

SOCIAL SCIENCES ✓

DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRARY MAY 11 1959

MAY, 1959

New World

25¢

REVIEW

THE TWO GERMANYS

GORDON SCHAFFER

The Bolshoy Ballet

Ralph Parker

American Composers in USSR

Roy Harris

HARRY BRIDGES

Visits Moscow and Prague

MINORITIES IN CHINA

SHIRLEY GRAHAM

NEW WORLD REVIEW

MAY 1959

Review and Comment	
	Jessica Smith 3
The Bolshoy Ballet	
	Ralph Parker 8
The Two Germanys	
	Gordon Schaffer 12
Minorities in China	
	Shirley Graham 16
Harry Bridges Visits Moscow and Prague	22
U.S. Worker Samples Free Soviet Medical Care	
	Sol Goldin 28
A Soviet Factory Club	
	Andrew Rothstein 33
U.S. Composers Visit USSR	
	Roy Harris 36

REVIEWS

Democracy vs. Communism—	
Kenneth Colgrove	
	Elizabeth Moos 40
Comrade Venka—Pavel Nilin	
	Murray Young 42
Guides to Travel in the USSR	
	Bernard Koten 44
Education Magazine Translated	45
New Soviet Records	
	Sidney Finkelstein 46

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

ESLANDA ROBESON
Our Roaming Correspondent
*Editorial Consultant on Negro and
Colonial Questions*

Vol. 27, No. 5, May, 1959. Second
Class postage paid at New York, N. Y. Sub-
scription \$2.50 per year. \$1.25 for 6 months
(Canadian, \$3.00, foreign \$3.50 a year.
Draw money orders or checks payable in
New York.) Published monthly by the
N.W.R. Publications, Inc., 34 West 15th
Street, New York 11, N. Y. Indexed in Bul-
letin of the Public Affairs Information Ser-
vice. Phone: CHelsea 3-0666.
PRINTED IN U.S.A.

209

TO OUR READERS

Our deepest gratitude to all who have responded to our financial appeal. But the returns are not yet enough to meet our needs. We must have another \$5,000 to get us through the summer!

Our managing editor, Murray Young, is in the USSR and will be bringing back reports from there, Poland and other countries. We shall bring you news of mysterious and turbulent Tibet; an article on Agriculture in Czechoslovakia by George Wheeler; latest information on Bulgaria by Commander Edgar P. Young (ret.). Please insure our publishing this and other exciting material by sending your contribution today.

We are grateful, too, for all the thoughtful answers to our questionnaire. We love the praise, we welcome the criticisms and suggestions. Soon we shall publish a summary.

Take advantage of our premium book offer, back page, for sub renewals and to get new subscribers.

TOWARD A SOCIALIST AMERICA

A Symposium of 15 Essays
Edited by HELEN ALFRED

Contributing Authors: Stephen H. Fritchman, Bertha C. Reynolds, John Howard Lawson, John T. McManus, Broadus Mitchell, Herbert Aptheker, Paul M. Sweezy, Carl Dreher, Victor Perlo, George Olshausen, Scott Nearing, Reuben Borough, Homer Ayres, W. E. B. Du Bois and Philip S. Foner.

"An eye-opener to those who do not understand what socialism really means . . . a challenge to the divided Left to find common ways of working for common purposes."

New World Review

WHY NOT ORDER YOUR COPY TODAY:
PEACE PUBLICATIONS
P.O. Box 164, New York 24, N. Y.

Name

Address

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

Reduced price — Cloth \$2; Paper \$1.

REVIEW AND COMMENT

by JESSICA SMITH

Romeo and Juliet

THE AMERICAN and the Soviet flags hung side by side beneath the center boxes in New York's Metropolitan Opera House, in an atmosphere hushed but electric with excitement.

A glittering array of movie stars and musicians, dancers and diplomats, high society in mink and diamonds, took their seats on time, respecting the good Russian custom that no one should come in to disturb others after the curtain rose. And along with those who spent \$50 to \$100 dollars for the opening of the Bolshoy Ballet, were those who came dressed to spend thirty hours in line for standing room, or scraped together hard earned dollars for top gallery seats—students, workers, balletomanes.

The audience burst into spontaneous applause as the spotlight picked out the Russian conductor, Yuri Fayer, taking his place to lead an American orchestra in Prokofiev's beautiful score for *Romeo and Juliet*, then stood to the strains of the American and Soviet national anthems which opened this historic occasion. The applause and the bravos continued on an ascending scale until the tremendous ovation at the end.

What a great sharing of culture took place that night as the Russians brought us the glory of their ballet! Those who performed and we who watched were bound together by our common heritage of Shakespeare's

immortal genius, a part of all our lives. The Russian company carried over into dance and pantomime the beauty of Shakespeare's sublime poetry, bringing to life the familiar lines and emotions which echoed in our hearts. It was like a consummation of that "dearest dream" of our Walt Whitman for cementing the deep kinship he felt between the great American and the great Russian people—the dream of "an internationality of poems and poets, binding the lands of the earth closer than all treaties and diplomacy."

It was fitting that the theme of the first ballet the Russians brought us was the universal theme of love. The response of the audience to Ulanova was not alone to the matchless artistry of her dancing, but because she expressed for us so exquisitely and poignantly the deepest treasure in every human heart, which no one has ever surpassed Shakespeare in describing.

"Truer than reality itself" John Martin, *New York Times* critic, called Ulanova's Juliet. He was ecstatic in his praise of Ulanova as a "glorious" and "supreme" artist. The whole performance, he said, was a "great, teeming dramatic pageant, overflowing with vitality, with choreographic invention, with miming, with spectacle and emotion," likely to change our whole conception of ballet. He spoke of the underlying atmosphere of the

ballet as "corny," but "nevertheless wonderful corn, richly theatrical and so dramatically persuasive that frequently it arouses actual shivers of emotional response." If the underlying spirit of *Romeo and Juliet* is corn—let us have more of it! And perhaps we should think a little about the reasons for the cynicism that has come into American life so that a dramatic expression of eternal and universal human values must be described as "corn." Yet it is significant that one of Broadway's most successful musical productions, *West Side Story*, (and, by the way, one of the production members of the Bolshoy company say they most want to see) is a modern *Romeo and Juliet*.

The occasion was far more than a wonderful cultural event, the climax, so far of the U.S.-USSR exchange program. Who could sit in that audience and not recognize the great human heritage the American and the Soviet people have in common, the great cultural riches we can give each other? Who could experience the emotions of that evening and not vow that we must do everything in our power to extend our relations on levels like this, and abandon forever the hates and the hazards of the cold war and the hot war to which it might lead?

I do not suppose the Russians had any political propaganda in mind when they chose *Romeo and Juliet* as their opening ballet, other than that expressed in the desire to show us their finest art.

But surely there is propaganda in this—propaganda carried on by Shakespeare himself for friendship and love and peace. His "star crossed lovers" were not victims of fate, but

of violence and hatred of which they wanted no part, stirred up by a Tybalt whose evil mind and actions cried havoc, preventing a reconciliation between the feuding Montagues and Capulets which might otherwise have come. We need not carry the application too far. But was not Shakespeare saying, are not the Russians saying, are not the great masses of Americans who want peace saying that feuds and violence destroy the most precious thing in the world—love and the human beings who are the fruits of love—and let us therefore have done with hatred and wars forever and forever?

Prepare for Negotiations by Easing Tensions Now

THE DISAPPEARANCE from the international scene of the Dulles-Adenauer axis supporting outworn policies fraught with deadly peril to humanity, could mean a great new turn in world affairs toward a course of negotiations and peace. Yet the danger is great that this turn will be obstructed by the forces trying to resist all change and to continue in the same old way.

Before our country is a supreme opportunity to turn the scales for peace. With Washington in confusion, unable to exercise its asserted leadership over its split allies, it is the American people on whom the main responsibility rests. The Administration, with an election year looming ahead, cannot afford to ignore their voices. What the pressure of the British people accomplished with Prime Minister Macmillan, what the pressure of the German people—and members of his own party—accomplished in West Germany with Adenauer, is a meas-

ure of what can be done here too if each does his part. Too much is at stake for any person concerned with human survival to remain silent. Tell the President, tell Christian Herter, the new Secretary of State, tell your Senators and your Congressmen how you feel. Do not hold back because the problems that face us are complex, because all the issues around Berlin and Germany may not seem completely clear. No one can claim that there are any easy or quick solutions.

The main point is that peaceful solutions must be found, that war must be avoided. This means negotiations, with good faith on all sides, for as long as they may take. It means that whatever may happen at the foreign ministers' conference opening May 11, a summit conference must follow.

Every effort should be made to create conditions for the success of the negotiations. They should be prepared for by an effort to ease tensions in advance. This means an end of bellicose statements like those still heard in Pentagon circles, an end of provocative actions like the flight of U.S. planes above the 10,000 feet altitude for Western planes using the air corridor over the German Democratic Republic from West Germany to West Berlin, which had previously been adhered to.

There should be pressure to stop the arming of West Germany, especially with nuclear weapons, instead of stepping up this process as has recently been done.

There must be recognition of the fact that two Germanys with different social systems now exist, that neither could consent to being swallowed by the other, that there can

be no present solution that does not take this into account, that unification must be a gradual process and in the hands of the Germans themselves.

The abnormality of a Western-occupied Western Berlin 110 miles within the border of the German Democratic Republic of which East Berlin is the capital must be faced, and the need of a change in West Berlin's status recognized, to eliminate what is otherwise bound to be an endless source of friction in East-West relations.

The great wrong of the lack of a peace treaty with Germany fourteen years after the end of the war must be rectified. Since there does not now exist a single Germany to sign such a peace treaty, the only possible course is to conclude a peace treaty with both the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic, pending such time as one Germany shall again exist.

Some measure of disengagement in Central Europe, such as an atom free zone in Germany, Poland and Czechoslovakia, conventional arms reduction, troop withdrawals, must be worked out as a start toward further disarmament measures and toward the elimination of the hot bed of war that exists in the heart of Europe, where victims of Hitler's aggression live in constant fear of renewed conflict, and East and West confront each other in dangerous proximity.

Finally, there must be endless pressure on our representatives at the Geneva conference for the ending of *all* nuclear weapons tests, including those deep in the earth and high in the air, as a first step toward the complete prohibition of all atom

and hydrogen bombs, their production, stockpiling or use.

All of these things correspond to the desires and the deepest interests of the American people and the overwhelming majority of people everywhere. This is made clear by the differences among the allies revealed at the NATO conference in Washington and by divergences in Washington itself, where a few sane voices show some understanding of the people's real needs.

There are sharp divergences between the United States and Britain as well as between Britain and Bonn. Britain wants more flexibility in negotiations, recognizes the need for some new status with regard to West Berlin, understands that there must be some sort of tacit acknowledgment if not recognition, of the position of the East German Government, advocates a limited form of disengagement in Central Europe.

France and Germany have been close together in urging a tough position, "standing firm" in Berlin, refusing any degree of recognition to the German Democratic Republic. But at the same time, de Gaulle has incensed Adenauer by stating his belief that "Germany's unification in freedom seems to us the normal destiny of the German people, provided that this does not bring into question its present frontiers." Adenauer would risk a new world war to get back the parts of Poland and Czechoslovakia transferred under the Potsdam agreement.

Adenauer has insisted that his decision to step down from the chancellorship and run for President in the fall elections means no change in policy and that he will bring new powers to the post of President. But

the German people, and even his own party, which forced the change, are still to be reckoned with.

President Eisenhower assures us there will be no change in the Dulles policies. But the American people, a few leading Democrats and a few sane voices within his own party are still to be reckoned with—not to speak of the 1960 elections.

Walter Lippmann, astute Republican commentator, who has just been travelling in Europe, reports his findings that "every responsible European statesman recognizes that there are now two German states, that all of us must live with the fact and sooner or later find some solution" (*New York Herald Tribune*, April 6). On April 9 he wrote:

The case for recognizing that there are two Germanys and that there is therefore, a special situation in Berlin is this: It is our best chance to arrange for an orderly evolution in Germany. If we could get an international charter for Berlin, we could greatly reduce the risks of dangerous incidents caused by misunderstanding, by the recklessness or carelessness of subordinate officers and officials, or by mischievous provocation. If we could bring the two German states into a legal relationship with each other, there would be a chance that the movement toward German unity, which is certain to grow, would be open and visible, rather than clandestine and conspiratorial.

Mr. Lippmann continued that if we drift along, accepting the fact of partition but refusing to recognize it, we might manage for a while, but that what we shall have done is "to buy a temporary standstill for ourselves or the risk that at some later date there will be an explosion of pent-up popular feelings which we have managed to frustrate."

That outcome—which could mean

a new world war, can be avoided by a great outpouring from the American people demanding a recognition of world realities, a new course in foreign policy, and continuing negotiations until a peaceful solution is reached.

East-West Diplomatic Exchanges

AS our last issue went to press, the Western notes to the USSR on the question of a Foreign Minister's and Summit Conference had not yet been published. The March 26 notes from the United States, Great Britain and France all agreed in proposing a Foreign Minister's Conference of the four powers to be held at Geneva on May 11. They also agreed that "German advisers" (understood to mean representatives of the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic) be invited to the meeting and be consulted. Each one, answering the Soviet proposal that Czechoslovakia and Poland be invited, said that the participation of other countries could be contemplated at a certain stage of the negotiations, but that at the outset they should involve only the four powers.

In certain other respects the notes reflected the differences among the Western allies, notably on the matter of replying to the Soviet proposal that the Foreign Ministers' Conference should definitely be followed by a Summit Conference.

The United States said it would be "ready to participate" in the latter "as soon as developments in the foreign ministers' justify holding a Summit Conference."

Britain, putting it more positively, said "As soon as developments in the foreign ministers' meeting war-

rant holding a summit conference, Her Majesty's Government will be glad to participate. . . ."

France put its conditions in much flatter terms—"if the conference of foreign ministers permits the envisagement of genuine progress, the French government would be disposed to accept a conference at the summit. . . ."

