombo will be to place this movement for colonial liberation not so much into the perspective of international affairs as into the framework of the peace movement. As M. D'Astier de la Vigerie, a vice president of the Council, stressed: "The continuance of colonialism, the development of new doctrines leading to the imposition of political, economic and military tutelage, carry within themselves the seeds of war. We must proclaim this fact and put the people on guard, but we must never forget that we are the partisans of peace. On the questions of independence and the right of peoples to decide their own destiny, we must search for solutions through peaceful negotiations."

That is the task after Colombo

and I set on record as matter of plain fact that the peoples of Asia, of the Arab world and South America are looking to China and the Soviet Union for leadership simply because they equate their hatred of colonial exploitation with the Western powers. The propaganda in these Western countries which stresses that standards in the socialist countries are still much below Western levels, simply has no effect against the terrifying poverty of the colonial and former colonial countries. Every move by the West to suppress movements of liberation or to increase the areas of white domination and race hatred widens the gap. Every sincere effort to help these countries by economic assistance based on the principles of equality strengthens peace.

One felt here, more perhaps than at any previous conference, the strength of those pacifist and religious sections of the peace movement which have so much in common with the principles of non-violence to which hundreds of millions in India and other Asian countries owe allegiance. It was a matter of great sorrow to many of us that we have not yet secured unanimity in the world movement on support for the conscientious objection to military service on which so many of them base their faith.

The outstanding feature of the Colombo conference was the breadth of the representation. From India, Ceylon, Indonesia came delegations which could just as well represent their countries at the United Nations. From Japan, which a few years ago actually prevented anyone leaving the country to attend a peace conference, came lead-

ers able to speak for the whole nation. Men and women of the greatest eminence in science, literature and other fields were sent by many of the seventy countries. The socialist countries showed by the caliber of their delegations how firmly they support the world peace movement.

Claude Bourdet, the courageous French Liberal who was a welcome visitor, made the criticism that what he called the "political balance of world forces" was not represented and he also emphasized how much the question of Hungary is in Western minds. He pressed the Council to regard its function as conciliation rather than propaganda. He advocated action to secure disengagement between East and West in Europe, the Middle East and Asia and expressed the view that policies on these lines would go far to make possible united action between such forces as the British Labor Party and the West German Socialists. I am sure he is right in stressing the value of a common effort with the Western socialist movements, but I think we shall realize increasingly that the political balance of world forces is now in the hands of the alliance between the countries demanding coexistence in the Bandung group, the socialist countries and the lands of the Arab world and South America who are repudiating the tutelage of the West.

It is in that light that the final conclusions of the Colombo confer-

ence should be read, for they represent an agreement to which most of the human race subscribe. The appeal for an end to the nuclear weapons tests represents the greatest area of unanimity in the history of the human race and any power will ignore it at the risk of earning the hatred of mankind. The appeal to the Secretary of the United Nations to speed the disarmament talks was a recognition of the wide belief that the basis for agreement exists. Again any power which sabotages the chance of agreement will incur a heavy responsibility.

The long declaration on world problems, centered around the appeal for an end to the division of the world into opposing blocs and military pacts and support for the struggles of a large part of mankind still denied national independence, expresses a pattern of opinion that cannot be denied.

We saw at Colombo the immense strength of the world movement for peace, but we also realized that the dangers are still terribly near. The dangers are terribly near because there are forces in the world ready to use the threat of atomic war because they fear this changing balance of power in the world. Our task after Colombo is to use the inspiration of these immense forces of peace to create in our own country and in the other countries in the West so broad a front in favor of peaceful solutions that no government and no leaders can deny them.

FROM ELEANOR ROOSEVELT'S COLUMN

I WOULD BE INTERESTED to go to Communist China to talk with the people in power. I especially would like to see Madame Sun Yat-sen, for whom I always have had a great deal of respect." *N. Y. Post, June 6.*

Birth Control in China

by GRACE LIU

NOT LONG AGO I was congratulating one of my students on the birth of his fifth child. He was pleased and happy, because he is a person who really loves and enjoys children; and there was a rueful look on his face when he said, "But I think this must be the last one, although we are still pretty young. Five children make a big problem when both parents are working." He and his wife are just under thirty and she has a full time job. "My mother looks after the two eldest, one in the first grade and one in kindergarten. The other two are in the nursery from Monday until Saturday."

"I used to argue against birth control," he went on, "but I see now that it's really being irresponsible to have children without thought or plan and then have to turn them over to the nursery to care for."

Many young working couples of my acquaintance have come to this same conclusion in spite of the strong traditional opposition to birth control in China. And recently the government has taken up this question of planned parenthood in great earnestness.

GRACE LIU is an American who lives in China with her three children. She teaches English and has frequently contributed articles to New World Review.

The National Committee of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Council at its annual meeting in Peking this March discussed how to correct various errors and mistaken policies and how to solve some of the important questions facing the country. One of the questions being tackled is that of controlling the increase in the population. As the people's livelihood becomes better and better, more people are able to marry and conditions are more favorable for having children, so that China's population is increasing by about 15,000,000 a year.

In a survey of some textile mills in Shanghai, among 609 pregnant women, 17 per cent were pregnant twice within one year, 53 per cent each year and 22 per cent twice in three years. In one mill having 7,000 male and female workers, the women workers had had 7,000 children in seven years.

In the old days most children did not have a chance to live. Another of my students told me that before liberation, in his native province of Kiangsi, out of every nine children born, only two lived. But now with raised hygienic standards, better mother and child care, better food and better living conditions all round, most children live.

This is now creating problems. One of them is that such a big and constant increase in population

makes all the more difficult the task of improving the welfare of the people while engaging in great industrial construction. Considering today's realities, that China is still a backward country in so many respects, it is necessary to keep this burden of an extremely large population from becoming any bigger.

How to care for the working mother's children when there are too many, and the effect of too close and too many pregnancies on the health of mothers, are also problems that cause concern. The authorities have been doing some birth control work since 1954 and this has begun to show results, for last year Peking's birth rate was 37 per thousand compared to 43 per thousand in 1954.

But this new effort is something very much bigger. A nation-wide campaign is being launched to teach the population the advantages of properly spaced childbirths and to overcome the age-old opposition to birth control, which is still strong especially in the countryside among the peasants.

