

SOCIAL SCIENCES ✓

JULY, 1958

25¢

✓ **DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRARY JUL 11 19**

New World

REVIEW

SPORTS IN THE USSR

PROF. I. I. NIKIFOROV

Towards Ending Nuclear Weapon Tests

Corliss Lamont

Warsaw University

Margaret Schlauch

Stalingrad - City Reborn

Scott and Helen Nearing

NEW COLLECTIVE FARM POLICY

NEW WORLD REVIEW

JULY

1958

Toward Ending Nuclear
Weapon Tests *Corliss Lamont* 3

Warsaw University—
150th Anniversary
Margaret Schlauch 9

Stalingrad—City Reborn
Scott and Helen Nearing 13

"Friendship" *Archie Johnstone* 18

Physical Culture and Sports
in the USSR
Prof. I. I. Nikiforov 20

The MTS and the Kolkhozi 28

Speeding Up USSR Chemical
Industry and Consumer Goods 35

Conference of Warsaw Treaty
Countries 36

Meeting of Council of Economic
Mutual Assistance 37

BOOKS

Inside Russia Today
John Gunther 38

JESSICA SMITH, *Editor*
MURRAY YOUNG, *Managing Editor*

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

Vol. 26, No. 7, July 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

Dear Reader, Please Take Note!

As a necessary economy to help us
through the summer months, we must
skip the August issue. The next NWR
you receive will be dated September.
All subscribers will receive an extra
issue later to make up the full 12 for
the year.

In your hands is our urgent summer
appeal for funds. Many of you have
acted swiftly and generously, and we
are deeply grateful. But we are still far
from our goal.

Will those of you who have not yet
responded please use the blank below
and send in your contribution, large or
small, whatever you can afford, today?
Of the \$6,000 we have asked for, about
\$2,000 has come in—that leaves us
\$4,000 to go—and we *must* make up
that sum if we are to continue publish-
ing.

These are deeply troubled and dif-
ficult times. Heavy clouds are now
obscuring that Summit toward which we
had looked with such hope. This means
more work than ever for those who be-
lieve in international negotiations, un-
derstanding and peace.

Let's get those nuclear weapon tests
suspended! This is our first and most
vital task, and we believe it can be done.
Your contribution will help us do our
part in this.

PLEASE FILL OUT AND MAIL TODAY

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

I enclose \$..... for your SUMMER SUS-
STAINING FUND.

I enclose \$..... for renewal of my sub-
scription ☐ \$2.50 one year ☐ \$1.25 for
six months (check one).

Name.....

Street.....

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

Towards Ending Nuclear Weapon Tests

by CORLISS LAMONT

ON MARCH 31, 1958 the Soviet Government announced that it was halting nuclear weapons tests. It urged the United States to do the same. Instead of accepting this proposal, our Government has advanced numerous excuses for continuing nuclear tests, among them saying that since the Soviet Union suspended testing only after the successful conclusion of its latest important series, it had nothing to lose by calling quits now.

To me these official excuses are not valid. They embody a number of solemn non-sequiturs that certainly provide no adequate grounds for the U.S. to proceed with its tests scheduled for the Pacific during spring and summer of this year. We are already far ahead in this dangerous game. On the date of the Soviet suspension, the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission reported that the United States had already set off a total of more than twice as many nuclear explosions as Soviet Russia.

DR. CORLISS LAMONT, teacher of philosophy, writer and lecturer, has made outstanding contributions in the struggle for civil liberties, international understanding and peace. This article is based on the forthcoming pamphlet by Corliss and Margaret Lamont which summarizes the worldwide campaign against nuclear weapons tests and includes the authors' correspondence on the subject with American and Soviet officials and others.

I believe that the time to halt is now. Not next week, not next month, not next year. Now.

I am in favor of an international agreement for the ending of nuclear weapons tests that will put into effect an adequate United Nations system of inspection covering Britain, the Soviet Union and the United States. Contrary to the interpretation of the U.S. State Department, the Soviet Government has long been willing to accept such inspection, not only as applied to the testing of nuclear weapons, but also to the banning of their production and the destruction of stockpiles.

Let us look at the arguments against these proposals for peace, to see whether or not they are valid. First of all, highly placed and influential Americans, including officials of the AEC, have claimed that there can be no adequate inspection system because no instruments can be devised to register certain underground nuclear weapons tests. After the AEC had set off a small atom bomb in September 1957, 2,000 feet inside a Nevada mountain and 800 feet from its top, the Commission announced that the blast was detectable only 250 miles away. But in March 1958 it became known that the underground explosion had been recorded as far off as Fairbanks, Alaska, 2,300 miles from the blasted mountain. Later the AEC admitted

its mistake, but called it an "honest error."

That the Commission, with boundless scientific facilities at its command, could have made such a boner seems almost incredible; there have been many drastic criticisms of it. For example, Dr. Hugo Wolfe, acting Chairman of the Federation of American Scientists, declared that the AEC's "purpose was to mislead the American public and to influence public opinion against the idea of an agreement on inspected cessation of nuclear testing."

At about the same time, the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, a group of public-spirited citizens organized in the fall of 1957, issued a detailed report. It said that the AEC, which is required by law to safeguard the public from nuclear hazards, had failed to be candid about the dangers of radioactive fall-out from nuclear bomb testing.

The AEC has also argued that the U.S. testing of nuclear weapons must be continued so that the so-called "clean bomb" may be perfected. AEC member Edward Teller, who is often called the "Father" of the H-bomb and who recently stated that "disarmament is a lost cause," has been especially vocal in supporting this theory of a clean bomb. In his press conference of April 30 President Eisenhower undermined to a considerable degree Dr. Teller's position by stating that less than half of the 1958 U.S. tests would be concerned with clean bombs. "I was told," said the President, "by the Chairman of the AEC that at least 40 per cent of the tests have their principal purpose to get cleaner bombs."

Then a few days later Admiral Strauss, testifying as Chairman of the AEC before the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, proceeded to undermine Mr. Eisenhower: "There will also be a number of detonations to observe the effect of explosions upon military structures and materials. *Excepting this latter category* which, strictly speaking is not for weapons development, some 40 per cent of the tests are related *directly or indirectly* to the development of weapons with greatly reduced fall-out—that is to say, to so-called clean weapons." (*Italics mine*—C.L.) As I. F. Stone puts it in his *Weekly* (May 12, 1958): "It is impossible to tell *just what that 40 per cent is 40 per cent of*. It might easily prove to be only 20 per cent of the total number of tests, perhaps more, perhaps less."

Dr. Albert Schweitzer, whose "Declaration of Conscience" in April 1957 was a high point in the campaign against nuclear weapons, provided another sort of answer to the AEC in his new statement of April 1958, entitled "An Obligation to Tomorrow."

Dr. Schweitzer reminds the world that the much publicized clean bomb is "only relatively clean. Its trigger is an uranium bomb made of the fissionable uranium-235—an atomic bomb as powerful as the one dropped over Hiroshima. This bomb, when detonated, also produces radioactivity as do the neutrons released in great numbers at the explosion. . . . The intention seems to be to convince people that new nuclear tests will be followed by less and less radiation and that there is no real argument for the discontinuance of the tests. . . . We are constantly be-

ing told about a 'maximum permissible amount' of radiation. What does 'permissible' mean? And who has the right to 'permit' people to be exposed to these dangers?"

If the Third World War takes place, what essential difference will it make, I ask, if tens of millions of persons in the combatant nations are burned to a crisp by the terror weapon of the "clean" H-bomb or the horror weapon of the "dirty" H-bomb?

What the Eisenhower Administration does by continuing nuclear weapons tests is not only to expose the American people to more and more radioactive poisoning—and even the AEC now admits that the United States is "the hottest radioactive place in the world"—but also to imperil in similar fashion the populations of other countries both near and far. So long as the Soviet Union was testing nuclear weapons, it was equally responsible for the international diffusion of fall-out.

For a long time now the U.S. Government has imposed upon mankind yet another frightful hazard connected with nuclear weapons. On the pretext that the USSR may at any moment spring a surprise military attack on the United States or its allies, our Strategic Air Command regularly keeps flying and armed with atom or hydrogen bombs numerous planes*—including many of those assigned to bomber bases clear around the world.

In March 1958 a U.S. jet so armed accidentally dropped an A-bomb in South Carolina. Six persons were injured, but nobody was

killed. The A-bomb did not go off, but the TNT for triggering it did. Although the AEC and Defense Department had repeatedly issued assurances that no such accident could release fall-out, they both rushed teams for radioactive decontamination to the area. Later *The New York Times* revealed: "An undisclosed number of accidents involving atomic bombs has occurred since the Air Force started carrying the perfected weapons in training and alert flights."

In the meantime the campaign for the termination of nuclear weapons tests, and for the total abolition of these weapons, goes on all over the world. For here is a cause that cuts across all national and class boundaries, across all economic, political and religious viewpoints, to enlist the emotions and intelligence of human beings everywhere who are concerned about the well-being of future generations and the survival of mankind.

The National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy continues to hold public meetings and to print forceful advertisements. It has established more than seventy local committees in cities throughout the United States.

Another group doing splendid work against nuclear bombs has been the American Friends Service Committee (Quakers). This was one of the cooperating groups in a special committee which, on the Memorial Day weekend of 1958, staged a great Walk for Peace to Washington. The walkers finally reached the White House and paraded in front of it. One of their most effective posters read "Peace in the World or the World in Pieces."

* The British Government has to some extent done the same thing.

Closely associated with the Quakers is a committee called Non-Violent Action against Nuclear Weapons, which in 1957 staged the Prayer and Conscience Vigil at the U.S. nuclear testing site in Nevada. In 1958 it planned the voyage of Albert S. Bigelow, a captain in the U.S. Navy during World War II, and three other pacifists, in the thirty-foot ketch *Golden Rule* to the Eniwetok Proving Grounds in the Marshall Islands to protest against the new U.S. tests in the Pacific. To thwart this demonstration, the AEC issued special regulations banning all unauthorized Americans from the test area of approximately 390,000 square miles of open sea. On May 1 the *Golden Rule* crew, through its attorney, the famed civil liberties lawyer, A. L. Wirin, argued in a Federal Court in Honolulu that the AEC was violating the long-established principle of freedom of the seas and the Marshall Islands mandate agreement. Although the judge ruled in favor of the AEC and issued an injunction forbidding the boat to sail, the crew defied him by setting out twice. Each time a Coast Guard cutter intercepted the ketch and brought it back to Honolulu. After the second attempt, early in June, Skipper Bigelow was sent to jail for 60 days on a conspiracy charge, while the other crewmen received the same sentence for criminal contempt of court.

Meanwhile, their attorney, Mr. Wirin, flew to Japan to obtain testimony and support for another legal action he is handling—the suit of Bertrand Russell, Linus Pauling, Norman Thomas, Brock Chisholm, T. Kagawa, Martin Niemoller and some 35 others to restrain the Ameri-

man, British and Soviet Governments from further testing of nuclear weapons. Although this court test has little chance of success, it possesses considerable educational value.

In England the movement against nuclear weapons has been a good deal more successful than in the United States. In the first part of April thousands of Britishers took part in a huge march to Aldermaston, the site of the Government's nuclear bomb plant; eight thousand persons were present at the final meeting. A week later 12,000 people turned out for the giant rally called by the Labor Party in Trafalgar Square. Among the speakers on "Stop the Tests Now" were Hugh Gaitskell, head of the Party, and the militant Aneurin Bevan. The Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, which includes in its ranks many M.P.'s, now has 183 local branches throughout the country, and a Nuclear Disarmament Mass Lobby Committee has been established to bring pressure on Parliament. In spite of all this, the British Government went ahead with the testing of a nuclear weapon device at Christmas Island in the Pacific on April 28.

