

SOCIAL SCIENCES

NOVEMBER, 1958

25¢

New World

REVIEW

TWO GREAT ANNIVERSARIES

**25 YEARS OF
AMERICAN-SOVIET RELATIONS**

**41 YEARS
OF THE USSR**

Albert Rhys Williams

Harry F. Ward

Rockwell Kent

D. N. Pritt

Maurice Dobb

Robert W. Dunn

Ralph Parker

Eslanda Robeson

Corliss Lamont

Frederick L. Schuman

Helen and Scott Nearing

NEW WORLD REVIEW

NOVEMBER 1958

Two Anniversaries	Jessica Smith	3
"We Will Now Take Up the Building of Socialism"	Albert Rhys Williams	7
America, Russia, China	Frederick L. Schuman	11
A Message from Rockwell Kent		21
A Peace Program for the U.S.	Corliss Lamont	22
Effects of November 1917	D. N. Pritt	27
Those Who Are the Future	Eslanda Robeson	34
The Soviet Contribution	Harry F. Ward	37
Cultural Exchanges Go Forward	Murray Young	43
Our Friends from the USSR	Helen and Scott Nearing	50
On Combating Cancer	Prof. Nikolai Blokhin	56
Soviet Industry Marches East	Ralph Parker	56
Changes in Soviet Economy	Maurice Dobb	63
Britain, Quemoy and Mr. Dulles	Gordon Schaffer	69
Symphony No. 11—Shostakovich reviewed by Sidney Finkelstein		72
Dr. Zhivago—Boris Pasternak reviewed by Murray Young		74
World Balance Sheet—Robert R. Doane—reviewed by Robert W. Dunn		76
Artificial Satellites—A. Shternfeld		77

JESSICA SMITH, *Editor*

MURRAY YOUNG, *Managing Editor*

ESLANDA ROBESON

*Editorial Consultants on Negro and
Colonial Questions
and UN Correspondent*

Vol. 26, No. 10. November 1958. Second
Class postage paid at New York, N. Y. Sub-
scription \$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 Bul-
letin of the Public Affairs Information Ser-
vice. Phone: CHelsea 3-0666.
PRINTED IN U.S.A.

209

TO OUR READERS

As usual, we have counted in advance on your support in getting out this special, enlarged 80-page November anniversary issue.

We hope you will feel that we have merited your support in the roster of fine authors we have brought you and their rewarding articles.

And we hope that you will, in turn, let us know that our confidence in your help was justified by acting immediately on the two matters we suggest.

First, we would like to see greater distribution of this issue, and to have it used to get more subscribers—we are sure you agree that in these truly world-shaking times the information in our magazine should reach a much wider public—there is no other magazine in the country that covers the field of East-West relations and the progress of the socialist countries as fully as we do. Will you get more copies and use them to introduce NWR to potential subscribers?

Second, we need funds to cover the additional expenses this issue has brought us, to carry on a promotion campaign, to finance our continued publication and bring you the kind of exclusive, informative material you and your associates need as a weapon in the struggle for international understanding and peace. Will you send at once whatever you can afford?

**PLEASE FILL OUT AND
MAIL TODAY**

NEW WORLD REVIEW
7th Floor, 34 W. 15th St.
New York 11, N. Y.

I enclose \$..... for copies
of this November issue. (1 copy, 25
cents; 5 copies, \$1.00).

I enclose \$..... for a subscription.
\$2.50 for one year. \$1.25 for six months.
(Note if renewal).

I enclose \$..... for your SUSTAIN-
ING FUND.

Name

Street

CityZone....State.....

Two Anniversaries - Your Part in Them

by JESSICA SMITH

WE ARE devoting this issue of *New World Review* to the 41st anniversary of the establishment of the world's first Socialist State, on November 7, and the 25th anniversary of the establishment of American-Soviet diplomatic relations, on November 16.

Both these anniversaries have a deep significance for the people of America, for the progress and peace of our country and the world.

So vast have been the achievements of the Soviet Union in its 41 years of existence that it is not possible to encompass them in a single issue of the magazine or in many volumes. More of them will be brought you as new facts become available on progress in industry and agriculture, science, health, education and culture, on rises in living standards, new advances in human relations and on corrective measures continually being applied to overcome frankly acknowledged lapses from socialist legality and socialist relations. These advances are shared equally by the many nationalities, dark skinned and light, that make up the USSR.

What we would like to do, in these introductory words, is to urge very strongly that you, our readers, each one of you, make this month of November a period of effort to bring about a new turn in American-Soviet relations, this time an en-

during one, such as began with the attack on the Soviet Union by Hitler which brought about the alliance that saved civilization, but which was to end with the end of the war.

Even more urgent is the situation today. Greater than the threat of the fascist aggressors, is the threat of the senseless and annihilating nuclear war that will hang over mankind until the cold war is ended between the United States and the Soviet Union, between West and East, between the capitalist world and the socialist world, and replaced by peaceful co-existence and peaceful competition.

Each one of you can play a part in bringing this about.

The record of American-Soviet relations, as pointed out by Prof. Frederick L. Schuman elsewhere in this issue, is for the most part a record of lost opportunities, a record of mistaken (I would use a stronger word!) actions by our government—actions based on force or threats of force through which, ever since November, 1917, it has sought to destroy the Soviet Union, to weaken it, to make it somehow disappear from the face of the earth. All these actions failed, yet today they are still being tried not only against the Soviet Union, but against the great new socialist nation of China, with its 650,000,000 people. They are constantly being repeated in ever

new crises in which Secretary Dulles brings us again and again to the brink of war, at a point of history where the fate of the world hangs on an accident or deliberate act on the part of some officer or bomber commander who might set in motion a chain reaction that would lay the earth in ruins. There are people who want this to happen. The U.S.-protected Chiang Kai-shek, for example, and his wife, who is given our radio and TV facilities to promote this monstrous purpose, and, to our shame, high placed Americans who have called for atomic war, or support policies that could have no other outcome if continued.

Any objective appraisal of the main events in the history of American-Soviet relations must concede that year in and year out, again and again, the initiative in proposals for friendly relations, for peaceful co-existence and competition, for top-level negotiations to solve controversies instead of warlike postures and "positions of strength," for banning atomic weapons, for banning tests, have come from the Soviet Union, and not from the United States. Calls for war, policies that lead to war, formation of military blocs and military bases all over the world, have come from the United States and not from the USSR.

If the USSR has at times, by its own admission, shown less flexibility than required in seeking to lessen international tensions, it has always been against a background of the implacable hostility of the West led by the United States, the ever-recurring war danger that hostility created, and against a background of an overall policy of the Soviet Union unswervingly dedicated to peace. Where

there has been inflexibility, it has been acknowledged and corrected. Innumerable concessions have been made by the USSR in all negotiations that have taken place with our country to pave the way for agreement on disarmament and other matters, only to have the United States withdraw from the very points the USSR has conceded.

This policy of peace is being pursued more strongly than ever today by the Soviet Union, within the United Nations, in its relations with other nations—a policy necessarily based on strength, lacking agreement on disarmament, but most of all based on the support of the peace forces of the world. In the Middle Eastern crisis the Soviet Union called for peaceful solutions, withdrawal of foreign troops, agreement on an arms embargo, no intervention from outside, support of the just aspirations of the Arab national liberation movement, constructive economic aid. The statement of the Soviet Union in the Far East crisis that "an attack on the People's Republic of China, which is a great friend, ally and neighbor of our country, is an attack on the Soviet Union" was a sober warning of a reality the United States must face. But at the same time the Soviet Union undoubtedly has supported and encouraged in every way the course of negotiations whereby China is trying to solve the issue peacefully in the face of flagrant provocations, and the current cease fire at Quemoy and Matsu which China has put into effect in order that the negotiations may succeed and war be avoided. Soviet and Chinese policies open the way to a peaceful settlement on the Taiwan

issue and China's off-shore islands.

And where do you come in?

You come in right here and now, because in the few instances where our government has made some peace initiative, or agreed finally to enter into negotiations to settle a war situation or a situation threatening war, it has been because of the pressure of public opinion. It was this pressure that ended the fighting in Korea, that prevented U.S. armed intervention in Indo-China, that brought about the Geneva Summit Conference of 1955 which held the war forces in abeyance at that time, that has kept the Middle East from bursting into flame, that so far has stayed the hands of those who would plunge the world into war over Quemoy and Matsu. The voices of the Americans who have been writing to the State Department, 80 per cent of whom oppose going to war over China's islands, have had their effect.

Despite the menacing clouds that overhang the world, there are rays of light gleaming through that indicate that public action may be successful if carried through with enough determination, by sufficient numbers of people.

The growing opposition to Administration policies in Washington itself, the new tone in many radio and TV programs, the pressures from world public opinion and America's own allies, the changing atmosphere within the United Nations where the powerful influence of the African-Arab-Asian members is bringing new alignments for peace, all show the need and usefulness of every voice that can be raised for peace.

New opportunities for progress

in international negotiations lie ahead. The report of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation, showing the irrefutable dangers to mankind and the genetic effects of radiation from nuclear weapons testing, have taken the ground from under the feet of Americans like Dr. Edward Teller, Admiral Lewis Strauss and others who have sought to deny or belittle these dangers. The recent Atoms for Peace Conference in Geneva, bringing forth greater exchanges and revelations by world scientists than ever before, has shown the way to the breathtaking possibilities for mankind in cooperating in the use of atomic energy for life instead of death. The agreement between U.S. and Soviet scientists on technical means for the detection of all nuclear weapons tests lays the basis for agreement at the meeting opening October 31 on the question of test suspension or cessation. The experts meeting scheduled to begin November 10 to consider the question of averting surprise attack offers a new opportunity for steps to eliminate the measureless danger of accidental launching of world war through the planes now constantly in the air with their cargoes of death for humanity.

Added to all these things, a new understanding is growing up between the peoples of the Soviet Union and the United States through the increasing exchange of visitors and delegations, a growing realization of all that we have to give each other if enduring peaceful and friendly relations can be established.

Eleanor Roosevelt, just back from her second trip to the USSR, is an

outstanding example of what these contacts mean. She continues to stress the desire of the Soviet people for peace and the possibility of reaching greater understanding between these two great countries. In one of the columns written on her return (*New York Post*, October 12) she advocates more strongly than ever extension of human contacts "because of the greater understanding created by these contacts and the hope that we will further the cause of peace in the world." She stresses the responsibility of each of us to help form a public opinion that will make for good feeling. At the same time, she reminds us that actually "we must depend on the actions of our leaders in government for any real results for peace." She asks that the people be informed of the objectives of our government on the one hand, and that on the other we find a way of translating the mass desire of the peoples "into moves that will strengthen the actions of our leaders in bringing about peaceful solutions."

This is good counsel from the wife of the far-seeing President who established American-Soviet diplomatic relations, and understood their meaning for the highest interests of our country and the world. Let us take it to heart.

Whatever the immediate crisis, American-Soviet relations remain the key problem in world affairs. Their improvement will bring about improvement in all other aspects of international relations.

We believe it is not enough to mark the anniversary of these relations just by recording what they have meant and can mean. If the words written about them in this

issue mean anything, they must be translated into action.

The action we propose is to write to the President during November, but particularly messages to reach him on November 16, calling for implementation of the agreement made on that day 25 years ago by President Roosevelt and Maxim Litvinov that "the relations now established between our peoples may forever remain normal and friendly, and that our Nations henceforth may cooperate for their mutual benefit and for the preservation of the peace of the world."

There are many roads whereby this agreement can be revived and strengthened—through cultural interchange and trade, through a first step toward disarmament by agreement on cessation of nuclear weapons tests and then their banning altogether, above all by ending the cold war and using the method of top level negotiations to solve all problems, no matter how long they take. Choose your own point of emphasis, but let the Administration know how you feel.

Do not stop with an individual action—talk to your family, friends, associates, shop mates and urge them to do likewise. Write letters to the press urging such action. Bring up the matter in your union, church or club, in any peace or civic organization with which you may be associated.

Each of you can play a part in shaping the policies of our government, in helping to bring about a new era which will see the end of wars and threats of wars, in which friendly American-Soviet relations can become the brightest hope for mankind's peace and progress.

"WE WILL NOW TAKE UP THE BUILDING OF SOCIALISM"

by ALBERT RHYS WILLIAMS

A LONG with a fellow American, John Reed, I was an eyewitness of the main events of the October Revolution forty-one years ago.

The storming of the Winter Palace, as we followed the Red Guards over the barricades into the glittering salons. The march of the ill-clad army of workers—men, women and children—through the chilling rains and mud out of Petrograd to meet the Wild Divisions riding in to strangle the Revolution. The Baltic sailors at night with the flaming torches surging through the gates of the Telephone Station to force the surrender of the Junkers.

A quick succession of dramatic episodes, heroic deeds, flaming speeches during those ten days that shook the world. Out of them all, most deeply etched on my memory is that red-letter sentence that fell from the lips of Lenin as he emerged from underground into the lights of Smolny. Stilling the thunder of applause with a wave of his hand, he

said, "Comrades! We will now take up the building of socialism."

Epoch-making words under any conditions. But addressed to an exhausted, war-stricken people they were the height of audacity. The proclamation of the birth of a new order—the building of socialism—when materially there was so little to build with!

The country was in a state of collapse. The cities were freezing, the bread rations daily growing smaller. Typhus and cholera swept through the villages. The hospitals were crowded with the sick and wounded. The army was disintegrating; and the Germans advancing. Mines were flooded, factories at a standstill. "Cemeteries" of dead locomotives and cars stood on the railway sidings. Everywhere enemies were predicting the imminent downfall of the Soviets and speeding it on by plots and sabotage.

Around the Soviets, with the watchwords of "Land!" "Bread!" "Peace!", increasingly rallied the mass of workers and peasants. With their abilities and energies quickened by the Revolution, Lenin confidently counted on them to bring order out of chaos and overcome all liabilities. But they had one great disability. Most of them were illiterate. Over three-fourths could not read or write.

ALBERT RHYS WILLIAMS, eye-witness to the historic events of 1917 and later phases of Soviet development, has made incomparable contributions to Americans' understanding of the USSR. Soviet writers, cabling greetings on his recent 75th birthday, called him "One of the oldest and most faithful friends of the USSR." Among his many books are "Lenin, the Man and His Work," "Through the Russian Revolution" and "The Russian Land."

Once, while reading a placard on peace posted up on a kiosk, I was interrupted by two peasant soldiers, "We can't understand a word of it," they cried with indignant voices. "The Tsar only wanted us to fight and pray and pay taxes—but never to read!"

Although beset on all sides by a host of life-and-death issues, with the slogan "Only a literate people can build socialism," the Soviets tackled this one with vigor and ingenuity. On the walls gaily colored posters vividly depicted the sorry plight of the ignorant in contrast to the joys and wonders to be found in books: "They will give you a hundred eyes, the strength of a giant, the wisdom of a sage."

In huts and barracks—often so cold that the ink froze in the bottles—hosts of adults wrestled with alphabets and the mysteries of grammar—and presently they were reading, not only newspapers but textbooks and novels. In hastily improvised theaters with the legend "To live without work is robbery; to work without art is barbarism," they were acting out the plays they were reading.

From these crude beginnings, in keeping with Lenin's three-fold injunction, "Study! Study harder! Keep on studying!" emerged a universal system of education. While covering all branches of knowledge, the swift industrialization and electrification of the country created an ever-growing demand for scientists, architects, specialists in all fields of engineering. In response to this—aided by a loyal corps of able scientists from the old regime—rapidly rose an imposing edifice of institutions, from the Academy of Sciences at the apex

reaching through hundreds of well-equipped research institutes down to the grass-roots—the little laboratories in the villages with meager collections of test tubes and chemicals.

Evidence of the deep universal interest in the sciences are the answers of children about their plans for the future as set down in a book I wrote twenty-five years ago. Some said, "I want to be a great writer like Gorky," "A composer of music like Tchaikovsky." But for the most part the answers show minds fired by science, the conquest of nature, "I want to be an engineer and build dams for power plants on the Volga," "An agronomist and turn out the best seeds in the world." And, prophetic of the future, "I want to invent a rocket machine and fly in airless, interplanetary spaces. . . ."

On this broad basis, with a consuming zeal for learning, millions of children of workers, peasants and nomads were transformed into inventors, technicians, chemists, aviators. How well-trained and competent is attested by the triumphs scored by the Soviets—not only in chess and sports and music—but in those scientific spheres in which the West was so confident of superiority. Had the West heeded the implications of these more recent Soviet "firsts"—jet-liners, missiles and rocketry—it would not have been so astounded by that crowning exploit of last October—the super-rocket that shot Sputnik up into the skies on its circling flight around the earth.

An epoch-making feat that won the plaudits of the world. Nonetheless—as Khrushchev observed—there is nothing exclusive and final about this. Other countries, along with the Soviets, presently will be making

bigger and better satellites—precursors of a galaxy of space-stations in ever-widening orbits journeying around the earth. Then on to a space-ship cruising to the moon, from the moon on to Mars and from thence into the stars beyond!

If this is still in the far-off realms of fantasy, in the launching of the Sputniks the Soviet people have made a notable first step toward realization of that dream that has long haunted the minds of men—the dream of the conquest of the far reaches of space.

THERE is another dream long cherished by mankind — the dream of the good society of justice, freedom and plenty in this world. No longer shall the strength and cunning of man be pitted against his fellow men—but with each enjoying the fruits of his labor, all will work in union together for the common weal. Swords will be beaten into plowshares and all peoples of the world will dwell together in peace and concord. These lofty visions—largely on the part of poets and philosophers—were shared in more realistic fashion by many exploited workers of the world, and in the West increasingly found expression under the name of socialism—of various types and schools. Little groups of idealists in Utopian colonies sought to enjoy the communal spirit of socialism. While certain countries—usually with the aim of taking the insurrectionary edge off the rising socialist movement—sought to realize some of its objectives by means of social welfare and reform.

But it was not until the October of 1917 that a great nation went all

out for socialism, committed all its resources and energies to it and multitudes of workers were imbued with the conviction that in the building of dams, mills and power plants they were engaged in the building of socialism. For this they toiled, hungered and gave up their lives. In the words I copied from the wooden obelisk over one of their graves:

Against riches, knowledge and power for the few you fought a good fight, and with honor you died in order that power, knowledge and riches should belong to all.

The Soviets have a long way to go before achieving such a beatific state of affairs. But here, as in any undertaking, success is to be measured by the distance to travel, the difficulties to overcome. "There is nothing so difficult to begin," says that acute, albeit cynical observer of human affairs, Machiavelli, "so perilous to conduct, so uncertain of success as to take the lead in the introduction of a new order of things."

The new order the Soviets were initiating involved nothing less than the social organization of all the resources, industries and people of one-sixth of the land area of the globe. Among the obstacles to this colossal pioneering undertaking—too complex and too many to enumerate here—the main difficulty lay in the human element, in the contentious nature of man.

In keeping with known laws, the atoms can be made to fuse or to fission invariably in the same fashion to produce the desired result — a bomb or a power plant. But how induce vast multitudes of men and women with clashing minds, wills

and tempers with all their wayward impulses and prejudices to work in some degree of harmony together? Far more difficult than the marvelous creations of science—even the fashioning of Sputniks — is the achievement of a society of justice, freedom and plenty, or even keeping humanity headed in that direction.

But in spite of all the ordeals by war, famines and purges and all the road-blocks set up by bureaucrats, careerists, renegades—the Soviet people, ever mindful that the good society was the final goal of the Revolution, have steadfastly continued on the course marked out for themselves.

If they still have far to go before achieving the communist ideal—"From each according to his ability, to each according to his need," they have laid deep and secure the socialist foundations therefor.

In evidence of this are many notable Soviet achievements culminating last year in October with the launching of Sputnik. Quite rightly the Soviets are rejoicing in their man-made moons circling the earth. A symbol of the great strides made in science and education since those feeble beginnings forty-one years ago—a salute to the anniversary of that October night when Lenin said, "We will now take up the building of socialism."

AMERICA NEEDS A NEW FOREIGN POLICY

UNDER THE ABOVE heading a group of leading Americans placed an ad for peace in the *New York Times* and other papers on October 16. It opened with the statement that U.S. cold war policy has carried us time and again to the brink of disaster, that modern war means total destruction and offers no solution to anything. It declares:

- It is time we faced reality. Whether we like it or not, more than one-third of the earth's population is governed by communist regimes and there is no indication that this situation is going to change any time soon.

- Since the people of the world must either live together or die together, it is imperative that all the world be opened up, and that travel, trade and cultural exchange be encouraged among all peoples.

- We are unwilling to sacrifice our country in pursuit of a policy which has been tried and failed.

- We reject the dogma that humanity stops where the iron curtain begins. We believe that a solution can be found.

- Therefore, we urge that the Government and the people of the United States, through every possible means, enter into a discussion and a reconsideration of our entire foreign policy.

Among the signers are John A. Mackay, Lewis Mumford, Stringfellow Barr, Sarah Gibson Blanding, Peter Blume, Alexander Calder, Stuart Chase, L. C. Dunn, Kermit Eby, Eich Fromm, Harry Golden, Donald Harrington, Brig. Gen. Hugh B. Hester (U.S.A., ret.), Howard Mumford Jones, Freda Kirchwey, Robert J. McCracken, Lenore Marshall, Seymour Melman, Walter Millis, C. Wright Mills, A. J. Muste, Jay O'Rear, David Riesman, Eleanor Roosevelt, Elmo Roper, Frank Rosenblum, Ben Shahn, Mark Starr, J. David Stern, Norman Thomas, James P. Warburg.

Those who wish to join this action are asked to write to Clarence Pickett, Room 809, 1201 Chestnut St., Philadelphia 7, Pa.

America, Russia, China

by FREDERICK L. SCHUMAN

The 25th Anniversary of US-USSR relations points lessons to be applied in relations with China if we are to live in a world of progress and peace—or indeed to live at all

THE human race in the year 1958 consists of some 2,800,000,000 men, women and children. Of these, 175,000,000 or a little over 6 per cent inhabit the 3,000,000 square miles of the United States of America. Some 210,000,000 or 7.5 per cent dwell within the 8,500,000 square miles of the Soviet Union. Almost 650,000,000 or nearly 24 per cent live within the 4,000,000 square miles of mainland China. These three great communities thus comprise, between them, almost one-third of mankind.

I wish to take up some aspects of the relationships among these three major segments of humanity, because these relations are constantly on the minds of all of us, and also because these relations pose a supreme challenge to religion and a supreme challenge to politics. In saying this I take it for granted that the highest social function of reli-

gion—all religion—is to promote peace on earth and the brotherhood of man and that the highest social function of politics—all politics—is to foster the non-violent settlement of disputes among human beings and to further cooperation in the service of human welfare. Finally, these relations among America, Russia, and China are, have long been, and promise to be, profoundly unsatisfactory, frustrating, and so dangerous as to threaten the very survival of mankind.

