

SOCIAL SCIENCES✓

✓DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRARY NOV 14 1959

NOVEMBER, 1959

25¢

New World

REVIEW

Special Anniversary Issue

US-USSR RELATIONS AND THE EISENHOWER-KHRUSHCHEV AGREEMENT

42 YEARS OF THE SOVIET UNION

Albert Rhys Williams

W. E. B. Du Bois

Barrows Dunham

Rockwell Kent

Corliss Lamont

Holland Roberts

Anton Refregier

Jessica Smith

Richard Morford

Anna Louise Strong

NEW WORLD REVIEW

NOVEMBER 1959

Two Great Anniversaries

"An Idea Whose Time
Has Come" *Jessica Smith* 3

The Dream of Socialism *Albert Rhys Williams* 11

"The Wings of the Future" *Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois* 14

Soviet Russia After 21 Years *Rockwell Kent* 18

A Visit Among Soviet
Philosophers *Corliss Lamont* 21

On the USSR and China *Barrows Dunham* 26

Tamerlane's Uzbekistan Today *Dr. Mordecai Johnson* 31

An Artist Visits the USSR *Holland Roberts* 33

The China-India Border *Anton Refregier* 41

National Council of American-
Soviet Friendship *Anna Louise Strong* 46

Khrushchev Across America *Richard Morford* 53

Inside the Khrushchev Era—
Guiseppa Boffa *Jessica Smith* 57

BOOKS-MOVIES-RECORDS

The Bolshoi Ballet Story *Murray Young* 65

Soviet Commitment to Education *Eugene Onegin—Film* 66

New Recordings *Sidney Finkelstein* 68

Sidney Finkelstein 69

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

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

Vol. 27, No. 10, November, 1959. Second
Class postage paid at New York, N. Y. Sub-
scription \$2.50 per year. \$1.25 for 6 months
(Canadian, \$3.00, foreign \$3.50 a year.
Draw money orders or checks payable in
New York.) Published monthly by the
N.W.R. Publications, Inc., 34 West 15th
Street, New York 11. N. Y. Indexed in Bul-
letin of the Public Affairs Information Ser-
vice. Phone: CHelsea 3-0666.
PRINTED IN U.S.A.

209

TO OUR READERS

This special, enlarged November An-
niversary issue in honor of 42 years of
the USSR and 26 years of American-
Soviet relations, appears at a particu-
larly favorable moment in the develop-
ing international situation.

The visit of Premier Khrushchev to
our country in September was a land-
mark in the history of American rela-
tions with the Soviet Union, and it was
as well a significant stage in the long
struggle for world peace.

Never before have the people of
America been so alert to world prob-
lems, never before have they questioned
and discussed so earnestly the meaning
of events. This means that potential
readers of NWR are everywhere.

We appeal to you as long-time sub-
scribers to see that this issue gets as
wide a distribution as possible. Send
copies to your friends so that they may
become regular subscribers.

More readers will help us continue
our existence so that we can bring you
the kind of informative material we
all need in the struggle for interna-
tional understanding and peace. At
the same time we need money immedi-
ately if we are to continue publishing.

Will you send us at once as generous
a contribution as possible?

PLEASE FILL OUT AND
MAIL TODAY

NEW WORLD REVIEW

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

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

I enclose \$..... for a subscription.
\$2.50 for one year. \$1.00 for five months.
(Note if renewal).

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

Name

Street

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

Two Great Anniversaries— *and the Khrushchev Visit*

by JESSICA SMITH

TWO anniversaries of measureless importance to humanity take place during the month of November: November 7, the 42nd anniversary of the establishment of the world's first socialist state by the Russian Revolution of 1917 under the leadership of V. I. Lenin; and November 16, the 26th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the United States and the Soviet Union.

The meaning of these two anniversaries to the people of the Soviet Union, the people of our country and the world, is best brought home to us by a review and assessment of the visit to the United States of Nikita Khrushchev, Chairman of the Council of Ministers and First Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which took place September 15-28—thirteen days that changed and shook the world.

This visit brought home to millions and millions of the American people the long, long way the Soviet Union has come in its 42 years of existence, its phenomenal economic, cultural and scientific achievements. Despite all outside opposition, armed foreign intervention, and the vast destruction of World War II, the USSR has reached a point where Khrushchev can challenge the United States to peaceful competition with confidence that his country in ten years or so will surpass us in both over-all and per

capita production and in the standard of living of its people. Yes—they reached for the moon—and succeeded in getting there too!

The visit also brought home to our people the meaning of American-Soviet relations for the lives of all of us, of all the peoples in the world. It brought the hope that the era of friendship and cooperation which meant our common victory over the fascist powers would reopen, and bring with it an even greater victory, a victory over war forever, a common victory, through peaceful competition, over hunger and want in a world without war.

The Results of the Visit

It would take a book of encyclopedic proportions to cover all phases of this historic visit, all that Khrushchev said, all that was said about him, all the American people learned, all the Soviet Premier learned about us. In all our history there has never been such coverage of a single event as that of the visit of Premier Khrushchev, his family and entourage, over press, TV, radio, through every avenue and organ of reporting and photographing news events and forming public opinion. And all this, of course, meant an immense widening of knowledge of the Soviet Union and mutual understanding between the two countries.

In our last issue we covered the

highlights of the first part of the visit, including the magnificent proposal for total disarmament within four years made by Khrushchev in his address to the United Nations. That report must therefore be read as a prelude to the present review.

To begin with the end of the visit, its main general results were recorded in the joint U.S.-Soviet Communiqué issued on September 29 after the talks at Camp David.

The Communiqué recorded, first, agreement on mutual efforts to find a solution of the question of general disarmament, as the most important one facing the world today. It was agreed to reopen negotiations on Germany and the question of a peace treaty, and on Berlin, with a view of achieving a solution "in accordance with the interests of all concerned" and of the maintenance of peace. It was recorded that useful conversations were held on trade and other matters affecting American-Soviet relations, and that progress leading to an early agreement was made in the matter of further exchanges of persons and ideas. The decision that the return visit of President Eisenhower would take place next spring was noted.

Of paramount importance was the announcement of the Eisenhower-Khrushchev agreement "that all outstanding international questions should be settled not by the application of force but by peaceful means through negotiation."

Behind and beyond the formal agreements reached in the communiqué are not only further details that will contribute to their realization, but far-reaching results of the visit which will surely affect the whole course of human history. We

cannot cover all facets of the impact of the visit in all areas of U.S. life and world affairs. Here are a few which seem of primary significance:

- The visit and the talks, as Harrison Salisbury put it in the *New York Times* September 28, produced *at least a limited armistice in the cold war*. Already, of course, groups opposing this armistice are trying to violate it. But we firmly believe that the forces of peace are strong enough, if they will but put forth their efforts with greater unity and determination, to utilize the armistice to bring about the final end of the cold war.

- The question of total and universal disarmament is now and forever in the forefront of the struggle for peace. It has first place on the UN agenda, and on the action agenda of peace forces everywhere. Many who originally expressed skepticism have had to change their tune, and take the Soviet proposal with the utmost seriousness. Attempts to dismiss it as unworkable and unacceptable because lacking in inspection arrangements until the program is completed, have been proved fallacious in view of Khrushchev's own original statement, which critics ignored, and his later enlargement on it, that *control and inspection must accompany every phase of the plan*. Already there is progress toward the ending of nuclear weapons tests as a first step.

- A Summit meeting this winter, despite those circles still seeking to avoid it, now seems in sight. This was made possible by Mr. Khrushchev's meeting the President's condition that there must be some progress toward a solution on Berlin.

and the removal of what had previously been considered the Soviet "threat" of unilateral action if a settlement was not reached within a given time. Mr. Khrushchev assured President Eisenhower that no time limit would be placed on renewed East-West negotiations on Berlin, and followed this up by an official statement to this effect after his return to Moscow.

- The personal relationship established between the heads of the two leading world powers may be counted one of the happiest results of the visit. If the original reception to Khrushchev was correct but cool, photographs and news reports indicated that an aura of human warmth and friendship hung over the Camp David talks, the visit to the President's Gettysburg farm, and the famous "conference" with the grandchildren. A mutual respect, a mutual conviction in the sincerity of the desire of both for peace, seemed to have been developed, and was reflected in later statements of both men.

- Prospects for progress in mutually advantageous trade seemed heightened by the Soviet agreement to reopen stalemated negotiations on a Lend Lease settlement. Such a settlement, State Department officials have explained, would mean that the Soviet Union would no longer be under the legal ban against extension of long term credits to countries in default to the United States.

- Exchange in various fields will be greatly stepped up as a result of the visit. A new agreement for expanded cultural and scientific interchange is in process of negotiation. An important agreement was reached

for the two countries to engage in a number of joint health research projects on such questions as cancer, heart disease and others that touch the lives of us all. This will be carried out through specific coordinated research projects, exchanges of scientists to work in the laboratories of both countries, exchange of visits by medical scientists and increased exchanges of technical information. Closer U.S.-Soviet cooperation in peaceful uses of atomic energy is already indicated, with the tour of Soviet atomic energy installations in the USSR by AEC Chairman John A. McCone, and a reciprocal tour to be made here by Prof. Vassily Yemelyanov, director of the Main Administration for Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy in the USSR. In the United Nations, the USSR has proposed a UN forum and international conference for the exchange of space exploration results, and also indicated a willingness to join a non-governmental approach to the problem. With another conference expected under the auspices of the Committee on Space Research (continuing cooperation inaugurated under the International Geophysical Year) there will inevitably be greater U.S.-USSR cooperation in this field.

- Finally, there is the completely new image the American people now have of Nikita Khrushchev and the country he represents. How different this image from the one presented for so many years by the cold war propagandists! Here was the very head and symbol of the country depicted as our enemy through all the cold war years, appearing in millions of American homes as a warm, down-to-earth hu-

man being, incessantly urging peace, cooperation, friendship; deeply serious in his mission, yet full of wit; proud of his country and its achievements and ready to talk about them at the drop of a hat (was he not met everywhere with peans of praise to America and our way of life?); quick to take offense when insulted—as who worthy of his mettle would not be—brimming with vitality, a kidder of the kind Americans love ("MY capitalist—his recurrent reference to Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge who accompanied him as the President's representative in his tour). Despite all the elements hostile to his visit, Khrushchev showed deep appreciation of the real feelings and aspirations of the American people, never losing sight of his main purpose—to cement better relations with our country, to end the cold war and all threats of war, to end the evil arms and nuclear weapons race and enter into an era of peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition in the struggle for a better life for all people.

The New Image of Khrushchev

We can only give a few samples of comments in the press which in the past had pictured the Soviet Premier in a very different light.

James Reston, in the *New York Times*, September 22:

... Most observers think he did change the American image of Khrushchev the man. The popular illusion of the past, that he was a rough and uncouth politician who was forever threatening war, has certainly been changed.

He talked peace wherever he went. For thirteen days, in every speech, every conference, every toast, every casual talk with anybody he met, he argued the cause of his Government with immense vitality.

In the process he came across as a tougher, more talented, more human, more amiable figure than he was widely supposed to be before he arrived.

His family, and particularly his wife, greatly helped to change the old impression. . . . Official Washington, on the whole, is glad that he came and glad that he got away in reasonably good spirits. . . . The Premier has convinced a lot of people high in the United States Government that his intensity of conviction on the need to avoid war is genuine.

Other comments in the *Times*: "Americans saw that he was tough and resourceful, at the same time they saw that he has some engaging human qualities—vitality, an earthy humor, a quick mind." "An effervescent personality." "Full of dynamism, earthy parables, mental agility." The *New York Herald Tribune's* malicious Joseph Alsop found him "marvelously humorous." The *Wall Street Journal* spoke of his "obvious personal talents," called him "very fast on his feet," quoted big business men as saying, "The visit may serve to make the American people realize we can't just sit down and expect to stay ahead of Russia, we'll have to work at it." "No one who has heard or seen him can fail to realize that in his own language he is one of the most eloquent men in the world." The *New York Post*, "Khrushchev scored an extraordinary success." An anti-Soviet woman correspondent on the tour told Joe North of *The Worker* that Khrushchev had "such an abundance of life, such cheer, such gaiety and gallantry" in the many moments of adversity she had seen him in during the trip that she had been forced to revise her estimate, that a first "startled, begrudged respect" had turned to admiration and liking,

and she had come to believe in his "simple sincerity and devotion to peace."

Eleven-year-old David Eisenhower to his 6th grade classmates:

He said he has grandchildren, boys and girls, just our ages. He asked me to come to Moscow when our grandfather goes, and I'd like to go. He seemed like a real nice man..

There were, of course, some different appraisals. There were sour notes from Harry S. Truman and former Secretary of State Dean Acheson, from New York's Governor Rockefeller, and from Vice President Nixon (working both sides of the street in his Presidential aspirations).

There were instances of hostility and rudeness. There were ugly, war-inciting ads. There were a few anti-Communist rallies held by such groups as the reactionary magazine *National Review*, Crusade for America, and various refugee and "captive nations" groups and their American friends. Over these affairs hung the stench of McCarthyism; sponsors and speakers were professional anti-Sovietees, rabid pro-fascist elements. Conservative newspapermen, reporting them, were shocked at their behavior. A group of Senators and Congressmen called for "national mourning." Some of the Catholic hierarchy, like Cardinal Spellman, assailed the visit. Labor leaders—of this more later—joined the pack. There were, here and there, hostile pickets, mostly refugees.

All these were answered by welcoming statements and actions of leading Americans who understood the importance of the visit to our

country's highest interests and peace, by thousands of friendly letters sent directly to Premier Khrushchev and his party, by thousands of warm letters sent to the press throughout the country, by invitations to Khrushchev that flooded the State Department and the Soviet Embassy. Hearst lady (?) reporters who wrote with revolting rudeness about Mrs. Khrushchev's clothes were met with an indignant storm of protest. Pickets were assailed by others in the crowds ("Aw, shut UPI!" said a man outside the Waldorf to an Eastern European refugee making scurrilous remarks).

