

SOCIAL SCIENCES ✓
OCTOBER, 1959

25¢

✓ DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRARY OCT 13 1959

New World

REVIEW

KHRUSHCHEV PROPOSES TOTAL DISARMAMENT

**Youth in a World
Without War**
J. D. BERNAL

The Crisis in Laos
SUSAN WARREN

Uzbekistan Impressions
CORLISS LAMONT

NEW WORLD REVIEW

OCTOBER 1959

The Soviet Disarmament Proposal	3
The Khrushchev Visit	Jessica Smith 11
Youth and the Future	J. D. Bernal 19
A Visit to Sochi	Murray Young 25
Letter from Bulgaria	Rockwell Kent 30
Industry in Bulgaria	Edgar P. Young 32
Uzbekistan Impressions	Corliss Lamont 35
Rebuilding Bucharest	Arthur D. Kahn 37
Sun Pao-san's Story	Grace Liu 41
Not So Quiet Americans in Laos	Susan Warren 44

Report to Our Readers	52
BOOKS	
Main Street, USSR—Irving R. Levine	54
Since Sputnik: How Americans View the Soviet Union	Herbert Aptheker 54
What I Saw in the Soviet Union Today	George Morris 54
Soviet Education Today and Tomorrow	Elizabeth Moos 54

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

ESLANDA ROBESON
Our Roving Correspondent
Editorial Consultants on Negro and Colonial Questions

Vol. 27, No. 9, October, 1959. Second Class postage paid at New York, N. Y. Subscription \$2.50 per year. \$1.25 for 6 months (Canadian, \$3.00, foreign \$3.50 a year. Draw money orders or checks payable in New York.) Published monthly by the N.W.R. Publications, Inc., 34 West 15th Street, New York 11, N. Y. Indexed in Bulletin of the Public Affairs Information Service. Phone: CHelsea 3-0666.
PRINTED IN U.S.A.



THE SPECIAL NOVEMBER ISSUE

The exchange of visits between Premier Khrushchev and President Eisenhower make this year's two November anniversaries—42 years of the Soviet Union and 26 years of American-Soviet diplomatic relations—of great historic significance. The whole world watches and waits and the people of our own country question, discuss and debate matters of foreign policy as never before. Does a peaceful future await them and their children, or will the ominous clouds of an annihilating war continue to hover over them?

Each November NWR has published an enlarged issue. This November, because of the decisive period of American-Soviet relations through which we are now living, we have made a special effort to get outstanding material. A number of the contributors to this issue have just returned from visits to the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies of Eastern Europe.

Among those contributing are Rockwell Kent, Corliss Lamont, Holland Roberts, Albert Rhys Williams, Barrows Dunham, Ralph Parker, etc.

We are sure that you will want to distribute copies of the November issue to your friends, as has been your custom in the past. Using the blank below, send in your order immediately to insure getting the number of copies you want.

PLEASE FILL OUT AND MAIL TODAY

NEW WORLD REVIEW

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

I enclose \$_____ for _____ copies of the special, enlarged November issue.

(25 cents per copy—5 copies for \$1.00)

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

For Total Disarmament

Khrushchev's Proposal to the UN

We print below the full text of the section of the historic address to the United Nations on September 18 by Premier Nikita Khrushchev of the Soviet Union, proposing general and complete disarmament for all nations.

WE, ALL OF US, are faced with many outstanding international problems. Not all of them are equally important as to their significance or urgency. Some of them concern the relations between individual countries, others affect the interests of the peoples of several countries and continents. But there is one problem whose solution is awaited with hope by the peoples of all countries, big and small, irrespective of their social system and way of life. It is *the problem of disarmament*. Its correct solution will determine to a great extent whether mankind will proceed to war with its disastrous consequences or whether the cause of peace will prevail. The peoples are thirsting for peace, they want to live without fear for their future, without fear of losing their loved ones in the flames of a new war.

For centuries the people dreamed of getting rid of the destructive means of warfare. The demand for disarmament has been advanced and upheld by the best minds, by the greatest public leaders and statesmen, and by parties having the closest ties with the working people. But, instead of disarmament, the world, for many decades, has been shaken by the armaments fever.

Who can honestly say that the arms race has helped to solve a

single, even the simplest international problem? On the contrary, the arms race only complicates and further embroils the solution of issues in dispute.

Destructive Power of War

Never before in the history of mankind has the arms race been conducted at such a pace and with such dangers involved as today, the age of the atom, electronics and the conquest of cosmic space.

Only recently rapid-fire automatic weapons, tanks, long-range artillery and aerial bombs were regarded as the most terrible, the most powerful means of annihilation. But can they stand any comparison with the weapons available today? We have reached a stage where it is difficult to find a weapon more powerful than the hydrogen bomb which has practically no limit as to its potential. If all the means of destruction that mankind has possessed in the past were put together, they would constitute, in power, only an insignificant part of what the two or three great powers possessing nuclear weapons have at their disposal today.

I would not disclose any big secret in saying that the explosion of one—only one, mark you—big hydrogen bomb releases a tremendous energy of destruction. I happened to

read recently a remark by the American nuclear physicist W. Davison that the explosion of one hydrogen bomb releases a greater energy than all the explosions set off by all countries in all wars known in the history of mankind. And he is right, apparently. Is it possible to disregard the fact that the destructive potential of the means of warfare has reached such tremendous proportions? And can one forget that there is not a spot on the globe today inaccessible to nuclear and rocket weapons?

It is hard to imagine the consequences for mankind of a war with the use of this monstrous means of destruction and annihilation. If it were allowed to start, the number of victims would run not into millions, but into tens and even hundreds of millions of human lives. It would be a war in which there would be no difference between the front and the rear, between the combatants and the children. Many large cities and industrial centers would be reduced to ruins and the greatest monuments of culture, created over centuries by the efforts of human genius, would be lost irrevocably. Nor would this war spare future generations. Its poisonous trail in the form of radioactive contamination would long maim people and claim many lives.

A dangerous situation has developed in the world today. Various military alliances are in existence and the arms race proceeds without a moment's let-up. So much inflammable material has accumulated that a single spark would be enough to place everything on the verge of a catastrophe. The world has reached a point where war may be-

come a fact on the strength of no more than some ridiculous accident such as a technical fault in a plane carrying a hydrogen bomb or mental aberration in the pilot behind the controls.

It is well known, moreover, that the arms race already constitutes a heavy burden for the peoples. It leads to the rise of prices and reduction of the real wages. It has a harmful effect on the economy of many states, and disrupts international trade. Never have so many states, so many people, been drawn into military preparations as at present. If we consider, in addition to the military, the number of people directly or indirectly connected with the production of arms and involved in various branches of military research, we will find that over 100 million people have been taken away from their peaceful labors—the most vigorous and able-bodied people, men of science and technology. A priceless fund of human energy, knowledge, ingenuity and skill is thrown as into a bottomless pit, squandered on growing armaments.

The annual military expenditures of all states today total approximately 100 billion dollars. Is it not time to call a halt to this senseless waste of the people's means and energy for the preparation of war and destruction?

The USSR Stands for Peace

The Soviet Government, guided as it is in its foreign policy by the principle of peaceful coexistence, stands for peace and friendship between all nations. The aim of our domestic policy—the sole aim—is to create a life worthy of the best

ideals of mankind. Our seven-year plan is permeated with the spirit of peacefulness and with concern for the welfare and happiness of the people. The aim of our foreign policy—the sole and unchanging one—is to prevent war, to insure peace and security to our country and to all countries.

Some people in the West expected that the material resources of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries would be exhausted in the "cold war," that their economy would be undermined. But their calculations have been wrong. Even though it has to bear a definite armaments burden, the Soviet Union is able to insure the rapid development of its economy and the ever fuller satisfaction of the growing requirements of its people. Of course, the people's material requirements would be better satisfied if the arms burden were removed.

The Soviet Union is a resolute and consistent champion of disarmament. In our state, there are no classes or groups interested in war and the arms race, in the conquest of foreign territories. You will all agree that to accomplish the great tasks that we have set ourselves, to raise the well-being of the Soviet people and implement the economic construction plans, we need peace. In common with the other states who cherish peace we would like to devote all our economy and resources to peaceful purposes in order to provide to our people an abundance of food, clothes, homes, etc. With the arms race going on, however, we cannot devote all our efforts to peaceful construction without endangering the vital interests of our

people and the security interests of the country.

All peoples need peace. At the conclusion of World War Two, the Soviet Union submitted concrete disarmament proposals in the United Nations. We proposed the complete prohibition of atomic weapons, a substantial reduction of the armed forces and armaments, and a big cut in arms expenditures. We went on record for the liquidation of military bases on foreign territories and the withdrawal of armed forces from foreign territories.

We have proved our desire to solve the disarmament problem by deeds, not by words. The Soviet Union has time and again taken the lead in proposing specific steps toward putting an end to the arms race and getting down as soon as possible to practical measures toward disarmament. Immediately after the end of the war, we carried out an extensive demobilization in our country. The Soviet Union has closed down all the military bases it had on the territories of other states after the Second World War.

You will recall that the Soviet armed forces have been reduced, unilaterally, by a total of over two million men. The Soviet forces in the German Democratic Republic have been reduced considerably and all Soviet troops have been withdrawn from the Rumanian People's Republic. We have also effected a considerable cut in our military budget.

In 1958, the Soviet unilaterally suspended tests of atomic and hydrogen weapons in the hope that the other Powers would follow this noble example. It is only to be regretted that these hopes were not justi-

fied. The Soviet Government has now decided not to resume nuclear tests in the Soviet Union if the Western Powers do not resume theirs. Only if they resume the tests of nuclear weapons will the Soviet Union consider itself free of this commitment.

The problem of disarmament has been discussed for over 14 years now, in the United Nations and by other international forums, but no practical results have yet been achieved. What is the reason for this? I should not like to rake over the past, to consider at length the obstacles and differences that arose in the course of the disarmament talks, much less to bring accusations against anyone. This is not the main thing to-day. The main thing, in our conviction, is to remove the main roadblocks that have been raised in the way of disarmament, to find a new approach to the solution of this problem.

The experience of disarmament talks shows that the question of control has been raised as one of the main obstacles to agreement. We were and are for strict international control over the implementation of the disarmament agreement, when it is reached. But we have always been against the system of control being separated from measures toward disarmament, against the organs of control becoming, in effect, organs for the collection of intelligence information in conditions where there would in effect be no disarmament.

We are for genuine disarmament under control, but we are against control without disarmament. It would be easy for the opponents of disarmament to make any measure

conditional upon such demands of control as the other states would be unable to satisfy in the conditions of a universal arms race. Indeed, those same countries which, for some reason or other, advance such far-reaching demands of control would not be inclined to accept these demands themselves, if it came to their implementation.

There exist other difficulties also. So long as disarmament is conceived only as partial disarmament and it is assumed that some armaments will remain after the conclusion of a disarmament agreement, states would still retain the material possibility to launch an attack. Apprehensions would always exist that with the aid of the remaining types of armaments and armed forces the possibility to launch an attack would continue. The understanding that such a possibility remains was in no small measure an obstacle in the disarmament negotiations.

Many states feared that disarmament measures would affect precisely those types of armaments in which they had the greatest advantage and which they believed to be particularly necessary for themselves. Naturally, under these circumstances in the atmosphere of the "cold war" and mutual suspicion, no state, speaking seriously and not for propaganda, could reveal its military secrets, the organization of its defense and war production without damage to the interests of its national security.

All the delegates will, I am sure, agree with the necessity of focusing the collective reason of all states as well as the United Nations on the search for a new approach to the solution of disarmament.

The task is to find a lever by grasping which mankind could be stopped from backsliding into the abyss of war. At present just one thing is necessary and that is to rule out the very possibility of wars being unleashed. So long as there exist large armies, air forces and navies, nuclear and rocket weapons, so long as young men on the threshold of life are first of all taught to wage war while the general staffs work out plans of future military operations, there is no guarantee of stable peace.

Let Us Completely Disarm!

The Soviet Government, having comprehensively considered the existing situation, has come to the firm conviction that *the way out of the deadlock should be sought along the road of general and complete disarmament*. With such an approach the possibility of creating any military advantages for one state or another is completely ruled out. *It is general and complete disarmament that will remove all the barriers that were raised during consideration of questions of partial disarmament and will clear the way for the establishment of comprehensive and complete control.*

What does the Soviet Government propose?

The essence of our proposals is that over a period of four years all states should effect complete disarmament and should no longer have any means of waging war.

This means that armies, navies and air forces will cease to exist, general staffs and war ministries will be abolished, military educational establishments will be closed.

Dozens of millions of men will

return to peaceful creative labor.

Military bases in foreign territories will be abolished.

All atomic and hydrogen bombs at the disposal of states will be destroyed and their further production terminated. The energy of fissionable materials will be used exclusively for peaceful economic and scientific purposes.

Military rockets of all ranges will be liquidated and rocket facilities will remain only as a means of transportation — and harnessing outer space to the benefit of all mankind.

At the disposal of states there should remain only strictly limited contingents of police (militia) agreed for each country, armed with small arms and intended exclusively to maintain internal order and protect the personal security of citizens.

To insure that no one could violate their obligations we propose the setting up of an international control body comprising all states. There should be initiated a system of control over all disarmament measures which should be created and should function in conformity with the stages by which disarmament should be effected.

If disarmament is comprehensive and complete then upon its attainment control will also be general and complete. States will have nothing to conceal from one another; none of them will dispose of a weapon that could be used against the other, and therefore the controllers will be able to manifest their zeal to the hilt.

Such a solution of disarmament questions will insure the complete security of all states. It will generate favorable conditions for the peace-

ful coexistence of states. All international problems will then be resolved not by force of arms but by peaceful means.

We are realists in politics and understand that some time is required to work out such a broad disarmament program. While such a program is being elaborated, while the questions are negotiated, one should not sit with folded hands and wait.

The Soviet Government believes that the elaboration of a program of general and complete disarmament should not hold up the solution of such an acute and fully mature question as that of the discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests for all time. There now exist all prerequisites for such a solution. We hope that the appropriate agreement on the discontinuance of tests will be concluded and put into effect without delay.

The danger of a rocket-nuclear war looming over the peoples requires courageous and far-reaching solutions to insure peace.

The decision to carry out within a short space of time general and complete disarmament and its implementation would signal the start of a new stage in international life. The agreement of states to commence general and complete disarmament would be a convincing factual confirmation of the absence of any aggressive designs on their part and of the sincere desire to build their relations with other countries on the basis of friendship and cooperation. Along with the destruction of weapons and the abolition of the armed forces there would remain no material possibilities for the pursuit by states of any policy other than a peaceful policy.

Having achieved complete disarmament, mankind would experience a feeling similar to that which overcomes an utterly exhausted desert traveler, tormented by the fear of perishing from thirst and exposure, when after long wanderings he reaches an oasis.

General and complete disarmament would provide the opportunity to switch enormous material and financial outlays from the manufacture of the instruments of death to creative purposes. Human energy can be directed at creating material and spiritual wealth which embellishes and ennobles the life and work of human beings.

The implementation of a general and complete disarmament program would provide the opportunity to transfer enormous sums of money to the building of schools, hospitals, houses, roads, to the production of foodstuffs and industrial goods. The money thus released would provide the opportunity of substantially reducing taxes and lowering prices. This would beneficially affect the living standards of the population and would be welcomed by millions of ordinary people. Just the money spent by states over the last decade for military needs would be enough to build over 150 million houses which could comfortably accommodate many hundreds of millions of people.

General and complete disarmament would also generate entirely new opportunities to render aid to states whose economies are at present still underdeveloped and need assistance on the part of the more developed countries. Even if but a small part of the money released as a result of the termination of the

milit
was c
this
epoch
of A
Al
way
tiona
shape
proh
The
the U
many
coun
order
zation
result
the l
for t
tion.
arma
econ
trial
of th
ous.
WI
the o
tary
terna
devel
fiden
ish, a
one a
The
nomin
tion
time
which
aspire
Bei
aims
the j
under
ciples
ter, t
of So
for co

military outlays of the great powers was earmarked for aid to such states this could open up virtually a new epoch in the economic development of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

All the artificial obstacles in the way of the development of international trade which exist today in the shape of discriminatory restrictions, prohibitive lists, etc. would vanish. The industries of such countries as the USA, Britain, France, West Germany and other highly developed countries could at last receive large orders from other states. The utilization of the money released as a result of disarmament would create the broadest possible opportunities for the employment of the population. Therefore assertions that disarmament would lead to a crisis or economic depression in the industrially highly developed countries of the capitalist world are erroneous.