For this we have readily at hand a simple explanation, repeated daily by most of our political leaders and by all the mass media of communication. That explanation, reduced to crystal clear simplicity, is that Russia and China—alas and alack!—are ruled by Communists; that all Communists are wicked people while all anti-Communists are virtuous; that Communists are evil atheists while Americans worship God and even have a Secretary of State who has a pipeline to God; that Communists, like Fascists twenty years ago, are bent upon conquering and enslaving the world; and that it is the patriotic and Christian duty of all of us to resist this foul assault upon civilization at any risk and any

FREDERICK L. SCHUMAN, distinguished historian and writer, is Professor of Government at Williams College. Among his many outstanding books are "Europe on the Eve," "Soviet Politics" and "Russia Since 1917" (published 1957). This article is a condensation of an address prepared for delivery, in part, at Carnegie Hall, New York City, November 14, 1958, under the auspices of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.

cost, even including, if need be, the thermonuclear incineration of the human race.

This explanation has familiar corollaries: for example, that all evil in the world and all evil in America is a product of the Communist conspiracy; that the Red Plotters can be defeated and ultimately abolished by a firm national resolve to practice the art of brinkmanship or, if necessary, the art of atomic warfare which, we are told on the highest authority, assures our victory in the war to come; that millions of Russians and Chinese are yearning to be liberated, with American help, from Marxist oppression; and that once Communism is destroyed the millenium will dawn and all peoples will abide by the rule of law and live together in peace and brotherhood forevermore.

This explanation of our problems has only one defect: it bears no relationship whatever to the facts of the contemporary world. Please accept my apologies for this obviously heretical view. I agree that Communists are wicked people. I cannot agree that all anti-Communists or even all Americans are virtuous, not in the era of Bernard Goldfine, Sherman Adams, Governor Faubus, and the present condition of public education in Arkansas, Virginia, and elsewhere. I agree that Communists are atheists, but I can see no sign of divine inspiration in recent American foreign policy. I agree that many Communists believe that Communism will eventually embrace all mankind, as many Christians believe that Christianity will eventually embrace all mankind and as many Moslems believe that Islam will eventually embrace all mankind.

From the evidence of the record, I cannot agree that Communists are embarked upon any program for the military conquest of the non-Communist world. I cannot agree that Communism and Fascism are identical. I cannot agree that America has a sacred mission to consummate the atomic annihilation of mankind simply because Americans fear and hate Communism. I cannot agree that all evil in the world is the product of a Communist conspiracy. I cannot agree that brinkmanship spells peace or national security or that the people of Russia or China are yearning to be liberated or that any millenium can be arrived at through the destruction of Communism.

In short, there is something wrong, seriously wrong, in the attitudes and policies of America toward Russia and China. It is equally true that there is something wrong, seriously wrong, in the attitudes and policies of Russians and Chinese toward America. This I propose not to discuss, for it is discussed daily, sometimes accurately but more often erroneously, in every newspaper, periodical, radio program, and TV program in the United States.

As an American I take no pleasure in dwelling upon American errors and sins. Yet it seems to me that the time is ripe, and over-ripe, for all of us to reconsider most seriously the course of action of our nation in dealing with Russia and China. That course has brought us once again to the brink of war—a war which, once unleashed, no one can possibly win and in which all will miserably perish. These recurring crises, threatening armed violence and the possible co-annihila-

tion of mankind, must suggest to all of us that we have somehow failed to give adequate expression to our religious convictions and to our political beliefs.

NOVEMBER, 1958, marks the 25th anniversary of American diplomatic recognition of the Soviet Government of Russia. I believe that the record of American relations with Russia offers some lessons for the problems of American relations with China in our own time.

On October 10, 1933, President Roosevelt invited President Kalinin to send an envoy to Washington, "to end the present abnormal relations" between America and Russia. Moscow sent Litvinov, who arrived on November 7.

On November 16, 1933, President and Commissar agreed to an exchange of Ambassadors (William C. Bullitt and Alexander Troyanovsky) and expressed hope that diplomatic relations would lead to cooperation for: "mutual benefit and for the preservation of the peace of the world." Litvinov agreed that Moscow should refrain "from interfering in any manner in the internal affairs of the United States"; should restrain all persons and organizations under its control from all agitation or propaganda aimed at "bringing about by force any change in the social or political order of the whole or any part of the United States"; and should not permit on its territory any organization or group aiming at intervention in, or subversive propaganda against, the United States. Roosevelt accepted reciprocal obligations. Questions of financial claims and counter-claims were deferred. But Litvinov agreed to

waive all counter-claims arising out of the American intervention in Siberia.

This settlement very soon gave rise to controversy. In debt negotiations, Litvinov asserted that it had been understood in Washington that new loans would be granted in return for payment on old debts and claims. Secretary Hull contended that initial payments on past obligations must precede any fresh advances. Washington guaranteed commercial credits through the Export-Import Bank, founded for this specific purpose. But the Johnson Act, passed in April, 1934, forbade public loans to any foreign government in default. The Soviet Government had never defaulted on any of its own obligations. It was nevertheless held in default for declining to pay the Kerensky debt unless it received compensation for damage done in North Russia in the intervention of 1918-19. Negotiations over these matters ended on February 1, 1935, with an agreement to disagree. A commercial accord was signed in Moscow in July, 1935, by which the USSR agreed, in return for tariff concessions, to purchase \$30,000,000 worth of American goods during the ensuing year.

This figure was modest by comparison with what would have been possible under more favorable credit arrangements. The accord was renewed annually at somewhat higher levels. The two Powers now at least had the means of direct communication with each other.

We may well rejoice 25 years later in this elementary act of common sense. The uninterrupted maintenance of diplomatic relations between the United States and the

Soviet Union for a quarter of a century has paid rich dividends to both governments and to both peoples, particularly during World War II and during the years since the Summit Conference of 1955. All Americans, all Russians, and all mankind have nothing to lose and everything to gain from trade and travel between the two giant Powers of the 20th century, from cultural and scientific exchanges, from collaboration in developing industrial uses of atomic energy, and from negotiations for a cessation of atomic tests, for security against surprise attack, for reduction of armaments, and for many other common purposes conducive to human health, wealth, and happiness.

It is nonetheless true that this quarter of a century of American-Soviet relations is a record of lost opportunities. When Litvinov came to Washington in November, 1933, he hoped to negotiate some pattern of political and military cooperation between Russia and America which might deter the Fascist regimes of Japan, Germany, and Italy from their contemplated course of military conquest. Had his hopes been realized, World War II would never have come to pass. Litvinov did not return to Washington until December of 1941, by which time Russia and America had both been attacked by the Fascist madmen and forced into a strange alliance against a common enemy. Had his original hopes been realized, the tragedies of 1941 and of the long and bitter years of blood and tears which followed might all have been prevented. This was not to be.

On the contrary, American-Soviet relations from the outset were all

sicklied-over with a mental and emotional aberration which was far more an American than a Russian disease.

In the summer of 1935 Rear Admiral Yates Sterling, Jr. made a public appeal for an American alliance with Hitler to promote what he called "a great crusade led by Germany, not only laying forever the ghost of Bolshevism but opening up the fertile land of Russia to a crowded and industrially hungry Europe." When Litvinov protested against such statements by American public officials, Secretary of State Hull rejected the protest. But when Earl Browder appeared in the summer of 1935 at the 7th Congress, which turned out to be the last Congress, of the Communist International, Hull instructed Bullitt to protest to Litvinov on the ground that the Congress was a violation of the anti-propaganda pledge of 1933. Litvinov rejected the protest. Paradoxically it was this final Congress of the Comintern which abandoned, or deferred, all dreams of World Revolution in favor of a People's Front of all Communists, Socialists, and liberals against Fascism. But all Russian efforts to make common cause with America, Britain, and France against the Fascist menace and the threat of war were foredoomed by Western hopes that Hitler, Mussolini, and Hirohito would attack Russia and leave the West in peace.

So came again the insane frenzy of armed violence. Only when Russia was attacked in June and America was attacked in December of 1941 did Washington and Moscow become allies against a common foe. Do any of us in America any longer

remember that in paying the price of common victory Russia's sacrifice in devastation and death was ten times greater than that of all the other United Nations combined? Do any of us remember that the 8th of November of 1943 was proclaimed "Stalingrad Day" by Mayor LaGuardia of New York and that 20,000 people gathered in Madison Square Garden in a "Congress of American-Soviet Friendship" with Corliss Lamont as Chairman and Joseph E. Davies as Honorary Chairman and that stirring words were spoken and warm greetings were sent by Franklin D. Roosevelt and Dwight D. Eisenhower? From this high point of solidarity relations deteriorated as the tides of battle turned. Yet there was every prospect of continued cooperation in building the peace, as in winning the war, so long as Franklin D. Roosevelt lived. Despite frictions with Stalin in the winter and spring of 1945, Roosevelt wired Churchill on April 12: "I would minimize the general Soviet problem as much as possible because these problems, in one form or another, seem to arise every day and most of them straighten out. . . ." An hour later Roosevelt died.

His successor in the White House was the Vice President who, as Senator from Missouri, declared in June, 1941, when Hitler invaded the Soviet Union: "If we see that Germany is winning we ought to help Russia and if Russia is winning we ought to help Germany and in that way let them kill as many as possible. . . ." Within a few months after Mr. Truman's accession to the presidency, the so-called Cold War had already begun, with the enthusiastic biparti-

san support of a majority of party leaders and most of the press. The Cold War has gone on intermittently ever since with immense loss and waste and peril to all mankind.

THUS the quarter of a century of American-Soviet diplomatic relations falls into two equal parts of a dozen years each. The first 6 years were years of wasted opportunities for political and military collaboration which, had it been consummated and rendered effective, could have prevented the war unleashed by Fascist aggression. The second 6 years were years of close cooperation in fighting and winning World War II. The ensuing 13 years have been years of hollow postures of hostility and empty gestures of enmity everywhere poisoning human minds and hearts with hatred and fear.

But if we would derive maximum benefit from a review of the record as a guide to a brighter future we must, I believe, take cognizance, however briefly, of American attitudes and policies during the whole 41 years since the Russian Revolution—and we must notice, if we are wise, how these attitudes and policies have repeated themselves during the 9 years since the Chinese Revolution. If in doing so I seem to ignore Russian and Chinese follies and crimes during these years this is not because I seek to minimize such follies and crimes, of which there have been many. It is because these things are daily pounded into our heads and because, as Americans, we can surely learn more for our own guidance in days to come by reconsidering what we have woefully neglected—namely, American attitudes and policies which, with

the wisdom of hindsight, we can now see were errors of judgment that, if we were wise, we would not repeat.

It was a mistake for the Wilson Administration to equate diplomatic recognition with moral and political approval and to seek to use diplomatic recognition as a weapon of power politics. By such methods changes of government can sometimes be brought about in Cuba, Nicaragua, Guatemala, or even Mexico. But such methods can never bring about the disappearance of a disliked regime or reverse the course of a great revolution in a Great Power like Russia or China. For 16 years the United States refused to recognize the Soviet Government of Russia—all to no purpose. For 9 years the United States has refused to recognize the People's Republic of China—all to no purpose.

It was an error, if not a crime, for the Wilson Administration in 1918-19 to suppose that the Communist revolution in Russia could be crushed by blockade, invasion, and armed intervention to subsidize civil war. The result was the victory of the Red Army over the American forces invading North Russia, over other Allied armies elsewhere, and over the counter-revolutionary White Armies of Kolchak, Yudenich, Denikin, and Wrangel financed by Washington, London, and Paris. The policy-makers of the Truman Administration sought to crush the Communist revolution in China by arming and subsidizing Chiang Kai-shek. The result was that the People's Liberation Army threw Chiang out of China in 1949 and drove the remnants of his forces to Formosa where the United States has

spent close to two billion dollars in protecting, arming, and financing a lost cause in a continuing civil war and dreaming fatuously of Chiang's return to power on the mainland. But Humpty-Dumpty cannot be put together again. America can restore Chiang to power in China as easily as it can restore Kerensky to power in Russia.

It was a blunder for Washington to assume that it could weaken or promote the downfall of the Soviet regime in Russia by forbidding American trade and travel. This blunder was happily corrected in 1921 after 4 years of embargo. There followed generous American famine relief on the Volga, the establishment of the Amtorg Trading Company, and the healthy growth of commerce and travel during the 1920's and 1930's long before diplomatic recognition was granted. But in the case of China Washington has forbidden all American trade and travel for 9 long years, thereby strengthening, rather than weakening, the People's Republic of China and insuring the solidarity of the Soviet-Chinese alliance.

It was a mistake to assume in dealing with Russia that national policy could safely be based on fictions. It continues to be a mistake to assume in dealing with China that national policy can safely be based on fictions. Endless are the fictions: that the Russian Revolution was a German conspiracy; that the Chinese Revolution was a Russian conspiracy; that Communist rule of Russia will disappear a week from next Wednesday; that Communist rule of China will disappear the day after tomorrow; that socialist economic planning can never work; that the Soviet

economy is collapsing; that the Chinese economy is collapsing; *et cetera ad infinitum*. Other fairy-tales are no less fantastic. Kerensky, driven out of Russia, is the Government of Russia, said our State Department, as it recognized his Ambassador, Boris Bakhmetev, and then his Ambassador's attache, Serge Ughet, as official envoy of Russia for 16 years after Kerensky's government was overthrown. By the same logic, Chiang Kai-shek remains the Government of China and is entitled to China's seat in the United Nations. All of these and scores of other official American views about Russia and China were and are sheer myths and fables, acted upon at the highest level as bases of foreign policy.

It is an error, moreover, to assume that the military encirclement of a Great Power will reduce it to immobility or helplessness when that Power has a larger area and population and larger potential resources than the encircling Power or Powers. Russia and China have no present inclination and no present means of encircling the United States. If they had, all Americans would devote themselves wholeheartedly to breaking out of the encirclement. Americans have for years pursued a national policy of encircling Russia and China—not by remote control but by hundreds of bombing bases all around the frontiers, by military allies on frontiers, and by defense of hostile positions a few miles from the frontier. We are solemnly assured that Quemoy is West Berlin, that Communism is Fascism, that Formosa is Czechoslovakia, that Warsaw is Munich, and that if any one of these positions is lost all will be lost and the Chinese Navy will at-

tack California and the Russian Army will invade Western Europe. No greater nonsense was ever uttered by responsible statesmen or even by irresponsible statesmen. There is no Chinese Navy, not even enough to threaten Formosa. No Russian Army has ever invaded Western Europe or will ever invade Western Europe unless Western Europe first seeks to invade Russia.

But the American attempt at encirclement means that all Russians and all Chinese will inevitably seek to break out of the encirclement, as indeed they have already done with marked success. When Premier Khrushchev tells President Eisenhower that if the United States does not withdraw from Formosa the Chinese will sooner or later drive the Americans and Chiang Kai-shek out of Formosa, he is stating a simple fact of the future, as inevitable as anything can be in a world of power politics.

Finally, it is a basic fallacy for Americans to assume that they still exercise preponderant power. In the last analysis the Cold War is largely a consequence of American refusal to treat the Soviet Union as an equal Power with interests and aspirations commensurate with those of the United States—and quite susceptible of peaceful and orderly accommodation with those of the United States through diplomatic compromise and bargaining. The men of Washington are reluctant to bargain or compromise because they are bewitched by the false belief that Russia is bent upon conquering the world and by the further false belief that refusal to negotiate between equals will somehow redound to American advantage. In their com-

pounding of error, the men of Washington refuse to negotiate with China as an equal Power. The American premise is that America can dictate terms to Russia and China or somehow induce unconditional surrender to American demands. All attitudes and policies based upon this fundamental fallacy will, of course, lead only to frustration or catastrophe or both.

IT IS clear—is it not?—that in dealing with China Americans have learned no lessons as yet from their earlier dealings with Russia. Apart from the matters already touched upon, what is it that we need to learn? I shall limit myself to three propositions.

I believe we need to learn in the first place that the challenge of Communism is not a military challenge, unless we choose to make it so—in which case heaven help us all! The challenge of Communism is a social challenge, an economic challenge, an educational challenge, and a technological and scientific challenge. If we will but meet it creatively and not destructively we can make the challenge and our response to it a source of immense benefit to ourselves, to our rivals, and to all mankind. Communism is no cure for the evils of capitalism, as Marx and Engels assumed a century ago. These evils have largely cured themselves. Communism in our time, despite all the abuses perpetrated and the crimes committed in its name, is a method of raising rapidly the productivity and the living standards of people hitherto desperately poor. If we would meet the challenge, we have to do at least as well in this global search for a better life. If

we continue to envisage the problem in military terms, we shall fail utterly.

Let me quote Raymond Robins, an American millionaire, social worker, and Progressive Republican, who happened to be head of the American Red Cross Mission to Russia in 1917-18 and, for a time, unofficial Ambassador to the new Soviet regime. In testifying in 1919 before hostile Senators who accused him of being pro-Bolshevik, Colonel Robins said: "I would never expect, sirs, to suppress the desire for a better human life, no matter how ill-founded in political fact and experience, with force. The only answer to the desire for a better human life is a better human life."

I believe we need to learn in the second place that anti-Communism is not, and can never be, a workable foreign policy. Anti-Communism as an attitude and philosophy has many functions in the civilization of the 20th century. It is a lucrative source of income for many academicians, clergymen, politicians, and publicists, most of whom protect their revenues by denouncing anti-anti-Communists who are somehow worse than Communists themselves. Anti-Communism is an even more lucrative source of income for American businessmen and labor leaders with lush defense contracts. Anti-Communism, under certain circumstances, is the perfect formula for the destruction of democracy by the forces of Fascism, as happened in Italy, Japan, Germany and Spain in the 1920's and 1930's. Anti-Communism abroad in our time has served as the rationalization for the bloodiest and most destructive war ever fought and for the most atro-

cious mass murder of human beings in all recorded history. Anti-Communism at home in our time has served as the rationalization for McCarthyism; for un-Americanism disguised as Americanism and subversive of all the values of decency and tolerance most precious in the American tradition; for the perpetuation of a monstrous pattern of racial discrimination, segregation, and persecution; and for other evils without number afflicting contemporary American society.

On another level anti-Communism in America is a splendid source of inspiration, togetherness, and self-righteousness in a community which desperately needs to evade realities because this community seems, to date, incapable of maintaining full production and full employment save through massive public spending on armament and quite incapable, despite the Supreme Court, of treating human beings as human beings if they are of the wrong epidermal pigmentation. Anti-Communism, you see, has many uses for many people. But we need to learn that anti-Communism is not a foreign policy—unless we wish our foreign policy to lead us through successive frustration to aggression and irreparable tragedy.

I believe we need to learn in the third place that America is not omnipotent and that America is not God. This is perhaps the hardest lesson of all to learn. Our years are full of pretentious American injunctions, sanctimoniously pronounced with divine overtones and ostensibly intended to be imposed on all the world with the aid of heavenly grace and American arms. We began with Woodrow Wilson's "war to

end war" and to "make the world safe for democracy." We proceeded, despite isolationism, to the Stimson Doctrine of 1932 whereby we refused to recognize any situation abroad brought about by aggression. We continued into the Truman Doctrine in 1947 whereby the United States nobly committed itself to help "free people to maintain their free institutions and their national integrity against aggressive movements that seek to impose upon them totalitarian regimes." We went on to the Eisenhower Doctrine of 1957 for the Mid-East whose terms are so remote from any reality that I need not review them. We have come to the Dulles Doctrine of 1958, according to which the United States forbids all other countries to resort to "indirect aggression" and to use force in international affairs. The apparent meaning, if any, of the Doctrine is that when the United States uses force in international affairs, as in Guatemala in 1954 and in Lebanon last July and in scores of other places throughout the world for many years, such use of force is justified by the purity of American motives, but that if anyone else uses force, whether our Allies or enemies or the neutrals, such use is an intolerable evil which Americans must suppress. The meaning of the Doctrine, further, is that when the United States spends in secret \$100,000,000 a year, as it has been doing for 8 years, to foster revolution in countries whose government we do not like, this shows devotion to virtue, but that when other governments do likewise this is proof of vice. The motto of the Dulles Doctrine is: "Come Weal, Come Woe, My Status is Quo."

Yet, despite the dark portents of

recent months, I venture to suggest that all is not lost and that there is much reason for hope in the future. The Communist rulers of Russia and China are, fortunately, not madmen. They are merely good chess-players, dealing—alas!—with bad chess-players. Our own policy-makers in Washington are also not madmen despite some evidence to the contrary. They are victims of past mistakes and continuing illusions. Happily, we have allies. The chief function of our allies, now as on many occasions in the past, is to tell us what not to do. And, happily, for the first time in many years, some considerable section of the American public has overcome its inhibitions and is now able to speak out—not on all the matters we have here considered but quite definitely in opposition to a thermonuclear World War in defense of Quemoy and Matsu and Chiang Kai-shek.

My crystal ball, albeit clouded, tells me that there will be no World War over Quemoy and Matsu and Chiang Kai-shek, but only a prolonged war of nerves at the end of

which American policy-makers will reluctantly face reality and find some face-saving formula for abandoning a desperate, wholly fatuous and unnecessary enterprise. Beyond this crisis looms the possibility of some pattern of fruitful cooperation among Russia, America and China in the service of all their peoples and of all peoples everywhere. The rulers of Russia and China, in my judgment, would welcome all efforts at such cooperation once they were assured that America had abandoned its efforts to destroy them.

I cannot forecast the actions of the rulers of America. But I hope that reason will prevail. I am persuaded that peace and order in the world community depend primarily upon some negotiated design of collaboration among Americans, Russians, and Chinese, the three peoples who together comprise one-third of the human race. May we move toward this goal as the first step, a small step, but an important and decisive step, toward the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God, in a world of peace.

MRS. ROOSEVELT ON US-USSR UNDERSTANDING

... NOW WE COME to a point that everyone of us must think about. We believe in contacts among human beings because of the greater understanding created by these contacts and the hope that we will further the cause of peace in the world.

As simple citizens . . . we devote ourselves to trying to get to know one another and to create good feeling. We try to form public opinion and to have some influence through the organizations to which we belong. . . . But actually we must depend on the actions of our leaders in government for any real results for peace.

How distrust is to be changed into confidence, how peoples are to be brought to work together instead of surreptitiously trying to destroy one another is something that only our leaders and our responsible heads of state can really bring about. . . . The leaders of the world must talk to one another or no agreements can be made. . . .

—*New York Post*, October 12, 1958.

A Message from Rockwell Kent

“WHAT! You’ve been in Russia! How did you get in? How did they treat you? How”—and this question was implicit in the almost incredulity expressed in people’s eyes and voices—“did you get out again—alive?”! Airlines and customs officials, taxi drivers, the uninformed generally, here and in Europe, asked these questions of the returned traveler.

Years ago when my children were little we lived on a remote mountain-side farm in Vermont, and every day in rain or snow or shine the children had to go two miles to school over a lonely woodland road. Now, a little way from this road in the thick woods that bordered it lived a certain man who, because he lived alone in a little shanty he had built and followed his own way of life, had come to be thought of, especially by the young, as some sort of a monster cast out by humankind—a sort of human beast of prey who might devour little children. But it happened one bitter winter’s day when the snow on the children’s road for home lay deep, that they became so tired and cold that from sheer necessity they were driven to seek shelter in the “monster’s” shack. They were late in reaching home that day, and full of wonder and delight at what had befallen them: what a nice man he had turned out to be! “He gave us hot chocolate to drink and cookies to eat; and he played the accordion and sang to us!” And so, and forever in those children’s lives, all fear of that “monster” had vanished. They came to think of him as friend and went to see him often.

