

SOCIAL SCIENCES

FEBRUARY, 1959

DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRARY FEB 6 1959

25¢

New World

REVIEW

THE MIKOYAN VISIT

THE CHINESE COMMUNES

Elsie Fairfax-Cholmeley

Jewish Life in the USSR

Mandel Terman

The Accra Conference

Eslanda Robeson

Soviet Education

Elizabeth Moos

Social Security in the USSR

NEW WORLD REVIEW

FEBRUARY 1959

Mikoyan's Goodwill Visit	
Jessica Smith	3
The Accra Conference	
Eslanda Robeson	13
Jewish Life in the USSR	
Mandel Terman	15
A Look at the People's Communes	
Elsie Fairfax-Cholmeley	20
Education Makes Headlines in the USSR ...	
Elizabeth Moos	28
Social Security in the USSR	33
USSR Note on German Peace Treaty	38

BOOKS AND RECORDS

<i>The Causes of World War III—</i>	
C. Wright Mills	
reviewed by Robert W. Dunn	40
<i>Decision in Africa</i>	
W. Alphaeus Hunton	
reviewed by Scott Nearing	43
<i>A Peace Program for the U.S.A.</i>	
Corliss Lamont	45
New Recordings	
reviewed by Sidney Finkelstein	46

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

ESLANDA ROBESON
Our Rising Correspondent
Editorial Consultant on Negro and Colonial Questions

Vol. 27, No. 2, February, 1959. Second Class postage paid at New York, N. Y. Subscription \$2.50 per year, \$1.25 for 6 months (Canadian, \$3.00, foreign \$3.50 a year. Draw money orders or checks payable in New York.) Published monthly by the N.W.R. Publications, Inc., 34 West 15th Street, New York 11, N. Y. Indexed in Bulletin of the Public Affairs Information Service. Phone: CHelsea 3-0666.
PRINTED IN U.S.A.

209

To Our Readers

We want to express the warmest thanks to all of you who have responded so generously to our last financial appeal—each dollar we get is deeply appreciated—and we know how difficult it is for many of you to squeeze out that much extra from your budget.

Then there was the excitement of receiving from an oldtime supporter a check for \$1,000 that had not been expected—usually these larger sums mean much personal work. This check simply came in answer to our mail appeal with the wish "that it could be more."

We also want to thank those of you who have helped in bringing us new subscribers. Through your efforts and a special mailing our circulation is rising. This is good.

But our costs are rising too! Paradoxically, new subscribers, in a situation where we have no big advertisers to count on as do the commercial magazines, mean larger printing bills for us to meet. And this year there are greater postage expenses too.

And at this period, we feel we have a special obligation, both to our old readers and to our new—many of whom have taken only a trial subscription—to try to get better and fuller material than ever on developments in socialist countries, on East-West relations, on prospects for peace and what can be done to further them. This can only be done with more financial help.

Will those of you who have not responded to our last appeal send us as much as you can? Everything from \$1 to \$1,000 helps, and is deeply appreciated.

PLEASE FILL OUT AND MAIL TODAY

I enclose \$..... for your publication fund.

Name

Street City.....

Zone State

Mikoyan's Goodwill Visit

by JESSICA SMITH

"OUR WORLD has grandeur and life has hope. In spite of the despair of the beats and the wailers, the harp in the air still sings the melody of hope, and hope in action will sing on everlastingly. . ."

So wrote the beloved Irish playwright, Sean O'Casey, in the lead article in the *New York Times* magazine of January 11, bringing to us, as he does in all his plays and writings, new strength and spirit to fight for the joy of life, for life itself, and vanquish all those who are trying "to frighten hope from the human heart."

O'Casey is writing about poets and playwrights and novelists—but his words, shining out from a press that is mainly devoted to reporting the cold war policies of our government which would destroy all hope—and if they explode into an atomic war all life too—cannot but have a deep political significance.

Inevitably the contrast must come to mind between the message of peace that has been brought to us by Anastas Mikoyan, Deputy Prime Minister of the USSR and the brink-of-war policies that have been pursued by Washington. But already a change in the air can be detected as result of Mikoyan's visit and at the end of it there were signs that the administration was beginning to respond to his words of hope and peace.

With all the speculation that has

been indulged in about the purposes of Mikoyan's informal visit as a guest of Soviet Ambassador Mikhail Menshikov, (his first visit here since 1936) there is really no mystery about it at all. Aside from any concrete results that may result from the discussions, every word and action of the Soviet visitor has demonstrated that his main purpose is to ease the cold war, to pave the way for more friendly relations and for peace. This he has stressed in all his discussions and numerous press conferences. Far from blaming everything on the U.S. he has said that if Solomon were asked to assess the blame for the cold war, he would probably "split it down the middle."

"He Is Running for Peace"

From San Francisco Harrison Salisbury reported in a dispatch headed "Mikoyan's Success" (*New York Times*, January 11) that Mikoyan's was a "goodwill mission," having a "deepening impact resulting from his blunt words, crackling wit and unfailing good humor." Likening his progress across the country to a national Presidential campaign, Salisbury wrote:

He is running for "peace" at every point, in every city, before every kind of audience—before working men in the River Rouge power plant of the Detroit Edison Company, before the bankers of Cleveland, the furniture salesmen of the

Chicago Merchandise Mart, the lawyers of the Middle West. To every American he can reach with his message Mr. Mikoyan is saying: Let's argue, let's dispute, let's compete, but let's not fight . . . he is saying with every modulation of his quick-witted Armenian temperament that this is one world and that Russians and Americans must live in it together.

All these things, Mr. Salisbury continues are said "in a salty language of his own" and the American audiences are reacting positively and with warmth. Through the large number of foreign correspondents covering the trip, much criticism has appeared in the European press about the "hands off" attitude of the State Department, the shameful harassment by Hungarian pickets despite President Eisenhower's appeal, and the erratic arrangements by local police; there have been acid comments about the official American attitude, and the "highest marks" to Mr. Mikoyan for maintaining his equilibrium under trying circumstances. Mr. Salisbury concludes by saying that Mr. Mikoyan has not uttered mere platitudes—

He has been advancing a consistent line for U.S.-Soviet relations. This is simply: Let us stop arguing about the past and concentrate on negotiating our way out of present difficulties.

In the midst of all this, and with a new planet in the sky to underscore Soviet power and achievements, there was at first no responsive note in Administration circles. The President's State of the Union message fell with a dull thud on a country longing for some new turn both in foreign and domestic policies, as the November elections showed. The message was a graveyard of lost opportunities. The President sang the same old anti-Communist tune; re-

ferred to our solemn obligation "to defend the people of free Berlin against any effort to destroy their freedom"; indicated that negotiations were futile "since Communists never live up to their obligations." with no answer to the great needs and opportunities of the times but a balanced budget, a greater air striking force and missile program.

New U.S. Approach on Germany?

Yet there is much to be hoped for from new pressures from the more enlightened section of the business community which has listened with such warm and sympathetic interest to Mikoyan's descriptions of trade opportunities, from an awakening American people who, hearing such reasonable and convincing words of peace from a leading Soviet statesman, have received new impetus for their peace efforts, from U.S. allies increasingly fearful of the dangers of the Administration's inflexible policies. While it is difficult to see just where accommodations can be made in the complex German problem, there are signs that the Administration is keeping the door open for some sort of negotiations. The NATO allies were willing to go along in rejecting the Soviet proposals on Berlin, but there are deep differences among them, and desires for a much more flexible policy on the part of the U.S. While Mikoyan has made clear that the Soviet Union is firm in its position that the abnormal situation of continued occupation of Berlin must be changed, he has continually asked during his trip for U.S. counter-proposals, which in itself is proof of Soviet readiness to negotiate.

The new Soviet proposal for

peace treaty with Germany, (see page 38 for resumé) with its emphasis on halting German rearmament and especially nuclear armament, its support of the Polish (Rapacki) plan for an atom-free zone in Central Europe and troop reduction, cannot but arouse the widest response among the people of Europe, who have never ceased to fear the results of a resurgence of German militarism. These fears are now heightened by the easing of former restrictions on West Germany rearming, and the current rebuilding of the Krupp and Thyssen and other industrial empires which were the backbone of Hitler's power, along with West Germany's growing economic dominance.

Despite the initial attitude of the State Department, U.S. officials have obviously regarded Mr. Mikoyan's visit as of the greatest importance, and Mr. Mikoyan has conferred with the highest Administration officials, Senators and Congressmen, trade union leaders, big business representatives and others as well as talking with workers in the factories, with Hollywood stars and many ordinary people in supermarkets and other places he has visited. Little would have been gained in any case by meetings with a few of the churlish die-hards who stayed away. Press reports have emphasized the favorable impression Mikoyan has made in all these contacts. James Reston wrote (*N.Y. Times*, Jan. 8) that he had already achieved the objective of informal bilateral conversations with the United States, which Washington had opposed in the past, and "provoked some reflection and review of U.S. policy in Germany."

After his first meeting with Secretary Dulles, which ranged over Berlin's future, the role of Germany in European security, disarmament and trade, Mikoyan characterized the talk as "very useful," and "improving the prospects for peace."

And in Mr. Dulles' press conference of January 13, the beginnings of a new approach could be detected. According to the *Times* correspondent, the Secretary "sought to leave the impression that on the basis of the Mikoyan visit the United States and its friends were taking a new look at their policies in Germany." The conference was devoted mainly to Mikoyan's visit and the German question. While terming the Soviet proposals for a German peace treaty "brutal" (agreeing with Adenauer's words) and "stupid" and sticking to U.S. opposition to the Soviet proposals, he conceded that the Soviet Union had "an understandable concern" about the future of Germany, which had to be taken into account realistically. He indicated that some formula for German reunification other than "free elections" might be found: "I wouldn't say that is the only method by which reunification should be accomplished. There are other methods." He said it was encouraging that the USSR had made clear that its proposal on Berlin was not to be considered as an ultimatum.

Mr. Dulles left the way open for negotiations in saying that while there were sharp differences as to what talks on Germany should be about, there was a common denominator "in terms of feeling that there should be discussions."

True, the Secretary and the President sought thereafter to sooth the

fears aroused by these remarks in Adenauer and others by insisting there was no change in U.S. policies—but Dulles' remarks could not have been accidental.

After the dinner given him in Washington by Eric Johnston, President of the Motion Picture Association of America (which has recently concluded an exchange arrangement with the USSR) Senator Hubert M. Humphrey (D-Minn.) told reporters he got the impression that the Russians were willing to negotiate a Berlin settlement. Mikoyan was quoted by the press as saying at the dinner:

We think there should be more contacts at all levels—from the lowest to the highest. And, in order not to spend years in trying to work out an agenda, it is best to meet without one. I think that is where we are heading. . . .

It might seem that contacts between people are a minor matter. . . . I would say that these contacts have brought about warmer winds in our cold war relations. . . .

Let us compete in having more milk and more meat and more clothing for people. And we hope you won't complain if we do catch up with you.

Mr. Mikoyan emphasized the Soviet desire for peaceful competition. He declared that the lunar rocket must not be regarded as a military threat, but as an achievement of science. He declared that Moscow regarded the ring of Western military bases around the USSR as a sign of bad intentions, as well as the planned nuclear armament of Western Germany and its inclusion in NATO, the new military threat in Iran, the supply of arms to Turkey, and certain statements by U.S. military leaders.

After a luncheon in Washington with James Carey, President of the

AFL-CIO International Union of Electrical Workers, UAW President Walter Reuther and other labor leaders (George Meany, AFL-CIO President, declined to attend), Mr. Carey reported that the import of what Mr. Mikoyan had said was "that he is trying to take the heat out of the Berlin situation and find a solution."

The Cross-Country Tour

In Cleveland, Mr. Mikoyan was the guest of Cyrus S. Eaton at a luncheon with business and financial leaders of Northern Ohio. The *N. Y. Times* reported:

Mr. Mikoyan lost no time in making clear that his primary objective was to ease tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union and thus to open the way to possible discussions of major consequence. . . .

His theme was "that the prime requisite in the world today was an end to the acerbity and tension that have marked United States-Soviet relations for years." Mr. Eaton joined in with a drive of his own to end trade restrictions between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Mr. Mikoyan said that "in one minute the fruit of the world's labor's might be destroyed by a nuclear explosion. . . . We are building and building and yet one explosion would be enough to annihilate everything."

Mr. Mikoyan was reported as praising U.S. business, its efficiency, and ways of organizing industry. A member of the audience who described himself as "just about the most anti-Communist business man you can find," remarked: "I have been following his arguments, trying to tear them to pieces. But I have decided he is telling the truth."

Before an audience of 300 of Chicago's leading lawyers, the *Times* (Jan. 10) reported that Mr. Mikoyan, answering a question from

Adlai Stevenson who was present, won a standing ovation for his "revelatory picture of inside Kremlin politics and past Soviet excesses . . . one of the frankest discussions of these subjects any Soviet statesman has made to a Western audience."

The dispatch continued:

Since the condemnation and execution of Beria in 1953, Mr. Mikoyan insisted, there has been no death sentence in the Soviet Union for what he called "political matters."

Mr. Mikoyan recalled that both Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev and he had made extensive speeches at the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party in February, 1956, denouncing the abuses of the Stalin regime.

He insisted that these abuses in the use of the police and particularly use of police methods in political matters had been substantially eliminated. . . .

Mr. Mikoyan also spoke frankly of recent serious disputes over policy, which were at first kept secret but later made public. He explained:

The essence of these disputes . . . was between forces led by Khrushchev that desired to carry out much-needed reforms, particularly in the Soviet Administrative system, and those who felt that change was impossible. Finally, he said, there had to be a decision on which road to take. This led to the ousting of Mr. Molotov and his associates.

Mr. Mikoyan praised Mr. Molotov, the report continued, but said he was very conservative and thought everything in the past good, and everything new bad. They had confidence in him as an Ambassador, as long as "he is not in a position to decide questions of reform." In conclusion, Mr. Mikoyan remarked "that the Soviet Union was not perfect, that there were defects in its governmental system. But," he said, "we think we know how to improve it and we would like to maintain

peace throughout the world to accomplish this."

In Detroit, Mr. Mikoyan toured plants of the auto and utility industries, where he talked with many workers and in the evening met with the top brass of Ford, GM, Chrysler and other industries.