In India the whole population has long been united against the threat of nuclear weapons and their testing. In April 1958 Prime Minister Nehru hailed the Soviet suspension of nuclear weapons tests, supported the Polish proposal for a zone in Europe from which nuclear weapons would be barred, and opposed Secretary Dulles' plan to supply such weapons to Western Germany.

In Japan there has naturally been a powerful movement against nu-

clear weapons ever since the summer of 1945 when the U.S. Air Force dropped the first two A-bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki (August 6 and 9 respectively). The Japanese Council Against A- and H-Bombs has set up a vast network of local chapters in cities, towns and villages. In 1955 it gathered 32,500,000 signatures for a petition presented to the Japanese Diet asking that body to demand that the United States, the USSR and Great Britain stop all nuclear testing. The Diet adopted such a resolution in February 1956, being the first national parliament to take action of this kind. This Council has called the Fourth World Conference against A- and H-Bombs to be held in Tokyo in August 1958.

In many other nations, too, groups and individuals are active in the struggle against nuclear weapons.

Coming back to my own country, I reiterate what I said in the Open Letter which my wife and I sent to President Eisenhower January 18: "Since it was the United States that first invented, manufactured and used atomic bombs, we believe that our nation has a special moral responsibility to take the lead in outlawing nuclear weapons." This responsibility is all the more serious, in my opinion, because I think that there was no military need which justified the use of nuclear bombs against the defenseless Japanese civilian population of two large cities. At the beginning of August 1945 Japan was already on the point of surrendering; and the Soviet attack on the Japanese army in Manchuria was due to start, and did start, on August 8, two days after the bombing of Hiroshima. Presi-

dent Truman could easily and reasonably have waited another week or two before giving his fatal order, to see what would be the effects of the massive Soviet offensive; or he could have arranged a non-lethal public demonstration of the power of the A-bomb to convince the Japanese Government that its cause was lost.

I cannot escape the conclusion, therefore, that the U.S. Government's resort to nuclear bombs, resulting in the greatest two-day casualties for civilians in the records of war, must be adjudged as one of the most barbaric military actions in history. Americans, who are so wont to condemn other peoples for letting the end justify the means, ought conscientiously to ask themselves what the ethical philosophy of their own government was at Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

I conclude on a slightly optimistic note. For it has become evident that since the Soviet Union put a halt to its nuclear weapons tests, the pressures on the Eisenhower Administration to take the same step have not been without effect. On May 17 *The New York Times* stated: "There is strong pressure within the Administration for a United States decision to suspend nuclear testing after the current series of tests in the Pacific is concluded."

Another sign of progress was that, after an exchange of letters during May, President Eisenhower and Premier Khrushchev agreed that a conference of nuclear experts representing the nuclear-weapon Powers should be promptly convened to work out the technical aspects of a watertight agreement for the termination of nuclear weapons testing.

The Conference is scheduled for July.

Yet even if the experts concur, a great deal remains to be done. There must be a formal treaty for the permanent ending of tests. And then must come agreements for stopping production of nuclear weapons and destroying all stock-piles. It is our hope that such accords will be worked out under the auspices of the United Nations, with

provisions for far-reaching U.N. inspection. If the Great Powers can achieve nuclear disarmament, then the way will be open for general disarmament treaties covering armies, navies, air forces and the whole array of conventional weapons. This is the only sure route to that lasting world peace which will free humanity once and for all from the agony of international conflict and the fear of annihilation.

OTHER VOICES TO END NUCLEAR WEAPON TESTS

ADLAI E. STEVENSON, speaking at Michigan State University June 9, renewed the appeal to end nuclear weapons tests which he raised in the last Presidential campaign, because, he said:

"... even the testing of nuclear weapons, let alone their use, is incompatible with human welfare. . . . Now Russia has taken the lead, and there is reason to hope we can reach a reasonable agreement on methods of inspection against violation. . . . This small step would be historic, it would break the disarmament deadlock."

A number of church groups have recently added their voices to those seeking an end to tests. The new United Presbyterian Church of the USA showed strong support for ending tests. Though the resolution on ending tests was defeated by the narrow margin of 516 to 418, the final session of the Assembly, on June 4, called for a halt to the armament race. In an earlier pronouncement, the body called for the substitution of persuasion for force in our foreign policy and for a policy of peaceful co-existence with Communist nations.

In June also, delegates to a Methodist Conference in Flint, Michigan, called for an end to nuclear bomb testing. The 600 delegates to the 576,000 member Augustana Lutheran Church urged President Eisenhower and Congress to continue their efforts to halt military nuclear tests. The United Church Women called upon the U.S. Government to cease testing for a trial period. Following a speech by Rev. Edwin T. Dahlberg, President of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., the Council's General Board adopted a statement urging control and limitation of all nuclear tests by international agreement. Dr. O. Frederick Nolde, director of the Commission of Churches on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches, put forward a proposal for ending of testing of atomic weapons and bringing about atomic disarmament.

The National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, the Quakers and other groups calling for an end to testing, are also campaigning against proposed legislation to give nuclear weapons to U.S. allies.

Warsaw University- 150th Anniversary

by MARGARET SCHLAUCH

ALMOST daily I hurry through the wrought-iron gates of Warsaw University, intent on the duties of the moment and paying all too little attention to the scene about me. But once in a while I stop to look at it and to take in the changes that have occurred since I began to work here seven years ago: the buildings that have been restored or refurbished, or created afresh where once lay heaps of rubble. There are still too few buildings, of course, and we are still terribly cramped for space in all departments, but the achievement is nevertheless impressive.

In my first year or so here I remember, for instance, holding lectures in the make-shift class-rooms (heated by inadequate iron stoves) at one end of a single-story building which had been completely disemboweled in the center by some sort of explosion. Now that building is completely restored. There are several fine classrooms (steam-heated) at both ends, and in the center is a large hall with balcony, called the Auditorium Maximum, where mass lectures and rallies and formal convocations are held.

MARGARET SCHLAUCH, former Professor of English at New York University and Johns Hopkins, is now Director of the English Department at Warsaw University. She has lived in Poland since 1951.

Every building—new, restored, or still battle-scarred—is eloquent of Polish history and Polish struggles for freedom. It was only when I had bought some elementary textbooks, and read up on the history known here to all high school students, that I began to understand what these brick-and-concrete structures and heaps of rubble were trying to say to me.

This year some special commemorative ceremonies have served to drive home the lesson of history.

The nucleus of Warsaw University, historically speaking, was its Law School, founded 150 years ago in 1808. Ten years later the addition of further faculties created the university proper. This was, we have to remember, the period of Napoleon and the struggles of mixed good and evil consequence which attended his career.

There followed the age of continued partition for Poland, with the Warsaw area subordinated to tsarist Russia. Polish students at Warsaw University as elsewhere played a dramatic part in the uprisings of the 19th century: the events of 1830 (which so moved Chopin, then living in France), the rebellions of 1848 and 1863 as well. Secret societies, illegal publications, defiant demonstrations and reprisals by the authorities were familiar features of student life. There were clashes

with tsarist militia, followed by widespread arrests.

The frustrated revolution of 1905 engaged the active support of large sections of the student body. Though this movement was defeated, the effort was continued with unabated determination to make Warsaw University a Polish institution serving the qualified youth of the nation (with certain financial restrictions, of course) in their own language. For a single generation only, in the 1920's and 1930's, that aim was to be realized before the Hitlerite onslaught; and during that period there were not only the financial limitations referred to, but also certain disabilities based on sex and race.

There was a German occupation of Warsaw in World War I which affected the University. This was a regime oppressive and wrongful enough, but relatively mild, as history was to prove, when compared with the Nazi occupation of 1939-45. During those years of World War II, the University of Warsaw was closed down entirely and education on this level became illegal.

Despite the dangers which attended it, such education was nevertheless continued by underground groups of organized professors who risked their lives, quite literally, in order to hand on to Polish youth the essentials of higher learning. All praise is due to these devoted teachers who ensured the continuity of advanced instruction in Poland during its darkest years, not so long ago. I often think of them when I walk through the University grounds today, especially when I am leaving at dusk or in the early winter darkness, after the day's work

is done and I no longer need to think of lectures, speeches and reports.

The Library of the University reflects the fate of the whole institution in many eloquent ways. Sometimes when I order a book the slip comes back to me with the curt notation: Lost during the Occupation. (An exhaustive grammar of the English language by a Dutch scholar, borrowed in 1940, has disappeared entirely: no one knows what became of the reader or his book.) Sometimes I receive the book and observe with interest an imperialist tsarist stamp of accession, or one in German or in Polish, depending on the date. As the old Romans used to say, books too have their fates! When I want to look up something published in the 16th or 17th century I consult a special card-catalogue in which many entries are recorded in the spidery script and faded ink of 150 years ago.

The Library building itself is an old-fashioned, rather ugly structure of the late 19th century, unfortunately blocking the view of a restored 18th-century palace just behind it, which would be a delight to the eye if opened up in proper perspective. The space for books and for people is limited, the facilities are alas old-fashioned. But at least the place exists, relatively undamaged and functioning well despite all handicaps. The preservation of its treasures is due to the courageous devotion and prompt action and hard work of its personnel in time of crisis, during the siege of Warsaw in 1939 and later.

Many precious manuscripts and other works were destroyed as a result of the ill-fated uprising of 1944,

but the central collection remained. When the entire city was doomed to destruction by the Hitler forces, the authorities permitted the evacuation of 100,000 of the most valuable books from the Library, and in addition the librarians succeeded in saving about as many more by hiding them in the cellars of the building. Others had been temporarily scattered for safe-keeping. It is easy to imagine what a huge job it was to collect these items and replace them and check the catalogues for them after the liberation of Warsaw and the rebuilding of the University.

The Library is just one example. Every part of the University is eloquent of national history during the last century and a half. The anniversary just celebrated this month (May) gave occasion for much retrospective thought. And it was in itself a colorful affair. I have just participated in the ceremonies, and I found them inspiring, not so much for themselves (impressive as they were) as for the historical background they suggested. First of all, it was something of a sight to behold the representatives of many other venerable institutions of learning gathered here to honor Warsaw and be honored by its University on such an occasion. The costumes of the delegates varied from medieval robes to Renaissance caps and ruffs, and some simply came in muf-ti. The Rector of Warsaw University and its important dignitaries were in impressive robes, with the proper appurtenances of wands, scepters, beadles and the like.

During the ceremonies I exchanged a jest in Latin with the professor of classics who sat beside me: it concerned a very handsome lady who

sat next to him and was obviously *not* a professor herself. Nobody seemed to know how she got there, and I was afraid that she would understand if I spoke about her in Polish. Thus it is clear that tradition plays a considerable part in such proceedings, Latin language and all. On formal occasions Polish academicians are very formal indeed. One doesn't say "you" or "he" in speaking to or about a rector under such circumstances, but rather "Your/His Magnificence." This reminds me of my student days in Munich in the 1920's, when we also spoke of the rector as "Seine Magnificenz" (abbreviated S. M.).