The main answer came from the great rank and file of ordinary people throughout the country who gave evidence in innumerable ways of the new spirit of peace and friendship the visit created, and the great welcoming crowds who waved and shouted their greetings throughout the trip. Now it is clear why those first crowds—very large crowds—that turned out in Washington, were so silent. The Washington police have confirmed the story that just before the official motorcade passed, a car drove along the parade route carrying a sign with big letters: "No Cheers or Applause. Be Courteous and Silent."

Throughout the world, the visit was hailed by the great majority of leaders and people as a great advance toward peace. Britain's Prime Minister MacMillan, making the most of it, rode to victory in the elections on the strength of his own earlier visit to Moscow and support of a Summit meeting, swamping the Labor Party whose leadership had been too weak on the peace issue, despite the militant stand of major

trade unions and rank and file membership.

In the socialist world, and especially in the Soviet Union, there was rejoicing that the ice of the cold war was beginning to break up, and a new era of better East-West relations dawning.

The President on the Visit

At his first conference following Premier Khrushchev's visit (Sept. 28), President Eisenhower declared that he felt a beginning had been made toward melting the ice of international tensions, and referred to his talks with the Soviet Premier on how much of the wealth of both countries is going into things that are "negative and sterile and purely defensive."

Confirming Mr. Khrushchev's version of the "conference" with his grandchildren (when the Soviet Premier said he had agreed with them that Spring would be the nicest time to visit Moscow, because everything was in flower then, nothing frozen), the President spoke of this as a "heartening family scene that any American would like to see taking place between his grandchildren and a stranger." On his own impressions of Premier Khrushchev, he said:

He is a dynamic and arresting personality. He is a man that uses every possible debating method available to him. He is capable of great flights, you might say, of mannerism and disposition, from one of almost negative, difficult attitude, to the most easy, affable, genial type of discussion. . . . I think the American people sensed that they were seeing a man who is an extraordinary personality, there is no question about it.

Most of the questions directed to

the President had to do with Germany and Berlin. He was asked at the outset "whether the renunciation of force mentioned in the communique means that Mr. Khrushchev now has withdrawn any Soviet threats or ultimatums with regard to Berlin." The President emphasized that "no one is under duress and no one is under any kind of threat," and that as a matter of fact Mr. Khrushchev had stated emphatically that he had never had any intention of presenting anything that was to be interpreted as "duress or compulsion." Mr. Eisenhower made clear that the negotiations to be reopened would try to find a solution in the interests of all concerned.

From the President's further answers on the questions of Berlin, it appeared that while Khrushchev on his side had made concessions in removing what the United States had interpreted as a "threat" to its occupation rights, the President himself had also gained a new understanding of the Soviet position and might in the future assume a more flexible attitude. Asked whether the agreement with Khrushchev meant there could be no fixed time limit on Western occupation rights and access to West Berlin, Mr. Eisenhower said:

Well, of course, there can be no fixed time limit. We do say this, all of us agree that this is an abnormal situation, all the world does.

Here is a free city, sitting inside a Communist country, and 110 miles from Western Germany of which it feels it is a part. Therefore, the only way you can get a solution is by negotiations that will probably take some time, and we agree that these would not be unnecessary or unduly extended, but we did say there is no fixed time limit . . .

He reiterated later the "abnormality" of the Berlin situation.

The President indicated that his former objections to a Summit Conference had been eliminated, and that the way was now open to one.

Khrushchev's Report in Moscow

In an address on his return to Moscow, September 28, the Soviet Premier gave a most positive appraisal of the results of his visit, reviewing all the details of his trip, expressing thanks to all those who had aided him, the warm welcome he had received, as well as noting some of the minority hostile reactions. At several points he expressed his admiration for President Eisenhower's "wise statesmanship," his courage and will power in assessing the present international situation. He also expressed his conviction that President Eisenhower is sincerely anxious to end the cold war, although this process will still take time. He declared:

I wish to tell you dear comrades, that I do not doubt the President's intention to exert his will and efforts to reach agreement between our two countries, to create friendly relations between our nations and to solve the urgent problems of the interests of consolidating peace.

At the same time I got the impression that there are forces in America who do not work in the same direction as the President. These forces are for the continuation of the cold war and for the arms race. I would not be in a hurry to say whether these forces are large or small, influential or not influential, and whether the forces supporting the President—and he is backed by the absolute majority of the American people—can win. . . . But we shall not rest idle . . . we shall do everything we can to tilt the barometer's hand away from "Storm" and even from "Changeable" to show "Fine."

The text of Mr. Khrushchev's report to his people needs to be read in full for an understanding of what the trip meant to him. (It was published in the *New York Times*, September 29.) Most important and eloquent is the opening section in which he sets forth the reasons all far-sighted statesmen must have to end the present situation which could have such grave consequences to the people of the world, and to normalize international relations. This portion of the speech follows.

FROM KHRUSHCHEV'S HOMECOMING SPEECH

THE Twentieth Century is a century of the greatest flourishing of human thought and genius. In our time people create with their own hands the things that mankind dreamed of for centuries, expressing these dreams in tales, which seemed to be sheer fantasy. Must we, in this period of the flourishing of human genius which is penetrating the secrets of nature and harnessing its mighty forces, put up with the preservation of relations that existed between people when man was still a beast?

If in those distant times these relations could be explained by man's being in the first stage of his development and differing but little from animals, today, when man has reached an unparalleled level in the development of his scientific knowledge and subordinates, step by step, the forces of nature to his will, making them serve society, today nothing can justify the preservation of such relations as existed between primitive people.

Our time can and should become a time of the realization of great ideals, a time of peace and progress.

The Soviet Government realized this long ago. Precisely for this reason we have repeatedly offered the Great Powers to arrange a summit meeting so as

to exchange views on urgent international problems. When we made these proposals, we believed in man's reason. We believed that, given a wise approach, the proponents of various political views, countries with different social systems, will be able to find a common language so as to resolve correctly and in the interests of consolidating peace the contemporary problems that alarm all mankind.

In our age of great technical progress, in conditions when there are states with different social systems, international problems cannot be resolved successfully otherwise than on principles of peaceful coexistence. There is no other way.

Those people who say they do not understand what peaceful coexistence is and are fearful of it contribute, willingly or unwillingly, to the further development of the cold war which will certainly extend if we do not interfere and stop it. It will reach a pitch where a spark might result, capable of producing a world war.

Much would perish in this war. It would be too late to discuss what peaceful coexistence means when the talking will be done by such frightful means of destruction as atomic and hydrogen bombs, as ballistic rockets which are practically impossible to locate and which are capable of delivering nuclear warheads to any part of the globe. To disregard this is to shut one's eyes, stop one's ears and bury one's head as the ostrich does when in danger.

But if we people imitate the ostrich and hide our head in sand, the question will arise: What is the use of having this head if it is unable to avert the threat to its very life?

No, we must display the reason of man, confidence in this reason, confidence in the possibility of reaching agreement with statesmen of different countries, and mobilize people by joint efforts to avert the war danger. It is necessary to have the will power and courage to go against those who persist in continuing the cold war. It is neces-

sary to bar the road to it, to thaw the ice and normalize international relations.

(Turn to page 57)

FROM US-SOVIET COMMUNIQUE

... The Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. and the President have agreed that these discussions have been useful in clarifying each other's position on a number of subjects. The talks were not undertaken to negotiate issues.

It is hoped, however, that their exchanges of views will contribute to a better understanding of the motives and position of each, and thus to the achievement of a just and lasting peace.

The Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. and the President of the United States agreed that the question of general disarmament is the most important one facing the world today. Both Governments will make every effort to achieve a constructive solution of this problem.

In the course of the conversations an exchange of views took place on the question of Germany, including the question of peace treaty with Germany, in which the positions of both sides were expounded.

With respect to the specific Berlin question, an understanding was reached, subject to the approval of the other parties directly concerned, that negotiations would be reopened with a view to achieving a solution which would be in accordance with the interests of all concerned and in the interest of the maintenance of peace.

In addition to these matters, useful conversations were held on a number of questions affecting the relations between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States. These subjects included the question of trade between the two countries. With respect to an increase in exchanges of persons and ideas, substantial progress was made in discussions between officials and it is expected that certain agreements will be reached in the near future.

The Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. and the President of the United States agreed that all outstanding international questions should be settled not by the application of force but by peaceful means through negotiation. . . .

September 29, 1959

"An Idea Whose Time Has Come"

by ALBERT RHYS WILLIAMS

A CONSIDERABLE number of Americans were privileged to be eyewitnesses of the October Revolution. While John Reed and I were the only out-and-out Socialists, to many others the Revolution was a deep and lasting experience. In our casual meetings over the years in New York and elsewhere I noted, as they viewed the Revolution from different angles and with different temperaments, what aspects made the deepest impression.

To some its greatness lay in the vast number of peoples involved—six times more than in the French Revolution, sixty times more than in the American Revolution.

To Colonel Raymond Robins it was the dedication and daring and erudition of the leaders—especially of Lenin. In point of fact, on the basis of the number of books written and languages spoken that first Council of Commissars was more cultured than any other cabinet of ministers in the world.

Most impressive to the University of Wisconsin professor, E. A. Ross, was the elemental power and passion of the insurgent peoples: "The robbed and oppressed masses—180

million men, women and children—swept forward to their long cherished goals like a river of molten lava that could not be stopped or turned aside!"

Most impressive to Judge Thomas Thacher and Alex Gumberg was the ease and celerity with which the Soviets became the government. An almost bloodless revolution until the assassin's bullets struck Lenin, and Intervention began.

While each of these aspects of the October Revolution was part of its greatness, it is something else that accounts for its continuing impact on the world. Something else lifted it into a wholly different category from all other revolutions and made it, according to H. G. Wells, the most important event in history since the rise of Islam. In the words of the Roman Catholic historian, Father Edmund A. Walsh, "the most important event since the fall of the Roman Empire."

That greatness lies in the actions inspired by the epoch-making sentence—as I have often repeated—spoken by Lenin on that fateful night in Smolny 42 years ago. Still- ing with a wave of his hand the thunderous applause that greeted him, he said, "Comrades! We will now take up the building of socialism."

Spoken in a simple matter-of-fact manner, for the moment few in that tense assembly grasped the full import of those words. But sitting

ALBERT RHYS WILLIAMS was an eyewitness to the historic events of 1917 and to later phases of Soviet development. He has through the years made important contributions to Americans' understanding of the USSR. Among his many books are, *Lenin, the Man and His Work*, *Through the Russian Revolution and The Russian Land*.

by my side John Reed, always alert to the crucial and the dramatic, hastily jotted them down in his notebook and heavily underscored them. He rightly discerned that in that sentence there was dynamite enough to shake the world, and we may add—to continue to shake it to this day.

It declared that the socialist society of justice, peace and plenty for which generations had worked and fought and died was henceforth the objective of the peoples of a sixth part of the earth. To the building of socialism it committed all their resources and energies.

A stupendous undertaking at any time in any country, in war-ravaged Russia it was the height of audacity. Everywhere hunger and cold. Typhus and sabotage. The army disintegrating, the Germans advancing. Transport paralyzed. Factories at a standstill. On top of all these and a hundred other grievous problems confronting the new-formed government was a still more crucial and formidable one. That was starting the economy going on an entirely new and socialist basis.

In the immense literature on socialism there was much about its ideals, its advantages and on the ways of making a revolution. But little or nothing on what to do on the morning after the revolution. Seeking light on this in every quarter, Lenin twice accosted me with an urgent request, "Tell me, please, where and how I can obtain the work of the American comrade, Daniel De Leon?" Lenin had heard that this one-time professor at Columbia University in New York was among the few who had written on the problems of creating a new social

order. But he found little guidance in De Leon or anyone else for this colossal, pioneering enterprise on which the Soviets were embarking.

"Nothing is so difficult to begin," said that cynical but acute observer of political affairs, Machiavelli, "so perilous to carry through, so uncertain of success as to take the lead in the organization of a new order of life."

Formidable as were the internal perils and difficulties with which the Soviets had to grapple, they were immeasurably increased by the antagonism of the outside world. As in 1789 the forces of reaction sought to crush the French Revolution, so in 1917 they sought in the mordant words of Churchill "to strangle the Bolshevik baby in its cradle." With armies converging on Russia from all points of the compass, socialism found itself fighting for its right to exist on seventeen fronts. There is no need of repeating here that heroic story and how at last the counter-revolutionists were forced to give up the struggle.

But they did not give up their hostility to the Soviets and hopefully looked—and worked—for collapse from within. "The last desperate bid for popular support by a tottering regime," they called the First Five-Year Plan, and in derision dubbed it "a blueprint of the millennium," "a dream and fantasy of statisticians."

But the Soviets went ahead vigorously translating that dream into reality. "In the course of a little over a decade," in the words of the *London Economist*, "the Soviets made the industrial progress that in most other countries has taken generations." At the same time there was

a vast increase in collectivization and in the socialist sector of the nation's economy.

In all this socialism was showing its power and mettle. But most people afflicted with a deep conservatism are strongly prejudiced in favor of the social system in which they live. Convinced that their own way of life is the only right and proper one they will not readily accept another radically different from their own. Believing that a great nation like Russia could not long continue functioning on a socialist basis they were always looking hopefully for any sign of return to the capitalist way of life.