On the question of the agenda for the foreign ministers, the U.S. and Britain said they should consider "questions relating to Germany, including a peace treaty with Germany and the question of Berlin," and noted that each participating Government should have the right to present its views on any question it considered relevant.

The Soviet Government's answer of March 30 accepted the proposal for a foreign ministers' meeting in Geneva on May 11, "to consider questions related to Germany, including the peace treaty with Germany."

The notes to the United States and Great Britain were identical. In the note to France, the Soviet Government added that of course each government would be able to state its views on all questions related to the problems brought up.

On the matter of the Summit meeting being dependent on concrete progress by the foreign ministers, it said that such progress would depend on the efforts of the parties concerned, that the Soviet Union would exert all its efforts to make the meeting a success and hoped the other participants would do likewise. But, it concluded, should these efforts not be sufficient, they should be redoubled at a Summit meeting to insure positive results.

The Bolshoy Ballet

by RALPH PARKER

AMERICA has waited twenty-five years for the Bolshoy Ballet, for it was that long ago that showman Sol Hurok made the first approaches to Moscow. The fact that the company is now appearing at the Metropolitan Opera House and will later appear in other American cities, Montreal and Toronto, is due, however, not only to Mr. Hurok's perseverance but also to the conclusion of the American-Soviet cultural agreement of 1958, in other words, to the political measures that have been taken to bring the two most powerful countries in the world nearer to an understanding of each other's achievements in science, technology and culture.

America is seeing a little over one-half the total strength of the Bolshoy Ballet, although, of course, it is seeing the best of the soloists. The fact remains that while the New York company is dancing four full length ballets and two Highlights programs, sufficient strength remains behind in Moscow to present a repertory of seven or eight major ballets, including one—Swan Lake—that is in the New York season. That fact should suffice to illustrate the size and resources of the company.

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

The Bolshoy Ballet is an integral part of the Opera and Ballet Theater popularly known as the Bolshoy (the Big or Grand), as its neighbor in Moscow's Sverdlov Square is known as the Maly (the Small) Dramatic Theater. The entire company, including the administrative and technical staff, the workshops and costume-makers, numbers almost three thousand, being large enough to have its own polyclinic, its house newspaper, its holiday homes on the outskirts of Moscow and on the coast of the Black Sea. Classified as an academic theater, it receives from the state an annual subsidy.

The Bolshoy theater operates under a general director, Professor Georgi Orvid, fifty-five year old graduate of Kiev Conservatory, a chief Choreographer, Leonid Lavrovsky, who is fifty-four and was trained as a dancer and choreographer in Leningrad, and, for the ballet, an elected Artistic Council, an advisory body whose role in the affairs of the theater has increased in recent years, headed by Galina Ulanova. The chief conductor is sixty-nine year old Yuri Fayer of Kiev who has been conducting ballet for fifty years. The art side, both of the opera and ballet, is under the general supervision of Ulanova's husband, Moscow-born Vadim Rindin, who has designed over 150 productions for various theaters.

A name not to be overlooked is that of Pyotr Danilov, the theater's

stage manager who is responsible among other things for the transfer of over thirty tons of sceneries, properties and costumes from Moscow to New York and for the complicated process of adapting the productions for the considerably smaller stage of the Metropolitan opera house.

The Bolshoy Ballet recruits its company of dancers almost exclusively from the Moscow Ballet School. Only very few of the dancers appearing in New York received their training elsewhere, but these include Ulanova who in 1928, at the age of 18, graduated at the Lenin-grad Ballet School. But the Moscow Ballet School trains dancers for other companies too. Some join the Moiseyev and Beryozka companies, the Stanislavsky Ballet, and other Moscow ensembles, while others become members of one or other of the 43 ballet companies to be found all over the Soviet Union.

Most children attending the Moscow Ballet School enter it at about 8 years old and take a full ten-year course which includes general primary and secondary education in addition to ballet classes. But there are exceptions. Liudmilla Bogomolova, for example, was 13 before she went to the Moscow Ballet School. Her dancing gifts had been noticed by a teacher of ballroom dancing who recommended her to take up dancing professionally.

Recruitment for the Moscow Ballet School is supervised by a commission on which several famous dancers serve. It is their experienced eyes which decide whether the young candidates are physically promising material. In fact, the proportion of pupils who for one reason or another fail to make the full course is

surprisingly small. A commission, too, decides the future of the dancer when he or she graduates. Some years as many as a dozen will go straight to the Bolshoy, but in others the number may be as low as three or four.

Long before they graduate, the pupils at this famous school have had opportunities to appear before critical publics. The name of Tatiana Tuchina, for instance, was well known in Moscow ballet circles twelve years ago though she is still in her mid-twenties: she made a charming Amour in the child dancers' scenes in Minkus' *Don Quixote*. Each winter pupils of the Moscow Ballet School stage their own production of Tchaikovsky's *Nut-Cracker* on the Second Stage (the *Filial*) of the Bolshoy Theater and it often happens that the young dancer who performs the taxing *pas de deux* in this ballet will be found on the bills of the Bolshoy the following season. Such was the case with 19-year-old Yekaterina Maximova who within six months after graduation was chosen to rehearse one of the main roles in Prokofiev's *Stone Flower*. Thus the Russian system entails giving trainees early opportunities to appear on the stage.

However, it is the exception rather than the rule for young dancers to step into the main roles during their first season. Only the greatest—the Lepeshinskayas, the Pliset-skayas, the Kondratievas—can hope for this. A more typical course is that taken by Nina Chistova. Nina graduated in 1951 and joined the Bolshoy in the following season. At first she received small solo parts—the Good Fairy in *The Sleeping Beauty*, one of the Cygnets in *Swan*

Lake. A year or two later she was "promoted" to be one of the Swans in the *pas de trois* in *Swan Lake* and Princess Florina in *The Sleeping Beauty*. In December, 1954, at the age of 21, Nina Chistova made her debut in the leading role of Parasha in Gliere's *The Bronze Horseman* and a year later was dancing Odette-Odilia in *Swan Lake*. In 1956 she had two new big roles—the Maiden in Yarullin's *Forest Devil* and Marian in Khachaturian's *Gayaneh*. Her latest role was in Dmitri Shostakovich's *Dance Suite*. New York will see her as Juliet's friend in *Romeo and Juliet*, as well as in other solo parts.

There has been a good deal of exaggeration in the foreign press about the salaries of Soviet ballet dancers. For several years their monthly salaries hover around 1,000 rubles. With six or seven years of dancing behind them a ballet dancer performing half a dozen solo parts and having also to dance in the corps de ballet, will earn about 1,500 a month. True, those who are classified as leading soloists earn up to about 3,000 rubles, while a prima ballerina expects to be paid up to 6,000 rubles for five or six performances a month. It should be mentioned that working conditions include two months holiday with pay and that after 20 years dancers are entitled to a pension.

But the work, the routine! An average dancer, say, twenty-five years old, performing in the corps de ballet with half-a-dozen small solo parts, will arrive at the theater for class or rehearsal at 10 or 11 in the morning, six days a week. She will return, very tired, at about 3 p.m., lunch, rest up and then return to the thea-

ter for an evening performance, reaching home at midnight. And this she will do at least twenty times a month. It is surprising that the foreign language classes and hobby circles run by the company have such good attendance and that several of the younger dancers find time to study extra-murally at the Lunacharsky College of Theatrical Art.

You will find in the company men and women of highly varied social origin. There are generals' daughters and the daughters of factory workers; Liudmilla Bogomolova's father was an army officer, Marina Kondratieva's an eminent scientist of Kazan University, Nina Chistova's a working man, Maya Samokhvalova's a railroad clerk. On the whole, you will probably find a rather higher proportion of the children of professional parents than in other walks of Soviet life. And, of course, there are always a number of dancers from "dynasties" of dancers, such as the Messerers, the Jewish family that has given so many fine artistes to the Bolshoy.

Incidentally there are sixteen married couples in the company touring the States. It is a Bolshoy—or rather a Soviet—tradition not to reveal much of the private lives of its artists, but it is no secret that Alexander Lapauri, the handsome Paris of *Romeo and Juliet*, is the husband of Raissa Struchkova or that Liudmilla Bogomolova is the wife of the choreographer Stanislav Vlassov, and the assistant conductor Gennadi Rozhdestvensky is married to Nina Timofeyeva, the graceful and dramatic Mistress of the Copper Mountain in Prokofiev's *Stone Flower*.

By the time these lines are read,

New York will have judged for itself the quality of the four ballets and other programs being presented. It may interest readers, however, to know a little of the recent background to the Bolshoy Ballet. A good many changes have been going on behind the scenes during the past twelve months. These, in brief, have been intended to introduce new choreographic and scenic ideas. New York will see only one complete ballet that reflects these changes—*Stone Flower*—though discerning spectators may detect novelties in the Highlights programs too.

Stone Flower (Yuri Grigorovich's choreography) was brought from Leningrad to replace the Lavrovsky production of the same ballet. Lavrovsky's version, in the opinion of many critics, failed because of its much too literal use of mime. In *Romeo and Juliet* the mime has, as it were, the backing of Shakespeare's text to which the choreographer's colleague, the late S. Radlov, his reputation now fully restored, brought his great experience of Shakespearian production. But the same miming methods applied to the Bazhov tale on which *Stone Flower* is based were not nearly as successful. Yuri Grigorovich's approach is a different one. He believes in telling the story through dance, and if that means some details of the story are lost, well, the dance is all the better for the reduction in the purely literary side.

The new mood in the Bolshoy is towards simplification in scenery and properties too. Peter Williams' sets for *Romeo and Juliet* are no doubt in keeping with the majestic and spectacular character of the whole production. The fact remains

that the sheer bulk of the scenery will prevent *Romeo and Juliet* being included in the repertory for other cities. On the other hand Virsaladze's sceneries, costumes and properties for *Stone Flower* weigh considerably less than two tons and could be flown across Europe quite easily after the first performance in Moscow to catch up with the rest of the shipment which had gone on ahead by sea.

While the company of 130 is performing in the United States the sister company in Moscow will be rehearsing Kara-Karayev's *Path of Thunder*, a ballet on South African racialism based on Peter Abraham's novel of the same name. This too is a contribution from Leningrad.

The visit of the Bolshoy Ballet by no means exhausts the program of cultural exchanges worked out between the USSR Ministry of Culture and various American impresarios who have visited Moscow recently. The same organization that is responsible for bringing in the Bolshoy has tentative plans to engage the Soviet circus, the Moscow Art Theater, the Obraztsov Puppet Theater and a number of dance companies including representative folk dancers from Georgia and the Ukraine.

For her part, America has sent ice-skaters and orchestras, and some of her best instrumental players. Now the question that many are asking in Moscow is when they are going to have a chance of seeing some big American musical show or a good dramatic theater. The need is urgent, for no one either in Moscow or Washington wants these cultural exchange programs to be a one-way affair.

The Two Germanys

by GORDON SCHAFFER

WHEN MR. MACMILLAN left Moscow after his talks with Mr. Khrushchev, he could have been in no doubt that the Soviet Union and her allies of the Warsaw pact are determined to find a peaceful solution to the German question, but at the same time will defend the German Democratic Republic against armed aggression of any kind. There is no doubt either that Mr. Macmillan has conveyed this fact to the other NATO countries. You can judge therefore how government circles here as well as the British public generally feel about the threats to use force over Berlin voiced by General Norstad, NATO commander-in-chief and such U.S. Generals as Twining and White and about the various cryptic comments by President Eisenhower. One observer, who was present at the time of the Washington talks between Mr. Macmillan and Mr. Eisenhower, assured me that the U.S. Defense Department is taking full advantage of the fact that the Administration is in the hands of a sick President and a doomed Secretary of State and is pressing for an armed showdown because it is convinced that at this stage, though not in a few years time, fifty million Russians would be killed for every ten million Americans. What happens to a couple of

hundred million Europeans is apparently of little concern.

Sincere Americans, who are as conscious of the realities of the situation as we are in Britain, may dismiss the ravings of the generals as a mere exercise in fire-eating, but they are not so easily dismissed here in Europe or in the Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern Europe.

I was in Moscow during the Macmillan visit and was able to see for myself the enthusiasm with which he was greeted by the Russian people and their desperate hope that it would lead to some lessening of international tension. I also had a chance to talk with Mr. Khrushchev when he received members of the Bureau of the World Council of Peace. Khrushchev sauntered in without anyone accompanying him and answered questions off the cuff for two hours. The Soviet viewpoint on the various questions at issue has been made clear many times and he did not go much beyond that, but he underlined certain points which ought to be understood by the West if the meeting of foreign secretaries and the hoped-for summit meeting are to lead to practical results.

First, the Soviet Union will not accept any solution at the expense of the German Democratic Republic. Commentators in Britain and America have done their best to create a picture of Eastern Germany as a Soviet puppet, with no democratic life and a population eagerly awaiting the chance to join Dr. Adenauer. The Soviet Union re-

GORDON SCHAFFER, former assistant editor of the London *Reynold's News*, is Chairman of the British Peace Committee. He has recently visited the German Democratic Republic.

gards it as a part of Germany where the militarists, the cartels and the Junkers have been deprived of their power for evil, as the victorious powers agreed they should be at Potsdam.

Any solution of the German problem, as far as the Russians are concerned, must therefore start off with the acceptance of two German states who alone can determine what steps can be taken to lay the basis for some form of reunification in the future.

Mr. Khrushchev told us that he had made clear the intention of the Soviet Union to defend the GDR if she were attacked, just as the NATO powers would defend the Federal Republic. He also said that it was a painful thing to see various European countries agreeing to have U.S. rocket and other bases on their territories because if the United States were to launch war, clearly these bases would have to be destroyed. He explained that he had pointed out that the suggestion of making both East and West Berlin into a free city was quite unacceptable, because Berlin is in GDR territory and the Eastern Sector is its capital. He had also made clear that if the West refuses to make a peace treaty with both German Republics, the Soviet Union will consider herself free to sign a treaty with the GDR and in so doing would only be following the example of the Western powers when they signed a separate treaty with Japan.