To some readers this reversion to titles may seem to be pretentious: difficult to reconcile with the realities of living in a socialist country. But one has to remember that tradition is very dear to Poles precisely because they were deprived of an independent national life in the 19th century. The present resurgence of formal usage is nothing new. From 1951 onwards I realized that I had to say "Mr. Professor" instead of "you" in addressing colleagues, in spite of an official trend to social equality. I could never say "Don't you think . . ." but rather "Does not Mr. Professor think . . ." Polish tradition as well as Polish linguistic usage require the third person.

There is an area for democratic informality existing along with the formalities, however. Although I say "Your Magnificence" to the Rector on formal occasions such as receptions, I still write to him as "Citizen Rector" in ordinary routine correspondence. Usage appears to differ from one socialist country to another. In Czechoslovakia, where I recently

visited three universities to give lectures in the philology departments, I noticed that academic courtesy was less formal than in Poland, and the second person pronoun is used generally in preference to the honorific third.

Coming back to the commemoration of Warsaw University's founding, the affair was colorful indeed, with tradition and formality emphasized in the initial ceremonies, and informal hospitality on the later occasions. Our own University dignitaries were in the medieval regalia of academic costume, which for the Rector means an ermine-trimmed scarlet gown and gold chain. Equally impressive were many of the visiting rectors and recipients of higher degrees. One of them (from Hamburg) looked like a Renaissance gentleman in grey velvet, stiff white ruff, and Henry VIII hat. On the other hand the rector from Peking University came in ordinary civil attire. When he arose to present a banner of crimson with a message of good-will embroidered on it in Chinese characters, he received a deafening ovation.

Very interesting to me was the award of an honorary degree to Professor Halvdan Koht of Norway, venerable author of books on Icelandic sagas and on Norwegian peasant movements of the 16th century. This scholar was a leader of his government (whether as prime minister or minister of foreign affairs I do not recall) at the moment when the Nazis attacked the country in April 1940. He had shared in the exile and return of the government, and it was good to see him being honored here in Poland, as a reminder of common sufferings and a

common sense of the past. Later we attended an exhibit illustrating the history of the university.

As European universities go, Warsaw's is not very old, though its history has been turbulent. I had more than a whiff of greater antiquity when I was recently in Prague as guest of the Czech Academy of Sciences. Of course I remembered the city, with its lofty citadel, its cathedral and palaces, from before the war, but this time I had greater opportunity to visit the institutions of higher learning and museums. I was impressed there as in Poland with the excellent work being done to make a sense of history seem immediate and vital to the most casual visitors.

In the newly organized Literary Museum not far from the cathedral there are rooms that are models of dramatic exposition, showing the history of literature against the panorama of developing society. The room devoted to the career of the great reformer Jan Hus is something I shall never forget. From Bohemia to Poland the cultural influences ran strong in the 15th century: bold thoughts leaped from the Charles University in Prague to Krakow in Poland, and onwards to the north and west. Today again the cultural interchange is lively and fruitful.

The ceremonies at Warsaw University seemed to me to be much more than an expression of homage to the past. They were that too, of course, but even more I think they were meant to be a pledge of close cooperation in the building of science by devoted scholars for peaceful ends: for the enrichment of human culture for all of us.

Stalingrad-City Reborn

by SCOTT AND HELEN NEARING

THROUGH forty years of pioneering, the Soviet Union has lifted its citizens out of the black slough of illiteracy, instilled in them a thirst for knowledge, and gone a long way toward satisfying that thirst by making millions of them into trained and experienced scientists, engineers, technicians who can match wits and match products with the people from any other country. Today they are exercising a profound influence over the peoples and over many governments in Europe, Asia, Africa, and Latin America. In the course of this forty years, while the Soviet Union has provided leadership for progressive peoples across the world, it has reorganized, rebuilt and re-equipped whole areas lying within its borders and given the peoples new hope and a new life. It has also built new socialist cities, a phenomenon of the middle-twentieth century.

Stalingrad was the new name given to Tsaritsyn, an old city lying along the Volga River in southern Russia. It had a population of 125,000 in 1925. Stalingrad entered the war, in June, 1941, a thriving community of 450,000 people. Two years

later it was a heap of ruins in which there was not a single undamaged building left standing.

Invading German armies, totaling 330,000 men, attacked Stalingrad in their march toward the Urals. There was house-to-house fighting for months, with fierce battles fought back and forth on Cemetery Hill, the highest point of the city. There 15,000 Soviet soldiers were killed and buried, alongside countless enemy dead. After an occupation of the city lasting for 125 days, with Soviet defenders holding on in pockets along the Volga and being supplied by boats with ammunition and food during the bitter winter months, two Soviet armies drove in and cut the German lines. Ninety-one thousand German prisoners, including the top generals, were captured. Slowly the evacuated civilian population drifted back to the rubble-strewn area that had been their city. It was winter. Crowded into cellars, huddled in tents, they began the gigantic task of clearing away the wreckage.

Stalingrad by this time had become a world-renowned synonym for courageous resistance. Supplies and helpers came from Soviet areas which suffered less war damage. City planners and architects, from home and abroad, after surveying the desolation, advised moving the site of the city. "You have plenty of good building land along the Volga. Here

THE NEARINGS traveled last year in the Soviet Union and China. Their lectures across country this winter described their experiences in the socialist world. A book to be called "Brave New World," recording these observations, will be published this fall.

are only tangled ruins. Select a rubble-free area. Begin over again."

The citizens of Stalingrad met, considered the suggestion, and rejected it. "We will rebuild our city on its old site," they decided. For a year they worked at disposing of the rubbish. Then they began to build, according to plan.

We saw this plan in the form of a huge, meticulously constructed model of the city-to-be. It covered many square yards of a large office in the City Architects Building. We also saw the city, after fourteen years of resolute, determined, united effort. Both plan and fulfillment were monuments to human ingenuity, resourcefulness, and dogged persistence in the face of difficulties that seemed insuperable until they were tackled and surmounted.

We had a talk in late November, 1957, with the Vice-Mayor of Stalingrad, a tall and powerful woman who had stayed on in the city through the siege. "What are your impressions of our city?" she asked as we sat down with her in the Mayor's office. "Well," we answered, "this is the youngest city we have ever visited."

"Yes," she said, "We are only 14 years old. The second birth of Stalingrad began in February, 1943. Fortunately, it was a warm February. We were in total ruin. Three hundred civilians were in the city, with the soldiers. We had no houses to live in, let alone beds to sleep in. We built huts and lived in cellars, tents, and wrecked planes and trucks that were lying about. In April and May, young Communists and other volunteers from all parts of the Soviet Union came here.

"Among our own citizens who re-

turned in those early days was a well-loved teacher, Cherkassova, who immediately established a kindergarten and school for those children we had with us. She organized a building brigade of women who worked with the men, on the reconstruction of the city. These women started with the house of Sergeant Pavlov, a war hero, and undertook to rebuild it by themselves. It was the first house restored after the war and it was done by this team of women.

"The brigade idea caught on. All citizens took a pledge to work, unpaid, in teams. They reported, with 'Cherkassov books' in which the hours they worked were entered. Some worked 500 hours for the restoration of the city. Some worked 1,000 hours; they were the richest in honor. Since then, we have all worked at rebuilding. Now that it is almost done, it is still a matter of honor for us to continue working to beautify our city. We make parks, plant trees and flowers, and tend and water them.

"Even schoolboys keep up their Cherkassov books. They collect trash and scrap, to keep the city clean. Every worker thinks it his sacred duty to work at beautifying the city. There is socialist competition among the brigades. This is the voluntary help that rebuilt Stalingrad."

Today Stalingrad is a splendid city of 700,000 people, a population half again as large as that of 1941. It is a city reborn and rebuilt out of its own rubble and amid its own ashes. In the winter of 1957-58 we found the important tractor factory restored, enlarged and in full production. New factories had been built and were in operation. Of the war

ruins practically nothing remained except the yawning walls and empty windows of a former factory that has been preserved in the center of the city as a memorial and perpetual warning against the destructiveness of modern war. The city center has been rebuilt around broad faultlessly paved streets. Squares and fine parks let in sun and air and open wide vistas. Esplanades and a children's railroad skirt the Volga.

The students of the city decided they would build a victory park. They have been supplied with plans, specialists, engineering direction, and will work in their off-time on a huge culture park, with sport stadium, dramatic theatre, a concert hall, cinemas, rest houses, and a special children's section.

An immense planting program is in operation. Flowers, shrubs and trees are to fill every available space. We saw four-year-old tree-belts circling the city. With yearly rainfall of less than ten inches, the long hot dry summer makes it necessary to water every green thing planted, at least for the first few years. This the citizens pledged themselves to do.

We were taken to a section of the city where streets were still rough and sidewalks not yet laid down. Here new building projects stretched in every direction. There were many small individual homes, self-built, by owners who borrowed up to 10,000 rubles from the city, interest free, to be repaid at the rate of 80 rubles per month. There were larger buildings, housing two or more families, constructed cooperatively in spare-time by teams of home owners, assisted by organized groups of professional building workers. There

were also big municipal housing projects in which the basic work had been done, including the installation of water, central heat and electric light. Inside finishing and decoration were being taken care of in spare time by the people who would occupy the new apartments.

We stood in one of these unfinished flats on a bitter winter day. The place was warm and the lights were on. The apartment we entered belonged to a young couple, recently married. Both worked in the nearby tractor plant. Both had ended their shift and were busy with plastering and painting. The half dozen in our party, including a trade union official, an engineer, the Vice Mayor and a strapping jovial woman from the local peace committee, crowded its two rooms. All of them had been through the Battle of Stalingrad. All had been planning and working for fourteen years to re-establish their city. Now, with the results of their efforts visible on all sides, and with plan-fulfillment almost a reality, they rejoiced, swapped stories and laughed together.

The object of their laughter, at the moment, was a story that had come over the radio. A woman visitor from the United States, prominent, highly connected, had been given the opportunity to go anywhere in the Soviet Union and see anything. After a month of traveling, she had recrossed the Atlantic and written in a newspaper article that she had never seen anyone laugh in Russia.

Standing on the littered floor of the unfinished apartment, the veterans of the grim Stalingrad battle repeated this story, holding their sides and shouting with laughter. The

young couple stopped their work and listened with amusement. Never have we been in jollier company nor heard more spontaneous peals of laughter.

Another cheering, enlivening experience for us was a visit to a Stalingrad secondary (ten year) school. It was well-managed and well-equipped. The classrooms and halls, serviced by children under direction, were orderly and neat. Classroom discipline, also teacher-pupil directed, was excellent. Pupils seemed to be deeply interested in their school work and determined to learn all that they could. This school had 796 students and in 1957 graduated 94 pupils at ages averaging 17. Of the graduates, 68 entered institutes and universities to do advanced work.

The most unusual thing about this school was the teaching of English beginning in the second year, with pupils ten years of age. Ordinarily, the school director told us, the study of a secondary language began in the fifth school year, when the pupils were twelve. But after the war, so many parents in Stalingrad were paying to have their children tutored privately in English that the school authorities decided to introduce English in the second year.

"Isn't it unusual for a single school to break away from the regular study course?" we asked the director. "Yes," he agreed, "but where there are social pressures and special demands, we try to meet them. We are going out of our way to provide the best education possible for our children. If parents feel that their children should learn English earlier, we will do our best to teach them. If the experiment proves

successful, we may try English in the first year classes. If there is an equal interest in German as an alternative language, we will teach that earlier too."