In California, the new Democratic Governor Edmund G. Brown, was the first state officer to give Mr. Mikoyan an official welcome. In a press conference in San Francisco, Mr. Mikoyan won applause for his relaxed attitude toward the vicious rock- and tomato-hurling and spitting crowds of Hungarian pickets, who he said were simply "ridiculous" and "did not represent the American people." He expressed the hope that the United States and the Soviet Union might reach agreement for a ban on nuclear weapon testing, as the first big step toward a new and more friendly relationship. He declared this was one point where a real start could be made "to find a common language."

The New York Visit

Returning to the East, it became apparent that the deep and favorable impact Mr. Mikoyan had made during his trip had caused the Administration and the most influential American leaders to revise their earlier hands-off attitude to the trip as "unofficial" and to look upon the discussions with Mikoyan as the most serious American-Soviet talks in years. Careful and thoroughgoing security arrangements were made to protect the Soviet Deputy Premier from the hostile demonstrations of Hungarian émigré groups, which had aroused the indignation of decent Americans.

Mr. Mikoyan spent two very busy and successful days in New York. He began with an early morning complete tour of Macy's Department store, where as everywhere he has gone, he showed the greatest interest in American merchandise, and Americans ways. Then came a luncheon with a group of leading Wall Street bankers, arranged by Howard C. Shepherd, chairman of the First National City Bank at the suggestion of Robert W. Dowling, president of the City Investing Program, who has been active in carrying out the official cultural interchange program with the USSR. There was much talk of trade as well as frank discussion of general issues in American-Soviet relations. One of the participants said that Mr. Mikoyan had given a "virtuoso" performance and "had made a powerful impression." Later, at the home of former Governor Averell Harriman, he met with many of the richest and most influential men of the United States. In the evening, more than a thousand persons attended a dinner for Mr. Mikoyan held by the Economic Club at the Waldorf Astoria. At the dinner he made a plea for an end to "Nyet, Nyet, Nyet" (No, No, No) in American-Soviet relations, and the introduction of "Da, da, da" (Yes, yes, yes) instead. He said his journey had convinced him that neither ordinary Americans nor business men wanted war. "Let us live and let live," he urged. This, the *New York Times* said, was his strongest public affirmation of his belief that both the American people and American business want peace.

The following day, Mr. Mikoyan, with Soviet Ambassador Menshikov, had a private luncheon with four

representatives of the American Jewish Committee, including former Sen. Herbert H. Lehman and Irving M. Engle, President of the Committee. At the luncheon, the question was raised about the rumor of a forced resettlement of Jews in the Autonomous Region of Birobidzhan. Mr. Lehman later announced that he had been authorized by Mr. Mikoyan to state that the rumor was without foundation.

In the late afternoon Mr. Mikoyan addressed the largest group that had ever attended a Council on Foreign Relations Meeting. This was followed by a private dinner given for Mr. Mikoyan by Mr. Dowling, attended by members of the Committee for Economic Development, where Mr. Mikoyan promised that an exchange of economists between the Soviet Union and the United States would take place.

The biggest event of the day was the visit and press conference at UN headquarters.

The UN Press Conference

After a private talk with Secretary General Dag Hammarskjöld, Mr. Mikoyan answered questions for more than an hour at an overflow meeting with the press at UN headquarters, presided over by Soviet UN delegate Arkady A. Sobolev.

Asked whether his proposal of a new policy of "yes, yes, yes," instead of "no, no, no" might be implemented by Soviet participation in the UN committee for the exploration of outer space for peaceful purposes, Mr. Mikoyan declared that his country was eager to see that the fruits of scientific exploration should become available to all mankind and was eager to cooperate with the UN

on this issue. The difficulty, however, was that the composition of the proposed committee would place the Soviet Union and the socialist states in a perpetual minority, to which they could not acquiesce. He said that out of 18 members, 12 were participants of military blocks such as NATO and SEATO; neutral countries were given three seats, and the socialist countries the same.

On the question of Algeria, Mr. Mikoyan emphasized the sympathy of the USSR in its struggle for liberation and for the Provisional Government of Algeria. He expressed the hope that the French Government would find the way to a peaceful settlement and satisfaction of the legitimate aspirations of the Algerian people, which would be of benefit to France itself and declared that the UN "could play a signal role in exerting influence in this spirit."

To a question on whether diplomatic efforts to establish peace are really worthwhile when mankind is doomed anyway, Mr. Mikoyan responded:

I am rather more of an optimist. I think mankind will not perish, and if all of us make good efforts there will be peace, and not war. Of course the danger of war is a serious one. . . . There is an armaments race; there is a "cold war" which can ever turn into a "hot" one. Therefore, we have to start out by liquidating the "cold war" and seek, with all the possibilities available to mankind, a restoration of confidence; if not full confidence, at least the measure of confidence which would make peaceful coexistence possible. . . .

There can be disagreements between peoples and there can be disagreements and divergencies between nations. This is not where the danger lies. The danger arises when there are attempts to resolve differences by using force as an instru-

ment, by seeking to foist one's will on the other party instead of by looking for an acceptable basis for a solution, a basis which would take into account the interests of all the parties involved.

On the prospects for early agreement on the suspension of nuclear tests, Mr. Mikoyan said that in essence "This is a question which is almost ready for solution, and this would be a signal step forward." He spoke of U.S. doubts whether controls could be effective despite the findings of the Geneva experts and the fact that both the U.S. and the USSR had managed to detect each other's explosions, and also the U.S. position that all decisions of the control body must be by majority vote, which would leave the USSR always in the minority. Finally, he said, the USSR wanted the prohibition of testing to cover all time and all peoples, whereas the Western countries wanted a one-year prohibition only, which would need no treaty since a year is require anyway for preparation of new tests. He added:

But I think the Americans will find it difficult to stop these negotiations without the achievement of any results, because world opinion is well informed and will condemn them, and I do not think the U.S. Government will wish to be condemned by world public opinion in so ticklish and so obvious a question as the cessation of atomic tests.

Answering a question regarding the attitude of the USSR toward Arab nationalism and Arab unity, Mr. Mikoyan declared that both were considered by his country as progressive movements, "designed to emancipate the Arabs from the colonial yoke, to achieve independence and to bring about the flowering of previously oppressed peoples."

To a query as to whether in stress-

ing American-Soviet cooperation Mr. Mikoyan meant that the world's problems should be dealt with primarily by the two big powers rather than the UN, Mr. Mikoyan responded:

We do not want two powers to solve issues that affect other powers, nor do we want to divide the Americans from their allies or get them to quarrel, just as no one will succeed in dividing us from our allies or getting us to quarrel. We do not wish agreements with one country to the detriment of other countries. We want just and equitable relations. However, this does not exclude the leaders of two states or three states from discussing questions of interest. The main point is that the objectives should be the reduction of tension and the improvement of relations, rather than the intensification of the "cold war."

Asked his views on some kind of meeting on Berlin and the German question, and on what level it should be held, Mr. Mikoyan said:

You know that for a long time we have advocated a conference at the highest level. Our partners sidestep this conference either by raising the issue of the level or the agenda. Getting together on the agenda takes years, and the years keep running by and the agenda still does not seem to emerge. . . . I do not think that a conference can be eschewed. One can sidestep it for a while, but it is bound to take place eventually when, it is difficult for me to guess.

When a correspondent asked him whether his discovery that Wall Street is inhabited by "peace mongers" implied a theoretical revision, Mr. Mikoyan said that in his case theory and practice did not diverge. He was of course pleased to hear business men express the desire for peace, yet while he had heard many expressions in favor of disarmament, he had heard no one say that they wanted to reduce the production of

weapons. "Their theory will have to be verified on the basis of practice the facts of life." He continued:

We cannot, after all, ignore the fact that the "cold war" is being fostered from the United States. No one will deny that American bases around our country . . . are being strengthened. West Germany, which was defeated in our common war, is being equipped with atomic weapons directed against an ally. All of this is bound to cause suspicion, and to cause the Soviet leaders to be cautious and vigilant.

With regard to Mr. Dulles' comment that the U.S. considers its own scheme for the reunification of Germany through free elections as not necessarily the only one, Mr. Mikoyan was asked whether the USSR felt that its own plan of confederation was not the only one. Mr. Mikoyan replied:

The Dulles statement was an interesting one, but he did not come up with a constructive alternative proposal. I regard our proposal as an excellent one. No one has so far come up with a better one.

As to what issues might now be soluble in terms representing the interests of both parties, Mr. Mikoyan declared:

I do not think it is possible to turn overnight all "nyet, nyet, nyets" into "da, da, das." One night is not capable of effecting such a revolution. There will have to be meetings and there will have to be willingness by the parties to achieve agreement; but things may be moving in that direction. Visits by American representatives to the Soviet Union, cultural relations with our people, all this serves to create a warmer atmosphere, and the warmer atmosphere is capable of creating conditions for confidence. This work for peace and confidence has to go on without sparing efforts.

When Mr. Mikoyan was ques-

tioned as to whether, being a Marxist, "for whom evidently capitalism is enemy No. 1," he really saw a possibility of cooperation and co-existence between the US and the USSR, he responded:

Of course, we consider communism to be better than capitalism. But capitalism exists; it is extant and it has had substantial successes in America—serious ones. It has been successful in other countries to some extent, but especially in America.

He declared that other countries had taken the road of capitalism and had become great as a result. But Communism had brought his country from misery and weakness to being a great country, and the great people of China had turned itself into a Socialist country and become great, although Americans know little about it. He continued:

Communism is growing and is successful and will continue along that road. But we know that only war could hamper our forward development. . . .

Capitalism will continue so long as the people of the country involved tolerate or support that system. As soon as the people see that this system does not help or is not good for them, they will alter it; they will overthrow it. Our people do not need or want to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries, but we do not want other countries to interfere in our internal affairs either.

Competition and peaceful coexistence are better than war and the danger of war. The Americans today have a higher standard of living than ours. We also want a high standard of living. We would like to overtake the Americans but surely this is no threat to you. Why should you not want us to live well also? In fact, whether you like it or not, we are going to live well of our own accord.

Therefore let us compete with and emulate each other. Our success in improving the life of our people will also be of service to the popular masses of the capitalist countries, because when

life improves, as it is doing swiftly in our country, the workers and people in other countries will see that; and capitalists, in order not to lose power in their own countries, will improve the condition of their workers' lives. . . . Therefore let us continue along these lines and compete with and emulate each other.

Talks with Eisenhower and Dulles

Returning to Washington, Mr. Mikoyan conferred at length with Mr. Dulles and attended a working dinner with the Secretary of State, Vice President Richard Nixon and an extraordinary assortment of high Administration officials. During the day there was a luncheon meeting with Senate leaders, most of them members of the Foreign Relations Committee, where special attention was given to the question of Germany and Berlin. While some of the Senators made rather surly statements, Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D-Minn) said he thought there were signs of flexibility in Mr. Mikoyan's discussions of Germany, and Senator J. W. Fulbright, (D-Ark.) found him "most conciliatory." Senator Fulbright said that in discussing the Soviet proposal for making Western Berlin a free city, Mr. Mikoyan had mentioned a mutual 500-mile withdrawal of foreign troops, guarantees of free access to the city from the West, and free elections in West Berlin; he also said the UN might participate in overseeing the Berlin agreement, or, if preferred, an international commission could be selected for the purpose.

The next day in Washington Mr. Mikoyan spent an hour and 45 minutes with President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles. Mr. Mikoyan said there had been "a useful exchange

of views," but no negotiations. "We did not conduct negotiations," he said "but rather tried to find out what the positions of our countries were on various international questions." The President and the Secretary concurred in the view that the talks had been useful.

White House Press Secretary Hagerty said that among the subjects discussed had been Berlin, Germany, disarmament, increased trade and the increased freer exchange of persons between the U.S. and the USSR. The Soviet deputy premier conveyed to the President on behalf of Soviet Premier Khrushchev "best wishes for his good health and success on the road for better relations between our two countries." In turn, the President asked him to convey "similar warm greetings" to Mr. Khrushchev.

MEANWHILE there are hot-and-cold reports from Geneva on further progress being made by the conferees on the ending of nuclear weapons tests. A recent White House announcement, however, to the effect that a panel of seismologists had concluded that underground tests are not as easy to detect as the earlier Geneva conference of experts had found, is a disquieting hint that some AEC scientists who want tests to continue, are trying to torpedo the Geneva Conference. The Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy held a three-day secret hearing in December on this question. It was reported that Dr. Hans Bethe, member of the President's Science Advisory Committee, testified at the hearing that it was still possible to develop an effective atomic test inspection system. Mr. Dulles at his press conference said

it was too early as yet to evaluate the new findings of the seismologists and that permission of small weapon tests underground was a "fall-back" position that had been considered by the United States.

These hints of new obstacles to agreement indicate that new pressures are in order by American peace forces concerned with the ending of all tests. The National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, which on October 31 last issued an appeal, signed by leading international figures headed by Albert Schweitzer, "To the Men at Geneva" to reach agreement on ending tests, continues its campaign in this direction. On December 30 the American Association for the Advancement of Science adopted a resolution at its annual meeting calling for East-West agreement on suspension of tests. On January 12 a group of 42 prominent Americans appealed to the 86th Congress calling for a reappraisal of U.S. foreign policy, including an end to nuclear weapons tests and the arms race. Among its signers were Dr. John A. Mackay, president of Princeton Theological Seminary; Clarence Pickett, honorary secretary of the American Friends Service Committee; Lewis Mumford; Eleanor Roosevelt; Brig. Gen. Hugh N. Hester, USA (ret); Prof. C. Wright Mills of Columbia University; Erich Fromm, psychoanalyst and writer.

We believe that the visit of Anastas Mikoyan brings new impetus to all who are concerned with ending the cold war, ending nuclear weapons tests, finding a common ground on ending the menace of a rearmed Germany, and other steps toward insuring human survival in these dangerous and yet so hopeful times.

The Accra Conference

by ESLANDA ROBESON

I FINALLY WAS ABLE to attend an African Conference. I missed all the five Pan-African Conferences held over the years in England, France, Belgium. And I missed the Afro-Asian Conference at Bandung. But happily I was able to attend the All African Peoples Conference at Accra, Ghana, December 5-12, and it turned out to be the most important of all the conferences for Africa. For the first time in modern history Africans from North, East, Central, South and West Africa met in conference on African soil to discuss African Affairs.