He went on to express his hope that negotiations would find a settlement and renewed his offer of a non-aggression pact between the Warsaw and NATO powers as a way of expressing the determination

of both sides not to attempt solutions by force.

In this talk and in the many public statements made by the Soviet leaders, the fact clearly emerges that the Russians are not attempting unilaterally to deprive the Western powers of any of their rights in Berlin. They have pressed the view that the time has come to end the occupation period and that they themselves are prepared to hand over to the Germans. They have also indicated their concern and that of the GDR at the continuing hostile activities of Western organizations in West Berlin. Since most of these activities aimed at sabotage and subversion in the GDR are financed by official U.S. grants this is hardly surprising.

But the point that must be understood is that the one point of dispute is the intention of the Russians to hand over their occupation rights to the East Germans. The threats of war—because that is what “forcing a way to Berlin” means—are being made because the West wants a Russian rather than an East German stamp on travel documents. The war of Jenkins ear* was a major issue compared with this.

My belief is that Mr. Macmillan returned from Moscow with the conviction that the policy of threats would get nowhere and could lead to incidents capable of starting the third world war. Although there was no sign of a basis of agreement, he accepted the readiness of the Soviet leaders to negotiate and the reference to some measure of disengagement in Europe was the one point

* This war was fought by Britain against Spain because a certain Captain Jenkins had his ear cut off by the Spaniards.

on which he believed the discussions could start.

The angry reception given to this modest essay in peacemaking in Washington, Paris and Bonn has undoubtedly shaken even Britain's Tories.

Of course the real reason behind the clash is that neither Washington nor Bonn is ready to accept the failure of their hopes to restore capitalism in Eastern Europe. Adenauer and the ex-Nazis who have come back in droves in the Federal Republic dream not only of regaining the territories of Eastern Germany but the territories (by agreement of the U.S., Britain and Russia) incorporated in Poland and Czechoslovakia, with a portion of East Prussia in the USSR. The vicious attack on General de Gaulle, who has tried so hard to look important by teaming up with the West Germans, because he said the postwar frontiers must be accepted, is an indication of how far the leaders of the Federal Republic are ready to come out in the open.

The British Government will not so far defy the rest of the Western alliance by itself recognizing the GDR, but there have been many inspired suggestions here that some form of de facto recognition should be given. It was no accident that the Federation of British Industries, the most powerful group in Britain, signed a trade agreement with the GDR at the very time the United States was threatening war rather than admit the right of the GDR to take over the Russian occupation duties. More than 100 businessmen attended the Leipzig Fair in March. Neither of these things could have happened without the tacit agree-

ment of the British Government.

What does the situation look like from the GDR itself? I stopped there on my way back from Moscow. The first restaurant I went into in the Eastern sector of Berlin had menu cards with the printed prices crossed out, and new prices substituted in ink. That happens in London sometimes. But these menus had *lower* prices marked in. Would any of the commentators who constantly write about the contrast between East and West Berlin care to compare prices today for restaurant meals, bread, butter, tinned foods and a whole range of commodities? If they do they will be compelled to admit that in terms of purchasing power for necessities of this kind the East mark is almost level with the West mark. For luxury goods and for a good many articles of clothing, though not for working clothes and most children's clothes, the West is still cheaper. But rents, the first claim on wages, are very much lower in the East. So are electricity, gas, transport and other services. The free health service, the nursery schools, facilities for holidays, and so on are much better in the East.

The economic recovery in East Germany in the last few months has been startling. The GDR in fact is today one of the major industrial countries, with trade agreements with most of the countries of the world. The earlier mistakes, which led to an over-concentration on capital goods at the expense of living standards, have been overcome.

I called in at a peace conference of trade union and other delegates in the magnificent theater built for the workers of Buna, the great synthetic rubber plant which was for-

merly part of the I.G. Farben empire. The biggest applause of the day came when one speaker referred to the threats from West Germany and said: "Never will we allow our factory to go back to I.G. Farben!"

People who only read about refugees from Eastern Germany ought to realize that those trade unionists at Buna speak for the majority of the population. There are, indeed, opponents of the socialist regime in Eastern Germany and to be a "refugee," you have only to take a five cent ticket on the underground. But the majority of the population are not ready to sacrifice the prospects of an improving living standard; and generally they accept the fact that socialist planning is making this promise possible.

There is quite a flow of people from West to East today as well as from East to West. I met a professor at Rostock University who had come from one of the West German universities because he could not bear to see the Nazis coming back. Skilled workers, fearing unemployment in the West, are taking jobs in the East. Women with families who have little hope of getting jobs in the West, come to the East because their children can be cared for in the nursery school while they are at work.

The Social Democrats in Western Germany have realized these facts and have recently put forward proposals for a settlement, which at least recognize that there must be talks between the two Republics and an acceptance of the different economic systems and social services. That is the only sane path, and it has strong support in West Germany.

In Britain, the great march from Aldermaston to London culminating in the biggest demonstration in historic Trafalgar Square for many years, showed how people are at last awakening to the threat of atomic war. The mass participation of young people in the march was of particular significance. Labor M.P.s, many regional Labor Parties and some important trade union leaders took part, but the Labor Party leaders were silent.

The way the Labor Party under its present leaders is failing to meet the situation is one of the greatest tragedies of our time. Haunted by their past acceptance of the cold war, the military alliances and the anti-Communist line up, they are losing the chance to give the lead for which the people are desperately waiting.

Mr. Macmillan, who has an even worse past to redeem, has undoubtedly won support because he made a gesture in the direction of peace. He knows if he can pull only a slight achievement out of the present crisis, he will be set to win the election.

It is almost farcical to note how electoral considerations can play their part in issues which involve the threat of ending our civilization and maybe even life itself. Not a single British interest would be sacrificed if a peaceful solution involving acceptance of the GDR and the need for coexistence were arrived at. Not a single American interest would be sacrificed. Dr. Adenauer, indeed, would be unhappy. But apart from a few fire-eating generals, most of us would agree that this would be preferable to atomic annihilation.

Minorities in China

by SHIRLEY GRAHAM

AMONG the many absorbing aspects of New China, certainly one of the most important is the unification of its many peoples and the policy of the People's Republic of China towards minorities which in the past have been oppressed and exploited by the ruling majority. It is not surprising that I should be particularly interested in this subject. As we travel throughout the wide expanses of this great land I am gathering material for a book on China's national minorities. At this time I would like to share with *New World Review* readers an introduction to this phase in the development of new-born China.

I have found China a bewildering country. We traveled by boat up the Yangtse River far into the interior. Then we took a train and went farther westward. I will give only one example of what I mean by bewildering: We were in Szechuan Province in the upper reaches of a tributary of the Yangtse river. We were being shown a marvelous irrigation project which I was admiring for all its "progressive" and "modern" efficiency. Then I learned that the complete

irrigation dam, floodgates, new channeling of the river and all had been planned and executed more than 2,000 years ago! "All we have done," said our accompanying friends, "is to extend the reaches of the water." They had merely dug several additional ditches.

China is the third largest country in the world. Its population is rapidly becoming one-fourth of the total world population. This density of population was cited in the past as excusing the crimes of imperialists. Cheap labor was "natural" because laborers were so numerous. Floods and famines in China were regarded by the west as signs of a "divine Providence" which thinned out the "overcrowded" population. But today, of all the rich resources of this great land none is so highly valued, none so carefully tended, none promises so bountiful a return as its many people.

In a population of 680 million, about six per cent belong to national minorities, who are to be found mainly in the border or distant provinces or in the mountainous or most arid regions of the large provinces. In many cases these peoples were the original settlers of the land but have been pushed out by invading hordes, forced to live in the more difficult highlands and excluded from contact with civilization. Before liberation, that is, ten years ago, many of these people

SHIRLEY GRAHAM is the author of many books, including biographies of Frederick Douglass, Phyllis Wheatley and Booker T. Washington. She collaborated with her husband, Dr. W.E.B. Du Bois, with whom she is now touring China, on "In Battle for Peace."

lived in the most primitive conditions. Tribes fought among themselves, slavery was common. Few had reached the state of feudalism.

4,000 Years of History

It is to be remembered that China's history goes back more than 4,000 years with control of the land passing through many clans, tribes and nations until it was unified under the Chins (thence the name China) in 221 B.C. While the Chinese Empire did not include the vast areas which constitute the People's Republic of China, it was larger than all Europe and included many different peoples speaking various languages and with entirely different cultures. Gradually the more humane culture of the Hans began to spread, the Han people became dominant, two ruling Han houses, one in the East and one in the West, merged, and the Han dynasty was established which ruled all China. All this happened before the Year 1 A.D. Many dynasties rose and fell during the next 1700 years, but it was not until China was conquered and overrun by the Manchurians in the middle of the 18th century that the Hans lost their superiority as the largest and most influential nationality.

The Manchu government imposed cruel oppression on the non-Manchu nationalities in China. The proud Hans were forced to till land. In time, however, Han landlords shared with Mongol princes and Manchu nobles in holding high position and ruling all other peoples. Gradually, also, the Manchurians were absorbed by the Hans until by the beginning of the 20th century only the Manchu dynasty

itself could be sure of "pure" Manchurian blood and only in the Imperial Court and in a small north-west province was the language of the Manchus spoken or written. I am told that the 94 per cent of the dominant Hans now given, represents the Han people plus all the many nationalities and individuals of nationalities which through hundreds of years they have absorbed. Neither the people of Canton nor of Shanghai are really Hans though these several millions are now so counted.

The minority problem in China has little in common with minority difficulties in the United States. Fifty-one different minority nationalities were separated from each other and from the dominant majority by locality, language, customs and savage tribal laws which forbade marriage, or indeed, any contact outside the community. Some of these people were once part of great empires but now lived isolated apart from all human progress, or under savage exploitation and oppression.

With the establishment of the People's Republic of China, immediate steps were taken to right the wrongs of past centuries. Article III of the Constitution reads:

The People's Republic of China is a single multi-national state.

All nationalities are equal. Discrimination against, or oppression of, any nationality, and acts which undermine the unity of the nationalities are prohibited.

All the nationalities have freedom to use and foster the growth of their spoken and written languages, and to preserve or reform their own customs or ways.

Regional autonomy applies in areas where people of national minorities

live in compact communities. National autonomous areas are inalienable parts of the People's Republic of China.

It is, however, a fact that an Article in a Constitution cannot of itself change conditions or people. Soon after arriving in Peking I went to the College of Nationalities to learn more about minorities in China.

College of Nationalities

We drove far outside the city walls along a wide avenue lined with very young trees. War, famine and flood had denuded north China of trees. For the past two years there has been an intensive campaign of tree planting with the result that tender, young trees are seen everywhere. Peking, like Moscow, is spreading miles beyond what was once the city boundary. Our car had to weave its way through two continuous streams of workers: men and women with loaded baskets hanging from a pole laid across the shoulders or dragging carts piled high with produce; carts drawn by small donkeys, resembling our western burros, bicycles, pedicarts, motor trucks filled with building materials, oil tanks. We passed imposing state buildings, blocks of new apartment houses (they are called "dormitories"), a College of Engineering, a large handsome broadcasting station, (I was told in Moscow that the new Peking Station is more powerful than the Moscow Broadcasting System), clusters of old-style huts surrounded by vegetable gardens, new buildings just going up.

Finally, we passed through an arched gateway into the college

grounds. One saw at once that this was a large institution with many attractive buildings. I would have liked to have stopped to watch a group of students going through gymnastics on the athletic field, but a delegation of students in the colorful dress of their various nations had gathered to greet us, the smiling, courteous President of the college warmly welcomed and conducted us to the reception room where tea was served.

Forty-six of the fifty-one national minorities of China were represented in the 2,498 students now registered in the college. Most of these students come from the four big Autonomous Regions: Sinkiang Uighur in the northwest, Inner Mongolia in the north, Kwangsi Chuang in the south and Ningsi in the west, and from Tibet which was designated as "not quite autonomous."

The college was established in 1951 to train people belonging to the minority nations. The years of wars and constant struggle from 1911 when the Manchu dynasty was forced to abdicate, to the triumph of the People's Liberation Army and the setting up of the People's Republic of China in 1949, had brought little change in the regions occupied by these nationalities. They were sometimes forced by rulers to fight on one side or the other but they had no interest and little knowledge about why they fought. Wars only made their lot harder and brought famine closer to their homes. It was the task of the new government to inform these isolated communities that the triumph of the Liberation Army was their triumph, that they too had

been liberated from the hardships and oppressions of the past and to show them the path to a better way of life.

This was not an easy undertaking. Fear and hatred towards all "outside" peoples was the most common characteristic of most of the nationalities. In addition, no matter how primitive might be their social system, i.e. whether it be tribal, slave society or feudal, each nationality had its small ruling class at the top, with its mass of degraded toilers at the bottom. Also, each group had its fierce religious taboos, superstitions and priesthood. Each group had its own language.

That day at the college I studied maps, and charts and tables, examined pictures and exhibits and learned something of how this tremendous job was started. First, the physical needs of the people in these areas were filled. Food, clothing, salt were sent to them, agricultural experts brought seed for planting, doctors and nurses arrived, roads were opened up, bridges were built. And all this time *nothing* was demanded of the people, until finally, they themselves began asking questions, and asking *what they could do to help*.

The College of Nationalities and the many Institutes of Nationalities now located in every province where large groups of minorities are found, do not educate away from the customs, habits or religion of the nationality. Rather, each student is trained into a deeper understanding of his own nation's history and to a realization as to why his people are as they are. Backwardness is shown as the result of

oppression and superstition. Political and economic ideas are brought forward, examined and discussed.

As rapidly as possible teachers from the minority groups are placed in charge. Each school has Buddhist, Islamic and Lama chapels where the students of these faiths worship. In one large institute in Yunnan I saw a Catholic chapel. Though all the national minorities have their own language, few have a written language. In cases where there is a written language, books are printed in that language and the new schools use that language in their elementary work. In the middle schools, however, and in the institutes, the Han language is taught throughout China just as Russian is taught throughout the Soviet Union.