On my return to America in 1928 a famous editor, Herbert Bayard Swope, proposed my writing a series of articles for a chain of newspapers. "In this writing," he assured me, "you will have complete freedom. All you need is to show how the basis of our society—rent, interest and profit—are gradually, perhaps for the time imperceptibly, re-establishing themselves in Russia." Just as the old Russian peasant believed that the world rested on three whales, great numbers in the West really believe that a good and going society—nay, civilization itself—rests on these three capitalist whales—rent, interest and profit.

This disbelief in the strength and

dynamics of socialism showed itself when the Nazi legions at the peak of their power marched into the Soviet Union in 1941. "Russia is a colossus with feet of clay," cried the skeptics. "A few weeks at the most and the swastika will be flying from the towers of the Kremlin."

Then came Stalingrad—the rout of the Nazis—the victorious march of the Red Army into Berlin. Even after this triumph, doubts as to the power and stability of the Soviets persisted in many quarters. But the advent of the Sputniks put an end to such illusions, and now from far-ranging travelers in the Soviet land—such as Adlai Stevenson, Averell Harriman—came a stream of reports testifying to the vast achievements in almost every realm of activity.

Impressive as are Soviet achievements in the Arctic, in the Olympics, in medicine, science, rocketry, they are the more impressive and significant in that they were done under the aegis of socialism. They bear witness to how steadfastly and successfully the Soviets have adhered to that commitment of Lenin 42 years ago in the face of incredible obstacles and ordeals. They give point to Victor Hugo's saying that all the forces in the world cannot defeat an idea whose time has come.

CHARLIE CHAPLIN SPEAKS FOR PEACE

CHARLIE CHAPLIN on his recent 70th birthday made the following statement:

"My hope is that we shall abolish all atomic and hydrogen weapons before they abolish us. We must have peace and settle all our problems around the conference table.

"The future of the world calls for modern thinking. We must use the full force of our intelligence and stop thinking in terms of homicidal methods for settling our differences."

The Dream of Socialism

by DR. W. E. B. DU BOIS

HUMAN minds dream and human dreams come true. Not all dreams, but some. Some day there will be on earth, Liberty, Equality and Brotherhood. Some day but not yet. No Christian nation to-day pretends to follow even afar the ethics of Jesus Christ. But one dream, old and long-pursued was started toward reality forty-two years ago, and today no one in the world denies that socialism is a reality in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. This is reason for world rejoicing that human dreams can come true.

Thinkers have long believed that the evils of capitalism could be cured. But industry supported by private capital ridiculed the idea. They did not deny the evils, but they said that human nature being what it was, would never support a welfare state nor would men work effectively for all instead of striving each for himself. Efforts like the French Commune and many smaller trials failed disastrously; then in 1917 came the Russian Revolution. The world was not content to watch the experiment-making with unbelieving eyes and with no proffer of aid. Oh no! The leading states of the civilized world—

Great Britain, France, the United States, Japan and others made every possible effort to compel the proposed experiment to fail. Perhaps the world has forgotten or certainly wants to forget what was done to the struggling socialist state in Russia from 1917 to 1928 and even later. The Soviet Union was attacked not only by armies and navies, but by spies and traitors; by lies, calumnies and suspicion. It came to be the firmly held accusation of the Western world that Russian socialism was a conspiracy against civilization, a crime against religion and culture and a deliberate attempt to turn the clock of human progress backward. The hurt and heartbreak of those awful years will never be adequately recorded. I saw but the dying shadow of it in 1926 when I first visited the Soviet Union.

Today what a change! Not simply a change of world attitude toward the first socialist nation of the modern world, but what actual change in the status and accomplishment of this nation! This great people whom the Western world confidently expected to starve to death, to flounder in anarchy, to commit suicide in civil revolution, or wallow in crime, is not only well-fed and adequately clothed, increasingly housed in comfortable and sanitary homes, cared for in disease and employed in ever-widening industry, but—and this has long been most difficult for the capitalist world

DR. W. E. B. DU BOIS, renowned Negro scholar and author, received the International Lenin Peace Prize in May of this year. His most recent book, *Mansart Builds a School*, the second volume in his trilogy, *The Black Flame*, was published in October.

to believe—has established the best educational system in the world for children and adults and as a result leads the world in science and research. There are nations in the world with higher average money wage; there are classes of citizens in the United States, Britain and France with higher standards of living; but nowhere on earth is the great mass of the citizens so well protected in sickness and age, so continuously employed and so systematically educated and trained as in the Soviet Union.

Until the launching of Sputnik in 1957, it was customary in the West to regard all Soviet claims of social, scientific and industrial accomplishment as exaggerations or plain lies. Today that is changed. It is admitted that the Soviet Union has successfully established a socialist state. That this state is one of the greatest industrial states of the world and likely soon to lead all others. That the Soviet Union is already leading in education and science and has met the problem of poverty as no other nation. Of its future as a great nation, there is today no doubt.

As proof of this the First Minister of the Soviet Union has visited the United States, has been received with courtesy and in places with enthusiasm, and has spoken clearly and frankly to a nation which has long depicted him and his country as its prime enemy. This alone marks an era. It would have been impossible ten years ago. Yet Nikita Khrushchev did it. It took courage of a high order. It took moral determination and rare physical stamina.

I was afraid when he planned

this trip. I feared that some American fanatic, some constitutional hater of communism, some refugee from the Baltic states or from Hungary would smear him as they annually daub the Fifth Avenue home of the Soviet UN delegation. I held my breath as he sailed the skies and landed on American soil. All did not go well in this remarkable visit. The government was as scared as I was. They took extraordinary pains. Some parts of his trip, like his swift, guarded flight through New York City astonished him and us. His insulting welcome to Los Angeles was inexcusable. But he never faltered and at last in San Francisco basic American decency prevailed. While in Iowa and the great Middle West he was welcomed with the customary cordiality due a great man and a statesman who stands above most of his contemporaries. He was frank. He was a Communist and never denied nor excused it. He answered every question and met every objection, not to the satisfaction of all, but to the confusion of his enemies. He made few converts to communism, but he made thousands of Americans cease to regard communism as a crime and to begin to study it as a great human system of thought and action. He gained the respect of all Americans who listened to him. Especially in his great plea for peace before the United Nations, he made the whole world listen and pause. It was the greatest speech of this insane century.

This does not mean that the battle for socialism and communism is finished. In a sense it has just begun. Capitalism is going to fight tomorrow as never before to

overthrow communism and maintain its grip on the world. In the United States, the preparation for war is still fantastic, and is still supported by vast numbers of Americans. Even those who hate war and would work for peace, do not dare in most cases either to act or even to speak aloud. The Quakers, long peace-makers of the world, confine their efforts to careful statements which avoid any recognition of communism as a permissible goal of decent government and refuse to associate in the United States with known Communists even in efforts of which both approve. I was, at the same time with Khrushchev, granted the International Lenin Peace Prize. I was invited to receive the medal and diploma at a celebration in Moscow. I preferred to wait until I reached home and have the ceremony take place in America. So far I have been unable to arrange this. When the chairman of the awarding committee, a member of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, asked permission to come and award the medal, he was denied a visa.

Above and beyond this the United States continues to try to control nations of Africa, the West Indies and South America by its investments. American capital is decisive in the Union of South Africa and in the Rhodesias. American industry is strong in the Belgian Congo, and North Africa. America stands ready to supplant France in Algeria and the Sudan. We are stirring up trouble in former French Indo-China and infiltrating into Indonesia. We are wooing India and trying to stir up enmity between her and the Soviet Union and China. We have seized and hold Chinese

territory and refuse to recognize 680 million Chinese as a nation with the rights of nationality. We are holding our grip on South America and the West Indies.

This is not the conscious aggression of the American people. Few Americans understand or are conscious of the designs and deeds of American capital. But behind capitalistic control of news and publishing, hides the propaganda of our need of unlimited defense against communist aggression. There are signs, small and too rare, of an awakening conscience on this urge to war; on this stopping of free speech and harnessing of freedom to think. I think I see the signs of dawn, but they are still far away. I hope the Soviet Union will pursue its policy of peace and friendship with America, but that never for a moment will it forget that the United States is still spending for war vast sums of money needed for education, housing, medicine, pensions and abolition of poverty and meantime keeping up her standard of living by exploiting land and labor not only over half the world but in her own land in the case of her Negro citizens.

The conference of Khrushchev with the leaders of labor unions was most revealing. The unions did not dare admit reporters but published only their own garbled version of what was said. They revealed, as most men knew, that they represented not the mass of American workers, but through their leaders were the servants of employers and that their high wage came from capitalist profits made on exploited labor and theft of materials. It is this trade unionism which helped

divide Germany after World War II; which split the attempted union of world trade unionism started in Paris in 1945; that today keeps masses of African workers out of unions entirely and in the United States herds most Negro workers into segregated unions with limited rights. This trade unionism sup-

ports world war and hatred of socialism.

This is the world in which we fight for Peace and Freedom. And in this world we rejoice that a great socialist state has been born, lives and expands in deed and influence and bears in its hands the hopes of mankind.

FURTHER REDUCTION IN SOVIET WORKING DAY

THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Council of Ministers of the USSR and the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions, have adopted a decision to complete the transition of factory and office workers to a reduced working day in the period from the fourth quarter of 1959 to the fourth quarter of 1960. The transition will be effected simultaneously with an adjustment of wages.

The decision envisages the transition of all factory and office workers to a seven-hour working day and those engaged in underground work to a six-hour day.

The decision fixes increased piece rates and a new system of graded rates for workers as well as new salaries for engineering and technical staffs and clerks.

The lowest wage is to be increased at the same time to 400-500 rubles in accordance with the decision of the Twenty-first Congress.

The decision points out that following the workers and employees of the coal industry and the steel industry (and those engaged in underground work) getting a seven-hour working day in 1958-1959, the six-hour day was introduced and new conditions of payment for workers and employees established in the non-ferrous metal industry, the chemistry industry, the cement industry, the manufacture of reinforced concrete articles and structures, the production of salt and ozocerite.

The transition to a shorter working day will begin before the end of this year for factory and office workers in the engineering and metal-working, the oil and gas industries.

The decision emphasizes that the transition to a shorter working day and the simultaneous adjustment of wages—above all, in the principal branches of heavy industry—make an important contribution to the further advance of the socialist economy and the rise in the material and cultural standards of factory and office workers.

September 19, 1959

The Wings of the Future

by ROCKWELL KENT

IT WAS only a year ago that, having just returned from a month's visit to the Soviet Union, I told in *New World Review* of the wonder expressed by many people of the Western world at a traveler's having really been to that dread land—and gotten out of it, alive! Now I have been again, and so have tens of thousands of Americans and countless thousands from the world at large. And in place of wonder at the traveler's hardihood there is in general but envy of his great good fortune. From the beginning of time mankind has been in terror of the vast unknown, peopling it, in the darkness of his mind, with gods or monsters absolute in power and ruthless in its exercise. Knowledge, far more illuminating than the sun itself, has changed all that. We know our universe, and fear it not. Some day, let's hope—no! not "some day" but *now*, and not just hope but *will*—let's will that we shall know our *world*; and, applying to mankind the admonition "Know thyself," come through that knowledge to respect all men.

The millions of Americans who, in fact or televised, have seen and heard Khrushchev and Mikoyan, Oistrakh, Gilels and Kogan, who have

seen the Moissejev Dancers, the Bolshoy Ballet and the Russian Festival have tasted, as it were, the fruits of Soviet culture. And the thousands who have visited the Soviet land have trod the soil and seen the vineyards and the vines that yield it. *The proof of the grapes*—no, this is not a Russian proverb. I've just coined it—*the proof of the grapes is in their wine*. And we who justly pride ourselves upon our high standard of living, the richness, one might say, of our cultural soil, may well remind ourselves that the best wine comes from vines that find their sustenance in gravelly soil. The Soviet "soil" in some respects is harsh. What of the wine?

Somewhere in a well-intentioned book by John Gunther (misentitled, it would seem, "Inside Russia") we are told that foreign visitors are never admitted inside Russian homes. Too bad, it would appear, if it were true. It is so far from true that on our recent trip it was the fate of us two travelers, my wife and me, to see little of external Russia but through the window panes of our friends' houses; and it was our privilege, once that far "inside," to see still deeper—no, let us keep our metaphor—to taste in our friends' minds and hearts the wine that Russian vineyards yield. That wine, warmed by the friendly hands that held the cup to us, had magic properties.

Its potency revealed to us, as though we stood upon a mountain

ROCKWELL KENT, distinguished artist and writer, is Chairman of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. His *Of Men and Mountains*, published last year, is a record in words and drawings of a visit he made with his wife Sally to the USSR and Ireland.

top of time, the deeper meaning of November, 1917. The Revolution was, of course, the human spirit's break from centuries of bondage, the assertion of a people's will to *live*. To live, they claimed as theirs the Russian soil, as theirs to share, to cultivate, build factories and parks and cities on. They claimed its mineral wealth, its forests. Its rivers theirs, they harnessed them for power and to irrigate their fields. They claimed each other's loyalty to each and to the task in hand: the building of a state so strong as to deter intrusion, and so rewarding of its fruits to all, that all should live at last in plenty and in peace. Enough? No. They planned more. Material accomplishments and wealth should not be of themselves the end; they were to be the *means*, the soil and vines (to use our metaphor again) from which a better fruit, a nobler order of mankind should grow. "If this be nature's holy plan"—and in the Revolution it was clearly implicit—may we not someday have reason to rejoice (and not, as Wordsworth wrote, "lament") at what "mankind has made of man"?

Toward the accomplishment of this high purpose, and despite, throughout the years, the appalling devastations of two wars and the Cold War's haemophilia, education has been fostered and advanced at a pace unparalleled in history. Countless thousands of schools and universities, of Houses, Palaces and recreation camps for youth have been built—and operated to capacity. There are schools for students of the arts and crafts, night schools and correspondence schools for working adults; while labor unions vie with

one another in the operation of Houses of Culture for both young and old. *All*, in the Soviet Union, read and write—not only can but *do*. And the use to which the people's literacy is put is evident both in the quality of Russian books and in the vast editions in which good books, great books, great books of all the world are published. So people read—the *masses* do—great books.