When no state will in fact have the opportunity of unleashing military action against other states, international relations will begin to develop under the hallmark of confidence. Suspicion and fear will vanish, all nations will be able to regard one another as true good neighbors. The door will open wide to economic, trade and cultural cooperation between all states. For the first time reliable and stable peace to which all the nations so strongly aspire will become a reality.

Being convinced that these great aims can and must be achieved by the joint efforts of all states united under the sign of the peaceful principles of the United Nations Charter, *the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics submits for consideration by the United Na-*

tions a Declaration on general and complete disarmament comprising concrete proposals on this question.

Alternate Partial Steps

It goes without saying that if at present due to certain reasons the Western powers do not manifest their readiness to embark on general and complete disarmament, the Soviet Government is ready to come to agreement with other states on the appropriate partial steps on disarmament and the strengthening of security. The major of these steps, in the opinion of the Soviet government, are the following:

- (1) The creation of a zone of control and inspection with a reduction of foreign troops on the territories of the corresponding countries of Western Europe;
- (2) The creation of an atom-free zone in Central Europe;
- (3) The withdrawal of all foreign troops from the territory of European states and the liquidation of military bases on foreign territories;
- (4) The conclusion of a non-aggression pact between the NATO member-states and the states-parties to the Warsaw Treaty;
- (5) An agreement on the prevention of surprise attack by one state on another.

The Soviet Government deems it appropriate to recall its proposals of May 10, 1955, on disarmament which contain concrete considerations regarding partial steps in the field of disarmament. It is convinced that these proposals are a good basis for agreement on this vitally important problem.

The idea of general and complete disarmament is not being submitted

by the Soviet Union for the first time. As far back as the period between World Wars I and II the government of our country came out with a comprehensive program of complete disarmament. The opponents of disarmament were then wont to assert that the Soviet Union had introduced these proposals because it was a weak state economically and militarily. If at that time this false thesis could delude anyone it is now universally evident that talk of any weakness of the Soviet Union is absurd.

The new proposal of the Soviet

Government is prompted by the sole desire to secure truly stable peace between the nations.

We sincerely say to all countries: "In counterbalance to the slogan 'Let us arm!' which is still current in some quarters we put forward the slogan 'Let us completely disarm!'" Let us compete in who builds more homes, schools, hospitals for his people, produces more grain, milk, meat, clothing and other consumer goods, and not in who has more hydrogen bombs and rockets. This will be welcomed by all the nations of the world.

The Khrushchev Visit

by JESSICA SMITH

HOW IS IT possible to keep up with the swift strides of history these days!

One day the moon, which for so many eons has arisen and sunk so far above the joys and sorrows of this earth, is hit by a space rocket from the Soviet Union—a 236,875 mile bullseye, as one writer put it. This great event, added to the sputniks already sailing the skies, opens new possibilities for space travel, a new era for mankind and its aspirations, which have ever reached out to the stars.

Two days later a giant turbojet plane hurtles through the skies from the Soviet Union to our shores, bringing Nikita Khrushchev, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR and First Secretary of the Communist Party, his family and entourage, to our country as guests of our government. This perhaps is an even greater event in the lives of all

of us, which we may hope also opens a new era for mankind and the possibility of realizing our aspirations for peace forever on this earth of ours.

It is not so easy to be going to press in the midst of this historic visit. The temptation is to watch and hear what's going on over T-V and radio, giving the visit complete coverage. Just to read the press which in preparation and current reporting—even including advertising—has given this event more attention than any event in our memory, takes all the time there is. Not being a daily or weekly publication, with facilities to cover everything, all we can do at this point is to cover some of the highpoints of the first days of the visit in the East, knowing that by the time this reaches our readers history will already be far ahead of us.

On Tuesday morning, September

15th, when the huge Soviet plane rolled to a stop, and Premier Khrushchev and his party disembarked, President Eisenhower, Secretary of State Herter and other top officials greeted them, to the accompaniment of the full military honors due to a head of state.

President Eisenhower, in his formal welcoming address said he was looking forward to the talks. Declaring that the American people want peace, he said:

Although we shall not be negotiating any issues affecting the interests of other countries, I trust that a full and frank exchange of views on many subjects may contribute to a better understanding, on both sides, of unresolved international questions.

The Soviet Premier emphasized that he had come "with open heart and good intentions," and the desire of the Soviet people to live in friendship with the American people. Referring to the moon rocket and the launching of the first Soviet atomic icebreaker as achievements of peace, he continued:

We are aware Mr. President, that the idea of the peaceful use of atomic energy is dear to you, and we note with gratification that your aims in this field coincide with ours.

We have no doubt that the excellent scientists, engineers and workers of the United States who are engaged in the field of conquering the cosmos, will also carry their pennant to the moon. The Soviet pennant, as an old resident, will then welcome your pennant and they will live together in peace and friendship, as we should live together on earth in peace and friendship and as all the people should live who inhabit our common mother earth who is so generous to us all with her gifts.

Peace was the theme of the discussions, the toasts at social affairs, the addresses of the Soviet Premier

that filled his first days. After the preliminary exchange of views between Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Eisenhower, the announcement was made that "the atmosphere of the talks was friendly and frank, with agreement that the discussions should continue in this spirit to seek ways to achieve better understanding."

The reception accorded Premier Khrushchev, the large crowds that turned out to welcome him, showed the tremendous interest of the American people in this historic visit. The minority who have marred it by hostile paid advertisements, or demonstrations, have only shown their own lack of concern for the real interests of the United States and for peace as the paramount issue today. They have been answered by others who do have this concern, who welcome the visit and the President's initiative as a constructive step toward understanding and peace.

Most of all, Mr. Khrushchev has impressed the people who have heard him or seen him on T-V as a profoundly *human* being, a man of deep sincerity and high intelligence, full of humor, completely unself-conscious, quick to anger when provoked, quick to respond with warmth to every evidence of friendship and understanding. Pulling no punches about what he dislikes in us, and his conviction in the superiority of the socialist system, he has spoken with greatest respect of American achievements, showed his reverence for the best in American history by his tribute to Abraham Lincoln when visiting the Lincoln Memorial, and in the solemn ceremony of laying a wreath on the tomb

of Franklin D. Roosevelt as "the great champion of progress and peace." He also expressed his disappointment that his visit did not allow for more direct contacts with ordinary American people.

Mrs. Khrushchev, too, has won the hearts of the American people with her warm and motherly attitude.

Summing up the impressions of those who saw Mr. Khrushchev in action during the first five days of his visit here, Harrison Salisbury wrote in the *New York Times*, September 20:

This is a Khrushchev of incredible dynamism, of lightning quick wit, of energy that never seems to run down. A stubborn man. A fighter. A man of extraordinary gifts.

At this point, midstream in the visit, we shall concentrate rather on what Mr. Khrushchev has had to say than on the commentary, because we believe that the message Mr. Khrushchev has brought us is the matter of primary concern to our readers.

At the National Press Club

KHRUSHCHEV SAYS NEW WAR WOULD BE 'SHEER MADNESS' was the headline of the *New York World Telegram*, September 16, over its report of the Soviet Premier's speech that day before a National Press Club luncheon in Washington. And the *New York Times* headline next morning read "KHRUSHCHEV . . . ASKS PEACE EFFORT LEST EARTH TURN INTO 'ASHES AND GRAVES.'"

Mr. Khrushchev declared at the outset that it would be premature to anticipate the results of his visit, but that judging by the first day of

the meetings and talks in Washington "I should say that the barometer shows 'fine.'" He said President Eisenhower's "outstanding qualities are highly esteemed in the Soviet Union," and stressed the value of personal contacts.

He declared he had come to us with a feeling of friendship for the American people and a sincere desire to bring about an improvement in relations between our countries, to strengthen world peace. Noting the primary issues on which he would like to reach agreement, he declared:

First of all I should like to mention the easing of international tensions and abolition of the cold war, disarmament, a peace treaty with Germany, world trade and improvement of the relations between our countries.

Mr. Khrushchev said he fully shared the President's recently expressed concern over the continuation of the arms race and the possibility of an explosion if tensions should continue. Speaking of the growing destructiveness of modern war and atomic weapons, he declared:

Under these circumstances it would be sheer madness to allow a new world war to come to a head.

To insure peace and to banish war forever from the life of human society is the noble aim to which all people aspire. Our age has produced an awareness among the people that war must be averted and peace must be insured. It is to this noble goal that the mighty peace movement is dedicated. We are confident that war is not inevitable in our time. Man can and must be freed of the fear of its horrors.

Turning to the question of Germany, he stressed its special importance as the source of two world wars. He restated the Soviet position

of the importance of ending the vestiges of the last war, including the continued occupation of West Berlin, and concluding a peace treaty with Germany. The existence of two German states at present must, he said, be acknowledged, so the only way out at present is conclusion of a peace treaty with both German states. Declaring that an eventual united Germany was of course the best thing, he argued that the conclusion of a peace treaty with both Germanies would, by eliminating present frictions over Berlin, contribute toward this end. Referring to President Eisenhower's pledge to U.S. allies to protect the freedom and welfare of the Berlin population, he affirmed that the Soviet formula of declaring West Berlin a free city with reliable international guarantees, with or without the UN, would accomplish this, and there was no intention of incorporating West Berlin into the German Democratic Republic, or changing its social and economic status. He noted with satisfaction that the position of the three Western powers and the Soviet Union had come closer at the Geneva Foreign Ministers' Conference.

Emphasizing the importance of close economic and cultural contacts among all nations and especially between the Soviet Union and the United States, who he said, had a special responsibility because of their discovery and development of nuclear and rocket weapons, Mr. Khrushchev made a special plea for the use of atomic power, the development of rockets and the penetration of outer space for a peaceful future and the development of mankind—"or they will be used for the

purposes of destruction and annihilation, and as a result, the earth will be covered with ashes and graves."

He declared that the "Soviet people have long made their choice for peace," and spoke of the first atomic power station, the launching of the sputniks, and the first atomic ice-breaker, as demonstrations of the "shining heights mankind can reach if it concentrates its energies on peaceful work." He continued:

We are convinced that the American people also are for peace. But if our interests coincide in this, the most important question, the question of insuring peace, we must march together, and, pooling our efforts and energy, press for a fundamental turn in the climate of international relations.

Asked later whether the Soviet Union had any schedule for sending a man to the moon, Mr. Khrushchev said that because they valued human life, such a plan would be considered only when technical possibilities, that do not now exist, were achieved. He also indicated that the USSR would be ready to share with scientists of other countries the results of their Arctic explorations, and was in favor of international cooperation in that field.

The Soviet Premier declared that his government was ready to consider any proposal which might help toward the establishment of good neighbor relations between the USSR and the United States. No one could be so naive as to consider that all difficulties could be ironed out at once, but there are already, he declared, signs of thaw in the mutual visits and mutual exchanges of recent years.

As one of the most important elements in improving relations Mr. Khrushchev mentioned the develop-

ment of trade between the two countries, and doing away with the present discriminatory policy.

Taking note of the apprehensions expressed that the USSR wished to drive a wedge between the United States and its allies, the Soviet Premier said that on the contrary the Soviet Union would like to improve its relations with all the allies of the United States, and that better US-USSR understanding could only be of benefit to all other nations, large and small, and the cause of peace everywhere.

In conclusion, Mr. Khrushchev expressed his admiration for the great contributions the American people have made to mankind and transmitted friendly greetings from the Soviet people, himself and his party to the people of America.

After the hour speech, a forty minutes question and answer period followed, chaired by William H. Lawrence of the *New York Times*, Press Club President. In an astonishing display of rudeness Mr. Lawrence opened the questions by asking Mr. Khrushchev to comment on a "possibly apocryphal story" having to do with Khrushchev's speech about Stalin to a closed session of the Twentieth Congress, and what Khrushchev himself had been doing "while Stalin was committing these crimes." Mr. Khrushchev, with a most serious and dignified demeanor, said he would not answer this question which he considered provocative.

Asked whether the timing of the moon shot on the eve of his arrival was coincidental, and whether the sending of the Soviet emblem indicated a desire to claim possession of the moon, Mr. Khrushchev re-

plied that any scientist would understand the impossibility of setting the launching of a moon rocket for an exact date. On the second part of the question he said that while not wishing to offend anyone, this reflected capitalist psychology, a person thinking in terms of private ownership. He continued:

But I represent a Socialist country, where the word "mine" has long receded into the past and the word "our" has taken its place, and therefore when we launched this rocket and achieved this great thing, we look upon this as our victory, meaning the victory not only of our country but of all countries and all mankind.

To a question on what specifically Mr. Khrushchev had in mind regarding trade, he replied:

We want to be good partners in trading with you . . . and as for the goods to be traded, we should buy what we need and you should sell what you want to sell. And as for any specific goods, we, on purpose did not include any person from our Ministry of Foreign Trade in our party so that no one would think we have come here begging for something from Uncle Sam.

Mr. Khrushchev turned aside a question on Hungary with the remark that if there were a desire for the discussion to take that turn he too could raise a number of questions. Any difficulties between the Soviet Union and Hungary, he said, had been solved. He himself would not raise questions of such a nature here because he came not to revert to old difficulties in our relations "but rather to soften our relations, improve them, to remove any stones that might lie in the path toward better relations."

The concluding question had to do with Mr. Khrushchev's oft-

quote
Mr.
what
an ex
course
questi
develo
victio
ings
that
way t
bound
as a
vides
velopm
forces,
to dev
insure
that so
Ma
but t
either
of us
you u
tinue
All
away
form
and g
a cou
tainly
the sh
state c
place
before
opmer
count
our c
else.
gradua
year .
count
tists w
collaps
to our
We re
New Y
In
as ten
Mayor
change

quoted remark "We will bury you." Mr. Khrushchev explained that what he had had in mind in using an expression of this kind was of course not "physical burial," but the question of "the historical force of development." He expressed his conviction, based on the scientific teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin, that "just as feudalism had given way to capitalism, so capitalism is bound to give way to communism" as a system of society which provides better possibilities for the development of a country's productive forces, which enables every person to develop his capacities best, and insures full freedom of a person in that society. He went on:

Many of you will not agree with that, but that means I cannot agree with you either. What is to be done? Let each of us live under the system we prefer, you under capitalism, and we will continue to build under communism.

All that is not progressive will die away at once, because if the capitalist form of society is a better form of society and gives better opportunities to develop a country's productive forces, then certainly it would win. But we think that the short history of the existence of our state does not speak in your favor. What place did our country hold in economics before the revolution, and in the development in the world? It was an illiterate country. Today the rate of literacy in our country is higher than anywhere else. We now have 106,000 engineers graduating from our universities each year . . . three times more than this country. Some say that the more scientists we have, the sooner will communism collapse. Then we seem to be working to our own end. But that is not the case. We regard communism as a science.

New York Economic Club Dinner

In New York City, a luncheon was tendered the Soviet Premier by Mayor Wagner. A friendly interchange took place, in which Mr.

Khrushchev, speaking extemporaneously, emphasized the importance of concentrating on those things that unite rather than divide us.

Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, acting as President Eisenhower's Representative during the visit, gave a panegyric to something which he called "economic humanism," rather than monopoly capitalism, as the best way to describe our system, in introducing Mr. Khrushchev to the Economic Club. He declared:

American business recognizes the deep desire of people for peace and they recognize that there is no profit, but only disaster in war.

Referring to the Chairman's remark that he had never known of a day when the interest in the club was as high as today, the Soviet Premier replied:

I say that there are areas in our country where people have never seen a camel. And if a camel appears, many people show great interest in him and some even want to pull him by the tail.

You will excuse me if I draw another analogy. The flower of the New York and perhaps not only of the New York business world is represented here. And naturally when a live Communist appears in such company, there is a great interest in him; to look at him, to hear him, and if he has a tail to pull it.

Mr. Khrushchev told of how Marshall MacDuffie had first suggested that he visit America, "because many Americans thought I had horns on my head, and it would be a great achievement for the Soviet Union if I could prove otherwise. . . . I should say that the gentlemen here present can easily see that I have no horns on my forehead because there isn't much hair to hide them if there were."

