

SOCIAL SCIENCES

FEBRUARY, 1958

25¢

PUBLIC LIBRARY

New World 1958
DETROIT
REVIEW

USA - USSR

**LIVING STANDARDS AND SCIENCE
THE TWO EDUCATION SYSTEMS
CULTURAL EXCHANGES**

**New Soviet Peace Proposals
Changes in Soviet Labor Laws**

**China's Water Power
Resources**

**David Alfaro Siqueiros
On New Forms In Art**

NEW WORLD REVIEW

FEBRUARY 1958

Living Standards and Science
Ed Sears 3

Gala Night In Moscow
Helen and Scott Nearing 6

China's Water Power Resources
Cheng Chan-li 9

Siqueiros on New Forms In Art
Ralph Parker 13

Antonin Zapotocky, Statesman,
Trade Unionist, Man of Letters
Eleanor Wheeler 17

"Russia Since 1917"
William A. Williams 20

The Ordeal of Soviet Russia
Corliss Lamont 23

Recent Changes In Soviet Labor
Law Dr. A. K. R. Kiralfy 27

New Soviet Peace Proposals 31

Two Education Systems:
USA - USSR
Radio Discussion: New York-
Moscow 33

MUSIC AND BALLET
Gilels, Kogan, Shostakovich,
Ulanova 36

BOOKS
The Right to Travel
Corliss Lamont 38

On "Not By Bread Alone"
A letter from Holland Roberts 39

JESSICA SMITH, Editor
MURRAY YOUNG, Managing Editor

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

Vol. 26, No. 2, February, 1958. 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 N.W.R. Publications,
Inc., 34 West 15th Street, New York 11,
N. Y. Indexed in Bulletin of the Public Af-
fairs Information Service. Phone: CHelsea
3-0666.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

209

LIBRARY SUBSCRIPTIONS

From your letters it is clear that
you do not think enough people read
our magazine. We heartily agree. In-
deed we are confident that we have
potential readers throughout the coun-
try.

You can help us reach these readers
by making a contribution to our gift
library subscription fund.

We have a special library rate of
\$1.25 a year for libraries who signify
their desire for gift subscriptions.
It is our custom to assign donor's sub-
scriptions to specific libraries, therefore
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 pur-
pose. Otherwise we shall assign the
subscriptions to libraries on our list,
and send the names to you for con-
firmation.

Help us to reach the many readers
we know are to be found throughout
the country in these momentous days
by filling out the blank below and
sending 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 _____

Living Standards And Science

by ED SEARS

SPEAKING before the recent convention of the National Association of Manufacturers, Vice President Nixon laid the groundwork for what appears to be a carefully worked out campaign designed to convince the American people to accept a lower standard of living in order to meet the challenge of Soviet science.

"The standard of living of the average Russian," Mr. Nixon states, "not only has not kept pace with the rate of improvement in the free world but actually is little better today than it was forty years ago."

Mr. Nixon went on to make the further assertion that the Soviet government was able to marshal the resources necessary to launch a satellite only by forcibly depriving the Soviet people of consumer goods. The American people, he implied, must be prepared to make similar sacrifices.

Without discussing the questionable logic of Mr. Nixon's thesis—that a lower standard of living is somehow a prerequisite for scientific achievement—it is worth noting that this thesis is based on a false assumption; namely, that the standard of living of the Soviet people has not risen in the last 40 years. This as-

sumption has been recently challenged by no less a personage than former Brigadier General Hugh B. Hester of the United States Army.

In a letter to the New York Times (Dec. 21, 1957), General Hester wrote that he found the Soviet people "well-fed and adequately dressed" when he visited their country last summer. There was no doubt in his mind that the Soviet living standard has risen sharply in the last 40 years.

"According to Dr. Jerome Davis, the leader of our group last summer, who spent most of 1915, '16 and '17 in Russia with the American Red Cross," he wrote, "the improvement in the general conditions of the Russian people today over 1917 is very great indeed."

Not only can these observations of Gen. Hester and Dr. Davis be statistically verified, but it can also be shown that the Soviet standard of living in the past few years has been increasing at a much faster rate than the American.

In the United States personal consumption expenditures—the amounts spent by individuals on consumer goods and services—are considered a measure of the standard of living. Between 1950 and 1955 real personal consumption expenditures—that is, consumption expenditures which have been deflated by the price index—grew from almost \$18¢

ED SEARS is a professional economist. He formerly contributed articles on economics to "The March of Labor."

billions to nearly \$216 billions, or by 18 per cent. At the same time, the population rose from 152 million to 165 million, or by 9 per cent. In 1950 retail trade turnover stood at 360 billion rubles; in 1955, it was slightly over 500 billion rubles. This represents an increase of about 40

CHANGES IN U.S. STANDARD OF LIVING, 1950-1955

Year	Personal Consumption Expenditures (Billions of 1947-9 Dollars)-a	Population (Millions)-a	Standard of Living	
			Per Capita Personal Consumption Expenditures (1947-9 Dollars)	Index of Per Capita Consumption Expenditures (1950 Equals 100)
1950	182.8	151.7	1,205	100
1955	215.5	163.3	1,304	108

a-Source: *Economic Report of the President*, January 1957.

The real per capita personal consumptions expenditures—the actual amount of goods and services purchased by the average American consumer, therefore increased from \$1,205 in 1950 to \$1,305 in 1955, or by 8 per cent. This figure, 8 per cent, represents the rise in the standard of living for the average American between 1950 and 1955. This is shown in the statistical table printed above.

The closest comparable Soviet statistic to personal consumption expenditures is called retail trade turnover. This represents the sums Soviet consumers spend at the retail state and cooperative establishments. Since it excludes the amounts spent in the free market and the state benefits granted the people, such as free medical care, it may overstate the rise in the standard of living. Nevertheless, a comparison of the retail trade turnover figures for a number of years is an indicator of the movement of the standard of living.

per cent. But the actual volume of goods purchased was much greater for retail prices fell by 26 per cent between 1950 and 1955. In real terms the volume of retail trade rose from 193 billion rubles in 1950 to 363 billion rubles in 1955 or by approximately 88 per cent. At the same time the population grew from 184 million to 199 million or by 8 per cent. Real per capita retail trade turnover—the actual amount of goods and services purchased by the Soviet consumer at the state and co-operative stores—increased from 1,049 rubles in 1950 to 1,822 in 1955 or by 74 per cent. Thus, the standard of living for the average Soviet resident rose 74 per cent during this period. This is shown in the table on the next page.

This estimate of the rise in the Soviet standard of living is confirmed by the following production data. Between 1950 and 1955, the period during which Soviet science was greatly expanding, the production

CHANGES IN SOVIET STANDARD OF LIVING, 1950-1955

Standard of Living

Year	Retail Trade Turnover (Billions of Rubles)-a	Retail Trade Price Index (1940 Equals 100)-a	Real Retail Trade Turn- over (Bil- lions of 1940 Rubles)	Population (Millions)-b	Real Per Capita Retail Trade Turnover (Billions of 1940 Rubles)	Index of Real Per Capita Retail Trade Turnover (1950 Equals 100)
1950	359.6	186	193.3	184.2	1,049	100
1955	501.5	138	363.4	199.4	1,822	174

*Source: *National Economy of the U.S.S.R.*, 1957.

bSource: *Information Please Almanac*, 1957.

of passenger cars increased by 67 per cent; meat by 62 per cent; butter by 37 per cent; radios by 236 per cent; television sets by over 1,500 per cent; refrigerators by well over 12,000 per cent; and washing machines by almost 29,000 per cent. These figures, which are based on Soviet statistics, are believed by most American economists to be accurate. This spectacular jump in the Soviet standard of living may well rank as an achievement equal to—if not greater—than the launching of the earth satellites.

The outstanding achievements in Soviet science were thus accompanied not by a fall but by an unprecedented rise in Soviet living standards.

The latter undoubtedly helped create the conditions making possible the former. Science can make significant advances only in a society in which the well-being of its members is constantly rising.

The lesson the American people must draw from the launching of the satellites is therefore just the opposite of what Vice President Nixon is trying to tell them. What is needed is a higher, not a lower, standard of living. More schools, better housing and improved living conditions are the only ways to catch up to the Soviets. Only under these conditions can American science really blossom forth and bring to the world the full force of its vigor.

Because of the illness of the editor, Jessica Smith, the monthly survey of American-Soviet relations and peace developments has been omitted from this issue.

We call our readers particular attention to the summary of the latest Soviet peace proposals on pages 31-32.

Gala Night In Moscow

by HELEN and SCOTT NEARING

FROM THE NIGHT we landed at the Moscow airport for the celebrations of the 40th Anniversary of the October Revolution we have been in a whirl of activities—meetings, dinners, concerts, theaters, ballet performances and sight-seeing. The great-hearted Soviet people have laid out the red carpet for foreign delegates as they did in the summer for their Youth Festival guests. And the generosity of our Soviet hosts is matched by the richness of what they have to give.

On our second evening in the city we were whisked off to a performance which we believe could be matched nowhere else in the world. It was held at the Lenin Sport Palace, a great new stadium hall seating 17,000. Representatives from 15 of the Soviet Union's Constituent Republics, with the united choruses of the All-Soviet Radio, the State Academic Russian chorus, the Red-Banner-decorated Soviet Army chorus and the Symphony Orchestra of the All-Soviet Radio, participated in the performance.

When the red-embossed program commemorating the 40th An-

niversary was handed to us we were appalled at its length. Thirty-four separate presentations. It looked as if the concert would last all night. But such was the skill and organization of the directors that the acts clicked by without a hitch; the timing could not have been bettered, and the whole affair was over with performers and audience as fresh as daisies. The huge back stage had to accommodate thousands of performers, their street clothes, their costumes, their apparatus and the scenic effects. It was a colossal project magnificently and efficiently carried out.

We cannot set down the program in all its detail. But here are some of the more striking gems in an evening studded with jewels.

The first half of the program was made up of 19 acts and scenes from epochs of the revolutionary period. There was Lenin exhorting crowds; people fighting and dying on the barricades in the civil war; grim battle scenes of the two world wars. The vast choruses that filled whole blocks of seats on either side of the stage sang early civil war and battle songs, and later songs by Shostakovich. A striking part of this half of the program was the living tableaux framing each scene. Actors costumed in the period of the

THE NEARINGS have recently completed a tour of Southeast Asia and the main countries of Western Europe. An account of their trip, "Socialists Around the World," has been published by Monthly Review.

enacted scene posed in small groups on either side of the stage. They were memorable figures in their ragged uniforms and costumes, carrying pitchforks, guns, sheaves of wheat, and banners.

The first half of the performance ended with a grand splash of color, movement and music as crowds of performers, depicting all the peoples of the USSR, streamed down from all parts of the great stadium and marched up onto and off the stage. They sang as they marched and waved scarfs, flowers, handkerchiefs and banners. It was a tremendous display, showing the triumph of the working people of Russia.

During the intermission we carried on what we considered an interesting conversation with a man we met in the foyer. He was a simple fellow, a cook from the restaurant, whom we found standing near the food tables watching people devour the products of his labor. We thought we were getting along finely with our rusty Russian till he called over an interpreter. "Tell me," he asked, "why do these comrades speak such poor Russian?" "They are strangers and have only been in the Soviet Union for two days," said the interpreter. "They should stay here longer and learn our language better," the cook said as he went back to his kitchen. A bit crestfallen we returned to our seats for the second part of the show.

The lights in the great stadium were turned out, then flashed on again. All the entrances were filled with children, kindergartners, who raced down the aisles pelting the audience with flowers.