In cities large and small all over that vast Soviet land, in army and construction camps, the people hear great music, see the living theater, the ballet, look at art. And yet again, like wealth in *things*, culture is not of its own self the end. "A truly good book," wrote Thoreau (and how often I have quoted this!) "teaches me better than to read it. I must soon lay it down, and continue living on its hint." To live upon the hint of art—of books, plays, pictures, music, ballet—is action that great art impels. And *how* men, living, think and act determines what at last they come to be. Inculcated from earliest childhood, fostered in schools and colleges, inspired by the arts, exemplified in action and honored by rewards is the principle and spirit of peaceful co-existence one with another, the ethic of the brotherhood of man. Human nature, Soviet spokesmen have proclaimed, can and shall be changed. And though quite certainly, thank God!, it can't, human *behavior* unquestionably can be modified, conditioned to cooperative, peaceful living, civilized.

And in the sweet behavior of Soviet youth, in people's courtesy and in the all but total absence of adult violence and crime, in the deeply heartfelt yearning for peace, good

will toward men that is proclaimed by men's very reticence to think or utter evil of their one-time enemies, and in the Soviet people's wholehearted devotion both to the lofty principles of socialism and to their leaders toward its full accomplishment, one must recognize a degree of civilization, of social grace and civic virtue, that does great honor to the Soviet way of life.

Yes, Russian people *are*, as many have observed, much like ourselves. In the display of kindness and affection, to be sure, they are less inhibited; they are better educated, by and large, than we; and in the care of their country, knowing it to be their own, in the cleanliness observed on streets and country roads and parks they show themselves to be—as we, admittedly, do not—"house broken."

Justly proud of their accomplishments, they are not blind to their shortcomings. They incline to generous respect for the accomplishments of others—a respect that, incidentally, was not heightened in regard to us by the tawdry, bargain-basement show we staged this year in Moscow. Nor, in their pride, did they much heed the disrespect implicit in its tawdriness, aiming, it would seem, by the general restraint of public criticism to show at once the courtesy due guests and

their determination to be friends.

Yet Soviet culture that flowers and bears fruit today is rooted in the age-old Russian soil, and draws its sustenance from all the past. It is a river, broad and deep by virtue of the streams that in its course have entered it. Folk arts, folk ways are not discarded and forgotten, nor is tradition scorned. "Honor thy father," we are told: this, respecting all the past as parent of today's accomplishments, they do.

We had hoped, last summer, in the company of a dear Russian friend to visit Kizhi and be shown the marvels of old wooden architecture that are there. But time forbade. So on our departure from Leningrad our friend gave us a beautiful drawing he had made of the Church of the Transfiguration at Kizhi.

Here is his beautiful inscription to us written on the drawing's back. Read in it a Russian's simple pride in Russia's past, in Soviet achievement now and faith in Soviet wings:

"And this time we missed the miracle of a Russian axe—but next time we shall see everything—the wonders of a country that was always itself, the country that restores every trace of Russian history and at the same time builds the wings of the future—Sputniks."

BOOK ON VAN CLIBURN PUBLISHED IN MOSCOW

A BOOK about Van Cliburn, the young American pianist who won the International Tchaikovsky Piano Competition last year, has just been published in Moscow.

Relating the story of Cliburn's childhood and his musical training, much space is also devoted to his trip to Moscow and the concerts he gave in New York accompanied by the orchestra under the direction of Kirill Kondrashin, the Soviet conductor.

The book sold out as soon as it was published.

Soviet Russia After 21 Years

by CORLISS LAMONT

IN MY recent six months' trip around the world, trying to make up for the State Department's refusal to let me travel abroad for almost a decade, I naturally spent considerable time in the Soviet Union where I had not been since 1938. Shortly after my return in that year I wrote: "It is my own feeling that the Soviet people are well-nigh invincible in an economic, moral and military sense. From without, Soviet Socialism can undoubtedly be set back, but hardly destroyed. . . . The very fact that, over a territory far larger than the United States and non-Russian Europe combined, socialist economic planning has for many years been operating on a fairly efficient basis proves that it *can be done*."

Twenty-one years later, in the summer of 1959, what I observed in the USSR shows clearly that my earlier expression, "It can be done," has become a decided understatement; now it is accurate to say that Soviet planning is carried out on so wide a scale and so successfully that the whole world, including the most conservative capitalists, is tak-

ing note, if not alarm, and trying to fathom what is the secret of Soviet Russia's remarkable achievements. After enormous setbacks resulting from the Nazi invasion, Soviet Socialism has come fully into its own and is operating with marked effectiveness in all sectors. It gives promise of becoming more productive in due course than even the capitalist economy of the United States. And Soviet productivity not only proceeds with practically no unemployment, but is able to support certain social and cultural accomplishments already more advanced than those of any other country.

I think especially of Soviet Russia's socialized medicine, which Britain is seeking to rival; of the USSR's impressive educational system, which has abolished illiteracy and forged dramatically ahead both in the field of general education and scientific training; and of recent technological wonders in the exploration of outer space and sending rockets to the moon and its vicinity. As to the educational system, it is difficult to work out exact figures for comparison; but I believe the soundest estimate available is that the Soviet Union allocates 10 or 15 per cent of its national income to education, while the United States spends about 3 per cent for the same purpose.

In June and July my wife and I spent a month in Soviet Russia and

DR. CORLISS LAMONT, philosopher, writer and lecturer, has participated for many years in the struggle for civil liberties in this country and for international understanding and peace. He has published among other books, *The Peoples of the Soviet Union*, *Soviet Civilization*, and *The Philosophy of Humanism*.

saw at first hand the great progress that had been made. Moscow was in some ways hardly recognizable because of the tremendous building and city planning programs that had been effected. Everywhere as we drove around the city there seemed to be beautiful broad boulevards—twice as wide as New York's Park Avenue—and fine new apartment houses. However, when we looked closely at the apartment houses, it was evident that some of them had been shoddily constructed and hurriedly finished to cope with Moscow's ever insistent housing program. The cold weather had dealt harshly here and there with tiles and plaster on the outside of buildings. And occasionally it had become necessary to put wire netting near the base of a structure in order to prevent debris from falling upon passers-by.

We found that architectural styles had improved little since 1938 and were, with the notable exception of the unique subway stations, either drab or grandiose. From our hotel window we could see six of Moscow's new skyscrapers, including the University of Moscow, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and two big hotels. The buildings looked splendid from a distance, but when you got close up the gingerbread decorations became obtrusive. The Soviet authorities themselves have become aware of these various defects; and there is now under way throughout the country a far-going movement for the improvement and modernization of architecture.

While we were in Moscow my wife and I of course talked with many different types of Soviet people, especially in the professions.

Soviet individuals did not have the slightest hesitation to visit with us, or with other American travelers and foreign visitors in general from capitalist countries. It was a boom year for tourists in the USSR; and it is very hard to understand why American State Department officials still refer to the Soviet "Iron Curtain," a malicious phrase that was never justified.

One of the persons we saw most of was our old friend Vladimir Kazakevich, a Russian who for many years brilliantly taught and lectured in the United States on Soviet affairs. After the Cold War began, the U.S. Immigration authorities began to get rough with him; and he chose to go back to the Soviet Union rather than to endure insult and persecution from the McCarthy gang. Mr. Kazakevich has a good job in the American section of the Institute for World Economy and International Relations. He is one of the outstanding Soviet experts on America.

Some years ago the well-known ex-spy and professional informer, Elizabeth T. Bentley, made a number of false statements about Kazakevich in her book, *Out of Bondage*. Referring to his return to the USSR, she said: "I often wonder whether he is six feet under now." This suggestion that Kazakevich had been shot is typical of Miss Bentley's weird writings.

Another Soviet citizen who greatly impressed us was Professor of Psychology A. R. Luria, whose article on Soviet Schools for the Handicapped appeared in *New World Review* in 1958. I was particularly interested in his views on psychoanalysis. He stated that while most

Freudian theories have zero for verification, Soviet psychologists do not discard psychoanalysis completely. They do, however, insist on proof for any psychoanalytic hypothesis. Professor Luria asserted that Freud gave too much emphasis to animalistic and biological factors in man, who also happens to be a social being.

During the Second World War the Soviet psychologists and doctors expected a great deal of neurosis in the Soviet Army and among the civilian population; but very little developed. Neurosis comes when there is trauma plus internal conflict, because you don't know what to do. During the war, Professor Luria went on, there was trauma without much internal conflict because everyone was part of a group and knew what to do. The pervading sense of WE throughout the Soviet Union has been and is a major factor in holding down to a minimum the incidence of neurosis and the disturbed personality.

Naturally I enjoyed talking with the alert editors of the Foreign Literature Publishing House, which last fall issued a Russian translation of my book on American civil liberties, *Freedom Is As Freedom Does*, in an edition of 25,000 copies. Mr. P. A. Chuvikov, the head editor, told me that this edition sold out quite quickly; and it was only with some difficulty that he was able to find two copies for me. After Mr. Chuvikov had presented me with a handsome author's fee (in rubles), I discussed with him and his associates the whole question of the Soviet Union entering into some international copyright agreement that would cover the rights of foreign

authors in the USSR and Soviet authors abroad. This controversial matter remains in the domain of unfinished business. The lack of any Soviet copyright accord has aroused much resentment among foreign writers, many of whom are not even informed by their Soviet publisher when one of their works is issued in the USSR.

Still another delightful occasion in Moscow was the bountiful luncheon given us by Ludmila Pavlichenko, famous woman sharpshooter who disposed of about 400 Germans in the Second World War and has recently been doing a good deal of writing. She visited the United States in 1942. The party at her comfortable apartment was warm and gay, with many toasts, both flippant and serious, drunk in vodka that flowed somewhat too freely for my limited capacity. Miss Pavlichenko's attractive husband was present, as were Mr. and Mrs. Albert Rhys Williams who were spending several months in the Soviet Union. Still a productive writer at 76, Mr. Williams is the only American still living who was an eye-witness to the storming of Petrograd Winter Palace, which marked the final takeover by the Communists in the great Russian Revolution of November, 1917. He is also the only American left who was personally acquainted with Lenin during the critical days following the Revolution.

MY WIFE and I have always been a bit nervous about traveling by airplane; and so we felt some trepidation as we boarded the big Soviet TU-104 to go from Moscow to Tashkent on our first jet flight.

We did not need to worry. For the Soviet jet operated smoothly and efficiently all the way.

We had long wanted to make a trip to the southernmost section of Soviet Central Asia both to see the magnificent architectural beauties of the Moslem culture that so long dominated this area and also to study the functioning of the Soviet minorities policy in an enormous region where five major Turco-Tatar peoples intermingle with one another and with the Russians. We were able to fulfill our two main purposes during our fortnight's stay in Tashkent, capital of the Uzbek Republic, with side trips in a 200-mile radius to such places as Samarkand, ancient capital of Tamerlane's earth-shaking empire, and the Fergana Valley, where a network of irrigation canals has transformed former desert lands into a most fertile agricultural district.

Wherever we went in Central Asia there seemed to be plenty of food, as in the Moscow area. In the towns and cities crowds of people were busy buying the abundant consumers' goods that are available in the stores. The general standard of life, including the spheres of education and health, is fairly high in this vast region where before the Revolution a primarily nomadic and semi-Oriental population had maintained a precarious existence in poverty and squalor, ever facing the depredations of drought, famine and epidemic disease.

From everything we could observe, the different peoples in Uzbekistan all live together on a plane of equality, with the old racial prejudices and discriminations almost completely eliminated. Among the

444 deputies chosen for the Supreme Soviet of the Uzbek Republic in the last elections held early in 1959, thirteen separate nationalities were represented. The most important minority is the Russian with 62 representatives. The central Soviet Government, far from exploiting the more backward national groups in the former Tsarist empire—as is sometimes charged—has taken special pains to encourage and aid the development of local industry, agriculture and cultural institutions for the greater wealth and welfare of the native populations.

As I pointed out in the October issue of this magazine, the Uzbeks are a delightful and handsome people, their skin pigmented into the color of a lustrous sun-tan. Apparently they did not mind the intense heat, although the colorful little caps that the men and women wore on the back of their heads did not really give much protection from the sun. The youngsters were frolicking everywhere like kids in any other country. One of my favorite relaxations was to go swimming in Lake Komsomol (built by the Young Communist League as a special volunteer project), where I could mingle freely with the Uzbek youth at play. I felt a deep warmth towards all these people and should have liked to remain among them indefinitely.

However, we had set out to circumnavigate the globe and had a long, long way to go. Hence on a very hot morning in the middle of July we drove out to the Tashkent airport and took another Soviet jet, this time bound for New Delhi. We flew over the towering Tien Shan, meaning "Celestial

Mountains," over a part of Communist China's Sinkiang Province that juts out between the USSR and India (will this admission get me into trouble with the U.S. State Department?), then over the Himalayas themselves with soaring, snow-capped peaks stretching out for hundreds of miles on either side of the jet, and finally down to our destination on India's wide northern plain. It was the most thrilling trip by air that I had ever made.

AS I left the Soviet Union my mind went back to my first trip to the country in 1932 when I was profoundly impressed by the achievements of the First Five-Year Plan and felt that the new socialist system of the USSR was becoming firmly established. At the time I said: "The direction in the Soviet, from both the material and cultural standpoints, seems steadily and on the whole upwards, and the problems those of growth." That statement is still relevant today, although I would put the word "rapidly" in place of "steadily."