In the formal part of his speech,

Mr. Khrushchev spoke of the fact that industrial production in the Soviet Union has increased thirty-six times compared with 1913, while it had increased only four times in that period in the United States. The present seven-year economic plan, he said, would bring the Soviet Union close to the level of economic development attained by the United States. The answer to these achievements, "we think lies in the advantages of our system." Only an ostrich could fail to take account of these realities. Already production in the first eight months of this year had increased by 12 per cent, whereas the plan had provided for a 7.7 per cent increase, thus it was demonstrated that they could catch up with the United States in over-all economic development, and later on in per capita production, even more quickly than had been envisaged. Noting specific fields in which production will increase, he assured his hearers that while the Soviet Union had always advocated international trade, he had not come here to beg, and that in raising the question now it was not because the seven-year plan could not be fulfilled without such trade. He continued:

I want to stress that the Soviet Government always has been and always will be for international trade on the basis of equality and mutual advantage, without any discrimination. . . .

We are opposed and will continue to be opposed to all embargo lists in trade as an unreasonable practice. If you do not want to trade in so-called strategic or other goods, do not. It is your business. But do not introduce discrimination against any one country or group of countries. This practice disrupts the normal flow of international trade and leads to political complications. Indeed, it is known from history that countries resort to restrictions

in trade when they contemplate a military campaign against any country against which they discriminate.

Let us then clear the road to insuring normal commercial relations among all countries regardless of their social systems.

Mr. Khrushchev then noted that the volume of foreign Soviet trade last year amounted to over \$8,600,000,000, seven times the 1938 figure. He said that trade was on the rise with Britain, West Germany, Italy and France, and asked why America should remain apart, adding, "He who comes late must be content with a picked bone." He declared that those who felt refusing trade with the Soviet Union was justified by retarding the economic development of the USSR were mistaken because the Soviet Union had to develop itself machinery it had expected to import from the United States, so that "the artificial curtailment of trade had strengthened rather than weakened us." Citing Soviet achievements in technology, use of hydrogen energy, the sputniks and rocketry, he continued:

All of you are well aware of the fact that we offer you economic competition. Some describe this as our challenge to the United States. But speaking of challenges, one might say—and that would be even more correct perhaps—that it was the United States that developed its economy above that of all other countries of the world.

For a long time no one was in a position to challenge your supremacy there. But now the time has come when there is a state which accepts your challenge, which takes into account the level of development of the United States and in turn is challenging you in this field. And we have no doubt that the Soviet Union will be able to stand on its own in this economic competition, and will in time overtake you.

But what's wrong about that? N

matter who wins in this competition, you or we—both the Soviet Union and the United States will gain, because our nations will live in conditions of peace and even better than we do now.

The Soviet Premier went on to say that competition by no means excluded cooperation, and mentioned the help of American corporations when the Soviet Union started building up a large-scale industry:

Ford helped us build the automobile works in Gorky. The prominent American specialist [Col. Hugh] Cooper acted as a consultant for the construction of the hydroelectric plant on the Dnieper, which was the world's largest at that time. Your engineers helped us to build tractor plants in Stalingrad and Kharkov. Americans, along with the British, acted as consultants during the construction of the Moscow subway. We were grateful to your specialists for their cooperation. . . .

He spoke of how much the two countries could learn from each other today, and how they could jointly help the underdeveloped nations. He said the Soviet policy of coexistence meant greater unity rather than disunity in the world, and said that to live in peace as good neighbors or to slide into war were the only alternatives between the two countries. He expressed the hope that the businessmen present would use their influence toward peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition, mentioning his respect for Cyrus Eaton, who had chosen this course. He concluded:

I want to end by asking you all to think what you, each one of you, could do to contribute to better relations between our two countries, which have such a profound importance; for peace between the United States and the Soviet Union, for world cooperation and international peace.

Following a frank and friendly interchange in the question and answer period, Mr. Khrushchev was asked about the reasons for censorship of US publications and correspondents' reports and the jamming of U.S. broadcasts. Mr. Khrushchev started to answer that he and President Eisenhower had agreed there would be no question of interference in internal affairs in their discussions, but before he could continue was interrupted by hecklers shouting "Answer the question," etc. Mr. Khrushchev, one of the most natural of human beings, was naturally angered. He reminded those present that he was here as their guest—and said:

I'm an old sparrow, so to say, and you cannot muddle me by your cries. You don't have to listen to me if you don't want to. But surely you must show enough hospitality not to interrupt. If there is no desire to listen to what I have to say, I can go. . . .

After silence was restored, Mr. Khrushchev went on to explain that what the Soviet public listened to and read was an internal matter, not to be decided by any outside influence. He reminded his audience, too, that in the matter of jamming, the Soviet people had not been able to hear for many years the voice of Paul Robeson, which had been jammed by the American government, and declared that when the voice broadcast to the USSR was a friendly one it would not be jammed.

Khrushchev at the UN

Space unfortunately does not permit a fuller report on Mr. Khrushchev's great speech before the United Nations, other than the section on the historic proposal for complete

and universal disarmament which we publish in full. He appealed to the great world body to live up to the great principle of international cooperation on which it was founded and to do its part toward ending the cold war poisoning international relations. In this connection Mr. Khrushchev made a strong plea for ending the intolerable situation which deprives the People's Republic of China of its lawful place in the UN:

Everyone knows that when a person dies he is eventually buried. No matter how dearly beloved the deceased is, no matter how sad the parting with him, life compels everyone to face up to the realities. A coffin, or a tomb or a mausoleum is made for the dead man, and he is taken out of the premises of the living. This was so in ancient times and this is what continues to be done in our day.

Why then must China continue to be represented in the United Nations by the corpse of reactionary China, that is, by the Chiang Kai-shek clique. We consider that it is high time the United Nations, too, acted the way all nations, all peoples, deal with corpses. That is, carry it out so that a real representative, the genuine representative of the Chinese people may take its rightful seat in the United Nations.

After all, China is by no means Taiwan. Taiwan is merely a small island, a province, that is, a small portion of a great state—China is the Chinese People's Republic, which for ten years now has been developing at a swift pace; which has its own strong government, recognized by the entire Chinese people, governmental and legislative bodies elected by the entire people of China.

China is a great state whose capital is Peking. Sooner or later, Taiwan, as an inalienable part of the sovereign Chinese state, will be united with the whole of People's China, that is, the rule and authority of the Government of the People's Republic of China will be extended to this island. And the sooner this is done, the better.

The restoration of the lawful rights of People's China would not only greatly enhance the prestige and authority of the United Nations, but would also be a notable contribution to improving the international climate generally and restoring health to it.

The Western UN delegations in general were reported to be "reserved" and "skeptical" about the Soviet plan for total disarmament, though a number of Asian and African nations have hailed it. Secretary of State Christian Herter has declared it requires "the most careful examination," as have British officials and major attention of the current United Nations General Assembly session will be concentrated on this proposal.

If it is merely propaganda, as some say, we must ask ourselves why this should be so. The only answer is that those circles in the West who gain from the continued armaments race and cold war policies will refuse to consider it.

And if it is propaganda—what glorious propaganda it is indeed! It is propaganda for a world disarmed in which we all should join. This writer, for one, would like to live to see the world without arms and without war depicted by Mr. Khrushchev.

And it is certain that this proposal for universal and complete disarmament is greeted with joy by hundreds of millions of people in every nation and from this time forward will be the center of the peace efforts of all the peoples of the world.

For an account of the warm reception accorded to the Soviet Premier in other parts of the country, and the results of the final Eisenhower-Khrushchev exchanges—see our November issue!

Youth and the Future

by J. D. BERNAL

We are privileged to present to our readers this address by Professor Bernal to the World Youth Festival held this summer in Vienna. We believe it becomes all the more timely in the light of the Eisenhower-Khrushchev talks which enkindle new hopes for a warless world and the measureless bounties it can give mankind.

I AM GOING to talk about what I think may be the world of the future—not in 100 years but in 10 to 40 years from now. But it is your future and not mine. You will have to work it out, to realize and to live it. All that we of the older generation can do is to give you a few sign posts based on our experience but you will soon find yourselves far ahead of any tracks that we can mark out. I am particularly happy at being able to address here the young men and women from so many different countries and civilizations. In this room we have some who have worked in the most highly advanced technologies, others who come from countries where industrial development is still in the future. Some are from socialist, others from capitalist economies. But all are united in wishing to live and work in a better world than

that of frustration and anxiety which for so many of our youth destroys all hope in the future.

To the many who are not here and to some that are, the prospect of a better world for all seems a very distant one. But this is not so. Never in human history has that prospect been closer than it is today. This is not a platitude, it is a scientific fact based on the actual developments of science and technology in the last 20 years. Mankind has, in principle, effected such a breakthrough in science and technology as dwarfs all previous human achievements—fire, agriculture, machinery. But this is a breakthrough as yet only in principle, not in reality. To make these possibilities real is the immediate task before us. For with the new powers has come the greatest danger that mankind has ever had to face, the threat of atomic war. And this is more than a threat: the very preparations for such war and the political tensions in which they take place are actually hindering and in some places setting back the course of human development. Atomic war is an unthinkable disaster. It is capable of setting back civilization by a thousand years or more, if not of damaging human society beyond the possibility of recovery. To resist and stop the danger of atomic war is clearly the first priority for everyone. But here I will take this for granted and try to describe a

J. D. BERNAL, internationally famous scientist, is a Fellow of the Royal Society, and University Professor of Physics at Birkbeck College, London. Professor Bernal is one of the leaders of the World Council of Peace. NWR reprinted a chapter from his most recent book, *World Without War* in our April, 1959, issue.

world in which there can be no war.

It is in the measure of what is being devoted today to military expenditure that we can see the immediate possibilities of improvement. One hundred thousand million dollars are being spent every year on military preparations. This is nearly as much as the sum of the combined national incomes of the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. If that waste could be stopped today the standards of living of the great majority of the human race could be doubled immediately and from then on could increase at an accelerated rate. This simple comparison shows to what extent the cold war is a drag on human advancement as a continually aggravated danger. If we could get some degree of relaxation of the cold war, some degree of disarmament so that nations compete, not in preparations for mutual destruction but in constructive efforts, the world could be transformed in less than a generation.

The world is very rich, far richer than anyone dreamed fifty or even ten years ago. But riches are there only for those who can see them and use them. Our ancestors shivered with cold, camping on beds of coal which they did not know would burn. We can now extract more energy from a ton of granite than from a ton of coal. It is scientific knowledge that shows us the way. We can now see the different aspects of these riches, which we can put in three words: power, control and science.

The liberation of atomic energy assures us that mankind will never lack power in the foreseeable future. In fact, from today, if the

world was well organized, power should be available as required, as free as air for anyone who can breathe. And power is the direct equivalent of all other materials. There can be no shortage of materials on this solid earth. With power, earth, water and rocks can be converted into steel, aluminum, plastics and all other materials. With power all the land, and not only a small fraction of it as today, can be made to grow crops in abundance. Power, therefore, is the equivalent of food, clothing, and houses.

But, it may be objected, much work and ingenuity will be needed to convert power into all these things, and this is so but, at the same time, a great new technological development has emerged which changes altogether the character of that work. The steam engines of the early industrial revolution removed the necessity of back-breaking physical toil for mankind, at least in principle. For in practice over the last hundred years, most men have had to slave as hard as before. However, this was the fault of the social system rather than the failure of technology.

With the new developments of automatic and electronically controlled industry, the necessity for dull repetitive and monotonous work also disappears in principle. The automatic factory can already relieve the workers on the assembly line, each doing his endlessly repeated job and passing it on to the next worker. Hours of work can be reduced so that it will be a matter of choosing whether to work 20 hours a week, one week in two or 5 months a year. And we can also re-

lieve all the dull tasks of the office workers, all the adding of figures, filling of forms and even very soon of typing, translating and other work of reproduction. I can foresee the time when at a meeting like this every speaker will have attached to him a small microphone, a translating unit and an ear plug so that if he speaks in his own language he is automatically understood by all the others in their own.

None of these devices can ever be used effectively without a corresponding change in social organization. This is only too evident in capitalist economies where already the small amount of automation that has been introduced has produced growing and permanent unemployment. Whatever our social philosophy it should now be evident that social and economic forms must be changed to fit in with the new powers of science and technology. It is a false alternative to pose—either the acceptance of the new technology and its social application, or retaining both the old society and the old technology. The second alternative does not exist. Any country that tries to do without science today dooms itself to decay through famine and disease. The new possibilities may be used unwisely but they cannot be refused.

These realized achievements of mankind might seem enough for one generation but they are only a small part of the range of possibilities which we now see are accessible to us. It is through the third factor, the progress of scientific research itself, that the greatest and most useful changes can come. We are only beginning to understand and control the world of inanimate and

animate nature. We have hardly begun to understand the social world. With this understanding, as it grows, will come control, and control of aspects of life that are far closer to us than the primary necessities of food and clothing, or even of the mechanical work of our daily life.

Our own bodies in health and disease are now coming for the first time within the scope of effective medical science. The enormous triumphs of antibiotics have already altered the whole population picture of the world, by preventing the deaths of hundred of millions of children. We are now faced with the problem of finding food and work for them. Unlike the Malthusians I find this a healthy change to social enterprise, one which will force people to find a way of life rather than to reconcile them to death. For now the possibilities in biological and medical sciences show us that most of the deaths to which mankind has been resigned, as in the course of nature or according to the will of God, are in fact either murders or suicides. If people are forced by poverty or oppression to live with insufficient food or wretched housing and die in consequence far sooner than they need, then they are being murdered as surely as if blown up by an atom bomb, shot by the police or put into gas-chambers. If, on the other hand, people in more fortunate countries die at an early age from heart disease or cancer they are, though unwittingly, committing suicide. What they have eaten and smoked or what they have done or not done with their life has effectively killed them. But socially speaking even these are all

murders, for if society were to give a fraction of what it devotes to war preparation to medical research instead, we would know by now the way of living that should avoid these deaths and would prevent people committing suicide in these days. It is even doubtful whether there is any such thing as natural death or death from old age. . . .

Now these are only a few of the most obvious possibilities of scientific research. What is most exciting about it is that we cannot say what will come out of new discoveries. All that the recent past shows us is that each new discovery will have an effect on our everyday life but besides this the very process of discovery changes the mental capacity not only of the discoverers but of the rest of society. And this change of attitude emanating from science can make the necessary social transformations smoother and more easily acceptable.

To summarize the state of the new possibilities we can say that as from now, poverty and drudgery can be abolished, disease and disability can be conquered. The fundamental economic fact is that there need be no more scarcity. Up till now, at least in capitalist countries, economics has even been defined as the science of scarcity. The Malthusian arguments have now been effectively refuted in practice by the experience of the Soviet Union and China. It would be sufficient, in order to cope with a population increasing at any practicable rate, say of 3 per cent per annum, to increase agricultural production at a higher rate and this has been far exceeded in recent years not only in Soviet and Chinese agriculture but

also in the United States. There in spite of Government subsidies for not cultivating land, production from the remaining fields has by now yielded such surpluses as defy destruction or storage. . . .

The world, we now realize, is underdeveloped to an extent difficult to measure but so great as to give a possibility for a good living to thousands of millions of new human beings. The very deserts may turn out to be sources of the greatest riches. Underlaid as they are with pools of oil and water, they can be made to grow in the constant sunlight an amount of crops which the most fertile, well watered, lands cannot hope to rival. Behind this, but some years further on, lies the possibility of the direct synthesis of foodstuffs for animals and ultimately for man from illimitable mineral sources.

One question remains which is often raised, at least in capitalist countries, to prove the impossibility of all such material changes. It is that of the limit of human intelligence. Sufficient capacity cannot be found, they argue, in existing populations. Men are too stupid to cope with the scientific complexities of such a world and women should be occupied with the kitchen and the children. Here, again, facts have disproved these prophets of impotence. They had considered higher education as a privilege of few, chosen appropriately from the best or at least from the richest families who alone were deemed capable of higher education. Now it has been proved by experience first in the Soviet Union and then in China that this is an illusion fostered to preserve, through a monopoly of knowledge,

the dominating position of the upper classes.