The official delegates to the conference represented trade unions and political parties of every shade from all parts of Africa. There were also fraternal delegates, observers and representatives of the press from all over the world. Interestingly, the United States sent more observers than any other country—more than 30, eleven of whom were Negroes. Perhaps Americans did not want to miss the boat at Accra, as they did at Bandung. Strangely enough, the N.A.A.C.P. did not send a representative, and there was no official American message to the conference. Messages of greeting, good wishes, encouragement to the conference were sent by Premiers Khrushchev, Chou En-lai, Nehru and many other leaders of Government, and were received by the conference assembled with enthusiastic and grateful applause. Mr. Nixon's "personal" mes-

sage to Prime Minister Kwame Nkrumah—not to the conference—certainly did not rate as an official greeting.

At the conference there were plenary sessions which were open to everyone, but the five committees in which the important discussions and business took place were held in closed sessions, with only official delegates admitted.

The slogans of the Conference were revealing. *Down with colonialism and imperialism. Down with tribalism. Africa must be free*, etc. This denunciation of tribalism interested me very much, and when I inquired into it I found that Africans are determined to put an end to inter-tribal hostility, the corruption of chieftainship, but wanted to preserve the best aspects of tribal organization—the communal ownership and collective working of the land, and the practical and moral influence of responsible chiefs.

Prime Minister Nkrumah pointed out that in the vast rural sections of Africa ancient communalism still exists today, and that Africans will be wise to build a modern Pan African socialism upon this old and firm foundation. Mr. Nkrumah declared that Africans would adopt and adapt those aspects of other ways-of-life which they find suitable, and reject those which they do not need nor want.

It was fascinating to observe the disruptive activity at the Accra Con-

ference. Most of it was carried on by white westerners, sometimes directly, sometimes through the few but obvious African mouthpieces they could find. Westerners were notably friendly with opposition parties—the old divide-and-rule policy. Westerners also tried to suggest and foment serious rivalry between Nasser and Nkrumah for the leadership of Africa. To most Africans this was uninteresting. Everyone knows that Nasser's primary preoccupation is with the Arab world. These preoccupations, amounting almost to passions, will keep them very busy for some time to come, and there is no important rivalry between them now, so far as one can see.

Africans assembled at Accra decided that all two hundred million of them will unite, consult and co-operate closely in "positive action for independence now" for all Africa. They hope this positive action will be non-violent, but they said clearly that the character of the struggle will naturally depend upon the attitude and activity of the colonial powers. They declared that Africans will not "turn the other cheek," and that "if you hit us, we may hit back." How effective will non-violence be against the brutality and viciousness of France in Algeria and Cameroons, against white settlers in Kenya and South Africa? These were questions in the minds of Africans at Accra.

As usual I was disappointed over the absence of women at the Accra Conference. There were only eight official women delegates, and only two women addressed the plenary sessions. Mrs. Martha Ouandie told the terrible story of French colonialism now rampant in Cameroons,

and Shirley Graham Du Bois read the clear, forceful, constructive message to the conference from her husband, Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois, father of the Pan-African movement.

I spoke to the women at the conference, and to the women's organization in Accra about the lack of women delegates to the conference. They agreed that this was a sign of backwardness, that women in Africa do participate in all the freedom struggles, and that therefore they should be duly represented in force at all conferences. A whole population cannot be properly mobilized if half of it is officially ignored.

Africans are now stepping out in Africa. They know, more than any foreigners, from direct personal experience, what Africans need and want.

Africans plan to assert, as from now, a new African personality in world affairs and at world forums, and above all this African personality will express an independent sovereign African people. For too long now the colonial powers have spoken for Africa, in the name of Africa. White Frenchmen, Britons, Belgians have "represented" Africa. Recently, noting the trend of world affairs, the colonial powers have brought out their African Uncle Toms, these black would-be Frenchmen, Britons, etc., the especially trained black "elite" to speak for Africa.

But as from the Accra Conference, Africans, not French, British etc., Africans—will speak for Africa, and we shall hear the authentic voice of the African People. And Africans plan, for all of Africa, government of, and by the African people. Africa is on her way.

Jewish Life in the USSR

by MANDEL TERMAN

In October, 1958, the author of this article, a Chicago businessman and Chairman of the Chicago Council of American-Soviet Friendship, visited the Soviet Union as the guest of the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries and its Chairman, Nina Popova. Mr. Terman's full report of his trip is being published in the January issue of the Chicago Council's Bulletin, "Friendship."

The whole report is of great interest. Mr. Terman was deeply impressed by the strong desire for peace and friendship with the United States he found everywhere he went in the USSR. He noted the overwhelming approval of the Soviet people for the cultural exchange program agreed upon in January, 1958, by the late Soviet Ambassador to Washington, Georgi Zarubin, and Ambassador William B. Lacy of the U.S. State Department.

AS AN American Jew long active in the Jewish community in Chicago, and disturbed by the numerous reports circulating here about alleged discrimination and cultural repression affecting Soviet Jews, I concentrated intensely on Jewish life in the USSR. I learned Jews are not discriminated against in any walk of life. I learned that Jewish cultural expression exists and is growing, though still suffering from the after-effects of the oppression during the latter days of Beria and Stalin, an oppression which affected all Soviet citizens and especially the national minorities.

I arrived in the Soviet Union with a Gallup-type poll on language habits and desires in my briefcase, as

Through many interviews with ordinary Soviet citizens as well as officials, Mr. Terman found great progress in Soviet living standards along with many difficulties, especially in housing. Yet while the Soviet people are not satisfied with their present living standards, they look forward with confidence to great advances under the new Seven-Year Plan, especially in solving the present housing shortage.

In discussing questions of Soviet foreign trade Mr. Terman was struck with the huge contracts the USSR is now negotiating with many foreign countries and the benefits our country is losing by holding back on the establishment of normal trade relations.

Believing that our readers will be especially interested in Mr. Terman's findings on Jewish life in the USSR, we are publishing below the full text of this section of his report.

well as a whole series of questions and accusations from various Jewish groups and organizations in the U.S.

Typical of what I found was Moscow University. There I taped an interview with Deputy Rector Leo Kalinin. He said that racial or religious quotas are completely alien to a socialist society. He stated that more than 9 per cent of the student body were of Jewish nationality and that approximately 18 per cent of the faculty were Jews. He named many prominent professors among them, and said that the whole charge of quotas was "a deliberate falsehood spread by the enemies of the Soviet Union." Jews constitute 1 to 1½ per cent of the Soviet population.

When I asked Kalinin on what he based his figures, he pointed out that everyone in the Soviet Union carried an identification card ("passport") on which they state their nationality. He, as did many others, stated that the question of nationality is used strictly for statistical purposes. Students, he pointed out, are selected on the basis of qualifications.

I went into the marble foyers of the University with Mr. Kalinin's assistant and stopped every student and faculty member I saw who appeared Jewish, and asked them whether they had experienced any discrimination, and was assured that never in their lives had this been the case.

There is a widespread charge that Soviet Jews are forced to put "Yevrai" ("Jewish") or even the insulting term "Zhid" on their identity cards as their nationality. I found among the many Jews I asked about this, that a large percentage, even those non-religious and culturally assimilated, do put "Yevrai" down. Of course the stories about the use of "Zhid" are pure fantasy. Since the question asked is "nationality?" and everyone in the USSR states their nationality, some Jews consider themselves Russian, Ukrainin, Byelorussian, etc., and so state on their cards, as I saw with my own eyes. Everyone affirmed that the matter is completely voluntary, up to the individual.

I asked Ilya Ehrenburg about this when I visited him, and he said that he could best state his feelings in the words of Julian Tuwim, a Polish Jewish poet: "Why do I say I am a Jew? Because of my blood! But wait a moment, I am speaking of different

blood than you. There is blood that flows in veins. But there is blood which runs out of veins into the rivers and gutters. It is because of this blood that I speak as a Jew."

Ehrenburg continued, "Here, in our passports, are asked questions of nationality. I am an internationalist. I don't know or speak Yiddish.

"My parents spoke Yiddish, so I can understand a little. I grew up in Russia. The first word I spoke was in Russian. And the first words of love I spoke were in Russian. But I put in my passport, 'Yevrai,' and will stop doing so when the last anti-Semite perishes from this earth. I told you all this because I see the future of Soviet Jews in assimilation, but only on one condition: that is if the dignity of all Jewish people will be respected."

One of the most widely discussed questions about Soviet Jewish life is that of Yiddish culture. I took with me a poll form on which I entered the occupation of each person questioned and answers as to whether they speak Yiddish, read Yiddish, and want Yiddish publications. To further test the last point, I distributed many Yiddish publications from America. Of the hundreds of Jews I met, I used the questionnaire 182 times.

The results on the cultural questions were embarrassingly like those that would be obtained in a similar poll in New York or Chicago. Thirty-five of the 182 spoke Yiddish; 92 could not speak it at all; and 55 had a smattering. Twenty-five could read Yiddish; 149 could not read it at all; and eight could read a little. Twenty wanted Yiddish publications; the rest were indiffer-

ent or negative. A solid bloc of 10 votes from the Moscow Synagogue make up 40 per cent of the 25 persons able to read Yiddish. A ratio of 20 desiring Yiddish publications out of 182 polled, applied to approximately 2,500,000 Jews in the USSR, gives a possibly inflated potential readership of about a quarter of a million.

In a conversation with the famed Yiddish poet, Samuel Galkin, he said he preferred having his works published in Russian because that way they can reach 200,000,000 people.

Boris Polevoi, Secretary of the Union of Soviet Writers, showed me 25 different titles of books by Yiddish authors recently published in Russian in a total of well over a million copies and asked me if I would prefer to see Yiddish authors' works read by everyone in the Soviet Union in Russian or perhaps published in Yiddish in a few thousand copies. I assured him that, speaking for progressive people everywhere, I was happy to see this. But I added that I felt a government that has prided itself on preserving and even restoring and creating the cultures and literatures of minority peoples, should be gracious enough to print 3,000 copies of, say, Sholem Aleichem's "Bewitched Tailor" in Yiddish as well as the 225,000 copies already published in Russian and English.

Polevoi told me of the Yiddish theaters now functioning in Bukovina and Birobidzhan, and the Yiddish newspaper and other publications in the latter Autonomous Region, where courts and schools are also conducted in Yiddish.

While I was in Moscow, I called

and wired the editor of the "Birobidzhaner Shtern," the region's newspaper, requesting Yiddish material published there, which I hope to receive in the near future.

As I related earlier, there is a lively interest in Yiddish singers and performers throughout the Soviet Union. I brought home with me many of the large posters (mostly in Russian, but partly in Yiddish), announcing recitals of Yiddish songs, poetry, stories, humor, dances, etc. (Previously Mr. Terman had reported on the many Yiddish theatrical ensembles currently touring towns and cities of the USSR—in 1957, over 3,000 Yiddish performances had been given, with a total audience of approximately 3,000,000.)

I visited the Leningrad, Moscow and Kiev synagogues. The religious life, I found, is free and unrestricted, and in fact in Leningrad I saw the synagogue being reconditioned with a 400,000-ruble government subsidy. The president of the Leningrad synagogue told me: "Tell the Jews in America to stop worrying about the Jews in the Soviet Union. We are happy and enjoy complete freedom. We are concerned with the bombing of the two temples in your country recently. This could not happen here."

In Moscow I arrived at the synagogue just as services were ending, and the cantor and about 30 of the congregation members returned to the altar and the cantor did part of the service over so that I could tape record it and take it back to America. He also made a fervent plea to American Jews to struggle for peace and friendship between our countries.

In Kiev, where over 90,000 Jews

were murdered by the Nazis and 72,000 lie in a mass grave at Babi Yar, I was deeply moved by Mr. Bartok, the president of the synagogue, as he told me of the tremendous loss and of the Jews' well-being today in Kiev. He made an eloquent plea, which I also have on tape, for American Jews to stop cooperating with those who are promoting hatred against the Soviet Union. He pointed out that this can only lead to tension and the possibilities of a third world war, and if that war should ever come, no Jew anywhere would be spared atomic death.

My own conclusion from what I have experienced in America and what I learned in the Soviet Union, is that anti-Semitism and crimes against Jews and other minorities thrive on cold war tension and hysteria—witness frame-ups of Jewish cultural leaders in the Soviet Union under Beria and the Rosenbergs at home, all under the guise of “protecting the security of the state”—and that only in a world at peace can Jewish life flourish, or even survive.

I presented a list of my own questions and a copy of the B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation League bulletin “Anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union” to a Soviet authority on nationality matters, Mikhail Kammari, editor of “Problems of Philosophy” and a member of the Philosophical Section of the Academy of Sciences. He assured me that the questions and the ADL document would both be studied by a competent group of specialists called together for this purpose, and that a manuscript of their report would be sent to me prior to its publica-

tion. I am looking forward with great anticipation to this report, which promises to be of considerable importance in clearing the atmosphere. Kammari, as did every other prominent person I interviewed, gave me a long and impressive list of Jews in leading positions in his field, which I have on my tapes.

Just to give my readers a hint of how Soviet Jews make a living, here are the first 25 occupations in my poll: photographer, reporter, chemist, hotel clerk, Intourist guide, assistant school principal, language teacher, geologist, Intourist clerk, chief railway inspector, teacher, doctor, construction engineer, department store section manager, teacher, housewife, upholsterer, restaurant hostess, auto mechanics teacher, chemistry teacher, math teacher, physics teacher, student, professor of geology, professor of chemistry. I might add colonels and generals, cab drivers and factory workers, the director of the Sochi Circus and famed ballerina Maya Plisetskaya, and many, many more.