I have visited some of these resurrected nations and seen with my own eyes what has happened. In a village of the Yi People in western Szechuan I talked, through an interpreter, with beaming villagers who ten years ago were slaves. Fifty per cent of these people were of far less importance to their masters than horses or cattle. Forty per cent of the remainder led a precarious life on the edge of poverty, constantly in debt, sick, hopeless. The remaining ten per cent who were the masters were themselves ignorant, afraid to leave the boundaries of their own land, driven by superstitions, they fought among themselves. Today these people know that they are among the first peoples of the world to pass directly from a slave society to socialism, completely jumping over feudalism and capitalism! One chapter of my book will deal with the Yi Peo-

ple and their amazing "leap forward."

What I Learned of Tibet

The success of the People's Republic of China in reeducating landowners and effecting land reforms is phenomenal. But I have just come to Canton from the borders of Tibet where stubborn resistance to any distribution of wealth or abolition of slavery has flared into armed revolt. This is not a surprising development. Here we have a big, mountainous country with a total population of less than 1,300,000 where a small pinnacle of wealth and luxury rests on one of the most benighted and vicious feudal systems the world has ever seen. It is built on human slavery, superstition, poverty and ignorance. For many centuries rule in Tibet has been taken over by a religious hierarchy with a Dalai Lama—the reincarnation of Buddha—as Head of State. When, in 1951 a young and seemingly enlightened Dalai Lama rejoined Tibet with China as a member nation in the People's Republic, lesser lamas and nobles grumbled but could do little.

The agreement made at that time provided for the reform of Tibet's social system, serfdom, by the local government of Tibet, without any compulsion from the central authorities, and only when the people themselves raised demands for such reform. Many of the poor people of Tibet enthusiastically welcomed changes which promised to improve their lot. Soon water from newly built dams was irrigating their arid fields, salt could be had for their herds, doctors appeared in isolated regions, the first plows were seen.

In 1956 the Dalai Lama, accompanied by the Panchen Lama, made history by traveling from Lhasa, capital of Tibet, to Peking, capital of the Central Government, over a newly constructed road, a miracle of engineering through the Himalaya mountains. At that time the State Council adopted a resolution setting up a Preparatory Committee for the Tibetan Autonomous Region. As Chairman of this Committee, the Dalai Lama made an agreement to put into effect the 1951 agreement, which had thus far been blocked by the reactionaries.

There is a progressive element among the ruling class of Tibet which heartily supported the Dalai Lama in his efforts to lift his country out of feudalism and backwardness. But this was too much for some Tibetans whose "divine right" to live in ease off the sweat and blood of slaves had been decreed by the ages. Their protests were loud. Then, in keeping with their national policy to educate and enlighten rather than force changes, the Central Government informed the local Tibetan government that change of the social system could be postponed until the completion of the second Five Year Plan which would deal primarily with agriculture, sanitation and construction. This meant that serfdom would not be officially abolished until 1962. Meanwhile every means towards gaining the cooperation of landowners was to be encouraged.

Rebellion activity began with terrorizing the countryside. The Central Government left the stopping of these bandits to the local Tibetan Government; the rebels redoubled their activities, thinking

tha
too
T
by
rad
slav
tem
No
for
Tib
the
Au
the
out

•
Peki
man
man

that the Central Government was too weak to do anything about it.

This was a mistake. When, backed by outside help, and encouraged by radio messages, armed revolt of the slavers and reactionaries was attempted, it was speedily put down. Now, instead of waiting until 1962 for the abolition of serfdom in Tibet, measures will be taken by the *Committee for the Tibetan Autonomous Region to wipe out the last vestiges of feudalism without further delay. And now the

army of the Central Government will be close by to protect the ex-slaves and to see that their rights are not violated.

The full story of any one of these national minorities would fill a book. Their history, cultures and social systems differ so radically that most general statements about them are misleading. A wealth of material is here. Old China amazed Marco Polo with its splendors and beauty, its gold, silver and precious stones. New China can also dazzle a traveler with its limitless resources, its wealth, its beauty. But most amazing is the springing forth of its many peoples.

* According to the latest information from Peking, the Panchen Lama, formerly vice chairman of this Committee, is now its acting chairman.

50,000 PEOPLE SEE SANE NUCLEAR POLICY EXHIBIT

FIFTY THOUSAND PERSONS saw the exhibit on "Our Stake in the Geneva Conference" during the four weeks it was on display in the 42nd Street Information Center of the New York Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy.

The center closed April 12. The exhibit, however, reopened at the Community Church, Park Avenue and 35th Street, for a week, after which it was scheduled to be displayed in other boroughs of New York.

Prominent New Yorkers addressed lunch-time meetings at the center. Among these were City Councilman Stanley Isaacs; Norman Thomas; Rev. Paul Rischell of the N.Y. Protestant Council; Dr. Hugh Wolfe, former president of the Federation of American Scientists; Rabbi Edward Klein of the Stephen Wise Free Synagogue; Algernon Black, leader of the Society for Ethical Culture; and Margaret Halsey, author of "With Malice Toward Some."

Over nine thousand signatures were collected on a petition to the leaders of the three nuclear powers negotiating in Geneva. Postcards to Senators Javits and Keating were signed, urging them to support Senator Humphrey's resolution on behalf of the Geneva Conference. Reprints of the *Consumer Report* study of Strontium go in milk and thousands of pieces of other literature were distributed to visitors.

The displays of the exhibit show how the Geneva Conference, by succeeding to halt further nuclear weapons tests, will stop further damaging fall-out, be a start to curbing the arms race and encourage progress toward turning swords into plowshares. Other displays show the work of the Sane Nuclear Policy Committees across the country and in New York City, as well as actions by people in other nations in support of stopping nuclear weapons tests. Among the artists contributing to the displays were Anton Refregier, Ben Shahn and Philip Reisman.

It is to be hoped that this example will be followed in other parts of the country. NWR will welcome news from its readers of peace activities in their communities.

Harry Bridges

Visits Moscow and Prague

During the first part of this year, President Harry Bridges of the ILWU, accompanied by William Glazier, Administrative Assistant, made a two-month tour of Europe and the Middle East. Their trip was for the purpose of observing the trade union and labor situation in the countries visited and to furnish background for discussion in the ILWU on international affairs and foreign policy.

We publish below excerpts dealing with brief visits to Czechoslovakia and the USSR from Mr. Bridges' report on the tour to the ILWU convention in Seattle, Washington, on April 6, and from his speech at the Commonwealth Club in San Francisco, March 20. Mr. Bridges pointed out that the ILWU delegation considered that the most important thing about the socialist world is not how it compares with the United States, but how it compares with the past of these nations and these peoples and how the present fits into the expanded plans for the future. He declared:

"For years these people, especially the Russians, have been living in the future. All of their massive efforts to industrialize their nation were carried through on the promise of better times some day. Things are still tight, but the promise is slowly beginning to be realized. This is the most impressive fact about life in the socialist world today—it is improving, and everyone who goes there sees this and must recognize its significance."

In Czechoslovakia

CZECHOSLOVAKIA was the first socialist country we visited. There we used our same yardstick for measurement. We found that—as we found in Denmark and Israel—the trade unions play an important role in the whole economy and in social administration. They were in charge of medical care, hospitals, vacation rest homes, child care centers. They helped set the prices on food, public utilities and housing. The people appeared to us to be well fed and well clothed. On the street a worker could not be distinguished from a business man or a professor.

We were struck by the care and affection lavished upon the children. They put chrome plate on their baby buggies as we put it on autos. There is much skating and skiing, and

every kid seems to have an ice hockey stick in his hand. To us the people seemed relaxed, cheerful, easy-going and friendly.

All the stores were crowded. The goods, clothing and other items were not of the highest quality according to our standards but they seemed in ample supply.

The trade unions deal with management to set norms of production and to see that enough money is set aside to pay wages and bonuses and provide nursery schools, kindergartens, recreation, culture and housing.

Unemployment has been abolished. More machinery and automation is sought after to increase production and consumption, and to allow enough left over for export. Wages are based upon production norms with bonuses paid for

overproducing on a group basis.

The right to shift from one job to another is severely restricted. The prohibition against changing jobs at will is part of the guarantee of a job. Because of the many medical and other benefits it might be possible to get by with the help of friends and no job. Workers have the same attitude against those who chafe at the restrictions that unions have here toward "free riders."

Many women work in the foundries and factories. We saw one woman high up in the operator's cabin of an overhead crane. I called up to tell her she had an easy job. She complained: "I'm up here by myself with no one to talk to."

We attended a social evening given by a branch of the Transport Workers' Union. The first blast of the amateur jazz band nearly lifted me out of my chair. The Minister of Communications sat at our table along with the trade union officials. He had spent four or five years in a German concentration camp. The place was packed. There was food, beer and wine, and dancing—and everybody was sure of having a good time.

The American Embassy told us the government had been struggling with the unions to get production norms changed, since they had not been changed since 1946. Those making good money with little effort were loath to make any change, as I suppose they would be anywhere.

In the Soviet Union

In Moscow, the people seemed less relaxed than those in Czechoslovakia; they too were well and comfortably clothed. Their clothes were not too fashionable but we

were told that fashions had greatly improved during the past few years.

The people were certainly well fed, and again our eye was caught by the treatment of the children—the same elaborate baby buggies and the same tender care. In the Soviet Union, as in Czechoslovakia, they say that unemployment has been forever abolished.

The answers we got to some of our questions made us feel a little silly. We asked why middle aged women were sweeping snow off the sidewalks. We were reminded that the USSR lost 22 million people in the war, and that no pair of hands was too old or too useless to work at something.

We got to Moscow after the 21st Communist Congress ended. The trade union leadership was busy with plans to squeeze their part of the new 7-Year Plan into five years. The Plan calls for doubling the wages of the lower paid agricultural and industrial workers, and increasing all other wages 40 per cent. It calls for shortening weekly hours to 30 in heavy work industries, and to 35 in all others, and for further reducing prices and labor costs. All this in five years!

We visited the U.S. Embassy in Moscow and discussed these goals with two American economists stationed there. They were skeptical because the plans required Russian production growth at the rate of 11 per cent a year. We expressed our doubts, too, both to the Embassy officials and the Soviet trade union leaders. The Russians laughed and said in effect, "Just watch our smoke. If we can't do it, or don't do it, we fail. Fair enough, send a delegation of your union back here

in five years as our guests to check on our progress. We challenge you!" Then they hoisted the vodka glasses in a toast—"To the unions and the country which does the best job for the people!"

Now we were union officers. Here in America we don't concede that any other union does a better job for its members than we do. I don't intend to concede that unions in another country *will* do a better job, and I don't think that business, government or industry leaders here at home should concede either. I was given a challenge—and for my union I accepted.

Let me repeat the challenge:

1. Within ten years the USSR production will give Soviet workers the highest standard of living in the world.
2. The highest wages in the world.
3. The shortest work day and work week in the world.
4. The best and most comprehensive free medical care for all its people.
5. The best education—free for all who want it.
6. No unemployment.
7. All these within a World Peace, even though it be a peace of uneasiness and tension.

Now that's some challenge. That's talking turkey in any language, and I don't have to speak Russian to know what it means—if it can be done. And I said to the Soviet unionists, "Time will tell." I see the challenge handed me as one directed to business in our country, as much as labor, and I want to see America win this horse race.

I know something else, too. It is the kind of race where even, if we lose, we win for the working men and women I represent.

All I can say is, that if confidence alone will do the trick, the Russians have it. They point to the recent

accomplishments in China and say they can and will go as fast, or faster.

I found myself wondering where that left me and the people I represent, and where does it leave our employers, and our official labor movement which forbids its unions to send delegations to Russia. While we were there we saw trade unionists from all over the world—even from the most backward places.

The challenge is directed at us, because we are the only nation left that can come near to comparing—that is if any comparisons can be made. By our yardstick the Soviet Union has already either caught up, or will soon overtake Great Britain, Germany, France and Italy. Thus, as we see it, it is in the nature of a real challenge—not a military challenge, or a race for the moon, but a challenge to see who can do most for the people.

I think we are in this race whether we like it or not—and the whole world, particularly the working people, will be watching for the winner.

—Commonwealth Club Speech

THE SIGNIFICANT fact Americans must recognize is that the USSR has gotten over the hump, the basic structure of its economy is now firmly established and, much like the United States thirty years ago, the economic machine is ready to pour out the wealth for which these people have sacrificed and sweated year after year.

Meanwhile, however, the life of the average Soviet worker is still a pretty grim affair when compared to what most ILWU members take for granted. The quality and quantity of goods the people consume

are below what ILWU members are accustomed to. And many of the restrictions would prove pretty irksome to most Americans. For example, workers in the Soviet Union are guaranteed the right to a job but they don't also have the right to quit or to move to another place of employment at will. Moving about from job to job or just quitting because you don't like the boss is out; only under special circumstances are workers permitted to transfer from one employment to another.

Not Just Automatons

On the other hand the picture of the country as one big slave labor camp with people working with a gun at their heads is nonsense. For example, very attractive inducements have had to be offered to get young people to move out to the newly opened farm lands in the East or to go work as coal miners. Coercion couldn't do it.

In addition it's impossible to believe—after talking to a few Russian unionists—that the country is just one enormous collection of automatons who do what they're told without a murmur. Right now the unions are engaged in negotiations all over the country on hours reductions, pay scale and changes in production norms as the result of the introduction of new machinery, etc. Any American unionist knows what a complicated business reclassifications can be and how many diverse interests and points-of-view have to be reconciled in arriving at workable compromises. In addition the Russians are about the "meetingest" people the ILWU delegation met on the trip; it's not hard to imagine what must be going on in

plant after plant as these matters are debated and argued.

The arguments of the unionists and the issues—overtime, hours of work, wage scales, classifications, production methods are all quite familiar to the members of the ILWU. The debate over the relative merits and demerits of socialism versus capitalism goes on in a most profound way, but a Czech machine tool operator, when asked how things had improved on the job since the new regime replied simply:

In the old days when I wanted a smoke I used to sneak one in the toilet and I was fired if they caught me. Now I can smoke at the machine.