It is in education that the intrinsic contradiction of a class divided society is now showing itself most clearly. The new scientific industry cannot be run by making use of the old type of deliberately uneducated workers, capable only of carrying out simple orders. It requires men and women of scientific background able not only to keep the new machinery running but of knowing how to improve it. For with technical progress at its present rate, a machine will hardly run for two or three years without becoming obsolete. Already in the advanced sectors, more men are employed in research and development than actually in carrying out production. Now men and women capable of this cannot be trained in sufficient numbers without a secondary and higher education open to all. If, therefore, the authorities in capitalist countries continue to restrict higher education to the few, they will lose in the race for technical superiority. Already the Soviet Union is producing some twice as many engineers per head of population as the United States, and five times as many as Great Britain.

Thus, we can see that in many different ways the new possibilities opened up by science, will impose, by the mere necessity to put them into action, important and indeed decisive social changes. . . . However, it would be a fatal mistake to imagine that this process left to itself could occur easily or smoothly. The period that we are just entering is one in which the productivity of frankly socialist states is equaling and evidently bound to surpass

that of capitalist countries. This is likely to be a time of exceptional strain and difficulty and especially full of danger in the absence of any international agreement on disarmament and with many unresolved political problems each capable of setting off an atomic war. That is why in thinking of a constructive and happy future, our first duty is to avert the war danger. However, one of the most effective ways of doing so is to make people realize what enormous possibilities are ready within the next 10 or 20 years for increasing the wealth of mankind and for insuring that every man or woman, even in the countries that are the poorest today, can be at least as well off as those in the most fortunate countries. In other words the economic prizes, the pursuit of which by violence has already caused two world wars in this century, are almost infinitely smaller than those that could be gained in a short time by international cooperation or even by peaceful competition. The positions of some of the powers today are as tragically absurd at that of a set of brigands quarrelling over a few pennies while sitting on chests full of treasure.

It is for you, the young people of today, to see that this folly is ended and the real constructive work is started. It will have to be, of its very nature, an international effort. The great and largely unused resources of the old industrial countries need to be turned to the task of helping to build the new industries in all the parts of the world. Through these the peoples of the underdeveloped countries will be able to create for themselves a mod-

ern industrial economy capable of raising the standards of living to the highest level within a generation. This idea is the very opposite of the old colonialism which doomed all the peoples of these countries to be producers of raw materials and kept them in backwardness, poverty and ignorance.

This great transformation of humanity will be your task in the future. But there is no need for you to wait until the decisive steps to establish a peaceful world are completed. Rather, it seems to me, you should begin here and now to consider how this new world should be built.

FULFILLMENT OF USSR ECONOMIC PLAN IN FIRST HALF OF 1959

THE CENTRAL STATISTICAL BOARD OF THE USSR has reported that the six-month industrial plan both for total output and the production of most major items was over-fulfilled. The semi-annual gross output plan was topped by 5 per cent and production was 12 per cent above that in the same period last year.

All the Union Republics and all economic councils exceed the six-month industrial output plan.

Increase in production of certain industries compared with the same months of last year: iron-and-steel and nonferrous metals—9 per cent; fuel and power—9 per cent; engineering and metalworking—15 per cent; chemicals and rubber—11 per cent; building material—25 per cent; timber, paper and woodworking—9 per cent; light industry—7 per cent; and the food industry—13 per cent.

Economic councils, industrial enterprises, research institutes and designing organizations continue to introduce new techniques. In the six month period more than one million inventors and rationalizers submitted more than a million and a half proposals.

The plan for sowing spring crops was overfulfilled. The herd of livestock rose for the country as a whole. The semi-annual plan for the purchase of meat was fulfilled 135 per cent, milk 108 per cent, eggs 116 per cent, wool 108 per cent.

Machines belonging to the machine-and-tractor stations (MTS's) continue to be sold to collective farms according to the law adopted by the Supreme Soviet of the USSR on March 31, 1958. Since the beginning of the sale of tractors to collective farms up to July 1, 1959, 610,000 have been sold and 247,000 grain combines, as well as many other machines.

Houses having a total floor space of 13.6 million square meters (one square meter equals approximately 10.764 square feet) were built with funds allocated under the state plan. This is 13 per cent more than was built in the first six months of 1958.

The value of Soviet domestic trade was about 18 billion rubles for the first six months of 1959. This is a 20 per cent increase over the same period in 1958.

There were 1.8 million more workers and office employees engaged in the national economy by the end of the first six months of 1959 as compared with the corresponding period for last year.

The transference of workers and office employees of certain industries to a shorter, seven or six-hour, workday continued.

For the first six months of 1959 the population received grants and benefits worth more than 116 million rubles, a 9 per cent increase over the same period last year.

A Visit to Sochi

by MURRAY YOUNG

OUR morning flight from Khar'kov had set us down in what seemed another season. As we drove from the airfield along the climbing road that was to take us over the mountain to the Black Sea resort of Sochi, the sunlight was clear, the air warm, and the flowers in full bloom.

Descending the winding mountain road, we began to glimpse among the increasingly tropical trees—palm, magnolia and cypress—the facades of white-columned buildings in what we had already begun to recognize as the Russian classical style.

That building there, with its broad, white columns, was the sanatorium of the Teachers' Union, our guide told us, and in a few moments we would be able to see the sanatorium of the Engineers' Union behind its trees on the other side of the road.

More and more handsome buildings—rest homes and sanatoria—appeared as we approached Sochi, some in the modern style with walls of glass and clean, geometric lines, but the classical style predominated. Union after union was named as sponsor as we passed these imposing buildings set among trees, flowers and fountains.

At every bend of the road statues of vigorous young men and women caught in the powerful rhythms of athletic movement—tennis players, discus throwers, runners, swimmers—celebrated the delight of the healthy body in action. The Soviet

use of public statues for political, historical, or purely esthetic purposes gives to their cities an intimate, human quality very different from the increasingly bleak, dehumanized look typical of most modern cities.

Curving around the last steep hill that led directly into Sochi, we suddenly saw the marvelous blue waters of the Black Sea along whose shore the city is built. Behind the city rose the foothills we had been descending and beyond them, glittering in sunlight, the snow-capped peaks of the Caucasian mountains.

We arrived in Sochi towards the latter part of April before the flood of summer vacationers fills the hotels and crowds the beaches. Our hotel, the Primorskaya, on the splendid promenade that overlooks one of the city's finest bathing beaches, made the most of its position—huge windows and generous balconies gave its guests a constant view of the sea. The large dining-room on the second floor with its pale green-blue walls and great windows seemed to bring the space and color of the sea directly into the hotel itself. The pleasant rooms, the wide halls and the frequent lounges with windows overlooking the blue water where guests could write letters or read, gave an air of spacious ease.

At dinner time, as is customary in many Soviet hotels, an orchestra played for dancing. The tunes were popular Russian songs mingled with American dance music in the style

of thirty years ago—very unexpected in the Soviet Union, and for those of us for whom this music had been fresh in our youth, nostalgic and rather endearing. (That the same reaction was true for Soviet young people is hardly to be expected. Indeed as far as it was possible to tell their taste in dance music tended toward jazz of the kind popular in America and Western Europe today.)

The sanatoria were, of course, full as they are the year round with people combining rest periods with medical treatment, sent on advice of doctors through the trade union to which they belong. We visited several with their sun and windswept rooms, comfortable lounges, libraries, swimming pools and their elaborate diagnosis and treatment sections. Conducted usually by a leading doctor on the staff (in every case a woman), our tours gave us a clear picture of the care and thoughtfulness with which the patient-guests were treated. The doctor's explanations were always supplemented by our conversations with the patients who were eager to tell us about the treatments they were undergoing, the food they ate, the entertainment available to them.

The standard period of stay in a sanatorium is twenty-four days—for rest homes it is twelve days—subject to extension at the doctor's request. Tickets are distributed by the trade unions. Twenty per cent of the places in the sanatoria and ten per cent in rest homes are free; the other places are either at a nominal price or generous discount.

Combined with constant expansion of the facilities of resorts already in use, there is continuous

search by experts in all parts of the country for new areas with favorable climate, mineral springs, curative muds, etc. Over 4,000 such localities have already been surveyed and marked for future development.

The Central Health Research Institute in Moscow is in charge not only of discovering new areas but also of finding the best possible means of using the natural factors such areas contain. The Institute coordinates the work throughout the various republics. Apart from the many resorts found in the Black Sea region, health centers have also been established along the Azov, Caspian and Baltic seas as well as in the coastal regions of the Far East, in Central Asia, Siberia and the Far North.

With some 5,000 sanatoria and rest homes already established, the opening up of centers in new areas will constantly increase the network. In line with the general policy of decentralization, each Republic is now in charge of the centers in its region under the Ministry of Public Health. This policy has already allowed for consolidation, helped do away with superfluous staffs, and increased the capacity of the resorts. Sochi by consolidating with adjacent Matsesta—famous for its sulphur springs—has considerably increased the number of people it can accommodate each year.

Apart from the sheer pleasure of spending periods of rest in beautiful surroundings, or overcoming ill-health in sanatoria, the network of health centers throughout the country is part of the whole Soviet concept of preventive medicine. Disease and ill-health are products in great part of unsanitary, unhygienic

living and working conditions. Since the establishment of its regime the Soviet Government has made an enormous effort to eliminate the harmful environmental conditions left by the past. The thousands of summer camps for children, the unparalleled medical services, the planning of industrial communities so that the workers live in areas separated from the factories by greenbelts, the turning of urban centers into garden cities, and the massive rehousing program, are all part of a determined plan to do away with the conditions in which disease and ill-health flourish.

In Sochi, as everywhere we visited, much construction was in progress—new rest homes, sanatoria, public buildings, as well as apartment houses and individual homes for the permanent residents of the city. Because of the sub-tropical climate of the area and the fact that Sochi is a health resort, considerable imaginative play was evident in the design and decoration of the newer buildings. Fantasy had been given a freer hand than in more work-a-day centers and the architects had clearly welcomed the opportunities presented them.

We went one day to see a new market to which peasants from the nearby collective farms brought their produce for sale. Designed for the maximum of light and air, the architect had charmingly stylized fruits and vegetables as decorative motives on the shed-like structure that housed the main area. The shed was scrupulously clean inside with a special water system that allowed it to be flushed daily. There was obvious pride in the appearance of the vegetables; fresh from the gar-

den, they had been washed and scrubbed and fairly sparkled on the clean display slabs.

The playfulness of the decoration of the market shed was also evident in the new railway and boat stations. Whimsical use of marine motives in the station for boat passengers announced at once as the visitor stepped ashore that Sochi was vacationland as did the brilliant colors and exuberant tropical designs in the ceramic panels decorating the railway station.

It was not a surprise to learn that since 1933 Sochi's development has been directed by the country's leading architects. The fine placing of the many sanatoria among the hills, the broad avenues, the gardens, the many-columned public buildings that give the city a festive air has been achieved by the most careful and expert planning.

The Black Sea area is associated with a number of Russian writers who found the climate more favorable than elsewhere. Tolstoy, Gorky and Chekhov are closely linked with Yalta where they had all lived. In Sochi one of the most famous Soviet writers—Nikolai Ostrovsky—spent his last years. His home is now a museum. Ostrovsky's sister who, along with his wife, helped make the painful final years of his life bearable, is in charge of the museum and acted as our guide.

Blind and immobile, Ostrovsky dictated his last novel, *Born of the Storm*, in Sochi. The indomitable spirit that has made his books so widely admired is summed up in his statement carved over the doorway to the library: "What can be finer than for a man to continue to serve mankind even when he is no more."

We went one evening to the State Theater, a handsome building in the classical style, to see a performance by the Stalingrad Operetta Company of a new operetta not yet presented in Moscow. The music was by Dmitri Kabalevsky, one of the younger composers of serious music. We found the story, I am afraid, hopelessly confusing but the music was gay and sparkling and two of the actors were comics of a very high order.

The plot concerned college students volunteering for work on the Virgin Lands. The "positive" and "negative" characters were easily identifiable but the actual unraveling of the plot even confused our interpreter who, more critical than we were, dismissed the story as too "schematic."

The following evening the same company was to present "The Merry Widow"—a perennial favorite in the Soviet Union. Unfortunately, we left that morning and so missed the chance of seeing what Lehar's fifty-odd-year-old operetta would have looked like on a Soviet stage.

Throughout the summer season opera, ballet and dramatic companies visit Sochi and other resorts. We looked enviously every time we passed the bulletin board in our hotel announcing coming events—the Bolshoy Ballet and Opera Companies, the Leningrad Symphony, the Moscow Art Theater, and concerts by artists already known to us by their appearance in the United States.

We never got over our amazement that music and the theater—definitely luxuries with us—seem woven into the very texture of Soviet life. Theaters and concerts were

always full, the audiences absorbed, the performances unfailingly professional, if by our standards the costumes frequently lacked style and the settings imagination.

Sochi was a small spa before the Revolution. Its present size and beauty is a product of the Soviet regime. Nationalized along with all other resorts shortly after 1917, its sub-tropical climate, medicinal spring, curative muds and superb location between the mountains and the sea, combined with the most careful planning both scientific and architectural, has made it one of the leading health and rest resorts in the country. It is always spoken of with great pride in the Soviet Union—and with justice.

Our visit to Sochi was of special importance in our coming to understand the nature of this new society: for the first time in man's history the favored places of the earth such as Sochi, Yalta and the other resorts of the Black Sea region, have been set aside for the use of *all* the citizens of the country of which they are a part, for rest, for medical care, or simply for the enjoyment of air and sea and healing sunlight.

By plane, boat, railway, or increasingly by private cars, Soviet citizens come to these lovely spots from all over the country to spend the holidays that are their's by constitutional right, or to seek the medical help which is likewise constitutionally guaranteed them.

Constitutions are abstract documents; the principles and guarantees which they so nobly lay down must be seen in life to be really grasped. Article 119 of the Soviet Constitution says:

Citizens of the USSR have the right to rest and leisure.

The right to rest and leisure is insured by the establishment of the eight-hour day for industrial, office and professional workers, the reduction of the working day to seven or six hours for arduous trades and to four hours in shops where conditions of work are particularly arduous, by the institution of annual vacations with full pay for industrial, office and professional workers, and by the provision of a wide network of sanatoria, rest homes and clubs for the accommodation of the working people. (The seven-hour working day is in course of introduction.—*Ed.*)

With its sanatoria, rest homes, parks, beaches, theaters, its atmosphere of holiday ease, Sochi brings this Article of the Soviet Constitution to life.

Beyond this, Sochi, like the other health and rest centers throughout the country, shows in its planned beauty more clearly perhaps than do the larger cities, where the problems are of a greater complexity and will take longer to solve, what the truly human environment of the future will be like.

NEW PRIVILEGES GRANTED TO SOVIET STUDENTS

THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF THE USSR adopted a decision in July on privileges for students of evening and extra-mural secondary specialized and higher educational establishments. Beginning with the 1959-60 academic year, such students making good progress will be granted additional paid leave.

First- and second-year students will be granted annual leave of 10, 20 and 30 calendar days respectively for examination sessions and laboratory work.

Third-year and senior students will be granted annual leave of 20, 30 and 40 calendar days respectively for examination sessions and laboratory work.

A leave of 30 calendar days will be granted to students for taking state examinations.

A leave of two and four months respectively will be granted students preparing for and defending their thesis.

Students granted leaves will be paid on the basis of their average monthly pay in the 12 previous months before the leave.

Throughout the ten academic months before commencing the thesis or taking state examinations students will be released one workday a week to do their lessons, for which they will receive half-pay but not less than the minimum. Factories and office managers may give students another one or two workdays off a week, but without pay, should they so desire. When students go for examinations and laboratory work, and when they go to prepare for and defend their theses and take state examinations, their place of employment will pay half the fare to and from the place of the educational establishment once a year.

At the recommendation of educational establishments, factory and office managers may grant students additional leave of one month without pay to go directly into production to acquaint themselves with the work in their chosen specialty and to prepare material for their theses. During this period the students are entitled to a scholarship stipend according to the general rules.

Factory and office managers may grant employees admitted to entrance examinations additional leave-without-pay of 10 calendar days to those aspiring to enter evening or extra-mural secondary specialized educational establishments, and of 15 days to those aspiring to enter extra-mural institutions of higher learning.

It has been recommended that collective farms grant student-members additional leave, paid according to rates applicable to the leave rates established in the present decision of the USSR Council of Ministers.