To begin with, public opinion is being energetically aroused against the teen-age marriages that have been the custom in China for so many centuries. Newspaper editorials and magazine articles, quoting doctors and statistics, are discouraging these early marriages; and although the legal age is eighteen, are urgently advising girls to wait until they are twenty-four or five and men until they are around thirty. These later marriages between mature adults, they claim, tend to be more stable and satisfying and more apt to yield happier homes and stronger children. So far, in my city environment, I see nothing

but approval for this attack on the old ways; but there is and will be tough opposition in the countryside from the older generation who demand more grand-children now that the economic conditions are favorable for producing more!

Extensive propaganda for the practice of contraception has been started. A birth control exhibition which opened in the Chung Shan Park in Peking on March 8, was visited by 4500 Peking citizens the first day. The processes of conception and the methods of contraception are explained in charts on display; and charts and models set forth the advantages of properly spaced child-births. Qualified persons give advice; and booklets are distributed.

A spokesman for the Ministry of Public Health announced that such exhibitions are now being held in many parts of the country, along with discussions and lectures to spread the knowledge of contraception. Sixty birth control clinics have been set up in Peking, not counting those attached to factories and mines and in the country the peasant women are being taught by personnel from the rural maternal and child care centers.

Li Teh-chuan, Minister of Health, when she spoke in the People's Political Consultative Council meeting, said that from now on maximum efforts must be made to improve the supply and lower the price of contraceptives. Speaking in the same meeting Li Chien-sheng, deputy director of the Peking Health Bureau said that the birth control clinics must teach the men as well as the women. In other speeches also, it was emphasized that far too much

responsibility for birth control was put on the women—husband and wife must share the responsibility.

Induced abortion and sterilization have also been discussed as methods to hold the population in check. Nineteen doctors made a joint statement to the CPPCC in which they expressed strong opposition to abortion unless medically necessary. They opposed the random use of sterilization, but had no objection to its use where both husband and wife were in agreement after mature consideration. Their statement supported control of conception and said that in standing for planned families they were taking into consideration the health of the mothers

and of future generations, family happiness and the fact that birth control was one of the inalienable rights of the people.

"This is great!" an American-educated friend said to me the other day. "To have this tremendous problem taken firmly in hand, with determination to get it solved, will mean so much not only to the progress of the country, but to the health and happiness of the people. When I was young there was no place to turn for any intelligent advice on the subject. It was wicked and disgraceful even to think of limiting one's family, and my wife died far too early because the babies came too fast."

ROCKWELL KENT HONORED IN MOSCOW

THE SEVENTY-FIFTH birthday of Rockwell Kent, newly elected Chairman of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, was celebrated in Moscow on June 19 at a meeting arranged by the USSR Society for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries.

The meeting hall was decorated with reproductions of many of Mr. Kent's paintings and leading Soviet artists were represented on the platform.

Konstantin Yuon, Chairman of the Board of the Union of Soviet Artists, in his opening address expressed regret that Kent had been prevented by the State Department in carrying out his intention of coming to Moscow to celebrate his birthday among his Soviet friends. "In his 75 years," Yuon said, "Rockwell Kent has traversed a long and fruitful path as an artist and writer. Throughout his life he has adhered consistently to realistic principles in his art. . . . He searches for great and profound universality in art, and as a result his works are distinguished by their monumentality and significance both in concept and execution. His interest in the desires and aspirations of all peoples on earth has made him one of the most prominent participants in the present-day struggle for peace."

Professor Andrei Chegodayev lectured on Kent's life and work accompanying his lectures by slides of Kent's pictures and drawings of Greenland and Alaska and his illustrations for Voltaire's *Candide*, Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*, Goethe's *Faust*, Walt Whitman's *Leaves of Grass* and Pushkin's *Gavriiliada*.

An exhibition of Kent's paintings and drawings will open in the Soviet Union early this fall.

Automation in the USSR

by DR. SAMUEL LILLEY

Dr. S. Lilley, British authority on automation whose book *Automation and Social Progress* is reviewed on p. 37, here summarizes a series of articles on Soviet engineering that ran last winter in the British technical journal, *Metalworking Production*. We are reprinting Dr. Lilley's summary of the articles because they give compelling evidence of the results of the planned technical and scientific education in the Soviet Union described in two recent issues of *New World Review*: "Soviet Technical Education" by J. G. Crowther, March, 1957; "Science in the USSR", by J. D. Bernal, April, 1957.

SINCE THE beginning of November last the technical journal *Metalworking Production*, has been running a series of articles on the Soviet machine tool and metalworking industries. Reading them has been an exciting experience. The authors, Norman Stubbs and Peter Trippe (Editor and Associate Editor, respectively), spent between them many weeks in the USSR in the autumn and winter of 1956 gathering firsthand information. They are technical journalists well equipped to report on the subject.

To begin with they have the following to say about the development of automation in the USSR:

Soviet preoccupation with automation can, of course, be traced back to historical necessity; it is a natural development in building up a powerful industrial potential, starting from a population which was almost wholly unskilled technically to begin with. Such conditions,

we believe, make first, mechanization; secondly, automation in various forms; and finally, highly complex integrated lines, an entirely inevitable development. The trend has been consistent and has grown progressively from the early days of the Soviet's industrial programs right up to the present time; forced by an inescapable necessity to deskill the work and put all the skill into the machine. This policy has clearly been an indispensable factor in attaining the level of industrial output now apparent.

Automation is simply one more aspect of a fundamental principle which has been energetically pursued ever since the Soviet came into being. Throughout the history of the USSR, it has been emphasized that the development of heavy industry is a prerequisite for raising the country's production forces and for transforming it into an economically powerful state. To quote Marshal Bulganin in his report to the 20th Congress: "As hitherto, the leading rôle in the development of the Socialist economy will be played by industry—primarily by heavy industry, the production of means of production." The latter phrase: *The production of the means of production*, might well be taken as a slogan for the present Five-Year Plan—and, indeed, for those that preceded it. It is certainly evident in the figures for the Plan itself. As far as implementation is concerned, it is also evident in the organizations, not only in factories themselves, but in the remarkable bodies set up for research and development in machine tools, cutting tools, instruments and so on, of which we shall say more later. At this stage it is sufficient to say that, in our experience, these organizations are on a fantastic scale and are quite unlike anything we know in this coun-

try. It is also, of course, evident in the technological training program.