My persistent questioning was sometimes downright embarrassing. For example, at the Stalingrad hydro project, I barged in early one morning with the deputy mayor of the city. The top engineers of this huge project, employing 32,000 people, were in a huddle, red-eyed and unshaven after a sleepless night spent solving installation problems on the second turbine. A request was made for a cable car to carry us across the Volga. Seeing that the chief of the project was preoccupied and disturbed by our intrusion, I motioned to my host that we should leave. At this point, the big, burly chief engineer stopped his discus-

sion and came over to me and said "Pozhaluista." And then added, "I didn't mean to be rude." At this point I took the opportunity to ask him "How many Jews do you employ on this project?" He looked astonished and said, "How should I know? We don't ask what a man's nationality is when we hire him. All we want to know is if he's got brains," and he pointed to his head. "And besides," he added, "I'm a Jew!" His name was Malinsky.

I came to the Soviet Union as a friend, and I departed firmly convinced that the cause of American-Soviet friendship to which I have devoted myself with all my heart through the years is the noblest and most important task of my life. As a result of my visit, I am determined to redouble my efforts to build a lasting peace and genuine friend-

ship between the people and government of my country and the people and government of the USSR. I am convinced beyond a shadow of doubt that every display of friendship towards the Soviets will be returned to us with interest.

Let us all do everything in our power to help create the conditions in which our great people and their peace-loving people can work together in peaceful, constructive harmony and thereby create a world of joy and abundance for all.

MANDEL A. TERMAN is Chairman of the Chicago Council of American-Soviet Friendship and President and administrator of the Waveland Manor Convalescent Home. He is also President of the Chicago Nursing Home Association; a director of the Louis Harrison Lodge of B'nai B'rith and on the executive committee of the Midwest Jewish Council.

WILLIAM SAROYAN IN THE USSR

"I FOLLOWED THE CROWD, the endless crowd of pedestrians (in Moscow) whom I never saw in any city of the old world. These people don't make haste running after imaginary business, they don't gape before shop windows, they don't stand around chatting—expecting some nod of Fortune. They are very sure of themselves, proud of their city, polite and available for a talk. They know they have attained something and are more willingly than in many old nations disposed to share their achievements and their knowledge with other peoples. They speak very openly, they know lots of thing about our world and still want to know more. They honestly believe in human capacities, they respect truth and fidelity, they love their work.

"This is perhaps the reason for the numerous discoveries and improvements of these people, who also understand how to keep their smile and good mood. All that needs more profound consideration, but I am sure this week I really saw good-humored people, people worshipping one faith—faith in themselves, faith in man. 'To be a man sounds proudly'—these words of Gorky seem to me to be the most quoted in the Soviet country. I saw also an abundance of culture. . . . I shall come back again—during the spring—with my 15-year-old son Aram, this time for a longer period."

From *Moscow News*, Oct. 22, 1958

A Look at the People's Communes

by ELSIE FAIRFAX-CHOLMELEY

AFTER LIVING in Peking for seven years, I left last June for a vacation in England. The year previous to my departure had been one of hot open debate by the whole Chinese people. They were allowed to have their say unhampered and it became clear where the many stood, and where the few. As a result there was a much closer idea of the essence of socialism. A new closeness in working relations between the Communist Party and the people at large had laid the ground for a big leap forward in industrial and agricultural production. All through the winter of 1957-58, tremendous work had been done in every field and in particular, 100 million people daily had been busily engaged in digging rural water conservancy works. The results of this battle against nature were staggering: winter wheat, which in China is harvested in May, had reached 34.45 million tons, 68 per cent more than in 1957. The advance in agriculture stimulated industry, and industrial targets were being revised again and again.

I left China with the current slogan: "We shall catch up with Britain in the output of steel and other im-

portant industrial products in fifteen years," ringing in my ears, and a happy feeling that the old, backward, poverty-stricken China was indeed being changed at a phenomenal rate. But I was completely unprepared for the tremendous and universal transformations which took place in the four months that I was away.

The day I returned to Peking at the end of October, my Chinese teacher came to see me. He is an old-fashioned man, a devout Catholic who has never traveled beyond the city limits farther than his bicycle will take him in a day. "You don't know what has happened," he beamed. "Food is now free in the countryside. There are people's communes and we are going to have them here too."*

This was staggering. Food becoming the free right of all, like air, where in the old days the only thing that millions of people had to look forward to each year was starvation! It seemed like a dream. What my teacher had reported was the current talk of the town. But the actual situation, of course, was not so simple as these few words indicate. It was one of the whole country of 650

ELSIE FAIRFAX-CHOLMELEY who now lives and works in Peking, was correspondent in China of the London "Daily Telegraph" during the Sino-Japanese war. She is the wife of Israel Epstein.

* In its Resolution on the People's Communes, the plenary session of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, (Nov. 28-Dec. 10 '58) noted that more complex conditions in the cities made it advisable to "wait a bit" before establishing urban communes, until they could be based on the rich experience gained in the countryside and everyone could be convinced of their usefulness. The Resolution also declared that a part wage system would have to continue for some time to come.

million in a kaleidoscopic pattern of change, united in principle but as endlessly varied in detail as local initiative could make it. Some of the new communes, it seemed, had voted a distribution system of half supply and half wages, the supply half covering all or part of the food. Others had introduced a complete wage system—the first time such a thing had happened in agriculture—or retained the old method of payment for labor through a system of daily work points.

The merging of farm co-ops into people's communes had come as a natural step in socialist advance, following the reaping of huge crops and the increased political consciousness of the people after the rectification movement debates. The commune is a new form on a bigger scale than the cooperative and not confined to agriculture, but merging farming, industry, education and culture, and military affairs into an integrated, democratic unit, speeding the building of socialism in China and preparing the way for a gradual transition to communism. There were, I found, no rules and regulations to be followed by the whole country although the tentative regulations of the first commune to be established—the Weihsing (Sputnik) People's Commune in Honan—were widely publicized for reference. In some cases a whole county has been organized into a single unit; in others several communes in a county have been linked into a federation covering the whole.

Two weeks after my return, I left by train for Ankuo, a county with a population of 420,700 in west Hopei province. The former farm cooperatives that had been there

had, at the end of August changed into people's communes. It was to find out exactly how this had come about; how it worked, that I made the trip. This briefly is the story.

The Story of Ankuo County

Ankuo County, with nearly 158,000 acres of farmland and 92,876 households, lies at the western edge of the vast north China plain. Year after year through the centuries it had suffered from terrible spring droughts and autumn floods because although there was an annual rainfall of 600 mm., it all fell in July and August. It was one of China's typically poor agricultural regions before the liberation, with an average yield of staple food crops (grain and sweet potatoes) of no more than between 5 and 6 cwt. an acre.

Liberation in 1949 had meant to the peasants land freed from feudal shackles. Under the new system, they were gradually able to increase production by pooling their labor through the formation first of mutual aid teams (which became nationwide in 1952) and later of socialist farm cooperatives—a process completed in 1955-56. Apart from better organization of field work, campaigns were launched for the sinking of irrigation wells, collection of fertilizer, improvement of farm techniques and development of sidelines. All this involved not only tremendously hard physical work, but a huge effort in education. At each step there were those who held back, fearing that they might personally lose out and whose doubts were fanned by some of the ex-landlords and ex-rich peasants who were always ready to start rumors and sabotage. It was only through in-

tense discussion and debate and a variety of organizational and economic measures, under Communist Party leadership, that the collective was gradually welded together, that the vast majority of peasants became convinced that only in the building of socialism could they have any future.

The results were shown in the 1957 harvest when the average grain yield reached well over 27 cwt. per acre. This marked the point where Ankuo changed from a grain importing county to one with a considerable surplus for supply to other places. Two-thirds of the cooperatives had reached a standard of living and production equal to that of a pre-liberation rich middle peasant. This was a great achievement because there had been two of the worst floods in history during 1954 and 1956, as a result of which the grain yield slid down almost to the pre-liberation level and four-fifths of the houses in the southern part of the county were totally destroyed.

A new record harvest in 1957 and publication by the Communist Party in October of a draft program for agricultural development inspired the co-op farmers to strive for even bigger yields in 1958. They increased the winter wheat acreage by three and a half times. An intensive winter program covering the whole county—part of the nationwide effort in water conservancy—was mapped out. It included the building of 300 reservoirs, an increase in the number of wells with mechanical pumps from 38 to 1,391, and the digging of many ponds. Land once waterlogged was drained. Plowing on 70,000 acres was deepened from the former five or six inches to one foot,

in preparation for spring sowing. Huge quantities of green manure, pond mud, sewage and other fertilizer were amassed in the same winter. Experimental plots were prepared. They called for digging up the earth to a depth of five feet and adding bottom fertilizer at the rate of 60 tons an acre. The whole program was tremendously bold.

The reward exceeded all expectations. The average yield of staple crops soared to 155 cwt. an acre, nearly six times the 1957 average. On the plot of winter wheat (the lowest yielding of the grain crops) the yield was equivalent to fifteen tons an acre. (This plot was about $\frac{1}{3}$ of an acre in area.)

But new methods of cultivation with all the work they required had brought new problems. Where there had once been a surplus of labor in the countryside, there was now a shortage; mechanization meant the establishment of local industries; and there were growing demands for all kinds of commodities. The co-operative form was no longer adequate, water conservancy, the planting of crops on the land best suited for them, rational allocation of labor, and the building of local industries, required larger units of unified management.

Already in Ankuo during the winter of 1957 the scale and scope of cooperation had extended beyond the limits of individual co-ops. A hundred thousand peasants had worked on water conservancy projects and helped to sow and reap on land other than their own. In the spring 70,000 peasants from various cooperatives had banded together to deepen a river bed and build new canals connecting with farmland.

Early last fall, three villages had pooled their labor to establish a pig farm with 5,000 pigs. Other villages had joined together to found a new "Red and Expert College"—giving both political and technical education. Two large-scale farm tool repair shops had been set up by the co-ops in two of the townships.

Thus the productive forces had outstripped the relations of production. In the minds of everybody concerned, the co-ops began to show that they could not cope adequately with the bigger economic perspectives. The way to the communes had been opened.

First Communes Are Formed

At the beginning of August, Mao Tse-tung visited Ankuo and discussed the new problems and solutions for them with the co-op leaders and members. Immediately after he left 3,000 people in one township went to the local Party Committee with the request that a commune be organized. Mass meetings and demonstrations followed rapidly in every district. On August 27, 315 co-ops were merged into eight communes under one federation, and the federation in its turn began to perform many of the duties of the old county government. Each commune had an average of 11,000 households and 20,000 acres of farmland. Each had special organs and plans for the development of local industry, education and commerce, a militia headquarters, etc.

The spur the commune form gave to development and production was immediate. It was like the breakthrough of fast flowing water after an obstructing dam has been removed. In the month following the

establishment of the communes, 1,597 small chemical fertilizer plants had been built—in ways recommended by the government—and already produced half a million tons of products. By the end of the second month there were 60 new pig farms, with an average of 2,000 animals in each. Facilities for education had taken a leap with the establishment of 22 new middle schools and 12 colleges. Ten villages had been supplied with electricity from a power house built before the commune was formed but never put into operation because the co-op that planned it had never been able to accumulate sufficient funds for the final piece of equipment. But the thing that made the deepest impression was that the 65,000 acres of land set aside for winter wheat was sown in a month even though 70 per cent of the county's manpower had been mobilized for local steel making, which was then a national campaign, and those left to do the work were mainly women and the physically weaker men.

Wages and Supply System

The huge scale on which the commune was now being run demanded much higher efficiency and greater maneuverability of labor than had been necessary in the case of the farm co-ops. This sparked an immediate social revolution in the villages. First, the distribution system was changed. Earnings through work points calculated on the basis of piecework were scrapped and a system of part supply and part wages introduced. This measure helped to close the gap between the poorer and better off farmers and thus strengthen unity. For all working

able-bodied people between the ages of 16 and 60 the supply portion covered food, the wages portion all other expenses. All those under 16 and over 60 were entitled to free food, clothing and other living expenses; they were no longer an economic charge on their families.

Second, in order to cope with increased production and to build and man new industries, it was necessary to release the women from household duties so that if they wished they could participate. The setting up of community dining rooms freed them from marketing and cooking. The need to watch over their children—their other main responsibility—was removed with the establishment of nurseries and kindergartens where they can put the kiddies if they wish. It was left to each commune to make its own specific arrangements on the basis of its economic condition. Nothing was done without thorough discussion by all the members.

Care of Young and Old

The "Pioneer Commune" which I visited—one of the eight at Ankuo—had 17 work brigades, each brigade embracing four villages. In each village there was a day nursery and a kindergarten where the children lived in. Both nurseries and kindergartens were run by the commune without fees and supplied the children with food served in special dining rooms, clothing and other necessities. There was a small hospital (the county as a whole has 1,500 hospital beds) and in each village a maternity center where mothers could lie in, as well as a clinic with a doctor and nurse. In one village I went to there were six community

dining rooms which had been installed with ingenious home-made chopping machines, flour mills, noodle makers and so on. I even saw an electric bellows blowing up the fire in a traditional Chinese earthen cooking range. All of these devices greatly accelerated and saved labor and were being dexterously operated by some ex-housewives turned professional cooks. The pensioners in this village who were without families to look after them or who for some other reason needed to be cared for had just moved into an old people's "Happy Home" with everything provided and were engaged in organizing activities which included a band and light work like vegetable growing.

Members of the Pioneer Commune had agreed to set aside roughly 40 per cent of their profits for distribution. But it had been calculated that the average annual income in 1958 would be nearly 50 per cent higher than in 1957, while the difference in living standards between big and small families would be greatly narrowed because of the supply system. This, like every other commune, passed on 20 per cent of its income to a mutual-aid fund administered by the federation and reserved the remaining 40 per cent for new investment.

All Housing for Family Units

In another of the Ankuo communes, the "East Wind," I found the management committee discussing rehousing plans. It had been agreed to rehouse every family in small town units by 1962 and to complete the first such center, a community of about 6,000 people, before next October. This was a press-

ing problem because it was here the 1956 flood struck hardest and existing houses were particularly poor. Blueprints had already been made and discussed by all the members. They were discussing whether kitchens would be necessary since it was expected that everybody would be eating in community dining rooms, but plans called for electric lighting, gardens, trees and parks. It was interesting to note, in view of some of the stories that have appeared in the American press regarding the "break-up of families" that all housing provides for family units, with floorspace allocated on a per capita basis for all members of a household, *including the children and old people.*

In answer to a question about the position of the family, a leading member of the commune told me: "Whether children go to the nursery or not is a voluntary matter and for the parents to decide. It is the same for the old people. If they feel lonely or have no one to care for them, they can live in a 'Happy Home.' But they are free to live elsewhere if they wish. The family is the basic social unit, as it has always been, is now, and will be in the future. The difference between now and the old days is that relations within the family are changing. What we are wiping out are the old feudal relationships and economic dependence." Big families will be under no economic disability and the head of the family will be the most capable member, not necessarily the husband as "breadwinner."