Laughing and shouting and sing-

ing they tumbled onto the stage and down into the hall again and away through the exits. It was the most refreshing, novel and breeziest act we have ever seen anywhere. It was all over in a few minutes, but it took the audience by storm and left them breathless.

The great curtain went up. There were over a hundred children packed together,—the boys in dark suits, white collars and red-orange Pioneer scarfs and the girls in black dresses, white pinafores and the same Young Pioneer scarfs. They sang Shostakovich's Song of Peace and then, in the twinkling of an eyelash, whipped out violins which they had been holding behind their backs, and in perfect order and bowing, played the song they had been singing. They were all pupils of the music schools of Moscow and their execution and ensemble playing could not have been better. The act brought down the house.

Folk dancers from all over the Soviet Union put on several lively brightly-costumed dances. Then the curtains were drawn, the hall darkened, and a tall, lanky chap in a business suit walked out to the edge of the stage into a bright spotlight. A short, humorous stooge followed him. For ten or twelve minutes they kept the audience roaring while they told topical jokes, with a few friendly pokes at the U.S.A. and the inevitable references to Sputniks I and II.

An exquisite ballet scene followed. The music was by Glière and the Adagio was danced by Ulanova, prima ballerina and People's Artist of the USSR.

We gasped when the curtain rose next. All this and Oistrakh too!

There stood one of the world's most famous violinists, taking part in this great variety show.

Now came the wind-up—a united performance of the All-Soviet Circus. The stage was crowded with a kaleidoscope of one brilliant act after another, with the great clown, Popov, amiably messing things up.

The grand finale came with a march before the audience of the Soviet winners in the XIV World Olympics. All were be-ribboned and heavy with their medals. The stage then filled with the champions of sports in the USSR. These were students in athletics, calisthenics and acrobatics. They tumbled and jumped and leaped and swung and climbed. It was a dizzying and moving sight to see these strapping young folk demonstrating their superb physiques and skills in perfect rhythm and boundless grace.

The audience was filled with unforgettable impressions of sight, sound and color. We had witnessed an overwhelming expression of vitality, enthusiasm and consummate

skills. We rose to our feet as the sound of the Russian national anthem rolled through the great hall from orchestra, choruses and audience.

Two things we learned as we left the hall. Premier Bulganin and many members of the Supreme Soviet had been sitting directly behind us all the time. There had been no fanfare or fuss over their presence. Only at the end, at the final applause, was a television camera rolled up.

Item 2: The concert had been a free gift of all the performers, and no person present had paid admission. The tickets were allotted to visiting guests and delegates and to local workers. We considered ourselves lucky to be included in this magnificently generous gesture from our hosts and the Soviet producers and performers. We wished we could have shared the opportunity with many of our American friends. As a second-best, we are sending this report to them through *New World Review*.

EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

ACCORDING TO THE *New York Times*, Jan. 19, an exchange visit of Soviet and American teachers has been arranged for this coming year by the Comparative Education Society of the USA and the Educational and Scientific Workers Union of the USSR.

Fifty professors from Soviet institutes of higher learning will visit American schools during the month of November. A similar delegation of American educators will visit Soviet schools during August and September.

According to Dr. William W. Brickman who is president of the Comparative Education Society this will be the first delegation of Soviet leaders in education and related fields to visit the United States.

In addition to the reciprocal visits there will be an exchange of publications and educational material between the two countries.

China's Water Power Resources

by CHENG CHAN-LI

IN WATER power resources China ranks among the richest countries in the world. Estimates by the Electric Power Ministry place China's hydroelectric power resources at 544 million kilowatts. This is greater than the combined potential of the United States, Britain, France, Japan, Italy and Canada. And it is two and a half times more than the old estimates, made before 1949.

As hydroelectric power is one of the cheapest fuels to use in her growing industry, especially in the chemical and metallurgical fields and for domestic purposes, New China is making the best of this tremendous natural endowment while also developing thermal power stations. Several new hydroelectrical power stations have been established and old ones expanded in the past five years in the Northeast, North China and the Inner Mongolian Autonomous Region where China's first line industrial bases are going up.

Hydroelectric power is given a prominent place in the schemes for building new industrial bases in the Southwest, Northwest and the Sanmen Gorge area during the second five-year plan (1958-1962). Here new hydroelectrical power stations and

steel complexes will form the nucleus of industrial development.

Helpful Topography

China's rich hydroelectric power potential stems from her topography. With high land in the west, and lowlands in the southeast, practically all her major rivers flow west to east. As they descend, frequently down steep slopes and through narrow gorges, they provide ideal natural conditions for hydroelectric power. Some rivers have a water level differential of as much as 5,000 meters.

All this permits extremely low cost hydroelectric power stations to be built. Initial cost of investment of a station is estimated to be only one and a half times that of a thermal plant. In countries in the West the cost is usually two to four times as much. Electricity charges for both domestic and industrial consumers in China are estimated to be among the lowest in the world.

Another important point is that most Chinese rivers are near the present and projected centers of industry and mining. Fortunately, too, the areas with few coal deposits are abundant in hydroelectric power resources. An outstanding instance of this is Southwest China, which possesses 70 per cent of the country's total potential of hydroelectric power

CHENG CHAN-LI is a Chinese writer who specializes in scientific and economic subjects.

but only a fraction of its coal reserves.

In the Old Days

China's plans for using its water power potential are linked with its powerful effort to eliminate floods. Several of the rivers marked down as sources of power earned for themselves a bitter place in China's history. The 1933 Yellow River floods alone spread disaster over more than 11,000 square kilometers, killing 18,000 people and affecting 3,640,000 in all. Losses in property were incalculable. The Yangtze River inundation in 1931 affected several million people. Two hundred and sixty thousand were drowned.

The 1,100-kilometer Huai River which, with its tributaries, covers one-seventh of all the arable land in the country, has been the scourge of densely populated Kiangsu, Anhwei and Honan Provinces for two thousand years. The records kept during the past seven centuries show that it flooded the area seven years in every ten. In 1931, one of the worst years, it caused famine to 20 million people and submerged three million hectares of farmland.

The Yungting near Peking, though a minor river, has been almost as unruly, producing seven major floods in some 40 years before 1949. In 1939 it inundated 2,000 square kilometers, including the important North China port of Tientsin. Tens of thousands of people were drowned.

Thus it was natural that a combined flood control and power development plan was put into execution soon after the founding of the young People's Republic, to tackle the problem at its root. By now

numerous reservoirs and dams have been built and more are under construction. Seven of 27 planned reservoirs along the Huai River were completed by 1957. The Sanmen Gorge reservoir on the Yellow River, on which work has already started, will rank among the world's largest.

By contrast, during the more than 30 years of Kuomintang rule only a few small hydroelectric power stations were built. The largest produced only 3,040 kilowatts, leaving aside those built by the Japanese in Northeast China and Taiwan.

Works Completed

In the past eight years, extensive surveying and investigation has had to be carried out because very little was done during the old regime. Altogether 1,598 rivers, big and small, have been surveyed and the necessary fundamental data obtained for the constructing of hydroelectric power plants.

In the last five years, four hydroelectric power stations have been extended, including the giant 567,000-kilowatt Fengman station, now the largest in China. A score of new ones have been put into operation such as the Shihtzutun station in the Southwest, the Kwanting power station on the Yungting River near Peking and the Shangyiukiang in Kiangsi Province. The total generating capacity of these stations alone exceeds 520,000 kilowatts, which is 42 times the power created in the whole thirty years of Kuomintang. In terms of fuel consumption, they represent a saving of 5,380,000 tons of coal annually.

Several big new hydroelectric power stations are under construction. They include the 580,000-kilo-

watt station on the Sinanking River in Chekiang Province and the 360,000-kilowatt station on the Yili River in Yunnan Province. The generating capacity of these stations aggregate more than two million kilowatts. Work has begun, too, on about a dozen other medium-sized projects. All of these will be completed before the second five-year plan is ended. Among them are the last one of the four-step Lungki River cascade project, and the Meishan and Futzeling stations on the Huai River.

The Fengman station is worth a special word to itself. It was built by the Japanese during the occupation but at the time of liberation it was in a sorry state. Even the dam was leaking badly. By last year repairs and renovation were finished. Work on extensions to the station is still going on. By the end of 1958, the station, complete with automatic control, will have a generating capacity of 567,000 kilowatts. Even before it was finished it was supplying twice the record capacity reached under Japanese occupation in 1949—to Anshan, Fushun and other industrial bases in Northeast China.

Near the other end of the country, in Szechwan Province, a plan was put into operation as early as 1937 to use the resources of the Lungki River. Yet in a period of over ten years only one small 3,040-kilowatt station was built. Now this old plant has been greatly extended, but in addition New China's engineers have been designing and building three more stations on the four-step cascade of the river which will provide 100,000 kilowatts for the fast expanding industries of the Chungking area. The fourth of these

stations is expected to go into operation in 1958.

In the national minority areas the plentiful hydroelectric power resources are being developed for the first time in their history. Among the first built is one at the Wulapu on the Urumchi River in the Sin-kiang Uighur Autonomous Region and another on the Lhasa River in Tibet.

Special attention has been given to the building of small hydroelectric power stations in the rural areas. One hundred and eighty three such stations were built by 1956, with an aggregate generating capacity of 12,000 kilowatts. Now many more small stations are going up in many parts of the country, and mills and irrigation systems in rural China are being powered by electricity instead of by draft animals or human labor, and homes are being provided with electric light. Even greater emphasis will be placed on this work in the future.

Better Technique

China is now in the position to survey, design and build her own thermal and hydroelectric power. She supplies her own complete sets of machinery and equipment for these plants. An army of technicians has grown up in this field, now numbering 4,500 as against 100 at the end of 1949. Compared with 1953 they can now undertake 115 times the amount of designing work, 12 times the geological surveying and many times the amount of construction work.

These achievements are bound up with the technical help given by the Soviet Union. Since 1949 Soviet experts have helped in the renovation

and expansion of the Fengman hydroelectric power station, giving technicians on-the-spot training there. Great quantities of machinery have been supplied by the Soviet Union to China for both thermal and hydroelectric power plants.

In consequence, Chinese technicians can now design and construct even such large projects as the 60,000-kilowatt Shangyiukiang station. The four 15,000-kilowatt generators installed there were manufactured in Harbin and Shanghai. A 72,500-kilowatt hydroturbine has also been trial produced this year. Formerly all such complex equipment had to be imported into China from other countries.

A Promising Future

As the development plans of the past few years have gone into operation, the percentage of hydroelectric power in the whole electrical industry has gone up from 17 per cent as originally scheduled to 21 per cent. It will climb still further, to 28 per cent, within the second five-year plan period. The three major rivers, the Yellow, Yangtze and Amur, will play the main role. The

Yellow River will be harnessed in a cascade of 46 steps as mapped out in the multi-purpose plan for the river announced in 1955. When completed, its total generating capacity will be 2,300,000 kilowatts. The Sanmen Gorge station, whose construction was started in April 1957, is the first stage in this far reaching scheme and the Liukia Gorge station will be the next.

Along the Yangtze River, a dozen construction sites have been provisionally selected and are now under survey. The "Three Gorges" station in Szechwan Province alone will be able eventually to reach a generating capacity of 20 million kilowatts—ten times greater than the Grand Coulee power station in the United States. The designing and surveying of the Amur River are being undertaken jointly by experts of China and the Soviet Union. Estimates so far show that it can generate between 13 and 20 million kilowatts and the initial cost of investment will work out at about one cent (100 cents equal one yuan; one cent is roughly one third of an English penny) a kilowatt, among the cheapest in the world.