If only tens or hundreds of thousands of the millions of people in America

who have been taught to fear the “monster” who dwells in the fastness behind what we have been brought to term “the iron curtain” would save their pennies for a while, gird up their loins and, disregarding all that they have been told, go there to the Soviet Union and, as my wife and I have done, see for themselves what manner of humankind these dreaded Communists are! And how they love the way of life that they have built for themselves! They would come home as we have come, filled with warm memories of the friendliness they met on every hand and with wonder at the vast material accomplishment—the growing cities, the ordered farms, the thriving industry and, on this foundation of material accomplishment, the widespread culture that has come to enrich the lives of old and young. And so, as it happened to my little children and their “monster,” forever in their lives all fear of the Soviet “monster” might vanish and, taking the hand of friendship that is extended to us, we could together build that peace on earth for which mankind so desperately yearns.

This can be no more than a greeting from two travelers whose hearts have burned at coming home again to their fellow countrymen, and the assurance that more of what we have seen and felt we will hope to write about in these pages.

We are happy to announce that Rockwell Kent, great artist and friend of man, Chairman of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, has promised a full report of his trip to the USSR for our next issue.

A Peace Plan for the United States

by CORLISS LAMONT

IN 1933 President Franklin D. Roosevelt reversed the ill-advised and obdurate Republican policy towards the Soviet Union and brought about its diplomatic recognition by the United States Government. Today, twenty-five years later, the rational goals of American-Soviet relations are the same that President Roosevelt had in mind in that earlier period: cooperation for peace, for disarmament, for flourishing international trade and for inter-cultural understanding. If the Republican Administration would at present put into effect throughout the world a genuine policy of peace and international cooperation, that would almost automatically start the USA and the USSR moving together towards those great American-Soviet goals whose fulfillment is so essential for the well-being and progress of both nations.

I am convinced that a Third World War, with atom and hydrogen bombs raining down on countries large and small, would be the greatest catastrophe in history for the American people and all hu-

manity. Everyone knows that the massive radioactive fall-out from nuclear weapons in a world conflict would threaten extermination of the human race. So every sane American necessarily supports the goal of international amity, realizing that the only sure way for the United States to achieve lasting national security is through the establishment of peace on earth and good will among nations.

The achievement of international peace, then, must be the first and primary point on the agenda of American foreign policy. And world peace means abolition not only of world war, but of medium-sized and little wars. Little wars, which may be temporarily localized, are a noxious evil, not only because of the economic ruin and loss of life they involve, but also because in this day and age they may erupt into big wars which sweep over the entire world.

When I speak of international war, I do not mean to include genuine civil wars. Much as I prefer a settlement of domestic issues in every land through peaceful and democratic methods, I do not think that we can deny the right of an oppressed people to resort to revolution. The United States, which itself came into being through revolution, should be the last country to try to take away that right from

DR. CORLISS LAMONT, teacher of philosophy, writer and lecturer, has made outstanding contributions in the struggle for civil liberties, international understanding and peace. Dr. Lamont is the Independent-Socialist Party candidate for U.S. Senator in the current New York election campaign.

other peoples. Since the end of World War II successful revolutions have taken place in Eastern Europe, in China, Egypt and Iraq. A bloody anti-colonial revolution is going on in Algeria; and freedom-loving Americans should support, in my judgment, the courageous struggle of the Algerians against the brutal French imperialists.

The present crisis in the Far East leads me to my second point: The United States should at once withdraw its military forces from the region of Quemoy and the other Chinese offshore islands, and also from Formosa.

I want my country to mind its own business for a change. The Eisenhower Administration has no business interfering with Communist China's plain legal, moral and historical right to assert domain over Quemoy and Matsu during a civil war artificially prolonged by U.S. military aid to the aging and ruthless dictator, Chiang Kai-shek.

Who with any feeling for reality can take stock in the Dulles-Eisenhower doctrine that American defense of Quemoy, less than seven miles from China and some 7,000 miles from San Francisco, is essential to our national security? It would make just as much sense for Mao Tse-tung to claim that China's security depends on its control of Santa Catalina island off the California coast. In his September 11 speech President Eisenhower argued that the Chinese Communists, in attempting to recover islands which clearly belong to mainland China, were behaving like the fascist aggressors of the Thirties. There is not a shadow of justification in this comparison. Hitler and Mussolini

repeatedly invaded other countries; the Chinese Communists are using force only to take over part of their own country. And for Chiang these islands serve as a base for the constant harassment of Communist shipping and for his possible attempt to reconquer the mainland. What is going on is clearly a bitter civil war; and the American policy ought to be "Hands off!" now and permanently.

Beyond that—and this is my third point—we need a far-going change in America's general policy towards Communist China. U.S. recognition of the Chinese People's Republic is long overdue. The Communist regime, for eight years recognized by our closest ally, Great Britain, has shown beyond reasonable doubt that it is strong, stable and in complete control of mainland China. It has effected enormous economic progress, has abolished graft and other forms of corruption, has instituted equality for women, and has initiated far-reaching cultural advances for the close to 650 million Chinese people.

It is time, too, for the U.S. Government to give up its opposition to Communist China's admission to the United Nations. It is fantastic to deny representation to one-fourth of the world's population, and give it to Chiang's rump regime. That regime, which has received close to 2 billion dollars in U.S. financial aid, would in all likelihood lose control of Formosa if its population were given a chance for a fairly conducted plebiscite. What I am pleading for is an American policy which is realistic on the Chinese situation.

The Administration's policy in the Middle East has been just as unin-

telligent and unrealistic as in the Far East. President Eisenhower sent the Marines to Lebanon on the absurd pretext that the revolt in Iraq showed that Soviet Russia and "indirect aggression" were threatening Lebanese independence. The facts demonstrated that neither Nasser nor Khrushchev engineered the Iraqi coup, but that it was carried through by a determined group of purely Iraqi military officers and Arab nationalists. The U.S. Marines landed in Lebanon, as British paratroopers landed in Jordan, in order to suppress the thoroughly legitimate nationalist movement in the Middle East.

The U.S. Government was once more refusing to mind its own business. I suggest that sending the Marines to Lebanon has been a species of military intervention designed to intimidate the Lebanese people and the Arab populations throughout the Middle East. My fourth point is, then, that without waiting for a UN settlement, our troops should retire from Lebanon. At the same time, the U.S. Sixth Fleet should get out of the Mediterranean. How would Americans like it if a big Soviet fleet were cruising around in the Caribbean Sea?

A peaceful and enduring settlement in the Middle East must recognize the natural rights of the rising Arab nationalism in that area, including the right of the Arab countries to remain neutral as between the United States and the Soviet Union. Such a settlement also demands that the United Nations guarantee the borders of the brave and progressive Republic of Israel.

More than any other American official, Secretary of State John Foster

Dulles has been responsible for embroiling the United States in two major international crises in the course of two months during the summer of 1958—in both cases bypassing the United Nations. It is Secretary Dulles who year after year has kept the whole world on edge as he grimly steers this nation from one brink-of-war to another. And now I offer the fifth point in my program: *If international peace is to come, Secretary Dulles must go!* In the interests of America and all humanity, it is time for President Eisenhower to dismiss Mr. Dulles. I suggest that Harold Stassen, a member of the President's own party, who has worked hard and sincerely for disarmament, should replace him.

Secretary Dulles also bears primary responsibility for the fact that under the Eisenhower Administration the Executive Branch of our government has increasingly arrogated to itself the power to involve this nation in international conflict. Under the American Constitution, however, Congress alone has the right to declare war. But we have now reached the point where the President, through a *fait accompli* of military intervention utilizing nuclear weapons, can commit Congress and this country to a horrible hydrogen-bomb world war.

Thus we have a species of Executive *dictatorship* as regards the most significant question a people can face—the question of going to war.

My sixth point for world peace is that the Great Powers should immediately halt the testing and production of nuclear weapons. Radioactive fall-out from atomic and hydrogen bombs is poisoning the air

of this planet, and penetrating the foods we eat and the milk and water we drink.

While an agreement to stop nuclear weapons tests would probably be self-enforcing, a Geneva conference of East-West experts last August worked out a system whereby violations of an agreement could surely be detected. Quickly following their report, the U.S. and British Governments announced that on October 31 they would be ready to discuss with the Soviet Union a treaty for the cessation of tests, and that at that time they would conditionally stop their tests for a year. The Soviet Government agreed to the suggested date, and the conference will be held at Geneva.

Meanwhile, it is to be recalled that in March 1958 Soviet Russia took the commendable step of unilaterally terminating nuclear weapons tests, urging Great Britain and the United States to follow its example. Unfortunately neither Britain nor America did so, but instead kept on with a long series of H-bomb tests in the Pacific.*

An Anglo-American-Soviet treaty to halt nuclear weapons tests would catch the imagination of mankind and could be an immense stimulus to breaking the international stalemate. Such an accord, however, would only be a beginning; the necessary goal is to abolish nuclear weapons by stopping their production and destroying stockpiles. Then the enormous potentials of atomic power could be harnessed entirely to the constructive purposes of peace

and general economic upbuilding.

Disarmament in nuclear weapons would pave the way, we may hope, for general and drastic disarmament in conventional weapons, in armies, navies, air forces, artillery and so on. This is my seventh point. There should also be a ban on bacteriological warfare and poison gas.

Not only do today's huge armaments serve as a constant temptation to reckless militarists to plunge the world into war, but they represent the most colossal economic waste in history. Of the total \$75 billion United States revised budget for 1958-59, approximately \$48 billion, or 64 per cent, is allocated to current military spending. If we add interest payments, veterans' benefits and other expenses growing out of past wars, the total for military purposes is approximately \$60 billions, or 80 per cent of the total budget. Since the 1958 operating budget of the United Nations is about \$55 million, we see that the USA devotes approximately \$164 million per day to military expenditures—about three times as much as the UN budget for a whole year.

The official justification for the tremendous size of American armaments is that they act as a deterrent to the warlike designs of the Communist bloc and in particular of Soviet Russia. This claim that the Russians intend war is a provocative political myth. Neither Communists in the USSR nor anywhere else aim to spread their doctrines and social-economic system through international conflict. The Marxists believe, in fact, that the internal contradictions in capitalist countries will eventually lead to the establishment of socialism by the working

* The Soviet Union resumed tests on Sept. 30 on the grounds that it had been forced to do so by the provocative Anglo-American policy in continuing nuclear bomb experiments.

class. In order to bolster its own self-defense, the Soviet Union has gotten tough along its frontiers, as it did in Finland and Hungary; but with this qualification the USSR has an excellent record for peace. It does not have the slightest desire to initiate or wage a general war.

In the Second World War the USSR lost more in casualties and economic destruction than any other belligerent. They do not want it to happen again. Soviet leaders as well as the masses of the people wish above all to devote their full energies to the further construction and expansion of socialism within the borders of the USSR. The Soviet Government can be depended upon to keep the peace and uphold treaties for disarmament if only because of sheer self-interest.

My proposals for nuclear and general disarmament naturally lead to point eight: Let us end the Cold War! The Cold War has brought no real advantage to any of the countries involved; it is a pain in the neck for all of them. The termination of the Cold War would mean normal trade once more between the East and West, with the abolition of the embargoes which the United States and some of its allies have put into effect against the Communist world; it would mean the withdrawal of American troops, planes, nuclear weapons and warships from some 950 U.S. military bases in 73 countries; and it would mean a vast increase in cultural and scientific interchange between East and West.

More than ten years ago the Cold War was initiated by the United States against the Soviet Union; since that time it has come to involve all the allies of both the USA

and the USSR. The basic antagonists, however, still remain America and Soviet Russia, and if the Cold War between these two giants were liquidated the rest of the world would in all probability quickly follow their example. The Soviet Union and the other Communist-led nations never wanted the Cold War in the first place; and its termination is today one of their chief objectives in international affairs. The main obstacle to that termination is the Dulles-Eisenhower policy of implacable hostility and unceasing stupidity towards socialist countries.

No program for peace today can neglect the problem of Germany. And so my ninth point is that East Germany and West Germany should re-unite as a peaceful, democratic, *neutral* nation belonging neither to the Soviet-led bloc of Eastern European states nor to the American-led bloc represented by NATO. Germany would then serve as a buffer state between the Atlantic Powers, on the one hand, and Soviet Russia and the Eastern European People's Republics, on the other hand.

Finally, as point ten, I urge that a Summit Conference of the heads of the Great Powers, similar to the one held at Geneva in 1955, take place as soon as possible to discuss the pressing problems of peace and to work out some such program as I have suggested. I believe that if President Eisenhower and Premier Khrushchev met face to face and talked over frankly and sincerely the international difficulties facing mankind, they might make great progress in finding solutions helpful and acceptable to the United States, the Soviet Union and the entire world community.

Thoughts on the Effects of November, 1917

by D. N. PRITT

I REMEMBER vividly the moment in November, 1917, when the news of the Russian Revolution burst on an astonished world; and I remember the world of that period too.

What a world it was! It was so different from today that it seems in retrospect to be more like two centuries ago than 41 years. Its rulers were so confident, confident even of the future! They had scarcely any understanding of the contradictions of their system; they had no conception that they were approaching the end of an era, an end involving greater changes than the end of feudalism had involved—greater and far more rapid. They knew indeed so little that, for example, the by no means unintelligent Lord Milner had visited Russia in the winter of 1916-17 and reported to the Government on his return that there was no danger either of revolution or of the Russian war-machine breaking down.

That old-fashioned world, which had not at any time before, say, 1908 been much preoccupied with danger of war, was in November

1917 engaged in the fourth year of what we now call the First World War. The USA had come into the war a few months before. A mutiny in the French army (in the summer of 1917) had nearly taken France right out of it. And the Tsar's armies, after winning some great battles, were by then in a bad state, their organization and supply in particular being near to collapse. The rulers of Britain presumably knew quite clearly what was the real contest; namely that they were fighting Imperial Germany for the right to dominate the world, and above all the colonial world. And the rulers of all the countries involved still thought that large-scale war was "good business"; that it could be profitable; that it really was "a continuation of policy by other means," and not a suicidal march of Gadaréne swine. They would indeed have been largely right in that view if it were not for the one element that wars bring not only military victories and defeats, but October revolutions, too.

The "February changes" eight months before, by which the Tsar was quietly removed from power, and an uneasy bourgeois republic took his place, had caused the Western rulers little alarm. They thought of them mainly in terms of their possible effects on the war, and

D. N. PRITT, Queen's Counsel and former Labor M.P., is one of England's most distinguished lawyers. The author of many books, his most recent, "Spies and Informers in the Witness Box," has recently appeared in England.

judged that they would be small. There was in truth little to alarm them; no real shift of power, above all no shift towards the working-class or the peasantry; no likelihood of confiscation of property or repudiation of debts; nothing essential was threatened. Extreme royalist circles were naturally alarmed; but for the rest the Western rulers were still too short-sighted and too badly served by their diplomats and other sources of information to realize the real danger and to concentrate on consolidating "Alexander IV" (Kerensky) in power by making every conceivable effort to avoid the real revolution that was to come.

And then, into that purblind, "feet-of-clay" but still rich and even—for a time—viable world, there burst the bombshell of the first Socialist Revolution. The workers and the peasants of Russia combined to take power and to proclaim a republic which should have no capitalism, no factory owners, and no land-owners except the whole community, which was to own and use the resources of the country for the benefit of the community, that is, of all the citizens; and—even worse—a republic which at once and insistently called for peace at a time when the great quarrel over world capitalist power was still undecided, and peace was the last thing its rulers wanted.

The effects, direct and indirect, immediate and long-term, of this bombshell were and are incalculably great; once the revolution succeeded, nothing could ever be the same again, nor could anything develop as it would otherwise have developed. Thus, if we seek to discuss "the effects of October,"* we are con-

fronted in a sense with the task of analyzing and narrating the history of the world in the 41 years that have followed. Nevertheless, it is possible to pick out and study in a reasonably small compass certain clear and basic results, and to learn from that study much that is directly useful for our understanding of the problems of today.

First Stage Effects

Let me begin by considering the immediate effects that confronted that small and important core of intelligent persons among the Western rulers who had the capacity to think out the position seriously, to understand it to at any rate a substantial extent, and to decide how to face it. What were the effects which they had to face at once, and what effects did those effects have upon them?

In Russia itself the whole power of the ruling and possessing class had gone; indeed the members of that class had largely departed. Their restoration may have seemed possible, but it was obviously at best a matter of long and costly fighting and uncertain outcome. Further, the whole Eastern war front was almost certainly gone, at a moment when the war was at one and the same time causing great anxieties and yet drawing nearer to a Western victory than at any earlier period.

The immediate effects outside Russia were even more serious. Every ruling class—as could plainly be seen both by itself and by others—became far less secure than it had been, or had been thought to be;

* Under the old Russian calendar the Revolution took place on October 25.

and the practical possibility had to be faced that revolution, involving an end of landowners and capitalists, might take place in any and every developed country, as it had taken place in Russia. Next, in parallel, so to speak, every worker and peasant in every country was suddenly presented with the lesson that capitalists were—or at any rate might be or become—both unnecessary and removable, that poverty and subjection were not inevitable, and that peace—the so deeply desired end of bloodshed and misery—might be secured by the common people—the workers, the peasants and the soldiers—instead of being negotiated (or withheld) by and at the will of their rulers.

Those being the fears, the prospects, and the ideas that sprang from the outbreak and the first consolidation of the revolution, let us now look at the immediate reactions of the Western rulers. They would obviously want, if possible, both to crush the revolution and to keep Russia in the war as an effective combatant. To seek both these ends involved deep contradictions. Friendly cooperation, indeed financial and material support at a very substantial rate (if not at the rate of £1,000,000 a day, which had practically throughout the war been the extent of the loans made by British financiers to Russia) were necessary to keep Russia in the war and to keep her strong enough to fight usefully; but to crush the revolution called for open hostilities against the new state, for the infliction of all possible damage on her economic and military strength, and indeed for armed invasion.

These contradictions, at any rate,

vanished when it became clear—as it did very quickly—that the new rulers of Soviet Russia and their policies were not for sale, and that when they talked peace they meant it. They went out of the war, and left the Western world free to react against their little new world that threatened to grow, and to bring loss and disaster to capitalist rule.

What did the Western rulers then do? Their actions at that stage had, broadly, two aims: one, to avert as far as might be possible the effects of the revolution on the peoples of the world outside Russia; and the other to crush the revolution by force. It was at that moment that Mr. Winston Churchill used the apt phrase—"We must kill the old hen before she can hatch too many chicks."

The task of averting the "infection" of the revolution was attempted by various means. There was, of course, simple propaganda—negatively, the wholesale suppression of the true facts about what was happening in the new republic, and, positively, wholesale lying on the same topic. (This last operation, once started, has never stopped, even if it slowed down during the Second World War). But there had to be something more positive than anti-Soviet propaganda; the masses in the Western countries had to be persuaded that the war had some meaning and value for them and that capitalism was worthy of their support. President Wilson's Fourteen Points, so well received and later so ill-observed, were part of this operation—indeed, they were a direct and immediate reaction to the revolution, being designed to persuade the general mass of people that the

war was being fought for honest purposes capable of securing real peace, and not for such selfish purposes as were disclosed by the Secret Treaties that the Bolsheviks found in the Foreign Ministry at Petrograd and published to the world. Another part of this operation lay in intensification of the talk about making Britain "a land fit for heroes to live in," and of the war being "a war to end war."

The other side of the immediate Western counter-action against the revolution lay in the military invasion of Russia—politely called "intervention"—followed by years of boycott and non-recognition. The intervention is a long story, that has often been told. I need make but two points on it here; the first, that it ended in a colossal defeat—the first of a number to come in the half-century that was to follow—for the Western world, and the second, that it cost the Soviet peoples endless suffering and hardship. I might add, as a significant indication of the way in which the West gave priority to the attempt to crush the revolution even over their own vital quarrels with Germany, that well before the end of the First World War French, British and German troops whose brothers were destroying each other on the Western front, were fighting side by side against the Red Army in Southern Russia, and that when the Germans surrendered in November, 1918, they were ordered by the victorious allies not to leave Latvia, Lithuania and Esthonia at once, but to remain there and hold the areas against possible Soviet occupation until Allied troops could arrive to take over.

That is really the completion of a

summary account of the first-stage effects of the revolution in and outside Russia, and of the reactions of the main capitalist powers thereto. The short and long term effects overlap a little in time, of course, but they lend themselves, nevertheless to fairly clear division.

Longer Term Effects

The longer-term effects inside Russia are of course tremendously important, but do not call for long examination in this article, since they constitute in effect the history of the Soviet Union from, say, 1921 to date. They consist essentially of the transformation of a desperately poor and ignorant mass of peasants and of a comparatively few workers into a fairly prosperous mass of the most highly educated people in the world, and in the parallel development from a primitive feudal economy into a highly developed and well-balanced scientific industrial-agricultural state—in a word, a swift march from the wooden plow to the Sputnik.

Turning to effects outside Russia, which are of course more complex, to my mind the primary broad long-term effect is a development in the workers and peasants of every continent and every variety of civilization of the consciousness that there is no need for them to be subject to the will and interest of domestic or foreign oppressors or exploiters, or to starve or to be ignorant; that all men and women of all races and colors are equal; and that genuine freedom is available to all who make up their minds to win it. This consciousness remains real and true and important in spite of every propaganda attempt to prevent its

formation, and in spite of every propaganda attempt to lull the possessing classes and their satellites into the belief that nothing of the sort has happened.

Nor is this consciousness something academic or hypothetical; it is present and actual, and it has already been largely responsible for the liberation of half of mankind from direct or indirect colonial or quasi-colonial subjection; it has also immensely stimulated and reinforced the working-class movements in non-colonial countries. In its total effects it is a forward leap in history far surpassing anything that the Reformation or the Renaissance can show us.

Think for a moment what it has already done. It has led to the liberation of nearly 450,000,000 people in the sub-continent of India, of over 600,000,000 in China, and of nearly 100,000,000 more in Czechoslovakia, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Albania, and at any rate partially in Yugoslavia. It can take credit for the liberation of nearly all Indonesia, for the liberation of part of Korea and of the countries labeled Indo-China; and much the same may be said of Ceylon and Ghana and other territories. In countries still under colonial rule, such as Kenya, Uganda, and Tanganyika, it has stimulated nationalist movements to such an extent that when I recently suggested to an African leader that colonial rule even in Africa would be a thing of the past within twenty years, he accused me of pessimism in thinking that it would last so long.