I looked around in these villages at the new dining rooms, nurseries, clinics and other amenities. I saw

the broad roads running through the fields that have replaced the narrow footpaths, the wheelbarrows that have taken the place of the carrying pole, the steam engines pumping water into the irrigation ditches. And I saw the people walking and working with a "new look." It was hard to believe that things were changing so fast.

An Army Against Backwardness

I also saw the people's militia, sturdy young girls and lads marching briskly from the fields for military exercises, rifles slung across their backs.

The people's communes, it should be noted, were formed just before the U.S. threat of war over Quemoy and Matsu. People throughout the country held huge mass protest rallies and demonstrations, and peasants and townsmen flocked to join the people's militia movement which arose not only in the communes but everywhere. The people's militia has now become an immense force not only for national defense but also for what Chairman Mao Tse-tung has said will be a three-year hard battle against nature. The militia has answered one of the demands of an expanded agriculture, that people be better organized, able to act more quickly and with greater discipline. Huge forces can now be deployed wherever and for whatever work is needed.

When I was in Ankuo 30,000 peasants were away in a neighboring county building a reservoir which will remove forever the fear of flood from the whole area. There are literally thousands of such projects being undertaken throughout the country at the present time. Where-

ever work is needed—for tree planting, road or railway building, factory construction or water-works—a huge labor force can be mustered at a moment's notice. It is a concerted assault against poverty and backwardness with a life of plenty and ultimately of a great deal of leisure time, as the goal. Already peasants have one day off every two weeks—a tremendous thing in a country where for centuries the peasants worked sun-up to sun-down with never a day's rest.

The militia is the concept of the citizen-soldier "marching as to war" against poverty and backwardness, and also able to defend the country in the hour of peril. People like it because it is appropriate for the present conditions. Nobody minds getting up in the morning to the whistle because clocks in villages are still scarce and a whistle is a surer timekeeper than the sun.

The militia is armed—every unit has some rifles and other weapons. I don't know how Mr. Dulles squares this with his charge of "slavery." History knows of no instance of weapons being put freely into the hands of slaves, or indeed of any oppressed group.

Education and Culture for All

The growth and organization of the communes, as will be seen, is by no means a purely economic matter. They have given a huge spurt to education; the ground has been cleared for the entire peasantry to study science, politics and culture. In Ankuo, primary and middle school education has become universal and illiteracy wiped out except among the old people. Besides the semi-monthly holiday, everyone

has two hours a day for study. Most of the peasants are enrolled in newly founded "Red and Expert" schools which aim to raise all students, many of whom only recently became literate, to the level of secondary technical schools by 1962.

The 22 middle schools and 12 colleges established after the organization of the commune are all run on a system of part-time work and part-time learning and will be self-supporting from 1959 on, on the basis of the income from production. There are already 300 factories being run by students and teachers, including a machine building workshop and foundry, and electric appliance, chemical, cement and paint factories. Emphasis next year will be on raising the quality of education—at present the aim is universality at the available level.

In addition to this each commune has its own library and cultural group, and each village a club, with art and literature groups. This is culture not only of and for but by the people. In every village I visited the walls were covered with murals by the members of these clubs. Sometimes rather crude but often of high artistic quality, they depict the life of today, literally or symbolically, explain the new and mock and laugh at the backward. They covered all aspects of life in the commune—eating, living, public health, production, recreation and administration. The most popular picture was that of a flying horse, representing the great leap forward, but there were literally hundreds illustrating the bumper harvests—huge ears of corn and wheat, enormous cabbages and so forth. In one courtyard there were pictures of

various vegetables and other farm products with the Chinese character written beside them—a relic from the campaign against illiteracy. There was also a poster showing forty ways to cook a sweet potato and a lively picture of a chorus organized by the pensioners from a "Happy Home" jointly with the children of a nursery. One evening I saw a performance by a Song and Dance Ensemble which four months earlier had only been an amateur group but which has now been put on a full-time basis and continually tours the area. Old folk tunes, rhythms, and forms had been used to present a rich and varied program centering on the activities and problems of the commune.

Literacy had also made easier the spreading of information and propaganda. There were white-painted notice-boards in every experimental field with detailed specifications for cultivation; others giving results. There were also slogans and challenges. One saying: "Now we sweat but next year we will all eat white flour!" was a typical and ever-present reminder of the common goal.

One thing that must be noted is the outburst of popular poetry.

"Write your poem on the wall," seems a universal urge. There were hundreds of them, from simple jingles to more ambitious efforts, all full of vigor and vitality.

The People's Communes are still in their infancy. Many different ways of work and organization are being tried out. It is impossible to describe a typical day in a typical commune, for as yet no such thing exists.

The general policy? A resolution of the Central Committee of the

Chinese Communist Party on August 29 says: "The basis for the development of the people's communes is mainly the all-round, continuous leap forward in China's agricultural production and the ever-rising political consciousness of the 500 million peasants. . . . At the present stage our task is to build socialism. The primary purpose of establishing people's communes is to accelerate the speed of socialist construction and the purpose of building socialism is to prepare actively for the transition to communism."

This is the goal. The life of the Chinese peasant, so poor that he lived for year after year on the brink of death in the past, has been raised to a tolerable standard. It will now improve by leaps and bounds. By 1962, in places like Ankuo, the old villages will have disappeared, literally plowed under, since the walls of the smoke-blackened mud houses have been found to make very fine fertilizer. A solid beginning will have been made toward eliminating the difference between town and country—(Ankuo county's production is 90 per cent agricultural and 10 per cent industrial in terms of value; next year it will be 50:50; by 1960 industry will have the lion's share); between worker and peasant in terms of income and to some degree of skills; between manual and brain worker (with universal education).

There will be time for work, for study, for rest and recreation. These things are not dreams, they are the reality of tomorrow for the basis is there today for all to see. Rooted in the needs of today, the commune is the already-sprouting seed of the future.

Education Makes Headlines in the USSR

by ELIZABETH MOOS

INTEREST in the reorganization of the Soviet school system now going on has been worldwide and within the Soviet Union it has been a major topic of discussion in all circles for many months. The proposals have a two-fold aim: the raising of the general level of education and the preparation of young people for production work by relating school to real life.

Briefly, the new program would increase compulsory schooling from seven to eight years. After the eight years, all boys and girls would be given experience and training in industry and agriculture under some form of work-study program. True, young people may go to work directly in certain fields after eight years of school, with limitations on hours, working conditions, etc. It is apparent, however, that every effort and every medium of public opinion is being exerted to encourage all those who do leave school to complete their secondary education in correspondence schools, evening classes, or on the job. The government stresses the necessity for a minimum of ten years of education for all in this age of mechanization and automation.

ELIZABETH MOOS was formerly director of Hessian Hills School, Croton-on-Hudson, New York. She is the author of *The Educational System of the Soviet Union*, and *Higher Education in the Soviet Union*.

In publishing the proposals, the Central Committee of the Communist Party called for the widest possible public discussion. Such discussion is carried on in the press. (*Pravda* has devoted a full page daily to letters from readers on "Relating Our Schools to Life."), in trade unions, parent groups and among teachers and students.

During November and part of December, when I was visiting Soviet schools, I found the question, "How do you think these changes will affect your school?" or "What do you think of the new proposals?" a most fruitful opening for conversation whether with pedagogues or lay citizens.

I was corrected at first because I referred to the "Khrushchev proposals" and to the work-study program as "new." I was told by the head of a Pedagogic Institute that "the plan is a formulation by the Central Committee of the Communist Party based on years of experimentation in our schools." She stressed that the proposals are not basically new, that the idea that every citizen must be equipped to participate in productive work is an essential part of Communist theory, and that education through productive labor has been going on in many schools for years. The new program broadens the work-study plan while making full use of past experience.

For example, since 1953, some fifty schools in the Moscow region have been spending 30 to 50 per cent of school time in productive work, and 50 to 70 per cent in the classroom in upper grades. In the agricultural region of Riazan, there is a widely publicized and successful experiment in carrying on agricultural work and socially useful construction (roads, playgrounds, school buildings, workshops, etc.) as part of the school program.

A Moscow school is now working on a schedule in which the 8th grade spends three hours a week in productive work of some sort, the 9th grade and 10th grade four hours. This school also sends its 8th grade to a collective farm for two weeks every spring, and the biology teacher goes with them. The 9th grade spends a week in a factory. An 11th grade is to be added to this school and this group will spend three days in work and three in study. In Leningrad, Kiev, Yaroslavl, Tallin, similar work-study programs are in operation.

It is therefore not with the *principle* of combining work and study that the public and the pedagogues are so deeply concerned and about which they are expressing such different opinions, but the practical details of working out the program.

How can one give an idea of the scope of this unprecedented mass discussion? Perhaps by letting some of the participants speak.

There is even some difference of opinion about the length of the school period, that is, eight years of compulsory schooling beginning at age seven, followed by two more years of secondary school study combined with productive work.

A Georgian machinist reports that at a trade union meeting where education was the topic, there was agreement with

... the idea of introducing real work into our schools. But for our schools, we should have nine years instead of eight. We need this time to study the history and geography of Georgia and because we have a heavy language schedule.

The director of an Estonian school writes:

Our teachers welcome with great pleasure the proposals for reform of the middle and secondary schools. But for non-Russian schools, where three languages are studied (Russian, the native language and a foreign language) in our opinion we should plan for 9 years, not 8.

The director also writes that "in the opinion of the majority of our parents, it is above all essential to lighten the burden of study in school and at home. This should be part of the new program."

In Tashkent, the director of a Tadzhik school told me that his school would have eleven years, not ten. Three directors of Moscow schools said the same, and in Tbilisi, Georgia, I was told that the Georgian schools need an eleven-year period. The head of a pedagogic Institute in Moscow said that before very long all secondary schools would have twelve classes—"like yours in the USA."

In Leningrad, school No. 118 has already added an eleventh year and its tenth and eleventh year students have been spending three days of six hours each in work on farm or factory.

A blacksmith from Kuibyshev disagrees with the school entering age. He writes:

Above all, teaching should begin for children at 8 years of age, not 7. The seven-year-old is too little to participate in a school group. This is especially true if after eight years of school the boys and girls can go to work. They should not do any regular productive work until they are 16.

I met some parents who would agree with the blacksmith that 16 is early enough for beginning real work, but other parents were delighted with the plan for work beginning after the 8th year and said that their own 15-year-old boys and girls needed the discipline of practical work.

Where will the young people get their work experience and who is to set it up? This question concerns the relation between the schools and the factories and farms.

A member of the RSFSR Academy of Pedagogical Science writes:

... middle polytechnical schools should be created by the enterprises that want to make it possible to prepare the specialists they need.

An experienced teacher in *Peoples' Education Magazine*, on the contrary, declares:

The school itself must undertake the setting up of productive work. This is a pedagogical problem; for the moral value of collective work is great in developing character and personality. The pedagogue must never let the responsibility for organizing productive work out of his hands.

From Yakutia, a school inspector urges that:

Every school must have as patron a factory or farm, and the patron must take full responsibility for setting up productive work for the school children.

The problem seems to be not only the division of responsibility, but the difficulty of finding a suitable

nearby enterprise to act as patron. The director of a Moscow ten-year school in which I spent two days expressed the feeling that many schools were making a great mistake by insisting on having some very large farm or major factory with which to work. He said:

It is a mistake to think that every school can find some big enterprise to work with it. We must find factories or plants of smaller size in our own area and use them.

His school cooperates with three small nearby enterprises; an automobile repair shop, a clothing factory, and a drafting bureau. For each type of work the school has a corresponding workshop—a shop including three old cars for practice, a drafting studio, a sewing room etc. Thus students may combine work in school workshops with outside practical experience.

There are differences of opinion about the courses to be given during the second stage of the program, the ninth and tenth years. Shall they be the same for all? Two members of the Academy of Pedagogical Science of the RSFSR say:

It is obvious that education during the secondary stage must be differentiated. There should be differentiation between the physical-technical; the chemical-technical; the natural sciences agricultural; and the humanities. All students should spend the same amount of time in productive work, but with different content. There should be specialization. With this separation there can be special schools for children who show aptitude in one science or another.

"Schools of Various Types are Unnecessary" is the title of an article by a leading educator from Kursk who attacks the idea of specialization, or differentiation. He writes:

Many years of experience have demonstrated that the majority of pupils in the eighth, ninth and even tenth class are still far from having chosen their goal in this or that science or technology. Many of them have some inclination which becomes formulated during the period of study. It often happens that the teachers think the pupil would be remarkable in a literary career, and after finishing school the pupil decides to enter medical school.

The question of differentiation of courses is related to the widely discussed suggestion that young people who show special scientific ability be educated in special schools. On this subject Academician Lavrentyev wrote:

I consider it completely wrong to set aside a privileged group of "wonder children." What we should make sure of doing is to impart to broad circles of our youth an unquenchable interest in and love for creative work and investigation and not to single out and isolate from the others a certain number of quick-witted children.

The Minister of Education of the RSFSR, Evgeny Afanasenko, expressed wholehearted agreement with Academician Lavrentyev, as did the head of the Moscow Pedagogical Institute, and all the teachers with whom I talked.

The question of the preparation of teachers for the new program is receiving much attention. A Moscow engineer, M. Beloyev, writes on this subject:

It is obvious that the proposals for beginning reforms in 1959 and carrying them out over a 4 to 5 year period, will require a large number of specially qualified teachers, with a knowledge of industrial and agricultural processes. In our opinion, the organization of 6 to 8 month courses in pedagogy for engineers and technicians will equip them with the necessary pedagogical skill and have the desired effect in our school work. Ped-

agogical schools should immediately institute such courses.