CHINESE TRANSLATION OF ZAPOTOCKY NOVEL

A CHINESE TRANSLATION of the novel "New Fighters Will Arise," by the late President of Czechoslovakia, Antonin Zapotocky, was published in Peking last November.

This novel is the first of the late President's trilogy depicting the struggles of the Czechoslovak working class. "New Fighters Will Arise" deals with the workers' movement at the end of the 19th century and the development of socialism in Czechoslovakia. The chief character of this novel, Ladislav Zapotocky, is the father of the author. President Zapotocky's father was one of the pioneers of socialism in Czechoslovakia. (See p. 17).

Siqueiros

On New Forms In Art

by RALPH PARKER

IN OCTOBER, 1955, the Mexican painter David Alfaro Siqueiros at a reception given by the U.S.S.R. Academy of Arts under the presidency of Alexander Gerasimov delivered an open letter to Soviet painters, artists and engravers. This letter which contained a vehement appeal to Soviet artists to abandon formal academism and mechanical realism caused a considerable stir in Moscow academic circles, but its author's hopes that it would appear in print in the columns of one of Moscow's many journals devoted to cultural matters were not fulfilled. Indeed, when a year later Siqueiros asked Gerasimov what had happened to the document he was told that it had been "misplaced." To this the Mexican tartly replied that the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. were the only two countries where he could not obtain free discussion of his views.

This winter David Siqueiros received an official invitation from the USSR Academy of Arts to attend the celebration of its 20th anniversary jubilee. On arriving in Moscow he was handed a Russian translation of the Open Letter, which had

in the meantime been "found", and also of his accompanying thesis entitled *Return to Great Art*, in which he set out his views on the role of the civic-minded artist in a socialist society. Moreover, he was invited to take part in consultations with officials of the Party Central Committee that have resulted in the adoption of decisions of considerable importance to figurative artists in all parts of the world and which if fulfilled, can have a profound influence on Soviet art.

Before returning to Mexico, David Siqueiros shared his views on his latest visit to Moscow with your correspondent.

"The practical results of my talks with Party officials and representatives of the Ministry of Culture is that there will in all probability be a world congress of figurative artists at the end of this year or early next year. Naturally, we Mexican artists would like this to be held in Mexico. Participation would not be limited to artists who describe themselves as realists: we should welcome all artists who do not deliberately exclude the human being from their work."

Siqueiros continued: "We must admit that if we exclude academic painters we are in a minority in the art world today—we painters who seek to create what we Mexicans

RALPH PARKER, NWR correspondent in Moscow, formerly represented the "New York Times" in the USSR, where he has lived for fifteen years. Mr. Parker has translated into English a number of recent Soviet novels.

call a public art (*arte publico*). New York and Paris are able to mobilize immensely influential publicity organs in the service of non-figurative art. The influence of the Museum of Modern Art in New York and of what may justly be called its branches in certain Latin American countries cannot be overestimated. Even in my country a whole generation of painters—the ones between ours and that of the youth—is wedded to the canons of non-objective art.

"But we have strong groups in many lands, principally I would say in Italy. We are influential enough to launch a multi-language art magazine to dispute the formalist contamination. Indeed, I found strong support in Moscow for such a journal."

"Did you find any new currents in the Soviet art world?" I asked.

"Among the older painters I found it generally realized that what they had painted and were at present painting was inadequate and that the Soviet Union's contribution to realist painting was disappointing. Among the younger artists I found an immense desire for change and development.

"For example, when I was invited to speak to a 'small group' at the Pushkin Museum on my latest works I arrived to find an audience of over 300 present. I showed slides of my mural decorations for the new Social Insurance Hospital in Mexico and described the new methods I devised for using concave and convex surfaces to show the relativity of geometrical forms in murals when the spectator is on the move. Everything I had to tell of our use of new plastics and paints

and of the work of the Mexican laboratories which are investigating the production of plastics for art—a unique institution—aroused the keenest interest of young Soviet artists and critics.

"Above all, though, I was impressed by the interest taken in my views about harmful academism by leading Party officials. If in the past I met with resistance (one might even speak of sabotage) to my ideas on the part of certain elements in Soviet academic life, the results of this latest visit enables me to say with confidence that the Party is now taking a keen and active interest in the Mexican contribution to realism. An agreement in principle has been reached for Soviet painters to work with us in Mexico and for Mexican mural painters—possibly myself included—to work in the Soviet Union."

The views to which Moscow has shown itself so much more receptive today than it was two years ago were summed up by Siqueiros in the following words:

"I am sure that indirectly and directly Soviet art is accomplishing a political function of unexampled greatness in the history of the world. All its work is in the service of a social movement which has opened up a new era for humanity, and for that Soviet artists can rely on the unlimited support of the first proletarian state.

"Soviet art is an art with an ideological mission. But it has shortcomings about which it is my duty as a Communist to speak frankly.

"Soviet art, it is true, is not contaminated by the effects of the type of formalism one finds in capitalist countries. All the same,

it suffers from another kind of formalism—mechanical realism and academism. And if we compare formalism with academism we find in them an element of similarity: both lead to the denationalization and depersonalization of art. The formalists who paint in the style of the *École de Paris* and the academicians who paint in the style of the Academy of Rome, in no matter what country they are to be found, resemble each other like two peas. There is no difference between an Argentinian formalist and a Japanese formalist, but there is no difference either between a Hungarian academician and a Guatemalan academician. This fact was brought home to me very strongly by my visit to the Venice Biennale. Had the titles of the countries been changed on the pavilions showing academic art, I, for one, would not have noticed it. Soviet art, in short, continues to apply the obsolete international academic laws which arose at the end of the Renaissance when public art was replaced by art for private collectors, painting left the Church for the country mansion and the long fruitful alliance between mural-painter and architect was interrupted."

I told Siqueiros a current Moscow joke about the vast Jubilee Exhibition in the new Manège Gallery where the works of hundreds of painters are exhibited. "How did you like it," a Soviet guide asks a foreign visitor, the story runs. "Well," says the foreigner politely, "it's not quite the sort of painting I like as a rule, but it's a remarkable fact that one man was able to paint so many pictures".

"But don't underestimate the

qualities of modern Soviet painting," Siqueiros cautioned me. "It has real qualities that belong to public art—a sense of composition, monumentalism in the good sense of the word, and a sense of history. Its faults to my mind are due to a false idea of realism prevalent in Soviet circles and to complacent neglect of research. Let me read you what I wrote in my Open Letter for the words still apply today:

"You agree with me that realism cannot be a fixed formula, an immutable law. . . . Realism can only be a means of creation that is always advancing. Our Mexican painting, considered as a whole, has forgotten this principle because of formal speculation in the sphere of archaeologism. You Soviet artists have forgotten it too and this has led to the persistence of obsolete realistic styles such as the styles of Yankee commercial realism of the early years of this century!

"Or this passage: 'It is completely wrong to say that all exaltation of form is formalism, for if that were so we should never arrive at an understanding of any of the great Venetian painters or, for that matter, Michelangelo, El Greco, Goya, Daumier, etc. The formalists exalt art for its own sake in purely plastic play, whereas the realists have always been determined to attain a greater plastic eloquence. . . . The study of the history of art proves that the realist artist has always followed the path of perfecting his medium of execution and his tools. If we take a look at the four centuries of great Italian art we will reach the conclusion that artists in their different periods never conformed to the methods of their predecessors

but that on the other hand they were always searching and inventing new methods and processes."

If, as Siquerios hopes, he is invited to return to work in Moscow on murals his visit may coincide with the beginning of Soviet industrial research into plastics and other derivatives of the modern chemical industry. Such research has been promised under the new long-range plan which will come into operation shortly. He, or other Mexican artists, are likely to be working in Moscow when the plans for the new Palace of Soviets are under consideration. This will provide an opportunity that the Soviet Union is not likely to let slip. The Mexican mural painters have amassed an incomparable experience in the surfaces and paints available to the artist of the industrial age, especially in a socialist country where there are no narrow commercial interests to deny the artist access to the latest achievements of science. They, like no others have worked out the new laws of perspective that take into account the curved surfaces of modern architecture and the mobility of the spectator. (Siqueiros, for instance, has been working on these problems ever since 1930 when he decorated a building in California with external murals).

It is a hopeful sign for Soviet art—not only for Soviet art—that this rapprochement has come about between the Party Central Committee and the Mexican school of realism.

As we sat looking down at the Kremlin from a high vantage point in a Moscow hotel I recalled the words of David Siqueiros' great compatriot, the late Diego Rivera. He had prevailed on the doctors at the Bodkin Hospital to allow him to watch the May Day Demonstration in the Red Square from an open window in this hotel. He had been sketching all morning when I called on him.

"Thirty years ago when I came to Soviet Russia for the first time," Rivera told me, "I went to the club of one of the big plants and suggested that I should paint a mural there. 'No,' said the workers, 'not now. Come back when we have built a palace of culture. These walls are old and will not stand for long'. I am too old and sick a man now to paint the walls of that palace which has been built. But who knows, perhaps another Mexican artist will come and contribute the work of his brush to the glorification of a new and free society."

Rivera did not live to see that day. But perhaps it is not far off. . . .

ROCKWELL KENT'S PAINTINGS IN MOSCOW

AN EXHIBIT of the paintings of Rockwell Kent was opened in the Pushkin Museum of Fine Arts in Moscow on December 12. There were more than 50 canvases and many black-and-white drawings.

The opening of the exhibition was attended by many of Moscow's leading artists and members of the U.S. Embassy staff.

On his seventy-fifty birthday last June Mr. Kent was elected chairman of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.

Mr. Kent was refused a passport by the State Department to attend the exhibition of his paintings.

ANTONIN ZAPOTOCKY

Statesman, Trade Unionist, Man of Letters

by ELEANOR WHEELER

TOO few people outside the socialist countries realize that when Antonin Zapotocky died Czechoslovakia lost not only a statesman and able trade unionist, but also a man of letters. In Peking, Moscow and other places in this part of the world, exhibitions of his works were held, but knowledge of the late President Zapotocky's literary work in the West is practically confined to the excellent filming by Jiri Weiss of Zapotocky's first work of fiction, *New Fighters Will Arise*, or to the English, French or German translations of the book.

New Fighters Will Arise was perhaps the best of Zapotocky's novels, but the others were of a calibre to silence effectively—or at least shame—those writers who moan that they cannot do their best work, burdened as they are with meetings and public activity. Antonin Zapotocky would rise at four or five in the morning when, during the years of his presidency, he had to put the finishing touches on a book to meet the deadline at the printer's. He was very scrupulous about not putting private matters on the office agenda.

In his first novel, Zapotocky told about the banishment of his father

from Prague for activity as radical editor of workers' papers. The family was exiled to their home village of Zakolany, near the mining town of Kladno, and there little Tonik was born. The father earned a small living as tailor, but soon—in spite of the vigilance of the helmeted Austro-Hungarian police, and to the distress of his wife—Ladislav Zapotocky turned to the organization of a cooperative, to journalistic tasks, collaborating with the editorial staff of Kladno's *Svoboda* (Freedom).