Recently an American economics professor on a grant from a U.S. foundation came to Soviet Russia with the incredible instructions to look for evidence of a collapse of the socialist economy. The poor fellow looked and looked, asked questions and traveled, but could obtain no facts for the fulfillment of his assignment. He went home a very disgruntled man. All such missions are a total absurdity and waste of time. Had our American economist, however, been willing to make an objective study of Soviet economic planning, then he would have discovered the "secret" of Soviet success that has so baffled the capitalist world.

The socialist economic system in the USSR is plainly functioning very well and will continue to make notable progress. But fortunately economics does not make up the whole of life. And it is my hope that the next great advance in the Soviet Union will be a further evolution towards political democracy and the full implementation of the civil liberties guarantees of the great 1936 Constitution.

AMERICAN BOOKS IN THE SOVIET UNION

THE PUBLICATION of books by American writers goes on at full flood in the USSR. In the past four years more than 250 American books have been published in a total edition of some 25 million copies.

Jack London, Theodore Dreiser, Mark Twain and Upton Sinclair continue to be published in huge editions. Special editions have recently been published of Nathaniel Hawthorne's *The Scarlet Letter*, Walt Whitman's *Leaves of Grass*, Frank Norris' *The Octopus*, John Steinbeck's *Grapes of Wrath*, Sinclair Lewis' *Arrowsmith*, and William Saroyan's *The Human Comedy*.

During the past year many new translations into Russian have been made. Among these translations are: Martha Dodd's *The Searching Light*, John O. Killens' *Youngblood*, Albert Maltz's *A Long Day In a Short Life*, the short stories of Dorothy Parker, plays of Lillian Hellman and Arthur Miller and the poetry of Carl Sandburg.

A Visit Among Soviet Philosophers

by BARROWS DUNHAM

AT THE International Congress of Philosophy last year I met some Soviet philosophers, among them particularly Professor Melvil of the University of Moscow. We fell into friendship at first sight, and we could converse because of his admirable fluency in English. One result of this friendship, I rather think, was that the Institute of Philosophy in Moscow invited Mrs. Dunham and me to visit the Soviet Union and to discuss with members of the Institute such subjects as philosophers would be likely to have in common. Accordingly, we went thither on May 15, 1959, and spent a glorious month enjoying the Institute's hospitality and the rubles accumulated as royalties on the translation of *Giant in Chains*.

The distance from Paris to Moscow is about one-half the distance from Paris to New York, but estrangement is not measured in miles. The taxi-driver who took us to the Gare des Invalides, whence buses leave for the Orly airport, asked, "You're going to New York?" "No," I replied, "we're going to Moscow." "Oo-la-la," he said, "that's a long way." I rather thought so, too.

Nevertheless the Soviet jet plane makes it in a little more than three hours. When we reached Moscow,

the airport was encircled by thunderstorms, and vertical shafts of lightning flashed to the ground from clouds which were still below us. I was glad to see the wheels come out from beneath the wings. A party of three was there to greet us, with a bouquet of flowers—for flowers are an eloquent and customary form of address in the Soviet Union. Professor Melvil was there, and Mme. Zaitseva, our interpreter, and Professor Ignatiev, a member of the Institute and a theorist in the proper use of leisure time. I am sure nothing of the sort was intended, but his presence did seem peculiarly appropriate for the arrival of an unemployed teacher from America.

It will be quite a while, I dare say, before a trip to the Soviet Union ceases to have, for Americans, the look of adventure; and so I am telling you how our adventure began—the weather a little hostile, the people extremely kind. During our visit, the weather varied, the people never. They were always and everywhere genial, open-hearted, affectionate. It sometimes happened that they remembered me when I didn't remember them, and I would suddenly find a handclasp and a smile such as ordinarily greets a friend long absent and much prized. It's a great place for feeling valuable.

Nor have I seen a people which unites respect for others with respect for self so delicately and so

DR. BARROWS DUNHAM taught philosophy for many years. He is the author of two books on philosophy, *Man Against Myth* and *Giant in Chains*.

successfully. Everyone meets (it seemed to me) on equal footing—guest with host, colleague with colleague, person with person. There is nothing whatever of the obsequious posture in which major or minor celebrities are often received among us. I do believe that in the Soviet Union fame or achievement in any one person never afflicts others with a sense of inferiority; rather, the others share in it as a socially enjoyable fact and as a reminder that they too are in their several ways talented. It's a great place to be yourself.

Nor have I seen a people so accurately aware of the values they now possess and the values they will acquire later—next year, the year after, or seven years hence. They constantly review their history by visiting palaces, museums, the tomb where Lenin and Stalin rest. They learn their present achievements, cultural or economic, from the opera or the theater or the ballet, from exhibitions of various sorts, from the great fair which annually displays the products of their several nationalities. They can see the future, for example, upon great billboards in the parks, which set forth in luminous detail the prospects of the seven-year plan. It's a great place for knowing where you are and where you're going.

All these phenomena are immediately observable. Indeed, the first impression of them is so strong that you draw back, you pause a little, and you think, "Well, now, it surely can't be altogether like this." But the impression repeats itself over and over until at last you yourself grow infected with the general creativity, the universal *élan*. I know

that when I was asked to write an article for *New Times*, I sat down at Sochi and wrote it with an ease such as I have never felt in my life—and this despite several admonitions that "one doesn't work at Sochi, one goes there to rest." There was a glorious moment, along about the third week of my visit, when I suddenly became aware that the little prison of the self in which I have lived these many years immured had broken open, that the walls had fallen down and the roof flown off, and that there was nothing to do but soar.

In view of these facts, you will not suppose that I ever committed the folly of asking Soviet philosophers whether they felt "free." I know something of the philosophical life elsewhere: its constriction by vested interests and the power of money, its pieties and timidities, its waste of toil upon trivial lucubrations, its tedious wailings over the "predicament" of man with never an effort at abolishing the predicament. I think it is not for sinners to denounce salvation, nor for prisoners to chide the free.

Besides, how can it unduly limit men to agree that the universe exists independently of them, that it can nevertheless be known and controlled, that change is of its essence, and that the aim of human effort is to make mankind (in the great Cartesian phrase) "lords and possessors of nature?" These four assertions, taken together, probably form the philosophical ground of all liberty. They also state the meaning of dialectical materialism.

I was therefore prepared to believe that people don't generally need to be coerced into accepting

those truths which their own freedom depends on, and I believed this the more readily because I had myself accepted those same truths despite some coercion to the contrary. Nevertheless I was surprised to see how advanced the philosophical enterprise has there become. For, as I was told on several occasions, Soviet philosophers have been assigned the task of discovering the laws of the transition from socialism to communism and of preparing the public mind for life in an economy of abundance. "We don't yet know these laws," said one philosopher to me, "but we are sure that there are laws, and we expect to find them." My reply was, "I can only congratulate you on having such a problem."

To a Western eye, perhaps the most striking thing about this is that philosophy should be recognized in so basic a social role. I have been a philosopher for thirty years, but the only thing any agency of government ever asked of me was *names*. Yet it appears that in the Soviet Union philosophers are to be, if not "kings" in the Platonic sense, at least advisers to the commonwealth. And they are to be such at a very advanced moment in human history, where the prospect opens, long desired but no longer distant, of enough and more than enough for all. Yet even this stupendous goal (a millenium many a man has thought it) is not conceived as devoid of problems, but rather as having new problems for which some preparation is required in advance.

An enterprise like this restores to philosophy the sense of discovery and of adventure which, among us, the sciences have monopolized these

last three hundred years. The unknown is to be made known, the undone is to be accomplished; and the enjoyment which Soviet philosophers take in their work has the added exquisite pleasure that a man rejoices the more in success just because he knows he might have failed. Among us, philosophers criticize one another, and the public eye pays no attention to any of them. As for historical relevance, I am satisfied if I can do some small bit toward preventing philosophy from sliding back into medievalism. Then how should a philosopher not rejoice that somewhere in the world philosophy is set in the fore of social progress?

Now, an enterprise of adventure and discovery necessarily involves much difference of opinion, the kind which arises when a subject is only partly understood or not understood at all. In the Soviet Union, however, these differences are not institutionalized (as they are, for example, when the Protestant churches differ with the Catholic Church, or with one another). Accordingly, since they arise from incompleteness of knowledge, they can be (and are) expected to disappear with growth in knowledge. There won't be the nuisance of having the differences perpetrated by the effort of some archaic organization to survive.

I put to Professor Fedoseyev, the head of the Institute of Philosophy in Moscow, a question as to how wide the range of philosophical disagreement is. (I may say that Professor Fedoseyev is an intellect of the very first rank and is so recognized by his colleagues, and in my conversations with him I enjoyed the greatest of all philosophical delights, the swift clean precision of a

mind which knows exactly what it intends to say.) His reply was something like this:

"We are all agreed," said Professor Fedoseyev, "that the universe exists independently of human knowledge of it. But after that single assertion, disagreement begins. There are different views of the nature of 'consciousness,' 'mind,' of 'spiritual values.' However, these differences exist"—and here he smiled—"because we don't really know those subjects well enough." This remark gave rise on my part to the sort of observations I have made in the preceding paragraph.

As I listened to the range of views and to their content, I began to have the strange feeling that some of them were what I would have judged to be philosophical idealism. I think they were not that, but sometimes the distinction between idealism and materialism, like the distinction between the private and social appropriation of surplus value, gets very tenuous indeed. The effect of dialectics upon materialism—the requirement, that is to say, that every new phenomenon be recognized as new and not reduced to its origins—seems to involve some borrowing of terms from the old idealist vocabulary. Thus, though I myself prefer to say "cerebral cortex" instead of "mind," or "brain and nervous system" instead of "consciousness," there are several Soviet philosophers who refuse to do anything of the sort.

It happened that I had brought with me a copy of my article called "The Love of Wisdom," which has since appeared in *Science and Society*. I gave it to Melvil to read and then to turn it over for transla-

tion. But before the translator got it, I had a chance to see Melvil's marginal comments, which were addressed to me and intended to be erased (though I did not erase them). I was delighted to find that our close friendship had made him feel able to write, next to the appropriate arguments, such words as "No!", "Wrong," "Weak."

In this way I learned something about philosophy itself as well as about its present development in the Soviet Union. For example, I learned that my own form of materialism may be laggard, a vestige of the nineteenth century. Although in our culture any kind of materialism seems advanced, it may in fact be the case that I have not caught up with the times. But, you see, in discussions like these, one is always aware that there are times to be caught up with, that there are refinements in formulation and in knowledge to be achieved, that one can hardly fail to contribute something, and that, whatever the fate of the contribution, the making of it will be prized.

So I went on learning, rather more perhaps from the questions put to me than from those I myself asked. I gave three lectures in Moscow, two at the Institute and one at the University (the charming old place near the Kremlin)—all on contemporary American philosophy. The main schools, I found, were already known in respect of their doctrines. What was, understandably, less known was the social ground for the continuing life of those schools: positivism, say, or pragmatism or existentialism. The questions put to me in the extensive periods after the lectures probed

deeply into the social ground, and I was forced to generalize (I hope accurately) more than I am accustomed to do about the lives and habits of my countrymen.

It was the undergraduates at the University of Moscow who gave me my happiest two hours. Of late years I haven't had much contact with college youth, and the sight of them always fills me with nostalgia. What a joy it was to feel the old rapport setting in again, and setting in immediately! Mme. Zaitseva, always competent, had by this time grown familiar with my style, and rendered it perfectly in her translation—so that the first alarming minutes (every teacher knows them to be so) passed successfully, the jests being properly laughed at, the premises of the discussion understood. After a quarter of an hour I was at home as in my old classroom, and the youngsters before me seemed very like (indeed, very, very like) the ones I used to know. I take some pride in that performance, because I had been eager to show what an American professor can pedagogically do. When it was all over, my hosts were pleased to say that, if I would learn Russian, they would like me to lecture at the University for a year. But—but Russian: who can learn *that*?

Well, I think this article has turned out the way such articles do, namely, that they tell more about the traveler than about the travels. "Let me tell you about my trip," "Let me tell you about my operation," "Let me tell you about my mother-in-law"—alas, we know well enough that human experience is always possessed by egos. Who is hardy enough to strip

from such renderings the beloved and passionate I? At this late stage I am not to be extricated from so much egocentricity, so let there be one anecdote more.

While I was in Moscow, I had a letter from a friend of mine in France, who wrote, "I'm glad you're visiting the USSR: it renews one's faith in people and especially in oneself." This was very true and is very true, but perhaps one would not expect the corollary, which does in fact follow, that one's love of one's country is renewed also. There is some sort of "noble contagion" (the phrase is from the old poet Edward Young) which makes a man find pride and peace in his immediate brethren—those, that is to say, who bore him and reared him and gave him love. The feeling is not mystical, though it has mystery; and I would urge you to go there and bring it home with you.

In much this mood I sat at the little farewell dinner the Institute gave us. The vodka went round, and I always drank what they poured me—though I observed that some of our Russian friends were putting water in their vodka glasses, the better to control destiny. Now, I am a man who gets preoccupied with his food, and, though I drank all the toasts faithfully, I quite forgot that I had duties of my own. Then I heard my wife whispering, "Barrows, Barrows, it's time for you to give a toast." So I raised my glass and said, "May our two countries unite to settle the problems of the world!" All the Russians cried out, "That's a lovely toast, a beautiful toast!"

And I'm hanged if it didn't come true.

DR. MORDECAI JOHNSON

On the USSR and China

The following is an excerpt from a speech given in London at the Atlantic Congress of the NATO countries, held June 5 to 10, by Dr. Mordecai W. Johnson. Dr. Johnson is the son of a former Negro slave and the President of Howard University, Washington, D. C.