The effects are equally important, if less visibly dramatic, in countries that are not colonial in the conven-

tional sense, such as Britain, France, Italy, and to some extent the USA. In, at any rate, most of these countries the working classes are more militant, their trade unions stronger and more effective, and their left-wing political parties more powerful and more active. In Britain, the great Labor election victory—the crucial importance of which must not be obscured by the subsequent substantial failure of the Labor Government to develop a really progressive policy—would not have happened until many years later if it were not for the Russian revolution.

Equally important is it to consider the other side of the picture, those other long-term effects of the revolution which consist in the counter-actions of the Western world. These have been varied and complex, very disastrous to their authors, and largely unsuccessful in achieving their object. There has lain at the root of all of them the primary purpose of weakening and if possible destroying the Soviet Union, and the secondary purpose of blinding their own citizens to the real facts about the new world. We should all realize clearly what these counter-actions are, what terrible damage they have already done to all of us, and what even more terrible damage they may yet do.

Counter-Actions of the West

Let us examine in a little detail what these counter-effects have been since, say, 1921. Many of the international, and not a little of the domestic, activities of Western European governments between the wars, and an even higher proportion of the activities of the U.S. Government

since the Second World War, have been determined by anti-Soviet policy. All the following disastrous activities fall in truth within that category:

1. The encouragement of Germany between the wars, with a view to building up that country as a spearhead against the USSR.
2. The support and encouragement of the Hitler regime up to and even beyond the eve of hostilities in 1939, with the same object.
3. The obstruction and sabotage of negotiations with the USSR in the summer of 1939 for an alliance to resist Nazi aggression, i.e., to prevent Hitler starting the Second World War or to secure his swift defeat if he should do so.
4. The subsequent lukewarm conduct of the war—"the period of phony war" for the first seven or eight months—in the hope of turning Germany against the USSR.

It is thus right to assert that the coming of the Second World War when it did, and in the circumstances—so advantageous for Nazism—in which it came, was one of the effects of the Western world's counter-action to the October revolution.

Bad as this was, the counter-actions of the Western world *after* the Second World War, led this time by the U.S.A., were even more disastrous, and in particular were more disastrous in their domestic results. I can, here too, list the damaging counter-actions:

1. The open and deliberate encouragement from a very early stage of the rearmament of Western Germany, and the enlistment of her forces in an alliance (NATO) aimed at the USSR (and this in spite of all the terrible lessons of the results of the same policy 25 years before).
2. The greatest armaments race in the history of the world, aimed at the USSR, and having among its results the lower-

ing of the standards of living of most of the countries in both camps; ever-increasing international and even national tensions, and the gradual destruction of civil liberties in many countries, including above all the USA itself. In this I include the establishment of the doctrine—half myth and half paranoia—under which practically everything which is unwelcome to the American ruling class, either at home or anywhere else, is attributed to "International Communism," and few American citizens who are not 100 per cent conformist are safe from denunciation by professional "finger-men" and informers, with consequent loss of livelihood and even liberty. In this way the millions of friendly open-talking "mixers" who comprise much of America's population, are gradually transformed into frightened clams.

3. The open and systematic fomentation by authority of Congress—and with large sums of money voted by Congress—of subversive and treasonable actions inside various countries in Central and Eastern Europe.

The total damage already done to peace, to the development of economies and living standards, to international trade and relations, to culture, to truth, to sanity, and to tranquillity of mind, by all these activities, is incalculable. And it is all the direct result of the counter-actions—now plainly as unnecessary as they are unsuccessful—taken by the Western Powers against the October Revolution and its sequelae. (I say "unsuccessful," for surely nobody today thinks that the thousands of billions of dollars spent on the arms race has made anybody feel safer, or imagines that the USA—or any other country except perhaps the USSR and China—could survive a third world war if it were to come).

Fortunately, in this attempt to give a brief account of the more important effects of the October Revolution, I do not have to end on such

a gloomy note as that, for there is another and newer stage of these effects to be noted in the positive aid which the USSR can and does now offer to the more or less underdeveloped countries. Until recently, for a century or more, almost any country in Asia, Africa or Central or South America in need of aid in the form of finance or material supplies for capital developments, has had to resort either to large financial or industrial enterprises in the Western countries or to the governments of those countries; the result has inevitably been that they have had to accept onerous terms as to interest, repayment and the placing of orders for the supplies required, and also to see themselves reduced in great or less degree to a position of semi-colonial dependence.

But of recent years the industrial wealth and scientific development of the USSR has made it possible for that country to "break the ring" and to offer to any underdeveloped country supplies and loans on easy terms and free from "strings." Such countries can benefit from these offers either directly by accepting them or catalytically by seeing their capitalist would-be lenders compelled to offer far better terms than but for this competition they would dream of giving. (Similar aid can be and

is also given by the USSR by purchasing raw materials from underdeveloped countries when capitalist countries seek to "bring them to heel" by stopping the usual and normal purchases of such materials from them).

It is a particularly healthy result of this effect of the revolution that the "terms of trade" for underdeveloped countries are thereby improved. The normal tendency for the rich countries—or more precisely the already rich industrialists and financiers of the rich countries—to grow richer, and of the whole population of the poor countries to grow poorer or remain poor, is thus reversed, to the good of the whole world.

I will not attempt to catalogue the countries already receiving important material aid from the Soviet Union, or benefiting substantially in their negotiations from the mere fact that the Soviet Union has been ready to make offers to them. I will merely add a few words about the future effects of the revolution. They are bound to be manifold; they are bound to be in the main beneficial; and the dangers which—as I have shown—may arise from some of them are dangers which the progressive forces in all countries can avert, and must work hard to avert.

CYRUS S. EATON ON IMPROVING US-USSR RELATIONS

IN AN INTERVIEW with the editors of the Soviet English-language magazine *NEW TIMES* in Moscow (see issue No. 37, 1958), Cyrus S. Eaton, Cleveland financier and industrialist, said he "was convinced that the people of the Soviet Union and the present government and leadership are strongly in favor of good relations with my country. This is the time to push forward a program that will enable both of us to forget the difficulties and animosities of the past and improve our relations." He urged an exchange of visits between President Eisenhower and Premier Khrushchev as a first step toward this end.

For Those Who Are the Future

by ESLANDA ROBESON

Yalta, Crimea, USSR

PAUL and I spent this morning at *Artek*, the world famous camp for children a few miles from Yalta along the Crimean Coast of the Black Sea.

The first children's camp was established there in 1924. There are four camps there now, comprising the *Artek* of today. Some 1,400 children from all parts of the Soviet Union are in residence now for the 40-days vacation ("resting"), and when they leave, 1,400 more will replace them. This means that from May to September some 7,500 children vacation there. During the winter children come to *Artek* to convalesce, and during that time a school is maintained there, so that the children may not fall behind in their studies.

Artek is known throughout the Soviet Union as the camp for Young Pioneers. Twenty years ago when we were in the Soviet Union with our son, Pauli, a Pioneer was a child who won high grades at school and/or showed some evidence of leadership in the community—in other words one who was in fact a pioneer in the new socialist society. Pauli was among the children at his school in Moscow who won this high honor, and he wore his pin and bright red Pioneer tie with pride. He still has the tie and the pin, stored away with his precious possessions.

Today the Pioneers are somewhat comparable to our American Boy and Girl Scouts, although here they are not separated, but boys and girls all belong to the one organization. Most children between the ages of nine or ten to thirteen or fourteen years become Pioneers. Every region, every district, every school in the Soviet Union has its Pioneer organization, and every city and town has its Palace of Pioneers, with special and often very elaborate equipment for extracurricular activities for boys and girls. There are miniature subway systems, wind tunnels, airplanes, photographic laboratories, carpentry and metal-working shops, cooking and sewing rooms, science labs, painting and sculpture studios, sports and games rooms, chess rooms, etc. The Pioneer Palace is as spacious and well equipped a house as the community can afford, and is one of the most important responsibilities and concerns of the local and national authorities.

At *Artek* there are children from all the Soviet Republics, from China, India, the socialist countries of Eastern Europe, and a few from Western Europe. It is said that the son of a member of the American Embassy staff in Moscow spent his vacation at *Artek*, and had such a good time that he implored his father to help him become a Pioneer!

These children at *Artek*, from widely scattered areas, with such dif-

ferent backgrounds and customs, learn to play, sing and work together, come to know each other, to help each other. An international spirit pervades the camp, with natural, healthy competition and comradeship. Boys and girls make up the teams for sports, the girls becoming captains when they rate such rank. There are prizes, decorations and citations such as all children love, and these are greatly coveted and honored.

What becomes of these children when they outgrow the Pioneer organization? They join the *Komsomol* (Young Communist League) and can remain with this organization until the age of 27 or 28.

The *Komsomol* is a great force in the Soviet Union. It comprises most of Soviet youth, and plays a very important role in Soviet life. The *Komsomols* serve as teachers, counselors and leaders to the Pioneers, who regard them as older brothers and sisters.

A Russian friend, herself a *Komsomol*, told me: "When trouble comes, when times are difficult, then you see the *Komsomol*." They come forward and assume responsibility and undertake the difficult tasks which youth with its strength, endurance and adventurous spirit, can accomplish more easily than the older generation. My friend is just 28 years old, and is reluctantly leaving the *Komsomol* because of the age limit.

What do you mean, when trouble comes, I asked. "Well," she said, "there was the project of the virgin lands. Our population is increasing rapidly, and while we did have bread, in some districts there was not enough. A lot of countries in

Asia likewise needed grain badly.

"In 1953," she continued, "Comrade Khrushchev suggested a plan to develop our virgin lands. The plan was very imaginative and daring, and many believed it to be impractical and wasteful, and therefore opposed the plan. But Khrushchev had faith in his plan, fought for it and won, and it proved to be very successful."

My young friend told me, her eyes shining, that the virgin lands were developed almost entirely by the *Komsomol*. Thousands and thousands of them from many cities, towns and villages volunteered to go to this undeveloped area in southern Siberia and the Far East for periods of one to three years, to work and live there. Many students spent their summer vacations there. Comrade Khrushchev cautioned them: "This will not be a picnic, the life will not be easy." So they knew, and still they went. Life was extremely hard. There was almost no population, no houses, bitter frosts in winter, no water in summer; they had to live in tents and dig wells. Now there is a good population, now there are towns, and wonderful crops where before there were none.

"In 1956 we had the record year for crops in our country. Always the Ukraine has been very famous for its fine crops. Now Kazakhstan (lower part of Siberia on the edge of Middle Asia) is also very famous for its crops, and takes second place, thanks to the courage, determination, endurance and pioneering of the youth. The virgin lands will make a proud page in the history of the *Komsomol*, and in Soviet history," concluded my young friend. All *Komsomols* are very proud of this

contribution to the development of their country.

The opening up of new lands continues. There is an important program for extended cultivation and development of Siberia, to build new plants there, and also to transfer plants and factories from the Ukraine and other highly developed western regions to Siberia. Siberia and the Far East are very rich regions, with a wealth of natural resources. It is too expensive to transport ore and other raw materials all the way from Siberia to the West, so the plan is to build the plants, factories and electric power stations right on the spot.

Now that almost all virgin lands are under cultivation, there is another great project under way. Youth is being invited to go to the far, far North, to Norilsk and to Magadan, which is north of Kamchatka, just opposite Alaska. There are many natural resources in this region: minerals and ores, oil, coal, a lot of gold; a very rich new diamond field was discovered two or three years ago near a village called Mirny (Peaceful). But here conditions are also very hard, life is not yet good, and so youth with its adventurous spirit goes out again to pioneer.

In the areas where the young people go to work and build, the local authorities invite them to remain and become local citizens, honored

and appreciated for the contribution they have made. Many of them do so.

The Soviet Government also honors these heroes of the virgin lands, and many medals and decorations have been conferred upon them.

Children and youth in towns and cities go out into the nearby countryside during summer vacations, to help with the work of the collective farms, with the crops and the harvest, and they also work in the factories; small children busily collect scrap metal and waste paper—all proudly make their direct and personal contribution to the development of their country.

Thus, a wise, practical and far-seeing Soviet Government carries out a program for young people, this large and very important section of the population, who are the future. The overflowing energies, the restlessness, the romantic adventurousness, the urgent need for immediate self-expression of youth are directed into interesting and constructive channels. A Soviet child need not take refuge in old-fashioned hero-worship and day dreams. He can go out and himself become a hero in the finest sense of the word, and can make his dreams a reality by making a major contribution which is universally noted and appreciated by a grateful government and a grateful people.

CENTER OF MOSCOW TO BE GARDEN CITY

WITHIN THE NEXT 20 to 25 years the center of Moscow, including the Kremlin and the Red Square, will be turned into an area of parks and historical and architectural monuments, and will be surrounded by a ring of boulevards. All government institutions will be removed from the Kremlin and the Kremlin itself will be turned into a museum.

THE SOVIET CONTRIBUTION TO MANKIND'S FUTURE

by HARRY F. WARD

AS THE USSR comes to the second year of its fifth decade it is a significant coincidence that the Conference on Economic Progress in its study of "The Recession—Cause and Cure," should prove by a series of statistical graphs that "the Soviet economy is growing faster than our economy." Its finding is that "the Soviet Union has been catching up with us rapidly on many fronts, and threatens to surpass us unless we resume full growth." This thirty-year proof that a planned and planning socialist economy can avoid the recurrent crises of halted expansion, unemployment and bankruptcies which are inherent in capitalist economy, is a technical contribution of vast importance to the future of mankind, particularly to those peoples who have yet to industrialize their mode of living. The value of this contribution is increased heavily by what it means for the moral values upon which the further development of human life depends.

One of the dangerous cold war underestimates of Soviet strength is the belief that the only concern of its leaders is the material aspect of human living. In his last message to

Congress concerning foreign aid President Truman declared:

We know that the men now in the Kremlin . . . deny the worth of the individual human being and despise the concept of human dignity.

That judgment, parroted by Dulles and Eisenhower, seconded by the majority of editors, columnists and commentators, and too many preachers, has played a large part in producing the fears and hates of the cold war. The record shows the exact opposite. It reveals that for Marxist thinkers and Soviet leaders economic production is a means to an end. That end is the development of human personality. They seek abundance of material goods in order to make the abundant life possible for all the people.

A political dictionary issued by the Soviet Academy of Education defines communism in practice as:

. . . A higher form of human society in which exploitation of man is removed, in which the means of life are commonly owned, and in which the development of productive powers are limitless, and the opportunities for the evolution of human personality highest. . . .

A 1946 summary of Soviet gains under social economic planning makes a forecast:

The transition to the second phase of communism presupposes an all-round development of the most important productive force of society—people.

DR. HARRY F. WARD is Professor Emeritus of Christian Ethics at Union Theological Seminary. His books include "In Place of Profit" and "Democracy and Social Change." His latest book, scheduled for early publication, is "Jesus and Marx," from which the present article is, in part, taken.

In his last public statement entitled "Economic Problems of Communism," when he was discussing the conditions of passing from the formula "to each according to his labor" to the formula "to each according to his needs," Stalin added:

It is necessary in the third place to secure such growth of society with omnilateral development of their physical and mental capacities that all members of society should have an opportunity to receive sufficient education to become active members in social development. . . .

The ground for this position was staked out by Marx. In an article in *The Protestant* (1942), from sources not available in English, David Easton asserts that Marx insists that only socialist society can produce "as a continual reality man in all the richness of his being, the complete and well-rounded man," including "the genuine spiritual richness of the individual." The support for this claim is the changes socialist economy makes in the relation of man to both nature and his fellows.

Marx wrote about the "humanization of nature," meaning not only the human control of the forces of nature through knowledge and use of its laws, but the use of this control for a moral purpose—the development of all the potentialities of both men and nature. In place of exploiters and exploited, socialist economy requires and produces fellow workers both with nature and with each other. The dominating principle is mutual aid, the force which created the first organizations of human beings and, according to some scientists, produced the first living cells. In its highest expression

in human society this principle requires creative activity by all persons, with equal opportunity to get the education to fit them so to act.

As cooperative activities in the use of nature for the highest possible development of both persons and the social order increase, a parallel change occurs in both nature and mankind. In both, the destructive tendencies continuously give way to the constructive, the death-dealing to the life-giving. Predatory animals and predatory humans alike diminish. Floods and famines are eliminated. Fire is controlled. Hurricanes and earthquakes are foretold and may yet be prevented. Selfishness gives way to good will, ways of war to paths of peace. Man the creator wins out over man the destroyer.

The extent to which a social order can become consciously purposeful obviously depends on its ability to produce sufficient individuals who seek to realize this objective. This in turn depends upon how much the primary character-shaping forces—the family and the educational system—contribute to this end, and upon whether the economic process works for or against this goal.

That a socialist economy works on the side of the purpose set forth by the Marxist social philosophy was demonstrated by my firsthand study of Soviet incentives in what they called "the third and decisive year of the First Five Year Plan" (*In Place of Profit*, Scribner's, 1933); brought down to date in *The Soviet Spirit* (International Publishers, 1944), with the aid of Andrew Steiger (who taught in the USSR from 1931 to the outbreak of World War II.) Those findings are con-

firmed by the speed and extent of postwar reconstruction, and the vast enterprises of construction that have been accomplished since. Such undertakings require mutual cooperation for mutual ends. Without it Soviet economic planning would have failed from sabotage long ago. With it a great area of virgin soil in Siberia is now being opened up for settlement by the joint effort of a hundred thousand technically competent volunteer youths from all the vocations needed to build and operate successfully a modern community life.

What the Soviet family is doing to produce the purposeful people needed to develop the kind of society Marxism-Leninism proclaims to be its goal, requires study that cannot be undertaken while present tensions exist. After observations at intervals over a considerable period the Dean of Canterbury, in his latest book, concludes that what has been removed is the economic family which depends upon male dominance. Coming in its place he sees the creative family in which husband, wife and children are bound together not only by the ties of natural affection but by the bond of participating in a common enterprise—the building of socialism and then communism. That Soviet leaders recognize the role of the family in shaping the kind of lives needed to realize the purposes of the social order their philosophy seeks is shown by the recently reported campaign in the Party press throughout the Union against violations of "communist ethics" for family life.

The part played by the educational system in giving purpose to the lives of youth is summarized

in an article on "Thirty-Two Years of Educational Progress in the Soviet Union" by A. Pankratova, Member of the Academy of Pedagogical Science (*USSR Information Bulletin*, June 9, 1950):

Communist education is the purposeful, planned upbringing of the youth for active participation in the building of communist society and for the defense of the Soviet State which is building this society. [Its results are] the comprehensive and harmonious development of the personality of the young patriot, the builder of communism. [Interacting to this end are the five aspects of communist education—mental, moral, physical, intellectual, polytechnical—whose content is briefly described.]

Moral education molds the moral outlook of the Soviet man. It includes first and foremost the development of Soviet patriotism. Soviet patriotism has nothing in common with nationalism. On the contrary Soviet patriotism is inseparably combined with genuine internationalism, with a friendly, fraternal attitude for the people of other countries. It is known that there is no national enmity or national or race discrimination in the Soviet Union.

Moral education also includes the inculcation of socialist humanity, and of the spirit of collectivism, friendship and comradeship; of the spirit of diligence in work and of a thrifty attitude toward public property; the sense of conscious discipline and firmness and persistence of character.

Supplementing the educational system the press, posters, radio and film continually stress devotion to the building of socialist and then communist society. For Soviet movie audiences not personal success but sacrificial devotion to the common cause is the ideal. For Soviet youth to be a good person is not merely to be a good citizen; it is to be a creative member of a creative society. Ralph Parker, Mos-

cow correspondent for British and other journals, reporting on the 1952 Congress of the Communist Party (NWR, Dec. 1952) stresses the prominent part given to discussion of "the problem of remaking man," man who produces not for production's sake, but to satisfy his needs; man without whose conscious creative effort the planners cannot hope to build communism.

In the past few years there has been considerable discussion of moral emphasis in Soviet fiction. An article in the magazine *Soviet Literature* declares that:

A play, *Dawn over Moscow*, brings out the fact that under socialism not only is there no conflict between personal interests and the interests of society, but on the contrary socialism alone assures the full development of the individual. . . . In the socialist man's spiritual world there is no gap between the personal and the social, nor can there be.

Frontier society needed the strong, independent individual. Complex industrial society needs the strong cooperative individual. The Soviet record shows that the moral qualities which constitute this person increase with the growth of the classless society, in which the antagonisms which produce the class struggle, and the fighters on both sides of it, have gone into history. This indicates that these qualities will grow on a world scale as we achieve a warless world and all peoples look at each other as fellow workers instead of potential enemies.

The evidence that the Soviet Union is trying to produce this kind of purposeful people is sufficient. The question is how far is it succeeding. A generation has come

to maturity under the influence of Marxist principles. The majority of those who have become acquainted with its representatives in international gatherings—scientific, cultural, trade, athletic, youth, women—agree that their best is as good as ours.

The many Soviet writers who have discussed the moral emphasis in their fiction insist that the qualities and purposes of its characters are those embodied in the average person.

Metropolitan Nikolay of the Orthodox Church has written:

. . . we see the face of the generation which has grown up in these years (since the revolution). It is the face of a true human. I repeat the universally known truth of the gospel. "A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. . . . Wherefore by their fruit ye shall know them."

At the Moscow 1957 International Festival of Youth a British delegate, familiar with the language, had a number of discussions with students, especially on Russian literature, with no representative of the government present. The qualities she noted in the participants were:

An awareness of individual responsibility; a lack of the egoism and materialism which are prevalent in the West; a dedication of young people to work which will help the community and a sensitivity in personal relations; a hunger for knowledge which can only go with intellectual energy and honesty.

One of the vicious falsehoods spread abroad by cold war propaganda is that Soviet leaders have no regard for the moral standards that have grown up with human society through the process of trial and error and are accepted the world around, with some variations of em-

phasis due to historic environment. They were formed in tribal life, put into legal codes and given philosophic and religious sanctions as nations and empires grew. The Egyptian Book of the Dead, the Babylonian Code of Hammurabi, the Mosaic Decalogue, the sayings of Lao-tze, Confucius, and Buddha, the Golden Rule and the Sermon on the Mount, were all efforts to standardize conduct to meet national and racial needs, which are now recognized as world-wide.

Marxist writers, regarding these moral standards as social necessities and not merely personal virtues, maintain they will be more fully developed in socialist society. In his inaugural address at the founding of the First International, referring to the lack of international morality, Marx emphasized the need for:

. . . the simple laws of morals and justice which ought to govern the relations of private individuals as the rules paramount in the intercourse of nations.

In his *State and Revolution* Lenin spoke of:

The day when people will gradually become accustomed to the observance of the elementary rules of social life that have been known for centuries and repeated for thousands of years in all school books . . . without force, without compulsion, without subordination. . . .

Writing on "Our Road to Realism," Alexander Fadeyev, the late Soviet novelist, asserted:

Soviet literature endeavors to restore to their rightful significance the true human values. It holds that love for one's native country and friendship between the nations are great human feelings, that the love of man and woman is noble and beautiful, that true friendship is disinterested, that the name

of mother is sacred, that life is given for work and creation. The old humanism can prevail in our country only because it has won the victory over evil. And from the standpoint of socialist humanism man is not man unless he works and creates. . . .