"You study German here," we asked, surprised, "after your ordeal under the Nazis?" "Any cultured person should know foreign languages," replied the director tolerantly. "German is one of the great languages of the world."

"The war had a profound effect on our people," he went on. "It made us more anti-war than anti-German. It also convinced us that if we are to get on together in this very complex world, we must know something about each other. One of the obstacles to communication between people is the language barrier. The learning of English and German will help in the understanding of our common problems."

We went through the school, stopping in various classrooms. In a third year class of 10-year-olds, one small girl volunteered to recite a verse in English called "Why, Willie, why, oh why?" The "W" is hard for Russians, because there is no corresponding letter in their language, but the youngster tackled the difficult couplet as though she intended to master it. Another small girl told about her cat: "My catch likes fitsch." In a fourth year class we were greeted with "How do you do" and "We are glad to see you," from boys this time. Students in a fifth year class (12 years old) extemporized: "We live in Stalingrad." "Stalingrad is a large and beautiful city." "I am a Pioneer; I go to School Number Five." "Please take our greetings to the children of America." These children were courteous to

strangers, if not quite at home with them. Among Soviet children we saw few bashful girls or boys. Most were upstanding, vocal and forthright.

While we were in Stalingrad, the young people were celebrating Youth Day. The evening rally was to be held in the auditorium of the newly completed Trade Union Headquarters which we were visiting. When we heard that the gathering was to be held that night we expressed interest and were cordially invited to attend.

Meeting time came and the balconied hall was filled with over five hundred young people. Before the entertainment part of the evening commenced, the local youth secretary spoke briefly about the world youth movement. "Youth in many parts of the world," said she, "do not have our opportunities. Either there are few institutions for higher education or else the fees demanded of students are so high as to exclude most of the daughters and sons of workers and peasants. The situation is different in the Soviet Union, where higher education is free and students receive stipends large enough to cover all their needs while studying. Since Soviet youth is so fortunate," said the girl, "it is our

duty to do everything we can to assist young people in less fortunate countries. One way is the development of relations with youth of all countries in the interest of peace."

A lad led off the program on his accordion with the Hymn of Democratic Youth, which all sang. The evening was filled with their amateur performances. They sang, danced, played the accordion and mouth organ. In the intermission interval, as we strolled through the hallway, we were surrounded by avid groups of young people who questioned us keenly on everything from student's chance to study in the USA to the newest American plays, books and music. Each of us was the center of a circle, five or six persons deep, which only broke up reluctantly when the bell rang for the remainder of the performance..

Fourteen years have passed since Stalingrad lay in ruins. Then these young people now in schools and colleges were either babies or unborn. Their parents have reared a splendid planned socialist city for them to live and grow in. As we watched and listened, it seemed to us that the young people of Stalingrad are worthy of their heroic parents and of their shining new socialist city.

ARTUR RUBINSTEIN IN WARSAW

WARSAW and Artur Rubinstein have met again after twenty years and they have brought tears to each other's eyes. . . . Only once had a Warsaw audience been known to stand to greet a musician and that was for the pianist who became President, Ignacy Paderewski. Last night, however, the audience stood for Rubinstein. They stood when he walked onto the stage. . . . They rose again with a surge with the last chords of Chopin's "Polonaise." They stood and shouted and sang "May He Live a Hundred Years" and ten times they brought him back from the wings. . . .

Dispatch from Warsaw, N. Y. Times, June 13

“FRIENDSHIP”

New publishing venture to increase understanding of the English-speaking world among Soviet youth

by ARCHIE JOHNSTONE

BY ITSELF, there is nothing epoch-making about the publication in Moscow of an English language magazine called *Friendship*: what could be epoch-making would be the publication in America or England of a comparable magazine called, say, *Druzhba*, the Russian word for friendship.

Friendship is an illustrated monthly for Soviet school children who are studying English. With its stable companions, *Freundschaft* and *Ami-tié*, in German and French respectively, it is published by the Ministry of Education of the RSFSR with an initial circulation of 50,000 copies.

Because the magazine will be available in school clubrooms and libraries, the English edition alone will have a readership of tens of thousands—a sharp reminder of the fact that the Russian language simply does not exist as a school subject in most parts of the English-speaking world!

I have just seen the first number and had a preview of the material

ARCHIE JOHNSTONE from 1947 to 1949 edited the British Embassy newspaper, *Britanski Soyuznik* (British Ally), published in Moscow. He has lived in the USSR since and his witty and illuminating articles on Soviet life are highly regarded by readers both in this country and in England. “Ivan the -not-so-terrible,” a collection of his articles, was published in 1956.

prepared for the next few numbers and while reading them I tried to put myself in the position of the young people for whom the magazine is intended. Frankly, I envy them.

If there had been a similar magazine in French when I was struggling to learn the language in my teens I would have read it avidly; and when, still in my teens, I went to France in the first World War, I would certainly have spoken French much less atrociously than I did.

More than that (for *Friendship* gives its young readers many interesting glimpses of life in the English-speaking world) I would have known much more about the French people as well as the French language.

In other respects, too, *Friendship* is a good deal more than a mere brush-up-your-English aid. In fact there is little about the magazine that is specifically “educational” except in the sense that any reading matter which interests and stimulates the youthful mind—or any mind—is educational.

For easier reading the more difficult words and phrases in the text are key-numbered and their Russian equivalents, or explanations in simpler English are given as footnotes.

Here are some of the items for the

first few issues that caught my attention:

Episodes from the adventures of Robin Hood (who, by the way, is far better known here than is any non-English hero in England or America);

"Conducted tours" of famous places in the English-speaking world (usually in dialogue form, as an aid to conversational English);

Notes about pen-friend circles, plays, concerts and other activities at the "English clubs" connected with various schools;

Messages from pen-friends abroad;

Special "corners" for chess, stamp-collecting, hobbies, handicrafts and so on;

Anecdotes, jokes, riddles, etc. (with puns of the when it's ajar type explained, of course);

English translations of Russian verses for young folk (and *vice-versa*) printed with the originals.

There is no high-sounding editorial statement of the magazine's aims but, as I see them, they form a simple chain of cause and effect: (1) to add to the young reader's knowledge of English and thus to increase (2) his interest in (3) his understanding of and (4) his friendly feelings towards the English-speak-

ing peoples. Hence the title *Friendship*.

Frankly, my main interest in *Friendship* centers on a quite accidental sidelight it throws on one aspect of the troubled international situation. Others may see it in a different light but "from where I sit" here is how I see it.

The almost automatic reaction of the Dulles-minded to any Soviet gesture or concrete proposal for disarmament and peace is to question the good faith of the Russians. That line of "argument" is in a sense unanswerable because good faith cannot be either proved or disproved: one certainly cannot prove that any accusation of bad faith is made in good faith! It is a matter not of proof but of evidence and evidence sharp enough to cut through national and other prejudices is often hard to find.

The publication of *Friendship* is not put forward in Moscow as evidence of Soviet good faith in international matters; on the contrary, the whole character of the magazine is as "domestic" to the Soviet Union as its non-political, teen-age readership. But that, paradoxically, increases its validity as evidence of good faith.

CHINA'S FIRST PASSENGER CAR

CHINA'S first passenger car was produced in May. Named the *East Wind*, it is reddish in color, fully streamlined, with a dragon emblem on the hood and the front and rear lights designed in the form of Chinese lanterns. The car is also equipped with a heating system and a radio.

Weighing 1.23 tons, the car has a 70-horse power engine, with a maximum speed of 128 kilometers per hour and carries six passengers.

Chairman Mao Tse-tung after a ride in the *East Wind* said to the delegates of the second session of the 8th National Congress of the Communist Party, "We have had a ride in our home-made car."

Physical Culture and Sports in the USSR

by PROF. I. I. NIKIFOROV

The following article is a condensed version of two lectures given by Professor I. I. Nikiforov, Vice-Chairman of the All-Union Committee on Physical Culture and Sport of the USSR, during a visit to England in January of this year as a guest of the British Soviet Friendship Society.

We are indebted to British-Soviet Newsletter, publication of the British Soviet Friendship Society, for permission to publish Professor Nikiforov's lectures.

Background

AS A result of the Revolution one of the most important gains of the Soviet people was the creation of a wide system of physical culture and sport for all-round physical and spiritual development.

In pre-revolutionary Russia sport was accessible only to a privileged few, though even with them it did not enjoy great popularity.

Physical culture in the gymnasias and military schools was taught by foreign specialists, Russian N.C.O.'s and retired officers. These teachers mainly conceived physical education as military drill and their teaching therefore boiled down, as a rule, to marching and handling a rifle. Although such a vast country, Russia had only 1,300 sports clubs and so-

cieties embracing about 50,000 sportsmen.

Pre-Revolutionary Work

Progressive scientists, teachers and doctors of those times tried to set up an educational system in which physical training would play an important part in all-round development.

Much credit for training instructors and creating a scientific basis for physical training belongs to P. F. Lesgaft, an outstanding Russian teacher and anatomist. He was the founder of the Russian system of physical training.

In 1896 Lesgaft opened private three-year courses in Petersburg for leaders of physical education. These courses were subjected to repeated repressions by the tsarist government and were closed down and opened time and again because of the revolutionary mood of the students and teachers.

Lesgaft's courses formed the first higher educational establishment for training teachers of physical education in pre-revolutionary Russia. Lesgaft employed the greatest specialists of the time, especially in the natural and biological sciences. The studies of Lesgaft and his collaborators laid down scientific principles for physical education and the training of teachers.

Lesgaft himself elaborated an original Russian system of physical education. During their existence Lesgaft's courses trained but a small number of specialists who could not, of course, radically influence the organization of physical education in the schools of tsarist Russia.

It is by no means accidental that the Russian team to the 1912 Olympic Games occupied only the 15th, the last but one, place. But despite lack of attention on the part of the government, the Russian people were attracted to sport, for they loved and appreciated vigor, agility and courage. The appearance of the strong-men, gymnasts and wrestlers at national celebrations, folk festivals and in the circus always made a hit. The people were also fond of the national sports of wrestling, horse racing and other equestrian games, archery, gorodki (a Russian form of skittles), ball games, boxing, etc.

New Course Under Soviets

The distinguishing features of the organization of physical training and sport in the USSR were already determined in the first months of the Soviet state.

An important feature of the leadership of the young Soviet physical culture movement was that it was provided, on the one hand, by state institutions and, on the other hand, by public organizations, i.e., the trade unions and a wide network of local sports clubs, physical culture groups in factories, offices, and educational establishments.

At the present time the state organizations engaged in physical training include:

(1) Pre-school institutions, elementary and secondary schools, teach-

ers' colleges, and vocational, special technical, and trade schools.

(2) Specialized secondary schools and colleges.

(3) Maternity homes, creches, hospitals, vacation homes, sanatoriums and other medical and prophylactic establishments.

Physical training is conducted by state organizations on the basis of programs of obligatory systematic training in various physical exercises and sports. These are aimed at drawing the entire younger generation and students into physical training. Over 50,000,000 young people take part in obligatory forms of physical training in educational establishments alone.

It must be pointed out that in all educational establishments, besides obligatory forms of calisthenics, voluntary sports activity is widely developed.

Ministries and their departments responsible for physical culture and sports have specialists in charge of such work. They also finance the construction of sports premises and supply equipment and other expenses.