Standing guard for socialist meetings in the woods, whisking copies of *Svoboda* to the distributors (devoted volunteer workers) faster than the Austro-Hungarian censor could catch them, taking part in the picnics and demonstrations of the small village cooperative—all these experiences not only started young Tonik on his career as leftwing journalist and trade union organizer, but also gave him abundant material for his later literary work. As Jan Petrmichl wrote in the memorial issue of *Literary News*, "The raconteur Antonin Zapotocky was not greatly troubled by the eternal worry of a writer—what to write about and how. He did not need to pace his study nervously to think up 'something.' The plots of his novels lived in him, complete and ready, long before he took his pen in hand. . . . In the final analysis, only this explains how in a relatively short period—not quite

ELEANOR WHEELER, a frequent contributor to NWR, has lived with her husband and four children in Czechoslovakia for the past ten years. Her older son, Frank, contributed an article to our January issue.

nine years—Antonin Zapotocky was able, despite all his important and exhausting political duties and despite an immense burden of work, to write four rather long novels. He was not a writer by profession and trade, he gave from the abundance of clear reason and a generous heart. He told stories to give himself and others pleasure. That is why every line he wrote bears the seal and charm of his personality."

The next novel in the series, *Red Glow Over Kladno*, tells how the news of the October Revolution ran like a forest fire through the mine-mill town of Kladno. When the big Kladno mills cast out the slag in the evening, the whole sky turns red, and to Kladnoites this is one of the world's beautiful sights. It was natural that it should furnish the title of a book by one whose life and work had been so bound up with this town. But with characteristic directness and unwillingness to lacquer over facts, Zapotocky also told how many workers were fooled by stories of how the "Bolsheviks played into the hands of the Germans" (the Centuries-old enemies of the Bohemians), of how some workers blindly followed right-wing Social-Democratic leaders in denying that Czechoslovakia could follow the same path as Russia. So the ferment ended in betrayal of workers' demands for workers' councils, and the bourgeoisie got the upper hand. Zapotocky, as labor leader and left-wing journalist, sat in prison several times as a result of this fateful turn in 1920. He was one of the founders of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia—although he had to cast his "aye" vote at the founding Congress from Pankrac Prison.

Zapotocky's third novel has its action laid in the period between the first and the second. Entitled *Stormy Year 1905*, it tells about the repercussions in Bohemia of the Russian revolution of 1905. This at a time when the Zapotocky family had been allowed to return to Prague, and young Tonik was active in the youth movement in the working-class district of Zizkov.

The fourth novel on Antonin Zapotocky's list was *Daybreak*, the story of his grandmother and mother, so in point of time it comes first in the series. His grandmother was a Rousseau-like child of nature, brought up in the wild Sumava forests. She had great ambitions to become a lady and be able to do what she wanted. But when Zapotocky's father, her son-in-law, explained the laws of society to her, she put the same energy and passion into defending his right to free speech and press that she had in trying to advance her own personal career. As the Women's Committee said in its message of condolence, one of the things Zapotocky was noted for was his defense of women's rights—the right to work on an equal basis, not the right to be a parasite. One of his non-fiction works, a collection of essays and speeches, was published on International Women's Day in 1956, and was entitled *Honor to Women's Work*. *Daybreak* was published at that same time.

In addition to his novels and collections of essays (the latest entitled *On Culture and the Intelligentsia*), Zapotocky wrote books on trade-union policy. For many years before the Second World War he headed the Red Trade Unions, when he and other progressives were try-

ing to unite the sadly split Czech trade unions. When, after 1945, the trade unions were finally united, he was elected their head. Even after he became Prime Minister and then President, he would make surprise visits to trade union meetings or to factories to see with his own eyes how things were going. These unannounced visits were the nightmare of bureaucrats who were often made to see the error of their ways when workers threatened, "I'll write about this to Comrade Zapotocky." Excuses for failure because of "objective reasons" had little value in Zapotocky's eyes, because he himself had surmounted many an "objective reason" for giving up: poverty, prison, concentration camp, ill health. The autopsy on his heart was a relief map of his whole life: overgrown scar after overgrown scar, each seemingly enough to invalid or kill an ordinary man. Yet up to the last he was working on his book for children, taken from the childhood of his grandmother, and insisting that some talented, but unknown, young artist should be given the chance to illustrate it.

This interest in people, impromptu manner and informal approach of Zapotocky's delighted Czechoslovak citizens. One story tells how he pricked the pomposity of a conference about his books. Apprentices, coached by misguided teachers, were giving long disquisitions on Marxism, on the history of the Czech working class movement and the international situation, anything but the particular events in the books. Zapotocky took the floor and drawled, "I don't know whether I wandered into a conference on books or into a Communist Party

course on Marxism-Leninism." This broke the ice and the young people began to fight for the floor to make off-the-cuff comments.

A little known fact is that he turned to photography in the 1930's to express himself artistically. Some of his photographs appeared in an exhibition in Prague and Brno, put on by the organization "Left Front." Some of his pictures had ironic titles such as "Apartment with Bath," showing a poverty-stricken miner's house with wooden tub, or "Romanticism from Necessity." Others—in some cases whole albums—had the straightforward titles "Sad Children," "We Want to Play," or "Miners' Strike, 1932." The album "Man Without Work," had a text written by Vitezslav Nezval. Zapotocky was concerned with more than the content of his photographs, however. He joined with Josef Sudek (still producing his remarkable photographs here) and Alexander Hackenschmied (cameraman and producer of "Crisis," about the Nazi invasion of Czechoslovakia, now working abroad), in opposing the fuzzy and false retouching and tinkering with negative or print.

This is a brief outline of the many sides of the life and work of Czechoslovakia's second working-class president who died on November 13, 1957. Accompanying his simple oak coffin through the streets of Prague were representatives of the armed forces, two miners, two mill workers, and two women in red kerchiefs, symbolizing his life as a fighter, a defender of the rights of workers and of women. His literary heritage is a similar monument to this militant life, and already part of the history of Czechoslovakia.

"Russia Since 1917"

reviewed by PROF. WILLIAM A. WILLIAMS

THE BURDEN of this review is that Professor Schuman's latest volume, his study and reflection concerning *Russia Since 1917*,* is a book that should be bought, read and pondered—not read about. This is so, among other reasons, because the book says much about America as well as Russia, and because, in many places, the wry and astute footnotes can be read as a counterpoint to the text itself. It is the perceptive, troubled, honest kind of a book that cannot be picked up and handed to the cocktail set or political activist kind of reader in a short sentence between installments of gossip.

In many respects at any rate, Schuman is an American intellectual composite of Edward Hallett Carr, Edward Crankshaw and Isaac Deutscher. His vantage point and outlook are delineated in a moving dedication of this book to his father, who taught him "much about Marxism," and to his mother, who taught him "more about the human condition." This provides considerable insight into why Schuman's analyses lack some of the depth and rigor of those by Carr or Deutscher; yet why his comprehension of the human factors in history is less impres-

sionistic and more realistic than much of Crankshaw's writing. Perhaps the latter consideration is the more important. For while Schuman knows that it is important to "type" Khrushchev as a peasant *alias* plumber *alias* bureaucrat, it is equally important to see how that peasant conception of the world has been modified by experience and reflection.

One of the most striking aspects of this volume is the way Schuman's review of internal affairs is better than his presentation of foreign policy. This reviewer, at any rate, laid down the book with the distinct feeling that Schuman is about to lean back and write a truly great essay on the political economy of the Soviet Union: something as fine as Thomas Balogh's piece on the political economy of the Cold War. Given the chance to omit all the data he considered essential to this work, he is capable of doing what nobody else in America has done in that genre. Perhaps this judgment of the foreign policy sections is too strong, and may stem, for that matter, from the mere fact that Schuman was short-changed on time and space. Yet two points may be raised concerning Schuman's handling of the crucial period from the turn of the tide in the Battle of Stalingrad to, let us say, the enunciation of the Truman Doctrine.

The first concerns development inside Russia, and may be symbol-

* RUSSIA SINCE 1917, by Frederick L. Schuman, Knopf, New York, 1957. 508 pp. \$6.50.

PROFESSOR WILLIAM APPLEMAN WILLIAMS teaches in the History Department of the University of Wisconsin. A specialist in America-Soviet relations, his "American-Russian Relations, 1781-1947," was published in 1952

ized by the vigorous debate about how to handle the massive problem of postwar recovery. Though cast in the forms of a theoretical argument about a new model of growth for Soviet economic development, and a somewhat less obtuse discussion of how to teach certain subjects, the issues were clear. There were three of them: (1) where to get the investment capital for reconstruction, and depending upon the answer to that question; (2) how to allocate resources between capital and consumer goods industries; and (3) whether or not to relax certain severe and brutal controls characteristic of the entire political economy. The story of that running argument is not only fascinating in its own right, it provides a central clue to Soviet foreign policy from mid-1943, when Stalin and Donald Nelson began to discuss a big postwar loan, to the early winter of 1947, when General Mashall let Stalin's final hint about the loan waft out the window across Red Square.

The same tale throws two kinds of light on American policy. First, the debate in Russia stands out in striking contrast to the lack of such analysis, projection and preparation in the United States. Second, it suggests that there was considerably more to the origins of the Cold War than a power or strategic struggle over Eastern Europe and the northern third of the Middle East. Among other factors, there was the ideology of the Open Door Policy, which defined American prosperity and democracy as a function of economic expansion. Such men as Kennan thought within that framework as surely as did those like Acheson, Dulles and Truman, and it is mis-

leading to use the former as a fundamental counterpoint to the others.

This reviewer was struck by those omissions in the volume because elsewhere Schuman has stressed or implied them—as in *The Commonwealth of Man* (which, incidentally, is a badly neglected book). Their absence here seems the more important because they weaken unnecessarily the great virtues of the volume. These are two. First, Schuman makes it absolutely clear, once and for all, that Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany are not totalitarian twins. Both harsh and brutal?—Yes. Both centralized and administrative to an extensive degree?—Yes. *But*. Therein lies the crucial difference. For Soviet centralization and administration is structured to formalize and institutionalize functional differences. And as any good Bolshevik or Soviet bureaucrat can testify, once functional differences are institutionalized then so, too, are conflict and change. They can be controlled and channelled for but so long, and only then under conditions of war and what is perhaps best described as rule by a leader with the “magic.”

It is here that Schuman makes his second central point. Unlike Nazi Germany, the Soviet Union has never defined its existence in terms of the continuing expansion of the Soviet state. Hence the institutionalization of function within the productive and administrative sectors of an industrial society not only asserts itself, it can do so within a single party. For those and similar reasons, the party can not perpetuate itself in the totalitarian sense. The resulting conflict and change do not take place within a Western

democratic framework, but neither do they proceed as a struggle for power *per se*.

In this connection, there are three eerie aspects of Stalin's career which assert themselves through all the paradoxes of his reign. One is defined by the parallel between his vote against war in Poland in 1919 and his actions in Greece, the Middle East and Asia between 1944 and 1948. Another pertains to the policy implicit in the resolution he imposed upon the long discussion about a model of economic growth. The competence—let alone sophistication!—of his economic theory need not be discussed at this juncture because, in this respect at least, they are largely irrelevant. What is important is the fact that he was groping for some way to resolve Russia's security problem by winning supporters on the basis of an improvement of Soviet life. At the end he was probably paranoid, but it is wise to remember that he was not so defined throughout most of his life.

In one of the more striking passages Schuman has written (pp. 206-217), he raises the third crucial question about the first forty years of the Soviet Union. How account, in all its aspects, for the Constitution of 1936? Neither its origins nor the violations of its spirit and its letter can be explained away, as Harold J. Berman and others have demonstrated, by simple references to the skills of manipulation and the monopoly of terror exercised by dictators.