The main theme of Dr. Johnson's speech was the need of objectivity about the positive features of the Soviet Union and People's China, and for the West to be more modest about its own record.

"WE MUST try to take a look at the Soviet Union through the eyes of their purest, most devoted and honourable men. When you do that you will see that at the central part of the Communist movement there is a simple and great faith. It is a faith that, with the scientific and technical intelligence which we have at our disposal in the modern world, if we put it in the hands of the right men, the struggle for existence in this world would be overcome in a world-wide way and that poverty, squalor, ignorance, disease and early death could be conquered and the foundation laid for a great society in which culture would be available to all human beings.

"These men believe this with a passion that is not exceeded by any movement in the world except early Christianity. They are responding to it every day and every hour with an enthusiasm which is nothing short of remarkable. On the ground of Russia and the Chinese soil they are making achievements of one

kind or another which have astonished us, and they are preaching it now around the world with an evangelistic enthusiasm that is immense. This message that they have is very fittingly addressed to the under-developed peoples of whom there are one billion, two hundred million, all of whom have a scale of living which is actually under a hundred dollars per capita per year, all of whom are living in a primarily agricultural civilization, and a very poor type of agriculture at that, all of whom are living in countries in which there is very little industry to supplement agriculture, all of whom are impoverished in the field of scientific and technical intelligence, and to most of whom it makes no difference how much money you would give them, they would have no governmental personnel prepared to make a wise and well co-ordinated use of scientific and technical plans and projections.

"The Soviet Union is saying to these people, 'Here we come to you from among those who, like yourself, have suffered. We have come not to make you strong and powerful so that you could dominate, exploit and humiliate your fellows, we have come to show you how to treble and quadruple your agricultural production, to supplement your agriculture with the industries which we will show you how to establish, to lend you scientific and

technical personnel, to sit down and talk to you about plans for the further development of your country, to lend you money at rates so low that you will see that we are not trying to make a profit on you and we are prepared to devote ourselves to this task for months and years solely because we believe that there is in you the power to conquer the struggle for existence in your country, and we want to have the joy of seeing you do that.'

"If we do not see that in them we shall have no power to deal with them because it is there. It is there. In pursuit of that purpose they are prepared to enter into a pure-hearted relationship with the people of Asia and Africa. Now, what do I mean by that? In spite of the fact that they do not have any metaphysics akin to our religion they have something that is very important, they have radical, universal ethics in their relationship to the black and brown and yellow peoples of the world. They have said in their literature—do not misunderstand this—'We take our position quite contrary to the Second International. We are not out to organize the white working people of the world. We are out to organize the working people of the world, and we say it to all of our workers everywhere, in Africa, in Asia and in the homelands of the colonial powers. Make solidarity with workers. Pay no attention to their national origin. We want to unite the workers of the world for a great society in which the struggle for existence is conquered, and all are led to a new freedom on the basis of that conquest.'

"Now they stand on a territory

that constitutes one-fourth of the landed areas of this world. They have one-third of the population of this world, and they have now established themselves in a place where they know that we no longer have the military power to dislodge them. 80,000,000 of these 1,200,000 people that are under-developed are on the border of the Soviet Union and of China, so close that they have to cross no water to reach them, they can also touch their hands any time of day and they can speak to them without a long-distance telephone.

"But all these 800 million people are black and brown and yellow Asiatics who in times past have suffered at the hands of the peoples whom we represent, and who have some fear of us. They look at what the Soviet Union and the Chinese people have done by their faith with admiration. . . .

"We are up against an immense antagonist. How many of these people does he have to win? Why, if he won India alone he would all but tip the scales of the majority population of the human race and, in a few months after that might turn the tables on us and put us in the minority of the world. We are up against a great antagonist with a great passion, with an immense achievement as a result of that passion, and with a profound faith that he is getting ready to turn the corner which leads to our graveyard. No, which leads to the graveyard and to the grave which we are digging for ourselves. He believes that.

"Now let us take a look at ourselves. I say the next thing we have got to do is to acquire some humility in the appraisal of ourselves."

Tamerlane's Uzbekistan Today

by HOLLAND ROBERTS

MY REASON for going to Uzbekistan was primarily to see how a large Central Asian minority far removed from Moscow and European Russia had fared under the Soviet nationality policy. Here I thought would be the acid test of the Russian Revolution, for the Uzbeks had not only been a conquered subject people, 95 per cent illiterate under the Tsars, but they were Islamic. What was the status and daily life of Uzbek women?

Visitors and tourists are welcome and answers to these key questions, along with the opportunities presented by the world-famous remains of ancient cities and civilizations and the beauty of the mountains and rich valleys are there for all the world to see.

Today as you stroll about the fabulous bazars of Samarkand or Bukhara or along the side streets that lead out into the countryside of Uzbekistan, it is a rare thing to see a woman hidden by the hideous full length black *paranja* or veil. Now only a dwindling remnant of aging women fear to step out into the sunshine with their attractive energetic sisters.

It is hard to believe as one sees Uzbek women, clear-eyed and confi-

dent, at work in the factories, out on collective farms, selling goods in stores, carrying on leading business, cultural and government jobs, that in 1924 they were still denied the elementary rights of human beings, that it was a shameful thing punishable by ostracism and death for a woman to show her face. Yet it has been only a few years since many of the women who threw off their imprisoning *paranjas* were cruelly murdered by the reactionary ruling clergy and landowners and their agents.

It is a notable fact that in Uzbekistan, where before the Revolution women were imprisoned in harem walls or closely guarded in their homes and kept in deepest ignorance and subjection, a woman is now president. She is Yadgar Nasreddinova, Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet. I learned about this remarkable woman at first hand in Tashkent, where her story, typical of the strides Uzbek women have taken from serfdom to equality, proves to every girl and woman the meaning of Soviet democracy.

When the Soviet Union opened free schools all over this illiterate republic, Yadgar began her education at the age of 11. Among his first acts Lenin had signed the decree founding Tashkent University in 1918, the only higher educational institution in all Central Asia. Soon

HOLLAND ROBERTS, formerly head of the California Labor School, is a teacher of many years experience. He is President of the American Russian Institute in San Francisco.

colleges and universities were opening everywhere and Yadgar Nasredinova enrolled in a local branch of the Workers' Faculty of the Tashkent Institute of Railway Engineers. Later she graduated with honors as a civil engineer from the Tashkent Transport Institute. She took a job as works superintendent on the construction of the Great Ferghana Canal in an area she knew well, then as a section chief at the Katta-Kurgan Reservoir, and later as a leader in the construction of the Tashkent-Angren Railway.

Everywhere she displayed ability as an organizer and administrator. Her work soon attracted public attention and she was elected by the people to ever greater responsibilities. At a recent first session of the newly elected Uzbek Supreme Soviet a group of deputies nominated her as President of the Presidium. The nomination received unanimous approval and the hall rang with applause and cheers as Uzbekistan's first woman president took her seat in the government box. Recently she came to the United States with Deputy Premier Frol Kozlov for the opening of the Soviet Exhibition in New York and visited major cities on a cross-country tour to California. She is the mother of two children and the wife of a Party and trade union official.

Tashkent, the modern thriving industrial capital of the Uzbek Republic, lies deep in Central Asia, three and a half days by train on the airline route to India. Our swift Soviet TU-104 jet made the 2,500 miles in three and a half hours. As I watched rivers and mountains and valleys as sharply outlined as a relief map in the snowy expanse 33,-

000 feet below us, my seat mate gave me brief glimpses of the many thousand-year-old history of this legendary land and its people.

Early man made his home here and civilization developed in the fertile valleys long before the days of Christendom. Ruins of Afrosaib, founded 4,000-5,000 B.C., were found near Samarkand (Place of Sugars), the oldest living Uzbek city. Samarkand was destroyed by Alexander the Great in 329 B.C., then rebuilt. Caravan routes from India, China and Persia followed the golden road to Samarkand and met here long before Europe entered the Dark Ages. The Arabs came in the great Moslem Crusades of the 7th and 8th centuries, made their capital and imposed their religion at "divinely descended Bukhara." Then in 1220 A.D. the Mongols of Genghis Khan overran all Uzbekistan and destroyed the irrigation canals and wiped out Samarkand once more. Yet Marco Polo called it "a very great and eminent city" less than a hundred years later.

Tamerlane rebuilt the city as the capital of a vast empire that extended from the Ganges to the Hellespont and the Persian Gulf to upper Siberia. From Samarkand his armies drove south to conquer India but his architects, artists and builders remained to erect many of the loveliest buildings extant in the world today. The Tsar's empire builders came in 1865, seeking Uzbek cotton for Russian textile mills idled by the Civil War in America. Now the Soviets have built 100,000 miles of irrigation canals, factories and collective farms are pouring out their riches and culture and the arts are in a renaissance.

More than 7,000,000 people live in the land of the Uzbeks. Recent research has proved that most of them have made their homes in this rich heartland of Asia for many thousand years. The ruins of scores of their ancient mosques, palaces, fortresses, city walls and tombs stand out against the sky in Samarkand, Bukhara and Khiva along with many well preserved lovely buildings, little disturbed by the turbulent years. They are among the great architectural triumphs of all time.

Uzbeks make up a large majority of the population, but there are significant minorities of Russians, Karakalpaks and others from the neighboring republics of Tadzhikistan, Turkmenia and Kazakhstan.

My watch told me we were nearing the end of our trip. The snow had disappeared and rectangular fields in browns and grays stretched out as far as our eyes could reach. Suddenly our plane turned swiftly down and we were on the air field at Tashkent.

As we walked into the substantial building—I saw black hair and eyes almost everywhere but beyond these two common surface characteristics there was a wide variety in appearance. Many of the people would have been indistinguishable in a crowd in London or Chicago. And the men and women carried on their work as quickly and efficiently as in any airport in the United States or Europe.

As we drove from the airport to the hotel I watched this new-old people who had created noted civilizations when Europe had not yet emerged from barbarism and had made major contributions to world astronomy, mathematics, art and

architecture. They were at work driving speedy big trucks that filled the streets, and building was in progress on every side, with giant cranes swinging prefabricated panels, sections and beams into place in new apartments, factories, and public buildings. As we came up to the newly completed, big modern hotel, I saw the architects had merged classic early Uzbek and contemporary European styles. There was brilliant, colorful ceramic work high over the entrance. As I saw their new theaters and public buildings it was clear that the architectural schools of London, Paris and Moscow would significantly advance their work if their professors and students came here to study.

Everywhere I went during my week in Uzbekistan I came on fresh evidence of the great drive for industrialization, but agriculture is basic. The invaders had understood this. They had destroyed the early canals; the desert had marched swiftly across the fertile fields, and the hungry steppe had taken over the rich orchard lands. Now the newly developed 100,000-mile irrigation system I saw everywhere was watering the arid land and had turned it into the fruit bowl of the Soviet Union, with luscious melons never seen in the West, apricots, peaches, figs and 200 varieties of grapes. But cotton is king, and the well-to-do collective farmers now grow more bales of this white gold than Brazil. Turkey, Iran and Pakistan together. Cotton is piled high in great storage depots, more than 3,000,000 tons in 1958, and by 1965 it will be nearly 4,000,000. Uzbekistan is the chief source of cotton for the more than 200,-

000,000 people of the Soviet Union and with each passing day the widespread new canals carry water farther out to transform the desert into blossoming orchards, white-bolled cotton plantations, and the lush green of the rice fields. More rice, silk and karakul are produced here than in any other Soviet Republic, and the fragrant local tea I drank every day was of the finest quality. All of these riches give a new turn and a creative meaning to the ancient Uzbek saying, "Where the water ends, the earth ends," for who can say where the work of the canal builders will reach their terminus?

In Moscow I had gone to the famous Uzbek Dance and Song Festival at the Bolshoy at the close of the Bureau meeting of the World Peace Council and joined the Muscovites in applauding the notable, varied creative work of this talented people. If it could be brought to the United States, the Uzbek Festival would match the appeal of the Bolshoy Ballet, the Moissejev Dance Troupe and the Soviet Folk Dance Festival.

There are two main Uzbek theaters in Tashkent, and we went to both legitimate and musical theater in turn. We arrived early and I was welcomed in the office of the director, Sahra Khanum Ishantaraeva. Her remarkable work is known far beyond Uzbekistan. But no role that Ishantaraeva has ever played could have been more dramatic than the one she played in life itself. She had been in the front lines of the revolution that flamed in Uzbekistan from 1917 on, a revolution that meant freedom not only to her people, but to her sex. Her work

as a leading Uzbek actress grew out of her eagerness to present to her people the meaning and drama of their background and the hope of their future. As one important step in their cultural advance she helped to bring to her people the great world classics of drama, and among the other roles, played Desdemona in *Othello* to packed and cheering audiences. She realized that choosing the plays to be presented to the people and directing them effectively was fully as important as acting, and soon she was combining her work as an actress with the work of director.

In the contemporary problem play which I saw that night the young Uzbek playwright was telling the story of the struggles in the building of collective farms and the sharp conflicts which must be solved so that the Uzbek people can continue to give to the Soviet economy more than half of all the cotton of the USSR. The plot dealt with a struggle between the chairman of the collective farm who was protecting a pilfering bookkeeper and his younger brother who had been sent in by the Communist Party to spur the farm on to greater success. The audience was largely young farmers from the surrounding countryside and their instant response to the telling lines and sallies proved how closely the theme was interwoven with the struggles of their daily lives. Their laughter and applause rang like quicksilver through the theater.

Between the acts we drank more of the fragrant Uzbek tea in Ishantaraeva's office. As I listened to her talk I understood why the audience in the theater was so young and re-

sponded so intimately to the theme of the play. The director had her fingers on the pulse of the new life which was transforming this ancient Asian people. It was women and men like Ishantaraeva who were responsible for the flowering of a new civilization in Uzbekistan, combining the art and culture which made Samarkand a major intellectual center of the world in the days of the noted Uzbek astronomer and scientist, Ulugbek, with contemporary world knowledge.