Letter from Bulgaria

by ROCKWELL KENT

Varna, Bulgaria, August 12
ESCAPED FROM the maelstrom of pomp and pageantry that was Vienna of the Youth Festival, met at the Sofia airport by a delegation of cultural—and cultured!—notables, we find ourselves, after two eventful days in Sofia luxuriously established in the huge Triumphantium Hotel in the great city of Philippopolis, now called Plovdiv. Find ourselves on our third day there—because our guides are tired or (more likely) think that we must be, with one hour to ourselves, for “rest.” And although the pace at which we have been doing things—traveling, looking, listening, learning—might well have brought us to the point of exhaustion we would rather sit a while with you and talk.

This morning our party of five inseparables—Professor Vasil Zakhariev (the noted creator of the wood-cut of which I send you a reproduction), our interpreter, Navena Geliakvova, (editor of the English department at the Foreign Languages Publishing House), our chauffeur, Victor Tanev, and Sally and I—the five of us drove to the mountain-girt Bachkovo monastery twenty miles from Plovdiv to see what still remains of its superb eleventh century murals. And, as it turned out, it being a Sunday of special observance in the Greek Orthodox Church, to mingle with the crowds attending service. If it be treason to art to say that most eventful to us was that Sunday

crowd, then, artists, make the most of it. Pictures, after all, serve best in bringing men to love life more; and this crowd, this happy, varied crowd on holiday—was what we had come this far from home to see and, in what degree we could, to know.

From the moment that we turned from the main highway to follow the tortuous road through a long river gorge we drove through crowds, monastery-bound, to whom the narrow, stone-paved road was as a sidewalk—people on foot, in horse-drawn carts and ancient wooden-seated surreys, young blades on motor cycles with their girls behind them; people with their picnic food in sacks and hampers, women with babies in their arms, youths with guitars; old, middle-aged and youth; and happy children everywhere. And the honking of our horn provoked them, as they slowly moved aside, only to smiles and hand-wavings of good-hearted greeting. And this, for all that our six days in Bulgaria have revealed to us, for all the ancient monuments we have seen, the museums we have visited, the works we have been shown, the mountains and the gorges we have looked at, is to us the world of Bulgaria: the spirit of the people. Here are a people proud of their history; proud of their integrity as a People maintained despite five centuries of bondage to the Turks; proud of their strength and of the way of life that it has won them; a people so happy in the present, so wholeheart-

edly devoted to the building of a new Bulgaria, so confident of its accomplishment that their hearts and hands go out in friendship to the world.

We left America at the commencement of what our Administration had proclaimed as "Captive Nations Week." While the God of the United Fruit Company may be said to have listened to the corporation's prayers for Guatemala, He is apt, if we may judge from the spirit of the Bulgarian people, to turn so deaf an ear to our supplications as to make our prayers for her not worth utterance. And, after all, relatively little oil has yet been found in Bulgaria.

Days have passed since this much of my letter to you was written. We have left the city of Plovdiv, spent a night at the vast resort development at the Sunny Sands, adjacent to Nessebur, driven from there over the lofty seaward termination of the

Balkan mountains, to find ourselves established for a day or two in one of the fabulous resort hotels of the great park that fronts the Golden Sands near Bulgaria's third city, Varna; mingling on the beach with happy crowds of sun-tanned holiday makers, dining deliciously, and drinking the famed wines of this region of vineyards. Two vagrant Americans, as we feel ourselves to be—overwhelmed by the hospitality and warmth of friendship accorded us, marvelling at the luxury which we, in common with the Bulgarian people, are privileged to enjoy—remarked to one of their hosts, Sasha Risov, that the Bulgarians appeared to have mistaken their identity—that they are not the Duke and Duchess of Kent, nor the proprietors of Kent cigarettes, but just a plain American artist and his wife who are quite unaccustomed to such splendor. "No," he answered, "You are Americans, and that is enough."

THE N. Y. PHILHARMONIC ORCHESTRA IN THE USSR

THE NEW YORK PHILHARMONIC ORCHESTRA under the direction of Leonard Bernstein gave a series of concerts in the Soviet Union in late August and early September in connection with the American Exhibition that closed in Moscow on September 5th.

While there were mixed reactions to Mr. Bernstein's lectures from the podium, particularly to so highly musical an audience as that which filled the Tchaikovsky Conservatory of Music in Moscow, there seemed only the most enthusiastic approval of his interpretation of the varied programs he offered.

Prokofiev's Fifth Symphony, Mozart's Piano Concerto in G Major (which Mr. Bernstein simultaneously played and directed), Beethoven's "Egmont" Overture, as well as Stravinsky's "Le Sacre du Printemps" and "Concerto for Piano and Wind Orchestra" were among the numbers presented.

Of the American music played—Bernstein's own composition "The Age of Anxiety," Samuel Barber's "Second Essay for Orchestra," Aaron Copeland's "Billy the Kid," and Charles Ives' "The Unanswered Question"—it was the brief Ives selection that seemed to most delight the Soviet audience which demanded a repetition of the little four-minute composition.

Industry in Bulgaria

by EDGAR P. YOUNG

IT IS frustrating when one is keenly interested in the progress of a country which is in process of transformation—as I am, personally, in relation to the People's Republic because of their gradual development of Bulgaria—not to be able to go there regularly and frequently. There is an advantage, however, in being so frustrated, in that, by going there after the lapse of ten years or so, one observes many things which, ment over the years, might otherwise pass unnoticed. Besides which, of course, in relation to Bulgaria in particular, the transformation which has taken place in the space of ten years or so is really spectacular. This was brought home to me immediately on my arrival, when I met at the Hotel Bulgaria in Sofia, an English businessman who was there to buy iron products! Only ten years before, I remembered, the Bulgars were looking longingly at the British rails shipped through their port of Bourgas to Yugoslavia by UNRRA, which cold-shouldered them, as "enemies," notwithstanding their major contribution, after September 9, 1944, to Allied victory in the Balkans, and not least to the liberation of Yugoslavia.

Not many days later, I was to see, at the new "Lenin" integrated iron

and steel works at Dimitrovo, Bulgarian steelworkers, still fresh from rural pursuits in their villages, rolling out rails for their country's railways, though not yet in sufficient quantities to meet their growing requirements resulting from vast increases of the freight they had to handle.

I am writing now of what I observed in the Spring of 1957—my last visit of any length and comprehensiveness having been in the autumn of 1946. So much was going on, in various parts of the country, that the people there seemed, often, to have a less complete picture of it than I had been able to form simply by reading their newspapers, which I had, fortunately, received regularly. My hosts, the Committee for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries, were, for instance, under the impression that half a day would be long enough for me to see all I wanted to see of the vast extensions of the non-ferrous metal mining industry in the Rhodope mountains, close to the Greek border, for which the two days which I eventually extracted from them proved far from sufficient! With their noses to the grindstone in Sofia, they were still routing their guests to the beauty spots and historical monuments of Bulgaria, lovely relicts of the past, instead of reading in their own newspapers of such marvelous monuments to the success of People's Democracy and

EDGAR P. YOUNG, Commander Royal Navy (Retired), has frequently contributed articles to *New World Review* on the countries of Asia and Eastern and Central Europe.

of socialism in the new Bulgaria, which it is surely their business to bring to the notice of visiting foreigners. I was not surprised, therefore, to find this well-meaning Committee satirized in Bulgaria's humorous weekly, ticking up with misplaced pride the number of kilometers traversed by their unsuspecting guests, though I was rather depressed, I admit, that such criticism either was not read or received little attention, while my own attempts at constructive criticism were regarded with patent disfavor!

But to return to the Rhodope mining basin: this was really amazing, not merely from a technical, but also from socio-political, point of view. Lead and zinc had been mined there in the past, but on primitive lines and on a very modest scale. Since the Liberation of 1944, however, and more especially since 1948, when the socialist transformation of Bulgaria into an up-to-date industrialized country, with a balanced economy, was inaugurated, scientific geological survey, first with Soviet help, but latterly by newly-trained Bulgarian geologists, had revealed mineral wealth of all kinds—and not only in this area. With technical and material help from the Soviet Union the exploitation of this vast wealth had progressed apace, and on the most modern lines, the lead and zinc from the Rhodope basin being destined, like the copper mined at Pirdop, near the port of Bourgas, for the newly-developing engineering industry of Bulgaria. I was sorry that I did not visit the latter, as I read about it only after my return to England—my hosts never mentioned it to me—because it will be among the more important of its

kind in Europe, as is the Rhodope basin.

I did, however, visit one of the most remote of the lead-zinc mines, at a place called Strashimir, way up in the peaks of the mountains. In its outward appearance, it reminded me of any primitive mining center in the United States or Canada, as I have seen them in pictures. But what a contrast with these was presented as I left Strashimir at nightfall, when the miners, all young fellows, flocked in to take it easy: no saloons, no pin-tables, no tarts, but a theatrical performance by a first-rate company which had come up by bus from the nearest largish town, Assinovgrad, to provide for the cultural needs of these isolated miners.

My other outstanding impression is that of the "Georgi Dimitrov" Shipyard, at Varna, which was then virtually the whole of Bulgaria's infant shipbuilding industry, though it is now being joined by the "Ivan Dimitrov" Shipyard, at Rousse, on the Danube, one of the largest and most up-to-date of its kind in the whole of Europe. Before the Liberation Bulgaria did not build ships at all: now, with help from the USSR, but above all as the result of her own investment and effort (as was the case also with her mining), she has a still small, but expanding, shipbuilding industry, building ships of various types and even accepting export orders! This May she handed over to Albania a 3,000-ton freighter, of which the next two are booked for North Korea and Czechoslovakia, besides which there are large orders from the Soviet Union, more especially for concrete ships for various special purposes, in the building of which the "Georgi Dimitrov" ship-

yard has no rival. I was quite prepared to believe the Deputy manager who showed me round when he waved his arm towards a blank piece of land and said "That's where we'll be building the ten thousand tonnes we are now designing—in the early 1960's!"

The reflection of all this, and the like, was very apparent, in the improvement of living standards, as compared with those of ten years before, which was particularly striking in relation to dress—the peasant girls now wear nylon (or rather sylon) stockings, when they come to town. What was even more impressive, and in the long run far more important, however, was its reflection in the fields of education and culture: little Bulgaria was about to become (and has since become) the first country in the world where every child receives secondary education, free of charge, up to the age of eighteen. I was very interested, moreover, in the way in which the youngsters receiving this education are made to understand how it is being achieved for them, and what they owe to the community, in the way of subsequent working service, in return for it. Even the Conservatory of Music has an economist

to lecture the students on this aspect of their studies! It would do some of the long-haired and bearded esthetes in Western countries a lot of good, I think, to have such lectures.

By and large, then, things have gone well in the People's Republic of Bulgaria, which has suffered less than other Socialist countries, I think, from the unfortunate evils which were exposed and denounced at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Two evils from which it has not escaped, however, are nepotism and bureaucracy.

The problem of nepotism seems to be an inevitable feature of any country with a peasant background; bureaucracy, to flourish in any kind of society, capitalist and socialist alike, if not checked. Both these were in process of correction, and have probably by now been substantially reduced, but it will be a long time, I fear, before an effective cure is found to the somewhat crippling tendency, so chronic in the countries which are planning their lives under People's Democracy, to divide everything up into water-tight compartments, between which liaison is inadequate.

AMERICAN ELECTED TO POLISH ACADEMY

THE POLISH ACADEMY OF SCIENCES recently elected three American University scientists and a Harvard scholar to membership in the Academy. The three scientists are Professor Roger Adams of the Chemistry Department of the University of Illinois, Professor William Prager of the Applied Mechanics Department of Brown University, and Professor Antony Zygmund of the Department of Mathematics of the University of Chicago. The fourth American professor elected was Roman Jakobson who teaches Slavic language and literature at Harvard University.

The four were elected at a Polish Academy convocation which also elected thirty other scientists and scholars from nine countries in addition to the United States.

Uzbekistan Impressions

by CORLISS LAMONT

Tashkent, Usbek Socialist Republic

AFTER we had thoroughly inspected the big Sverdlov Collective Farm (cotton) just outside Tashkent—and found it operating efficiently—they served us “tea,” consisting of a small portion of green tea and very large portions of vodka, champagne and *plov*, a national Uzbek dish of meat and rice. The Chairman of the collective raised his small vodka glass and proposed a toast to American-Soviet friendship. “Bottoms up,” he said. Since my wife, Margaret, and I had both chosen champagne, we did it and then went on gaily to the next glass as I offered a toast to world peace.

We drank a lot of other genial toasts, and a final one to the continued success of the Sverdlov Farm. Each time the Chairman repeated “Bottoms up,” and we maintained the pace as best we could. At the end of the “tea,” my wife, I and an American newspaper woman present had consumed two whole bottles of Soviet champagne! It is testimony to the high quality of this wine that none of us got either a headache or a hangover.

That was one of many occasions during our month's visit to the

USSR when we discussed with Soviet citizens the subject of international peace; and tried to answer their questions as to why the U.S. Government has seemed so reluctant to come to an agreement on stopping nuclear bomb tests, abolishing nuclear weapons and reducing armaments in general. There is not the slightest doubt that the people of the Soviet Union, from the top Government officials down to the rank-and-file workers, sincerely desire peace, and especially want friendly relations with America.

Here in Soviet Central Asia, where peoples of the West and the East work and live in harmony and equality, we have found the same cordiality and friendliness towards us as Americans that we did among the Russians in Moscow. Everyone, from intellectuals to hotel personnel, has been warm and thoughtful.

In Tashkent we have enjoyed immensely meeting and mingling with the dark-skinned and half-Oriental Uzbeks who make up the overwhelming majority in this land. They are a beautiful people, with mobile, fascinating faces; and the Uzbek children are a delight to watch. The girls wear their hair in two long braids hanging down their backs; and their dresses are brilliantly colored.

One afternoon we went to the most important mosque in Tashkent and witnessed an outdoor Moslem prayer service. At Moslem re-

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

ligious services the men and women are always segregated; and on this occasion all the women were out of sight in the back somewhere. So my wife, somewhat embarrassed, had to walk through the midst of about 1,000 silent, bearded, Mohammedan males to the chairs reserved for our small party. Almost all these men were native Uzbeks, many of them very handsome and some, with shaved or bald heads, resembling Yul Brynner! It was a real thrill to hear the Muzzein call out repeatedly in a high-pitched voice "Allah is great;" and to see each worshipper, kneeling on his little prayer rug, bow down his head to the ground. I have never been so close to Allah before!

After the service the Mufti, head of the Moslem religion throughout Soviet Central Asia, gave us tea, fruit and soup (lamb-stew) at a beautifully set table. We asked him many questions. He said the Moslems had complete freedom of worship in Soviet Russia, that they trained young men to be mullahs in special seminaries and freely distributed the Koran at the mosques. The Mufti was a dignified, charming man with seven children and five grandchildren. He was very sincerely concerned about world peace.

The Mufti explained that the Koran states that the Moslem religion, wherever it is functioning, should cooperate with the Government. Hence, he said, he and his associates are cooperating with the Soviet Government with which they now have good relations. This is also the attitude of the Eastern Orthodox Church, which is by far the most powerful religious body in the USSR. The patriotic services of the

Orthodox Church during the Second World War led to greatly improved relations between religion and state in Soviet Russia. The church now actually supports the socialist economic system. The Government, on its part, has eliminated most of the crude anti-religious propaganda that was carried on until the Nazi invasion in 1941. Of course the Communists still conduct anti-religious education, but in a more judicious and dignified way less calculated to arouse the resentment of the faithful.

The Tashkent Mufti also informed us that the Moslem religion throughout the USSR supports the Soviet Government's abolition of polygamy, an institution so long cherished by Mohammedan males. The development of monogamy is one of the main ways in which Soviet women have won equality with men in this vast territory of Central Asia. In Uzbekistan 99 per cent of the women have discarded the heavy, long black horse-hair veil which for centuries Moslem tradition demanded all females should wear outside of the home. We have seen a few old women still wearing these hot and unhealthy veils.

Soviet women in this region have also come into their own in the political sphere. Of the 444 deputies elected to the Supreme Soviet of Uzbekistan on March 1, 1959 for four years, 129 were of the female sex. And the President of the Soviet, who is also considered President of the Uzbek Republic, is a talented Uzbek woman, Mme. Yadgar S. Nasriddinova, who recently visited the United States at the time the Soviet exhibition opened in New York.