The Soviet machine tool industry is less than twenty-five years old. Indeed one can more seriously date it from about 1940, for until then it did little more than produce a few models that were fairly close copies of Western lines. Yet it can now bear comparison with that of any other country. It is well ahead in some respects. In others, as the authors are not afraid to point out, it is still quite a bit behind—their jig-borers are “immature, and one would expect that they have some way to go before equaling the best in the West”; in the field of gauging “they have not yet reached our standards.”

No Secrets

The authors went to Russia well prepared to find that a combination of bureaucracy and **secrecy** would prevent them from seeing the really important things. They did have a little trouble with bureaucracy, though only on minor points. But secrecy never stood in their way. Mr. Trippe, who did most of the detailed surveys, “was given complete freedom. He saw all the plants he set out to see, and he took his camera. He brought back over 200 photographs taken inside Soviet machine-tool plants.”

When he visited the Moscow automatic ball-bearing factory, which he described as “the most advanced production unit of its kind in the world,” he “was given the complete run of the factory, allowed to see everything I wanted to see, to use my camera without restriction, and shoot any questions I wanted at the

Director, the Chief Designer and others responsible for the line. It is doubtful whether any journalist ever had equivalent facilities before.” And he tells us that he “can think of no comparable case where it would have been open to inspection, freely and openly to a foreign visitor without reservation as to what photographs he took.”

The point he has in mind here is not military secrecy, but the fact that any private concern which had only recently set up such an advanced unit would certainly be trying to keep the know-how out of the hands of its rivals. One of the things that struck the authors most was the complete absence of such competitive secrecy—“We were, in fact, shown development work in progress . . . which would certainly be under lock and key in this country, but which we were allowed to photograph in detail, and which were fully described to us.”

Science Fiction Factory

The Moscow ball-bearing factory is the nearest approach that anybody has yet achieved to the automatic factory of science fiction. It makes both ball- and roller-bearings. Completely automatically it does all the machining processes on the races and subjects them to a complicated heat treatment (including deep freeze, a very advanced technique). Then—still automatically—it assembles the races together with balls and cages (which come from other shops) to make the complete bearings, subjects these to anti-corrosion treatment, wraps them in paraffin paper, packs them in boxes (which it makes itself out of card-

board), seals them and labels them. It does automatically all the inspection processes necessary to ensure that the work is up to standard, so that, as Mr. Trippe puts it, "no human intervention is required from the receipt of the rough tube or blanks from which the rings are made, at the beginning of the line, to the despatch of wrapped and labelled cartons" at the end.

It turns out 900,000 ball-bearings and 600,000 roller-bearings a year. The total staff is 178 people divided between two shifts, and this figure includes everybody from Director down to cleaner. Compared with previous processes at the same establishment (which were already highly automated, though not so completely automatic) it cuts labor requirements to half. The authors were not prepared to accept these figures without checking, but their investigations "have clearly indicated that, if anything, the figures quoted are on the modest side, and that the scheduled production figures for the lines can in fact be exceeded without difficulty."

The plant is flexible in the sense that it can accommodate work up to 15 per cent larger or smaller than that for which it was specifically designed, only re-setting time being involved in the change-over.

Soviet automation has already gone through two phases and is now entering a third. The emphasis at first was on the now familiar transfer machine. A little later they were building highly specialized lines like that at the ball-bearing factory. But the latest development—"what really took our eye"—is "the beginnings of a potential range of general-purpose type machines, as

it were, which would be readily adaptable for inter-linking by automatic handling gear to form a 'flexible' automatic machining unit." They are creating, as it were, a set of standard pieces that can be built up to make almost any automatic line in the way that one builds up a model railway from standard parts; already, say our authors:

They have come very close to this latest manifestation in practice, with an original line for machining armature shafts, and assembling and balancing the rotor. In this line, individual automatic production machines, including lathes and centerless grinders, are linked by automation units. In short, it seems fair to say that automation in Russia, today, is generally more broadly based than in the West. In some respects it is further advanced. In others it is behind, and notably so in those promising numerical controls of the punched card or tape type. Even so, development of those devices, too, is undoubtedly in train—and they could come quickly.

Mass-Produced Machine Tools

There was something that I think Mr. Stubbs and Mr. Trippe found even more exciting than Soviet automation. And that was the manufacture of machine tools on a mass-production basis, on a conveyor belt system. This is in essence the mass-production technique of the car industry applied to machine tool manufacture with its far higher demands on accuracy. They describe, for example, the line at the Krasny Proletarii works in Moscow, which turns out small universal lathes at the rate of 12,000 a year—4 per hour!—using only about 1,000 workers for the job.

Then there is the plant just starting work at Riazan, also conveyor-

ized, making 2,000 medium screw-cutting lathes a year. The real significance of these figures appears when we remember that total British production of center lathes of all types was 14,047 in 1951—just 47 more than the output of two Russian lines. And the Soviet output is based on one-shift production at that, and with the lines working well inside their capacity. Incidentally the savings obtainable by these highly rationalized production methods are enormous. The Krasny Proletarii lathe costs less than half the equivalent American model.

Mr. Stubbs and Mr. Trippe continually express their admiration for these achievements (while not omitting to criticize inadequacies where they found them). But what completely took their breath away was the speed at which these new plants have been constructed. The automatic ball-bearing factory took six months to design and another eighteen months to build the special machinery, install it and get into production. The Krasny Proletarii lathe line took only eighteen months, including the designing. The Director of the latter plant put the point dramatically: "The last time he wanted a British machine—quite a straightforward one—he was quoted three years delivery. In the time he would have had to wait for this single machine, he has had time to design a high-production line, build the machines, tool-up and get into production—and turn out 18,000."

What's the secret? There isn't one. "All this," say our authors, "is being done by methods with which we are thoroughly familiar, and which we could apply if we wanted

to. There is no world-startling technical secret behind it—simply foresight, drive, good production planning, organization, and engineering. And cooperation." Similarly they say of the ballbearing factory that "there is nothing in this line we don't know about here—it has been done by application of well-known principles. . . . It is primarily a tribute to brilliant production planning and engineering."

A system of planned priorities plays an important part in making possible these feats of rapid design and construction. There is no frittering away of resources in doing a little here and there. Many factories are far from being up-to-date—Mr. Trippe describes a Leningrad plant for making gauges where there is a good deal of line shafting (dating from 1932) and many almost obsolete machines. Factories like this are doing the best job they can in adverse circumstances, and waiting their turn for modernization.