With Ishantaraeva as with every other person with whom I talked in socialist lands, peace is an integral part of life and interwoven in every discussion. Her parting words were, "Tell our American colleagues that our new Uzbek theater is eager to exchange experiences with them so that we can learn together, but that we need peace most of all. With peace we will soon have a rich life with everything we can use."

In the center of Tashkent I found another, and extraordinary center of Uzbek life. Here in the friendly informal office of the Uzbek Society for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries I met the vice president, Gulandon Gulamova. She and the staff of young people she directed were reaching out to establish cultural exchange with many foreign countries. We talked over how we might do this with San Francisco.

I thought the language might be a barrier, but she quickly put my doubts aside by bringing out a sheaf of attractive materials, many of them in English. One was a unique guide to the "Cultural Establishments of Tashkent" illustrated with

photographs and distinctive drawings and designs. Another was a slender volume of Uzbek poetry published in 1958. Along with this were the memoirs of Sadridin Aini, *Pages From My Own Story*; Sharaf Rashidov's dramatic story of the struggle against the basmach (bandit) bands, *The Victors*; an attractive, fully illustrated guide to Samarkand, and half a dozen pamphlets describing the developments of the State Public Library, Pedagogical Institute, Medical Institute and textile combine.

Through these books and in many other ways nearly 8,000,000 Central Asian citizens are reaching out friendly hands to America and all the English-speaking world. They are asking us for cultural interchange, friendship and peace. It will be good if we can make a beginning by learning to find Tashkent on the map and recognizing the able modern descendants of one of the world's most ancient cultures.

But the riches travelers to Uzbekistan see are not limited to the wealth of the fertile soil and 250 sunny days a year. Lead and zinc are mined at Altyn-Topkan, and there is a large reduction plant at the new non-ferrous metallurgical center in Almalyk. Angren is a major coal center, and one of the world's largest natural gas fields has recently been discovered at Gasli near Bukhara and the great industrial complex built in the distant Urals. Production is to be stepped up 100 times during the seven-year plan. Oil production of 1,000,000 tons will be doubled by 1965 and the largest petroleum processing plant in Central Asia is now being con-

structed in the garden valley of Ferghana. More gas stations will soon spring up on the broad cement highways over which we traveled, linking the bustling new cities and the network of roads connecting the collective farms.

It is significant that the capital city of Tashkent is the major industrial center. I was surprised to find it nearly as large as San Francisco. Like my home city, it is the main business and cultural core of the surrounding region. Its busy factories and skilled workers make cotton harvesters, electrical and chemical equipment, excavators, spinning machines and looms. Shoes, clothes, furniture, crockery, canned goods and cotton and silk cloth are all made here. It is a wonderful thing to visit one of the world's biggest textile mills in this socialist land and sense the pride of the thousands of young people in their whirring shuttles and swift-moving looms. They know all they are doing will be devoted to their well-being and the urgent banners and slogans displayed make clear their concern that their success will contribute to the peace of the world. Visitors see on the walls everywhere: "Peace to the World," "Fulfill the Plan for Peace," "The Struggle for Production is the Fight for Peace."

The awakening needs of the people are creating a whole chain of rapidly growing industrial cities: cement, metal working and power at Bergovat, electro-chemical and farm machinery at Chirchik, and oil at Leninsk and Varmovskaya.

From these and other active centers the virile Uzbeks are challenging the advanced workers of England, France, Germany, Italy and

the United States to see what people can build the richest, most fruitful and cultured life for their citizens and make the largest contribution to their neighbors. At the turn of the century builders in that primitive land imported such simple necessities as nails. Now Uzbekistan exports complex farming machinery and mining and construction equipment for electrical, radio and chemical industries to Asia and Europe.

How have the builders of socialism reached such a tempo? I found one of the decisive answers in their schools and colleges. As I talked to teachers and students in Tashkent and Samarkand I heard the remarkable stories of how this perceptive Central Asian people made the great leap forward from almost total illiteracy to the most advanced levels of higher learning. University teachers and scientists who are members of the Academy of Sciences today were illiterate as late as 1924.

The leading countries of Europe may not long remain so, for Uzbekistan now has twice as many college trained men and women per 10,000 of population as France. It has seven times as many as Turkey and 28 times as many as Iran. Physicians, teachers, artists, writers, musicians, Orientalists are all trained here.

Nearly 1,500,000 children now study in some 6,000 elementary and high schools in every section of the Republic. Some 70,000 young people are in special and technical schools and junior colleges. There are more than 70,000 of their ablest students in the 35 universities, colleges, and institutes that have grown up since the Revolution.

I saw the new creative power of the people in a fifth grade foreign language class in an elementary school in Samarkand. The children were studying Hindi. In some forty years of teaching, much of it in supervision in the language arts, I have never seen the quality of sheer delight in learning a foreign language as I found it there. They recited long poems in unison and individually, sang many spirited songs and carried on dramatic question-and-answer interchanges. There was an elan and pride in their work which made it hard to break away to visit the remainder of the school. The principal and teacher told me that this work in Hindi was proving a most successful experiment and that the response of the children was greater than to any other language, the traditional ties to India and the fact that there are some identical words in Uzbek and Hindi may explain this in part. So bridges to the East and West are building.

Of course schools are only one part of the educational activity. Each year some 25,000,000 books are published here, three for every man, woman and newborn child. Many are such leading Uzbek authors as Zulfiya, popular poet and editor of the magazine *Uzbek Woman*.

Newspapers and magazines are abundant on newsstands and bookstores. Of the 14 papers published in Uzbekistan in Tsarist times, only one was in the native language. Today 162 of the 208 newspapers and 15 of the 18 magazines are in the Uzbek and Kara-Kalpak languages. Periodical circulation is 1,000,000. There are 3,400 libraries, grown from 13 in 1914, and the larger ones are spacious and provide facilities com-

parable to our best in the West. I found first class radio and television stations in Tashkent, a large stadium for major sports events. In the press of new building they have taken time to establish 36 recreational city parks, many lovely quiet squares with high-gushing fountains and tree-bordered avenues.

Samarkand has a custom which I hope can be adopted in America. Every night at 6 o'clock the wide, tree and shrub-lined streets in the center of the city are closed to traffic and are speedily filled for the evening with strolling couples, families and friends. In this softly lighted, relaxed atmosphere the tensions of the day subside and quiet conversation and laughter replace the city noise. Finally toward eight a part of the crowd moves slowly off to the nearby theaters, art galleries and museums.

There are many impressive people in Uzbekistan and to mention even a few provides a swift answer to the place of the nationalities under socialism. One of the famous contemporary painters is Rakhim Alshmedov. His lovely canvasses present modern life in sharp, brilliant color, the beauty and pride of the cotton harvest and the new wealth on the collective farm. He is only one of the many painters whose shows would create a sensation in any art center of the world. In music there is Muktar Ashrafi, composer and conductor, whose work is marked with the flavor of Asian folk music.

Among the outstanding young men and women is the novelist Sharaf Rashidov, who is now first secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party. He was born in 1917, the son of poor

peasants. The Revolution made it possible for him to study at a teacher training school and then major in philology at Uzbek University in Samarkand.

In the war against Hitlerism Rashidov was wounded in front line fighting. He became a journalist and editor of the newspaper *Kyze Uzbegistan* and served as chairman of the Writers Union. In 1950, at 33, he was elected President of the Supreme Soviet of the Uzbek Republic and Vice President of the USSR Supreme Soviet. It is in such ways that talent is developed and used, and the new socialist man created.

We often hear today that words must be supported by acts. Colonial, semi-colonial and all other countries are finding in Uzbekistan a brilliant answer to the plight of under-

developed and oppressed nationalities and minority groups.

In Nikita Khrushchev's new book, *For Victory in Peaceful Competition with Capitalism*, he writes,

The press in Western states has devoted much space to the need for rendering economic aid to underdeveloped countries. We are in favor of such assistance.

But such aid must be rendered as to enable the country assisted really to develop its economy and to rid itself of dependence on economically stronger countries, actually assuring its independence.

All who wish to go to the beautiful and freedom-loving land of the Uzbeks or wish to make serious inquiry about it will discover what I found. The nationality question has been solved.

DISEASE CONTROL IN THE SOVIET UNION

DR. A. A. SMORODINTSEV, a virologist of the Leningrad Institute of Experimental Medicine, reported to a meeting of the American Public Health Association, that an effective live virus to control influenza has been developed in the Soviet Union and is administered to 20,000,000 people a year. So far it has been given to 100,000,000 people. According to the *New York Times*, October 21, this development is regarded in this country as an important medical advance.

Dr. Smorodintsev also reported that medical scientists in his country had developed an effective live vaccine against mumps. He also stated that 12,000,000 children in the Soviet Union have been immunized against poliomyelitis with live vaccine of the type developed by Dr. Albert Sabin of Cincinnati.

In a warm tribute to American scientists working in similar fields, Dr. Smorodintsev said:

"In the USSR we highly appreciate the brilliant contributions of American medical scientists in the elimination of infectious diseases, prolongation of human life, the saving of millions of children dying previously from poliomyelitis and other grave infections and for the general well-being of many people."

Dr. Smorodintsev said that in the next seven to ten years Soviet scientists plan to eradicate malaria, diphtheria and venereal disease. Also in this period they plan to deal with trachoma and measles, in addition to polio and mumps.

An Artist Visits USSR

by ANTON REFREGIER

THE moment the plane left the ground and there was the endless water and the white caps of the Atlantic below, a feeling of elation and utter joy filled me. I was on my way to Stockholm to attend the 10th Anniversary Conference of the World Peace Council. I was to experience events which in former years I had known only by reading.

In Stockholm I joined 17 others from the United States. A small but effective group which in the course of the Conference left a considerable impression. From other parts of the world came Shostakovich, J. D. Bernal, Jorge Zalamea, Nazim Hikmet, Mme. Isabelle Blume, Boris Polevoy, Venturelli, a powerful artist from Chili, Kuo Mo-jo from China and hundreds of other noble men and women devoted to peace.

On the next to last day, speaking from the rostrum, I told the delegates that there would be copies of *The Song of Peace*—the work Walter Lowenfels and I had labored on for months—for each delegation: "Take it to your countries—translate it—bring it to the attention of your people so that it will be known that in the United States there are

people concerned with peace. Show it to your writers and artists and ask them to produce for your countries your own Song of Peace. And as Linus Pauling said in his introduction to the book: Let us raise our voices and join in a Song of Peace that will be heard throughout the world."

At the end of the conference several of us in the American group received invitations to visit the USSR as guests of the Soviet Peace Committee. Other invitations followed: Rumania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic. And so one morning I was traveling again—flying east.

That night in Moscow there was a dinner with Nikolay Tikhonov, Mikhail Khotov and others of the Peace Committee, and Mme. Lydia Kislova of the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries. Time and again we all rose in toasts to peace and to American-Soviet friendship. At 2 A.M. Michael Walden of Los Angeles and I walked out of the hotel, turning the corner to the Red Square. It was empty save for the guards at the Lenin-Stalin Mausoleum. The red stars of the Kremlin shone against a deep blue sky—this was a moment to remember.

For me, this was also coming back to the place of my childhood. The streets I walked on, the theater, the circus and the old school. And one cold October day in 1919 when

ANTON REFREGIER, distinguished American artist, has painted many murals in public buildings throughout the country. *The Song of Peace*, a collection of drawings and poems, which he did with Walter Lowenfels, was recently published.

I heard Lenin speak. But this was like a dream. For years, maturing in America, I had come to think of the Soviet Union in rather impersonal, theoretical terms: of defense of the Soviet Union against the hostility of the early years; and then the years of reading of the building of socialism. Everything had changed so much. The new broad, wide avenues, the new buildings—and the new people, dedicated, knowledgeable, intensely interested in the whole world, with a deep concern for the well-being of man.

The next day, May 16, our group was invited to the Kremlin to attend the presentation of the International Lenin Peace Prize to Premier Khrushchev and here, while I sat in the Hall of the Supreme Soviet, a lovely incident took place—so typical of the informality inspired by Khrushchev. Pandit Conderal, Chairman of the India Peace Committee, made a statement on Khrushchev's stand on religion. Later, during his speech, Khrushchev took exception to something he had said, at which point Conderal rose from his seat, walked towards Khrushchev and they embraced to the loud applause of the audience. This was to say that there are differences, but we do not lose sight of the object that unites us—peace.

Three weeks in the Soviet Union. Exhausting days filled with powerful experiences: meeting with the Dean of the Moscow University; visits to factories and talking with the workers; the night of the brilliant puppet theater Kukla when its creator, Obraztsov, came before the curtain during the intermission to announce that in the audience were a

group of Americans who had just attended the Stockholm Conference. And the audience rising and applauding. And the same thing in far-off Tbilisi when at the performance of the ballet *Othello*, the choreographer and leading dancer came before the curtain, and the vast audience rose and greeted us with applause. Everywhere peace was the first and last word. I heard it from children and students, from workers and artists. I heard it from hundreds of people.

At the conference of the All-Soviet Peace Committee, I listened again to the Patriarch Nikolay, who had spoken so beautifully in Stockholm, followed by Nadezhdina of the Beryozka dancers, who not so long ago was in my New York apartment. "We Soviet dancers have been accepted in our travels as ambassadors of peace," she said. Then a girl from a collective farm spoke of how when her father was killed during the war she took his place. She told of the increased production of the farm, and also of their peace meetings following the Stockholm Conference. I learned how people had been meeting all over the Soviet Union (and the same was true of all other socialist countries). They discussed the results of the recent Stockholm Conference and followed up with resolutions and messages to the Geneva Conference then in session.