Rebuilding Bucharest

by ARTHUR D. KAHN

I DID NOT really expect to find in the Balkans a "little Paris," as Bucharest is called, but this name is fitting for the capital of the Rumanian People's Republic not only because of the beauty of the city but also because of the excitement of life there. At first view Bucharest appears to be a delightful city of handsome boulevards brilliant with flowers, of parks and lakes and public squares, of ancient churches and stately modern public buildings, of rows of old mansions in French and Italian style alongside modern apartment buildings in the most advanced architecture, of delightful garden restaurants and numerous museums. The white and pastel stucco throughout the city provides an atmosphere of airiness and cheer.

But after a brief stay, I realized that something was missing in Bucharest—a definite character, a specific and particular quality distinguishing this city from all others.

Mr. Horia Maicu, the chief architect of the Bucharest Urban Planning Commission, did not agree, not entirely, that is. Bucharest, he insisted wryly, *has* a particular quality: anarchy.

At the beginning of the 18th century, a powerful Wallachian Prince, Brincoveanu, attempted to lengthen

ARTHUR D. KAHN is the author of *Betrayal: Our Occupation of Germany*, an account of his experiences in U.S. Military Government, *Speak Out! America Wants Peace*, and a novel *Brownstone*.

the Calea Victoria, Bucharest's main street. A boyar stubbornly refused to allow the extension to pass through his gardens, and the Prince was compelled to behead the boyar in order to carry on the city improvement. No one in more recent times could control the boyars, the court camarilla or the agents of the foreign corporations, in building according to their personal whims and profiteering. Each decided for himself what he would construct on his property. Accordingly, houses face every which way, mainly jut into the streets, cutting off the sidewalks and narrowing the avenues. Commercial, industrial and residential buildings are jumbled together. The Calea Victoria, formerly the major thoroughfare, twists and turns and narrows and widens without any sense or reason. The public squares in which the city abounds are not really squares, but oddly shaped open spaces with impressive buildings at one side and dingy structures at another.

Of course, the esthetic problem is not the major concern. In Bucharest as in other large cities there is a critical shortage of apartments. The old workers' quarters are more primitive than the most backward peasant villages. In 1944 eighty-five per cent of the city population lived in squalid cottages built of makeshift materials. Sewage, water pipes, electricity and gas were available only in the rich residential section near the

royal palace. Many of the streets were completely unpaved. Transportation was inadequate and chaotic.

Only in the last two years has the city government been able to attack these problems with a concerted effort. Until 1956 the entire energy of the country was concentrated on reconstructing the war-damaged areas, guaranteeing the food supply (there were severe droughts after the war) and building an industrial base for the national economy. In 1957 the grandiose plan for the reconstruction of the capital city was announced. According to this plan, 120,000 new apartments are to be constructed in the next few years. This year 6,600 will be completed; 10,000 in 1960; 15,000 in 1961; and 20,000 in 1962.

A bold new program for bringing order to the plan of the city is already being effected, based on an outer and an inner wheel connected by spokes. The old winding and narrow streets are being broadened and straightened (always with regard to the preservation of historic monuments) and several new arteries are being cut through the city. Already the sewage, water supply and electricity have been extended from the center of Bucharest to the extreme outskirts. In the next three years the water supply of the city will be doubled.

When Bucharest is viewed from the top of Scinteia, the tallest building in the city, it appears to be a sea of green, so numerous and extensive are the beautiful parks. But the new development program calls for increasing the green area five-fold. The chain of lakes extending along the north of the city will be joined into a single huge lake. A new

lake will be created at the southwest corner where the Dimbovitsa enters Bucharest. A belt of trees will surround the city to protect it against the winds that sweep in from the open plains. Thus the climate of the capital will be ameliorated.

I spent a full evening reviewing the new plans with the enthusiastic chief architect, who kept raising his hand to bid me to be patient whenever I asked a question (he had so much to tell me, enough to leave me with no questions). The next day two young architects, members of Mr. Horia's staff, took me on a tour of the city. Eager that I should miss nothing, they rushed me from one construction point to another. First we visited a new housing project providing apartments for workers in a nearby factory. The buildings are simple, neat and the apartments are small and crowded by American standards. But each apartment had its own terrace, and the buildings are pleasantly decorated on the exterior with elements of Rumanian peasant design. In an interesting experiment one thousand new apartments now being constructed around the former royal palace will be leased completely furnished and equipped with modern appliances in order to acquaint workers from the slums with modern living.

Six youth club houses scattered throughout the city have been completed, all equipped with auditorium and sports facilities. A former palace surrounded by a large park has been converted to provide every imaginable cultural and recreational advantage for the smaller children. The huge new city stadium seating 100,000 was constructed in three months by young volunteers pre-

paring for the World Youth Festival held here in 1953. Theaters and cinemas are being erected throughout the city so that it will not be necessary for people to travel to the center for entertainment. A huge circus is being constructed in a park and a new public auditorium behind the former palace. Work has been started on a new international airport at the edge of the city.

When I asked to see some of the remaining slum areas, my guides were not enthusiastic. "For us," one of the young men said, "these areas exist merely as statistics in the plans for demolition and reconstruction." I insisted, however, wanting a measure of comparison between past and present. The slums, I found, are not so oppressive as those in many American cities. The houses are tiny but they have miniature gardens with beautiful flowers. They lack, of course, all modern conveniences. In the older neighborhoods, vast stretches of the streets are torn up for new paving, new sewage, new electricity, new water and gas conduits.

In the tremendous building program, the question of architectural style provides a subject for constant discussion in the press. Mr. Horia is not impressed with the well-known new buildings constructed by leading western architects. In his opinion, these architects have not succeeded in uniting modernity with national character but have merely created experiments in personal styles. He does not believe, on the other hand, that Rumanian architects have achieved solutions to their problems either. "It is easy to write and talk about using elements of the national tradition in new build-

ings," he said. "But the new buildings are constructed of different materials and for different purposes." We discussed the Scinteia (Knowledge) buildings, the vast structure housing the publishing operations of the city and a great part of the country. This building is the chief landmark on the Bucharest horizon. Mr. Horia had been the chief architect. He himself is no longer satisfied with his achievement. He had attempted to utilize the traditional architectural pattern of Rumanian monasteries, an outer wall of apartments around a court in which stands the chapel. In addition, he had utilized motifs of Rumanian design. But the building is lacking in integrity. It sprawls. It is overly ornate and disproportioned.

All Bucharest seems to be a workshop. Everything the Rumanians undertake, they work at with a fury. Housing construction is conducted on three shifts, and families are moved into apartments as soon as the interiors of the buildings are completed and work continues on the exteriors. All night long the sound of hammers echoes through the otherwise silent streets. Three shifts are necessary not only because the Rumanians are determined to catch up quickly with the most advanced countries.

From my hotel window I watch the construction of a large apartment building across the street. The workers work hard, unceasingly, at a fast rhythm. Yet the work proceeds slowly. A simple mechanized escalator helps lift earth from the foundation to the surface and two cranes raise materials to the upper stories. But the workers spend hours shoveling earth into trucks and sawing

beams by hand. And I, as an American, think how with a few bulldozers and other American machines, Bucharest could be reconstructed in a fraction of the time it must now take. This, too, is an aspect of the Cold War. Rumanian purchasing agents have been refused licenses to buy machinery from us. Besides, without a two-way trade, they cannot afford to do business with us.

But Bucharest will be reconstructed with or without our ma-

chines. And it is that vigor and determination that makes Bucharest more than a "little Paris." It is more than a Paris, for it combines the charm and riches of its past with the energy and vitality of a people determined to leap decades in months.

It was the "thing to do" in the twenties to be an American in Paris. In the fifties, I think it is more the thing to do to be an American in Bucharest.

HOLLAND ROBERTS VISITS RUMANIA

HOW SUCCESSFUL IS THE NEW SOCIALIST SOCIETY now building in Rumania? This was the central question in my thoughts when I received an invitation to come for a visit.

I knew something of the giant strides made by the Soviet Union for I had watched her people work in the days of 1934, again in the reconstruction period of 1950, and I had just concluded a third visit in February 1959.

But how would it be in Rumania, a smaller country which had been at work for a much shorter time?

I found there a vital new world. It is thoroughly united and closely linked with other socialist countries, but creative and individual. Rumania today is one great building site wherever I traveled, from Bucharest to Stalin City, to Tirgu-Mures and Bicaz. Passenger cars are few but large heavy-duty trucks are everywhere in cities and countryside, hard at work constructing a solid economic basis for a prosperous and abundant life for the nation.

Production is rising steadily in the 23rd of August metal works in Bucharest in the May 1st oil equipment plant in Ploesti, and in the Ernest Thaelmann tractor factory in Stalin City. Some of the increase achieved is phenomenal. I watched a test of the new universal tractors that are guaranteed to run for 3000 hours without major repairs. Later I saw them at work on farms ploughing and preparing the ground and hauling heavy loads along the road. They are well designed, of sturdy construction. Doubters said Rumania could not make tractors. The answer is at work mechanizing the labor in the field.

When Lincoln Steffens went to the Soviet Union in 1921 and wrote back home, "I have seen the future and it works," he had far less to go on than is available at the great Bicaz hydro-electric plant which will begin pouring 430 million kw. hours of power a year into Rumania's electrical system in 1960. Or at the state farm, *The 30th of December, 1947*, where this factory in the fields near Bucharest produces almost every food product that is needed in a great city. Cattle and hogs and poultry are fed with grain raised on the farm, killed and prepared for the market or the table. I have never eaten better food in my life than at this farm.

The success of this new social system is assured by the creative daily work of a united people dedicated to peaceful buildings and convinced that they are on the highroad to a prosperous and expansive future.

From *Rumania Today*

Sun Pao-san's Story

by GRACE LIU

THE STOUT, middle-aged man in white cap and gown shaking hands with the American writer was not one of the sanitarium doctors. He was the head cook, and had just shown us over the spotless big kitchen and introduced us to his assistant cooks, one attending a huge cauldron of meat sauce—for noodles—and another frying fish. It was lunch time at the beautiful "Willow Forest" sanitarium for T.B. patients. The dining room was full, and all the diners were watching with great interest the two foreign women standing in the corridor between dining room and kitchen talking to the cook; some had even risen from their chairs to get a better view.

The American visitor was a well-known American woman making a tour of the country at the invitation of the Association for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries, and it had been my good luck to be able to accompany her on a sight-seeing trip around Tientsin and the Tientsin area. We had already been to see the new harbor at Tangku—thirty miles away—where the American visitor took pictures of boats from East and West Germany, Denmark, Norway and Italy. We had made a quick trip to one of the Peoples' Communes just outside Tientsin visiting the nursery, the home of a

woman on maternity leave, and the "Home of Respect for the Aged," where the visitor got a picture of three very pleased old men.

Other places we had visited were a big department store and the huge sports stadium. The store had been crowded with people from the country and we'd made our way around through a throng of towel-draped heads and big straw hats. Stopping at a cake counter we were promptly hemmed in by eager, curious men, women and children. Tientsin, unlike Peking, has very few foreigners. When the American guest, through her interpreter, told the crowd that she had come from America to see what was going on in New China, she was answered with friendly smiles and exclamations of welcome.

Going next to the sports stadium we had stayed only long enough for the visitor to be astonished at the very modern up-to-date, last-minute equipment of the great building, and delighted at the beauty of the flower gardens and shrubbery surrounding the out-door courts.

And now we had come to the "Willow Forest" sanitarium for workers. The Chinese style buildings set amidst willow trees and rock gardens, just at that time in full bloom, were connected by open corridors painted in brilliant red, blue and green, after the fashion of the Summer Palace outside Peking.

"Just to think," exclaimed the American visitor, "that all this beauty is not for kings or officials or

GRACE LIU is an American who lives in China with her three children. She teaches English and has frequently contributed articles to *New World Review*.

the very rich, but for the ordinary people—the workers! I feel as if I were in a dream.”

When we were being shown around I asked if we might see Sun Pao-san, the cook. Our guide said that word would be sent to Sun to meet us in the dining room and he told the visitor, “Our cook is very famous. Cooks from all over China come here to learn from him. He is also an opera singer, and has sung in performances in the biggest theater in Tientsin.”

The American visitor was not surprised because on the way to the sanitarium I had told her Sun Pao-san's story.

For more than twenty years he had cooked for my family, coming to us a boy of nineteen, the day after I arrived in China. He had been a “small-cook”—an assistant to the head cook—in the famous old British hotel, the Astor House. To his knowledge of European cooking he had added that of American style cooking and had become an extraordinarily skilled cook.

Four years ago, when we started living on a smaller scale after my husband's death, Sun Pao-san went to the Finnish Ambassador's family in Peking. Here he managed the other servants, planned the meals, even the big dinners, receptions and official banquets, and ordered all the food. His wages were high.

Some time later he came to see me. He had gained considerable weight and was looking prosperous. He told us about the famous people he had seen and served at the ambassador's big parties and banquets—the diplomatic corps in Peking, Chinese government leaders, famous people from many countries.

“Well, Sun,” I said, “you must feel very satisfied and pleased with such a job.”

“No, Tai-tai, (a title of respect)” he said, “I'm not. I know it's a good job. I never thought of getting so much money before. And the Ambassador and his wife are good to me. They always ask if I am working too hard and tell me to hire more people to help. But I don't feel happy there.”

“Oh, you'll feel different when your family moves to Peking,” I said. His wife and eight children were still living in Tientsin.

“No,” he said. “It's not my family. It's just that I feel left behind. I'm making money. I get to see interesting, famous people. I live comfortably; my family is comfortable. But—” and his voice rose—“I'm not getting anywhere. I'm not learning anything. The whole country is going ahead on a new road. Everybody is studying and learning new things. All my friends belong to the union and have their study groups and are going forward with the country. But I am standing still, learning nothing, belong to nothing—just a cook in a private family!” He struck his hand with his fist. “I can't stand to be left behind! I want to get a job in a government institution and belong to the union and or a study group.”

“But Sun,” I reminded him. “The pay in government places is quite low compared to what you are getting now. Your family couldn't live so comfortably.”

“I don't care,” he said stubbornly. “I'd rather live hard and feel that I was going ahead with all the people than to live easy and feel the way I do now.”

After a month or two he came back, much thinner.

"I'm working in a sanitarium now," he told me, "The 'Willow Forest' T.B. sanitarium for workers. It's hard work and the pay isn't much, but I feel I'm really living and learning. We have meetings all the time to discuss our work and how to improve it. And in our study group I'm learning politics and international affairs and what's going on all over the country. And"—smiling proudly—"I belong to the opera group!"

"So you're not sorry you gave up the fine job in Peking," I said.

"Never!" he declared. "Now I'm in step with the whole country. We study and discuss everything the government does and give out opinions freely. I used to work just to support my own family, but now I'm working for the people of the whole country."

The next time I saw him was many months afterwards, in the late summer of 1958. He had regained much of his former stoutness. The union, he said, had long ago had his wages raised to almost the amount the Finnish ambassador had

paid him, because he worked so hard and so well and also because he had such a large family. He had become a labor model and had been sent that summer for a ten-day vacation to Pei-ya-ho beach, a famous summer resort only for foreigners and rich Chinese in the old days. His opera group (Peking opera) had given several performances in Tientsin and he sang a leading role.

He had come this time to ask me a favor. He wanted some more recipes of American dishes, especially desserts and salads. I got out the latest magazine I'd received from the U.S. and we cut out all the recipes that sounded enticing. He told me that cooks were coming from sanitariums all over China to learn from him.

I didn't see him again until the American guest and I met him in the sanitarium dining room. When we said goodbye to him we shook hands with a man who was no longer just somebody's servant. By giving his best services unstintingly to the people and working and learning collectively he had become a personage and an individual of dignity and honor.

YOUNG DEMOCRATS FOR RECOGNITION OF CHINA

DELEGATES TO THE WESTERN YOUNG DEMOCRATS CONFERENCE held in San Francisco voted, according to the *New York Times*, September 3, in favor of trade and diplomatic relations with the People's Government of China. The national organization of the Democratic party is on record as opposing both trade and diplomatic relations with China.

The resolution declared that the Nationalist Government "does not speak for all the people of China." The resolution further called for "early opening of diplomatic relations with China for the purpose of seeking solutions to outstanding differences between our two nations, as well as for the resumption of trade and cultural exchange."