If for nothing else, and there is a very great deal more, Schuman is to be thanked and praised for bringing back to the center of the stage a crucial issue. How, indeed, account for the origins and history of the Constitution of 1936? Perhaps it is time for someone to write an essay on "An Economic Interpretation of the Soviet Constitution." That might serve to counterbalance the simplistic psychological interpretations of Soviet history, and clear the way for more work in the vein of Professor Schuman's latest volume.

"I AM at a loss to understand what purpose can be served beyond obfuscation by editorial and official misrepresentation of Soviet policy toward Germany. Why keep repeating that the rulers of Russia consented at Geneva in 1955 to the reunification of the Reich and later repudiated their pledge?

"At the summit conference it was agreed that 'the reunification of Germany by means of free elections shall be carried out in conformity with the national interests of the German people and the interests of European security.'

"At Geneva, and long before Geneva, and ever since Geneva, in hundreds of policy statements and diplomatic notes the men of Moscow who govern the land which suffered the most appalling losses of any of the belligerents in two world wars unleashed by German aggression, have defined 'European security' in terms of the demilitarization and neutralization of Germany. . . .

"American policy is still inflexibly fixed in a posture of insisting that European security requires the Reich to be united, armed and allied with the West against the East. . . .

"In Geneva,' declared Bulganin correctly on Aug. 4, 1955, 'we did not find a common language on the German question. . . .'

From a letter by Prof. Frederick L. Schuman to the New York Times, Jan. 21, 1958

The Ordeal Of Soviet Russia

by CORLISS LAMONT

IN HIS *Russia: What Next?* written shortly after Stalin's death in 1953, Isaac Deutscher predicted with a considerable degree of accuracy some of the main trends which have taken place in the Soviet Union since that time. In his most recent book* he continues his analysis of Soviet developments and gives a lucid and realistic appraisal of the USSR on the threshold of its fortieth anniversary. His is a middle-of-the-road approach which recognizes that Soviet socialism has been and is a complex mixture of good and bad.

Mr. Deutscher is perfectly clear as to the tyrannical nature of the Stalin regime and its widespread violations of basic civil liberties and ordinary human decency. Even before the Khrushchev revelations, he had no illusions about Stalin's ruthless character. But the author does not follow the familiar pattern which utilizes the terrible shortcomings of the Stalin era as a justification for denouncing the whole Soviet enterprise.

Mr. Deutscher's recognition of

DR. CORLISS LAMONT, philosopher, writer and lecturer, has made outstanding contributions in the struggle for civil liberties, international understanding and peace. He has published such noteworthy books as "Soviet Civilization," "Freedom Is As Freedom Does" and "The Philosophy of Humanism."

Stalin's vices does not blind him to the enormous contributions that Stalin made to the upbuilding of the Soviet Union. Not even an anti-Communist government in the USSR, writes the author, could afford to renounce the system of economic planning and of collective farms established under Stalin. Industrial growth, in a half-ruined economy, after the close of the Second World War and while Stalin was still alive, was so remarkable that future historians may well describe it "as the most momentous feat in social technology achieved in this generation."

Mr. Deutscher sees three main reasons underlying the evolution of Stalin's harsh dictatorship. First, there was the general backwardness of the country when the Communists took power and set out "to impose on the Russia of the *muzhiks* an ideal and a way of life for which Russia was not prepared, either materially or mentally. The primitive magic of Stalinism, the deification of the Leader, and the bizarre and elaborate rituals of Stalinism had all sprung from Russian backwardness and all served to tame that backwardness. Since the vast and swift transformation of the whole

* *Russia in Transition and Other Essays*, by Isaac Deutscher, Coward-McCann. New York, 1957. 245 pp. \$4.50.

social outlook of Russia, undertaken by Stalin, was not based on the will and understanding of the people, its origin had to be traced to the super-human wisdom and will of the Leader."

Second, the author states that the relative weakness of the Soviet working class, especially in numbers, at the end of the exhausting civil war and foreign intervention paved the way for the rise of a powerful, hard-driving, dictatorial bureaucracy. "A social vacuum arose," Mr. Deutscher declares, "in which the new bureaucracy was the only active, organized and organizing element. It filled the political vacuum and established its own preponderance."

Third, the policies of the Stalin regime were of course much affected for the worse by the isolation of the Soviet Union in an encircling capitalist world. The capitalist nations constantly kept Soviet nerves on edge through economic embargoes, sinister diplomatic maneuvers and massive military attacks capped by Hitler's aggression in the Second World War.

If I may spell this out a little further, it has always seemed to me that a conscious part of capitalist efforts to destroy and discredit Soviet socialism has been to put such pressures on the USSR that, even if it did not collapse, it would be forced into a Draconian dictatorship in order to survive. This has certainly been a prime capitalist motive in the Cold War and armaments race. The intent has been to increase tension within the Soviet Union by compelling it continually to step up the pace in armaments production and so divert effort from general industrial growth and from

raising the standard of living in terms of increased consumer's goods.

While the capitalist elements of the Western democracies have ever outwardly lamented the lack of political freedom in Soviet Russia, inwardly they have rejoiced because this state of affairs gives them a most potent propaganda weapon against both the Soviets and the new socioeconomic system of socialism. Maliciously to paint socialism as inherently bound up with an austere garrison type of government has been especially effective in capitalist countries with a democratic tradition.

The first reason Mr. Deutscher gives for the development of the oppressive Stalin dictatorship is no longer operative. A country can hardly be called "backward" which has been able to abolish all student tuition fees from the elementary school up through the college, university and graduate school levels; and which has produced two successful earth satellites. The second reason for the extremes of the Stalin era is, according to the author, on the way out.

The third reason has become considerably modified because the isolation of the USSR ended when the Communists won control of mainland China in 1949. In this connection Mr. Deutscher argues convincingly that Stalin tried to dissuade the Chinese Communists under Mao Tse-tung from launching their final offensive against the Nationalist Government. But contrary to Stalin's advice, Mao and his associates decided to go ahead, and were completely successful. Here is another important consideration that belies the notion that the present Chinese Government is a puppet

in the hands of the Kremlin leaders.

There remain now the Cold War and capitalist nuclear threats, emanating principally from the United States, as serious factors in holding back the growth of democracy within the Soviet Union. Mr. Deutscher feels sure, however, that today "It is the twilight of totalitarianism that the USSR is living through."

I do not have the space to analyze some of the author's best essays in this volume: "Post-Stalinist Ferment in Ideas," for example; "Stalin's Last Word"; "Marx and Russia"; "Two Revolutions," which makes a brilliant comparative study between the French and Communist Revolutions; and "1984—The Mysticism of Cruelty," which shows the tremendous harm done to East-West understanding by George Orwell's popular novel and that "the plot, the chief characters, the symbols and the whole climate of his story" were borrowed from a little-known Russian emigré writer, Evgenii Zamiatin.

I do, however, want to add a special comment on Mr. Deutscher's perceptive dissection of "The Ex-Communist's Conscience," in which he takes as representative examples James Burnham, Whittaker Chambers, Ruth Fischer, André Gide, Arthur Koestler, Ignazio Silone and others. These problem children of contemporary politics, as the author calls them, all claim, in Koestler's words, that "We ex-Communists are the only people who know what it's all about." To this Mr. Deutscher retorts: "One may risk the assertion that the exact opposite is true. Of all people, the ex-Communists know least what it is

all about. . . . Most of them (Silone is a notable exception) have never been inside the real Communist movement. . . . As a rule they moved on the literary or journalistic fringe of the party. . . .

"Worse still is the ex-Communist's characteristic incapacity for detachment. His emotional reaction against his former environment keeps him in its deadly grip and prevents him from understanding the drama in which he was involved or half-involved. . . . Whatever the shades of individual attitudes, as a rule the intellectual ex-Communist ceases to oppose capitalism. . . . Having once been caught by the 'greatest illusion,' he is now obsessed by the greatest disillusionment of our time. . . . He advances bravely in the front ranks of every witch hunt. His blind hatred of his former ideal is leavened to contemporary conservatism. . . . He contributes heavily to the moral climate in which a modern counterpart to the English anti-Jacobin reaction is hatched."

Mr. Deutscher points out that the ex-Communist "may no longer be concerned with any cause except one—self-justification. And this is the most dangerous motive for any political activity." Now endless self-justification is one of the chief varieties of preoccupation with self. And I have noticed that most of those liberals and radicals with whom I have been acquainted and who have turned into professional anti-Sovietes seem to be colossal egoists. They tend to lose the larger vision and the long-run perspective on Soviet affairs in their bitter feeling that they have been personally betrayed by the course of history.

And having become used to appreciative—and some times adulatory—audiences when they were sympathetic to the Soviet venture, they must at any cost build up appreciative audiences to maintain the nourishment of their egos when they transfer their allegiance to the anti-Soviet crusade. This means they are compelled to become more and more extreme in their denunciations of Soviet Russia and the other Communist states; for they must somehow outdo the large tribe of long-established specialists in the flourishing business of anti-communism.

In their attempts at self-justification, many ex-Communists evidently feel that the only way they can expiate their former passionate love for all things Communist is to give expression to a fanatical hate for the Communist world—a hate so intransigent that they are willing to risk the extermination of the whole human race—in a nuclear war—if only the Communists can be exterminated in the process. Lord Macaulay a century ago described in universal terms the obsession to which I refer when in the *History of England* he spoke of “that peculiar malignity which has, in all ages, been characteristic of apostates.”

Mr. Deutscher goes on to quote a significant aside by Koestler that

answers some of the latter's own attacks on the Soviet Union. Koestler asserts: “If we survey history and compare the lofty aims, in the name of which revolutions were started, and the sorry end to which they came, we see again and again how a polluted civilization pollutes its own revolutionary offspring.” In the case of Soviet Russia, this means that the Communist revolution was “polluted” from the start by the Tsarist civilization from which it sprang. In other words, new-born societies no more than new-born individuals can escape the bad effects of a bad inheritance. And the Soviet Republic was bound to inherit a large measure of the backwardness, cruelty, corruption and despotism rampant in the old Tsarist empire.

As Professor Paul A. Baran puts it in *The Political Economy of Growth*: “Socialism in backward and underdeveloped countries has a powerful tendency to become a backward and underdeveloped socialism.” This formulation, I believe, provides a key to understanding much that on the surface has seemed unintelligible or unprogressive in the socialist commonwealths of the USSR, the Eastern European People's Republics and China, the new giant looming up on the world horizon.

PEARL BUCK ON NATIONAL DEFENSE

“THE BASIC WEAKNESS in our national defense today is not in military matters or even in the realm of science. It is in human relations and especially in race prejudice. Three-quarters of the world is not white. How can we do our part to enable people of every color to live together in equality and therefore in peace? We must, time is no longer on our side.” *Pearl Buck speaking on the special telecast from the American Nobel Anniversary Committee Dinner and Forum, Saturday, January 11.*

Recent Changes In Soviet Labor Laws

by DR. A. K. R. KIRALFY

The following material is taken from a much longer article by Dr. Kiralfy entitled, "Recent Legal Changes in the USSR" in Soviet Studies, Vol. IX, No. 1, July 1957. Soviet Studies is a quarterly review of the social and economic institutions of the USSR published by Basil Blackwell, Oxford, England.

MOST of the recent legislative changes in the USSR have taken the form of the replacement of compulsion by "voluntary" action. Forced labor and the direction of labor are now to be discarded as outdated and unnecessary.