In any social order there will be maladjusted, misfits and malcontents; some who are depraved, corrupt and corrupting will appear. One test of the value of a system for the future is whether the number of these unsocial and anti-social persons is increasing or decreasing. By their dialectical analysis of history, as well as from common sense, Soviet Marxist-Leninists are well aware of those destructive tendencies in mankind which theologians classify as the sinfulness of human nature. They expect to overcome these by their moral education, their discipline of self-criticism, and the continuous demand of their economic technique for creative action by the entire population.

When, after the death of Stalin, the new regime took office, an amnesty decree for several categories of prisoners was issued. Also criminal responsibility for malfeasance in office, economic offenses, breaches of the peace and similar misdemeanors, was replaced by administrative and disciplinary measures:

As a result of the consolidation of the Soviet social and state system, the rise in the material and cultural standards of the population, the growth of consciousness of the citizens, their honesty in carrying out their civic duty, the law and socialist order have been strengthened and crime has considerably declined in our society.

How much actual gain is covered by the words "considerably declined" cannot be determined by our social

scientists until cultural intercourse between the United States and the Soviet Union is freely and fully established. When however there is added to the decree just quoted what has been, and is being, done to get rid of what they call "hooliganism," and also what has happened in the exposing and punishing of bureaucracy and corruption—evils that all states are heirs to, a judgment on the direction of movement is warranted. This has to take into account the degenerating effects of the destruction of homes and family life by the Nazi invasion and occupation, and then the counter-attack that drove them out. To this must be added the similar effects of the prolonging of the civil war after the revolution by the military intervention of fourteen capitalist nations. Allowances must also be made for the delay in realizing the creative possibilities of a socialist economy by the terrific Soviet losses of manpower and plant in World War II and the inability to use for constructive development the amount of both required to meet the threat of the cold war.

When all the factors are in, the balance sheet adds up to movement upward not downward. Despite all the hindrances created by the capitalist world the constructive forces are ahead of the destructive, the builders are gaining over the wreckers. Since the goal is continuous development this demonstration of possibility is sufficient to establish the significance of the Soviet Union for the future of mankind. Where it is succeeding it registers the promise of what can be. Where, like all other systems it has by admission of its leaders violated some of its own

principles, it is a challenge to others to avoid that calamity.

By its achievements in continuous production, extension of culture, raising of moral standards, development of purposeful, creative living—collectively and individually—the Soviet Union is demonstrating that a socialist economy can provide the base for the synthesis of self-interest and the common good which the capitalist world has sought in vain as its first defender, the moral philosopher Adam Smith, recognized before he died. This union of self-interest and the common good enables each person to find himself in seeking the well-being of all. It enables society to find its life through seeking the fullest possible development of all individuals.

In this process society becomes a serving, sharing, sacrificial fellowship instead of a set of institutions trying to adjust the conflict between antagonistic classes. A social consciousness appears which is more than the individual awareness of social relationships. It is the mutual awareness of life moving in a chosen direction. A social conscience appears which is more than a personal response to inequalities and injustice. It expresses the common agreement on the ways in which the currents of life ought to move, and on what needs to be done with nature by mutual human activity if life is so to move. So living the individual is not a disappearing fragment on the stream of time. Working with his fellows in the greatest task before mankind he becomes a part of the upward struggle of the human race from the dawn of history, and of the ongoing process of the universe from the beginning of time.

The Cultural Exchanges Go Forward

by MURRAY YOUNG

IT IS gratifying to be able to note on this twenty-fifth anniversary of American-Soviet relations the growing scientific and cultural exchange that is taking place as a result of the agreement between the two countries signed last January. Even a partial review of what has been accomplished so far will give an indication of the scope of the exchanges and the promise for the future in greater understanding and cooperation between the two peoples.

In the first half of 1958, 409 Soviet citizens visited our country, according to a special State Department report. In the same period 392 Americans visited the Soviet Union. The exchanges continue.

A Good Life for All

In his State of the Union message last January, President Eisenhower called upon the people of the world, and particularly the Soviet Union, to join together "to eradicate from the face of the earth that age-old scourge of mankind: malaria," and to fight cancer and heart disease, "the common enemy of all mortals." The President went on to say:

There is almost no limit to human betterment that could not result from such cooperation. Hunger and disease could increasingly be driven from the earth. The age-old dream of a good life for all could, at long last, be translated into reality.

This was a call for action on a world scale that must have echoed in millions of hearts—a struggle not of man against man, but a shared fight against the common enemies of all men: hunger and disease. And this is a fight in which the present stage of scientific advancement has assured victory to mankind.

Some ten months earlier at a meeting of the World Health Organization in Geneva the Soviet Union had announced that it expected to wipe out malaria in its territories by 1960 and offered to make available Soviet physicians and specialists to under-developed countries and to train students from such nations in Soviet institutions. In May of this year the Soviet Union proposed to the United States that the two countries exchange research information on cancer and heart disease and form joint teams to fight against malaria and small-pox in Africa and South America.

The State Department welcomed the Soviet proposals but suggested that to the fullest extent possible the two powers should cooperate through the World Health Organization. Individual American scientists and doctors have sounded a more urgent note.

For instance, John T. Connor, president of Merck and Co., speaking before the Manufacturing Chemists Association (*N. Y. Times*, June 13), called upon the U.S. to

challenge the Soviet Union to a longevity race. "It promises to be a tough race," he said, "but the only losses would be disease." The goal of such competition, he declared, should be to raise the average life expectancy to 75 years. (The average length of life in our country in 1956 was 69.5 years.) He went on to say that the health program which had lifted life expectancy in the USSR from 44 years in 1926-27 to 67 years in 1955-56 might well have been the Soviets' most successful innovation.

In July, Dr. Leona Baumgartner, head of the New York City Health Department, returned from a month's visit to the Soviet Union. She was accompanied by five other leading American women physicians. In an interview with the press (*N. Y. Herald Tribune*, July 18) she said she had come back "from the safari with batteries charged" and with ideas to be applied here. One idea she stressed was a "medical International Geophysical Year," a worldwide cooperative program against disease. The head of the delegation, Dr. Helen Taussig, of Johns Hopkins Medical School, observed a heart operation in which a leading Soviet heart specialist, Prof. Alexander V. Shevsky, employed a method developed from a suggestion of Dr. Taussig's some years ago. Dr. Taussig said on her return that medicine is advancing so rapidly that sometimes there was unnecessary duplication of research and that scientists in this country agree that visits to foreign laboratories are the best way to exchange information.

In line with the whole urgent problem of health and social welfare services, Charles I. Schottland, U.S. Social Security Administrator, who

headed a team of five other Social Security officials touring the Soviet Union during August, said on his return that some recent Soviet research into disability merited study by U.S. authorities.

At this year's UN session the Ukrainian delegation proposed as an agenda item that 1960 be designated as International Public Health and Medical Research Year.

Television, Movies, Music

Earlier this year, Americans saw Nikita Khrushchev in a television interview. On July 4, U.S. Ambassador Llewellyn E. Thompson, Jr., spoke on Soviet television. Official TV exchange programs began in September. The first program televised to this country was a discussion between First Deputy Premier Anastas Mikoyan and a group of U.S. students who had visited the Soviet Union this summer. Dr. Detlev W. Bronk, President of the U.S. National Academy of Science, who recently spoke on Soviet television, was the first of the Americans scheduled. The others who will speak are Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas, Senator Allen J. Ellender of Louisiana, and Marion Folsom, former Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. This fall there is to be an exchange of television technicians.

On October 8 it was announced that the agreement for exchange of movies for country-wide distribution in each nation had been completed. So far the U.S. film distributors have selected four of the seven Soviet pictures they want: *The Cranes Are Flying*, a love story set in the period

of World War II; *The Idiot*, based on Dostoyevsky's novel; *The Captain's Daughter*, from a story by Pushkin; *Swan Lake*, a full-length film of the Tchaikovsky ballet as performed by the Bolshoy Company. The Soviet Ministry of Culture has so far selected six of the ten American pictures it wants: *Marty*, *Roman Holiday*, *The Old Man of the Sea*, *Lili*, *The Great Caruso* and *Oklahoma!*

The agreement also calls for the exchange of fifteen documentary films beginning January 31. The first of the feature films to be shown will have a gala opening in the respective capitals to be attended by delegations, including the stars.

The agreement on film exchange has heartened Hollywood producers who for some time have wanted to make co-productive films with the Soviet film industry. American producers have already proposed plans for fifty films to be made in partnership with the Russians.

The first Soviet musician to appear here this fall is the young pianist Vladimir Ashkenazy, to be followed in November by the Beryozka Dance Ensemble. Next April is to see at last the world-famous Bolshoy Ballet here for a cross-country tour. Kiril Kondrashin, the brilliant Soviet conductor who flew here to conduct Van Cliburn's first concert, is to conduct at the Chicago Opera. And Cliburn himself, after his triumphs last year in Moscow, New York, London and Brussels, is to appear again in the Soviet Union in the spring.

David Oistrakh, the Soviet violinist, is to come again this season, and the rising young Negro soprano, Leontyne Price, is expected to go for a tour of the USSR.

Although the State Department did not include Paul Robeson in its exchange program, his triumphal concerts in the USSR, made possible by the Supreme Court passport decision, must certainly be included in any account of cultural exchange!

Rockwell Kent, famous American artist and writer and President of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, was also not included in the exchange program. Nevertheless, thanks to the passport decision, he also traveled to the USSR, to receive, a year late, the honors extended to him on his 75th birthday, and to participate in the closing of the exhibit of his pictures which won great acclaim there.

In September a group of American composers, including Roy Harris, Roger Sessions, Ulysses Kay and Peter Mennin went to the Soviet Union to acquaint themselves with the musical life there and to consult with Soviet composers, a group of whom, including Aram Khachaturian, Dmitri Kabalevsky and Dmitri Shostakovich, it is hoped will come here during the winter.

Also in September, a group of American writers left for a month's visit to the USSR. Among them were Carson McCullers, Bruce Catton, MacKinlay Kantor and Wright Morris. Their Soviet counterparts coming here in exchange have so far not been announced.

Tourists and Visitors

While not a part of the exchange agreement a number of leading Americans visited the Soviet Union this summer and have made statements on their return. Among them have been Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Adlai Stevenson and Cyrus S. Eaton,

Ohio financier and industrialist, who said on his return:

While I am convinced that our system of private enterprise is more desirable and more effective for us than the Russian system I urge on my fellow citizens that we permit the Russian and Chinese Republics to work out their own destiny and not attempt by force or political maneuvers or alliances or by propaganda to attempt to challenge their system.

A steady stream of American ministers, Quakers and other religious representatives have gone to the Soviet Union in the past several years, singly or in groups. They have taken part in services there, preached from pulpits, and consulted with Soviet ministers throughout the country.

Two groups of Russians came here this summer for the sheer pleasure of seeing America for themselves. One group was composed of three young men invited by the Young Friends Committee of North America for a four-week visit at the grass-root level. They went by car as far west as Des Moines, Iowa.

The other group consisted of 14 regular tourists who came at their own expense for a 14-day tour. They visited among other places Jones Beach, a racing-track in Yonkers, N. Y., Niagara Falls, the New York Stock Exchange, Chicago and Washington. On leaving they said their tour had been "lots of fun."

Seventeen tourists is little compared to the 5,000 Americans visiting the Soviet Union this year but it is a beginning and a happy promise for more Soviet tourists in the future.

Sports

This summer U.S. athletes took part in three sports events in the Soviet Union. The 14th World

Gymnastics was held in Moscow July 6-10 with 22 countries entered; on July 19 in Moscow American oarsmen raced Soviet crews in three events, and in the main event the crew from the University of Washington won over the Soviet oarsmen.

The most important of the three, the Track and Field Meet, was held in Moscow July 26-27, shortly after the U.S. Marines landed in Lebanon. The ominous shadow cast over the world by the Middle East crisis did not reach to Moscow Central Stadium.

In Moscow all was friendliness and happy competition marred only by an unresolved controversy over the system of scoring points, which gave the victory to the USSR. When the U.S. and the Soviet teams meet next summer in Philadelphia it is to be hoped that this strictly intra-sports problem will be satisfactorily settled.

Industry and Automation

The report of the 19 representatives of American steel and iron ore mining industries who visited the Soviet Union this summer under the exchange agreements has been published by the American Iron and Steel Institute.

In his introduction to the report, Edward L. Ryerson, director of the Inland Steel Company, and chief of the delegation, had this to say:

As we left the Soviet Union we were asked to appear on television to tell the Russian people our reactions to their country. We said we were impressed with recent developments of the steel industry of the Soviet Union, and with the friendly attitude of the people themselves. They had come a long way in a short time, and they seemed determined to make still more progress. We concluded by saying that if the visit of our Delegation had helped in any de-

gree to bring about better understanding between the peoples of the two nations, our trip was most worthwhile.

At the Fourth International Automation Exposition and Congress held in New York last June the USSR exhibited 77 instruments, all but 7 of which are in production. American experts were impressed by the quality of fine workmanship displayed in the instruments and the high level of theoretical understanding the machines revealed.

Major General Preston W. Corderman, commanding general at Fort Monmouth, N. J., said at a special meeting opening the exhibition that the peak of accomplishment for automation would be "a sort of international computer and control system" that would take global data and use them for developing "workable solutions towards continuous peace and friendship."

Also this summer a group of 8 U.S. plastic experts visited the Soviet Union. A group of Soviet plastic experts are expected to come here in November. Much interest has been aroused in chemical manufacturing circles by the announcement of the Soviet program for the expansion of her chemical industry by two or three times by 1965.

In September the United States and the Soviet Union agreed to exchange exhibitions of science, technology and culture next summer. The U.S. exhibit will be held in Gorky Park, Moscow, the Soviet exhibition in the New York Coliseum. Private enterprise will be asked to contribute individual exhibits along with the exhibitions offered by the Department of Commerce.

One private enterpriser seems already to have found exhibiting his

wares in the Soviet Union profitable. Romaine Fielding, a Los Angeles businessman, took an exhibition of 10 washing, drying and pressing machines to Moscow this summer for the proposed U.S. exhibit, plans for which fell through. He set his exhibit up in a new apartment basement, attracted hundreds of Muscovites, and sold all his automatic laundry equipment directly to the government.

In July two other U.S. delegations visited the Soviet Union: 5 U.S. farm experts, headed by Dr. Herman A. Rodenhiser, assistant administrator of the Agricultural Department's Research Service; a group of lawyers headed by Charles S. Rhyne of Washington, D. C., president of the Bar Association.

Education

Dr. Lawrence G. Derthick, U.S. Education Commissioner, returned in June from a month in the Soviet Union as head of a ten-member educational exchange team. In a speech before the National Press Club and in a televised interview on CBS, shared with some members of his delegation, it was clear that the findings of Dr. Derthick and his group seemed to them of the first importance, not only for the knowledge gained about Soviet education, but because of the new insight their visit had given them into the strengths and weaknesses of our own educational system.

A group of seven U.S. educators, mainly college presidents, spent two weeks in June in the USSR (their counterparts to come here in November). Dr. Edward H. Litchfield, Chancellor of the University of

Pittsburgh, in a preliminary report said:

... One over-all pattern is abundantly clear. The Soviet Government and its people have dedicated themselves to higher education to a degree which must inspire their allies and give very serious pause to any nation which finds itself in a competitive position. (*New York Times*, July 14.)

A much larger group of educators—73 in all—spent 5 weeks in August-September getting material for a book on the USSR educational system. A similar number of Soviet educators have been invited to come here.

Student Exchanges

In accord with the exchange program six American student-editors spent the month of May in the Soviet Union. They complained when they returned that their time was too much taken up with official formalities. Nevertheless, an article by one of the students, Judith Davison of Swarthmore College, in the *Wall Street Journal*, July 2, summarized their visit thus:

But given what little time there was, I was generally pleased at the ease with which U.S. and Soviet students were able to communicate and at the basic similarities of interests and aspirations.

Nineteen Soviet students came here in July for a month's tour of universities and colleges. At the end of their stay they expressed deep appreciation for the warmth and hospitality with which they were received but expressed astonishment at the ignorance of the USSR almost everywhere displayed by U.S. students.

Later in the summer 36 U.S. students spent 30 days in the USSR.

The most important of the student exchanges began with this school year. Twenty American graduate students will be attending regular classes at either Moscow or Leningrad universities and 20 Soviet graduate students will study at various U.S. universities, among them Harvard, Columbia and the University of Chicago.

Science

Outside the exchange agreement, but of great significance in cooperative effort, is the International Geophysical Year. The International Astronomical Congress to mark the first twelve months of the I.G.Y. was held in Moscow in August.

Also outside the exchange agreement but of similar significance in the growth of cooperative effort in the field of science was the Second UN International Conference on Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy held at Geneva in September.

Dr. George K. Skriabin, Soviet medical scientist, who spent five months under the exchange program studying with Dr. Waksman at Rutgers University and Professor Konstantin Bykov, leading Soviet authority on Pavlovian psychology who attended the American Psychiatric Association in San Francisco and the Congress of International Society of Gastroenterology in Washington this summer, both expressed hope that such fruitful exchanges would continue.

In calling for a "good life for all of us" President Eisenhower was restating the ancient dream of man which the scientists see more clearly than the rest of us, if they are allowed to work freely together on

a world scale, can quickly become a reality for all mankind.

While reviewing these important exchange developments on the official level, a word should be added about the work of a number of organizations which have devotedly worked to promote American-Soviet understanding throughout the whole difficult cold war period. Chief of these is the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, headed by the noted artist Rockwell Kent, with Rev. Richard Morford as director and Theodore Bayer as administrative secretary. For years it has worked unremittingly to bring about cultural interchange and mutual visits. By meetings, publications, films, lectures and libraries it has sought to keep information about the Soviet Union before the American people. It supplies material to schools, colleges and libraries: pamphlets, documentary films,

books and magazines. Similar work on a local level is being done by the Chicago Council of American-Soviet Friendship, headed by Mandel Terman, and the American Russian Institutes of San Francisco and of Los Angeles, headed respectively by Dr. Holland Roberts and Judge Stanley Moffat.

The Library for Intercultural Studies in New York has the best library and source material in the country, in both English and Russian, on the Soviet Union and American-Soviet relations.

Great credit is due to these organizations for their part in laying the basis for the official American-Soviet exchanges that are now taking place, and for helping to create that understanding between our two countries that is not only the necessary condition for peace but for that "good life for all" that science has revealed beckoning to us from the future.

WHAT SEAN O'CASEY SAID

LABOR IS NOW, thanks to the people of the Soviet Union's tremendous revolution, well on the road to a sensible and progressive society, to socialism. . . . Lenin, bent over the works of Karl Marx, gathered into his wide-ranging mind the visions of the poets, thinkers and scientists of the centuries, and forged them, with gigantic skill, into an amazing plan of offensive and constructive action to convert the upheaval of the revolution into a thriving and invincible socialist republic. . . .

During my own lifetime, I have seen the workers become the great power in more than half the world, with the other half beginning the climb of the hill. I have seen the workers, peasant and proletariat, widen their ranks to welcome home as workers, too, the poet, the artist, the scientist, the doctor, the teacher and the thinker, who in their labor in their differing ways are all one, proving the truth of the old slogan of Each for All, and All for Each. There are many countries still within whose borders the workers still struggle; whose lives are unhappy and whose chances are few to enjoy a fuller and more harmonious life. But they are learning from those others who have done so much. . . .

From a May Day article written for the Soviet magazine New Times, No. 18, 19, May, 1958.

Our Friends from the Soviet Union

by HELEN AND SCOTT NEARING

SOVIET aid and cultural exchange are deeply appreciated in People's China. Throughout the whole population, from the oldest to the youngest, this appreciation is felt. In Peking one wintry day we met a score of children walking with two nursery school teachers. The rosy-cheeked youngsters, three or four years of age, bundled in padded jackets, were having an afternoon's outing at the zoo. The group was so fetching that we stopped to watch it go by. When the children saw us they called out in Chinese, "Hello, Auntie! Hello Uncle!" In a moment we were surrounded. One small boy approached us gravely, put his hand in ours, and asked, "Are you our friends from the Soviet Union?" We were strangers; we were friendly. The little chap put two and two together and concluded that we must be from the Soviet Union.

Foreigners have not always been given the hand of friendship in China. On a visit in 1927 many Chinese who passed us on the streets

THE NEARINGS, as our readers well know, have dedicated their lives to the cause of human progress to which they have made measureless contributions through their books and lectures. The present article is based on two chapters of their latest book "The Brave New World" which reports their observations on a trip to the Soviet Union and China last year, and which will be published November 15.

of Canton gritted their teeth, glowered, and looked as though they would enjoy running us out of town. Through a hundred years the Chinese suffered aggression, intervention, invasion, occupation and humiliation. At the time of the First Opium War China was an independent, sovereign, almost self-sufficient country. Sixty years later, after foreign troops had suppressed the Boxer Rebellion, China was occupied by armed men in foreign uniforms and under foreign command. From 1932 to 1943 Japanese armed forces moved from city to city, taking over military control of China.

Foreigners collected Chinese customs and deposited them in foreign-owned banks. Foreigners were masters in Chinese ports. Foreigners held special concession areas where they established their business, set up their governments, maintained their own police forces and their courts, and enforced their own laws. The concessions were inhabited chiefly by Chinese who were the menials and did the hard work. Economic and political decisions were made by tiny minorities of foreigners. Outside a park in their own city of Shanghai we saw in 1927 the insulting sign: "Chinese and dogs keep out."

Hong Kong and Taiwan, occupied by the armed forces of foreign pow-

ers, are remnants and examples of the position which the imperialists held in China before 1943, when foreign warships were stationed in Chinese harbors and patrolled Chinese navigable rivers. Today, a United States fleet patrols the narrow waterway separating the island of Taiwan from the remainder of China. Taiwan is occupied by the Nationalists, a defeated faction in the Chinese civil war. Their army is financed and supplied by the Government of the United States. About a third of the Nationalist's army is located on two islands, Quemoy and Matsu, which are within gunshot of the Chinese mainland. Yet if the Peking Government attempts to take back the islands, which are part of China, the Congress in Washington has authorized the President to make war on the Chinese People's Republic.

Most foreigners had gone to China merely asking for permission to trade. They had then settled down, taken possession, and dictated where necessary at gunpoint. With British, Germans and Russians the experience had been the same. The foreigners issued orders. The Chinese, living in their own country, disobeyed the orders issued by foreigners at the peril of their lives.

Against this century-old experience, the Chinese reacted with bitter anti-foreignism. Three times they took up arms and attempted to expel the invaders—in the Taiping Revolution of 1851-64, in the Boxer Rebellion of 1899-1900, and in the struggle against foreign intervention that began in 1932 and ended with the Liberation of 1949.

After Liberation, certain foreign governments and foreign peoples

came to China's aid. Heading the procession was China's ancient enemy, Russia. The Russia of the Empire-building Tsars had been changed into a Soviet Russia committed to replace imperialism and colonialism by socialism and communism.