The public organizations which provide training include: All-Union sports societies such as Burevestnik, Vodnik and Locomotive, belonging to various trade unions and conducting their work under the direct guidance of their Central Committees; sports societies in the Union Republics under the corresponding trade union councils in the republics; rural sports societies in the Union Republics; the departmental sports societies of Dynamo, Labor Reserves, and Spartak; the Anglers' Sports Society, and the hunters' societies in the Union Republics.

These public physical culture and sports organizations finance the construction and maintenance of premises, the acquisition of equipment, and the hiring of trainers. They bear the cost of training personnel and conducting mass physical culture and sports events.

In their many and varied activities the state and physical culture organizations base themselves on a vast number of volunteers who take an active part in trainers' councils, referee collegiums and various other committees.

For all-round guidance in the work of all the state and public physical culture and sports organizations, sport and physical culture committees exist consisting of leading workers, representatives of the Young Communist League and trade unions, ministries, departments and sport societies, and volunteer workers. This makes it possible to approach the solution of the problem of physical culture and sport while taking into account state interests, the needs of various ministries, departments, and public organizations in the development of physical culture and sport.

The principle of leadership applied envisages guidance from the center on the most important questions (training of personnel, drafting state programs, rules and schedules for the most important sports events, etc.), while local organizations are required to settle by themselves questions of mass activity in accordance with the needs of local conditions.

This combination of central and local initiative is called democratic centralism, and it also requires that all managers have to be elected and

are accountable to their members who elected them.

Organizational Basis

The most important principle of the Soviet physical culture movement is that public sports bodies are set up on the industrial principle. This means that the organizational base—the physical culture group—is organized directly at the factory, office, college, collective farm, etc.

Another distinguishing feature of the work of Soviet physical culture and sports organizations is the regular setting of targets for development.

The training and re-training of personnel in the physical culture educational establishments is conducted in accordance with a unified state plan.

By drawing up annual and four-year plans all kinds of contests (Spartakiads, USSR championships, various complex contests, etc.) can be planned more precisely.

The trade unions are the organizers of the physical culture groups at works, offices and educational establishments, and conduct large-scale health-building work among children in Young Pioneer camps.

Most of the sports societies are part of the trade union set-up, and a great part of existing sports facilities belong to them.

Voluntary Movement

In reviewing the organizational structure of Soviet physical culture, it is necessary to stress that the movement is fundamentally voluntary, basing itself on the broad network of physical culture groups.

According to the data available on

January 1, 1958, over a million people work in the physical culture organizations in the country, in a voluntary capacity, while there were only 7,778 paid functionaries working in the country's 5,329 physical culture committees.

During the post-war years systematic work has been conducted to improve the structure of the sports societies, and especially those belonging to the trade unions. At the end of October 1957 the Presidium of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions resolved to organize its sports societies on a territorial basis in the Union Republics instead of sports societies organized along industrial lines. Of the All-Union departmental trade union sports societies there remained only three: Locomotive, Vodnik and the student sports society Burevestnik, with another 15 being set up in the republics. The new reorganization of the trade union sports societies and the accompanying concentration of facilities and personnel will help to improve the work especially in the primary physical culture groups.

No Professional Sport

There is no professional sport in the Soviet Union.

The regulations on amateur status in the USSR are in complete accordance with the Olympic statutes and the rules of the corresponding international sports Federations of which the Soviet sports organizations are members.

Amateur sportsmen take up their favorite sport in their free time, and are united in primary physical culture groups, clubs and sports societies.

The Soviet sports organizations

are subsidized by the trade unions. As a rule, the trade unions allocate about 20 per cent of their annual budget for physical culture and sport, which makes up throughout the country an impressive total of over 600,000,000 rubles a year.

The rural sports societies and the construction of sports premises in the countryside are financed by collective and state farms, and machine and tractor stations. Considerable sums, mainly for the construction of sports facilities, are provided by the management of enterprises on the basis of collective agreements with the trade unions, and also by the state social insurance funds.

The cost of extra-curricular sports activities in secondary schools and colleges is borne by the ministries to which the corresponding schools belong.

A considerable amount of the funds that go for financing the work of sports societies consists of membership dues, gate receipts and the hiring out of sports facilities.

All the activities of the committees on physical culture and sport which exercise state guidance in the development of physical culture and sport in the country are financed by the USSR State Budget.

Considerable amounts are allocated by the state budget and city soviets for the construction of sports premises.

Membership Fees

The annual membership dues in sports societies are, on the average, between three and five rubles per annum. On joining a sports society, a sportsman can make use of all its facilities free of charge.

A comparatively small fee has to be paid by people who are not members of a sports society for the use of its facilities. Thus, for instance, the entrance fee to a skating rink for non-members ranges from 1 to 2.5 rubles. It costs about the same to rent a rowing boat or skis with the necessary equipment. Such equipment, as well as tourist clothes, skates and other sports goods, are available for a small fee.

Most sports organizations assist the general schools and give them an opportunity of using their equipment free of charge in the daytime, which considerably helps to put physical training and sports at school on a proper level.

Pre-revolutionary Russia did not leave us a single large stadium. But at the present time the Soviet Union boasts of over 1,500 stadiums. Among them is the Lenin Stadium in Moscow with grandstands for 104,000 people. This stadium has a Sports Palace, a small sports arena, a swimming pool and dozens of special courts.

The Kirov Stadium in Leningrad is also one of the largest in Europe. There are also large and well equipped stadiums in Kiev, Minsk, Tbilisi, Baku, Tashkent and in all the capitals of the Union Republics, as also in regional and industrial centers.

The working people of our country have at their disposal 5,000 combined sports courts, 25,000 soccer fields, nearly 20,000 basketball and volleyball courts, 7,000 gyms, 2,200 ski and 389 rowing stations, 44 indoor swimming pools, 300 ski jumps, 63 yacht clubs, hundreds of tourist bases and dozens of Alpine camps. Then there are also numerous arti-

ficial ice rinks, horse race courses, cycle tracks and tennis courts.

Gold Medals

In order to stimulate Soviet sportsmen the Government adopted in July 1948 a decision to award gold medals to people winning national championships and setting records, and silver and bronze medals to athletes winning second and third places respectively.

The best teachers, trainers and organizers are awarded, on the recommendation of local organizations, the title of Honored Trainer of the USSR, or a sports distinction badge.

The broad international ties that we are encouraging help to improve the achievements of Soviet sportsmen. At the present time Soviet sportsmen maintain contact with the sports organizations of 63 countries. Our sports federations have joined 31 international sports associations and participate in nearly all world and European championships. The international sports ties of Soviet sportsmen will continue to develop.

Physical Culture Training

The training of physical culture cadres in the Soviet Union began immediately after the Revolution. The first decrees of the Soviet Government opened up extensive opportunities for the development of physical culture and sport, and for the creation of a Soviet system of physical education.

Three month courses to prepare instructors in sports and pre-military training were opened in a number of cities in accordance with the decision of the First All-Russian Congress on Sports and Pre-Military Training held in 1919.

An institute of physical culture, first with a one-year and then a two-year course of study, was opened in Moscow in 1918 on the basis of the existing six-month courses for training instructors of physical education. By a decree of the Council of People's Commissars signed by V. I. Lenin in December 1920 the institute was reorganized into a higher educational establishment—the State Central Institute of Physical Culture with a four-year course of study. And an institute of physical culture with a four-year course of training was also opened on the basis of Lesgaft's pre-revolutionary courses and biological laboratory in Leningrad in 1919.

The organization of the institutes of physical culture in Moscow and Leningrad laid the foundation for the training of the country's qualified specialists with higher education and for the scientific elaboration of the problems of physical culture and sport.

The wealth and great diversity of the Soviet system of physical training did not arise at once; they developed in the struggle against all kinds of cranks who denied the beneficial effect of sport, rejected soccer and boxing, and deprecated sports contests as allegedly "alien to the spirit of the Soviets."

In 1925 the Central Committee of the Communist Party adopted a resolution which stated that physical culture must organically integrate physical training, gymnastics, games and sports with social and personal hygiene in labor and everyday life, and to take advantage of the sun, water and air as factors making for good health.

By 1933-34 our country had a sys-

tem of training physical culture cadres ranging from seminars and a network of courses for the training of public physical culture cadres to institutes of physical culture with post-graduate work and departments for improving, training and re-training specialists with higher education in physical culture.

Mass Contests

Contests were used as a means of bringing wide masses of the working people into physical activity and of popularizing the achievements of both individuals and groups. It was recommended that all forms of physical culture, health promotion and sports be conducted on a scientific basis. This gave an impetus to the wider development of sport in our country, and led to the organization of soccer, basketball, ice hockey and volleyball teams everywhere. The number of people taking up gymnastics, track and field events, skiing, skating, swimming, rowing, wrestling, boxing and many other sports greatly increased.

The Training "Complex"

Physical culture began to be applied more widely in medical establishments. With the development of radio, calisthenics became a regular feature of daily broadcasts. Physical exercises were also introduced at works and offices as a means of strengthening the health of the working people.

Physical training began to occupy a permanent place in the general curriculum of the schools, technical schools and colleges.

In 1931 an all-round syllabus of physical training (first stage) was

introduced, a second stage two years later, and then also a junior syllabus. These are called by the Russians the "complex" of physical training, aiming at all-round physical development in running, swimming, skiing, jumping, etc.

This complex became the main form of mass physical training and sports activity in school and college physical training programs and in local physical culture organizations.

In contrast to tsarism, a large personnel is now available in the development of the Soviet physical culture movement, trained from among the working youth.

Physical culture and athletic cadres are now trained in the USSR as follows:

(1) In 15 institutes of physical culture and nine correspondence departments;

(1) In 15 institutes of physical culture schools and their six correspondence departments;

(3) In 50 departments of physical education at pedagogical institutes of the Ministries of Education of the Union Republics and in their thirteen correspondence departments;

(4) In six coaching schools with basic departments (admission with a ten-year schooling) and special departments (admission with a seven-year schooling);

(5) In 17 pedagogical schools of physical education and their 20 correspondence departments;

(6) In 34 departments of physical education at pedagogical schools;

(7) In the secondary school of physical culture of the Chief Administration of Labor Reserves under the Council of Ministers of the USSR;

(8) By the higher courses for re-training organizational workers in Moscow and Leningrad institutes of physical culture, and in the wide network of short seminars organized by the voluntary sports societies and physical culture collectives for the training of public instructors and sports referees.

The physical culture personnel in the USSR are offered higher education at institutes of physical culture and departments of physical education.

Over-all Achievements

During the forty years of the Soviet system the physical culture schools of all types have produced 24,400 specialists with a higher and 31,000 with a secondary education. Tens of thousands of physical training instructors, from the ranks of the best sportsmen and enthusiasts, have passed short-term training courses. Such new subjects as the Physiology of Sport, Sports Hygiene and Medical Control, and also the Scientific Foundations of Training, were developed in the physical training colleges.

Three special scientific-research institutes in physical culture were set up (Moscow, Leningrad and Tbilisi), in addition to the research conducted in physical training colleges and higher schools.

The experience and theoretical legacy of the Russian scientists, Sechenov, Pavlov, Ushynsky and especially Lesgaft, together with the main foreign systems, have been studied and generalized. At the same time the experience gained by Soviet instructors have been tested and utilized.

Thanks to this work Soviet methods have been developed which, especially in the post-war years, have raised Soviet sport to one of the top places in the world as shown at Helsinki in 1952 and Melbourne in 1956 as well as in various European championships.