Forced Labor

Corrective labor is a common punishment for crime in the USSR. Many critics of the Soviet regime see in its criminal justice a sort of labor recruiting system, a permanent means of obtaining underpaid labor for immense public projects. If the recent developments in criminal administration continue it seems that the labor force so made available will shrink, since probation and remissions of sentence are recommended.

The duty of collective farmers to remain part of the collective sector might also be described as a form of forced labor. There are also, from time to time, temporary cases of conscription of non-convict labor, e.g., of local labor to meet disasters

requiring urgent assistance, such as the reinforcement of the banks of flooded rivers and fire-fighting.

The International Labor Office Convention of June 28, 1930 requires all ratifying states to bring any system of forced labor quickly to an end, and it is permitted for a maximum of sixty days a year and only for real emergencies when no other labor is available. On June 4, 1956 the USSR ratified this Convention.

Soviet writers have insisted that even before this the use of such forced labor was limited to cases like those referred to in the Convention. In rather strange contrast a recent law provides for compulsion to be applied to gypsies, to force them to give up their wayfaring life and adapt themselves to permanent work, on pain of imprisonment for up to five years. Many observers believe there is veiled compulsion by the party in the recent "voluntary enlistment" of workers for opening up the "virgin lands" of the East.

Direction of Labor

Most authorities agree that the initial choice of a job in the USSR is generally free. Large organized recruitment campaigns were formerly mainly used, so as to draw off surplus peasant labor, made free by the introduction of mechanization, into expanding urban industry. More re-

cently such drives have been temporary and seasonal, and the young urban population generally provides new labor for industry by advertisement and other means. Jobs in less favored places have some compensatory amenities. There is considerable competition among various enterprises for the best labor, and labor is said to be growing scarcer. Many enterprises must be tempted to seize the best labor in order to fulfill their own productive requirements, without much regard to the labor problems of others.

The Student Trainee. The trainee who has been provided at the state's expense with special qualifications for a better position is an important, and probably growing, type. All societies impose some obligations in such cases, though the tendency is to abandon close requirements in many cases, and to wait for the long-term results of improved education and training. Under a law and a Full Court ruling of the Supreme Court of the USSR a trainee must perform five years' service after graduation.

The Specialist. Soviet history is one of great migrations and relocation of industry. In the period after the outbreak of the last European war and before the German invasion of Russia a law was passed authorizing the involuntary movement of specialists and skilled workers with certain compensations in the form of improved wages and amenities. In recent years there has been criticism of this law as a survival of emergency legislation, and as no longer necessary in view of the proved willingness of such workers to "volunteer" for industrial transfers to remote places with severe cli-

mates and lacking any established urban attractions. It has now been abolished.

Retention of Labor

Western lawyers have described the compulsory direction and retention of labor as inherent in communism. Soviet lawyers appear to be sensitive to such attacks and desirous of proving that the worker in the USSR is free to leave his work and look for another job. There was an important eve-of-the-war law which prohibited voluntarily leaving a job except in a certain number of special cases, e.g., further study or training, maternity cases, old-age retirement. The original law imposed liability to imprisonment for a term of from two to four months, and this same period was referred to in the Standard Discipline Code which followed. In certain vital war industries there were, quite understandably, still more severe provisions. A special summary procedure was used in such cases. Soviet lawyers generally agreed that this law was no longer necessary in modern conditions and it has accordingly been repealed by the Supreme Soviet.

Not only is there to be no prosecution in any court of any worker for changing his job, but all convictions previously recorded are expunged, which means that the present Soviet regime completely disclaims the "Stalinist" system of using the criminal law to maintain labor discipline in this connection. Workers may now give a fortnight's notice if they wish to leave their jobs. Some sanctions remain. The worker loses certain seniority rights and some industrial benefit eligibil-

ity, but such sanctions appear relatively unimportant.

Fixed-term contracts seem to have been unusual in the past, as the employee could not leave in any case. As the enforcement of the old law became laxer, however, e.g., imprisonment ceased to be imposed, some enterprises appear to have started making fixed-term contracts, so that they could sue for breach of contract if the employee left prematurely. The effect on such contracts of the new legal permission to leave work is still disputed among Soviet lawyers.

There is some dispute among Soviet lawyers as to the effect of the wide language used in the new law on the position of trainees. Are they released from their duty to serve the statutory period? It appears that no prosecution of the trainee will now be possible, but there are several other sanctions which are important. The trainee may have his diploma withheld until he has done several years' "practical work" as part of his "course." Employers may still find themselves in legal difficulties if they take on a trainee who ought to be working for someone else, since the employer does not come within the language exempting the worker from prosecution. The worker will lose his deferment from military service.

Labor Discipline

The emergency law imposed criminal responsibility for absenteeism and truancy. This comprised cases of arriving late or leaving early, taking too long for dinner and so on, as well as taking whole days or hours off. A little later the full liability, up to six months' punishment "on the

job" was limited to cases of repeated or prolonged conduct of the kind. This punishment was not further defined by the law but was left to local management. The convict had to work all hours, needed a pass to go home and was paid as a convict and not as an employee.

By 1951 these severe penalties for what might seem a venial offense were no longer referred to in textbooks on labor laws. By 1953 fines appear to have taken the place of imprisonment. The courts recognized various humane excuses. Many instances were simply overlooked by the management. The new law now abolishes the criminal liability of the worker. However, there will be some penalties; disciplinary punishment by management will follow, or the man will be reported to a "court" of fellow-workers for admonition. The offender is also liable to discharge from employment, and his misconduct will be entered in his work record and prejudice his future. Comrades' courts appear in the past to have dealt with insulting behavior and petty thefts. Some guidance is now asked for as to the way in which they should use these new powers. The accused in any case can appeal to a regular court.

Worker Grievances

The system of conciliation for alleged violations of a worker's rights was laid down by a code of rules confirmed on August 29, 1928 and by other related provisions. The main feature of this code was the compulsory submission of a complaint to a body known as the Rates and Conflicts Commission, e.g., if a man was dismissed for bad work. If their decision did not satisfy him,

the worker might appeal to the local court or to a higher trade union.

A recent law has rather modified this system. The new Labor Disputes Commission will still be made up of representatives of management and labor and will still deal with much the same type of case as before, though housing claims will now come directly before the courts. Appeals from the commission go to the local trade union branch, and not to higher trade union levels, whose functions will now be consultative and supervisory. Soviet lawyers have

complained that higher trade union offices are often very far away from the factory and that the worker has suffered inconvenience in the past. Before 1933 a local Labor Inspector was able to check the work of the Rates and Conflicts Commission. On the other hand some critics may see in these recent changes a sign of the new "democratic centralism" by which more authority is delegated to the men on the spot, or even a jealousy of the development of too complex a trade union power structure.

GREATER ROLE FOR SOVIET TRADE UNIONS

THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union at a meeting in December discussed the work of the Soviet trade unions which are composed of more than 49 million factory and office workers. It was the decision of this meeting that the trade unions must play a still greater role in Soviet life.

The trade union must now make good use of the new opportunities made possible by the fact that economic management has been brought closer to the production centers by the establishment of regional economic councils and also by the fact that all factory and office workers can take part in these councils. The right of trade union organizations to participate in the management of production is now ensured by a series of new forms and methods of work.

Production meetings have been invested with new rights and functions. The range of questions under their jurisdiction will include the consideration of production programs, measures for better organization of production and labor, production norms, capital construction, improvement of interplant planning, etc.

Factory and local trade union committees at enterprises and institutions are being given a larger role. They will have greater prerogatives ensuring broader opportunities for expressing and unholding the interests of the workers and of caring for all aspects of the workers' life.

Specifically the enlarged role of the trade unions include: the right to take part in the working out of production and financial programs, deciding questions of norms and wages, controlling the observance of the labor code and the fulfillment of collective agreements, nominating candidates for executive managerial posts, and passing on the dismissal of all workers.

New Soviet Peace Proposals

As a service to our readers we are printing the full text of the specific proposals that accompanied Premier Bulganin's letter of January 10th to President Eisenhower.

It is important to note that the President's letter to Bulganin, dated as of January 12th, while officially an answer to the letter sent to all the NATO members on the eve of the Paris Conference in December by Bulganin, was sent after President Eisenhower had received the letter from the Soviet Premier containing the proposals we reprint. The President's letter was widely published in newspapers and reported on radio and television, but readers may not be so familiar with the important terms of the latest Soviet proposals.

In Eisenhower's letter and in the subsequent interviews both the President and Secretary Dulles seemed to reject all Soviet proposals; nevertheless there appeared to be loopholes opening up the possibility of further negotiations.

Slight as these possibilities may be, it is of the greatest importance that the American people, joining the other peace-loving peoples of the world, press powerfully for discussions and negotiations at this time.

THE Soviet Government has addressed proposals on questions concerning the relaxation of international tension to the governments of the member-countries of the United Nations and also to the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany and Switzerland.

The Soviet Government proposes to call within the coming two to three months a top-level meeting of leading statesmen with the participation of the heads of government. In view of the nature of the questions requiring consideration, it would be expedient to have representatives of all the member-countries of the North Atlantic alliance and those of the participating countries of the Warsaw Treaty take

part in this meeting. If any difficulties were to arise with regard to the participants in this meeting, the Soviet Government would not object to a more restricted composition of participants. The Soviet Union, for example, would consider expedient the participation in the meeting of such countries as India, Afghanistan, Yugoslavia, Sweden and Austria. The participation of countries without military obligations with regard to both groupings would necessarily play a positive role, since, without doubt, countries whose proclaimed policy is non-participation in military blocs and which have proved their adherence to the cause of peace and international cooperation could have a beneficial influence in the passing of decisions conducive to the consolidation of peace.

Naturally, all questions of direct concern to the People's Republic of China can be solved only with its participation.

The Soviet Government considers that such a meeting could be held in Geneva, subject to agreement on the part of the Swiss Government.

As to the proposal for calling a meeting at the foreign-minister level, there can be no assurance that these talks would lead to positive results. Moreover, statements made by certain statesmen coming out against the very idea of East-West talks prove that at this stage talks at that level would meet with serious difficulty which could create additional obstacles to the calling of a conference at the heads-of-government level.

Referring further to the definite problems that could be discussed at the proposed meeting with the participation of the heads of government, the Soviet Government states that attention should be focused primarily on the most imperative questions. Consideration of other issues could be left for the next stage of talks between the states.

The Soviet Government proposes to discuss the following questions:

1. On the immediate suspension of atomic and hydrogen weapon tests for at least 2-3 years.

2. On the banning of atomic and hydrogen weapons.

3. On the proposal of the Polish Government to establish a zone in Central Europe free from atomic weapons.

4. On a non-aggression agreement between the member-countries of the North Atlantic alliance and the countries participating in the Warsaw Treaty.

5. On the reduction of foreign troops stationed in Germany and on the territories of other countries of both NATO and the Warsaw Treaty and, more so, on the complete withdrawal of these troops.

6. On questions of control with regard to such steps in disarmament which could be agreed upon in the near future. A step in this direction could be envisaged through the maintenance of control posts at railway junctions, large ports and on highways. It is also proposed to come to an agreement on the setting up of an 800-kilometer (approximately 500 miles) aerial photography zone on both sides of the line demarcating the two opposing military groupings in Europe. Taking into account the fact that on the territory of Germany there is an abnormal concentration of armed forces and military equipment for peaceful times and that the armies of the chief military alliances of states are directly opposing each other here, it would be expedient to come to terms between the respective states, including the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany, on the enforcement on the territory of Germany of more extensive forms of control over the measures on which it is possible to agree today.