Disagreeing with this suggestion, a member of the Pedagogical Institute supports the thesis that "the technical colleges should give their students pedagogical courses, thus graduating engineer-pedagogues." From Poltava comes a suggestion that the factories and farms set up courses for teachers. L. Toleponocova, a teacher, describes the productive work going on in her school and says that the pedagogical council of the school visits factories, that a group of teachers formed a committee with workers and engineers to plan factory schools for preparing workers to become leaders of productive work in schools.

Suggestions for improvement are not limited to the specific changes under consideration. Methods of teaching are being examined in the light of the new program.

"Serious and fundamental changes are needed along with our program changes," writes a Moscow school director. "We now have too much regimentation. Teachers must be freer to carry on creative teaching and to use whatever is expedient in a given situation. . . . Our pedagogic Institutes should be preparing them for this kind of teaching."

From Orel a teacher writes, "Why should all teachers follow the same lesson plan? They should use initiative and find their own methods suited to the particular school and particular class."

A teacher who has been working on a work-study program says:

Such a plan requires a change in our methods, there must be greater creativity and teachers must arouse student in-

terest by more participation in activities.

When I questioned the formality of classroom procedure, the Director of a Teachers College declared that "along with other overdue changes, authoritarianism, which still exists in some classrooms, in spite of our efforts, will be eliminated."

Workers' education through correspondence schools and evening classes becomes increasingly important under the proposed plan and many letters urging improvement are published. For example, a sailor of the Black Sea Fleet writes:

Our Black Sea crews study by correspondence—over 2500 of us are now enrolled. Yet there is now only one consultation center we can use, in Odessa. That is wrong. There should be such consultation centers set up in every Black Sea or Azov port with a minimum number of teachers on duty both day and evening, so that we can make use of them when we can land.

A lathe operator from Rostov-on-Don complains that evening classes in his plant are set up only for workers free in the evening. "What are

we on the night shift supposed to do to get our education?" he asks.

From a Georgian worker comes a complaint that there are no classes at the factory, that workers must go into the city, a long bus ride. "This must be remedied. We who want to learn are many and the teacher is only one. He should come to us. We should not have to go so far after work to him."

As indicated above, Soviet people from all parts of the country are expressing their opinions on matters of education. It appears that they have confidence that their contributions are of value and will be taken into consideration. We cannot tell to what degree the thousands of suggestions being made will affect the program in the schools. But no one, I believe, who reads Soviet publications or talks with Soviet men and women, can fail to see that public attention on an unprecedented scale is now going on throughout the Soviet Union, and that the Soviet people are taking an active part in the reorganization of their educational system.

NEW SOVIET EDUCATION PLAN ACCEPTED BY SUPREME SOVIET

ON DECEMBER 24 the Supreme Soviet, after the nation-wide discussion that followed the publication of the theses, "On Strengthening the Ties of School with Life and on Further Developing the System of Public Education in the Country," (see NWR for December, 1958), approved a decree based on the substance of the theses. The decree states specifically that the period of change for the new system will last from three to five years, and that each Union Republic, in accordance with the special features of its economic and cultural development, will draw up its own plan for the change.

Social Security in the USSR

THE social security system in the USSR covers the major aspects of the material and cultural life of the working people; it is a factor for improving the living, material and cultural conditions of the working class, one of the levers for raising the welfare of all the working people.

Sources of Funds

The distinguishing feature of social security in the USSR is the fact that it is fully provided by the state or by public organizations, without any deductions from the earnings of workers and other employees. In 1958 social security expenditures in the USSR totaled 128.6 billion rubles, including 88.2 billion rubles for pensions and allowances, and 40.4 billion rubles for medical services. All expenditures for pensions, allowances, and medical aid are covered by the state. According to the way these funds are established and used the following are the sources of social security in the USSR:

1. *State budget*—provides pensions for disabled servicemen, for survivors of servicemen, personal pensions, allowances to mothers with large families and unmarried mothers. The state maintains children's homes and homes for

the aged and disabled. It also pays for medical services. In addition the state pays for the upkeep of the administrative apparatus of the social security system and public medical services.

2. *State social insurance budget*—made up of payments comprising a certain per cent (insurance rate) of pay-rolls. The size of the insurance rate varies in different branches of the national economy: 8.4 per cent in the oil and chemical industries, 7.7 per cent in engineering, 6.1 per cent in the construction and building materials industries, etc. With the expansion of the socialist economy, the rise in the number of enterprises, in employment and the social insurance funds increases.

The increase in social insurance funds is shown in the table below.

The state social insurance fund is used to pay pensions to labor pensioners, temporary disability benefits, maternity benefits, allowances for the birth of a child; to cover discounts from the cost of sanatorium and health resort cures for workers and other employees, expenditures for child health-building measures, tourism and many other things.

A distinguishing feature of the makeup of the state social insurance fund in the USSR is the fact that the basic

Figures in billions of rubles	1940	1946	1950	1955	1956	1957
Social insurance budget funds.....	8.6	11.6	19.3	26.5	31.5	49.6
Compared with 1940, in percentages:	100	134	225	309	366	576
Insurance dues of enterprises and institutions	8.4	11.4	18.9	26.0	27.8	30.3
Receipts from the state budget.....	—	—	—	—	3.2	18.5
Other revenues	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.8

source of this fund's revenues is designated for specific purposes and is directly linked with the number of workers and other employees in the given branch of industry, construction, transport and communications services, and at state agricultural enterprises, as well as with the total expenditures for social insurance in this branch. Though the social insurance budget is included in the general state budget, the social insurance fund is administered not by the state but by the trade unions of the working people. This fund can be used only to give material aid to workers and other employees.

3. *Cooperative insurance fund* covering members of handicraft cooperatives.

4. *Collective aid fund* for disabled members of collective farms.

5. *Special security funds* for writers, artists, architects and composers.

Social security in the USSR is planned. The funds necessary for social security are planned in advance and are ensured by reliable sources of revenue.

The social security fund in the capitalist countries is made up altogether differently. A substantial part of the funds

for social security consists of payments by workers and other employees themselves.

The share of payments by workers and other employees, employers, and the state in the social security fund in the capitalist countries is shown in the table below (calculated on the basis of 1954 data published in *The Cost of Social Security*, International Labor Office Geneva, 1958).

The data on the sources of the social security fund do not give the full picture unless they are examined from the viewpoint of the level of expenditures, i.e., the share of expenditures for social security in the distribution of the national income, on the one hand, and the role played by the payments from the social insurance fund in the incomes of the families of workers and other employees, on the other. In proportion to the national income, the social security expenditures in the capitalist countries are as follows: Australia—4.6 per cent, Great Britain—4.5 per cent, Belgium—9.6 per cent, Canada—6 per cent, Norway—3.7 per cent, Finland—5.4 per cent, France—9.5 per cent, the U.S.A.—2.4

Countries	Payments, per cent of total			
	by workers and employees*	by employers	by the state	other revenues
Austria	24	51	18	7
Great Britain	18	17	53	12
Belgium	20	47	26	7
Greece	46	50	—	4
Italy	6	74	15	5
New Zealand	60	4	34	2
Norway	28	19	20	33
U.S.A.	24	42	9	25
France	22	68	5	5
Federal Republic of Germany	28	45	17	10
Sweden	9	9	52	36
Switzerland	32	23	9	36
Japan	24	21	40	15

* Including special social security taxes

per cent, Switzerland—4.5 per cent, and Japan—1.0 per cent.

These data cannot be fully compared with the data for the Soviet Union, as the social security expenditures in the capitalist countries include unemployment relief. And the share of the latter sometimes runs into considerable sums, comprising in the USA, for example, 20 to 30 per cent of the total social security expenditures. (These figures are for 1954. At the present time with greater unemployment in the United States, this percentage has sharply increased.) In the USSR, on the other hand, unemployment has been abolished forever. The Soviet worker, not threatened by its occurrence, has no need for this kind of social insurance. In 1958 the social security expenditures in the USSR, including public health, comprised, under the state budget alone, 129 billion rubles, or 21 per cent of the total budgetary disbursements. Taking into account other sources of social security (cooperative insurance of members of handicraft cooperatives, social security for collective-farm members, etc.) one can safely say that the share of all these social insurance expenditures in the national income is higher in the Soviet Union than in any capitalist country.

Another distinguishing feature of the social security system in the USSR is its universality. The right to security in old age, in case of disability, at the loss of a breadwinner, in the event of sickness and maternity leave, is guaranteed by the Soviet Constitution to all citizens of the USSR. Social insurance covers all workers and other employees in all kinds of social security.

Pensions

The provision of pensions in the USSR is governed by the Law on State Pensions under which old age, disability and survivors' pensions are granted to factory and office workers and their dependents, to invalid privates and non-commissioned officers, and to the fam-

ilies of privates and non-commissioned officers in the event the breadwinner dies. Of the total of approximately 65 billion rubles allocated for all pensions in 1958, pensions under the law run to about 55 billion rubles, or 85 per cent of all the expenditures.

The provision of pensions in the USSR is based on the principle of distribution according to work. People, who by their long service have greatly contributed to the wealth of the country, are eligible for highest old-age pensions. Higher pensions are also provided for the loss of the ability to work due to an accident on the job or an occupational disease, as in these cases disability is connected with labor processes. Invalid pensions for disability due to common diseases are somewhat lower because a common disease is not necessarily associated with processes of work and does not characterize the participation of the worker in creative labor.

Consideration is given to the pensionable worker's and other employee's working conditions prior to their being pensioned. Jobs with difficult working conditions cause a more rapid loss of capacity to work; therefore favorable terms both with regard to the appointment and the size of pensions are provided for workers of this category. The size of the pensions established by the law is sufficient to provide for the basic requirements of an old-age or invalid pensioner of the first and second groups. For invalids of the third group who have only partially lost their capacity for work, the size of the pensions comprises a large part of the difference between the earnings prior to disability and after it.

Thus, the provision of pensions in the USSR proceeds above all from the interests of the working people and is aimed at most fully providing material security to the worker in old age and in case of disability, and his family in the event of the loss of its breadwinner.

In the first year of the operation of the Law on State Pensions the average

amount of pensions increased as follows: old-age 108.9 per cent, disability due to an industrial accident 48.1 per cent, disability due to a common disease 55.8 per cent, for families of workers and other employees in the event of the loss of breadwinner 74.4 per cent, disability of privates and non-commissioned officers 72.2 per cent and for families of privates and non-commissioned officers in the event of the loss of breadwinner 102 per cent. During this same time the number of pensioners increased by approximately two million and as of the end of 1957 totaled 18 million.

Old-age pension is the most widespread form of pension. The terms for eligibility for these pensions and their size give some idea of the general extent of pensions. Material security in old age is undoubtedly superior in the USSR to that in capitalist countries. This is primarily true of the method of determining the eligibility age. On the basis of vital statistics, data on the distribution of workers and other employees with regard to length of service and age, and considering working conditions, the Law on State Pensions has established three age groups: 60 years for men and 55 years for women working under ordinary conditions; 50 and 45 years respectively for workers employed in underground jobs, in the hot shops and jobs with harmful working conditions; 55 and 50 respectively for workers employed on other jobs with difficult working conditions. In addition it took into account the fact that the upbringing of children requires much energy and good health. Therefore the pensionable age for mothers having five children or more has been cut to 50.

In the overwhelming majority of capitalist countries the pensionable age is higher. According to United Nations data the minimum age eligible for an old-age pension is as follows: In Ireland, Norway and Canada—70 both for men and women, in Iceland and Sweden—67, in Finland, the USA, the FRG, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain and Swit-

zerland—65, in Great Britain, Greece and Denmark—65 for men and 60 for women, in France and Turkey—60 for both men and women, in Italy—60 for men and 55 for women (*Economic Survey of Europe in 1955*, United Nations).

Another important index characterizing the level of old-age security is the size of pensions. In the Soviet Union the Law on State Pensions provides that old-age pensions must comprise 50 to 100 per cent of the worker's earnings before the awarding of the pension. Special higher pension rates have been established for workers and other employees employed on underground jobs, on jobs with harmful conditions of labor and in hot shops. The scale of the size of pensions is so made up that it provides certain advantages for lower-paid workers and other employees. For this category of workers the pensions comprises the greater part of their earnings up to 100 per cent, while for highly paid workers it is 50 per cent and is limited by a maximum of 1,200 rubles. This reflects the policy of the Soviet Union aimed at reducing the gaps both in earnings and in size of pensions. In the Soviet Union old-age pensions compensate for the larger part of the lost earnings.

Temporary Disability Benefits

Temporary disability benefits are paid in the USSR in all cases of inability to work: due to an injury on the job, an occupational disease, a general disease, taking care of a sick member of the family, in the case of quarantine and absence from work owing to an infectious disease, during sanatorium or health-resort cure, injury outside the job, etc. Working people are entitled to temporary disability benefits from the very first day of employment. This right not only extends to permanent workers but also to temporary and seasonal ones. Both the categories eligible for pensions and cases of temporary disability are so defined that all workers and other employees are entitled to benefits in all

cases of inability to work. This is an essential advantage of the Soviet system of temporary disability insurance.

In the USSR, it will be remembered, the entire population enjoys free medical service. The state public health authorities follow a system of measures aimed at preventing disease and ensuring hygienic working and living conditions. There is an extensive network of sanatoriums, health resorts, polyclinics, children's and women's consultation centers and maternity homes designed to safeguard and build up the health of the working people. The state's expenditures on medical services to the population are increasing with every year. In the period of 1950-1956 alone they increased by 14.1 billion rubles and in 1958 will, together with expenditures on physical culture, run into 40.4 billion rubles. In 1956 free hospitalization was provided for 29.4 million patients. Great importance is attached to child health-building measures which are largely implemented at state expense. Some 6 million children and juveniles annually spend their

summer holidays at Young Pioneer camps, children's sanatoriums, in excursions and at tourist camps, or spend the summer in rural areas. All medical service is provided to the population of the USSR on the basis of the latest achievements of science.

The existence of a comprehensive system of social security and free medical service in the USSR makes it possible to improve yearly the material conditions not only of the able-bodied but also of the disabled members of socialist society. The growing welfare of all sections of the working people of the USSR is accompanied by a sharp decline in the mortality rate. Compared with the pre-Revolutionary period the general mortality rate in the Soviet Union declined by about 50 per cent and infant mortality by over 60 per cent. The average life span has more than doubled in our country as compared with pre-revolutionary Russia.