The Soviet Union now has nearly 200,000 local physical culture groups with a total membership of about 19,000,000.

More than 40 different sports are encouraged, track and field events having the most followers with 3,500,000 participants. This is followed by skiing (2,500,000) soccer (1,100,000), boxing (160,000), wrestling (180,000), and rowing more than 10,000.

The sports organizations have about 10,000 Masters and Honored Masters of Sport, and over 2,000,000 people with lower sports ratings.

In recent years sports have been developing rapidly in the Union Republics. (The Ukraine, for instance, had 1,400,000 athletes in 1948, but by 1957 this figure has jumped to 4,650,000. The corresponding figures for Uzbekistan are 162,000 and 540,000; for Kirghizia—50,000 and 172,000; Tadzhikistan—36,000 and 106,000, etc.) A great stimulus has been the traditional Spartakiads of Central Asia, the Transcaucasus, the Baltic Republics and especially the annual Spartakiad of the Peoples of the USSR.

In recent years Soviet sportsmen have captured many world titles in

Greco-Roman wrestling, gymnastics, rifle shooting, the modern pentathlon, weight-lifting, and also women's speed-skating and fencing. The European titles won by Soviet athletes include boxing, kayak and canoe, track and field, speed skating, basketball, and women's rowing.

The Ultimate Goal

Soviet athletes are proud of their sports achievements but they do not lose sight of their shortcomings. They are still lagging behind in many track and field events, swimming, cycling, tennis, figure-skating.

Physical culture and sport must sink more deeply into the life of Soviet people. The day of a typical Soviet citizen should begin and end with physical culture in the broad sense of that word throughout his entire life. We still have to improve the physical training of school children, make greater use of calisthenics before lessons start, introduce all kinds of physical culture throughout the day and develop mass extra-curricular sport.

Such forms of mass physical culture as morning exercises, gymnastics at works and offices during working hours, mass tourist trips on foot and on skis, swimming, rowing, and other kinds of sport should be widespread among middle-aged and elderly working people.

We aim at a state of affairs where physical culture is part and parcel of all human activity.

BOTVINNIK RECAPTURES CHAMPIONSHIP

MIKHAIL BOTVINNIK recaptured the world chess championship in May from Vassily Smyslov who had held the championship for a year. The two months contest excited as much interest throughout the Soviet Union as the World Series does in this country.

THE MTS AND THE KOLKHOZI

A documentary review of the new law for sale of agricultural machinery direct to collective farms and its background

WHEN THE NEWLY elected Supreme Soviet of the USSR met at the end of March, the actions that captured world attention were its passage of the resolution on the unilateral suspension of nuclear weapon tests, and its election of Nikita Khrushchev, First Secretary of the Communist Party, to the post of Premier of the USSR. Less widely reported was the passage of a law providing for the direct sale of agricultural machinery, hitherto concentrated in the machine and tractor stations (MTS) to the collective farms, (*kolkhozi*) and the transformation of the MTS into repair and service stations. This law is of far-reaching importance in the development of Soviet agriculture and economy, parallel to the measures undertaken last year in the reorganization of industry and decentralization of its management.

Important as had been the role of the MTS at an earlier period when the collective farms in general would have found it too much of an economic burden to buy the large numbers of tractors, combines and other agricultural machines required, it had for some time been apparent that the growing strength of the *kolkhozi* had made a change desirable. There had in fact, been a number of actual experiments during the past year or so in giving collective farms direct control over basic farm machines.

Nikita Khrushchev first raised the

matter officially in January of this year at a meeting of farmers and agriculturists at Minsk. He proposed that the matter be further discussed both among the farmers themselves and by members and leaders of the Communist Party. The favorable response from his audience and farmers and agriculturists throughout the country demonstrated the timeliness of the proposal.

Accordingly, Mr. Khrushchev prepared a report and detailed theses on the question, which were discussed and approved at a plenary session of the Central Committee of the Communist Party held on February 25 and 26, which decided that Khrushchev should present the question at the forthcoming session of the Supreme Soviet.

The theses constituted a remarkable 15,000 word document outlining the contributions that had been made by the MTS, the growing strength of the collective farms which made necessary the proposed reorganization of the MTS, answering the theoretical objections that had been raised by some economists, and proposing the carefully planned, flexible and gradual manner in which the new program would be applied.

Achievements of Collectivization

The theses emphasized the overall victory of the collective farm system as indicated by the fact that the 25,000,000 weak and scattered

farm households that had existed in the country thirty years ago were now replaced by 78,000 collective farms, 8,000 machine and tractor stations and 5,800 state farms.* It also noted the successes of the past few years in overcoming the lags that had existed (due to certain mistaken policies during the Stalin era and the terrible devastation that occurred during World War II) in achieving a great advance in grain farming through the opening up of vast tracts of virgin and long fallow land, and in the field of animal husbandry as well.

The theses declared that the collectivization of agriculture and its equipment with up-to-date farm machinery had resulted in a considerable rise in the productivity of farm labor, demonstrated by an increase in marketable produce several times over that of the pre-revolutionary period. Results of collectivization were shown in the enormous increase in the production of grain, cotton, sugar beets, meat and vegetables. The advance in the technical equipment of Soviet agriculture was illustrated by the fact that today there were 1,700,000 tractors (in 15 h.p. units) as against 158,000 at the end of 1932; 660,000 trucks as against 14,000; 450,000 harvester combines as against 14,000. Production advances due to collectivization and the modern, technical equipment of agriculture had meant that

real incomes of collective farmers had increased four times in comparison with pre-revolutionary Russia, or six times if free tuition and medical services, grants and other payments and privileges at state expense were taken into consideration.

Recent Agricultural Advances

The theses then turned to the results of the plan adopted by the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Government for increasing the output of grain and livestock products. It showed the tremendous amount of large scale machinery that has been provided in the last few years; the over-all increase in skilled agricultural specialists from 83,000 in the middle of 1953 to 277,000 today. Successes in the last few years in overcoming previous lags were outlined as follows:

In the last four years the gross grain harvest of the country was 27 per cent higher than in the preceding four year period. In this same period the gross harvest of potatoes has grown by 14 per cent, of vegetables, by 39 percent, of sugar beets, by 37 per cent, of flax fiber, by 91 per cent, of raw cotton, by 13 per cent.

As of January 1, 1954, the country had 55.8 million head of cattle, including 25.2 million cows, 33.3 million hogs, 99.8 million sheep. By January 1, 1958, the number of cattle had risen to 66.7 million head, including 317.4 million cows, the number of hogs had risen to 44.3 million, and that of sheep to 120.1 million.

Meat production has increased in the last four years by 38 per cent, including an almost 80 per cent growth in collective and state-farm production; milk production in the country as a whole has grown by 50 per cent; while in collective and state farms it has more than doubled. The program outlined by the January 1955 plenary session of the CC CPSU for increasing the milk yields of cows in collective farms and milk procure-

* The collective farms are producers' cooperatives to which the land has been given in perpetuity by the government. Their members receive payment in cash and kind for their cooperative labor, figured in work-day units, on the basis of kind and quantity of work performed. They also have small farmsteads of their own, the income from which is at their own disposal. The MTS, which are state institutions, paying their own workers, serve the collective farms with tractors and other farm machinery, their services being paid for by the collective farms. The state farms are large-scale socialized enterprises, employing labor on the same basis as factories and other state owned enterprises.

ment has been effected in three years instead of six.

The theses further noted that capital investments by the Soviet state in agriculture during the past four years had amounted to 10,000,000,000 rubles more than similar allocations in the second, third, fourth and three years of the fifth Five-Year Plan taken together. It stressed that the initiative of the collective farmers had been stimulated by the 1957 decisions raising procurement and purchasing prices on all basic agricultural commodities; lowering the agricultural tax; exempting households of collective farmers from obligatory sales to the state as of January, 1958; giving the collective farms larger scope in planning and the right to make changes in the Rules of the Agricultural Artel (whereby collective farms as a whole are governed) in accordance with local conditions and needs.

The Role of the MTS

At the beginning of the collectivization movement the majority of the peasants were still using the primitive implements of the past—wooden and horse-drawn plows, seed drills, reapers and so on. In 1928, there were only 27,000 tractors in the whole country. As industry began to increase the production of tractors and other machinery, and its use on state farms demonstrated its importance, the advantages of collective farming became increasingly clear to the peasants, who began to form collective farms in large numbers by the end of 1928. The question then arose as to how to make the best use of the machinery available. How the problem was faced was presented in the Khrushchev

theses in the following statements:

There were two possibilities. The first was to sell intricate machines directly to the collective farms. The second way was to retain them in the hands of the state, setting up special establishments for servicing the collective farms for definite pay. It was soon proven by experience that the first way was unacceptable for the initial period of mass development of the collective farm movement. The young collective farms, which were economically still weak, did not have sufficient funds for buying a tractor and other intricate machinery, for buying fuel, for building garages and repair shops. The collective farms also did not have skilled cadres capable of operating the new machines. Industry at that period had not yet produced such a number of machines as to fully supply all the collective farms.

The practice of collective farm construction showed that the second method, that of setting up large state establishments (MTS) with the task of servicing the collective farms with machinery, was more expedient. These establishments, enjoying financial support of the state and the might of socialist industry, provided enormous advantages to both the collective farms and the state. Firstly, they ensured the material and technical conditions for the highly productive utilization of new agricultural machines. Secondly, they could serve as a powerful guiding lever for the socialist state in influencing the collective farms, a means for further strengthening the alliance of the working class and the peasantry.

The organization of the MTS grew out of the initiative of the Shevchenko state farm in the Odessa region in forming a detachment of 10 tractors to aid the peasants of adjacent villages. In 1928, the country's first MTS was organized on the basis of this detachment, and in 1929 mass organization of MTS began. By 1932 the number of MTS reached 2,446, by 1957, 8,000. Along with the state farms, the MTS played an important task in developing the

36,000,000 hectares (a hectare equals 2.47 acres) of virgin and long fallow lands. During the last few years the MTS have been further strengthened and their help to collective farms increased; the number of tractors in the MTS as compared with pre-war times has doubled, and the volume of their work has increased 2.8 times. The over-all role of the MTS was described in the theses in these terms:

The aspect of the collective farms village and the entire mode of village life have radically changed thanks to the influence of the machine and tractor stations and their powerful techniques. Along with tractors and agricultural machinery, repair shops, automobile transport and electric power made their appearance in the village. A network of auxiliary enterprises of the industrial type arose and is developing.

An enormous army of machine operators were trained in the machine and tractor stations—tractor drivers, harvester combine operators, tractor team leaders, truck drivers, maintenance, repair and other workers who had mastered technique and the industrial methods of work. There were over two million regular workers in the machine and tractor stations in 1957.

The agronomist and zootechnical cadres of the machine and tractor stations have accomplished a great deal in improving the efficiency of farming and stock-breeding in the collective farms. Millions of skilled workers for collective-farm production have been trained in the schools and training centers for machine operators and at various courses organized by the machine and tractor stations.

Why It Is Time for a Change

The problem of MTS reorganization, the theses emphasized, had come to the fore because of the tremendous progress made by the *kolkhozi* as a result of measures undertaken by the Communist Party for advancing agriculture in the last

few years. It had also arisen as a result of the reorganization of industrial management in 1957, and the whole process of decentralization and of democratization that has been going on in the state apparatus and the developments in Soviet society over the past five years, which the logic of events is now extending to agriculture.