7. On measures for the further expansion of international trade.

8. On measures for prohibiting the war propaganda which is being conducted in some countries even today. It is impossible at one and the same time to speak of peace and to take no

measures against those who call for war.

9. On the ways and means for relaxing tension in the Near and Middle East area.

The Soviet Government expresses its readiness to consider other constructive proposals aimed at putting an end to the "cold war." It also proposes that there be agreement on the manner in which such outstanding issues could be discussed, agreement which at present meets with certain difficulties owing to the various views held by the respective states. In particular, it is noted that due to the stand taken by the Governments of the USA and Great Britain which refuse to agree to the banning of nuclear weapons, the only alternative is to refer questions connected with a radical solution of the atomic disarmament issue to a later stage in negotiations, after agreement will have been reached on less complicated questions.

Further, as may be deduced from official statements of the Western Powers, it can hardly be expected that the countries making up the North Atlantic alliance will at present agree to the following proposals:

On a considerable reduction of armed forces and armaments and on concluding an appropriate international agreement to this end;

On the complete withdrawal of foreign troops from the territories of the member-countries of NATO and the participants in the Warsaw Treaty, on the liquidation of all foreign bases on the territories of other countries;

On the replacement of all existing military groupings in Europe with a system of collective security.

In conclusion the Soviet Government recalls the fact that in recent years the USSR has unilaterally reduced its armed forces by more than two million men. The Soviet Government expresses the hope that the USA, Great Britain and France, on their part, will take steps toward the reduction of their armed forces, thus contributing today to the cause of creating real international security, to the cause of consolidating universal peace.

Two Educational Systems: USA - USSR

THE Columbia Broadcasting System on Monday, December 30, arranged an unrehearsed discussion between a group of Soviet educators in Moscow and a group of American educators in New York. So far as is known this is the first time in radio history that such a discussion has taken place. No questions were asked in advance. The translator in Moscow translated the comment of the Americans into Russian and in turn translated the Soviet comments into English.

The Americans participating in the discussion were: **Dr. Gaylord P. Harnwell**, President of the University of Pennsylvania; **Dr. Barnaby C. Keeney**, President of Brown University; **Dr. Carroll V. Newsom**, President of New York University. The Soviet educators were: **Dr. Mikhail Chelikin**, Director of the Moscow Institute of Power Engineering; **Dr. Ivan Petrovsky**, Rector of Moscow University; **Dr. Peter Polukhin**, Head of the Department of Mining, Metallurgy and Building Sciences in the Soviet Ministry of Higher Education.

After a brief discussion on the difference in the method of selecting students qualified to enter institutions of higher education and the differences in the level of training in the high schools of the two countries, the moderator asked the Soviet educators the following questions:

"What is the purpose of an education? Why do you educate a man in Russia, and how do you know you have succeeded? . . . How do you test the success of your education?"

Dr. Chelikin: I think we would all agree that the aims of education are indeed, humane. We expect from those who graduate from college a wide knowledge, and a wide spiritual knowledge in all fields. This is very important for us because only a short while

ago our country was a country of illiteracy. . . . The aim of education, as I understand it, is to raise the general culture of the people. And of course, when education encompasses not tens of thousands, not hundreds of thousands, but figures much larger than that, that means that we want to raise the cultural level, the educational level, of the people as a whole. And when we speak of education in this country, we must always keep in mind that it is very closely connected with the great numbers of people that have to be educated. Judging by our press, we have solved the quantitative problem, because there are something like 50 million people studying in this country, undergoing education in all its forms; which means that every fourth person, counting the aged and the infants, is studying. And therefore, when we speak of higher education, be it technical or be it of the humanities, we want to raise and to educate the spiritual forces of our students. It harmonizes and in no way conflicts with the government. This merges with the aims of the government and with the people.

President Keeney: I should like to ask Rector Petrovsky a question. First, though, I should observe that the number of people, or the percentage of the population studying in Russia, is almost identical with the percentage that is studying in this country. My question is this: Clearly education is of benefit to the individual who is being educated; clearly it's also of benefit to the society in which he lives. Which would you put first in importance?

Dr. Petrovsky: I think that education for the individual is of primary importance, but the education of each individual does good to other people too, and therefore to the people at large.

After a discussion on the methods of

selecting and training teachers in the Soviet Union, there followed a brief exchange on compulsory curriculum which led to the central point of the discussion: planning.

President Newsom: I must confess that I am a little curious in regard to the planning function, and I am asking this as a question that interests me very much because I think it is quite significant in any society. How do you plan to meet the needs of the total society? That is, your society is very complex, as is ours—so how do you meet the needs of all of that society? That is providing adequate medical care, experts in the various social sciences, experts in the business field, experts in art, literature, poets and so on. How do you weigh these various elements in your planning?

Dr. Petrovsky: I think that to plan the training of poets is impossible. I think it is even impossible to train a poet. But I think we can calculate the number of teachers to be trained.

Dr. Polukhin: I quite agree that the problem of planning the number of specialists to be trained in this or that field is a very complicated problem. But, you see, the fact that all of our economy is planned makes it easier to plan this part of our economy too. If we know the plan of the development of our society as a whole and of our economy as a whole, it's easier to calculate and to plan culture and education. Of course we cannot vouch for the fact that we are very accurate in our planning of specialists, but we can approach a level which would satisfy us; in other words, we can never vouch to being perfect in that field, but the fact that society is planned, and the fact that our economy is planned, makes it easier for us to plan say, such a field as education. But of course we cannot with the accuracy of a drugstore attendant weigh or determine the exact number of people that we need in this or that field to, say—if we are out by 25 per cent this or that way in the number of specialists that we need, we think we are good.

President Keeney: I'd like first to

make an observation, and then ask two questions. I think there is a fundamental difference in our educational systems. Our basic education is in the liberal arts and sciences, which is designed to prepare man's mind to move around in the world, and to move from one occupation to the other, if he decides to. . . . Now the two questions I have are these: suppose that the graduate student in your university selects a field where there are already more students and practitioners than the plan calls for—what happens to him? The second question: what do you do when a graduate of one of your specialized schools, after a rather exact and specialized curriculum, has to move from his specialty to an allied specialty?

Dr. Polukhin: We think we must not confuse two things here. One is the question of the aims of education. We, just as you, are interested that the student develop his talents and abilities to the widest possible degree and to the fullest possible degree. We offer such opportunities in an almost unlimited way. But we do not want the various tendencies and the various likes and dislikes of the individual, we would not like to see them bring us, or society to an absurd point. For instance, if all our boys and girls wanted to become lawyers, we would just be in a fix; we would not be able, for instance, to launch Sputnik. . . . There is nothing wrong if a person doesn't get a job in the narrow specialty which he picked, in which he graduated. We very often in life meet people who have graduated from one faculty or have trained themselves for one calling or specialty, and are now working in a totally different field. And this is possible because we give a very wide and very extensive theoretical and practical background. And this allows a graduate to switch over from one profession to another in life.

It was then proposed that each group express frankly what it believed was the chief weakness of the other's educational system.

The American educators' point centered about what they thought might

be the abuses of the all-over planning of education in the Soviet Union.

Dr. Polukhin: We do not want to convince anybody, or do not want anybody to follow our system or our actions. We like planning, and we not only like it, we think it's a necessity—a vital necessity. And we are not afraid of the things which you may think wrong in our system. We are very confident in this business of planning because the planning is done not by a narrow group of people, as you may think, but by a very wide group of scientists, of educators, and you may even say by the people themselves. How are our plans drawn up? Firstly, there are suggestions made by various enterprises, factories, plants and so on. These suggestions and demands are worked and checked and filed according to various fields of endeavor; and the various fields of endeavor, and the various branches of industry make their suggestions to the republican educational organ. All the suggestions made by the various Soviet republics are gathered and scientifically analyzed. This is very complicated work; it requires much analysis, much thought, and is very complex indeed. And it is not only thousands of specialists and research workers that take part in this, but tens of thousands of people actually participate in this work of drawing up the plans. And our plans, you could say, are the final result of the wishes, of the demands, of the needs of the whole nation at large.

The Soviet educators then turned to what they considered the chief weaknesses of the American system.

Dr. Chelikin: I think that free competition at entrance exams in Soviet colleges is a great force. And I think a weak point is when you select people, or people have their ability to enter college in your country according to—well, according to the well-being of the family or to the money that the family may have, and also according to the racial point of view—that is a weak spot in your educational system. That is, the monetary backing of the family as being the factor which determines his

chance of entering a college is point one, and the second point is the racial point.

Dr. Polukhin: In my opinion, the weakness of the educational system in the United States is that you have a break between theory and practice. I think that people who get the bachelor's degree and have to go through a four-year course in your universities are not very well prepared—are not prepared for practical activity well enough. And they're always faced with the problem: what niche, what part in life they can play. And to be quite frank with you, we don't envy the students in your country who are faced with such a problem.

The three American college presidents then made their answer to the weaknesses pointed out by their Soviet colleagues. All maintained that save for a few isolated incidents there was no racial discrimination either in their own institutions or throughout the country. They compared the practice of granting fellowships, scholarships and loans as well as the holding of part-time jobs to the Soviet system of stipends for university students. President Newsom asserted: "I think it's only fair to say that in the United States at the present time virtually no boys or girls are kept out of college on financial grounds."

The three presidents also maintained that there was no lack of employment for college graduates, President Harnwell pointing out that the University of Pennsylvania had a department to help graduates find work.

Dr. Chelikin: We are very happy to have spent this hour in the studio in Moscow and, if I may put it that way, in your company. I'm sure that our conversation, our free discussion, has far-reaching consequences. I hope it will bring together and work and make for better understanding between the people of the United States and the Soviet Union. Till we meet again, gentlemen.

The transcript from which the above excerpts were taken was prepared by the Columbia Broadcasting System through whose courtesy they are reprinted.

Gilels, Kogan, Shostakovich, Ulanova

EMIL GILELS

IN trying to fix in mind the special quality of excitement generated by the great Soviet pianist, Emil Gilels, the memory arose not of other pianists but of the late Italian genius of the baton, Arturo Toscanini. One does not think of Gilels as a "consummate technician," or as having conquered the difficulties of the keyboard. The piano itself seems to come alive, responsive to the finest shades of feeling, and to laugh, meditate, whisper and thunder. It was this malleability that Toscanini brought to the orchestra, making it a kind of human voice that no other conductor could rival. Toscanini's interpretations were often debated. His readings of the Beethoven and Brahms symphonies, for example, tended to be fast in tempo, with a surge and singing quality different from the kind of restrained, planned architectural conception of, let us say, a Felix Weingartner. But the self-effacing devotion to the music, the passionate absorption, were never questioned.

So Emil Gilels approached the Beethoven Fourth and Fifth ("Emperor") Piano Concertos, accompanied by the Symphony of the Air under Alfred Wallenstein, in Carnegie Hall on Sunday, January 12th. The occasion was his first American appearance this season. The piano sang tenderly and exultantly, with a lyrical ebb and flow, an ability to swell almost imperceptibly from a quiet pathos to a grandeur of statement, that carried the audience away completely.

It was not the kind of Beethoven that one remembers from the late Artur Schnabel, who used to lay out the basic structural lines of a concerto or sonata with a clarity and breadth that also gave a special heartrending poignance to the

slow movements. Perhaps this is what the *New York Times* critic, Howard Taubman, had in mind when he wrote of Gilels in the Beethoven concertos. "He tends to soften them and to give them a warm romantic glow. Could this orientation be the by-product of an absence of sufficient contact with broad Western influences in the maturing years?" It might be remembered, however, that Schnabel's re-studied Beethoven (like his Mozart and Schubert) were as great a revelation to "Western" pianists and audiences as to any other.