Masses of Technologists

But when that turn comes, enormous facilities are placed at their disposal—and that is one of the reasons why the completely modernized factory, up-to-the-minute in every detail, goes from drawing board to production in two years or less. Take the matter of technical staff, for example. Most of these plants are themselves very amply provided—the Ordzhonikidze machine tool factory has 400 designers and draughtsmen; Krasny Proletarii had 300 engineers at work designing their new lathe line. But in addition to this, when a big job is on hand, they call on the services of

a number of centralized research and development agencies which have large specialist staffs. So that when the automatic ball-bearing factory was planned, some 2,000 or 3,000 designers were involved.

One of the most important of these centralized agencies is E.N.I.M.S. (The Experimental Research Institute for Metal-cutting Machines) in Moscow. It has a staff of more than a thousand scientific workers; and these are backed up by another thousand or so non-scientific workers in the Stankokonstrukt-sia plant, a development works directly associated with the institute. Yet this organization deals only with metal-cutting machines. Other similar institutes deal with such matters as the cutting tools, or abrasives, or metal-forming techniques; and these, between them, employ another 2,500 to 3,000 workers. The availability of such masses of technologists and technicians goes a long way towards explaining how the new lines can be built and set to work so quickly.

But experts do not grow on trees. And behind all this lies the story of the enormous Soviet effort in education. With secondary education to the age of seventeen already compulsory in the cities and soon to be universal, with nearly two million students in higher educational institutions, with 6,500,000 specialists (with higher or specialized secondary education) already at work and another 4 million to be added to them by 1960, the USSR is far better provided with technical manpower than any other country.

After describing in detail one of the higher technical institutes—the Machine Tool Institute in Moscow,

with its 3,000 students, Mr. Trippe writes:

We expected to see something unusual, but we were completely unprepared for what we actually found when we got there. For here again is something well outside any scale with which we are familiar; and yet again, we realized how it was that Soviet engineers could talk in terms of astronomical production figures and rates of expansion as if there was nothing extraordinary about them . . . we felt that they had conditioned themselves to achieving programs which, to us, would seem impossible, but which to them were perfectly normal.

And all this is apart from the extensive facilities which most factories lay on to enable their own workers to improve their qualifications. One Moscow factory employing 4,000 workers has more than forty full-time teachers in its own technical school, which is attended by 700 of the employees—nearly a fifth of the total!—as part-time or evening students.

Standardization

The availability of engineers and designers partly explains the speed with which new production lines can be got into action. But of course the machines have to be built as well as designed. Often they are quite new designs and highly specialized designs, and yet the hundreds of machines required to set up a modern production line are produced and delivered within a few months of the receipt of the blue-prints. The "secret" here is partly good planning, partly enthusiasm, and to a large extent standardization. The building of the special machines for a job like

the automatic ball-bearing factory described earlier, is spread over a large number of machine-building plants.

Without a great deal of standardization, it would be impossible to ensure that the products of these various factories would (as it were) fit together—and so the only possibility would be to rely on one or a very few machine-builders and put up with the delays resulting from their limited capacities. Standardization allows many firms to cooperate in producing the equipment for a complete new factory in a few months. Needless to say, it also lightens the designer's job.

But it does not (as we are often told) limit variety. On the contrary it encourages it—largely because it allows the building of a large variety of machines comparatively cheaply out of unit heads and standard components, with only a minimum of components specially designed for the job.

Standardization is the basis, in an even more obvious way, for the new drive towards providing a set of units which can be built into flexible automated lines (as described above).

The two authors of these articles believe that this will be the main form of automation of the future — for the "tailor-made" transfer line is too expensive and too inflexible for very general use. But this raises problems. "Notably, it calls for a degree of standardization from makers which, on the face of it, might appear to be contrary to their own immediate interests. This problem does not exist in the USSR. There is no private enterprise there:

Does this therefore imply that we in the West are at a disadvantage? Certainly not. But we must surely accept it as a challenge. It is not enough to believe in free enterprise. We must also prove that it works. While we are arguing the pros and cons, and carrying out a multiplicity of developments along parallel lines to produce a multiplicity of non-standard units, Soviet development engineers are busily turning out the type of standardized machines which may well give them ascendancy over the West in the production engineering techniques of the immediate future. What is being achieved there can surely be achieved here. Private enterprise, to survive, must show, by voluntary cooperation between makers themselves as well as between users, no less than between makers and users, that it can achieve a unity of purpose of its own free will which is at least equal to that obtained by the state-controlled methods of the USSR.

This last quotation will make it clear that Mr. Stubbs and Mr. Trippe are far from being Socialists who see Soviet engineering through rose-tinted spectacles. They believe in free enterprise. But they differ from a good many other believers in that their belief does not prevent them from describing fully and frankly what they saw and heard.

Pride in Work and Competitive Spirit

One result is that they report as observed facts, with little comment, a great many points about the relation between man and machine, which others may or may not (according to their outlook) care to interpret in more political terms. Here is an example of how a different attitude to work makes it possible to treat a production problem in a quite different way. On

the Krasny Proletarii lathe-building line, apart from a final test:

We saw very little evidence of inspection, and this observation applies to every plant we visited. It seems certain that detailed inspection after each operation, as we know it, does not exist, and one never sees inspectors as such. It seems likely that far more responsibility for inspection is left to the man on the machine than here, and our personal opinion was that provided the man was qualified to make the inspections required, it could be done with complete safety. Without exception, every operator we talked to throughout the Soviet has a sense of *personal* pride in, and responsibility to, the work he was doing and a strong sense of responsibility both to his colleagues and to his plant as a whole.

Incidentally, the authors did take the trouble to check up with users and found that, even with a minimum of inspection, the machines produced are fully satisfactory and accurate. Mr. Trippe continues:

It is necessary to emphasize also the competitive spirit that exists, because we believe it accounts to a great extent for the achievement of sustained outputs on levels such as that at Krasny Proletarii. This is something which is quite apart from any political aspect, or any indoctrination which they may have received. It is simply that each man has identified himself with his work and with the plant he works for. . . .

There is also the strongest competitive element between plants making similar products. . . . Every shop has its target on a board or poster on the wall. And both that target and their output in relation to a 'rival' works, are followed in the same way as they would follow their local football team. It has been said that you can go into almost any factory in British industrial cities on a Monday morning and tell whether the local football team has won or lost by the atmosphere on the shop floor; you could tell in the same way if these Soviet plants had exceeded their targets or fall-

en short, and whether or not they were keeping pace with their rivals.