Clearly, looking at the situation as it is today it is quite pointless to try to make comparisons between living standards of working people in the USSR and the USA. The fact is obvious on its face—standards of living are higher, richer and more varied in the United States than in the Soviet Union today. And they probably will continue to be for a time to come.

Unions Responsible to Members

Turning to general union policies and union responsibility, what do we find? It is, of course, the basic fact about every trade union that its first responsibility is to the welfare of its members. Soviet and Czech unions insist that this is their first responsibility as well. Even in the ILWU we have learned that there can be sharp differences of opinion over whether this or that policy is the best one and does in fact advance the welfare of the members. This kind of a difference of opinion is obviously magnified when one

examines union policies under conditions of capitalist and socialist production.

Union responsibility in a planned socialist society extends to production as well as wages, hours and conditions.

The unions are concerned in seeing to it that the agreed upon production plans are carried through. This responsibility they insist is obviously in the interest of the rank and file since without increased output there can be no improvement in living standards. Such a point-of-view is, of course, completely foreign to American trade union experiences and policy.

The most striking economic difference between the socialist and capitalist countries is the absence of unemployment. Labor power is in short supply in the USSR and Czechoslovakia. And the introduction of new machines and new methods is urged by the unions in order to raise production and to relieve workers of heavy jobs and to free them for retraining and employment elsewhere. For example, longshoremen who have been displaced by new methods are either retrained—at full wages—to fill other jobs in the industry or to take jobs in other industries.

In view of the serious and growing unemployment and underemployment in many parts of the world today this guarantee of a job in the socialist world is of great significance to working people if not to employers and political leaders who think "a little" unemployment is a good thing.

Increasingly the unions are being called upon to play a more and more important role in the life of

the socialist countries. As production grows and becomes more decentralized and as local plant managers exercise greater authority and initiative over plant operations the unions are expected to display the same amount of initiative and vigor in "policing" management and in guarding the interests of the workers on the job. How well they will be able to fill this role remains to be seen.

In addition to concern with production, with wages, hours and conditions, unions have other responsibilities such as management of the social insurance program, supervision of safety, and development of cultural and educational activities. For example, in the discussions with Soviet trade union leaders they stated that one of the major deficiencies in their work was in the whole field of safety. Unions have the right to stop production when unsafe conditions exist; but this right is not exercised as frequently as necessary for several reasons including the fact that the workers, employed under production bonus schemes, themselves don't want to stop production because it cuts into their earnings. This is certainly a state of affairs with which American workers are quite familiar.

Soviet Workers Want Peace

No one who has observed the great sacrifices which Russian workers are making to raise their standard of living or the enthusiasm with which they anticipate the substantial benefits from the next era of economic growth is surprised at their fervent desire to live at peace with the rest of the world. These people—like average Americans—want to

enjoy the fruits of their labor undisturbed by threats of war or by the burden of heavy military expenditures.

Not a single Russian unionist expressed a word of hostility toward the United States or the American people, or made any disparaging remarks about American institutions or policies. Freely recognizing the widespread unfriendliness among Americans toward the Soviet Union they urged only that more and more Americans — especially unionists — come to the USSR and see for themselves.

The ILWU delegation, in acknowledging the peaceful intentions of Russian workers, nevertheless emphasized our own disapproval of the recent resumption of atomic-bomb tests by the USSR. From the point of view of the ILWU position that all tests cease—whether by the USA, USSR, or Great Britain—the unilateral cessation by the USSR

was a great step forward and the subsequent resumption of tests was a setback.

There is much that is challenging to Americans in the progress and the attitudes which prevail in the Soviet Union. For example, developments in Soviet science and education have had a wide impact in America and elsewhere. But no one achievement shapes up with greater significance than the economic challenge. Admittedly the first area of competition will be in the underdeveloped and backward countries. However, before the next decade is over we will be in a general economic race with the Russians whether we accept this challenge or not.

In the competition to see who can do a better job in filling empty bellies, wiping out disease, and ending illiteracy, the United States will be put to a measure like none before in our history.

—From Report to ILWU Convention

ILWU CALLS FOR ENDING OF WAR AND POVERTY

AT ITS SEATTLE Convention April 6-11, the ILWU, following the report of President Harry Bridges, issued a policy statement on "The American Economy and the New Challenge," which said in part:

"The USSR, China and other countries with similar economic organization and society are challenging the United States to do a better job for its own people and in helping the people of the underdeveloped countries. . . .

"On repeated occasions the ILWU has shown that the two immediate objectives, the ending of war and poverty, are essentially one. There is no question but that the energies released by lifting the immense burden of the cost of preparation for war, which now for years has terrified and paralyzed the world, would find their best use in helping the people of underdeveloped countries. A little help from us would make them capable of using their own resources and their own labor to raise themselves. But the same intensity, vigor and sacrifice must be thrown into this effort that goes into waging war. This is a war against poverty, a common effort to do good and not harm. It is a war in which there will be no vanquished and no victors."

In an address to the convention Sen. Warren Magnuson (D-Wash.) said that it is time "we took a new look at our China policy" and declared the U.S. "should have submitted to the Russians proposed solutions to the Berlin crisis a long time ago."

A U.S. Worker

Samples Free Soviet Medical Care

by SOL GOLDIN

LAST MAY, on a stopover in England on my way to the USSR, I was struck by an auto and spent ten days in a local hospital, and had a cast on my leg for a month. The cast was removed when I went on to the Soviet Union. My knee was swollen all the time, but I managed to limp through the 12-day Intourist tour I had planned.

During the tour we attended a Roman Catholic service. It was very crowded, mostly with women. We saw a great many people buying things in all the stores selling consumers' goods, and the book stores especially were always full of people. We had to have an interpreter, but I managed to speak to some people with my very limited Russian, and some knew English. Everywhere people asked us about America. Did we have a car, a house, the cost of our clothes, the cost of cigarettes, whiskey, what kind of work did we do? At no time did anyone tell us they had a better sputnik than we had, or a better anything else. We had been told Russians were boastful, but I found their modesty a very fine and dis-

arming thing. Their subway in Moscow is fantastically beautiful and efficient. The friendliness of the people was the main thing I felt wherever we went.

At the end of the tour, Intourist, on my request, sent me to a local clinic, which in turn sent me to the Botkina Hospital in Moscow. There I was put in the special building for foreign patients. I was given a private room with all conveniences for sixteen days. Then the surgeons who examined my leg said it required surgery. A week later I was transferred to a much larger building where mainly Soviet citizens were taken care of.

All the care I received was free. There were no cashier cages of any kind, no notes to be signed, no endorsers, nothing to show in any way that the injured person had any financial responsibility at all for medical care. This applied to X-rays, ambulances, special consultations—everything. No one had to pay taxes of any kind for medical care either. All this applied equally to non-Soviet citizens, a number of whom were hospitalized at the same time I was. In all my five visits for medical care and advice, I never waited more than five minutes. There were no waiting lines of any kind in any of the buildings I visited that gave medical service.

SOL GOLDIN is a carpenter and trade unionist from Chicago who spent three months in the USSR last spring and summer as a tourist and patient.

Prior to surgery, the surgeon drew a line on his leg, explaining to me just where and how he would operate. (The surgery was on the right medial ligament—I can now walk as well as ever.) He told me that this particular operation was an innovation of a British surgeon named Campbell. I recuperated in a three-person ward, which is the pattern in this hospital for most patients. My roommates were a former Soviet aviator who lost a leg in combat and a diabetic.

On our floor, an orthopedic male area, there were printed display cases and signs, carrying on a campaign against smoking and drinking, showing the negative effects these have, particularly on young people. In addition, on the second floor of this building, three afternoons and early evenings weekly were devoted to lectures and movies, covering all aspects of mental and physical health, and ending with entertainment, sometimes old Chaplin silent films. It was my pleasure to attend, though I did not understand it all because of the Russian printed and spoken dialogue. Never a day passed that I did not tell the Russians their language pained me more than the surgery!

In the hospital I observed that the average Russian men smoke less heavily than Americans. Soviet women rarely smoke in public. I do not know how much they smoke in private. Cigarettes are not prohibitive in price.

The food was ample and good. For breakfast I was given two boiled eggs with the dates of laying stamped on the shell. We had our choice of white or black bread, which was always free of preserva-

tives, and never turned green with blue stripes like our bread sometimes does. It would become hard after three or four days, but no matter how old it was, it was edible. Fresh baked bread was served three times daily, but at times I wanted the stale bread which I kept in the cabinet. Most of the cereal served was the whole wheat kernel, nothing removed from it, cooked with milk, a tablespoon of pure butter, and sugar. We also could have coffee, one or two glasses of sweet milk, sometimes kaffir—all the tea we wanted and a large plate of semi-sour cheese.

For the first half of my hospital stay oranges were also in my menu, provided by the hospital, but there like here, most of the fresh fruit is paid for and brought by the family of the patient. The patients' families brought them anything from delicacies to whole dinners, and for this purpose there were two large refrigerators in the corridor exclusively for the patients' use.

At 11 A.M. we were always served stewed fruit. At one o'clock we were served borscht or cabbage soup, boiled chicken with mashed potatoes, sometimes baked fish, or cabbage and meat dumplings. They did not serve a beverage at dinner except on request of the patient. Due to inactivity, constipation was a problem. I told the head nurse I did not care to take laxatives and asked if she would try to get me raw cabbage, carrots, boiled beets and onions. This she was very happy to order for me from the kitchen. The problem ceased. They were wonderfully gracious to me about everything I wanted, al-

though because of the language barrier, we did not always understand each other completely. Supper usually was lighter—potatoes or cereal with a piece of fish or meat, with all the tea and bread we wanted.

The food described was the regular diet in this hospital and I was not given special treatment except for the raw vegetables.

As regards the beds, I did not see any coil springs, so some of them sagged badly, but this was taken care of by placing a portable reinforced thin metal platform underneath the mattress. To prevent bed sores, there were plenty of extra pillows and pneumatic rubber rings.

There were radio ear phones at every bed, over which came beautiful music—vocal, instrumental, symphonic, etc. from 7 a.m. to 11 p.m. I never heard a commercial. Of course no one was bothered who did not wish to listen.

Lady barbers came every day except Sunday. Shaves and haircuts were free to all. There were dental offices on the grounds, where you could get anything from extractions to plates without fees—but appointments were needed. A former Stalingrad vet showed me the upper plate made for him in the hospital during a previous visit.

One of my fellow patients, Kozlov, a carpenter, had a fractured thigh and was hospitalized for three months. Kozlov was later sent to a Black Sea resort to recuperate, his fare and all expenses paid by his union. I heard from him and from others that all people who are hurt at work get 100 per cent of their wages, whether they are hospitalized or go home to recuperate.

He also told me that construction men never lose any wages when the weather does not allow them to work. The management tries to place the men inside, but in any case, 100 per cent of their wages is paid. When people are injured away from their jobs, they are paid from 70 to 90 per cent of their wages for all the time it takes to heal them. If they are permanently disabled, another security plan covers them.

As an example of the latter, Ivan Mikhailovich, a factory worker in my ward, had lost all the fingers and toes on his left side, and suffered a fractured knee and ankle in an accident at work. He had several operations and was put on 785 rubles a month pension. His wages had been 1200 rubles a month. He was due for more surgery. He had no expenses of any kind while in the hospital, nor at the sanatorium he was sent to later, where his union took care of him.

My friend, Vladimir Yefimov, whom I met in Botkina, a young man of about 25, had been on his way home on his motorbike, drunk. He fell off and was hurt.

He was hospitalized for two weeks and received all medical care as free as the air, but by way of reprimand, was fined by being deprived of insurance benefits for ten days. Later he wrote me he was getting 70 per cent of his wages. It seemed he was off of his job for about two or three months, but he was given his two weeks vacation time with full pay and all the regular benefits. In addition to his vacation he went to a rest home for twelve days, which ordinarily cost 300 rubles, but the law required him to pay only

75 rubles, the union paying the difference.

A coal miner, who lived and worked not far from Vladivostok, injured his spine at work, and was brought to Botkina, paralyzed from the waist down. His pay, I heard, was about 2800 rubles monthly. He was continuing to draw this until the doctors were able to determine whether he was permanently disabled. When I talked to him after he had undergone surgery, he told me the feeling was returning to his legs, and he was hoping he would be able to return to work.

Among many others I met in the hospital were an important Communist official, a photographer with the TASS news agency, the head manager of a huge trucking combine in Moscow and the director of a kolkhoz 50 miles from Moscow. These were all sick or injured. They were given everything in the same way at the same place and time as the patients who were workers. They had no special treatment, beds or rooms just because they held important positions.

The majority of the medics in the hospital were women. This was true of most of the doctors who took care of me. I also had a young man from Vietnam among my doctors.

The hospital, like every building I saw in Moscow, had double windows with a ten-inch space between, because of the cold, but fitted with special panes that could be easily opened. All the ward floors were laid out with criss-cross tile, so when a crutch would slip, it would not move more than three inches. All floors were washed twice daily. Large potted plants stood

about ten feet apart in all corridors. Everybody—visitors, hospital workers, construction people—must put on white smocks when entering the hospital buildings. This was rigidly enforced and applied to all buildings, whether containing contagious cases or not.

Many of the patients questioned me about articles in the U.S. magazine *Amerika*, copies of which some of them had. They were very interested in pictures showing clothing, which I think is their main consumer shortcoming. The prices are high, but in strolling around the stores after leaving the hospital, I saw good selections and quite a bit of the clothing was of good quality. Many of the Russians are good dressers, but I should say in general they are not as well dressed as the American average. The courtesy of the Soviet policeman—they call them militia—towards everyone, even the most poorly dressed, is one of the best sights to see in Moscow.

When I was leaving the hospital, a crowd of patients escorted me outside and gave me a very warm send-off and showered me with gifts and souvenirs. How I wish I had been as well equipped as some of the other tourists who had good cameras, and could have taken pictures of all this! So many of the friends I made in the hospital gave me their addresses, but unfortunately because of the language barrier, I cannot write to them.