At any rate this particularly "Western" audience in Carnegie Hall clapped and cheered and would not stop its clamor until Gilels—whose stage presence has a modesty and lack of mannerisms comparable to his musical devotion—sat down at the piano again, after five recalls, and gave as an encore an impassioned reading of the first movement of Beethoven's "Pathétique" Sonata. It is plain that he has become, to American audiences, not of course a "better" pianist than every other, but one of those unique musical personages whose every appearance is a memorable experience.

LEONID KOGAN

THE night before, on Saturday, January 11th, the young Soviet violinist Leonid Kogan, made his United States debut with the Boston Symphony Orchestra under Pierre Monteux, performing the Brahms concerto. The concert was broadcast. On this occasion too the audience response was an uproarious demonstration of cheers and cries of "bravo." Kogan is a violinist who prefers strength of tone to sweetness, and avoids anything that might seem to be a sentimental pitfall. Those with memories of Kreisler or Szigeti could quite properly

point out that there was more to say about the Brahms concerto than Kogan revealed, but the performance was fiery, dramatic, thoroughly musical, and had an electrifying effect.

Anyone who could find a common "Soviet" or "Eastern" style, other than the violinism of Oistrakh, who sculpts his musical conceptions in marble and ivory, to that of Kogan, who sculpts his in bronze and steel, would be performing a truly remarkable feat. I hope to report in future issues about the further appearances of Gilels and Kogan in New York.

DMITRI SHOSTAKOVICH

EARLY in 1942 Dmitri Shostakovich, evacuated to Kuibyshev, was putting into rehearsal his *Seventh*, "*Leningrad*" *Symphony*, most of which had been composed in Leningrad itself while the German fascists were bombing and shelling the city. His two children, Maxim and Galya, aged four and three, attended the rehearsals regularly, conducting from their seats and referring to the work as "our symphony." Now Maxim has grown up to be a musician of attainments, and his father has written a piano concerto for him, which he unveiled in Moscow last May.

This work, Shostakovich's *Second Piano Concerto*, was given its first American performance by the New York Philharmonic at Carnegie Hall on Thursday, January 2nd. Leonard Bernstein both played the piano part and conducted the orchestra. Bernstein, while somewhat older than Maxim, is a musical youth movement in himself, as pianist, conductor and composer of both symphonies and Broadway musical shows. A large crowd came to greet him, celebrating his first appearance this season with the New York Philharmonic and the news of his appointment as principal conductor of the orchestra for next season.

The new concerto was a complete delight to the ear, and yet somewhat dis-

appointing. Knowing Shostakovich's recent achievements in symphonic writing (the *Tenth Symphony*), piano composition (24 *Prelude and Fugues*) and chamber music (the *Fifth Quartet*) one hoped that he would tackle the form of the piano concerto in the same grand manner. Instead, he has turned the battery of his musical equipment, equalled by few in our times, on a relatively minor target.

The concerto, lasting about twenty minutes, is a blithe, whimsical work in three movements, with piano and orchestra moving hand in hand in an intricate relationship possible only to a consummate master of timbre and rhythm. But even as a light work, dedicated to youth, the music seemed to this writer, on one hearing, to lack the lyrical freshness that would have given it real significance. The musical vein was one that the composer had explored years ago; in the rollicking last movement of the *Sixth Symphony*, for example, and parts of the *Ninth Symphony*.

But one thing is certain. Pianists will enjoy playing this concerto, audiences will enjoy listening to it, and it was good to see this essay in open-hearted musical fun awakening the same pleased smiles in New York as it must have awakened in Moscow.

SIDNEY FINKELSTEIN

GALINA ULANOVA

"The Bolshoi Ballet," A Paul Czinner—I. R. Maxwell Production in Eastman Color. Produced and directed by Paul Czinner with the orchestra of the Royal Opera House, Covent Garden and the Bournemouth Symphony Orchestra conducted by Yuri Faier and G. Rozhdestvensky. Released through Rank Film Distributors.

The Cast

Galina Ulanova, Raissa Struchkova, Nikolai Fadeychev and the Bolshoi Theater Ballet

WHEN the Bolshoi Ballet was in London two years ago Dr. Paul Czinner had the happy idea of photographing them in action on the stage of Covent Garden. Under the direction of Dr. Czinner, the results are certainly the most successful so far achieved of catching the excitement of a ballet performance on film.

A group of divertissements opens the program, demonstrating in brief dances the range, brilliant technique and vigorous attack of various members of the company. But the major item is of course the full-length presentation of *Giselle* with Galina Ulanova.

Giselle is a classic of ballet repertoire, surviving from the great period of romantic ballet in the early part of the 19th century. The leading role of the ballet is called the ballerina's "Hamlet" and still remains a challenge to the aspiring dancer.

Ulanova meets the challenge nobly. Hers is a great recreation of the role in which superb technique is transmuted into a subtle, poignant language of gesture and movement that converts the faded old story and the rubbishy, thumping music into a memorable expression of deeply moving passion, grief and exaltation.

Giselle makes great demands on the acting ability of the dancer and here Ulanova again triumphs. Indeed her portrayal of the varying moods of shimmering first love, madness, and ecstatic bliss are so perfectly fused with the demands of the dancing that even the most technically difficult passages become not exhibitions of skill but the inevitable expression of hopeless despair, or, alternately, transporting joy.

Ulanova is supported by a corps de ballet beautifully exact in its smallest movements and by two splendid dancers in Nikolai Fadeyevich as Albrecht and the rising young ballet star Raissa Struchkova as the Queen of the Wilis.

This film serves to remind us again that the great ballet tradition so carefully guarded by the Bolshoi Ballet since

1917 is a wonderful treasure whose influence will, when a truly free exchange develops, profoundly enrich our whole theatrical life.

Now being shown in this country, the "Bolshoi Ballet" is not to be missed when it comes to your local movie theater.

M. Y.

THE RIGHT TO TRAVEL, by Corliss Lamont. Basic Pamphlets, Box 42, Cathedral Station, New York 25, N. Y. 10 cents each.

CORLISS LAMONT has written a vigorous defense of the right of all Americans to travel outside the limits of their own country as they choose. A traditional right of all citizens, Mr. Lamont shows how it has been turned into what the State Department is pleased to call a "privilege" during the cold war period.

A concise summary of how this change took place is presented by the author who points out that far greater issues are involved than merely the right to travel: the First, Fifth and Ninth Amendments to the Constitution have been seriously violated as the State Department more and more arbitrarily asserted its "powers" in denying passports to applicants.

Recent rulings of the Supreme Court, Mr. Lamont points out, give some hope that we are beginning to return to traditional rights and guarantees cancelled during the hysteria of the past ten years. This pamphlet, by reminding people of the basic American liberties involved in the right to travel, will help in bringing us back to our temporarily lost freedoms. Who will not agree with Mr. Lamont:

"People must be free to travel for the sake of pure pleasure and recreation, for simple sightseeing, for romance, or for any other purpose that strikes their fancy. The right to travel, as part of the general right of movement, is inherent in the free man's way of life."

"Not By Bread Alone"

MURRAY Young's review of Dudintsev's *Not By Bread Alone* in your December issue has the quality of good criticism. It provokes a review of the review to get at some of the neglected meat of this notable book and point to some significant errors in the reviewer's comments.

First, Dudintsev was not tackling the job of giving us a rounded picture of life in the Soviet Union today, and to criticize his book for not doing what he never intended is to fall into the trap against which every responsible reviewer must guard. *Not By Bread Alone* is a surgeon's attack on a key weakness of Soviet society as it had developed prior to the 20th Congress. It is a deeply graven novel of social criticism that may well become one of the chief literary records of this notable and tragic period. It must be placed in the proper perspective to be understood and to achieve its objective of warning us all that bureaucracy can destroy the creative spirit under socialism today, and that no easy formula can lead to automatic, built-in protection. Only the unflagging determination of the creators and the vigilance of every member of the collective.

We must not let ourselves drop back into the immaturity of an earlier period when it became one of the pillars of dogmatic criticism to insist that every work of art must be examined as a corrective for all the major ills of society. Dudintsev is telling us that socialism does not transform men and women into demigods, that in the very nature of the great advances of the Soviet collective there is the danger of hidden weaknesses that slow down its great potential growth. That we have such well documented social criticism coming out of the Soviet Union is one of the basic proofs of the dialectic strength of the new society. To cover it up would be a corrupting weakness, and to call it "a one-sided picture of the difficulties surrounding creative workers in the Soviet Union" is to condemn Dudintsev for thrusting his keen edged scalpel into an abscess. Re-

viewers should respect the intelligence of readers. No person capable of reading the book can think it is telling "the whole story." *Oliver Twist* and *Vanity Fair* were not the whole of England nor *An American Tragedy* nor *Babbitt* nor *Arrowsmith* all of America. Yet each made a notable contribution and left a mark on the times that produced it. Let us have more such books.

More important, perhaps, is the reviewer's entrapment by the phrase, "lone wolf" with which he twice categorizes the hero, Lopatkin. A chief contribution of the book is its projection of the role of the individual in our current history. One of the sharpest contradictions within the socialist system is the common failure to understand that the major test of a collective is its capacity to stir and utilize to the fullest extent the creative powers of its members for the common good.

The entire book down through the last paragraph is a record of the remarkable power of Soviet society to stimulate Lopatkin to creative thought and action and of the difficulties and failures it faced in taking full advantage of his achievements. Dudintsev is underlining in his swiftly moving narrative the necessity of working out more adequate safeguards for the imaginative genius of his people.

The lesson and the moral of the book is that these social organizations need major improvement, and will always need it to overcome the ever-present and constantly recurring contradictions that arise as a part of the process of growth. To make certain that no one can miss this, Dudintsev has spelled it out in the final dramatic scene with which he closes his book. To imply that Lopatkin chose the role of a "lone hero" is to line up with the bureaucracy who tried to destroy him. There were plenty of such "heroes" who fought alone against the Hitlerites at Leningrad and Stalingrad. The power of Soviet society lies in its ability to produce the tenacious steel of such men and women, capable of working and fighting alone through the years for the welfare of the collective when they must.

Holland Roberts

2nd PRINTING

Special

96 page November issue

NEW WORLD REVIEW

Still Available

Articles by:

G. D. H. COLE
ANNA LOUISE STRONG
D. N. PRITT
CORLISS LAMONT
J. D. BERNAL
SCOTT NEARING
ESLANDA ROBESON

and others

25 cents each—5 for \$1.00

New World Review

34 West 15th St., New York 11, N. Y.

ABOUT

TRAVEL TO

THE MOON



& other planets

Published in USSR — 50 cents

INTERPLANETARY TRAVEL

By A. STERNFELD

**Imported Publications
& Products**

4 West 16th St., New York 11, N. Y.

Write for lists of Soviet books

NEW SOVIET FILMS

A DAY IN MOSCOW

MALVA

FLAMES ON THE VOLGA

CARNIVAL

Coming:

BOULE DE SUIF

FESTIVAL IN MOSCOW

LENINGRAD SYMPHONY

Artkino Pictures, Inc.

723 SEVENTH AVE., NEW YORK 19

Telephone: Circle 5-6570

For Subscriptions

NEW WORLD REVIEW

34 W. 15th St., 7th fl.

New York 11, N. Y.

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

☐ *New subscription*

☐ *Renewal*

NAME

ADDRESS

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