This is not to suggest that they work at a fever pitch; they don't give the impression of working as hard as we do here. But the indisputable fact remains that the work gets done. We do not intend to try and analyze why this is so; our purpose in this survey is simply to observe and report what we found. As a purely objective statement, we must therefore say that the attitude to work which we found in the Soviet was completely contrary to what we had expected. There was no evidence of fevered working because they were afraid of the consequences otherwise; neither do we believe that, any more than the average man in this country, they are thinking in terms of political idealism. But they believe that they are on to something big as an industrial nation—and that they are part of it. . . . Discontented individuals there may be—there always are. But anyone who believes that there are millions of discontented workers, only waiting for the opportunity to escape from their unfortunate lot, are living in a fool's paradise.

The Soviet has found the key to the production of capital equipment on an unprecedented scale, and every single man in every single shop is behind it. The same spirit does not exist here. We realize that these are probably unpopular words, and that they may rebound on us personally, but we make them without apology, because, without a similar spirit here, we do not believe there is the vaguest chance of competing with the Soviet in terms of industrial production. It is a challenge to management and labor that must be met.

Belief in Automation

This enthusiasm for technical progress is something that Mr. Stubbs and Mr. Trippe found to be well-nigh universal. They report that:

Far from trying to inhibit the development of automation by restrictive practices or other means, quite as much

of the driving force towards modern techniques comes from the plant workers themselves and their trade unions as from management and higher organizations. One sees evidence everywhere of their belief in automation, belief that it will improve their positions rather than jeopardize them, and provide the key to a better future.

The authors do not attempt to say *why* the attitude of Soviet workers to automation should be so very different from what one commonly finds here. And this is not the place to introduce my own opinions (I have discussed the matter in my book, *Automation and Social Progress*.) But it is worth mentioning one point that may be relevant. In the ball-bearing factory, it was pointed out, the automation of some processes does not contribute to increasing productivity or lowering costs; but the processes have been automated nevertheless because this improves working conditions. "We were given the example of visual inspection of finish. This is a tiresome job which, they found, caused a certain amount of eyestrain. In the present line it has been replaced by pneumatic-electrical automatic gauging."

Trade Embargo Loss to West

The Russians, we are told more than once in these articles, were so keen to talk technology (asking as

many questions about British industry as they answered about their own) that they had no inclination to talk politics. There was one big exception—the embargo which, on alleged strategic grounds, prevents us from selling to the USSR an enormous number of machine tools (and other things) that they are anxious to buy. Mr. Stubbs and Mr. Trippe report that: "Many of those interviewed spoke strongly about the embargo. There is no doubt that the embargo is a major thorn in the Soviet's side. All our contacts were friendly enough, and our reception everywhere was most cordial, but they made it perfectly plain that they regarded the embargo as an affront."

If the embargo continues, it will be a serious nuisance to the Russians—they will have to wait longer for some types of machines; in other cases they will have to make by rather costly methods what could be more cheaply imported. But ultimately they can do the job themselves if they have to. In a word—Mr. Stubbs and Mr. Trippe do not say this, but I think it is clearly implied in what they tell us—we shall suffer more from the loss of markets than the USSR will suffer from the loss of supplies.

Reprinted from May and June issues of British-Soviet Friendship, 36 Spencer Street, London, E. C. 1.

NEW ATOMIC POWER STATION IN THE USSR

IN THE USSR three years ago the world's first atomic electric station, with a capacity of 5,000 kilowatts, went into operation. A new atomic electric station is now under construction, its first section, having a capacity of 420,000 kilowatts, is expected to produce current for industry in 1960.

This is the first of a series of atomic electric stations at present under construction under the atoms-for-peace plan. The station will be incorporated into the unified power grid of the European part of the USSR.

"Workers' Councils" In Hungary

by ANDREW ROTHSTEIN

In a series of articles published earlier this year in the British Labour Monthly, Andrew Rothstein described the role of Workers' Councils and similar forms of organization through which the workers carried on economic and political struggles in a number of countries after the first world war. Due to the considerable confusion as to the composition and role of the "Workers' Councils" in the Hungarian events of 1956, we believe our readers will be interested in the following excerpts from a postscript to this series of articles which was published in the Labour Monthly for May, 1957, in which Mr. Rothstein throws considerable light on this subject. Andrew Rothstein is a British economist and writer, and editor of the Anglo-Soviet Journal.

IN HUNGARY, in October, 1956, the factories, mines and railways, the banks, foreign trade and the bulk of home trade were public property, and capitalists and great landlords had been abolished as classes: although many individuals making up these classes continued to live in Hungary, they had taken employment as wage earners. Only 15 per cent of the land, however, was publicly owned: the rest was the private property of the peasants, among whom the biggest estates (including those of the Catholic Church) had been divided. The trade unions had great power, and thousands of former workers held public office in every sphere.

Thus, although Hungarian economy and society were not yet socialist—since private property in 85 per cent of the land still existed, and this meant the continuance of petty capitalism (Kulaks) in the countryside, petty traders, petty workshops, etc.—the working class was the ruling class in Hungary, in a position gradually to remold the whole of economy and society on socialist lines. Consequently there could be no question of a class revolt of the workers being necessary to change the system of society in Hungary. Any change in that system could only be to *weaken* the rule of the workers—the only class consistently interested in socialism—and correspondingly *strengthen* the position of

the classes interested in a return to capitalism.

While every kind of peaceful mass pressure upon the old leadership of the Hungarian Workers' Party and the Government was fully justified, in order to eliminate those responsible for the gross errors of policy, involving many crimes, over a number of years past, the essential thing was not to allow it to develop into an armed conflict, still more into the destruction of the armed forces on which safety of the Hungarian People's Republic (like every other form of State) depended. For within the country there were thousands of former active supporters of the Horthy regime—officers of the old army, members of the Horthy police and gendarmerie, businessmen and former landowners, members of the numerous Fascist organizations (Arrow Cross, Nilasist, and many others)—who, far from being "liquidated," had taken employment under the new regime (even in the army) and could be relied upon to take full advantage of such a collapse of the state power. From 1919 to 1944 the people had been soaked in nationalist propaganda still far from obliterated. Outside the country, there were powerful imperialist forces, headed by United States subversive agencies, known to be in touch with the internal enemies.