One thing I should add: in the over three months I was there, in and out of Moscow, I did not ever hear anything like an air raid siren, such as we hear in Chicago every Tuesday morning.

In visiting the "Children's World" Department store, I saw no pistols, guns, toy soldiers or any device suggestive of violence. I rode over 5,000 miles on Soviet railroads and everywhere saw signs for Peace and Friendship, made from flowers, stones and many other kinds of materials.

While in Britain I met a number of people who were in debt because of goods bought on time and because of their limited earnings. I found that many of the British people had to cultivate their own food gardens or else face partial starvation.

In the Soviet Union I was on the lookout for people who were in debt, because of something bought on the time payment plan, but didn't find any, although I heard that there were some Russians who were given long time loans on easy terms to build homes. The relaxed attitude of the Soviet people on this score is in contrast to the nervousness of the American and British people about meeting their installment payments.

I feel I should add that I also had no medical expenses while I was in England, where there is a system of socialized medicine. However, the system is not as all-covering as in the Soviet Union. Workers I met there told me that medical benefits paid to their families were quite

inadequate, and of course they do not have anything like the social security Soviet workers have. They also told me that the taxes they had to pay for the medical program were very high and going still higher, whereas no tax for medical services exists in the USSR. But I must say that the British people I met were very considerate. All the hospital personnel were very friendly, but the formality of the doctors towards the patients was in sharp contrast to the attitude of the doctors in Moscow, where everybody was more at ease. British hospital beds were more comfortable—but I had to wait much longer for medical attention.

Since my return home I have been trying to organize a delegation of construction workers, or factory workers, to tour the Soviet Union and barnstorm here when they get back. If we could get six live wires working as a team, I know we could make some big dents in the curtain over here, which keeps so many people from understanding what the Soviet people are like.

U.S. workers especially ought to know that they are not our enemies but our friends. Workers should understand that peaceful relations and trade would do more to guarantee jobs and security than making arms for war.

SOCIAL SECURITY UNDER THE 7-YEAR PLAN

IN THE USSR, the material well-being of the working people is determined not only by wages, but also by the enormous social welfare funds which are rising from year to year. Under the seven-year plan expenditures for pensions, social insurance, free tuition and scholarships, paid annual vacations, free medical care, kindergarten and nursery upkeep, and other grants and privileges, will rise to about 300 billion rubles in 1965 as against 215 billion in 1958, and will amount to an average of 3,800 rubles per worker per annum.

A Soviet Factory Club

by ANDREW ROTHSTEIN

THE Balashiha Cotton-Spinning Factory, near Moscow, is an old textile mill, founded in 1846 in the days of serf labor. The following are some notes on cultural activities there, made during a visit in January of this year.

The factory club—very exceptional in this respect—was built by the British management some years before the first world war: but in those days it was reserved primarily for the technicians and office staff. Today it is the center of cultural activity for the 4,500 workers, 80 per cent of them women. Under the factory's collective agreement, the management provides upkeep, heating and lighting free; the trade union committee assigns a considerable sum for artistic activities, technical studies, purchase of books, physical culture and sports (120,000 rubles in 1958, more than covered by its share—25 per cent of the 620,000 rubles taken on movie nights).

How was this money spent? As usual in Soviet workers' clubs, there are a number of "circles" for voluntary activities—music, choir, drama, folk-dancing, ballet, dressmaking, sports, physical culture—in which hundreds of workers take part. The

club employs six part-time trainers for these, who put in 75 hours a month, and are paid 600 rubles a month for it (10 per cent more if they have a higher education). There is an excellent auditorium seating 300, a small foyer and three good-sized rooms for lectures or study. For sports the factory has its own stadium, with adequate physical culture equipment. In 1958 5,000 rubles were spent on purchase and maintenance of cultural and sports equipment.

A clause in article 52 of the collective agreement contains the following undertaking by the trade union committee:

To draw young working men and women into evening schools for working youth, evening and correspondence technical schools and institutes.

Much of the organizing of this work falls on the elected club management committee (though some of the studies take place in the local school). Such parts of the ordinary training courses for raising the technical knowledge and skill of young workers as are not arranged in the production shops are held in the club. There, too, many of the 276 pupils of the schools for working youth (completing in their after-work time the 7-year or 10-year education which they left unfinished during or after the war) do their evening homework together. So do the 75 who, this year, are taking the Textile Technical School course

ANDREW ROTHSTEIN (M.A., Oxon), is a member of the executive committee of the British Society for Cultural Relations with the USSR and vice-chairman of the British-Soviet Friendship Society. He is a former lecturer at the University of London and author of many books on the USSR.

after working hours, for whom their lecturers come from Moscow four days a week. And there are no less than 50 worker-students enrolled in the four-year course of the Textile and other Institutes, from which they will graduate with technical or other degrees—while continuing at their work in production.

"If it were not for our library, I should never have taken my degree," wrote one such student last year, in the suggestions book at the club. It was with considerable pride that the club manager and Sergei Petrovich Bubnov, the librarian, referred to the first place won by the library in the All-Union Display of Cultural Institutions, held in 1958 by the Central Council of Trade Unions.

An indication of the part the library plays came from the large and crowded reading-room, with its stands of recommended literature on topical subjects, with the files of 27 daily and weekly newspapers, and the latest issues of 68 journals to which it subscribes.

In the library proper there are 57,000 volumes—novels, poetry, history, scientific and political works. There is a separate technical library, which announces new acquisitions in the weekly printed factory paper. With 3,067 registered readers, a daily issue of 300 books is no bad proportion. There are 570 more registered readers in the children's section.

But the library does not wait for its readers. Among the 100 or so activists (voluntary helpers) there are a fair number of "youth book carriers," who deliver books to the workers' homes on request, tell members of new books which have arrived and hold readings from new books

in the club rooms of the big apartment houses in which many of the workers of this factory live. Others help at the issue desk, make posters or arrange exhibition stands, write out index cards, mark up new books and put them on the shelves, even go to the station or as far as Moscow to pick up new books. Some of the activists are pensioners who have spent forty or more years at the bench in the factory, and have seen themselves and their fellow-workers "grow," as one of them put it. They are among the most enthusiastic. Incidentally, they have seen the library stock grow too—from some 1,800 books in 1918 to 45,000 in 1957 and another 12,000 last year, and still increasing.

It is due to their work that the library can make do with two full-time workers—the librarian himself (paid 1,030 rubles a month) and his assistant (a young beginner earning 660 rubles). It spent 22,000 rubles on new books and 9,000 on new journals in 1958.

Perhaps one should add that the neighborhood does not depend for its books on this factory. The town of Balashiha, which has grown up around this once isolated factory settlement in the last 35 years, has its own public library, as have the other factories situated there.

I got a picture of the library's general cultural activities from an interesting collection of the invitation cards to club events in 1958, attended, I was told, usually by 1,500 workers, though sometimes going up to 3,000 or even 5,000. Let some samplings from the list tell their own story (all events were followed by concerts, and began at 7 P.M., except where otherwise stated).

Dec. 19 (1957)

Invitation by young workers of the Factory Apprentice School, jointly with the Library, to a *Readers' Conference* on the theme: "What makes a human being beautiful?"

1958

Jan. 23

Evening of Humorous Story, conducted by the writer M. V. Edel.

Feb. 2

General Meeting of Workers. Report by Col. Anohin, deputy chief of the Department of the Interior of the Moscow Regional Soviet, "Maintenance of Socialist Legality and Public Order."

Feb. 9

Invitation by the Children's Library and the libraries of Schools 2 and 4 to a *Readers' Conference*: "What does cultured behavior mean?" Speeches by children and films will give you the answer."

Feb. 12

Invitation by the Factory Apprentice School and the Library to a *Readers' Conference* on the theme: "Friendship and Comradship."

Aug. 17

Meeting (for youth) with the writer Grigori Grebnyev, author of *Lost Treasures*, *The Secret of the Submarine Rock*, *Southern Aurora*.

Aug. 25

Lecture, "International Review," by

Fyodor Nesterovich Oleshchuk, of the Society for Dissemination of Political and Scientific Knowledge.

Sept. 18

Pensioners' Evening. Discussion of part which pensioners can play in public work. Big picture to follow.

Sept. 23

Meeting with the writer I. Z. Osipov, author of *On the Pobeda around Europe*.

Sept. 25

Invitation to youth by Middle School No. 2 and the Library for Discussion on A. Kuznetsov's *The Continued Legend* (a young man's diary). The author has been invited.

Evening of Humorous Story with the writer Victor Arlov. Before the meeting (6-7 P.M.) dancing. After the meeting, a film. Tickets two rubles, at the Library. (The only occasion of its kind).

Oct. 10

Meeting with the writer Arkadi Grigoryevich Adamov, author of science and adventure fiction. "You all know his books *Secrets of Two Oceans* and *Black Moth*."

There are few Soviet factories without a club or red corner where work of this kind goes on all the year round.

Courtesy Anglo-Soviet Journal

SOVIET TRADE UNION CULTURAL ACTIVITIES

IN HIS REPORT to the 12th Congress of Trade Unions of the USSR in March this year, Grishin, chairman of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions stressed the importance of cultural work. In 1958, he said, some 8,000,000 factory and office workers mastered new trades and raised their skills through various courses, some 4,000,000 are now taking evening or correspondence courses in schools and colleges.

In the past five years, Grishin reported, more than 4,000 new clubs and Palaces of Culture, some 5,000 public libraries, 20,000 club rooms and 4,000 film projection units, have become available to workers, in addition to what they had before.

The trade unions have 216,000 amateur talent companies with total membership of 4,000,000. Amateur drama groups, symphony orchestras, choruses, opera and ballet companies continue to make progress. In 1958 such groups gave 770,000 concerts and performances which were attended by a total of 160,000,000 people. There are now some 8,000,000 members of trade union sport clubs.

Composers Visit USSR

by ROY HARRIS

Last fall four American composers, Roy Harris, Roger Sessions, Ulysses Kay and Peter Mennin, spent a month in the Soviet Union as part of the Cultural Exchange program.

Roy Harris, one of our most distinguished American composers and member of the faculty of Indiana University School of Music, wrote a series of articles about his visit for International Musician, official journal of the American Federation of Musicians.

Through the courtesy of International Musician we are reprinting the first of the series.

TO THOSE of us who come from a capitalistic democracy the social-economic conditions of the USSR seem out of focus with the cultural conditions. We find it difficult to adjust to the obvious discrepancy, or what seems to us a discrepancy, between the restrictions and limitations of private living standards and the advantages and opportunities of collective planning and controls. We are born and trained to extol private initiative and individualism; they are conditioned to glorify nationalistic collectivism.

If we hope to understand the intensity and depth of their devotion to collectivism, we must do so against the background of their history. We must try to imagine and comprehend what physical suffering, intellectual tyranny, and personal indignity was imposed upon most of the people by Tsarism and feudalism. Our sons and daughters have never experienced such brutal absolutism to which there was no recourse but

death. Only then can we realize that freedom is relative to experience. As one Soviet protagonist said to me, "Our people have freedom. What do you have that we have not? We have food and clothes and an opportunity to work as much as we are able. What else is there to want?"

The Future Looms Big

With this basic kind of socialistic thinking, we must not then be surprised that the people of the USSR are enthusiastic about their progress, eager and energetic to cooperate, and filled with large expectations for the future. Each day is a new day, better than its predecessor. If they feel the need for improving their living standards they are confident that their needs will be satisfied in the foreseeable future. If their roads are inadequate, they will get more and better ones; if their telephone system is a travesty, it is still better than they were accustomed to; if their living quarters are crowded, they are not discontent because they can see hundreds of mammoth apartments being constructed. The future is evident to them in daily expansion and improvement. Meanwhile they are not serfs whose sons can be horse-whipped into servitude and whose daughters can be appropriated by the feudal master.

True—they live under new restrictions, repressions and disciplines;

but their children can have as good a technical education as they can use. They are assured work, housing, food, medical care and annual vacations—a job to do which is theirs as long as they can fulfill it. But, perhaps, most important of all, they believe that the state belongs to them; that they have a collective ownership in all their schools, institutes, universities, hospitals, theaters, ballet companies, orchestras, libraries, museums, parks, the vast domains of wheat and fruit, mines, factories, transportation systems, etc. In their thinking everything belongs to them; so they willingly sacrifice for it. They are building for the future of their posterity.

Only by understanding their expectations against the deprivations of their past can we learn how these people think and feel; what makes them tick. Only then can we understand their abiding pride in their civilization. Only then can we accept the good humor, the friendliness, the consideration and unstinting attention to detail which they lavish on those who come to them as visitors and observers.

Into the Unknown

When we took off from Copenhagen we left a land of miniature and delightful order. As we passed over the neat farms of Denmark and Sweden, we had a genuine sense of departure from the known to the unknown. And so it was.

When we finally came down into the Moscow airport the scale of values had changed. We were in a new world. Everything was big: big in space, big in numbers; great jet planes on all sides. Life seemed portentous, rumbling with urgent event

and destiny. One felt much smaller and less independent, immediately.

When I descended from my plane, a smart young man with a tape recorder strapped to his back stepped up to me holding a microphone and addressed me with the words, "What will be your first words on Soviet soil?" I responded, "I bring you the good wishes of my people to your people." He relaxed and the group that was with him crowded around with cordial curiosity. All of them were young and alert. Only one was older and he was obviously in charge. He proved to be Tikhon Khrennikov, the powerful First Secretary of the Composers' Union of the USSR. He took us immediately through customs without the delay of luggage inspection, and from that moment, until we left a month later, every path was cleared, every door opened to reveal Soviet culture at its present peak.

Many surprises were in store for us. The first surprise was the official limousine which awaited us and took us swiftly through fifteen miles of private homes (well equipped with television antennae); the business, the endless streams of private cars (in large, medium and small categories), the amount of new building, the huge stores crammed with consumer goods and jammed with jostling buyers. Then came the unflagging display of generous hospitality: the box seats at the opera, the ballet, the theater, the fabulous puppet show, the circus.

The well informed hostesses who spoke English so fluently as they guided us through the Kremlin, the museums, the schools and conservatories, were official representatives

of the Soviet Ministry of Culture.