When Chairman Mao and his colleagues, after Liberation, went to Moscow to sign a treaty of peace and mutual aid, the imperialist West was gleeful. "Now," they said, "we will see the Russian Bear swallow a neighbor country." Had the Soviet Union been following the policy which dominated the history of recent centuries, this would have been the time to grab and assimilate China. The Soviet Union was strong. China was weak. Here was an ideal opportunity for the strong to drive a hard bargain which would convert the weaker party into a dependency or a sphere of influence.

What misgivings must have been in the hearts of many Chinese as spokesmen for the People's Government met the representatives of their former enemy from the North, sat down around a conference table, and after prolonged negotiations signed a treaty of peace and friendship. What was this, the skeptics must have asked, but the camel's head, pushed under the tent flap? A century earlier, other Westerners had come in the name of peace and friendship, only to take over the economic and political control of the country. This had been the common practice of all Westerners who had dealt with Asians. Would not this new venture result in a repetition of an old and abhorrent experience?

Events during the past decade

have provided an object lesson, not only to the Chinese people, but to the entire world. The West has been amazed. The people of China have been reassured. The grab-and-keep pattern is not the touchstone of Russian foreign policy. Instead of smashing or subordinating a potential rival, the Soviet Government and people have done everything in their power to build up Chinese economy and strengthen the Chinese State. How does Moscow explain and justify such a policy? The answer is clear and emphatic: "We do not consider People's China a rival. We are neighbors and partners, both striving to build a socialist world."

Among the chief powers, People's China could rely for whole-hearted backing only on the Soviet Union. India, which remained friendly but on the whole neutral, was also starting planned production, but instead of being in a position to give material assistance to China was itself in great need of outside economic aid. During the critical years that followed its establishment in 1949, People's China needed not neutrality but trained manpower, materials, machines and money. The Soviet Union furnished all four.

Soviet aid to People's China took several forms: a treaty of alliance; backing in the United Nations; loans; technical assistance. All four forms of aid were of the utmost importance to the newly organized government.

Soviet loans of \$300 million in 1950 and of 520 million rubles in 1954 were spent chiefly on capital goods. The first loan was made at one per cent interest. Subsequent loans were at a slightly higher rate.

Soviet technical aid was of profound importance in enabling People's China to reorganize its economy and to launch its First Five Year Plan in January, 1953. Trained manpower, experienced in industrial techniques, was woefully deficient in People's China. The Soviet Union met this need by sending Soviet personnel into China and by training Chinese personnel at home and in the Soviet Union. Specialists in agriculture, conservation, industry, electronics, construction, moved eastward from Russia in a steady stream. Usually they went for periods of one or two years. The largest number of Soviet specialists in China at any one time has been estimated at 20,000.

Special hotels and other living quarters were provided for the Russian visitors. In every city we visited in China in the winter of 1957-58 we met these Russians, living in groups, with their borscht, caviar, black bread and sour milk and cream. Always they were unobtrusive, well-mannered, unassuming, business-like. Everywhere the comment on them was the same: "Our friends from the Soviet Union are our most valued and honored guests."

While we were visiting the great iron and steel complex in Anshan, North East China, we learned from the Chairman of the plant's Trade Union Committee something about the effects of Soviet aid on North East China. "This enterprise was organized by the Japanese," he told us. "From the beginning the Japanese ran the plant. We Chinese were workers. We were not allowed to learn anything concerning formulas, processes, administration. Consequently, when the Japanese sur-

rendered and left the plant, it was a body without a head. Then the Soviet Union came to our aid with materials, equipment and the much needed personnel. With this help we restored the plant and by 1952 we got it back into working order.

"The Soviet comrades were wonderful teachers," the chairman continued. "We were ready and eager to learn and they were equally ready to teach. Unlike the Japanese, who had told us Chinese nothing, the Soviet specialists stood at our elbows day and night, suggesting, guiding, directing. Today there are only a few remaining. Those few will leave the plant during 1958 and return to the Soviet Union. After that, when we need special help, they will send the necessary personnel to discuss new and difficult problems. They have no desire to take over our industry. Never have they tried to push us around."

China's First Five Year Plan provided for 694 major projects. Soviet aid went to 156 of these projects, which were designed to provide Chinese economy with a coordinated foundation of "parent enterprises." Among them were 7 iron and steel mills, 27 power plants, 27 coal mines and coal-washing plants and many engineering works. Of these 156 projects, 60 were in operation by the end of 1957; 70 were being built and the remaining 26 were in various stages of preparation.

Aside from direct assistance in planning and equipping key units of the Chinese economy the Soviet Union supplied gasoline, special steels, metal-cutting machinery, automotive units and other equipment. Plants constructed during the early stages of Soviet-Chinese collabora-

tion were built largely to Soviet design and supplied with Soviet-made equipment. As Chinese plants expanded the production of capital goods, Chinese equipment was installed to a greater and greater degree. By the end of the Five Year Plan, new power stations, factories, and transport installations were largely or, in some cases, wholly equipped with machines made in China. In return for this aid, China sent the Soviet Union farm products, animal products, minerals and the products of light industry. Sino-Soviet trade was about five times as great at the end of 1957 as it had been in 1950. [It now amounts to \$1,500,000,000 annually (Adlai Stevenson in the *New York Times*, Oct. 2, 1958).]

While Soviet specialists were planning, directing and training in People's China, large numbers of Chinese (workers, technicians and students) went to the Soviet Union, to work in the industries, to take special training courses and, in the case of students, to enroll in Soviet schools and colleges.

While we were in China many Soviet experts were returning to Russia. Only a few were being replaced. There were still highly technical jobs on which the Chinese were glad to have the advice and cooperation of Soviet specialists, but the bulk of the advisory and directing work had been done.

There were three striking aspects of Soviet aid to People's China. First, no political strings were attached. The aid was provided as a gesture of friendship to a socialist neighbor country. It was paid for on an agreed basis with exported Chinese products. Second, there was

no permanent occupation of China by Soviet personnel. They did not take over the Chinese economy. Soviet experts went to China as specialists go to any piece of work, made their contribution and then went home with good feelings on both sides. Third, the relations between the Soviet Union and People's China were civilian, not military. Soviet armed forces did not establish themselves in People's China.

Soviet aid to People's China was urgently needed by the Chinese. At the outset the economic and military strength of the Soviet Union was greater than that of People's China. There is no suggestion that the Soviet Union took advantage of this superiority.

This most recent experience which the Chinese people have had in their dealings with foreigners, and especially with those from the Soviet Union, has been reflected in the study of foreign languages. For generations foreigners had come to China and spoken their native tongues—English, German, Japanese. If the Chinese wished to get on with the foreigners, to take and execute their orders, it was up to the Chinese to learn the language of the intruders. Consequently, many Chinese had learned European and other foreign languages. This was particularly true among Chinese business men in the seaports. As the British were the dominant power in the south (Hong Kong) and in Shanghai and the Yangtse Valley, English was widely used and spoken there. Shop signs were in English. So were street signs and the direction markers on street cars and busses.

Since Liberation a new policy has been adopted. Chinese is the official

language. Business is done in that language and signs are painted in Chinese characters. Even hotels which cater to foreigners have their names in Chinese on the outside, and the floors are numbered in Chinese on the elevator shafts.

Soviet and other foreign technicians, coming by the thousands to People's China, created a demand for interpreters and translators. The popularity of "our friends from the Soviet Union" created interest in their language. A new foreign language pattern appeared in the schools. Before Liberation English was the popular language taught in Chinese middle and higher schools. After 1950, it changed to Russian.

This change in foreign language study reflects not merely the shift in Chinese political alliances but also a transformation in Chinese popular interests and preferences. Until quite recently the Chinese placed the United States at the top of the list of China's friends. Today the United States occupies a position toward the bottom of the list and the Soviet Union is in first place.

United States public officials spent the years after 1949 denouncing the Peking regime and misrepresenting developments in China. There were two paths ahead of humanity, these spokesmen announced—the path to freedom and the path to slavery. The Chinese people were following the path to slavery. There were two kinds of people in the world, they said—children of light and children of darkness. The Chinese were among the children of darkness.

Such statements were duly reported in the Chinese press and over the Chinese radio. Slowly but surely,

good will (which had been widespread in China after Washington's conversion of the Boxer indemnity money into scholarships which enabled Chinese students to study in the United States) was rapidly dissipated. United States and British participation in the Korean War and the general support given by the State Department to the Dutch in Indonesia, and the French in Indo-China and North Africa, and the occupation of Taiwan and the adjoining waters by United States armed units since 1950, lined up the United States with the imperialists against the colonials, thus undermining still further the confidence which the Chinese people had felt in the good intentions of Washington.

Since all aspects of imperialism were ferociously unpopular in China after 1949, a good-will vacuum was

created into which the Soviet Union stepped with socialist aid and friendship, cultural interchange and trade. The two big socialist neighbors became friends and fellow workers in building a socialist society.

Thus was created a new pattern in international relations. Instead of the rivalry, fear, suspicion and hatred that characterized the relations of the Western powers with one another through centuries of competitive empire building, these two builders of socialism turned to cooperation, sympathy, mutual confidence and friendship. A new formulation had been achieved in theory and applied to foreign relations in practice. From each nation according to its possibilities, to each nation according to its needs. This was assistance without domination or subversion, aid without strings.

CHAIRMAN MAO TSE-TUNG GREETSS ANNA LOUISE STRONG

ON THE EVENING of October 1 Chairman Mao Tse-tung, Vice-Chairman Chu Teh and Premier Chou En-lai received the heads of foreign delegations and other prominent people from foreign countries on a central rostrum built in Tien An Men square, from which they watched the brilliant display of fireworks in honor of the establishment of the Chinese Peoples' Republic.

Among the delegation heads and prominent people from many countries were Mr. Abdul Wahad Mahmoud of the Iraq delegation, Mr. Phemos Cornaros, prominent Greek writer, representative from the Indonesian National Council who brought a letter from President Sukarno, a delegation of lawyers from six South American countries, and Anna Louise Strong.

Chairman Mao Tse-tung first words to Miss Strong were, "How is your health?"

Premier Chou En-lai said to Miss Strong, "Did you ever imagine, when you were in Yenan over 10 years ago, that China would develop so quickly?"

Miss Strong in answering said that 10 years ago she did believe that China's revolution would definitely be victorious but not at such a rapid pace as today.

In an article in the *National Guardian* for October 20, Miss Strong spoke of Peking: "It is a confident city, feeling the pulse of the world's greatest population, one-fourth of mankind, all of whom rejoice like one man in celebrating a magnificent harvest which will more than double last year's."

On Combating Cancer

by PROFESSOR NIKOLAI BLOKHIN

THE problem of combating cancer is undoubtedly one of the most important in medical science and public health protection. Cancer engages the attention of both physicians and the public at large of the whole world, since it claims so many thousands of lives annually. The achievements of medical science which have made it possible to eradicate in the Soviet Union such diseases as cholera and smallpox, to liquidate typhoid fever almost completely and to decrease sharply the mortality from tuberculosis, make cancer mortality, which is still high, even more marked. There has been an increase in the average life span of the people, a great number of whom reach old age, when malignant tumors occur most frequently. All this emphasizes the importance of further development in the field of cancer prevention.

Many incorrect conceptions are circulated concerning cancer. Thus, one may hear that nothing has been learned in the cancer problem, that its causes are unknown, that there are no means of its prevention, and that cancer is incurable. But to a

considerable degree this is wrong. Although we cannot precisely establish the causes of cancer in each case, factors promoting the development of the disease have been studied to such an extent that scientists are now able to induce various tumors artificially in animals. It is well known that such tumors may be produced by the action of a number of chemicals, known as "cancerogenic preparations." They also occur as a result of certain physical influences, especially radiation. A number of tumors are also known to be caused by viruses.

The majority of oncologists at present consider that various malignant tumors in man may be due to different causes. Many investigations are being carried out in this direction. The works of L. A. Zilber and his pupils, as well as A. D. Timofievsky and his colleagues were presented at the USSR Oncological Conference held in Leningrad in January, 1958. They reported on new data connected with the viral theory of tumor origin.

Reports were also presented at the conference which criticized the viral theory and demonstrated the role of other factors, such as, for instance, the effect of various harmful influences in the surrounding environment (N. N. Petrov, L. F. Larionov, L. M. Shabad). Although the

PROF. NIKOLAI BLOKHIN is a Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences and Director of the Institute of Experimental Pathology and Therapy of Cancer in Moscow.

causes of cancer are still far from clear, much is known regarding the development of cancer, particularly the fact that cancer tumors usually develop upon the background of so-called "precancerous conditions." Several reports at the Leningrad conference (by L. M. Shabad, R. E. Kavetsky, M. F. Glazunov and others) were devoted to the problem of precancerous conditions. The study of preneoplastic conditions is of special significance in the prevention of cancer, since detection and timely treatment of these diseases is a practical method of cancer prophylaxis.

Prophylactic examination of the healthy population which has been carried out on a wide scale in the USSR for over ten years, has proved of great value. Millions of people were examined during this period and a considerable number of cases with various precancerous conditions and early tumors were detected.

Cancer prophylaxis should also be directed towards the removal of harmful influences in the surrounding environment (air pollution, food stuff admixtures, etc.) which may stimulate the development of tumors.

The statement that cancer is incurable is absolutely wrong. The present state of surgery, as well as the development of modern methods of radiation therapy (including X-ray, radium, and isotope treatment) have made it possible to cure many patients suffering from malignant tumors.

Cancer therapy by means of drugs is gaining more and more significance. These new methods were also discussed at the Leningrad conference. Data concerning the effect

of Soviet anti-tumor preparations, such as sarcolysin, amain, dopan and others were presented in reports by L. F. Larionov, by the writer of this article and other scientists. However, treatment of cancer by drugs is as yet poorly developed. Medicines have been discovered for only a few forms of tumors but this trend has a wide future.

Different forms of cancer are being treated with varied success at present. The best results were obtained in the superficial forms of cancer, which are more accessible for early diagnosis and treatment. Thus, cancer of the skin gives stable recovery in about 95 per cent of the cases.

Treatment of deeply located tumors is most difficult since their diagnosis is more complicated and they are less accessible to radiation therapy. However, even in treatment of such tumors as, for example, cancer of the stomach, definitely favorable results have also been achieved and the outcome of therapy is now much better than several years ago.

Timely detection of the tumor is especially important for its successful treatment. Early cases of cancer are completely curable by existing methods. The main reason for the high rate of mortality from cancer lies in late diagnosis.

Eight specialized scientific-research oncological institutes are functioning in the Soviet Union at present, not including the roentgen-radiological institutes which also devote much time to oncology. Scientific problems connected with cancer are also being studied by numerous medical and biological scientific institutions. The USSR has 211 oncological hospitals which conduct extensive therapeutic-prophylactic work. These

hospitals are specialized institutions with clinics and an out-patient department equipped with everything necessary for surgical and radiation treatment of tumors. They are also engaged in detection and registration of cancer patients and in the study of the results of treatment. A large number of oncological departments in the polyclinics assist in timely detection and examination of cancer patients. Various therapeutic institutions devote much attention to the problem of cancer as well.

Scientific-research oncological institutes in the USSR are connected with hospitals and, besides research work, prepare instructions on the most effective methods of treatment of various forms of cancer. After approval by the Ministry of Public Health these instructions are distributed throughout the country.

A Scientific Council on the cancer problem is functioning at the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences which is the center of medical knowledge. The most outstanding specialists take part in its work. The Scientific Council discusses the problems of planning and investigations of the cancer problem, examines various proposals advanced by scientists, etc.

The USSR Society of Oncologists

also assists in the work on the cancer problem. This society unites various specialists working in this field and has branches in many Soviet republics and regions.

Scientists of the whole world are studying the causes of cancer, the methods for its early diagnosis, prophylaxis and treatment. Scientific intercourse between oncologists of various countries aids this work. International anti-cancer congresses and symposiums, as well as reciprocal visits to scientific institutions by scientists of various countries are of great significance here. Soviet oncologists took part in a number of international congresses and participated in the Seventh International Anti-Cancer Congress held in London in July, 1958.

During the past few years the Soviet Union has been visited by many foreign scientists working in the field of cancer. In turn, many Soviet specialists have visited the oncological institutes of Great Britain, France, the United States and other countries. The cooperative work of scientists of various countries will in a short time result in important achievements in the prevention of cancer which still remains a dreadful scourge to mankind.

TOWARDS IMMUNIZATION AGAINST CANCER

A RECENT ISSUE of *Evening Moscow* published an article by Prof. Ivan Maisky, director of the Institute of Experimental Biology, in which he pointed out that while causes and cure of cancerous growths are still hotly debated, means for immunization against them may soon become possible. Experiments on animals have shown that tumors grafted on unfavorable areas of the body—such as the ears of rabbits—produce a general defensive reaction in other areas of the body which thus develop a stable immunity to tumor growth.

This possibility offers the prospect of obtaining cancer antigens. Similarly to live vaccines, these antigens would be able to prevent the transfer of cells of tumorous tissues through the body. Work on this experiment is being carried on in two important research centers in the Soviet Union.

Soviet Industry Marches East

by RALPH PARKER

ONE of the most important events in Soviet domestic affairs during 1958 was the Irkutsk conference on the development of Eastern Siberia.

First, a word about the constitution of the conference itself, which has one or two aspects of importance to an understanding of recent changes in economic management.

It was called by the USSR State Planning Committee, the USSR Academy of Sciences and the Russian Federation Council of Ministers. It was attended by delegations of the Krasnoyarsk Territory, Irkutsk and Chita regions, the Buryat and Yakut Autonomous Republics, the Tuva Autonomous Region, a big group of prominent scientists, members of the Academy of Sciences, the USSR Academy of Agricultural Sciences, and the Academy of Construction and Architecture, and also representatives of over 300 research, designing, planning and economic organizations, about 2,500 people in all.

This gathering of experts was the culminating conference in a series of seven, the previous ones having been held in cities in the various economic regions making up Eastern

Siberia, located roughly within 500 miles of Lake Baikal.

I doubt whether many readers of *New World Review* could place many of these cities (Kyzyl? Krasnoyarsk? Chita?) with much accuracy, but there is every prospect that within ten to fifteen years they are going to be in the news pretty often.

It is said that 850 papers and communications on a wide range of economic and technical questions and comprehensive problems of entire areas were heard at these conferences, and that 1,500 people took part in the discussions. The significance of this, I think, is that it shows how decentralization of economic management has drawn into planning large numbers of peoples and organizations whose role had tended to be overlooked previously. Certainly, the surveying of Eastern Siberia's potential productive forces that has been carried out during the past 18 months seems to have been done with extraordinary energy. Further, the setting up of economic regions seems to have encouraged planners to take a more integrated approach to economic planning, to examine the natural resources of the region—one of the richest in the Union—in relation to local productive capacity.

The Irkutsk conference was itself a stage in the drawing up of a national economic plan for the period

RALPH PARKER, our Moscow correspondent, has lived in the USSR for almost two decades. He is also Moscow correspondent for the British weekly "New Statesman," "The Times of India" and other publications.

1959-1965. The 20th Congress set the task of building a third iron and steel center in the eastern part of the Soviet Union. Based on a new plant in Western Siberia, a second at Taishet in the Irkutsk region, and the Karaganda plant in Kazakhstan, an annual production of 15 to 20 million tons of pig iron was called for.

Twenty-five years have passed since Soviet industry, which inherited a metallurgical base located in European Russia, took its first big step eastward. The result was the Urals-Kuzbas base. The frontier of Soviet heavy industry was pushed eastward to the Kuznetsk meridian, in central Siberia. There has been a steady development of this metallurgical base which is now producing five times the amount of pig iron and steel contemplated in the original plan.

Until recently it was considered that Siberia and Kazakhstan lacked iron ore resources. However, enormous resources of diverse high-grade ores have been discovered, sufficient, it is claimed, to guarantee an annual output of 60-70 million tons of pig iron, far more than stipulated by the 20th Congress's assignment for the third iron and steel center. The construction of a Karagabda metallurgical works, called "Kazakhstan-Magnitka" is now under way in Temir-an. Construction of the West Siberian iron and steel mills has been started in Stalinsk. On the basis of the raw material resources of Siberia and Kazakhstan the planners are now able to envisage the opening of at least eight or nine large metallurgical plants.

But it is to development still farther to the east that the Irkutsk

conference was looking. Several regions in Eastern Siberia disputed the right of becoming a new iron and steel industry there but the conference declared itself almost unanimously in favor of making the Lake Baikal meridian the place. The concrete recommendation made was to set up big metallurgical plants near Taishet in the Irkutsk region. The ore would be provided by the Korshunov and Rudnorgorsk mines of the extremely rich Ilimo-Pitsk iron-ore basin; at the outset coking coals would be supplied from the Kuzbas while later on local coals would be used.

To get some idea of how far to the east this means extending the frontier of heavy industry it is worth noting that Lake Baikal lies on about the same meridian as Singapore.

This however in no way limits the planners' vision. Professor Bardin of the USSR Academy of Sciences has spoken of the need to envisage an eastward advance across Lake Baikal in order to use the highly favorable conditions of South Yakutia and the Chita Region. Thus Soviet heavy industry is planning to head for the very borders of Manchuria and the Amur basin.

Let us confine ourselves, however, to the East Siberian picture. This territory has the most diverse and extensive deposits of basic minerals in the entire country. Its known iron ore deposits, for instance, comprise nearly a third of all reserves on the territory of the Russian Federation. It also has very large deposits of aluminum raw materials. Large deposits of nephelines have been discovered. There are also huge deposits of copper, lead, nickel,

tin, tungsten, molybdenum, gold, rare metals, mica, asbestos and graphites. Geological reserves of coal are estimated to be about 80 per cent of the total estimates of coal deposits in the Russian Federation. Eastern Siberia has the largest hydropower reserves in the USSR. Finally, more than half the forests in the Soviet Union grow in Eastern Siberia. There are also large reserves of fertile virgin soil.

Plans have already been drawn up for the first stage in the development of this stupendously rich area. About 67,000 million rubles are to be expended in the course of seven years by the economic councils of Eastern Siberia alone, which is over 12 per cent of the total capital investment by all the economic councils of the Russian Federation. The seven-year plan provides for the construction of the Taishet Metallurgical Works, the Krasnoyarsk and Bratsk hydroelectric stations, three aluminum plants, an alumina factory in Achinsk, diamond mines in Yakutia, large new coal-pits, capron fiber mills in Angarsk and Kansk, an artificial fiber mill in Usolya-Sibirskoye, a road machines factory in Achinsk, a cement factory in the Chita region, a worsted cloth mill in Kansk, and large timber and wood-working establishments near the cities of Yeniseisk and Bratsk.

Further development, however, calls for a rational solution of four basic economic problems: electric power, machine-building, chemicals, and transport.

Until recently planners had looked exclusively to hydropower as a source of supply for this area, through which the Angara, Yenisei, Lena and other rivers carry an enor-

mous volume of water along relatively steeply inclined beds. But thermal electric stations using coal which can be produced at a cost of 2-2.5 kopeks per kwh. can also produce huge quantities of cheap electric power. Much of this coal can be mined by the open-cast system.