The main responsibility for preventing mass discontent developing into physical violence (and thus giving these enemies their chance) lay upon the Hungarian Workers' Party as the political leadership of the working class. Events proved, however, that it had utterly lost any capacity to act in that way. Its internal cohesion, the authority of its leaders, had completely disappeared. It fell to pieces directly the mass discontent showed itself. As a consequence, that section of the workers who took part in the demonstrations had no political leadership—and it immediately fell into the hands of organized counter-revolutionary elements who, though relatively small in number, had as it proved been preparing for months past (many came in from abroad), had a well worked out plan of "shock" operations against key positions, and were assured of long-prepared support from within the army. Moreover they could appeal with confidence to the dispossessed elements already mentioned to follow their lead. Thus the *disintegration* of the political and military bulwarks of the Workers' State gave a chance to political and military forces aiming at a different state—one of restored capitalism (the broad program of which was drawn by Cardinal Mindszenty in his notorious broadcast of November 3). It should be noted that the vast mass of the peasantry, as well as a large section of the workers, took no active part.

This situation found its precise reflection in the "Workers' Councils" formed in factories during the October events. In a number of cases these consisted of much the same people as the previously existing factory and works committees—the basic trade union bodies—with the elimination of many full time workers who had become bureaucratic or apathetic to the workers' needs. But in many cases the counter-revolutionaries took advantage of the confusion in the minds of the workers—the absence of a firm and politically active workers' party—to set up "Workers' Councils" which were a travesty of the title. The general pattern was one of armed gangs raiding the factories and forcing on the bewildered workers "Councils" consisting of former Horthyites, often employees until then in the factory concerned.

Thus at Ganz Engineering Works, Buda-

pest, employing 3,700 workers, 250 were present at a snap meeting convened at the height of the lynching terror in the streets, and forced to elect a "Workers' Council" (including a former factory-owner and several ex-Fascists) under the eyes of four Tommy-gunners in threatening attitudes. At the housing equipment works, a similar meeting of 60 workers elected a "Workers' Council" which included a doctor who had served three years in jail for embezzling public funds, a former factory owner, a former officer in the Horthy army, and a baron who had owned 2,800 acres. A number of similar "Workers' Councils" came into being during the days of terror at other Budapest factories. At the "First of May" Clothing factory the chairman was a former large shareholder. At the 11th district Bus Garage the chairman was a former major in the Horthy Army. At the Central Bus and Trolley Depot the "Council" included two well-known former Nazis who threatened the workers with lynching if they resumed work. At the Heating Equipment factory the former owner became chairman of the "Workers' Council." At the Klement Gottwald works leadership of the "Workers' Council" was in the hands of the son of the chief editor of the Nilasist (ultra-Fascist) paper *Uj Magyarorszag* under Horthy, a former S.S. man and a member of Horthy's former personal bodyguard. At the "Fourth of April" Factory the chairman was a former landowner and the vice chairman a former Nilas member. At a large mechanized bakery the chairman was formerly one of Horthy's Under-Ministers. At the Ball-Bearings works one of the most active members was a former capitalist. This picture of active fascists and former exploiters becoming leaders of "Workers' Councils" could be extended. It also applied in other industrial centers of Hungary.

Moreover the same methods were used to set up local "revolutionary committees" or territorial "Workers' Councils." Thus at Ujpest half the members were common criminals released from jails by the armed counter-revolutionaries. At Szeped the vice-chairman had been a major in Horthy's army. In the Mar district the vice-chairman was a man with 17 convictions for ordinary (non-political) crimes, the secretary had spent a total of 11 years

in jail for similar offenses, two members had been captains in Horthy's army and four had been gendarmes under Horthy.

To sum up: 1) the "Workers' Councils" in Hungary did not represent a proletarian mass movement for the conquest of power; 2) they reflected in fact the exploitation by counter-revolutionaries of the mass movement of discontent against the old government and Party leadership; 3) set up as they were on the basis of "Workers' Councils against Communists," they naturally fell into the hands and under the leadership of representatives of the dispossessed classes and the old regime; 4) they were closer in type to the counter-revolutionary "Soviets without Communists" experienced in Russia—at Baku and Murmansk in 1918, and above all at

Kronstadt in 1921—than to any other body with a similar name during the last forty years; 5) like those cases, their success would have opened the way, not to a "more democratic road to socialism," but to direct intervention by "sympathetic" foreign imperialism and the full restoration of the capitalist system.

Reorganized and re-elected on a genuine delegate basis as factory organizations, and with the reconstituted Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party (now over 250,000 strong) increasingly winning back the confidence of the working class, the Workers' Councils may yet as advisory bodies play an important part in repairing the damage done last autumn, and in opening a new period of economic advance in socialist Hungary, but it is too early to be positive.

Light on Hungary

A review by JESSICA SMITH

THE TRUTH ABOUT HUNGARY, by Herbert Aptheker, *Mainstream Publishers*, New York, 1957. 256 pages. Cloth \$3.00; Paper \$2.00.

THE PUBLICATION of this book is an important event, especially in view of the new effort to stir up anti-Soviet hysteria through the publication of a one-sided report on Hungary by a Committee of the United Nations (which remains silent on the bloody French repression of the Algerian independence movement.) Dr. Aptheker's book, representing a massive amount of research and carefully documented from a multitude of conservative and non-Communist sources, is a powerful antidote to the poisonous UN report.

Dr. Aptheker reviews Hungary's historical background, stressing the fascist-dictatorial political form adopted after World War I and maintained, following the suppression of the short-lived Bela Kun government, for twenty-five years. He describes the extreme chauvinism of its ruling circles; the dominant and reactionary role of the Catholic Church; the feudal land system; the weakness of the trade unions; the rampant, legalized anti-Semitism; the subservience of the Social

Democratic Party to the Horthy dictatorship, which continued even during the latter's war alliance with Hitler; the extent to which Nazism infected large sections of the population and the resultant limited nature of the resistance movement during the war.