I certainly was not prepared for the highly organized Composers' Union which was our host in Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, and Tiflis. Each chapter of the Composers' Union differed according to its regional customs and officials. Each chapter was well housed in its own locale and well able to plan and develop the long conferences, discussions, parties and dinners which consumed our days so swiftly.

We found the works of dozens of young composers well recorded on tape; and we found the groups well coordinated and cohesive. If there were professional jealousies, certainly we were not aware of them. Their good fellowship, calm and pleasure in each others' accomplishments seemed genuine and normal. I do not think it could have been successfully feigned. I was most impressed by the headquarters of the Composers' Union in Leningrad. It was elegantly paneled in oak; had its own recital hall, library, gaming rooms and dining room. It had formerly been the Officers' Club of the Tsar's army.

Realism with a Difference

Certainly the economic-social status of the Soviet composers is far superior to that of our own. However, the question which plagued me was, of course, "What about freedom?" How secure are these men in their civil liberties? Who determines their separate destinies? Who is Caesar and how many little Caesars do his bidding?

If the reports of our press are 50 per cent factual, then Soviet composers are on a socialist hot seat.

The facts seem to be somewhat

as follows: 1. Composers are highly honored and well paid; 2. Composers must deliver the goods according to the rather vague dialectic of "Socialist Realism" which is implemented, as I understand it, by the elected officers of their own union—not by the Politbureau.

Socialist Realism seems to boil down to the professional ability and creative imagination needed to create a good piece which the public can understand. This does not leave much margin for experimentation. Tradition must be confirmed, but the composer may add as much variation as he is able to coordinate with traditional technics and forms. The composer must be considered a man of social service like the doctor, architect, or engineer. He must glorify his civilization with beauty which others can comprehend and enjoy.

Much of our obscure, so-called "advanced" music could not meet such social specifications; it would not be publicly performed. It would be considered socially remote or technically inept, or both! Much of our "pops" music would also be thrown out as superficial, vulgar, degrading to the public morale.

For instance, in discussing this matter, the Secretary of the Music Division of the Ministry of Culture told me that they looked with disfavor upon *Porgy and Bess* because it portrayed the Negro race to such a degrading disadvantage. "A Woman Is a Sometime Thing" could not be acceptable from a Soviet composer because it would be considered unworthy of Soviet womanhood. This puritan attitude was the rock on which Shostakovich's opera *Lady Macbeth* ran asunder (trombones

in the bedroom, no!). It was voted unacceptable for moral reasons, not aesthetic ones.

Of course, there are no commercial music critics in the Soviet. There are a few "historian-critics" who are asked from time to time to evaluate particular works of Soviet composers. This they do after concentrated study of scores and recordings. Historian-critics must have won their spurs as historians and musicologists.

There was a long and heated discussion on this subject between us American composers and two "historian-critics" at an extended dinner given us by the Leningrad Composers' Union. Of course the Americans pointed out the time-honored fact that critics have been notoriously wrong in the past, and that the time lag which seems necessary for the public (that they may catch up to new music) must not be arbitrarily by-passed.

The "Socialist Realism" point of view seems to us more socialistic than realistic. As a collective ideal we cannot deny that the arts, especially music, must communicate something to the people. But there are three loopholes: 1. Who are the people? 2. What is to be communicated? 3. When must "the people" understand and use the aesthetic idea created by, for and of human instincts? Is "the people" everybody? And, if not, what percentage constitutes a quorum of acceptance? Must the arts have social significance or may they communicate just anything about anything—human or not? Is music moral or amoral? Does the composer have any moral responsibility to anyone? Must his technic be couched in such

traditional terms that *all* can understand at once? And, if not at once, when? Should these matters be determined by the aimless, shifting sands of human multitudes, or by the highly trained specialists of controlled culture?

Resourceful Creativity

Of course, these aggravated questions cannot be permanently answered for all peoples for every society. Thus far in Occidental societies, history indicates certain patterns. Thus far minority authoritarian groups have been unable to contain the mercurial impulses of creative individuals. They are too quixotic, devious, unpredictable and shrewdly germane to their own purposes. They cannot be fenced in, smothered, stamped out, emasculated. They find their own ways of hibernation and with unerring instinct emerge into the warm spring sunshine of new regimes and controls sympathetic to their purpose.

We need only be concerned that many Soviet composers unknown to our public are producing much solid music; a bit conservative to our ears (a little more adventuresome than Prokofiev, Shostakovich, Kabelevsky and Khachaturian), but always sure-footed in the ways of Russian tradition and rarely fumbling as aesthetic communication.

We may be sure that the Soviet music world will continue to be very busy, very productive and very well sustained by the expectations of her artists and the social-economic underwriting of socialism. The historical outcome of the USSR experiment will be determined by the historical facts. Meanwhile, our own future is staring us in the face.

Cold War Text Book

A Review by ELIZABETH MOOS

Democracy versus Communism, by Kenneth Colgrove. D. Van Nostrand Co. Princeton, N. J., 1958. 424 pages. \$4.95.

WE HAVE had during the cold-war period, a spate of hate-Russia publications. This textbook, published for the Institute of Fiscal and Political Education, is one of the most elaborate and biased of any I have yet read. It is directed to the youth of our country and may make—may be making—a contribution to distrust, prejudice and fear, essentials in war psychology.

It is slick, no expense has been spared to make the format attractive. It is full of pictures and drawings, tests to help teachers, summaries, etc. In the preface a number of educators, some of whom are well known for scholarship and objectivity, are mentioned and we are told that they have criticized the text. The implication, of course, is that they have approved it. Probably because of this "sponsorship," the text has been adopted by boards of education in 21 states in spite of the fact that the author is better known for his support of McCarthyism and his attacks on scholarly foundations than for his educational achievements. It is difficult to believe that such informed educators as Dr. Howard Wilson and Dr. Richard Burkhardt, who are mentioned in the preface, have approved the book as published.

The book makes little pretense of being objective; the thesis is clear from the very beginning and no propaganda device however dishonest, is omitted in the effort to prove it. The thesis that everything Communist, i.e., Soviet, is wholly evil, that everything American is democratic and completely perfect.

There is some history, treated very tendentiously in an effort to prove that

revolutionary change is per se wrong and the Russian Revolution not only wrong but unnecessary. The Tsar was making the necessary changes; "Many freedoms that the Russian people had under the Tsar were swept away when the Bolsheviks seized power. . . ." and "almost half the people could read and write. . ." (under the Tsar.) We know what the "rights" of the people were before the revolution and we know that, at most, 24 per cent of the people were literate. But will the teachers or students who use this text know it?

In the effort to present a picture of our democracy as ideal, some statements are made that are rather more than merely misleading. Contrasting our treatment of minorities with the treatment purported to be given by the Soviets to their minorities we learn that "by 1957, integration was well on the way in the southern states," that the Indians who are still trying to hold some of their land (granted by treaty) "have been gradually gotten off their reservations . . . are becoming self-supporting useful citizens." Our democracy, writes Mr. Colgrove, rests on the principal of a vote for everyone, and now "one man, one ballot is the rule in the United States." Not a word do the students hear about the struggle now going on for this very right to vote of which millions of our colored citizens have been deprived.

Material on the Soviet Union, its government and the life of its people, is an amazing hodgepodge of bits of fact, pure fiction, generalizations. There are no objective scholarly references quoted, no bibliography. Quotations are used out of context, usually with no source given, undated. Pictures are used in questionable ways. So we have a picture of Soviet children doing exercises with rods—an exercise often used in our

gymnastics. The caption is "Russian children are being given special exercises to strengthen their arms and hands for factory work." No documentation is given for this.

Cartoons, some obviously dating from the '20's, are printed with neither date nor source. The many drawings were done to illustrate the thesis, in comic-book style with crude representations of the Soviets as robots or monsters.

When it is necessary to admit something positive, the author always counteracts it at once. So when we read that now there are refrigerators, washing machines, TV and cars in the Soviet Union we read in the next sentence that "Communist visitors say that no one but high government officials, army officers or factory managers can own such luxuries." What Communist visitor? When? Much of the most violent anti-Soviet writing is material quoted from stories told by refugees or some of the well-known anti-Soviet writers. Such melodramatic stuff is featured by being set in bold type, on a special page so that students who may not manage to read the dull text will surely get an emotional impression that may arouse hate and fear. This horror stuff is presented without background or date in most cases.

In every chapter, whether dealing with foreign affairs—treated from a point of view considerably to the right of John Foster Dulles—or with the Communist Party of the USA which is described largely by such notorious informers as Louis Budenz and Bella Dodd—errors of fact abound.

Let us illustrate with one or two from the section on children. (Much of this would seem to be taken directly from George Counts' "Country of the Blind"). Boarding schools that are being set up under the new law "are for wealthy little Communists." The facts: these schools are particularly for parents who need help or for orphans; neither finances nor politics enter into the question of admission, fees—as usual—are small and according to ability

to pay. The old story that "children are taught to spy on their parents" is repeated several times. Fact: the Code of the Young Pioneers stresses the importance of respect for parents and older persons, there is no documentation for the "spying story" and that is why none is given in the text.

"The Young Octobrists are similar to the Hitler Wolves," "Specially selected children are sent to Young Octobrist schools." Fact: there are no such schools. The Young Octobrists are a loosely organized group of youngsters from 6 to 10, something like our Cub Scouts, doing crafts, singing, etc., preparing to be Pioneers as our little ones may prepare to be Boy Scouts. Their code is on the wall of many elementary school rooms. I copied it and it may be of interest to see what these little ones—"Wolves?"—must be like.

1) Study well, love your school, respect your elders; 2) An Octobrist is an honorable, moral child; 3) An Octobrist must love work; 4) An Octobrist is a friendly child who sings and lives happily.

The economic picture is given without the use of any Soviet figures. A table is presented showing how many hours of work are needed in the USSR and the U.S. to buy articles. It is meaningless and no reference is provided. What is left out is almost as dishonest as what is left in! There is no factual material on the Soviet budget. This would show the truth about spending for welfare and education in relation to armaments. It is easier to make generalizations. There are no quotations from the mass of reports that appear in press and magazines by visitors to the USSR, official and unofficial. Most of the educators, scientists, medical men and business men have come away with an impression decidedly at variance with the picture this book aims to present. So they are ignored.

What will be the effect of such a dishonest book on students? If they do not have other sources of information, if they

read it, they will know that they are expected to answer the test questions near the end with a clear negative.

The questions:

Can a nation that rejects religious teaching come to agreement with a nation that supports freedom of religion? (Note the dishonesty of the phrasing implying that a nation, read USSR, that rejects religion can not support freedom of religion.)

Can a nation that breaks treaties (lengthy "proof" has been given that the USSR is such a nation) come to agreement with a nation that respects international law?

Can democracy and communism ever be reconciled?

Following—logically—we find a section on atomic bombs. Some people, we are told, thought we should not have dropped bombs on Japan. The explanation is as follows: "... the people were

weary of war . . . and although the allies had assisted Soviet Russia to expel the Nazi invaders, Stalin delayed declaration of war on Japan. *Accordingly* (my emphasis) President Truman consented to the use of the bomb."

The fact is that the USSR declared war on Japan on August 8, just as agreed. Truman ordered the use of the bomb *two days before* this date.

Reviewing this book has been a tough assignment. Its incitement to hatred arouses anger—the kind that is aroused when we read about the Strontium 90 in our children's milk. The only positive thing that can be said about *Democracy versus Communism* is that its overstatements, simplifications and bias are so crude that many of our students and teachers will be too sophisticated and have too much general information to be greatly affected by it.

New Soviet Novel

Comrade Venka, by Pavel Nilin. Translated by Joseph Barnes. Simon and Schuster. New York, 1959. 246 pages. \$3.75.

THIS swiftly paced Soviet novel takes place in the early 20's. This was a difficult period for the new Soviet government—the war of intervention was hardly over, many defeated White Guard soldiers had turned to outlawry, private trading (NEP) was being reintroduced. The authority of the government had still to be solidly established in many parts of the vast country, such, for example, as the Siberian taiga that provides the novel's background.

The story of Benjamin (Venka) Malishev is told by his friend who, like Venka, is a Comsomol and a new recruit to the OGPU. They are both young, just turned eighteen, and proud of their membership in the Young Com-

munist League and their jobs helping the government in its struggle against enemy and criminal elements still active in Siberia.

Venka is a singularly attractive young man—intelligent, practical, completely dedicated to the ultimate establishment of a communist society. He is, if you like, an idealist in the finest sense of the term.

In the course of the main plot—the capture of the chief of the bandits infesting the taiga—Venka wins over a peasant turned bandit. He is a lesser leader named Lazar Baukin and it is through his aid that the chief of the bandits is finally captured, by Venka and a small detachment.

The local head of the OGPU, an unimaginative, rather coarse, self-seeking man, decides to let the police take credit for the capture and orders Baukin shot along with the chief as an "example" to others.

Venka regards this decision as a disgrace to himself and a denial of the emerging justice and humanity of the new society he and his young comrades dream and talk about so touchingly during their pursuit of the bandits.

This decision comes at the very moment of a misunderstanding between Venka and the young girl, a fellow Comsomol, with whom he is deeply in love. Feeling himself doubly disgraced, Venka commits suicide.

This unexpected, tragic ending is not wholly convincing in light of what the reader knows of Venka's clear, realistic outlook on the world. Venka's friend, the narrator, telling the story many years later, feels that the suicide was a moment of weakness on Venka's part and that "the feeling of grief, anger and cha-

grin has not weakened in me to this day."

In the translator's introduction it is implied that *Comrade Venka* is outside the accepted stream of Soviet writing, but its first printing in an edition of 90,000 would seem to give evidence in the opposite direction. In any case, while the book is sharply critical of certain violations of socialist principles, it is in actual fact deeply concerned with the growth of a true socialist humanism.

The translation is sharp, clear and catches the pace of this fast, moving, almost lyrical novel. It is to be hoped that other books by Nilin will soon be available in this country for it is obvious that he is a writer of exceptional talent.