The Khrushchev theses pointed out that the indivisible funds* of the collective farms had grown from 63,078,000,000 rubles in 1952 to 98,594,000,000 rubles in 1956. The *kolkhozi* are today better equipped than ever before. Half of the 660,000 trucks used in the fields of the country belong to them, many of them already own some tractors and other farm machinery and have their own power stations and auxiliary establishments. Whereas formerly many of the skilled agricultural and machinery specialists were in the MTS:

The collective farms now have many qualified field cultivators, livestock breeders, mechanization specialists—tractor, harvester-combine and truck drivers, machinists, electricians, building specialists, and managers and organizers of collective-farm production capable of skillfully applying modern technical and scientific achievements. Whereas in 1953 the collective farms had only 18,500 specialists, they now have more than 150,000 with either a secondary specialized or higher education. At the collective farms there are hundreds of thousands of field-team leaders, heads of livestock sections and other experienced organizers of collec-

* The indivisible funds of a collective farm are those parts of its cash and capital which remain its general property and are not returned to members who withdraw or paid out to members for their work. They include the original property and membership fees paid into the *kolkhoz* when it was formed and when members joined, the capital structures built during its existence, the cattle and machinery acquired, and the social structures, schools, hospitals, etc., built by the *kolkhoz*. In contrast are the divisible funds from which the members are paid their share according to work done.

tive-farm production who have received instruction in off-season local improvement courses and specialized schools.

The following examples were given of the improvement in collective farm incomes and the material standards of their members:

In 1956 the cash incomes of the collective farms totaled 94.616 billion rubles, an almost threefold increase over 1950. The total income (cash and kind) of the collective farmers from the socially-owned economies and private holdings were, in comparable prices, 33 per cent more in 1957 than in 1955, per working collective farmer. This enabled the collective farms and their members to buy far more manufactured goods and widely expand housing construction. Within four years the turnover of the consumers' cooperatives operating in the rural areas went up 75 per cent, in comparable prices. During the past four years the collective farmers and rural intelligentsia have put up about two and a half million new homes.

With the MTS in many parts of the country, particularly in the grain-growing areas, performing the lion's share of the field jobs on the collective farms, the main productive force in agriculture, the labor force of the collective farms, was in the position of being removed from the main implements of production, the tractors and other machinery. This, according to the theses,

... interferes with the more effective use of the labor force and machinery. The existing practice means nothing else than that one and the same plot of land has two masters, the collective farm and the machine-and-tractor station, though today there is no need whatever for it. Since the machine-and-tractor stations control the complex machinery, the collective farms cannot directly do with it as they wish and employ it so as to secure the fullest utilization of all the reserves of collective-farm production. The collective farm and the machine-and-tractor station are forced to maintain two

management apparatuses for the execution of one and the same tasks, thus considerably increasing the cost of agricultural produce.

Thus the former function of the machine and tractor stations in acting as organizers of collective farm production is no longer necessary, since the collective farms themselves have by now accumulated a wealth of experience in the organization and management of large-scale common enterprise.

The Theoretical Problem

Some theoretical objections had been raised to the new program, chiefly by economists, on the ground that there would be confusion about the two forms of property under socialism. They argued that collective farm property is cooperative property, and hence a lower form of socialist property than state property, which is property belonging to the whole people, and that the transition to communism requires, therefore, that collective farm property as such should not be strengthened by the possession of agricultural machinery, but rather should be raised to the level of property belonging to the whole population; in other words, the collective farms should be transformed into state farms.

In the course of the discussions these objections were answered by a number of economists as well as by Khrushchev and members of the Central Committee. The theses put it this way:

It is true that the property belonging to the whole population is the highest form of property. This is how Lenin understood it. But at the same time Lenin

never contrasted the property of the whole population to cooperative property. On the contrary, he stressed that both forms of property are socialist, that both serve the interests of the people, our common aim: to build a communist society. The only difference is that one of them, property belonging to all the people, has a much higher level of socialization, while the other, collective-farm property, has a lower level of socialization.

Consequently, it is a matter of gradually raising the level of socialization of collective-farm property and thus elevating it to the level of property belonging to all the people. This can be done only through the further utmost consolidation and development of both state and collective-farm property.

Khrushchev pointed out that the mistake being made was to think of the collective farms as they were in the early stages of their development and to forget what a quantitative and qualitative change had taken place in the years between. He noted that back in 1929-30 *kolkhoz* property was simply the sum of the socialized means of production of the peasant holdings of that time, namely horses, plows, wooden plows, harrows and some farm sheds, but between that period and today had been years of strenuous effort to develop and strengthen the collective farm system, to raise its economy, and to make the material and cultural forces of the Soviet village flourish. The theses declared:

The present property of the collective farms has been created by the collective labor of the collective farmers under the leadership, and with the active assistance, of the working class, with the participation of the entire Soviet people. It has grown and gained in strength as the result of the development of the socialist economy. The indivisible funds of the

collective farms comprise nearly 100 billion rubles today as against the 1.5 billion rubles of shareholding contributions at the inception of collectivization.

A detailed explanation followed of how these funds had been built up with the aid of the state and the labor of the whole people and thus approached the status of public property. The collective farmers themselves were coming to look upon these funds as public property, using them for the same purposes which the state also performed, such as building schools, creches, hospitals, libraries and other social institutions not directly productive. The present task, therefore, is to strengthen and develop the property owned by the collective farms along with that belonging to the whole people:

Later, according to the growth of the socially-owned wealth of the collective farms, collective-farm property will rise to the level of property belonging to the entire people. The faster we develop the productive forces of socialist agriculture, the sooner will the day arrive when in fact the difference between the property belonging to the entire people and that owned by the collective farms will vanish. It is in this direction that we should view the transfer of the machinery from the machine-and-tractor stations to the collective farms, as being a step toward strengthening collective-farm property in the interests of the people.

From the above it is clear that we cannot place collective-farm property and that belonging to the entire people in opposition. Nor, consequently, can we place in opposition the two types of socialist establishments there are in agriculture, the collective farm and the state farm.

Naturally, we cannot mechanically put the sign of equality between the state farms and the collective farms. The state farm is a state-owned enterprise with a higher level of production organization.

For the collective farm it has been a good school, showing how large-scale socialist production should be carried on in agriculture. . . .

Leninism teaches us that as we advance to communism we must manage the economy on an increasingly broader democratic basis. Both the collective and state farms accord with this socialist principle of economic management. At the state farms, by enhancing the role of the workers' collectives, the trade union and other public organizations, the activity of each worker in the management of the economy can be made still greater.

The collective-farm form also harmonizes with this socialist principle. The collective farm has a board which is elected by the collective farmers and which is accountable to them, and all the most important questions are decided at the general meeting of the collective farmers.

A Nationwide Discussion

Following the publication and wide distribution of the theses, a nationwide discussion took place. When Khrushchev made his report at the March 27th session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, he told the deputies that in the period between March 1 and 25 a total of 576,879 general meetings had been held to discuss the question at collective farms, MTS and state farms, at plants and factories, in scientific organizations and educational institutions and in military units and government establishments. These meetings were attended by almost 50,000,000 people, and more than 3,000,000 persons made comments and proposals on questions of further development of the collective farm system and the reorganization of the MTS.

These nationwide discussions were widely reported in Soviet newspapers and magazines, leading to further discussions in their pages. Cen-

tral and local newspapers, magazines and radio and television stations received some 126,000 articles and letters containing proposals for the reorganization of the MTS, of which 102,941 were published. Three central newspapers alone—*Pravda*, *Izvestia*, and *Selskoye Khozyaistvo*, (*Soviet Agriculture*) received 5,975 articles and letters and published more than a fourth of them. Mr. Khrushchev reported that the discussions showed the warm support of the people for the proposals, as well as bringing out criticisms; he stated:

Many highly valuable suggestions and comments have been made, grave shortcomings in technical and production services to the collective farms and in the work of the agricultural agencies have been criticized, and concrete proposals and additions have been submitted.

The New Law Is Passed

The Supreme Soviet of the USSR, at its final session on March 31, voted unanimously for the "Law on the Development of the Collective Farm System and the Reorganization of Machine and Tractor Stations."

The preamble summed up the main points of Khrushchev's report and theses and the additions made thereto during the nationwide discussions. It gave as the purpose of the reorganization of the MTS: "to use to the utmost the advantages of the socialist system of economy and production reserves and to develop further the creative initiative and activity of the masses."

The operative section of the law provided that the MTS should be reorganized into repair and service stations, and that the tractors, combines and other agricultural machin-

ery belonging to them should be sold to collective farms wishing to buy, with deferred payment arrangements for those unable to pay at once. Beginning with 1958 new tractors, combines and other agricultural machinery will also be sold to collective and state farms. It stated that the reorganization should take place gradually, with due consideration for the level of economic development of the different *kolkhozi* and for specific features of different parts of the country, in accordance with schedules to be worked out by the Council of Ministers of the Union Republics.

In addition to the repair and servicing of tractors and machinery, the reorganized MTS will be charged with the sale to collective and state farms of new machinery, spare parts, oil products, fertilizers, chemical insecticides and fungicides and other goods for production purposes. They will still hire out cer-

tain machines which the collective farms do not have (such as road-building machines, dredging machines, etc.) and do special jobs under contract. They will also aid the collective farms in the introduction of new machinery, application of new scientific and technical methods and in raising the skill of farm machine operators. All their operations will be on the basis of cost accounting.

The law instructs the USSR Council of Ministers to examine the question of extending greater credits to the collective farms for purposes of increasing their production, to work out improvements in the present system of state procurements of agricultural produce, and to make provisions to guarantee the material well-being of the farm machine operators and agricultural specialists who will be transferred from the MTS to work on the collective farms.

Speeding Up USSR Chemical Industry and Consumers Goods

ON MAY 6 the Central Committee of the Communist Party adopted a resolution "On Speeding Up the Development of the Chemical Industry and Especially the Output of Synthetic Materials and Goods for Meeting the Requirements of the Population and the Needs of the National Economy." The resolution supported a report by Nikita Khrushchev outlining measures worked out by the Presidium of the Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers.

The resolution noted that while the Soviet Union holds second place in the output of the chemical industry, it has lagged behind the increased requirements of the national economy and the people especially in regard to output of

synthetic materials, and that its more rapid development would serve as a stimulus in the whole national economy, the further development of heavy industry and create a new, enormous source of raw materials for the manufacture of consumer goods. It declared that the use of synthetic materials to supplement agricultural raw materials would make it possible to greatly increase the manufacture of clothes, footwear, fabrics and household articles.

It said that the USSR has the necessary scientists, specialists and skilled workers to carry out this project. It also has vast raw material resources such as oil and natural gases, products of oil refining and coke chemistry, phosphorites, sulphur, potassium salts, shale and

other materials as well as the products of the timber industry and wastes of agricultural produce. Soviet industry is in a position to supply the necessary production equipment, apparatus and up-to-date automation devices.

The resolution stipulated that there should be an increase in the capacity of the chemical industry and especially production of synthetic materials by the end of 1965 as compared with 1957 as follows: A 2 to 3 fold increase in the output of the most important chemical products; a 4.6-fold increase in production of artificial and synthetic fibres, an 8-fold increase in plastics and a 3.4-fold increase in synthetic rubber. This would insure an increase by 1965 over 1957 of woolen fabrics, 2.3 times; silk fabrics, 1.7 times; cotton fabrics 6 times; knit goods from artificial and synthetic fibers, over 9 times; hosiery, 3.2 times; artificial furs, 14 times; footwear of artificial leather, 2.3 times.