The great power potential of Eastern Siberia is a particularly important feature in the selection of this area for modern metallurgical plants. Whereas in the recent past metallurgists needed 60 kw. per ton of output, they now require 250 kw., while new plants, owing to their use of high, furnace-top pressures and of oxygen, and to the switching over to the production of thin sheet and cold rolled metal require as much as 750 kw. for each ton of ultimate output.

Siberia is already producing powerful blast-furnace equipment, drawing mills and drags for the metal industry, and at the Irkutsk conference it was stated with confidence that Siberia would before long become a main supplier of machinery not only for itself but also for neighboring Asian countries.

Nature has provided conditions for developing a large-scale coal-chemical industry, for the East Siberian coals are not only cheap but are also among the younger grades, with higher proportions of volatile substances, the basic raw materials for the production of many chemicals. The erection of oil refineries in the Krasnoyarsk Territory and the Irkutsk Region for processing oil from the Bashkirian oil-fields by pipe-line will supply an East Siberian chemical industry with hydro-carbon raw material. Construction of several big plants for the

manufacture of artificial fiber, plastics and other synthetic polymers and also of mineral fertilizer, is slated. The electric cracking of hydrocarbon gases will provide rayon pulp for the textile industry, high-grade cords for automobile tires, paper and cardboard, fodder yeast, ethyl alcohol, furfural for plastics, edible glucose and other products.

The main tasks of the organizations responsible for improving transport are to electrify the Siberian trunkline, construct the Abakan-Taishet and Achinsk-Abalakovo railroads, build motor roads and expand shipping.

The surveying carried out during the past few years has revealed deposits that allow the planners to consider the setting up of a fourth metallurgical center beyond Lake Baikal. At the Irkutsk conference it was urged that this development project should be started within the next fifteen years. A huge coal area has been discovered in South Yakutia, large and dependable iron ore resources are available at Al-

dan, and near the Argun River in Chita Region.

Finally, a word about the manpower problem. The population of this mountainous, thickly forested area is small. Many thousands of skilled workers will have to be attracted to the area and the outlay in building new cities for them will be large. The planners therefore consider it vitally important to concentrate on new labor-saving techniques. In this respect they recommend a close study of the experience of Canada and Australia, lands which, possessing large natural resources, are also tackling the problem of quickly developing productive forces with the least outlay of labor.

Much remains to be done before the planners' dreams for Eastern Siberia are realized, but it is evident that the Soviet Union has taken the first steps in another mighty industrial advance eastwards which when completed will be of capital importance to Russia-in-Asia and to its Asian neighbors.

ADLAI STEVENSON ON FACING THE FACTS OF LIFE

IN A SPEECH in Milwaukee on October 18 Adlai Stevenson said: "Russia's resources are unmeasured, her energies immense and they are all harnessed to overtaking the United States in every field. It is wishful thinking at its worst, and most dangerous, to think and let alone pretend, that the Soviet system is about to collapse. It isn't. It is here to stay and we may as well face it, Secretary Dulles and President Eisenhower to the contrary notwithstanding."

Mr. Stevenson went on to say that the people of the world must either live together or die together, and that it was essential that travel, trade and cultural exchange be encouraged and that the United States should be ready to talk with the Russians on every level.

"How can we get along with the Russians?" he asked and answered with another question, "How do we know until we try?". He said further than this country must face the facts of life in its dealings with foreign nations, and added that we live in a time of world-wide revolutionary change and that the future lies with those who adapt themselves to change.

New York Times, October 19

Recent Changes in Soviet Economy

by MAURICE DOBB

DURING the prewar years, it will be recalled, the Soviet economy was undergoing a twofold transformation: a transformation of agriculture from the basis of small-scale individual peasant production to a socialist basis, and the transformation of industrial production by means of an extensive program of construction, especially in the so-called capital goods industries (metals, engineering, chemicals, etc.). Each half of this twofold transformation was complementary to the other: for example, a growing agricultural surplus was necessary to supply foodstuffs and raw materials to the expanding industrial sector; and expanding industrial output was necessary to supply tractors, fertilizers, etc., to raise productivity in agriculture. After the immense destruction of the Second World War, the concluding half of the '40's was devoted to restoring and carrying further this economic construction.

This process of transforming and greatly developing the productive forces provided the basis for the transition from the "mixed economy" of the NEP period in the 1920's to a socialist economy with

fully developed central planning. This socialist economy was characterized by two different forms of socialist property (in the means of production). The first (and more highly socialist form) was the directly state property of the state factory or state farm. The second form, which predominated in agriculture, was a form of cooperative property: the *kolkhoz* or collective farm, and in small-scale (mainly handicraft) industry the *artel* or producer-cooperative. It has been a common view both in the USSR and elsewhere that this second form was a kind of transitional compromise or bridge between peasant economy, backward and rootedly individualist, and socialism; and that sooner or later this second form would have to be transformed into the first form. As recently as 1952 Stalin in his *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, while repudiating the line of nationalizing collective farm property, spoke of the need "to raise collective farm property to the level of public property," and suggested that collective farm property and also commodity (market) relations connected with it, might be already "beginning to hamper the development of our productive forces . . . since they create obstacles to the full extension of government planning to the whole of the national economy including ag-

MAURICE DOBB, Professor of Economics at Trinity College, Cambridge, is an authority on Soviet economy. His books include "Soviet Planning and Labor in Peace and War," "Soviet Economic Development Since 1917."

riculture." Among the reasons he gave for rejecting the proposal to transfer the machinery of the Machine Tractor Stations (MTS) to the *kolkhozi* was that this would "dig a deeper gulf between collective farm property and public property," thereby extending the sphere of commodity circulation and taking the economy further from communism.

This conception of the line of development has been altered by recent discussion and policy changes. It is now recognized that during part of the prewar and postwar period agricultural production came to lag badly compared with industry, and planning and industrial administration became excessively centralized. The latter tendency was already apparent in the prewar years, when construction was accelerated and key priorities had to be enforced at all costs in face of the lengthening shadows of war; it was accentuated by the conditions of wartime and by the urgent tempo of postwar reconstruction. The former became particularly marked in the postwar period, with an actual fall in some branches of livestock in the years prior to 1953, especially cows. This was connected with faulty methods of planning agricultural production and of farm administration; too great reliance being placed on administrative methods and too little attention paid to price policy and the use of economic incentives to the collective farms. For example, there had come to be something like 200 or more output targets for each *kolkhoz* in the annual plan; the compulsory delivery quotas imposed on farms were specified in such detail as to be an instrument for controlling administratively their pro-

duction pattern; and very little discretion was left to the farms themselves to adapt production to their own special conditions. It turned out (in Khrushchev's words) that prices had been too low, and that distortions in price policy had "harmed agriculture, undermined the collective farmers' material incentive to expand production and retarded the development of the collective farms. . . . In establishing agricultural prices in the past the Leninist principle of providing a material incentive to develop social production was often ignored."

Changes in Agriculture

To come to the changes in the USSR of the last few years, first of all in agriculture. From 1953 onwards a series of reforms of agricultural price policy took place, coupled with some changes in taxation, designed to increase incentives to farm production. Along with this went improvements in agricultural planning so as to give more initiative to farm managements on production questions. Since that time there have been substantial increases in agricultural output. We don't know the grain figures; but the success of the virgin lands' campaign and the bumper harvests of last year and this, suggest that the 1960 target figure of a barn crop of 180 million tons (which many thought much too ambitious when it was first announced) may be fulfilled. We do know the livestock figures, and that meat and milk have increased by 40 and 50 per cent respectively in the past four years. It is, indeed, a quite striking fact (and too little known) that the USSR produces today more

butter than the USA and almost as much (about 95 per cent) milk.

Secondly, in March of this year came the decision of the Supreme Soviet to transfer (by sale) the machinery of the MTS to the collective farms, leaving the former as repair and service stations only. Thereby was ended what had come to be known as the "two bosses" system, whereby responsibility for the crucial agricultural operations of plowing and harvesting had been divided between the MTS which supplied the machinery (and also the tractor teams and combine teams) and the farm management. Apart from the political importance of this decision to transform agricultural means of production into the "second form of socialist property," one can say that the purely economic basis for the change had been prepared by the large growth in the average size of collective farms (as a result of amalgamation) during the past ten years. As a result many collective farms today cover as large an area, or larger, than the whole circle of adjacent farms served by one MTS at the time when the latter were started. To quote Khrushchev in a report of June 17 last:

Today most of the collective farms have become large-scale and economically sound establishments. . . . As a result of the amalgamation there are now some 78,000 collective farms in the country in place of more than a quarter of a million in 1949. Last year the collective farms of the USSR each had on an average 1,954 hectares [i.e., over 5,000 acres], or in other words over three times as much as before amalgamation. Many collective farms, especially in the country's main grain-growing areas, have from 5,000 to 10,000 hectares or more of arable land, a fact enabling them to employ machinery widely.

He added that the bulk of this amalgamation had taken place in 1950-51, that it had "opened up favorable opportunities for the more rational employment of machinery and manpower resources," but that since at that time "there were serious shortcomings in the guidance given to agriculture, this step alone could not bring about a radical turn in the advance of collective farm production."

Thirdly, and in many ways the most surprising, was the abolition, by a decision last June, of compulsory delivery quotas levied on collective farms. These compulsory deliveries were paid for at low prices, far below the current market price, and represented a kind of mixture of a tax and a rent. (Produce over and above these quotas were then sold at higher prices either by contract with the state buying organs or on the *kolkhoz* market). They had played the economic role in the early days of providing a guaranteed minimum supply of foodstuffs and raw materials for the towns and industry. Now they have been terminated and instead there will be a uniform procurement-price (differentiated according to zones) at which agricultural products will be purchased by the state from the farms.

About the new conception of the role of *kolkhozi* (and hence of the relation of the two forms of socialist property), it should suffice to repeat a key passage in an article by Academician Ostrovitianov (*Marxism Today*, August 1958) and to summarize the three main points in the speech of Khrushchev in presenting the Theses on the *Kolkhoz* and the MTS.

According to the former:

In the light of the Party's latest decisions . . . it is becoming clear that co-operative collective farm property can grow over into the communist form of property belonging to the whole people without being turned into state property. . . . The idea has gained currency in recent years that commodity circulation is allegedly incompatible with the prospects of going over from socialism to communism. Such a formulation of the question is wrong. The dialectics of the development of socialist economy consists precisely in the fact that we shall arrive at the withering away of commodity production and money circulation as a result of the utmost development of commodity-money relations in the socialist stage of development.

Ostrovitianov goes on to say that at the present time it is necessary for "the widest possible use" to be "made of the operation of the law of value for the advance of socialist production," and that this applies to agriculture as well as to industry.

The three main points made about the two forms of socialist property in the Khrushchev speech were these. Firstly, the *kolkhozi* had already evolved from what they had been originally, and were today different in significant respects from 20 or 25 years ago. Secondly, they had not yet exhausted the possibilities of development: "inexhaustible reserves for expanding production are inherent in the collective farms as in the state farms." Thirdly, the proper task is to strengthen and develop *both* forms of property; not only the collective farm but also the state farm would need to undergo further evolution along the road to communism.

Changes in Industry

In the case of industry there have also been important changes. Here there is no parallel problem of two

forms of property; but there are problems of decentralizing planning and administration, and of proper use of economic incentives in connection with a reformed price policy, analogous to those we have touched on in connection with agriculture. Among economists there has been extensive discussion over the past two years about the role of commodity production and the law of value, with special reference to price policy (which was formerly treated as outside the province of political economy proper and as simply part of the technology of planning).

Formerly, in the period of what may perhaps be called hyper-centralized planning, the production targets of particular factories and enterprises were apt to be set out in great detail in the central plans (as was the case also in agriculture). This included not only the output targets and the costing of this output (on which the sale price at the factory level was based), but also very often the amounts and sources of all the main raw materials and components used in the course of production. Any investment expenditure by an enterprise, whether on extensions or on renewals and replacement of equipment (except for quite minor repairs and maintenance) were, of course, controlled by the plan. While the management of the enterprise in theory had discretion as to what methods of production to use to carry out the plan targets, in practice its scope for initiative seems to have become very limited. Much of the detail in the output plans seems to have been unrealistic and at any rate made for inflexibility; and such inflexibility

encouraged various kinds of more or less covert direct arrangements between enterprises (with a proliferation of agents negotiating these arrangements, the so-called *tolkach*).

A perennial problem had been the failure of enterprises to fulfill what was called the "assortment plan" (i.e., detailed specifications about qualities and lines) even when they fulfilled the plan target in overall quantities. The bonus awarded to the staff for fulfilling the latter (which seems to have come to submerge other incentives to the enterprise in the war years and after) encouraged a tendency to put the emphasis on fulfillment in *quantity* terms. The temptation was to concentrate on the lines or styles that could be turned out most quickly and most cheaply, even if this was at the expense of quality or variety and perhaps of wasteful use of scarce machinery and materials.

In recent years there has been extensive decentralization both of planning and of industrial administration in the USSR. In the case of planning this has taken the form of drastically reducing the number of items included in the central plan, often by as much as two-thirds or even more. In the case of administration it has taken the form of disbanding most of the central All-Union Ministries dealing with industry and developing responsibility onto the new regional economic councils. This reorganization has been described elsewhere (for example by Andrew Rothstein, in *New World Review* for October, 1958) and we need not repeat a description of it here.

It should be added that there has

also been a trend towards democratization in the sense of reactivizing the initiative and participation at local levels of the trade unions: for example, the revival of production conferences in the factories under trade union auspices, and the other measures covered by the decision of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of July 15 last giving increased rights to trade union committees in factories and offices, including control over overtime and dismissals. One may perhaps in this connection quote Ostrovitianov again (this time from *Komsomolskaya Pravda* of March 18, 1958), who said: "Leninism teaches us that as we advance towards communism, we should manage the economy on ever more democratic principles."

It is not quite clear whether the decentralization of planning and administration in the USSR has led to increased scope for economic decision by the enterprise. The signs seem to indicate that it must have done so, at least in some degree. If less detail, e.g., about the output assortment produced by any one enterprise, is laid down in the central plan, then it seems to follow that decisions about such detailed questions must fall to the enterprise (unless of course the regional organization gives orders about them instead of Gosplan). And if such matters are decided by the enterprise, they will naturally be decided on the basis of prices (both of outputs and inputs, e.g., in deciding what can be produced most *cheaply*); and the question of whether prices are (in some sense) "right" or "wrong" becomes crucial to the taking of correct decisions.

What is clear at any rate is that

enterprises have more discretion than formerly about comparatively minor investments (e.g., in replacing obsolete equipment and small-scale extensions or innovations); and that, as an economic incentive to the enterprise, the old Director's Fund, or Collective Enterprise Fund (from which various projects beneficial to the enterprise, such as bonuses, housing, welfare facilities, can be financed), based on the surplus of receipts over costs as a result of the year's activities, has been restored to pride of place, taking precedence over previous bonuses for plan fulfillment.

It is clearly no accident that this new attention to problems of price policy and incentives, to adapting production more exactly to consumers' needs and other questions of balance and adjustment (by contrast with overall growth and construction) should have come to the fore at the present stage: a stage when past successes in industrial

construction in the USSR have laid the basis for a rapid advance of all branches of the economy, including the consumer goods sector. During the present decade in the USSR while priority for heavy industry has been maintained, the growth rate of the consumer goods sector has been much closer to that of heavy industry than formerly. It is a well-known fact that, apart from the rise in food production that we have mentioned, there has been a very rapid rise in consumption standards during the present decade: so much so that the talk now is about catching up the *per capita* consumption levels of Western countries, including even North America, during the next decade.

This article is appearing in the November issue of the British Labour Monthly, by whose courtesy we are publishing it. For reasons of space we had to omit some sections dealing with recent economic changes in the Eastern European Democracies which were in the original article.

MORE RUSSIAN STUDY IN U.S. SCHOOLS ASKED

THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF AMERICAN-SOVIET FRIENDSHIP reports more and more requests by libraries, schools and colleges for material on the Soviet Union. A dispatch in the *New York Times* for October 20, indicates how widespread this interest has become.

"... A conference recommended today a major expansion in Russian language and 'area studies' in United States elementary and secondary schools. . . .

"The conferees agreed that American students' knowledge of the Soviet Union and the Russian language was dangerously deficient in an era when earth satellites symbolized the challenge of survival. They called such knowledge an urgent necessity. . . .

"The parley was called jointly by the American Council of Learned Societies, National Association of Secondary School Principals and a subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Slavic Studies."

Recent visitors to the Soviet Union report on the increasing number of Soviet citizens they meet who speak English. English has become the main foreign language taught in many Soviet schools.

Britain, Quemoy and Mr. Dulles

by GORDON SCHAFFER

IF THE BRITISH scene during the Quemoy crisis has been fairly reported in the United States, the American people must be aware that the defenders of Mr. Dulles here could not have numbered more than a few per cent of the population. The only newspaper to give even luke-warm support was the ultra-right *Daily Telegraph*. The *Times*, the *Observer* and almost the entire provincial press were outspoken in their condemnation. The conferences of the Trades Union Congress, the Labor Party and the Liberal Party denounced the Dulles policy and asserted that the offshore islands were the lawful territory of the Chinese People's Republic. The official spokesmen, whose duty it is to "guide" the press worked overtime explaining that the Government, though not openly condemning the USA were using all their influence behind the scenes to restrain Mr. Dulles.

One thing is absolutely clear. If the United States becomes involved in war with China as a result of her obstinate refusal to recognize the facts of life in the Far East, she will be friendless and alone. No British Government could carry the people into war on such an issue.

This aspect of the situation has

already been recognized by the people as a whole but with this realization a larger section is beginning to understand that the American alliance is a source not of protection but of danger. The world aspect of the Quemoy clash was deliberately minimized. The Soviet warning that she would regard an attack on China as an attack on herself was given comparatively little publicity. Mr. Eisenhower did the Soviet Union a good turn when he returned Mr. Khrushchev's letter, because his action forced the newspapers to give more prominence to its contents. Nevertheless the grim realization that a trigger happy military leader in the Straits could start a war between America and Russia and that once war started H-bombers would operate under U.S. command from British territory, has shown millions of people exactly where the alliance can lead. The demand for evacuation of American troops and bases from our island is as yet only the cry of a minority, but with Mr. Dulles rampant for much longer, it will become a nationwide cry. The act of deception by Mr. Dulles at the beginning of the crisis when he threatened war against China in an "off the record" talk to selected journalists was a shattering revelation to his friends and this particular episode was exposed with complete frankness by the *London Times*.

GORDON SCHAFFER, former assistant editor of "Reynold's News," is the Chairman of the British Peace Committee.

If you were to put the question: "Who is most likely to lead the world into war, Mr. Dulles or Mr. Khrushchev?" to a fair cross-section of the British people today, there is no doubt the majority would plump for Dulles.

This is the paradox. The British people are saddled with an arms program which is draining their economy to a point where living standards are endangered and social services starved to "protect them from the Russians." They are a party to a world chain of alliances to guard them from alleged dangers of Communist aggression. Yet they increasingly see the real danger as coming from their main ally. They have realized in these weeks of Far East crisis that they may be led to nuclear disaster by a United States dragged at the heels of Chiang Kai-shek.

Harold Davies, M.P., who has just returned from the USA, has shocked many Labor supporters out of their complacency by his report of how he heard from the lips of Mme. Chiang Kai-shek that she is prepared for nuclear war. Chiang Kai-shek, Syngman Rhee, Franco Spain, a Western Germany where the Nazi generals are back in power, a France on the verge of Fascism: these are the allies who can call the tune and commit the whole Western alliance.

Ever since the grim facts of nuclear war have persuaded thinking men and women from all sections of the nation that our island is doomed once the H-bombs begin to drop, there has been a search for a way out. Some supporters of the campaign for nuclear disarmament, which has swept the country like no

other movement since the anti-Fascist campaigns before the war, have formulated the theory of unarmed resistance to a Soviet invasion. Commander King-Hall, who is no mean military expert, has put this plan forward as the only way Britain could survive. He and those who think like him have accepted the philosophy of the cold war. They accept that the Soviet Union is the enemy, but they at least do not deceive themselves into believing that a tiny island could engage in H-bomb war and live.

But once the propaganda barrier is broken down, the whole conception of the cold war alliance against communism is challenged. The struggle against communism for those who see it as the danger, emerges as an economic and social clash. The cold war alliance is exposed by Mr. Dulles himself not as a safeguard against attack from Communists, which no one seriously believes to be a possibility, but as an instrument to launch nuclear war against a country in which a quarter of the human race have chosen the communist path. Basically that is how the majority of Labor Party members view the situation. That is why the recent Labor Party conference started with a forthright denunciation of the U.S. actions in the Formosa straits and went on to pass resolutions on foreign policy which if adopted by a Labor Government would change the world situation. I believe that this would also sum up the view of Mr. Aneurin Bevan who is scheduled to be Foreign Secretary if a Labor Party Government is returned to power at the general election which is likely within next year.

But I think the evidence is actually clear that it does not represent the view of Mr. Gaitskell, leader of the Labor Party who would be Prime Minister in a Labor Government, or Mr. George Brown, who would be Minister of Defense. Mr. Gaitskell defended Britain's manufacture of the H-bomb at the Labor Party conference by saying that it would mean the second most powerful nation in NATO, sheltering behind the American bomb, and when a delegate shouted "get out of NATO," he angrily retorted that this might lead America to adopt an isolationist policy and leave Britain alone to face "Soviet threats and aggression." Mr. Brown talked of the deterrent of the H-bomb in just the same way as the present defense minister Duncan Sandys. At the Trades Union Congress a month earlier, Sir Vincent Tewson and other right wing leaders made exactly the same type of speech.

In the House of Commons a few months ago, Mr. Shinwell, a right winger and a former Minister of Defense, complained that there is more difference within the Labor Party on foreign affairs than between many Labor M.P.'s and the Conservatives and he is right. The Labor leaders have been forced by pressure from below to accept new policies. The party has recorded support for a nuclear free zone in Europe and has opposed nuclear arms being placed in the hands of the West Germans. Such a policy cannot be achieved with NATO in its present form. It has called for a Middle East settlement with Soviet participation, based on the rights of all Middle East states, including Israel, and on an end to oil imperialism. That

policy cannot exist side by side with the Baghdad Pact, or what is left of it after Iraq has gone. It has demanded the entry of the People's Republic of China to her rightful place in the United Nations. That must involve an end to the SEATO alliance which has one of its main members in Chiang Kai-shek.

Gaitskell accepts these decisions of the party, but also accepts the cold war alliance. In other words, the struggle goes on within the Labor movement against the bi-partisan foreign policy which has been a feature of British politics since 1945. Aneurin Bevan, whom the right wingers tried to expel from the party four years ago, appears to believe that if a Labor Government comes to power, he will be strong enough to impose changes of policy and to retain his position as Foreign Secretary designate; for this he has been prepared to make concessions, including acceptance of the British H-bomb.

This contradiction within the Labor Party is incomprehensible to most of its members, let alone the wider public and it is losing the opportunity to give a clear lead on peace, which would be the surest election winner.