Not So Quiet Americans in Laos

by SUSAN WARREN

As this article goes to press the United Nations Security Council overriding a Soviet veto, established on Sept. 7 a subcommittee composed of Argentina, Italy, Japan and Tunis to conduct an inquiry on the complaint of the Royal Laotian Government against North Vietnam. The Soviet veto was based on the consideration that the formation of the United Nations subcommittee is in violation of the 1954 Geneva Agreements discussed in some detail below.

ONE OF the problems of "keeping up" with U.S. foreign policy is that there is so much of it! To make confusion worse confounded there are seemingly so many different kinds of it! On the one hand there is the promise of relaxation in the Eisenhower-Khrushchev exchange of visits — a welcome breath of relief in a politically as well as literally sweltering summer. On the other are the ominous headlines from the East. Not least of these is from the small and remote kingdom of Laos, an area of East-West cold war since the Geneva Agreements of 1954 ended the fighting in Indo-China, which threatens to erupt into a new hot war engulfing all of Southeast Asia. We live in a time when tension and relaxation alternate and even co-mingle. While naturally rejoicing in and supporting every manifestation of relaxation it is more than ever necessary to understand the sources

of tension. It has been endlessly demonstrated that only such understanding and the pressures it generates from the people expands the relaxation.

Already the smokescreens are going up between the American people and the facts on the crisis in Laos. By those who fear the effects of the Khrushchev-Eisenhower exchange, and even by those who schizophrenically fear it and want it at the same time, the Laos situation is being seized upon to muddy the international waters. The Laos crisis which had actually reached an advanced stage in May (before the Khrushchev visit was even projected), and which was the subject of innumerable warnings by the North Vietnam and Chinese Governments which share over a 1,000 miles of border with Laos, is now the object of such nonsensical and contradictory speculations as "the Soviets under cover of Premier Khrushchev's visit to the United States are helping to stir up new trouble in Southeast Asia. . .", or, "it is anybody's guess whether the Chinese Reds are deliberately embarrassing Premier Khrushchev on the eve of his visit to the United States or, whether the Soviet leader is glad to have an issue on which he might threaten or offer to be 'helpful' to the West," or, "If Red China touched off the Laos revolt independently, it could be new evidence of a possible split between

SUSAN WARREN has long been a student and writer on Far Eastern affairs. She was formerly the editor of *Far East Spotlight*.

Peking and Moscow." It is no accident that of all the possible "guesses" offered—none has anything to do with the realities of Laos.

Nor have any of the emotional stops been neglected. The "Communist rebels" (the emotionally-charged name for the nationalist "Pathet Lao" or "Land of Lao" who are the direct descendants, under the same leader, Prince Souvanna Vong, of the "Free Laotian Movement" which fought with us against the Japanese in the last war and who as the "Pathet Lao" continued the fight against the reinstated French colonial regime for their national independence) are as reported by MacGregor of the *New York Times*, terrorizing communities. They are going about "slashing throats." Not just any old throat, but fiendishly seeking out the "throats of infants." And not just infants either—but always "slashing the throats of infants in the presence of their mothers." Such is the stuff cold wars are made of—and the counter weapon can only be facts, facts and more facts.

The fall of Dien Bien Phu to the forces of the Viet Minh on May 8, 1954, dramatized to the world the political and military collapse of the French in Indo-China. In those fateful days the U.S. State Department under Secretary Dulles worked feverishly to "internationalize" the Indo-Chinese war. In the Secretary's own words on June 11, 1954: "Last March, after the siege of Dien Bien Phu had begun I renewed President Eisenhower's proposal that we seek conditions which would permit a united defense for the area. I went to Europe on this mission and it

seemed there was agreement on this proposal. But when we moved to translate the proposal into reality, some of the parties held back. . . ." In less diplomatic parlance Secretary Dulles was told by America's allies that if he went over this "brink" he would have to "go it alone." What was to become a pattern—an overwhelming eleventh hour opposition by the American people, the revulsion of world opinion, and the flat refusal of America's allies to follow the leader—stayed the final plunge into war.

The Geneva Agreements of July 29, 1954, ended hostilities in the three associated states—Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia—which comprised Indo-China. Under conditions which the French themselves described to *New York Times* correspondent, Thomas Hamilton, as those in which "the Communists can win all of Indo-China in a few months battle," the Viet Minh entered into a negotiated peace in which it made innumerable concessions in the interest of liquidating a hotbed of war in Southeast Asia. While an anxious world welcomed the Geneva peace, the State Department considered it a major setback. A *Wall Street Journal* editorial, written during the Geneva negotiations candidly summed up Washington's position:

The United States viewed this conference with misgivings from the start. But it hoped . . . to persuade the British and French to take a position of such firmness that either an acceptable cease fire would be arranged or none at all. . . . The agreement that Geneva is headed for is exactly the kind the United States feared, hoped to avoid and has consistently opposed. . . . This is a peace which, if it comes, the United States can hardly sanction.

In the end, while declining to join in the General Declaration of the Geneva Conference the United States was forced, out of fear of an open break in the Western alliance, to make its own unilateral declaration in which it undertook to "refrain from the threat or the use of force to disturb" the agreements. E. W. Kennedy, recalling this period in a revealing feature for the *New York Times*, inadvertently exposes in the crassest terms the true position of the Administration:

Having washed its hands of Geneva, having refused to "appease" the Communists and having spurned a non-aggression pact, the United States was under the obligation to do something about the power vacuum left by Geneva.

Regarding a people's taking over their own country as a "power vacuum", Secretary Dulles moved with exemplary speed to fill the void. Two short months later, on September 8, 1954, the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) was set up in Manila. This *Asian* alliance has as its only Asian members Thailand, Pakistan and the Philippines. It was roundly repudiated by the major Southeast Asian states (India, Indonesia, Burma, Ceylon and Cambodia) who tended to agree with Walter Lippmann's characterization of it (*N. Y. Herald Tribune*, September 14, 1954) as "the first formal instrument in modern times which is designed to license international intervention in internal affairs. . . ." The main pillars and prime movers of SEATO are the United States, Britain, France, Australia and New Zealand with the United States firmly in the driver's seat.

Although the Geneva Agreements explicitly bar Vietnam (North and South), Laos and Cambodia from participation in any military alliance and prescribe neutrality in their external relations, the parties to SEATO gratuitously, provocatively and without consulting the peoples concerned announced a Protocol to their Treaty "placing" Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam under the "protection" of SEATO.

No occasion and no device has been overlooked in the effort to tie Laos into the military bloc of SEATO. France, a SEATO member is, according to the Geneva Agreements, the only foreign power permitted to have any military personnel in Laos. Haynes Miller, a former employee of the U.S. International Cooperation Administration (ICA) wrote in *The Reporter* (Nov. 13, '58) that "... the United States stepped in. We undertook to help transform the militia into a permanent force and to assume the entire financial burden . . . since they [the French] have no control over the purse strings, they have little power over the basic concept and organization of the Laotian army, that is the business of the thirty-odd men who represented the Pentagon while I was in Laos and who functioned under the sonorous title of Program Evaluation Office." France has an air base at Seno in Central Laos. Interestingly enough, personnel from the U.S. Clarke Air Base in the Philippines (another member of SEATO) have been stationed there. Moreover, on July 23, France entered into a further open arrangement with the United States whereby "French and United States specialists will begin a new joint training program for

the Laotian army" It would be strange indeed if this extraordinary show of French cooperation was not rewarded by an equal show of sympathetic understanding by the United States for France's problems in other troubled parts of the world.

On June 5 of this year the growing crisis in Laos was aggravated by a UPI dispatch from Washington speculating that if the Laotian situation develops into an "international crisis" SEATO may intervene directly. Acting on cue, Pote Sarasin, Secretary of SEATO, immediately announced that SEATO would not "sit and idle" in the face of Laotian developments. He also, in effect, invited the Royal Laotian Government to seek such aid by saying that SEATO would consider such a request. On August 26, the U.S. State Department announced that a special "informal" session of SEATO would be held in Washington in late September which would probably discuss the Laos situation. As an indication of how high and how deep ignorance and confusion on the relations of Laos and SEATO go, one need only cite Senator Sparkman of Alabama, a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee who told a CBS television forum "Face the Nation" on August 30 that "any action taken [in Laos] would have to come through the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization of which Laos is a member!" (Italics added.)

Since the Geneva accords in 1954, U.S. policy has been dedicated to upsetting the "peace it could not sanction." By outright diplomatic pressure and threats, by manipulation of military and economic "aid," by cloak and dagger subversion—in

short, by every cold war device, tension has been created to provide a pretext for the intervention of SEATO—or failing that "optimum bonum" UN "observers" dominated by a Western majority. As this goes to press events indicate that the latter "solution" is becoming the preferred way. If engineered it would save the United States from an exposed position of isolation and provide the necessary moral and legal camouflage. Raising the question of Laos in the UN is in itself a repudiation of the Geneva settlement since the latter made the participants in the Geneva Conference, and they alone, responsible guarantors of the Indo-China peace. To say that raising the question in the UN makes it possible "to react without undue delay" is a travesty of the truth because there is already an International Commission appointed by the Geneva Conference and still in existence for the purpose of observation and control in Laos.

Prime Minister Nehru of India put his finger on the heart of the matter. "If you sweep away the Geneva Agreements," he said at a press conference in New Delhi August 7, "then in a sense you would revert to the pre-Geneva stage. That will not be good. The Geneva Conference method was to take Indo-China out of the cold war or the hot war" The Geneva Agreements are the foundation of peace in Indo-China and the guarantee of the independence and sovereignty of the Indo-China states. They are a vital link in the peaceful coexistence of the Asian nations. What are the pertinent terms of the Geneva Agreements which apply in the crisis in Laos today?

From the Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities in Laos

Art. 6. The introduction into Laos of any reinforcement of troops or military personnel from outside Laotian territory is prohibited . . . the French High command may leave a *specified* number of French military personnel required for the training of the Laotian National Army in the territory of Laos . . . (Italics added.)

Art. 7. . . . the establishment of new military bases is prohibited throughout the territory of Laos.

Art. 9. . . . the introduction into Laos of armaments, munitions and military equipment of all kinds is prohibited, with the exception of a *specified quantity of armaments* in categories *specified* as necessary for the defense of Laos.

Art. 14. *Pending a political settlement, the fighting units of Pathet Lao . . . shall move into the province of Phongsaly and Samneua . . .* they will be free to move between these two provinces in a corridor along the frontier between Laos and Viet Nam bounded on the South by the line Sop Kin, Na Mi-Sop Sang, Muong Son. . . .

Each party undertakes to refrain from any reprisals or discrimination against persons or organizations for their activities during the hostilities and also undertakes to guarantee their democratic freedoms.

The Final Declaration of the Conference containing two specific Declarations by the Royal Government of Laos reaffirmed that the Kingdom of Laos should not become a member of any military blocs, should not agree to the establishment of foreign military bases on its territory, and should not, except in the cases prescribed by the Geneva Agreements, accept any reinforcements in foreign military personnel, or munitions and new armaments.

Casual readers of the American press would be forced to conclude that the Pathet Lao were interlopers and usurp-

ers in the two northern provinces of Phongsaly and Sam Neua. But the Geneva accords plainly state that "*pending a political settlement the fighting units of the Pathet Lao . . . shall move into the provinces of Phongsaly and Samneua.*" Around the words "pending a political settlement" hangs a tale.

In February, 1956, the neutralist oriented Prince Souvanna Phouma became Prime Minister of Laos. Negotiations for a political settlement with the Pathet Lao forces were opened. From July to October of that year U.S. Joint Chief of Staff, Admiral Radford, U.S. Fleet Commander, Admiral Stump and a host of other U.S. officials in a new streamlined version of "gun boat diplomacy" invaded Vientiane (the administrative capital of Laos). In spite of this pressure the negotiations were successfully concluded and a Phouma-Souvanna Vong joint statement was issued in Vientiane, December, 1956.

The Vientiane Agreement provided for a *coalition government* following which the Pathet Lao would become a political organization with the same rights as any other political party. The government and fighting forces in Samneua and Phongsaly would be placed *under the coalition government* and members of the Pathet Lao would enjoy full political rights. It was further stipulated that a foreign policy of positive neutrality would be followed. All of these provisions conformed in spirit and detail with the Geneva Agreements.

But Washington had just begun to fight. U.S. diplomats let it be known that they took a dim view of members of the Pathet Lao becoming part of the Government. They threatened to "re-evaluate" American aid. How effective a threat this was can only be appreciated with some understanding of the degree to which U.S. aid had penetrated and corrupted the Laotian economy and political life. An irate editorial in the *Wall Street Journal* (Aug. 14, '59) lifted the lid on the nature of U.S. aid to Laos.

Shortly after the 1954 agreements ending the Indo-China war and recognizing Laos as an independent country, the United States began pouring money into the former French protectorate. Most of the money went to a U.S. supported, supplied and paid Laotian army of 25,000 men.

Now, five years later, announcement is made in Vientiane . . . that French and U.S. military missions will begin intensive "training" of the Laotian army.

So what's been going on in the meantime?

The U.S. has been spending about \$40 million a year on the Lao economy. . . . The result: inflation that doubled the cost of living in Laos between 1954 and 1959. Lack of control over spending which led to profiteering. . . .

The Haynes Miller article in *The Reporter*, previously referred to, called the Laotian army "the only national defense force except our own whose budget is entirely underwritten by U.S. taxpayers." He also mentions the expansion of the Laotian police force planned and directed by a staff of U.S. police experts—a project certainly calculated to win friends and influence Laotians! Eighty per cent of this project had been paid for out of ICA "technical assistance" funds.

The emphasis on military and police "aid" is only one side of the story. The other is the disastrous character of the economic aid, "Laotian Capital, City of Contrast—High Priced Cars, Barefoot Pedestrians—U.S. Aid Enriches a Few" was a *New York Times* headline in February, 1958. And a report by the Foreign Operations and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on Government operations to Congress lamented that "the U.S. aid program has contributed to an atmosphere in which the ordinary people of Laos question the value of the friendship of the United States." The luxury goods flooding the Laotian market has no relationship to the needs of the people. They have, moreover, had the effect of crushing the

few national Laotian enterprises in existence. The once flourishing handspun cloth industry has been undermined by the import of U.S. textiles which increased from \$3 million in value in 1955 to nearly \$9 million in 1957. Coffee, once a major export has been all but replaced by the tinned American variety.

Stagnation of the home economy, a catastrophic imbalance in foreign trade (imports were 40 times greater than exports in 1957) and a rampaging inflation have, to date, been the benefits of U.S. aid. According to a statement by the U.S. General Accounting Office our policy in Laos has reduced that country to "a financial dependency" of the United States. While the ordinary people shoulder the burden, in classic semi-colonial style a new crop of piratical businessmen—a new Laotian comprador strata, totally dependent upon and thus totally subservient to Washington has emerged. Producing nothing they are entrepreneurs, stockholders, brokers and general "running dogs" out for the fat, speculative dollar. With them has mushroomed a new growth of lucrative banks and companies such as the Lao-Thai Monopole, Lao Thai Bank and Air Laos all busily amassing profits for the "happy few." An understanding of this social base of U.S. power in Laos is of extreme importance. It takes the mystery out of the generalization "U.S. dominated Sananikone Government." It explains how the repeated use of the threat to cut off aid makes those who depend upon it for existence toe the American line.

After the announcement of the Vientiane Agreement between the Phouma Government and the Pathet Lao in December, 1956, U.S. aid was indeed cut down to a trickle making it impossible to pay salaries to government employees. Premier Phouma was forced to resign. The *New York Times* wrote: "It was an open secret in Vientiane the day Prince Souvanna Phouma fell that the United States, France, Britain and neigh-

boring South Vietnam looked forward with satisfaction to the prospect of a new leader who would refuse to accept the Pathet Lao coalition." But the time was not yet. The sentiment of the people for unification and peace in Laos was strong. Phouma was returned to office and in November, 1957, a final rapprochement with the Pathet Lao was arranged. In the same month a coalition government was formed and Prince Souvanna Vong and another Pathet Lao leader entered the cabinet. In May, 1958, special elections for the Laotian National Assembly were held. The Neo Lao Hak Xat (Laotian Patriotic Party), the political party of the Pathet Lao, and the pro-coalition Santihab Party won an overwhelming victory.