In over-all figures, the stepped-up production of synthetic materials would mean by 1965 an increase in the output of woolen fabrics up to 500,000,000 meters (a meter equals 3.28 feet); silk fabrics up to 1.485 billion meters; cotton fabrics up to 480,000,000 meters; knitgoods up to 940,000,000 items; artificial fur up to 5,000,000 square meters (a square meter equals 10.76 square feet) and up to 515,000,000 pairs of footwear.

The resolution called upon the USSR Council of Ministers, the Councils of Ministers of the Union Republics, and the economic councils of the various economic administrative areas to make full provisions in the economic plan for 1957-65 for the necessary capital investments, raw materials, up-to-date machinery, research, designing and experimental work and further improvements in training of specialists and skilled personnel to carry out the above measures.

Conference of Warsaw Treaty Countries

ON MAY 24, 1958 the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty countries met in Moscow and issued a communique summing up their joint conclusions on the dangers of war existing in the present international situation and on measures for decreasing international tensions. Present at the conference were Government and Communist Party leaders of the Albanian People's Republic, the Bulgarian People's Republic, the Hungarian People's Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the Polish People's Republic, the Rumanian People's Republic, the USSR, the Czechoslovak Republic and observers from the People's Republic of China.

The communique issued by the conference stressed that a summit conference would be among the major means for averting war and strengthening peace at the present time, and approved the agenda proposed by the Soviet Union for such a conference, namely:

The immediate discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen weapon tests; the renunciation by the USSR, the USA and Great Britain of the use of nuclear weapons; the establishment in Central Europe of a zone free of atomic, hydrogen and rocket weapons; the conclusion of a non-aggression agreement between the members of the North Atlantic Alliance and the states parties to the Warsaw Treaty; the reduction of foreign troops on the territory of Germany and within the borders of other European states; the drafting of an agreement on questions connected with the prevention of surprise attack; the measures for extending international trade ties; the discontinuance of war propaganda; ways of easing tension in the Middle and Near East; the prohibition of the use of outer space for military purposes; the dismantling of foreign military bases on alien territory; international cooperation in exploring outer space; the conclusion of a German peace treaty; and the development of ties and contacts among countries.

The conference reiterated the previous proposal of the Warsaw Pact countries for a non-aggression pact between them and the NATO member-states, and drew up a draft of such a pact for presentation

to the governments of the NATO countries. They proposed that the pact be based on the following reciprocal commitments:

1. Not to resort to the use of force against each other, or to the threat of force;
2. To refrain from any interference in each other's internal affairs;
3. To solve all disputes that may arise between them by peaceful means only, in a spirit of understanding and justice, through negotiation between the parties concerned;
4. To hold mutual consultation when a situation arises that might endanger peace in Europe.

The communique cited as an example of the desire of the Warsaw Pact countries for peace the unilateral reduction of their armed forces, which since 1955 have been decreased by 2,477,000 men,

with a corresponding decrease in armaments and defense expenditures. New reductions in the armed forces of the Warsaw Treaty states in 1958 amounted to 119,000 men, in addition to the 300,000 reduction of the Soviet armed forces.

The conference approved the proposal of the Soviet Government, in agreement with the Government of the Rumanian People's Republic, on the withdrawal in the near future of all Soviet troops from Rumanian territory stationed there in accordance with the Warsaw Treaty. It also approved the decision of the Soviet Government in agreement with the Hungarian Government to withdraw nine more divisions of Soviet troops from Hungarian territory in 1958.

Meeting of Council of Economic Mutual Assistance

ON MAY 20-23 1958, a conference of the Council of Economic Mutual Assistance took place in Moscow. Present were representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the following member countries: Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, The German Democratic Republic, Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia and the USSR. Representatives of corresponding Parties of Vietnam, China, Korea, and the Mongolian People's Republic also took part in the proceedings. Excerpts from the communique of the conference follow:

The conference discussed questions of the further development of economic cooperation among the socialist countries on the basis of the consistent practice of international socialist distribution of labor, and of rational specialization and cooperation of production.

Based as it is on principles of full equality, mutual respect for national interests and socialist mutual assistance, the many-sided cooperation of the socialist countries, is making it possible to derive utmost advantages from the world socialist system of economy for the development of the productive forces of each of the socialist countries and for the

consolidation of the economic might of the socialist camp in general.

The conference maintains that today, when economic links among the socialist countries have become much stronger and all-sided, the further promotion and perfection of forms of economic cooperation among them and the deeper specialization and cooperation of production in the associated branches of the economies of the countries of the socialist camp have assumed particularly great importance.

The representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties have unanimously confirmed the need for the fullest utilization of the tremendous opportunities and the all-round consideration of one another's interests in the socialist countries in working out long-range plans and also in extending mutually advantageous forms of cooperation with a view to raising the level of industrialization in those countries where industry is on a lower plane of development.

The conference deemed it expedient to further enhance the role of the Council of Economic Mutual Assistance and its bodies in the organization of economic cooperation.

The representatives of the Parties of the countries not members of the Council of Economic Assistance made known at the conference their readiness to participate actively in economic cooperation among the socialist countries.

John Gunther on the USSR

a review by JESSICA SMITH

Inside Russia Today, by John Gunther, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1958. 550 pages, with index. \$5.95.

MR. GUNTHER, following his "inside" pattern, has tried to pile everything including the kitchen sink between the covers of this book. Not content with recording his impressions of the six-week, 12,000 mile journey made with his wife in late 1956, he has supplemented this with an enormous amount of material from books and periodicals. The result is a hodge-podge of reportage, scissors and paste excerpts, travelogue, guide book, biographical sketches—even including "A History of Russia in Half and Hour." Some of it is fairly fast-moving, interesting material, some of it rather dull. The book is difficult to characterize because of its unevenness and the problem of disentangling the objective and factual information, the fair and justified criticism, from speculative, gossip-type material and misstatements due to ignorance.

Mr. Gunther makes no bones about his anti-Soviet bias, which causes him to judge much of what he has seen and read by the yardstick of Western cold-war attitudes. Yet he deserves credit for recording many incontrovertible and enlightening facts about Soviet progress in industry, education, science, technology and many other fields. While he has hedged about many things still in a state of flux so that he would be right whatever happened, he has also been overtaken in many cases by actual events which have disproved some of his speculations.

The contradictions of which the book is full may be illustrated by Mr. Gunther's attempts to prove that "most citizens live out their lives against a background inexpressibly burdensome,

crude and dreary," while in his foreword, he declares: "The Russians are a terrific, a tremendous, a magnificent people. In some respects they closely resemble Americans—in good humor, robustness, curiosity, gregariousness, capacity for analysis, capacity for organization, inventiveness, technical skills, and so on. . . . During our whole trip I never saw an unfriendly face."

It is difficult to see how the Russians could express all these ebullient characteristics against the kind of background described above, or how the regime responsible for such conditions could be as stable as Mr. Gunther himself says it is. Furthermore, the author (this was his fourth visit) finds that Russia under Khrushchev is "much more dynamic, more fluid and experimental," than it was in the Stalin era.

Mr. Gunther takes issue with those who are inclined to underestimate Khrushchev. He stresses his liking for people, his moderation and flexibility along with his "toughness," "robust common sense," drive to get things done," "optimism and confidence," and is convinced of Khrushchev's sincere belief in peace and coexistence.

Indeed whatever the shortcomings, bias and factual errors in the book, a great deal must be forgiven Mr. Gunther for his emphasis on the Soviet desire for peace and the need for peaceful coexistence. "The Soviet Union certainly wants peace," he declares, "and considers nuclear war with the United States 'unthinkable.' But . . . it wants peace on its own terms. (As do we.)"

Mr. Gunther sees the best hope for the development of peaceful coexistence in greatly extended cultural and intellectual interchange, and offers some healthy advice to our own government:

... A long period of stalemate is before us. It could last forever. Maybe it will. The Russians cannot attack us, for fear that their country and their precious revolution and regime will be destroyed. We cannot attack Russia, without the grave risk that western Europe will be overrun, and the United States itself attacked. The United States should be strong—that goes without saying; it should also be patient, not so touchy as it is, less committed to the all-out Cold War approach, less dogmatic in our assumption that Communism is bound in time to disappear, more aware of the enlivening changes that are without doubt going on in the Soviet Union, more sensitive and sympathetic to the liberalizing developments in the satellites, less heavy-handed in the Middle East, more realistic about China, and, above all, not afraid. The Russians are tough, yes, but so can we be tough. But peace or even "nonfriendly coexistence" should rest on understanding and lack of fear as well as on strength and toughness. Above everything, there should be more information and knowledge—of each giant about the other.

NOW READY:

Bound Volumes of

1957 New World Review

\$4.00

Indexes alone, 35c each

For Subscriptions

NEW WORLD REVIEW

34 W. 15th St., 7th fl.
New York 11, N. Y.

I enclose \$2.50 (Canadian

\$3.00, foreign \$3.50) for a

☐ *New subscription*
(one year)

☐ *Renewal*

NAME

ADDRESS

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

PAMPHLETS ON THE USSR

HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE USSR

by Elizabeth Moos

32 pp., 25¢

EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM OF THE SOVIET UNION

by Elizabeth Moos

64 pp., illustrated. 25¢

WE SAW FOR OURSELVES impressions of USSR

100 pp., 25¢

WHERE MINERS ARE HONORED

Report of a Scottish miners'
delegation to the USSR on
living and working condi-
tions of Soviet miners.

32 pp., 5¢

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

Order from:

NEW WORLD REVIEW

34 West 15th Street, New York 11

7th Floor

NEW SOVIET FILMS

ROAD TO THE STARS
THE WORLD DANCES
BOULE DE SUIF
IN THE PACIFIC
FESTIVAL OF YOUTH
A DAY IN MOSCOW

Artkino Pictures, Inc.

723 SEVENTH AVE., NEW YORK 19

Telephone: Circle 5-6570

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.

Soviet Composers and Artists on LP's

SHOSTAKOVICH

A Festival Overture
Memorable Year 1919
Symphony No. 9

PROKOFIEV

The Volga Meets the Don
Kabalevsky: Symphony No. 4

DAVID OISTRAKH

Shostakovich Violin Concerto

SVIATOSLAV RICHTER

Schuman—Fantasiestücke
Waldscenen, March No. 2

SVIATOSLAV RICHTER

Rachmaninov Piano Concerto
No. 1
Saint-Saens Piano Concerto
No. 5

VICTOR MERZHANOV

Rachmaninov Piano Concerto
No. 3
Paganini—Liszt 3 Grand Etudes

GILLES - KOGAN - ROSTROPOVICH

Beethoven Trio No. 7

GILELS AND ZAK

Mozart Concerto for Two
Pianos and Orchestra
Saint-Saens Carnival of
Animals

KOGAN - MITNIK - GINSBURG

Beethoven Sonata No. 7
in C Minor
Mozart Sonata in F major

MARK REIZEN, bass

Mussorgsky—Songs from
Boris Godunov
Rachmaninov—Cavatina
from Aleko

SONGS AND DANCES OF THE UKRAINE

ARMENIAN FOLK SONGS

RUMANIAN FOLK SONGS AND DANCES

\$4.00 each

Order through

NEW WORLD REVIEW