The American people have not yet had the reckoning for the brinkmanship of John Foster Dulles. Perhaps I am being too optimistic. The bill may yet have to be paid in unimaginable suffering. For we cannot continue to rely on the patience of the Chinese in face of intolerable provocation. And we shall always be in deadly peril, when in Asia, in the Middle East and above all in Germany, cold war can flare into nuclear disaster.

SHOSTAKOVICH'S 11th SYMPHONY

reviewed by SIDNEY FINKELSTEIN

DMITRI Shostakovich's *Eleventh Symphony*, entitled "The Year 1905," has been recorded by Leopold Stokowski and the Houston Symphony Orchestra on two long-playing Capitol records (PBR 848). The symphony was first performed in Moscow and Leningrad during October, 1957, where it was greeted as a splendid work. Before advancing a critical opinion on the music, it may be of interest to take up some matters raised by American critics in their discussion of this work. The *New York Times* critic, Howard Taubman, heard it in Brussels last summer, and wrote a scathing account of its lack of quality, affirming that the composer was sacrificing music to political pressure. "Poor Shostakovich!" he lamented. The same banner was waved by Taubman's colleague, Harold O. Schonberg, when he reviewed the Stokowski recording. "And thus shrivels a talented composer. . . . It is propaganda, and has about the same relation to art that an election poster does. It is inconceivable that Shostakovich writes this way because he wants to; he is too thorough a musician for that. But he who pays the piper calls the tune. One can only hope that Shostakovich is well paid."

A different view was expressed in the magazine *High Fidelity* by Alfred Frankenstein. "It is clear that there is genius in this music, that it is a major work, and that its real theme is not the Revolution of 1905 but the tragedy of Dmitri Shostakovich. The whole tenor of the

piece is one of bitterness, regret, and escape into a historic past far older than 1905. . . . The symphony sounds like the product of a beaten and broken spirit, but one which can still lift its voice with great nobility and eloquence." Finally, in the *Saturday Review* Irving Kolodin refrains from interpretation, political or psychological, and says, "It is absorbing in its minutes of brooding and lamentation; disaffecting, even downright repellent in its outbursts of brass and percussion, which are meant to convey the clashes of strikers and palace guards but lacks either the musical materials or the sheer momentum to suggest anything but organized noise."

There is one thing American critics should know if they are to deal accurately with Soviet music, a worthwhile task since cultural interchange has already proved its value to both countries. The most recent example was the triumph of our Van Cliburn in Moscow and the friendly assistance which Kiril Kondrashin gave to the repetition of his triumph here. What the critics should know is that the Soviet composers love their country and believe in socialism. They are sharply aware of the contrast between Tsarist Russia, with its widespread poverty, disease, ignorance and misery, and the Soviet Union, with its enormous productiveness, its torrent of books reaching the smallest towns, its thriving science and its vast popular audience for music and the other arts. They admire deeply the comparative handful of brave people who challenged Tsarism in 1905, and were killed, jailed or exiled; the ragged troops who beat back the armies of intervention in 1917-21, after socialism was proclaimed; the fortitude, self-sacrifice and heroism shown by a major part of the population in stamp-

SIDNEY FINKELSTEIN, who frequently contributes musical reviews to "New World Review," has written several books on music and art. His "Realism in Art" was recently published in the Soviet Union.

ing out the blazing fire of German fascism, with its fearsome destructive power, when it threatened to envelop the world. To celebrate such achievements, to "strengthen the bond between art and the life of the people," or to take up such a theme as peace, is for the composers not a task dictated "from above" but one corresponding to their own feelings. Nor does the fact that the Soviet Government recently pointed out some of its own grave mistakes change the situation, any more than the scandals which appear in our own press all too often, should make an American feel that he must renounce his country. In other words, patriotic feelings are not an American monopoly.

As for the *Eleventh Symphony*, there is no doubt of the sincerity of the critics here who dislike the work, although it so happens that I find it beautiful music. They may be right so far as its lasting power is concerned. Yet there seems to be a pattern to their reactions to Soviet music. When a work expresses tormented feelings, and deep inner conflicts, or is written with a caustic irony, they are moved by it. When a work is warmly melodious, without overmuch dissonant spice, has some thought attached to it like "youth," "socialism," "peace," or the memory of a Russian historical event, and if, heaven forbid, it should be open heartedly happy (which is not true of the present Shostakovich composition), they are generally left cold. And then they decide that another Soviet composer has "knuckled under." Thus Taubman, writing from Brussels about "Poor Shostakovich," reminded his readers about how bad the *Song of the Forests* was, although I always think of it as a finely written, exhilarating work in a popular vein. He also referred to Prokofiev's *Seventh Symphony* as a "tired and saddening" work although every time I hear it, I am moved by its charm and lovely lyricism. Well, when critics feel this way it is their duty to write this way, but it is in bad taste to add gratuitous insults, especially to composers who have made a

considerable contribution to world culture, and also seem to like their land and people.

The *Eleventh Symphony* is different from other Shostakovich symphonic works. For one thing, he bases it, a procedure rare for him, on actual folk and popular songs, in this case those of the 1905 revolutionists. Also, it is not constructed according to the traditional pattern of the symphony. I am not raising this as a matter of terminology, but as a way of describing its character. The orchestral symphony is traditionally built to portray sharply contrasting aspects of life, with an "inner drama" of psychological conflict and resolution rather than an "outer drama" referring to an actual event. The tradition of this work of Shostakovich is really that of the looser tone poem. Its construction is shaped by the mental picture he has of the events of 1905, and unlike a symphony, it is meant to bring a picture before the eye. It is a long work, lasting about an hour and fifteen minutes, made up of four somber movements that flow without break between them. They are titled *Palace Square*, *The 9th of January*, *Eternal Memory*, and *Tocsin*. The songs, including "Listen," "You've Fallen a Victim," "Varshavyanka," and a melody from one of the composer's choral works which appears in the second movement, are handled with a fine plasticity, the texture of each movement being generally simple at the start, then developing imperceptibly into a rich counterpoint. There is no "conflict of opposites" but rather the feeling of a wreath laid on the grave of the heroes, named and nameless, of 1905. There is no attempt to create a musical battle scene. The passage of drum beats are only a momentary reference to the actual event and fit into the musical development.

There is no doubt that this work has a special and extra meaning to the Soviet people, to whose minds the historic songs themselves must bring many associations. But it also possesses "universal" values. What Shostakovich has captured

perfectly is the mood of such fine movies of the thirties that dealt with 1905, like *The Youth of Maxim*, or novels like *The Lonely White Sail*. For all the length of the work, the musical line never weakens. The music builds masterfully. The troubled disquiet of the opening, with deep pathos, passes through a slow transformation into a turbulent outburst of passionate indignation. Then comes the lament for the fallen, and finally the climactic expression of a fierce determination to settle accounts. Stokowski's reading is deeply felt and beautiful in sound. It is not a happy work, but it

certainly does not depict a "broken spirit."

Would an American composer writing of John Brown at Harper's Ferry, produce a happy or jolly work, even though he knew that this heroic defeat was the prelude to the abolition of slavery? And to the critics who dislike this work, I would suggest that if an American composer were to write a symphony entitled "John Brown," and weave into it songs of the time with the same imagination, deep feeling and artistry that Shostakovich has shown here, they might consider it an asset to American music.

DR. ZHIVAGO

reviewed by MURRAY YOUNG

Dr. Zhivago, by Boris Pasternak, Pantheon, New York. 559 pages. \$5.00.

BORN in 1890, Boris Pasternak came to maturity before the October Revolution and was very much influenced by the avant-garde *Symbolist* movement in poetry which flourished in Russia from 1890 to 1910 and produced its greatest figure in Alexander Blok. Pasternak's poems, unlike the broad, popular poetry of Vladimir Mayakovsky, the great poet of the revolutionary period, are said to be difficult and intensely personal.

Dr. Zhivago is his first novel, although he has published a number of other prose works. Composing a novel toward the end of a long literary career chiefly devoted to writing and translating poetry from other languages—his translations of Shakespeare have a very high reputation—Pasternak cannot be called a novelist, but is rather a poet who has chosen the novel to tell us something of the nature of his life, largely experienced within the context of the establishment and consolidation of the Soviet regime. Pasternak, reputedly a major poet, remained aloof from the main stream of Soviet life. His novel was awaited with impatience.

The version now available in English is the same as the Italian translation published last year despite the request of Pasternak that the manuscript be returned for revision. *Dr. Zhivago* has not been published so far in the Soviet Union.

On its appearance here this fall the critics almost to a man outdid themselves in praise: "a book of truth and courage and beauty," "reminiscent of Tolstoy," "a genius of towering proportions," "stands alone, unique in concept, devastating in power," "amounts almost to a miracle."

An event indeed! Turgenev, Dostoyevsky, and Tolstoy suffer by comparison: [*Dr. Zhivago*] "certainly excels them [the great Russian 19th century novelists] as a social document, as a work of observation of the highest order, as a fearless and intellectually honest commentary on the political situation in Russia before and after the October revolution." On the other hand, the reviewer in the *National Guardian* for September 29, says: "It is actually not a political work at all." Surely one of the most bewildering opinions so far offered about the book.

First of all, political or non-political qualities aside, is it a good novel techni-

cally? Keeping in mind that Pasternak is after all not a novelist but a poet, one must nevertheless, in view of the company of great masters of the novel into which the critics have hoisted him, judge his novel by very high standards. And the truth—admitted by the less biased critics—is that the novel is awkward in construction, obscure in continuity, wildly improbable in its use of coincidence, and like the prose of so many poets, the descriptive passages tend to clog the flow of the narrative. But worse than all this is the fact that Pasternak does not make his characters really come alive for us; he is not able to employ those psychological insights that the great novelists use to bring their characters close to us by our recognition of them as human beings like ourselves. His characters remain remote, neither their actions nor their words rising inevitably from firmly established individuals the reader fully accepts. Like the episodic, almost nightmarish development of the main events of the novel, the characters seem to move and speak with all the inconsequence of a dream.

Dr. Zhivago is a practicing physician as well as a poet of some repute. Serving in the 1914 war, he is briefly swept up in the excitement of the October revolution like so many intellectuals of his class. But as the hardships grow in the difficult years after October, Dr. Zhivago's sympathy for the revolution lessens and he finally takes his family across the war- and revolution-torn country to Siberia, where he hopes to work on the land and bring up his children. His decision to give up the practice of medicine, so sorely needed at this time, is never explained.

Shortly after his arrival in Siberia he is abducted by a band of Red partisans and for a year is forced to serve them as physician. In the meantime his wife and children are deported from Soviet territory. Grieving over their loss, he is comforted by Larissa, who since his youth has played a symbolic role

in his life. This relationship, we are told, is the love of his life, of a far more profound and "spiritual" nature than his love for his wife.

Returning to Moscow in 1922, Dr. Zhivago feels himself very much an outsider; goes to seed; loses his skill both as a doctor and poet. All the same, he manages another marriage which produces more children. (The reader is told casually that Larissa dies in a slave-labor camp.) Dr. Zhivago dies about 1932.

In a brief, bewildering epilogue some of the characters are shown in the Second World War. (Coincidence in this section is substituted for any pretense of building a solid novelistic structure.) At the very end we are given a glimpse of two of Dr. Zhivago's old friends in Moscow sometime after the death of Stalin, happy with a sense of a coming new "freedom of the soul."

This in brief is the main story, leaving out many of the side incidents all of which are only loosely woven into the main fabric. It is, however, a long book because of its many set pieces of poetic descriptions of nature, its vague mystical musings, and the frequent passages in which the course of the October Revolution is discussed, analyzed and evaluated.

What picture then emerges of the revolution in the eyes of such a man as Dr. Zhivago who early losing his belief in the goals of the great historical upheaval, seeks in exile, in self-enclosing personal relations, in deliberate surrendering of his skills as a doctor, and in quasi-religious "meditation," escape from the tremendous events surging about him?

Zhivago is reading some new decrees and newspaper articles on a wall-newspaper:

What period did they belong to? . . . Had they been composed last year? The year before? Only once in his life had this uncompromising language and single-mindedness filled him with enthusiasm. Was it possible that he must pay for that rash enthusiasm all his life

by never hearing, year after year, anything but these unchanging, shrill, crazy exclamations and demands, which became progressively more impractical, meaningless, and unfulfillable as time went by? Was it possible that because of one moment of overgenerous response he had been enslaved forever?

Or again on the leaders of the revolution:

But it turns out that those who inspired the revolution aren't at home in anything except change and turmoil, they aren't happy with anything that's on less than a world scale. For them transitional periods, worlds in the making are ends in themselves. . . . And do you know why these never-ending preparations are so futile? It is because these men haven't any real capacities, they are incompetent. Man is born to live, not to prepare for life. Life itself, the phenomenon of life, the gift of life, is so breath-takingly serious! So why substitute this childish harlequinade of immature fantasies, these school-boy escapades?

There is much more of this kind of thing—and how familiar it all is!

When opinions in favor of the revolution and its goals interrupt the gloom of monotonous condemnation, they come always from shadowy characters without real significance in the novel. Therefore the descriptions of sinister, ambiguous revolutionary characters, the constant use of abrupt separations and unexplained meetings, the selection of savage, bloody incidents, achieves the effect of presenting the whole revolution as a great misfortune that brutalized those who participated in it and made life valueless for those who merely endured. Such is the message of this "great humanist novel."

To attempt to give a picture of such events through the eyes and consciousness of a man who by temperament and character is alien to the profound human aspirations of the revolution, whose whole effort is to escape both its grandeur and its inevitable miseries, is to deny the source from which great writing comes.

Pierre Bezukhov in *War and Peace*, the young Marianna in Turgenev's *Virgin Soil*, or Doctor Astrov in Chekhov's *Uncle Vanya* do not turn from life. They stand full-stream in their epochs, and the consciousness with which their creators endowed these characters becomes a part of total human consciousness. Thus they are humanist creations in the only sense that this word can have meaning. Like great painting, poetry and music, these characters are milestones in man's long journey to make more human and more understandable the world in which he lives.

Praising *Dr. Zhivago* by comparing it to the great Russian writings of the 19th century is a shameless rejection of all critical standards and values for the purpose of bringing discredit to the October Revolution. Boris Pasternak has not written either a great artistic, social or humanistic novel. He has merely told us—and not very skillfully—how an egocentric, selfish, middle-class intellectual drifted through one of the decisive events in human history, isolated, self-pitying, blind.

THE EARTH'S LIMITS

reviewed by

ROBERT W. DUNN

World Balance Sheet, by Robert R. Doane. Harper & Brothers, 1957, 262 pp. \$10.

ROBERT DOANE is an economist and statistician of long standing and high reputation in business and academic circles. He once wrote a book, "The Measurement of American Wealth," that was considered the major if not the last word in the field.

Working along the same lines for some 20 years he has attempted what might seem the impossible for one man. But he has done it again, giving us what he calls a composite balance sheet

of the world economy. Facts on land, air, water, food, minerals, people, production, money are all inventoried along with striking facts about depletion of the world's resources resulting from the present rate of consumption. It is the most comprehensive summary of its kind we have ever seen.

Although Dr. Doane is not a pessimist on the general destiny of man, he is, in the light of recent developments, fearful of his fate if the current waste and depletion of natural resources continues. Note, for example, one of his findings:

"The people of the world today are extracting some 7.5 billion tons of raw materials of all kinds from the surface of the earth annually, while over the past 70 years man has used up nearly 1 trillion tons of these irretrievable materials from what he still considers to be his inexhaustible heritage. For every 100 tons he puts back 3."

Dr. Doane is obviously against any system that tends to deplete soils and waste resources, especially our human resources. And he implies that only a planned society can offer a solution to the dangerous tendencies now prevailing at least in that two-thirds of the world where the chaos of capitalism and imperialism continues.

The U.S. enemies of public power and TVA will not like his conclusions, nor will the Congressmen who recently voted against a big federally-financed dam at Hell's Canyon. And the power monopolies will object to his statements that "no owner has the moral right to waste a critical natural resource or to put it to uses which are harmful to the wider public interest."

This is the sort of book that every library should have as a supplement to the limited almanacs, yearbooks and UN reports on various world areas.

Although it deals primarily with the last 70 years, which are covered country-by-country with detailed tables on the relevant subjects, this work is likely to stand up for a long time. Even if the publisher calls it a "reference work," it is

a lot more than that. It might be considered a sort of introduction to the scientific studies that are being made in the present International Geophysical Year. Before we go rocketing off into space it is well for this generation to understand the limitations and possibilities of the earth itself.

Doane's work is a fine aid to an understanding of this world and its people. And it brings home the need for peace and real international cooperation to avoid mutual destruction.

INTO SPACE!

Artificial Satellites, by A. Shternfeld. State Publishing House of Technical-Theoretical Literature, Moscow, 1958; Translation prepared by Technical Documents Liaison Office, MCLTD, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio. Distributed by U.S. Department of Commerce, Office of Technical Services, Washington 25, D. C. 424 pp., \$6.00.

IN 1956 this book must have still seemed much like science fiction, even though the preface to the first edition promised that "the artificial satellite is no fantasy or daring dream, but a tangible achievement of the very near future." If the Soviet Union had not been first to fulfill this promise it is unlikely that the present volume would have been translated and issued by the U. S. Government. The format is a photo-offset of typescript, and is marred by obvious errors of typography, reproduction (especially of photographs) and translation. Nevertheless the volume is a document of extraordinary interest.

What we have here is a second edition, expanded and revised after the launching of the first two earth satellites. The author is a research scientist in the field, and includes results of his own investigation, as well as fundamental principles and quotations from a wide selection of relevant technical literature, in-

cluding that of American authorities. The book presupposes no prior knowledge of satellite mechanics, but it does assume a serious reader, who must be willing to study the problem under the author's guidance for thorough comprehension of the conclusions. It cannot be recommended for the intellectually lazy, but will give reward for effort spent.

The chapters on the laws of motion of artificial satellites, their motion relative to an observer on the earth, their construction and launching, and their observation from the ground, present information that has already been experimentally verified. Those on man in cosmic space, the view from satellites, and the problem of descent to earth, as well as the utilization of artificial satellites, involve elements that are still somewhat speculative, simply because the activities discussed have not yet been achieved. The possibility of an artificial satellite of the moon is now so familiar that even artificial satellites of other planets, of the sun, and of comets seem feasible. And orbital ships are now subjects for the engineer's drawing board, not science fiction. All these topics are discussed in detail by Shternfeld.

Shternfeld's discussion of the utilization of artificial satellites may be of most interest to the general reader. Satellites will be useful primarily as flying observatories for studying the earth as well as other members of the solar system and the stars. Not only will it be possible to observe the surfaces of the earth and large scale meteorological phenomena, but also to gain more information about the shape and even the interior of the earth, since the motion of the satellite reflects deviations of gravity from its normal value. As for astronomy, the very atmosphere which makes life possible on our planet also acts as a dense curtain for much information from the outside, and satellites penetrate this curtain. Of course a satellite can also explore the region in which it moves, and serve as a laboratory.

A number of American authorities

are quoted on the possible military applications of satellites. Shternfeld points out that bomb carrier satellites would be very difficult to build and much easier to shoot down, but concludes that "We are still firmly convinced that it will not be necessary to shoot down military artificial satellites, since the public opinion of the world would prevent their construction."—S. J.

RALLY for PEACE and FRIENDSHIP

*25 years of diplomatic
relations*

U.S.A. - U.S.S.R.

*41st Anniversary of the
Soviet Union*

•
FRIDAY

November 14

8:00 p.m.

•
Carnegie Hall
57th St. and Seventh Ave.

•
ROCKWELL KENT
DR. CORLISS LAMONT
PROF. FREDERICK L. SCHUMAN
ESLANDA ROBESON
UKRAINIAN LEONTOVICH CHORUS

Admission: \$1.00 (tax included)

**National Council of
American-Soviet Friendship**

114 East 32nd St. Phone: MU 3-2080
New York City

NEW SOVIET FILMS

MILES OF FIRE
NO ORDINARY SUMMER
CARNIVAL
LENINGRAD SYMPHONY
SONGS OVER THE DNIEPER
IN THE PACIFIC
Artkino Pictures, Inc.

723 SEVENTH AVE., NEW YORK 19

Telephone: Circle 5-6570

650,000,000

CHINESE VOICES

Hear them in

PEKING REVIEW

**A weekly review of Foreign Policy
and Trade; Industry; Agriculture;
Education; the Communes**

AIRMAILED FROM PEKING

Imported under USA License

\$5.00 for 1 year

Write for details

**IMPORTED PUBLICATIONS &
PRODUCTS**

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

STATEMENT REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AS AMENDED BY THE ACTS OF MARCH 3, 1933, AND JULY 2, 1946 (Title 39, United States Code, Section 233) SHOWING THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, AND CIRCULATION OF NEW WORLD REVIEW published monthly at New York 1, N. Y. for October 1, 1958.

1. The names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are: Publisher, N.W.R. Publications, Inc., 34 West 15th Street, New York 11, N. Y.; Editor, Jessica Smith, 34 West 15th Street, New York 11, N. Y.; Managing Editor, Murray Young, 34 West 15th Street, New York 11, N. Y.; Business Manager, None.

2. The owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding 1 per cent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a partnership or other unincorporated firms, its name and address, as well as that of each individual member, must be given.) N.W.R. Publications, Inc., 34 West 15th Street, New York 11, N. Y.

Frederick V. Field, Calle de Londres 87-201, Mexico 6 D. F., Mexico.

3. The known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: (If there are none, so state.) None.

4. Paragraphs 2 and 3 include, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting; also the statements in the two paragraphs show the affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner.

5. The average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the 12 months preceding the date shown above was: (This information is required from daily, weekly, semi-weekly, and triweekly newspapers only.)

(Signed) JESSICA SMITH
Editor

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 3rd day of September, 1958.

(Seal) MURRAY M. TITTLER
(My commission expires March 30, 1960.)

65
Publication Date: November 15, 1958

THE BRAVE NEW WORLD

by HELEN & SCOTT NEARING

Table of Contents

Preface: Why We Went

Introduction: Good News

PART I *The Soviet Union*

1. A New World in the Making
2. Steps in the Educational Ladder
3. Six Million Experts
4. Stalingrad, a City Reborn
5. The Green and Black Gold of Baku
6. Socialist Triplets
7. Tashkent and its White Gold
8. The Soviet Union Over the Top

PART II *People's China*

1. The Chinese People Win
2. China's Good Earth
3. One Big Family
4. Education for All
5. Industrialization
6. Social Ownership and Cooperation
7. House-cleaning and Rectification
8. Building Socialism Step by Step
9. The Government and the People of China

PART III *Socialism, Peace and Friendship*

1. Peaceful Socialist Giants
2. Soviet Aid to People's China
3. "Our Friends from the Soviet Union"
4. Hands Around the World
5. "Tell the People of America"

CLOTH BOUND

256 PAGES

\$3.50

The first hundred pre-publication orders will bring you autographed copies. Buy extra copies for Christmas gifts!

Order now from

NEW WORLD REVIEW

7th floor, 34 West 15th St., New York 11, N. Y.