While much given to praise of "free elections" in the abstract, Washington was so alarmed by this one in the flesh that it immediately began to tug at the strings on "aid." Although not daring to cut aid off completely for fear that Laos would turn to the socialist countries for help, it insisted that the kip (Laotian currency) be depreciated. Under these conditions and with the formation of the extreme right wing "Laotian Committee for the Defense of National Interests" the Phouma Government was again forced to resign. In August, 1958, the U.S. sponsored Sananikone Government was formed which excluded the Laotian Patriotic Party and *rejected the coalition on which the Vientiane political settlement was based.* It did so with no mandate from the people who, on the contrary, had clearly expressed their support for the coalition in the May 1958 voting. That it did so with the full connivance of Washington was boldly and shamelessly admitted by Joseph Alsop writing from Vientiane in the *New York Herald Tribune* of September 9, 1959. "In full awareness of the danger, with all sorts of assurances to the Laotians, the American government did everything possible to bring the Sananikone government into being." What

the Laotian people think of this government maneuvered into office against their will was described by an on the spot reporter for the *Wall St. Journal* (Sept. 8, '59) as "completely indifferent" or "frankly hostile."

Perpetrating what was perhaps a new low in sleight of hand political chicanery, Prime Minister Sananikone, with the full support of Washington, demanded and obtained "emergency powers" abrogating normal constitutional processes. With a heavy hand he immediately initiated a series of actions in open, flagrant violation of the Geneva and Vientiane Agreements. These actions are recounted by the *Wall Street Journal*, (July 25, 1959):

Premier Phoui Sananikone . . . first removed the two Red ministers from the Cabinet and later jailed them along with other leftist leaders. But even more disturbing to the Communists, perhaps, was his announcement last February that his government no longer considered itself bound by the 1954 Geneva agreements *because integration with Pathet Lao had been achieved as the agreement required.* At the same time he dissolved the international control commission comprising India, Canada and Poland which had supervised the freeze on the armaments level in Laos.

These moves, the premier contended, left him free to accept additional foreign military aid, and in July an agreement was concluded with the U.S. to provide more military equipment and nearly 100 army advisers. (*Italics added.*)

This cynical claim to be no longer bound by the Geneva Agreement on the basis of having fulfilled its requirement to work out a political settlement with the Pathet Lao at the very moment he was leaving no stone unturned to destroy that settlement, can only be palmed off on the American people because its own State Department is just as cynically claiming not to be violating the Geneva Agreement while at the same time evincing doubt as to whether the pact is still in effect. One spokesman

for the Department demurely noted that since Laos claimed to have fulfilled the pact's requirements, "We respect the Laos government's decision."

Those who read beyond the Laos headlines cannot fail to note that the reporting on the actual fighting taking place in Laos has been exaggerated, contradictory and often ludicrous. Are there North Vietnamese troops in Laos? North Vietnam denies it. In general, there has been a cautious retreat on the subject. Stemming from a policy which deplors the propaganda stampeding of American soldiers into "places literally undefendable" the *Wall Street Journal* has provided many valuable facts about internal conditions in Laos. It adds some significant ones on the point in question. From its correspondent Igor Oganessoff in Vientiane comes the following (Sept. 10, 1959):

When the United Nations observers land in Laos this weekend, their first look behind this nation's appeal for UN troops will uncover more evidence of a political tug of war . . . than of foreign military invasion . . . the UN observers will be hard put to find proof of it . . . the Laotian army has yet to produce a single Vietnamese prisoner.

Having unilaterally repudiated the Geneva and Vientiane Agreements, having initiated an orgy of arrests, repression and outright murder of former resistance fighters, having taken measures in complete contravention of the positive neutrality to which it was pledged, having instigated incursions by Royal Laotian troops into the Democratic Republic of Vietnam in order to create border incidents on which to hang a claim of North Vietnam interference, the Sananikone Government finally, in May 1959, launched attacks against the former Pathet Lao fighting units which resisted the onslaught. The Pathet Lao forces are defending the Geneva and Vientiane political and military agreements. They have at the same time re-

newed their bid to the Royal Laotian Government for negotiations for a peaceful settlement. The Washington sponsored Sananikone Government has thus rekindled the civil war in Laos and created the mounting tension and crisis in Indo-China and all Southeast Asia which menaces world peace.

As one of the co-chairman, with Great Britain, of the 1954 Geneva Conference, the Soviet Government on May 30 sent a note to the British Government calling for resumption of the work of the International Commission in Laos. The Polish and Indian Governments, as members of the International Commission, also requested its reactivation. As a neighbor of Laos, sharing hundreds of miles of border with that country and as a guarantor of the Geneva Agreements, China is vitally concerned. That concern is heightened by the Chinese charge that remnant Chiang Kai-shek forces are operating against China from Laotian territory. It has been publicly admitted (*New York Times*, July 23, 24) that planes chartered by the U.S. Government "have gone into service with the Laotian armed services transporting supplies to Sam Neua. The planes with American and Chinese pilots were rented from the Chinese Nationalist commercial airline."

There is a powerful drive in certain Administration circles for direct intervention with U.S. forces in Laos. Just as in 1954 Admiral Arthur Radford was the loudest spokesman for a U.S. atomic strike in Indo-China, so today Admiral Arleigh Burke is one of its strongest advocates. There also appear to be cooler heads both political and military within the Administration who see direct U.S. intervention as a "fate worse than Korea" and one likely to create a morass from which the U.S. could not extricate itself for years. The American people, as in the crucial pre-Geneva days of 1954 must throw their weight against such a hopeless, useless and self defeating involvement.

REPORT TO OUR READERS

FIRST of all, we want to thank all of you who took the trouble to answer the questionnaire we sent out last winter asking for criticisms and suggestions on New World Review. Although it was sent out some six months ago, answers are still coming in! Especially we want to thank those who took pains to give thoughtful, detailed answers in all our questions. This has been a very great help indeed in guiding us in our future work.

Space does not permit a detailed analysis of all the answers, criticisms and proposals. We can only assure you that every single answer has been carefully read and taken into consideration. If you do not see immediate evidences of this, please understand that it may be only because we are in process of trying to do something about your suggestions, and have not yet been able to get the particular material requested, or because some of the proposals made are beyond the scope of our magazine—both because the ever present financial problem limits the number of pages, and because we cannot cover the whole waterfront and still be effective.

Now we must register a strange sort of complaint. Too many of you wrote that you liked us just as we are, that NWR is everything it should be and couldn't be better! That is very gratifying, of course, the only problem is that it isn't and can't be true. Growth and improvement are always both necessary and

possible. Each month we are very much aware of how many important questions have not been covered, and of limitations on some of the material we do publish.

The criticisms we received are what we consider most valuable—even though some of them are rather contradictory, only proving that we can't please everyone, no matter how hard we try. Thus some consider that we are not sufficiently objective, too biased in our viewpoint, while others say we sometimes pull our punches and ought to be more hard-hitting. One complains we are too shallow—another, too erudite! One wants less on culture, more on living standards, another more on culture, less on news. We have taken to heart a number of criticisms that we are too solemn, dull and stodgy—"humorless, graceless, colorless" is the way one reader puts it. Don't expect a comic strip right away, please, but we'll try to do something about this.

It is gratifying to know that most of our readers find our review and comment section on international events and East-West relations useful. Quite a number, however, add that it's usually too long. Noted.

Some complain, "not enough of it," that we ought to have more pages. Agreed—but there's nothing we can do about it.

There are complaints, too, that some of our articles are too long. Here we must put up a counter-argument. We have rivals, the Na-

London Guardian for example, which gives splendid coverage to the socialist countries, yet as a weekly newspaper cannot publish long and detailed accounts. We feel that it is our special sphere, as a monthly, to give more space to comprehensive and detailed, document treatment of important subjects from time to time, than is possible for a newspaper to do, and that herein lies our special role.

Another rival is our Canadian neighbor "Northern Neighbors" — why can't we get out that kind of magazine, with more attractive format, full of brief items, pictures and lively material, some ask. Well, we can't, that's all! We had to give up pictures some time ago as an economy measure — perhaps sometime we can come back to them, not just now. Moreover, it takes a special kind of gift, in which your editors seem to be lacking, to get out that kind of magazine. Maybe we believe too much in understatement. If you can afford it, better subscribe to both, is all we can say.

To the person who complains that we ask too much for money—our only answer is to ask for more. This reader suspects poor economy in management. Will he please go out and find some big advertisers for us?

As to "articles liked best," this

was a numerous and varied list, too lengthy to go in to, but it is a helpful guide for the future.

We appreciate, too, the many suggestions on specific articles desired, and are working on this—although again we must note that many of these suggestions go far beyond our special sphere which covers mainly the Soviet Union, China and the other socialist countries, East-West relations and peace, and other countries in Africa, Asia and the Middle East in their relation to these questions. Similarly, practically every country in the world was mentioned in the question asking which ones our readers were most interested in knowing about, and such coverage is beyond our scope and power.

We are gratified at the number of people who mentioned world peace as their deepest concern, as it is ours, and for their suggestions as to how we can make a greater contribution in this direction. Noteworthy among these were proposals for more material of direct interest to youth and to workers.

We thank you again for your concern, support and constructive criticism. If this brief review leads any of our readers to further comment and suggestions, they will be gratefully received.

J. S.

Back Issues Available F R E E

Our March, April, and May issues have been hailed by our readers as among the most useful and informative we have ever published. Let us know how many you can use to spread information, to get new readers for *New World Review*.

NOW READY

Bound Volumes of

New World Review, 1958

\$4.00 each Index alone 35c

Order through NWR

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

Reports on the USSR

NBC Reporting

Main Street, USSR, by Irving R. Levine.
Doubleday & Company. New York,
1959. 408 pages. \$4.50.

MR. LEVINE was correspondent for NBC in Moscow. His book is a report on what he thinks Americans would like to know about the Soviet Union. It is not a very satisfactory book mainly because Mr. Levine has cultivated a "humorous" manner that does not succeed as humor. This unfortunate manner only succeeds in making his observations seem superficial and gossipy.

There is no reason why a book on the Soviet Union should not be written in a light and humorous manner, indeed such books are very much to be desired. But the point of such a book should be in the end to throw new light on the subject, not to cast doubt on the intentions of the writer and lead the reader to question judgment on serious points.

Mr. Levine begins each chapter with a "funny" story and then proceeds to fill in with a series of anecdotes and personal experiences. None of these stories are very fresh or very illuminating and the personal experiences seem merely routine. There is a good deal of information here and there in the book but it is not very well related to a consistent picture of the country and the final effect is desultory and haphazard.

Just what readers such a book is intended for is hard to imagine. A visitor to the Soviet exhibition this summer picking up the book to fill in gaps in his knowledge of the USSR would find little profit from his reading. And the reader who comes to the book hoping for new information will hardly bother to continue his reading for the slight reward he will find in all the clutter of anecdotes and "humorous" stories.

Happily in this period of broadening exchanges, because of the boundless interest that exists in this country about the Soviet Union, we can certainly look forward to more substantial reports as the reviews that follow indicate.

After Sputnik

Since Sputnik: How Americans View the Soviet Union, by Herbert Aptheker. New Century Publishers. New York, 1959. 32 pages. 25 cents.

THE placing of the first Earth satellite in orbit by the Soviet Union in the fall of 1957 announced a new stage in the history of science. This was achieved by a socialist country and was in dramatic contradiction to the opinion of socialism generally held in the USA. How was such a feat possible?

A flood of individuals and delegations went to investigate the situation in the USSR and see if they could find some clue to the answer. Dr. Aptheker surveys their reports in this extremely interesting pamphlet.

From Adlai Stevenson and Mrs. Roosevelt, college presidents, leading scientists and doctors, and specialists in many fields, there was unanimity in the deep impression the effort and achievement of the USSR made. The visitors were also deeply impressed by the desire for peace everywhere expressed by the Soviet people and by their eager friendliness towards the people of our country.

By collecting these opinions from a wide variety of sources Dr. Aptheker provides the reader with a record of a significant historical change in American attitudes toward the Soviet Union that has important consequences for the future.

Soviet Trade Unions

What I Saw in the Soviet Union Today, by George Morris. New Century Publishers. New York. 64 pages. 35 cents.

THIS IS a report by the Labor Editor of the weekly *Worker* of a visit he made to the Soviet Union last winter. A specialist in labor journalism for over 25 years, Mr. Morris knows the questions American workers want answered about conditions in the USSR.

Mr. Morris visited many factories and talked to both trade union leaders and rank-and-filers. His account of how Soviet trade unions are organized and how they operate from bottom to top is the best report we have had in recent years.

The questions of differences in living standards between American and Soviet workers is gone into with great thoroughness. Here a much more realistic picture emerges than is possible to obtain from the superficial comparison of wages that usually takes the place of a basic analysis. Mr. Morris points out the significance of the steady 10 per cent yearly growth of Soviet production, the vast health services—free medical care, rest-homes, sanatoria, the massive housing program, the educational and cultural facilities everywhere available; above all he stresses the sense of full security that arises in a country in which the workers actually own the factories and mines.

Every effort has been made to distort the American workers' ideas about the Soviet Union; this effort has in great measure been the special task of the leaders of the workers' own unions in this country. Even the exchange program so successful in many fields has not yet extended to the trade unions. Mr. Morris' report should be read widely for it is a real contribution to knowledge of Soviet life in an area still too little understood in this country.

Soviet Education

Soviet Education Today and Tomorrow, by Elizabeth Moos. National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. 114 East 32nd St., N.Y.C. 16, N. Y. 92 pages. 50 cents.

ELIZABETH MOOS spent six weeks in the fall of 1958 studying Soviet schools at first hand. The author of two earlier studies of Soviet education, Mrs. Moos' present study is a solid, detailed report on every aspect of Soviet education from pre-school training through the universities. The presentation of administrative organization, courses of study, classroom practices, and the realization of official goals and purposes, are made concrete by vivid descriptions of visits to particular schools and attendance at classes.

Mrs. Moos was fortunate in visiting Soviet schools during the period when the new educational program was being widely discussed and experimentally tried in various educational institutions throughout the country. Her report consequently makes the aims of the new program far clearer than any account we have had so far.

Especially useful in this study is the presentation of the whole development of Soviet education since 1917. This historical background is fundamental to a grasp of the concept of "polytechnical" educational to which the new direction of Soviet education—the bringing of the schools closer to life—is organically related.

Apart from its historical and theoretical material, and its lively description of the school system in action, this pamphlet by an experienced American educator is crammed with a storehouse of facts that make it an essential source for any serious understanding of the Soviet system of education. M. Y.

**Important Soviet articles
in English translation**

SOVIET HIGHLIGHTS

*A new monthly journal surveying
Soviet thought and developments*

In the September issue:

Biographical notes on Khrushchev
Ehrenburg's comment on the
Khrushchev visit

An article by Khrushchev on problems of automation, productivity, efficiency and other aspects of Soviet economy.

**\$6.00 per year
(12 issues)**

**50 cents per copy
(prepaid)**

Order through

**INTERNATIONAL ARTS
AND SCIENCES PRESS**

**33 West 42nd Street
New York City 36, N. Y.**

SOVIET EDUCATION TODAY AND TOMORROW

by Elizabeth Moos

A new pamphlet documented by personal observation of Soviet Schools and discussion with Soviet educators.

**96 pages — Illustrated
Single copy 50c — 5 copies for \$2.00**

Order through

**NATIONAL COUNCIL OF
AMERICAN-SOVIET FRIENDSHIP
114 East 32nd St., New York 16, N. Y.**

INSIDE THE KHRUSHCHEV ERA

by Giuseppe Boffa

Boffa was correspondent in Moscow for "L'Unita" during the last five years. He has written the first account in depth of Mr. Khrushchev's rise to leadership, his setbacks, his struggles, his successes.

Written by an eyewitness who kept his eyes and mind open — the result is an up-to-the-minute, controversial book guaranteed to excite and delight.

Price \$5.00

Order through the publishers:

Marzani & Munsell, Inc.

100 W. 23rd St., New York 11, N. Y.

NEW SOVIET FILMS

EUGENE ONEGIN

(Operatic version with
Tchaikovsky's music)

THE CAPTAIN'S DAUGHTER

THE HOUSE I LIVE IN

SOVIET RUSSIA TODAY

GIRL WITH A GUITAR

Artkino Pictures, Inc.

723 SEVENTH AVE. NEW YORK 19

Telephone: Circle 5-6570