MURRAY YOUNG

Bernal's "Science in History"

Science in History, by J. D. Bernal. Cameron Associates. New York, 1958. 984 pages. 2 vols. \$12.00 to non-members.

THIS important history of the development of science was first published in England in 1954 and in the Soviet Union in 1956. Now published in this country, its message seems even more timely for Americans than it would have been five years ago. "This book," Bernal begins, "is an attempt to describe and to interpret the relations between the development of science and that of other aspects of human history. Its ultimate object is to lead to an understanding of some of the major problems which arise from the impact of science on society." The point that "Whether for good or ill the importance of science today needs no emphasizing, but it does. just because of that importance, need understanding" has been made recently by a number of enlightened scientists and educators in this country, and to greater effect than hitherto. Perhaps only a few of those who stress the importance

of science education would fully agree with Bernal that the strongest reason for the study of the relations of science and society is to achieve in the best way a transformation from "an economy motivated by individual acquisitiveness to one devoted to the common welfare," but it is certainly the interaction of science with society which has stimulated their concern.

Science influences history in two major ways: by bringing about changes in the methods of production and by the impact of its findings and ideas on the ideology of the period. Bernal traces the origins of science and its chief influences through the ages of history. The reciprocal interactions of science and technology are exemplified in the rise of modern science through the Industrial Revolution, and finally in the 20th century, when science has taken on a dominant role. The easy Victorian adage (a vulgarization of Bacon's thesis), that science inevitably and automatically results in progress, is examined: while it is surely true that knowledge is better

than ignorance, the applications of science to devastating weapons is evidence that the utilization of this knowledge may be for evil as well as for good. What factors are responsible for the misuse of science? And how can we insure the benefits of science for human welfare?

There are no easy answers to these questions, but it is clear that they do not lie within natural science itself; the utilization of science is determined by society, and thus Bernal is led to consider social science. Social studies can be classed as sciences, he maintains, only in so far as they rest on a material basis and their accuracy can be checked by successful prediction and practical use. The backwardness of social science cannot be ascribed to the impossibility of experimentation—not only are social experiments the rule in socialist countries, but the Tennessee Valley Authority constituted such an experiment here. It cannot be denied that for other reasons the social sciences are more difficult than the natural sciences, however, and it is understandable that their growth has been relatively slow. Bernal sees a great future for social science, based on the ideas of Marxism, and not just in socialist countries. Marxist thought is being developed in every country, he points out, and has already had great influence outside strictly Marxist circles.

If the theme of Bernal's book can be put into a single sentence it is that "the task of human thought only begins in knowledge." Progress depends on increased knowledge for its very existence, but knowledge is not in itself sufficient as a guarantee of progress. The complementary requirement is for a level of individual and collective responsibility far higher than any reached up to now.

Science in History is directed towards a wide audience. The technical and scientific sections are presented with great clarity and require no special knowledge on the part of the reader.

Like Professor Bernal's important *World Without War*, this book is essen-

tial reading for all people concerned in understanding the grave contradictions of our time and anxious to find a possibility for their solution in the future.

S. J.

Guides to Travel in the USSR

Getting Along in Russian, by Mario Pei and Fedor I. Nikanov. Harper & Bros., New York. 260 pp. \$3.50.

Key to Russia, by Ben Jaffe. Crown, New York. 109 pp. \$2.75.

WITH the increased interest in the Russian language and in travel to the Soviet Union, handbooks for travelers and for beginning language students have begun coming out in large numbers. *Getting Along in Russian* is a part of the Holiday magazine language series, all edited by Mario Pei, Professor of Romance Philology at Columbia University.

Like all the other handbooks, this one creates its own phonetic transcription using only recognizable Latin characters. The letter combinations and the word chains presented as single graphic units give a very acceptable oral speech. However it is fervently hoped that some day all language book writers will accept one form of transcription for all languages. It is disconcerting to try to pronounce words in a new language according to the arbitrary signs of each individual expert.

The general material on the history and grammar of Russian is very interesting but much too sketchy to be educative and also because of its sketchiness is apt to confuse the reader. Many grammatical phenomena are touched on in a rather crowded fashion.

On the whole, the phrase section is satisfactory but there are slips here and there. In modern Russian, a reserved

seat
but
does
the
New
who
and
pect
ject
you
the
not
not
refer
Rus
mili

A
can
to
to
ful
ist
ner
the
basis
no
water
man
sua
T
secti
men
shop
wou
inde
nate
sion
show
origi
good
"plo
bad
plo
or pl
is o
Bu
usefu
trip

seat is considered not *rezervirovannoe** but *zabronirovannoe**; *c aerodromom** does not mean to the airport but with the airport; if you ask for a bus "*na Nevskom Prospekte**" you will be told where the bus stop on the Prospect is and not where to get a bus to the Prospect; asking for "*svechi*" with the adjective modifier of *zapolyne* might get you candles and not spark plugs, and the *sv* in *svechi** is pronounced *sf* and not *sv*; a gas station is a *koloaka* and not a *benzinaia stantsiia*. All the police references would not mean much to a Russian since they have no police but militia.

Another little handbook for the American traveler to the Soviet Union is *Key to Russia*, also part of a series of *Key to Europe* little books. It is full of useful information for the prospective tourist presented in a light humorous manner and in very good taste. Mr. Jaffe, the author, makes it very clear on the basis of his own recent experience that no traveler need worry about being watched or fear for his safety (as too many scare headlines have tried to persuade travelers over the years).

The information is broken down into sections: language, traveling arrangements, sightseeing hotels, restaurants, shopping and entertainment. But this would be more useful if there were an index. The language section unfortunately only lists words and not expressions, and has its own peculiar way of showing pronunciation without the original Russian for checking with a good neighbor Russian. I am afraid "*ploheey*" (which is supposed to mean bad) would not be recognized for *plokho** or *plokhoi**, pronounced *ploha* or *plahoy*, nor *kotz* for a blanket (which is *odeialo**).

But the *Key* is certainly among the useful handbooks to have with you on a trip to the Soviet Union.

BERNARD KOTEN

* Transliteration

Useful Translations

Soviet Education. English Translation of the USSR Journal *Sovetskaya Pedagogika*. International Arts and Sciences Press. 33 West 42nd St., New York 36, N. Y. \$70.00 a year (twelve issues); \$6.00 per copy.

THIS leading Soviet educational journal is now available monthly in complete, literal translation.

For anyone seriously interested in Soviet educational theory and practice this journal is indispensable. Each issue covers a wide field of material related to education: detailed discussion of classroom practice; scholarly studies of the history of Soviet education; lengthy considerations of educational theory.

A few titles of articles selected at random from recent issues give some idea of the scope of the material presented each month:

The Role of the Guidance Counsellor in Preparing Upper Class Students for Work; Socialist Competition in the Schools; The Establishment of Soviet Schools in Daghestan (1918); On the Bonds Between School and Life; Use of Visual Art Aids in Talks on Ethics; Public Education in the Mongolian People's Republic; Fostering Habits of Self-Control as One of the Means for Preparing Students for Practical Activity.

The articles are translated completely and there is no editorial comment. While the translations are literal, they are agreeable to read and present no obstacle to the readers' understanding.

In the past our views of Soviet education were hopelessly wide of the mark. This translation of the most important of the Soviet educational magazines goes a long way in helping us correct our superficial and downright ignorant views of the rich and complex field of Soviet education, both in its theoretical range and its day to day practice.

Soviet Records Reviewed

by SIDNEY FINKELSTEIN

SOME MONTHS ago Dmitri Shostakovich's *Eleventh Symphony*, subtitled "1905," was reviewed in these pages, as recorded for Capitol Records by Leopold Stokowski and the Houston Symphony Orchestra. Now Angel Records offers a recording of the same work (Angel 3586-3SL) done under the supervision of the composer, with Andre Cluytens leading the National Radio Broadcasting Orchestra of France. A comparison of the readings indicates that while the new one is more taut and tightly controlled, and so is slightly preferable, it is not radically different in conception from that by Stokowski, who always had a warm feeling for the music of Shostakovich. The symphony, as was said in the previous review, does not have the kind of "inner drama" of other recent Shostakovich symphony works, like the *Tenth Symphony* and *Violin Concerto*. It is a more "external" kind of musical panorama, its emotions created with broad strokes, evoking images of the historic 1905 uprising, against the tsar and making a creative and deeply felt use of the folk tunes of the period. As such, it is stirring and beautiful music.

On another Angel record (Angel 25704) Beethoven's great "*Archduke*" Trio Op. 97 is performed with a consummate elegance and refinement by a trio made up of David Oistrakh, Lev Oborin and Sviatoslav Knushevitsky. Three techniques and three musical minds coalesce to produce a sound that seems to come from a single miraculous instrument, responsive to every nuance of Beethoven's thought. In a splendid performance of the same work reviewed here some time ago, by Kogan, Gilels and Rostropovich, issued by Monitor, there was not that same perfect integration, but a little more bravura fire. My

suggestion is to choose the Oistrakh trio, although it would not hurt to own both. I am certain, however, that my colleagues in the commercial press, who are adept at reading between the lines, will find it impossible to let the matter rest at that. Can it be that in the Soviet Union there are such sharply dissenting views as to how to play Beethoven? Does the Gilels-Kogan-Rostropovich approach represent a revolt of the "youth" against the older Oistrakh-Oborin-Knushevitsky generation? Does this tendency of the Soviet "stars" to play trios indicate a subtle drive to confine the free, untrammelled individual spirit of the solo virtuoso? There is more here than meets the eye. And after carefully weighing all the evidence, I myself have come to a startling conclusion—that the Soviet Union public seems to be enjoying a remarkably high level of chamber music.

Through recordings, a legend is growing about another Soviet artist, the pianist Sviatoslav Richter, similar to that which preceded David Oistrakh's first visit here. A Monitor record (MC-207) presents Richter in performances of Schubert's *Sonata in A minor, Op. 42*, and two *Impromptus*, revealing pianism of incomparable technical virtuosity and impassioned poetry, turned always to musical ends. On another disc (MC-2022), on which he performs Franck's *Prelude, Chorale and Fugue* and Schumann's *Humoresque*, he likewise shows an originality of approach which is completely convincing, for it is the product of the most sensitive feeling and deep thought. A third disc, (MC-2026) offers the Schumann *Piano Concerto* and six of Schumann's *Fantasiestücke*, in technically impeccable and thoughtful readings. He is a wonderful pianist and first-rate musician.

NEW SOVIET FILMS

THE HOUSE I LIVE IN
SOVIET RUSSIA TODAY

Alexei Tolstoy's:
THE SISTERS and 1918

NEW CIRCUS ATTRACTIONS

MY BELOVED ONE

Artkino Pictures, Inc.

723 SEVENTH AVE., NEW YORK 19

Telephone: Circle 5-6570



OF MEN AND MOUNTAINS

by
ROCKWELL KENT

An account of the travels in
Europe and especially the USSR
of the author and his wife, Sally.

ILLUSTRATED BY THE AUTHOR

Price \$1.00 Postpaid

Order through

NEW WORLD REVIEW
34 West 15th St., New York 11

TOURS SOVIET UNION

Personally Escorted All Expense Air Tours

29 DAYS

21 days in Soviet Union in six cities
including Black Sea resort
Extension to Poland & Czechoslovakia
if desired

Departure from New York

TOUR "B" JULY 6th
TOUR "C" JULY 19th

Registration Limited
For full Information Write

**NATIONAL COUNCIL OF
AMERICAN-SOVIET FRIENDSHIP**

114 E. 32nd St., New York 16, N. Y.

Imported from Peking, China

Glimpses of China

1958 EDITION

large—beautifully illustrated
hard cover \$1.75

PEOPLE'S COMMUNES IN CHINA

the truth about the Chinese communes
from the original source—90 pages
Minimum order—five copies for \$1.00
Order through

**Imported Publications &
Products**

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

SO
JU
254

Save Money — Enrich Your Library

SPECIAL SUBSCRIPTION AND PREMIUM BOOK OFFER

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

- ☐ **\$1.00** for special 5-month trial subscription to NWR. (Really six month if you act quickly. We will include the especially informative March issue as long as it lasts.)
- ☐ **\$2.50** for one year subscription—12 copies of NWR. Plus either of the following books. (This is our regular sub price—the books alone regularly cost \$1.00.) Check one.

— **OF MEN AND MOUNTAINS, by Rockwell Kent.**
A glowing account in words and drawings of the recent trip of the distinguished artist and his wife Sally to Ireland and the Soviet Union. Just published.

— **HERE I STAND, by Paul Robeson.** The great singer and actor (now playing OTHELLO at the Stratford Festival in England) tells the story of his life and his convictions.

- ☐ **\$3.50** for one year subscription. Plus either of the following books. (Cloth—regular cost of books alone, \$2.00.) Check one.

— **EARLY DAWN, by Lev Kassil.** This leading Soviet writer for young people presents a sensitive story of young Soviet artist, Kolya Dmitriev, killed in an accident. Handsomely illustrated by Dmitriev's work, in black and white and color.

— **THE MALACHITE CASKET, by Pavel Bazhov.** Folk tales from the Urals retold with great artistry by a leading Soviet writer. **The Stone Flower**, in the Bolshoy Ballet repertory for their U.S. visit, is based on one of the stories of this collection. Illustrated in color.

- ☐ **\$4.00** for one year subscription PLUS
— **THE ROAD TO LIFE, by Anton Makarenko, in three volumes, cloth.** Classic account of establishment of a special school in early days of Soviet Union by this great educator. A literary masterpiece, this book is also a basic source of Soviet educational theory. (Regular cost of books alone, \$3.00.)

- ☐ **\$4.50** for one year subscription PLUS
— **THE BRAVE NEW WORLD, by Helen and Scott Nearing.** An inspiring and informative account of their recent journey to the USSR and People's China, by two gifted social observers. (Cloth—regular cost of books alone, \$3.50.)

(Add \$.50 to above prices for Canadian orders, \$1.00 for foreign).

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY _____ ZONE _____ STATE _____

☐ Check here if this is a renewal.