Abridged from *Sotsialistichesky Trud* (Socialist Labor), No. 9, 1958.

USSR SWITCHES TO SHORTER WORKDAY

IN NOVEMBER concrete plans were announced to switch over to a shorter workday (seven hours or less) in the enterprises of the machine-building, oil-and-gas industries, during 1959 and to regulate wages and salaries so that there will be no loss to the workers in the process. In regulating wages, the policy will be pursued for further raising the wages of the lower-paid factory and office workers and reducing the gap between maximum and minimum wages, while at the same time labor productivity will be stepped up.

The decision was reached by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the USSR Council of Ministers and the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions. The same policy will be applied later in other industries.

During the seven-year plan period, a five-day workweek, with a 6-7 hour work day is to be introduced, covering all factory and office workers of the USSR, without resulting in any loss of pay to the Soviet workers.

USSR Note on German Peace Treaty

In our December issue we carried a summary of the Soviet Note of Nov. 27 to the United States, Britain and France proposing a demilitarized free city status for Western Berlin. The U.S. Government and the other two powers replied on December 31 rejecting this proposal, offering to negotiate the question of Berlin only in the wider framework of the German problem as a whole, involving the question of reunification, European security and a peace treaty. In addition, the State Department on January 7 issued a long statement accusing the USSR of distorting history in its note and denying its charges of pre-war Western appeasement of Hitler, especially in the Munich period. Itself turning history on its head, it charged the Soviet Union with building up Hitlerism, responsibility for both the World War and the cold war, and violation of the Potsdam and other postwar agreements.

On January 11, the Soviet Union proposed an international conference on a peace treaty with Germany in a note summarized below.

THE SOVIET Government, in opening, calls attention to the abnormal situation resulting from the absence to this day of a peace treaty with Germany, depriving that country of the possibility of exercising full state sovereignty, with foreign troops still on its territory and an occupation regime still in force in some parts of Germany as, for example, Western Berlin. This abnormal situation complicates the whole situation in Europe, while in Western Germany, aligned with NATO, militarism gains in strength.

For years the Western powers have been rejecting Soviet proposals for a peaceful settlement with Germany and insisting on priority for "so-called free all-German elections" and reunification of Germany under the aegis of the occupation powers, whereas the question of German unity can only be brought

about through rapprochement between the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany. Conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany would be the best way to promote reunification.

The Soviet Union offers the draft of a peace treaty for consideration by the United States, and proposes that within two months a peace conference be called at Warsaw or Prague to negotiate regarding a peace treaty with Germany, to be attended by the governments that took part in the war against Germany on the one hand, and on the other by the Governments of the G.D.R. and the F.R.G. or, if a German confederation should be set up before the peace treaty is concluded, by its representatives as well.

The Soviet Government believes that practical steps can already be taken with regard to Berlin, as proposed in its note to the U.S. Government of Nov. 27, 1958. The U.S., in its reply to these proposals, still speaks in terms of the situation of the early years of Germany's occupation and disregards the great changes that have taken place in Germany in the postwar years. The stay of American troops in Berlin can no longer be justified by the fact that they came as a result of World War II, or by the postwar agreements of that period, but stems rather from the violation of those agreements by the Western powers, their abandonment of good relations with the USSR and their policy of whipping together military blocs. Their continued presence can only serve as a means of using West Berlin as an instrument of hostile activity against the Soviet Union, the G.D.R., and their allies, and heightens the danger of the cold war turning into a third world war. The occupation, necessary right after the defeat of Hitler Germany, can now only serve

the purpose of turning West Germany into a NATO stronghold in the heart of the G.D.R. In violating the Potsdam agreement by rearming Western Germany and drawing her into their military alignment, the United States, Great Britain and France have forfeited their occupation rights in Berlin and other parts of Germany. Furthermore, the quadripartite agreements on Berlin and Germany as a whole were valid only during the period of occupation. The ending of the state of war with Germany in fact ended occupation rights. Thus the Soviet Union has in mind no unilateral denunciation of agreements, but a recognition of the actual fact that these agreements have lost all validity.

[Replying to the U.S. declaration that it would agree to discuss the question of Germany at broader four power talks on the German problem as a whole, including German unification and the question of European security, the Soviet Government repeated its contention that with the existence of two independent German states the question of German unification had become an internal German problem that could be solved only by agreement between the two states, and was outside the competence of the four powers.]

Neither could the question of Berlin be linked with the question of all-European security. The Soviet Government attaches tremendous importance to this latter question, and has made numerous proposals for solving it through such measures as a non-aggression agreement between the North Atlantic and Warsaw Treaty countries, the withdrawal of foreign troops from the territory of Europe, and support for the Polish proposal for establishing an atomless zone in Central Europe. But this calls for a special discussion and cannot be made dependent on the Berlin question, or vice versa.

The Soviet Government is trying to settle the Berlin issue through negotiations between the states concerned, and

believes its proposal for making Berlin a free city provides a sound basis for agreement. However:

It goes without saying that the Soviet Government in no way regards its proposal for a free city of West Berlin as precluding any addenda or amendments. It is willing to consider proposals on this question advanced by other powers provided these proposals are directed toward ending the occupation regime in West Berlin and toward consolidating peace in Europe.

Refusal by the Western powers to negotiate on normalizing the situation in Berlin will not hinder the USSR from making its own arrangements:

No one can prevent the Soviet Union from renouncing its functions with regard to Berlin and its communications with Western Germany and from settling the questions arising therefrom through an agreement with the German Democratic Republic.

The Soviet Government suggests that the states concerned should discuss the Berlin question as well as the peace treaty. It is also prepared to exchange opinions on the content of the peace treaty prior to the convening of a peace conference [which would mean of course consideration of proposals advanced by other states as well as its own draft.]

Resume of Draft Peace Treaty

The draft peace treaty accompanying the above note was also sent to the other states that took part in the war against Germany as well as to the G.D.R. and the F.R.G.

As summarized in the note above, the Soviet draft "is based on the idea of Germany's peaceful, democratic development. It provides for the reestablishment of the German people's complete sovereignty over Germany, her territory and air space. There are no restrictions on the development of Germany's peaceful economy, trade, shipping or access to world markets. Certain military restrictions imposed conform "both to the na-

tional interests of the German people and the common interests of peace." The draft precludes the possibility of Germany's involvement in any military alignment directed against any of the states which were at war with Hitlerite Germany, and whose members do not include all the four principal Allied powers of the anti-Hitlerite coalition—the USSR, the United States, Britain and France. (This of course would rule out joining either NATO or the Warsaw Treaty and the G.D.R. and the F.R.G. would be free of existing obligations under the alliances.)

In addition, under Article 4 of the treaty, the relations of the signatory powers with Germany shall be cultivated:

On the principles of respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Germany, non-interference in its internal affairs, non-aggression, equality and mutual benefit.

Germany's frontiers would be confirmed as those existing January 1, 1959. (The Oder-Neisse line is retained). The Munich agreement is declared invalid. The treaty reestablishing Austrian independence and prohibiting *anschluss* is recognized. Nazi and affiliated or similar organizations are prohibited. Germany undertakes to dissolve and not to permit existence or activity on its territory of any organizations, including emigrant bodies, conducting hostile activities against any of the signatory powers;

and not to permit any type of threatening or war or revanchist propaganda.

Article 22 states that the signatory powers:

Recognize the right of the German people to the restoration of Germany's unity and express their readiness to render both German states all-out assistance in achieving this goal on the basis of a rapprochement and agreement between the G.D.R. and the F.R.G.

Both German governments undertake never to resort to force or threat of force in achieving unity or solving disputes.

Article 25 envisages that "pending the restoration of Germany's unity and the establishment of a United German state, West Berlin will have the standing of a demilitarized free city with its special status."

Articles on military matters provide that Germany shall have its national land air and naval forces necessary for defense. It shall not have, produce, acquire or experiment with "Any nuclear weapons or other means of mass destruction, including biological and chemical weapons; any rockets or guided missiles or apparatuses and installations for their launching or guiding; aircraft designed mainly as bombers or submarines." All foreign troops now stationed in Germany are to be withdrawn within one year of the coming into force of the treaty, and simultaneously all foreign war bases on German territory should be closed down.

THE REVISED RAPACKI PLAN

IN A RECENT INTERVIEW with a British correspondent, Polish Foreign Minister Adam Rapacki described his recently revised plan for a denuclearized zone in East and West Germany, Poland and Czechoslovakia, which, he said, would help in the process of German reunification.

Mr. Rapacki explained that his plan now divides the process of implementation into two stages: first, an internationally controlled and inspected "freeze" on those nuclear weapons already in the zone; and second, an overall agreement on the complete elimination of nuclear weapons at the same time as conventional forces in the zone are reduced. He stressed that the essence of his plan was to prevent the spreading of nuclear weapons to new armies, while negotiations regarding the link between conventional and nuclear disarmament in Central Europe were proceeding.

"The Causes of World War III"

reviewed by ROBERT W. DUNN

The Causes of World War Three, by C. Wright Mills. Simon and Schuster. New York. 174 pages. \$3.50.

PROF. MILLS of Columbia University, who wrote *The Power Elite* two years ago is convinced that this elite has a grip on the United States that is definitely set toward World War III. They are making the decisions and they are criminally irresponsible. But he thinks the American people can break out of this grip and make possible "alternate definitions of reality and alternate policies for action."

As his previous work showed, he is fully aware of the concentration in industry and finance and he argues that "all private profit must be taken out of the preparation for war in the U.S. economy." What he calls "capitalist brinkmanship" must be ended. This "consists of the continual preparation for war, just short of it." And the expensive arms race, he says, "under cover of the military metaphysic and in a paranoid atmosphere of fright, is an economically attractive business. To many utopian capitalists, it has become the Business Way of American Life."

This is an alarmist book. But unlike the alarms sounded, for example by the Alsop brothers, the conclusion is not that we should build bigger Hell-bombs and prepare for a war to end the human race. It is rather a book that not only analyzes the insanities of Dulles but offers the American people a detailed program of steps that could make possible a warless world.

The professional anti-Sovieteers, like William Henry Chamberlin of the *Wall Street Journal* have dismissed this book

as just another bit of socialist utopianism in the service of the Kremlin. They pounce on the volume precisely because it is such a trenchant attack on their "crackpot realism" as Prof. Mills calls it. It is an angry and devastating assault on all the assumptions of brinkmanship inherent in the present and past policies of the U.S. Although it contains some misconceptions of Soviet foreign policy, the book on the whole suggests an approach that the peoples of both capitalist and non-capitalist countries might well support.

Unlike his critics, Mills is for an end of the cold war forthwith and immediately. His "guidelines" of policy are concrete and specific. And the first one is that, "The only realistic military view is the view that war, and not Russia, is now the enemy." Also, that "from the standpoint of mere survival, let alone progress toward a goal of properly developing societies, there is now one and only one paramount goal and only one general means to it: coexistence."

He says the power elite of the U.S. has to recognize that there is another alternate way of industrialization in the world, that it works and has a great appeal for people everywhere and especially in the so-called backward countries which have remained undeveloped for generations "in the epoch of capitalist ascendancy."

We must give up the "military metaphysic," says Mills, and demand that the coexistence of the capitalist and socialist worlds be fully recognized, "and that the competition between them be conducted in economic and cultural and political ways, rather than by means of the idiot's race."

The means to peace can only be by negotiation. And he makes clear that this doesn't mean just one big confer-

ence or a lot of little ones. "It means to reason together—continuously, on every level—rather than to carry on exchanges of rhetoric. . . . It means to drop the hysterical fears and hatreds brought about by dogmas and petrified attitudes rooted in the status quo."

To come right down to U.S. action, Mills proposes a new diplomatic beginning. Specifically a fifth of the Federal military budget should be allocated to the economic aid and industrial development of underdeveloped countries, especially to India.

He refers to the U.S. government's fear of contact with citizens of the socialist countries. We should remove, he says, the silly and insulting finger-printing visa laws. "It should be as convenient legally for anyone in the world to visit the U.S. for six months or so as it now is for a citizen of West Germany to visit Italy, or for a Swede to go to Britain."

Other proposals include the removal of all "security" and loyalty restrictions on scientific work and an invitation to scientists all over the world to participate in such work with a view to the fullest exchange of information, technique and theory focused upon the mutual industrial problems of the world.

A still more practical suggestion from the standpoint of getting the profit interest out of war is to "remove from the private economy all scientific research and development directly or indirectly relevant to the military." For such research can no longer safely be left in the hands of private powers and vested interests. Mills answers the arguments against such a move and points to the remarkable achievements of the Russians working on a non-capitalist basis "in a society only 40 years removed from peasant, feudal backwardness."

A further step should be that the U.S. "should cease all testing of nuclear devices." And if, when the Russians do this, it is merely "propaganda," then "The U.S. ought itself to make such propaganda." It should also at once

and unilaterally "cease all further production of 'extermination' weapons—all A- and H-bombs and nuclear warheads."

Still more aggravating to the Pentagon mind is Prof. Mills' proposal that the U.S. government "should abandon all military bases and installations outside the continental domain of the U.S." He doesn't mention the number but all told they come to over 900. Says Mills: "It is easy to see why the Russians consider these bases as aggressive and provocative."

We, the U.S., should also encourage the European countries, especially West Germany, to disarm, renouncing the whole Dulles-NATO idea of "peace-by-power-of-retaliation." Especially as they have little if any power of decision "over the initial blow that could end Europe as a place of human habitation; and that such a blow might well fall through human error or accident." This trend toward neutralization of Europe should be encouraged by the U.S.

At the same time the U.S. should accept the Russian proposal for an embargo on all arms shipments to the Middle East. And some sort of oil authority under UN auspices should take the place of the "imperialist claims and actions" of the giant oil cartels.

The need to dump Dulles is of course implicit in all these proposals of Professor Mills. Certainly the one that involves the immediate recognition of the real China can only be carried out by a U.S. diplomacy that is not bound to continue support to the puppet on Formosa.