The author then traces the steps, following the liberation of Hungary from Hitler by the Red Army, that led to the formation of the Hungarian People's Republic in 1949. One might wish at this point some consideration as to whether Hungary's fascist background should not have made advisable a slower pace in the building of socialism than was then undertaken. Yet, at the time, many non-Communist participants quoted by Dr. Aptheker conceded the great importance of the role of the Hungarian Workers' (Communist) Party in pushing through the Land Reform Act when others held back, of their initiative in the nationalization of basic industries, secularization of the schools and other urgent reforms. The book contains a detailed account of the subsequent course of internal developments, the mistakes and crimes of Hungary's leaders and later efforts, too little and too late, at rectification. It covers both

positive and negative aspects of Hungarian-Soviet relations, and gives a detailed account of the origins and course of the October uprising and the events that followed.

In a particularly important section on "Counter-Revolution and the Cold War," Dr. Aptheker adduces a mass of evidence from official sources and numerous public and newspaper reports, "establishing the fact that the United States has, in fact, been practicing a policy to damage or overthrow, by counter-revolutionary violence, the Socialist Governments," and that special attention was given to Hungary in these efforts. He shows that the destruction of socialism was the implicit purpose of the cold war as launched by President Truman, and its announced purpose when "liberation" became official government policy under the Republican administration. He traces the implementation of this policy through the 1950 Lodge Act providing for the recruitment of an anti-Communist "Foreign Legion" to be trained on U.S. soil, the 1951 Mutual Security Act under which \$100,000,000 a year is allocated for the promotion of subversion in the Soviet Union and Eastern European Countries, and the well known activities of the Central Intelligence Agency in this direction. He gives a wealth of data on the activities of various anti-Communist groups with American backing both in this country and Europe, the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe and so on, and on American support to various reactionary Hungarian emigre groups plotting to return to power.

One does not necessarily have to believe that all these forces conspired together to bring about the specific events of October 23 which began, as Dr. Aptheker makes clear, as part of a legitimate protest movement. But no fairminded person could read the record of U.S. policies without concluding that they played a very large role in preparing the ground as well as the active reactionary forces for the transformation of justified protest into an actual counter-revolutionary uprising. When one adds to this the unbridled terror against all Communists that followed, the coming to fore of the clerical-fascists as the Nagy government lost all control, the mobilization of the fascist scum of Europe to support the insurgents, the calls

for military intervention by the West at the risk of a new world war, then the question of what would have been the alternative to the use of Soviet troops must be squarely faced. Dr. Aptheker states that alternative in these words: "At the least, a full scale civil war in Hungary (a Korea in the middle of Europe), at the worst, the ultimate catastrophe to mankind, a Third World War."

To be fully cognizant of the role of the Western "liberators" and internal reactionary forces both in preparing for and taking advantage of the tragic events in Hungary, is to absolve neither the Hungarian Communist leaders nor the Soviet Government of the errors which made it possible for such a counter-revolutionary situation to develop. Dr. Aptheker sums up these errors as follows:

"1) A failure to properly evaluate the national feelings of the Hungarian people; 2) a persistence in a badly one-sided economic policy resulting in a halt to the improvement of the material conditions of the masses, and for certain periods a decline in such conditions which never, at any time, had exceeded rather limited standards; 3) an insistence on monolithic unity in all spheres of life, enforced with terrible rigidity, deteriorating into crass administrative bullying and intolerable violations of legality, humanity, and sheer decency; 4) a failure to preserve the revolutionary clan and purity of the Marxist-Leninist Party."

The question of how such distortions of socialism could have taken place, remains beclouded. For this the author is not to blame. Such an analysis must await fuller information than is yet available about interrelated events of the Stalin era in both the Soviet Union and Hungary.

Dr. Aptheker pulls no punches on the sources of popular discontent in Hungary. He emphasizes that "without the mistakes and crimes of those building socialism" the tragic events in Hungary of October-November, 1956, would never have occurred." Yet, while considering these mistakes and crimes decisive in the actual outburst of the upheaval, his final conclusion is that "the fundamental sources of the upheaval were in the machinations and pressures of imperialism."

The present reviewer would put the two sources in more even balance. With full

recognition that imperialism by its very nature must seek to destroy socialism, and of the magnitude of its efforts to accomplish this, there remains the responsibility of the leaders of a socialist state to create such a solid foundation in the support of its people through fuller democracy, fuller satisfaction of their needs, and devotion to the high moral and humanist principles that must characterize a true socialist society, that a situation so suited to imperialism's purposes as that which developed in Hungary, would be impossible.

Believers in socialism and participants in socialist societies thus have the double responsibility of making the kind of searching re-evaluation and correction of

past policies which would prevent recurrence in any socialist society existing or to come of the conditions out of which the Hungarian events arose, and of intensifying their efforts to bring about an end to the cold war which the imperialists are using for their destructive purposes.

Among the requirements listed by Dr. Aptheker to achieve this are the right to dissent and protection of the full legal rights of each citizen in a socialist society, extension of democracy, dedication to humaneness, improved living conditions. His book is an indispensable arsenal of the facts needed to understand the Hungarian situation and the lessons to be drawn from it. It should be widely read.

The Promise of Automation

A review by MURRAY YOUNG

AUTOMATION AND SOCIAL PROGRESS, by S. Lilley. *International Publishers*. New York. 1957. 224 pages. \$3.75.

THIS BOOK should not be dismissed as a study for specialists only. It does have a couple of rather demanding technical chapters, but these are admirably clear if read with attention, and they do provide the solid groundwork for the real subject: the implications of automation for mankind's future.

Dr. Lilley sees automation as the logical development of man's control of the world about him. And since automation is the product of the highest rationalization of technical processes it requires for its fullest realization a fully-planned, rational society. Thus in the Soviet Union automation has been eagerly welcomed, great strides have already been made in its use, and bold plans have been laid for its future extension. On the other hand, both in the U.S.A. and Great Britain where automation has begun to penetrate the production system at a variety of levels, there is much hesitation to face the obvious developments that must follow. This hesitation on the part of management is paralleled by fear and reluctance on the part of the trade unions—with the exception of the United Automobile Work-

ers whose foresight and energetic educational and trade union program on the whole problem of automation Dr. Lilley singles out for high praise.

Short of socialism Dr. Lilley sees little possibility of the utilization of automation to bring about those unprecedented changes in our productive system that would free man at last to live a truly creative life. Among the chief obstacles to a bold and rational application of automation under capitalism Dr. Lilley lists: a) unwillingness to train the large number of highly skilled experts needed to operate a fully automated industry; b) unwillingness to build up markets in the backward areas of the world; c) unwillingness to spend the capital necessary to rebuild industry along the lines of automation; d) fear of the consequence of what both management and labor see as "inevitable unemployment."

Dr. Lilley summarizes the whole position of capitalism in relation to automation as follows: "There is no ultimate escape from the fact that capitalism, well though it worked in its time, is not a suitable economic structure for making beneficial use of the advanced techniques of today and the even more advanced techniques of tomorrow."

Turning in his final brief chapter to

what would be the future of a socialist Britain, starting on its present high level of industrial development, the author broadly sketches in what he believes would be the development:

"By the end of this century, we should be in the era of the fully automatic factory. . . . Assuming, as I think we have a right to assume, that parallel changes in working conditions take place in agriculture, transport and other spheres, there would be nothing left of mere manual labor or unskilled work or repetitive work. Every one of us would be doing a job that allowed him to use to the full all the skills of hand and brain with which he is endowed. . . . A man's powers will not be exhausted by his few hours in the factory; indeed, they will be stimulated by the type of work he does there. And so he will want to use his ample leisure creatively—writing or painting, taking part in scientific research, or studying local history, playing double bass in the factory orchestra, or trying to understand the philosophy of Aristotle or perhaps simply helping to make life more lovely with spade and hoe in the garden or by carving the woodwork in the Town Hall. From the revival of old crafts that have been almost killed by the primitive industrialism of the last two hundred years to the highest realms of scholarship, there will be opportunities of creative activity suitable for every type and degree of talent.

"Worker, thinker and creative artist would have become one. The division between manual and mental labor, which came into being with the beginning of civilization and class-divisions five thousand years earlier, would be again broken down.

"What heights would be open to humanity in these conditions! And these are not idle dreams or hopelessly distant prospects. A way of living something like that which has just been described could be reached within two or three generations from the moment that we set out to use automation and nuclear energy and all the other new powers that science provides constructively and co-operatively for the benefit of the people as a whole."

Dr. Lilley's knowledge of Soviet industry and his comprehensive grasp of capitalist production gives this first Marxist

study of automation special authority. The distinguished British scientist J. D. Bernal has described the period through which we are now living as a scientific revolution as important and probably more decisive than the industrial revolution. Dr. Lilley's book makes a real contribution in spelling out for us the potentials of this new revolution.

SOVIET PENSION LAWS

SOVIET PENSIONS, by N. Belyaev. *Soviet News*. London. 1957. 15 cents.

THIS pamphlet contains the full text of the new Soviet pension law passed in 1956. It also has a most useful explanatory introduction that gives some indication of the development of social security laws in the Soviet Union, describes the special features of Soviet pensions, and explains the reasons for the new laws of 1956.

Touching briefly on the pre-revolutionary past in which pensions were confined to tsarist officials and the court aristocracy, the introduction outlines the development of pensions and social security after the October revolution. The first social insurance decrees were passed in the months immediately following the revolution, and in the following years many changes and improvements, corresponding to the improvements in Soviet life, were made in the laws. In 1956 the new law, recognizing the great changes that had taken place in recent years, was proclaimed after very careful nationwide discussions.

The introduction points out the special features of the Soviet pensions laws: without exception all workers are covered; individuals do not themselves make any payments to the insurance fund, contributions come from enterprises and institutions; all forms of maintenance through social insurance begins the first day of work; all cases of incapacity are covered—illness, injury, old age, invalidism, pregnancy and after-childbirth. A further aspect of social insurance, apart from monetary benefits and pensions, is the provision of vacation homes, sanatoriums and rest homes for workers either free of charge or at reduced rates.

The introduction also explains why the new pensions are in every case higher than formerly—now generally from 50 to 100 per cent of the individual's former wages; why women are subject to special provisions as well as those who do hazardous work; how new provisions in the law take care of the cases of family maintenance when the breadwinner is lost; how pensions work for collective farmers.

Other aspects of Soviet social security are described such as those laws concerned with making it possible for the physically incapacitated to lead a useful life, and the generous, thoughtful provisions for the invalids and the aged.

Within its brief space this pamphlet provides one of the clearest possible indexes to the present advancing level of the material conditions of life in the Soviet Union, and at the same time makes clear to all how a socialist society cherishes the lives of its citizens.

POEMS

FOR THE ROSENBERGS

THE ROSENBERGS—Poems of the United States, edited by Martha Millet. Sierra Press. New York. 1957. \$3.00.

THIS is a collection of poems in memory of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg by Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois, Michael Gold, Walter Lowenfels and others. Written for the most part under the immediate shock of that grim June evening four years ago when the Rosenbergs were put to death, these poems reflect the agony and despair felt in the hearts of millions of people throughout the world. At the same time in many of the poems there is also sounded a note of exultation before the grandeur of the Rosenbergs' courage.

The Rosenbergs have already been the inspiration for an increasing number of plays, musical compositions, paintings and poems in many countries and the list will continue to grow as the dimension of their heroism becomes even more clearly understood in the perspectives of history.

This book should be in the possession of all those for whom the Rosenberg's sacrifice has become an inseparable part of the inspiring record of mankind's nobility and greatness.

U. S. S. R.

Your Questions Answered

A New Pamphlet of 40 Pages

Published June 1

QUESTIONS (50) on important aspects of Soviet society: government, national and family economy, industry, agriculture, science, engineering, education and culture.

ANSWERED with reliable, up-to-date information.

Single Copy 20c; 10 at 15c each;
20 or more 12½c each.

Published by

National Council

American-Soviet Friendship

114 East 32nd St.—New York 16

For Subscriptions

NEW WORLD REVIEW

34 West 15th St., 7th fl., New York 10

I enclose \$2.50 (Canadian \$3.00, foreign \$4.00) for a

- ☐ new subscription
☐ renewal

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

THE LAMONT CASE

History of a Congressional
Investigation

Edited with commentary by

PHILLIP WITTENBERG

Introduction by

HORACE M. KALLEN

**\$5.00 AT YOUR BOOKSELL-
ERS OR FROM**

HORIZON PRESS

Dept. NW,
220 West 42nd Street,
New York 36, N. Y.

NEW SOVIET FILMS

THE FORTY-FIRST

THE IMMORTAL GARRISON

BORIS GODUNOV

THE GADFLY

THE MEXICAN

Artkino Pictures, Inc.

723 SEVENTH AVE., NEW YORK 19

Telephone: Circle 5-6570

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

7th Floor
34 West 15th Street, New York 11