This is enough to suggest the original character of Mills' thinking. And he has some special "guidelines" also for the scientists, ministers and intellectuals of this country. He gives them concrete proposals as to what they can do, right now at the grass roots level to help head off World War III. They should especially resist the idea that there is no alternative to war. They have to draw up programs and make them into political issues. They should

carry on insistent debate, take democracy seriously, use their civil liberties, and write and speak through the mass media on their own terms and not just as "spokesmen" for the government. And they should get a few liberal Senators to investigate "the economics and politics of the drift and the thrust toward World War III." Finally, they should "cease being intellectual dupes of political patrioteers. This disgraceful cold war is surely a war in which we as intellectuals ought at once to become conscientious objectors."

Professor Mills' various proposals, he assumes, will probably be considered utopian, expensive, idealistic, unsound "and for all I know, traitorous." But, he says, "Utopian action is survival action."

His warning is clear and it appears at the end of his chapter on the Politics of Peace: "The continued attempt by the U.S.A. to defend the economic and political status quo of the world today

will end in war. To establish peace is to establish peaceful means of change, to debate their direction, and to get them under way. This, and only this is hard-headed, realistic, sound, practical. Peaceful change requires that we adjust to the changed relations of power brought about in the world by the economic, scientific, and military success of the Soviet Union."

Although this book faces the terrible realities of the present-day world it is anti-fatalist. Mills concludes with a positive call to action: "We no longer need to accept historical fate, for fate is a feature of specific kinds of social structure, of irresponsible systems of power. These systems can be changed. Fate can be transcended."

This challenging call to action is just the book for every reader who believes in the new world possibilities for peace—an ideal gift for your library, school, congressman, and friends.

African Freedom

review by SCOTT NEARING

Decision in Africa, Sources of Current Conflict, by W. Alphaeus Hunton, with a foreword by W.E.B. DuBois, N.Y.: International Publishers, 1957. 256 pages. \$4.00.

GEORGIA-BORN Alphaeus Hunton spent twelve years with the Council on African Affairs, first as educational director and later as executive secretary. The Council was dissolved in 1955, and Dr. Hunton formulated his information and channeled his long experiences with African problems into the writing of *Decision in Africa*.

Earlier pages of the book cover familiar ground: white exploiters seizing African land by armed force, pillaging the resources, plundering and enslaving the people; peonage on African farms,

owned and operated by Western whites; labor conscription which compelled Africans to work in mines owned by Europeans for a small fraction of the wages paid to whites who were doing the same work; job discrimination which forced Africans to do the dirty work, while the whites maintained a tight monopoly on more skilled, better-paying jobs; economic discrimination which turned over the best land to the whites and left poorer land for the Africans; political discrimination which enabled a white minority to make the essential decisions which determined conditions of life for the overwhelming African majority; segregation of Africans in shanty towns and slums and denial of the right to go and come in the country of their birth. These outrages in myriad

form were imposed by less than six million whites now living in Africa upon the 220 million native Africans.

Consequently, "two mighty cross-currents sweep Africa. . . . On one side is an aggregation of the continent's colonizers and exploiters who conceive it to be proper and necessary that *their* interests should have priority in Africa. On the other side is the forward thrust of many millions of people in every area of the continent who are determined to win their freedom and reclaim what is theirs."

European traders who five centuries ago crept down the west coast of Africa and around the Cape of Good Hope were searching for a sea route to the wealth of the Indies. The wholesale partitioning of Africa occurred chiefly in the closing years of the 19th century. Only in the present century has the mineral wealth of the continent, coupled with its immense hydroelectric potential, been realized. This is particularly true of U.S. business interests. Concern about North African military bases and Sahara oil has paralleled the period of the Cold War.

Three other factors have modified the African picture during the years since 1945. The first is the success of a score of colonial peoples in winning independence from Britain, France and Holland. Asian colonials led off in this drive to liquidate Western imperial controls. Africans followed speedily and eagerly. For the colonial peoples, winning independence in the post-1945 epoch was marked by the loosening of imperial controls and a rush of the colonials toward self-determination.

The second factor favoring independence and self-determination for the colonial peoples was the existence, at the highest economic and political levels, of energetic backing and assistance, at the outset, from the Soviet Union and subsequently from People's China and other people's republics. In the early stages of the turnover from colonial status to independence, emergent peo-

ples are desperately short of technical skills, materials, machines and money. Washington poured technical and economic aid into the shattered European states which tottered out of the 1939-45 war. The Soviet Union and later People's China came to the assistance of the erstwhile colonials.

The third factor was the unity with which the colonial peoples met the drive of the imperialists to re-establish control over their former colonies. At Bandung in 1955, in the Suez crisis of 1956, at the Cairo Conference in December, 1957, and during the crises over Lebanon and Taiwan in 1958, the Asian-African peoples reiterated their unanimous demands for an end of colonialism and an era of self-determination and peace.

It was during these eventful years of empire dissolution and the drive of colonial peoples for independence and self-determination that U.S. business and the United States Government directed covetous glances toward Africa—its natural resources, its labor force, its strategic location, and the immense markets provided by African modernization. Dr. Hunton treats these developments in his chapters on Dollars and Empire, Bases and Oil, Uranium, and the chapters on Liberia and Rhodesia. In Chapter 12 he summarizes post-war U.S. trade and investments in Africa, and points out that U.S. economic and political interests cannot grab off an empire in Africa in the mid-20th century as the British, French, Dutch, Italians and Spanish did a hundred years earlier. Times have changed. Today decisions regarding the future of Africa will be made in small part by the Western imperialists, in part by the nations building socialism, but mostly by the emerging African peoples and their supporters among the former colonials of Asia.

In Chapter 16 the author takes up the new horizons opening before the Africans, backed by the solidarity of Bandung and the assistance proffered by the countries building socialism. "The masses of Africans are not concerned

with East-West differences and rivalries," he writes. "They are greatly concerned with winning their freedom, and it is the continuance of Western domination" which threatens Africa with disruption, conflict and war."

"Who is on my side?" the author asks in his final chapter. Americans, he points out, are looking for profits to be derived from abundant African natural resources and cheap labor. They seem unaware of the African point of view. "The African's traditional practice of communal ownership and their ready acceptance of the modern system of cooperative enterprise would naturally seem to point toward the development of socialist rather than capitalist institutions. If so, what right have we to insist that they open up their countries to 'free enterprise' or scrap the system of collective land tenure?"

African freedom is certain, writes Dr. Hunton. "It can come more quickly, however, and with less violence and pain in the process for them and for us, if the United States wields its great influence to ease the transition to African independence. This requires that the concept of Africa as a European or American appendage be once and for all scrapped. It requires the implementation of entirely new Western aims that are in harmony with African aims." Such a policy must involve "the immediate liquidation of white settler and colonial domination." Dr. Hunton writes:

"The most certain way for America to 'lose' Africa—to lose what is left of African's friendship with this country and incur their enmity instead—is to continue the present methods of trying to 'hold' it. The people of Africa have their future to build. The Cold War measuring rod of United States objectives in that continent is out-dated and self-defeating. If 'losing' Africa means its ceasing to be the special preserve of Western interests, then it is as certainly lost as Asia. The leaders of the West, let us hope, will face up to the reality of the relation of forces in today's world

and resign themselves to the necessity of getting along otherwise than on the backs of the Africans."

The author insists that a new approach to United States-African relations will require a corresponding shift in United States-Soviet relations. "Humanity demands this, it is sick to death of the dead-end stagnation and senseless armaments burden of a world divided into Western and Eastern camps. The cry is for coexistence and cooperation in place of antagonism and conflict, for social reconstruction instead of atom bombs. The West can make a try at this new way of living with the East in Africa. The reality of coexistence will develop out of the fruitful results of cooperation. Africa's great economic and social needs offer an extraordinary opportunity for practical West-East cooperation. Why should not the United States and the Soviet Union work together in helping to building Egypt's Aswan Dam, for example? Here is one path to a unified world of peace and progress; what is done in Africa should promote similar advances in other areas."

Peace Program

A Peace Program for the U.S.A., by Corliss Lamont. Basic Pamphlets, Box 42, Cathedral Station, New York 25, N. Y. 10 cents a copy.

EXPANDING the article Dr. Lamont wrote for the special November issue of *New World Review*, the 10-pt. program outlined in this pamphlet is the product of a realistic appraisal of the present dangerous world situation. Dr. Lamont calls for immediate withdrawal of U.S. military forces from the Chinese offshore islands and Formosa, as well as for the withdrawal of U.S. troops from almost all of the over 900 American military bases throughout the world. He also calls for an immediate halting of all testing and production of nuclear weapons and for a Summit Conference of the heads of the Great Powers to take place as soon as possible.

New Recordings

Reviewed by

SIDNEY FINKELSTEIN

THE first new major work to be heard here in a long time, by the composer Aram Khachaturian, is available on a Monitor record. It consists of excerpts from the ballet *Spartacus*, with Alexander Gauk conducting the USSR State Orchestra (MC-2025). This is an evening-long ballet, in four acts, and offered here are only part of Act II and a scene from Act III. How representative they are of the whole work, I do not know. Many of the dances and also the "insurrection" music, seem to me to be lively, vigorous, and yet traveling in well-worn grooves. There are, however, two long Adagios (of Aegina and Harmodius, and of Spartacus and Phrygia) and a Dance of the Nymphs, that achieve a remarkable sensuous and electrifying beauty, and are well worth anybody's attention.

Monitor has also issued a group of records that fall in the realm of Soviet "light" or "popular" music. The best of them to my ears is Russian Folk Dances of the Moiseyev Dance Company, performed by various folk instrumental ensembles (MF 310). Here, aside from the lusty music itself, one is treated to some remarkable feats on the balalaika and accordion. A collection of Jewish Folk Songs from Russia, most of them sung, and very well, by Emil Horowitz, is a little on the sentimental side, but certainly entertaining (MF-309). Similarly Songs and Dances of the Ukraine, Vol. 2 (MF-308), contains what I would consider to be present-day popular derivations from folk music rather than the old "eternal classics" of folk song, but it is a pleasure to hear such voices as those of Ivan Kozlowsky and Boris Gmirya.

From the Monitor company have come three fine recordings of Soviet music and musicians. One presents a song cycle

by Shostakovich, "From Jewish Folk Poetry," consisting of eleven songs for three voices in varying combinations. The texts are taken from Jewish folk songs but the music is wholly original, declamatory and meditative, in the vein of "art song," making up a beautiful tribute to the Jewish people from one who is himself not Jewish. The singers are the great contralto Zara Dolukhanova, the tenor Alexei Masslennikov, and the soprano Nina Dorlyak, with the composer at the piano. On the reverse side, Nina Dorlyak and her husband, the pianist Sviatoslav Richter, provide a perfect performance of Mussorgsky's cycle of seven children's "patter songs," "The Nursery," and Mark Reizen sings three songs of Kabalevsky (MC 2020).

Another presents an early *Cello Sonata*, Op. 40, by Shostakovich, and a late Cello Sonata, Op. 119, by Prokofiev. The cellist is the young Mstislav Rostropovich, with Shostakovich collaborating in his own work and Richter in that by Prokofiev. The attractive Shostakovich sonata is given an excellent reading, but the real miracle of performance comes in the Prokofiev. It is a subtle work, tender, and reflective, with touches of humor, and I have rarely heard a performance of anything so absorbing in its ability to vibrate to every "heartbeat" of the music (MC 2021).

And once again Mstislav Rostropovich shows himself to be one of the coming great cellists of our time in his performance of the Schumann *Cello Concerto*, on a record of which the other side offers Schumann's rarely heard *Concerto for Four Horns and Orchestra*. Rostropovich here does not surpass other masterful cellists who have undertaken this work (including Pablo Casals, Gregor Piatigorsky, and his own colleague Daniel Shafran), but he reveals again his own sensitivity, deep "inwardness" of feeling, and almost violinistic tone, and the performance has many precious moments. (MC 2023).

NEW SOVIET FILMS

THE WRESTLER AND THE
CLOWN

RUSSIAN REVIEW

ILYA MUROMETZ

THRILLING SHOW

THE CAPTAIN'S DAUGHTER
(on wide screen)

Artkino Pictures, Inc.

723 SEVENTH AVE., NEW YORK 19

Telephone: Circle 5-6570

THE FAR EAST REPORTER

announces the publication in
pamphlet form of the splendid
article

WE BUILD THE MING TOMBS DAM

by Israel Epstein which ap-
peared in the January issue of
New World Review.

10 CENTS A COPY

Order from:

FAR EAST REPORTER

Maud Russell, Publisher

P.O. Box 1536, New York City 17, N. Y.

(Send for listing of other pamphlets)

FOR YOUR LIBRARY

Bound Volumes

of

New World Review

\$4.00 each

for 1957

Still a few volumes available

Place your order now for

1958

Order through

NEW WORLD REVIEW

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

AN OUTLINE HISTORY OF CHINA

487 pages

Illustrated

Published in Peking

\$1.75 a copy

A concise history of China from
prehistoric times to the present. In-
dispensable for an understanding
of China today.

•

PEKING REVIEW

a weekly review of Chinese news
and views.

Airmailed from Peking

\$5.00 a year

Write to:

**IMPORTED PUBLICATIONS
& PRODUCTS**

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

THE BRAVE NEW WORLD

by

HELEN and SCOTT
NEARING

Experiences in the Soviet Union
and People's China

256 pages
Clothbound, \$3.50

Readers of NWR, who have already read advance excerpts in our pages, will now have the opportunity to read the whole inspiring account of the journey of these two great humanists to the new New World.

*A prompt reply will bring you
an autographed copy. Hurry!*

*Place your order today
through NWR*

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

Enclosed please find \$3.50 for 1 copy of
THE BRAVE NEW WORLD, or \$.....
for copies.

Name

Address

City Zone State

Here in a new pamphlet

CORLISS LAMONT
suggests

A PEACE PROGRAM FOR THE U.S.A.

SOME OF THE AUTHOR'S
PROPOSALS:

Stop the armaments race • Halt
nuclear weapons tests • Recognize
Communist China • Neutralize
Germany • Put an end to the
Cold War • Withdraw from
military bases around the world
• Support the United Nations •
Establish normal international
trade and cultural relations

Single copy 10c 7 copies 50c
15 copies \$1.00
50 or more, 40% discount

BASIC PAMPHLETS

Dept. NW

Box 42, Cathedral Station
New York 25, N. Y.