In discussions on the United States, I noted that Soviet people were not interested in anything negative. That they already knew. They were anxious for positive information on all aspects of American life. They were happy about the good things one could say about the

United States. They wanted to be reassured that the peace forces outweighed the reactionary elements in our country.

As an artist, I was most anxious to meet people in my profession and to learn first-hand the details of the professional life so little known in America.

In Leningrad, I visited the Artists Union and their lithographic workshop. This was a large studio with several printers and 300 stones. The members of the Union work here and produce color lithographs. I was happily surprised to see the creative and often experimental work, the existence of which we know nothing about in the United States. The artist was free in his style and subject matter and the usual run of the first edition was 15 prints. These were his own and he could dispose of them through private sales or the art galleries which specialize in exhibiting and sales to the public. But, at the same time, the artist, if he wished, could submit a print to the Commissioning Committee of the Artists Union for their consideration on issuing the print in a mass edition. When such a decision is reached, the artist signs a contract with the Committee, receives a large advance and supervises an edition which usually runs to 500 copies. Should this print prove popular, other editions follow. These prints are made available through the Artists Union to community buildings, hospitals, Pioneer Houses and Palaces of Culture and there is a constant demand for them.

In the lithographic workshop I met the artist Kaplan, who showed me an extremely interesting portfolio of his on themes of Sholem

Aleichem. The work was typical of Jewish folklore character, utilizing Hebrew ornaments and lettering. This was one of the works printed in an edition of 500 copies. When I asked him to comment on the stories of anti-Semitism, he said that the fact he was able to have this portfolio in a large edition was the best answer he could give me. Very generously Kaplan gave me the portfolio to bring to the United States.

The following night, I appeared before the members of the Artists Union, speaking of our humanist period of the 30's and the present post-war period of abstract and non-objective art and also showing a film I brought along on my San Francisco murals. I was gratified when these murals elicited some of the highest critical praise I have ever received. There was a great deal of interest in the period of the 30's and also the fact that I was able to tell them that there are still a number of artists working in the United States in the humanist, realist, tradition. Send us the work of your realist artists, they asked me. The Leningrad artists, as the artists I met elsewhere in my travels, knew of current American art through our art magazines, but they knew little if anything of our realist painting which is rarely mentioned today in American periodicals.

The next day I was in the Hermitage and the few hours I had for this visit should have stretched into days, so magnificent is this collection, so rich an experience. Was I to stay in a room of Rembrandts or to spend time in the great collection of French Modernist? The Matisse dancers (or did I see them

in the Pushkin Museum in Moscow?), the magnificent Van Goghs, Cezannes, Gauguins, the Blue Period of Picasso. Room after room.

On to Kiev and the Art Academy. The Director of the Academy told me that for those accepted there are five years of free education with a stipend so that for five years one was free of all the worries that harass so many of the young students in our country. This stipend means enough money for all needs. My visit was at the end of the school year, when all the student work was up for grading. Some of the students were still working on the huge canvases required as part of the final examination. The Academy is rigid and, as do all academies, tends to reduce the individual to a common level of performance. There is a kind of lifeless sameness that I have been aware of in all Soviet painting that I could see originating here. And while there is re-evaluation and criticism and, here and there, examples of creative work, I think it will be some time before the strong hold of the Academy can be eased into a creative approach which will produce a deeper and more searching statement.

Later, visiting the Ouspensky Cathedral, I remembered reading during the war that when the Soviet troops re-entered Kiev they found the church in ruins. And now I stood in front of this mound of broken brick and stone, fragments of frescoes, twisted iron work. During the Nazi occupation, my guide told me, the partisans hid in the catacombs, harassing the Nazis by night, and there was one priest who became the leader of a partisan

group. Was this revenge, I thought, this barbaric destruction of a great work of art? Later, I stood in front of an obelisk in memory of those Ukrainian people and the Red Army men who perished during the war.

"We have seen three wars in our lifetime," said an old woman to me. "We want peace. We want peace for ourselves; we want peace for the whole world." On that June day of 1959, I drove through brand new streets where not so long ago not a single building stood, where all was destroyed by the Nazis. So it had been in Leningrad too. I have seen the Soviet Union rebuilt, its economy growing, its stores crammed with food and clothing, and people three deep at every counter buying.

Wonderful evenings with artists—meeting with the Kiev Peace Committee—the theater—and then the Caucasus—Tbilisi. By now I was used to the view from the plane window as we landed. The people with flowers at the far end. People representing the Peace Committee and the Cultural Relations Committee. Here was the memorable night of the *Othello* ballet, where at one point Othello is revealed as an African as he performs a tribal dance. A creative piece of choreography, of Shakespearean drama, this is something we here in the United States must see.

In the afternoon we visited a large tea plantation, first talking with the director and finally ending up, after a steep drive, in the home of one of the members of the kolkhoz. A long table set for 20 people was on the porch. Bottles of Caucasian wine, flowers, fruits, and at the head of the table sat the toastmaster, ap-

pointed, in accordance with their long tradition, by our hosts for the occasion. The role of the toast-master is to make people drink, and according to the form one drinks only after toasts—of which there were many! And so, as always, we toasted peace and friendship—and ended around 3 in the morning with a toast to the moon, "May it shine brightly on those wandering home!" Everyone rose to the occasion, our delegation through the translators, and our Georgian hosts with a lyricism and poetry never to be forgotten.

Back to Moscow and the next morning at 6, Alice, the lovely, intelligent and provocative guide of our group, called at the hotel to drive me to the airport. The golden sunrise was reflected on the huge construction site of the new housing development near the airport. I

had spent three weeks with Alice, Boris and Sasha, young college graduates, the constant companions of our group. I had shared all my enthusiasms—all the new discoveries with them. Alice said that they felt comfortable and at ease with Americans. They liked our informality, directness and frankness. At the gate, when we parted, we said goodbye as friends. I kissed Alice and walked to the waiting plane. Then the last look at Moscow.

My account of Rumania and the German Democratic Republic will have to wait for the next issue. But looking back on my visit to those three countries, I can say that my strongest impression was that the former gap separating artists from the rest of the people is rapidly diminishing. And the potential of this fact is as staggering to me as the development of the sputniks.

POWER DEVELOPMENT IN THE USSR

THREE UNITED STATES SENATORS sent to the USSR on instruction of the Senate to study relative power development in the USA and the USSR, left Moscow, according to the *New York Times*, October 20, with the "regrettable" conclusion that the USSR was assuming world leadership in the development of hydroelectric power.

The Senators were impressed not only by what they saw in their month's tour of the Soviet Union, but by what they had learned of Soviet efforts in China and Egypt.

While assisting in the construction of a large dam on the Yellow River in China, the Soviets have also taken the lead in planning for the Yangtze River a dam that will, when completed, produce more than twelve times the power generated by the Grand Coulee Dam, according to the Senators.

Also they reported that forty Soviet engineers are working with 7,000 Chinese engineers on plans for a dam in the Ichang Gorge, east of Chungking. The project is designed to produce 25,000,000 kilowatts, with generators to be manufactured in the USSR.

Soviet designers have received approval of their plans for the Aswan High Dam on the Nile, to be started by a credit of 400,000,000 rubles extended to Cairo by Moscow. The generators for Aswan are to be built in the USSR.

The Soviet Union is selling generators to thirty-six countries, the Senators also reported.

The China-India Border

by ANNA LOUISE STRONG

We are glad to present to our readers this on-the-spot story of the reaction in China, and especially Tibet, to the Sino-Indian border dispute.

It is interesting to note that on September 11, just prior to the Khrushchev visit to the United States, the Soviet News Agency TASS issued a statement to the effect that leading Soviet circles hoped the Chinese and Indian Governments would not allow the dispute to further the aims of those circles seeking to prevent the emerging relaxation of international tensions. It said that these leading Soviet circles "express confidence that both Governments will settle their misunderstanding, taking into account their mutual interests, in the spirit of the traditional friendship between peoples of China and India. This will also help strengthen the forces standing for peace and international cooperation."

Since Miss Strong's article was written, Premier Nehru has sent a note to Premier Chou En-lai rejecting Chinese claims to the border territory, and saying Chinese troops must be withdrawn from the disputed land before negotiations could take place. However, despite recent sharp exchanges between the two governments, on October 7, answering a message of greeting from Premier Nehru on the Tenth Anniversary of the Chinese People's Republic, Premier Chou En-lai declared that any difficulties in Sino-Indian relations "are merely an episode in our age-old friendship," and expressed hope for continuation of that friendship.

Peking, October 1, 1959

FOR the first time in history the Tibetan people have been holding mass-meetings in Lhasa on the Roof of the World to denounce the invasion of their land by foreign troops. And while in the American press it is the accepted view that Chinese troops invaded Tibet and suppressed Tibetans, the mass meetings are denouncing Indian troops. Nor do the accusations come from former serfs, who might be expected to support their Chinese Communist liberators. They come

from Living Buddhas, from former officials of the Tibetan local government, from a nephew of the Thirteenth Dalai Lama, from aged dignitaries who themselves took part in that notorious Simla Conference in 1913, and who now arise from the past to compile its history.

Indian troops, they state, have since 1951 increasingly invaded Tibet, occupying its farmlands and winter pastures, driving out or jailing Tibetan officials, forbidding the population to pay to Lhasa the taxes and labor duties they have given for centuries without a break. The Indians use as excuse a so-called borderline, which a British official drew some forty-five years ago, but which neither Peking nor Lhasa ever acknowledged and which Brit-

ANNA LOUISE STRONG, famous world correspondent and author of many books on the USSR, China and our own country, has been in China now for over a year. She recently visited Tibet.

ain never dared claim or put on its maps till 1942, because it was clearly illegal.

This will at first seem unbelievable in the United States where Premier Nehru has a reputation as a pacifist and progressive, and where China has been repeatedly labeled as "aggressor" over actions in Korea, the Taiwan Straits, Laos and Tibet. So firmly fixed has the assumption of Peking's aggressive nature become by constant repetition that the State Department's spokesman argued against China's admission to the United Nations on the ground that China had a lawless, aggressive government, as shown by the various armed conflicts on its borders.

There is no space here to note in detail that to the Chinese it seems that all these border conflicts—from Korea, to Taiwan, to Laos, to Tibet—arise from the actions of Washington, which sends money, arms and finally troops 8,000 miles in order to "contain" Peking. But both regard for truth and for peace would indicate that China's list of facts should be at least considered.

I shall not argue that China only entered the Korean war when her own territory was bombed and when American troops approached her border. Nor is there space for Laos, where China is not proved to have intervened, though the country is on her border, while Washington, 8,000 miles away, has conspicuously intervened to install and protect a new dictator with arms. But since I myself have just returned from Lhasa to Peking, I must take up the case of the Tibetans. For this is a conspicuous case not only of how conflicts arise between nations that

need to be friendly—like India and China—but of how Britain, in common with other imperialists, indulged in drawing borders which cut the living bodies of nations in half, and brought havoc down the years.

The argument over the Sino-Indian border has been smoldering for years, but has not erupted into flame because neither side wanted to make it an issue. It is now apparent that for the past eight years Indian troops have been steadily encroaching on territory that the Chinese believe belonged to China, and that Peking has not even announced this to the world because Peking did not wish to increase tension. The first Indian advances into disputed territory began in 1951, when the Chinese People's Republic, only recently established, was involved in a war in Korea in which she badly wanted India's friendly neutrality. In subsequent years China and India were building the Bandung policy throughout Asia, and both avoided controversy.

Controversy has now erupted, not from China but from India, in Indian claims that Chinese troops are invading India's territory. In August Nehru made ten speeches in the Indian parliament, charging China with sending troops over her border, each speech, up to September 6, being more bitter than the last. Other Indian officials went further; deputies demanded the bombing of China's territory and mobs demonstrated in front of the Chinese embassy in New Delhi and the Chinese consulates in Calcutta and Bombay.

For a month China did not even answer these charges and they became fixed as true in the eyes of the Western world. Then on September

8, Chou En-lai replied in a courteous but firm and detailed letter to Nehru, in which the Chinese view was stated:

1) That the long border between China and India had never been formally delimited by joint surveys and treaty and that China had been urging that this be done.

2) That the Chinese maps follow a traditional border line which has existed in rough form for centuries, defined by local administrations and taxation, and that this line had also been accepted on British maps and subsequent Indian maps until early in the century, after which Britain began unilaterally to make increasing changes in her maps, changes never accepted by either Peking or Lhasa as valid.

3) That no Chinese Government had ever accepted the so-called MacMahon line as valid, but the present Chinese People's Republic, while repudiating that boundary, but knowing that India claimed it, had resolutely kept her troops on the Chinese side while awaiting the border's definition; but that Indian troops had gone beyond the British claims and beyond even some expanded Indian claims, invaded Chinese territory and fired on Chinese border guards. Peking had kept silent for eight years in which India took increasing bits of territory, because Peking did not wish dispute, but now it was necessary to speak out because of the Indian charges against China.

Peking again suggested the need of a mutual delimitation of the border through joint surveys and treaties "with due regard to history."

Following Chou En-lai's letter, discussion broke out all over China, joined by experts on international law, on map making, and by Tibetans with experience regarding that particular border. Indian attacks died down and it was announced that Nehru would first collect his own proofs of border claims before giving formal reply.

The disputed area totals some

130,000 square kilometers, 90,000 (34,000 square miles) at the eastern end of the border, the smaller part at the western end. The total is thus about four times the size of Massachusetts, an amount of territory which no government would willingly give up without clear cause. The eastern end is the area where the British officer MacMahon drew in 1914 a British-desired border, which Nehru still defends as "natural border" because it follows the high crest of the Himalayas.

Diplomats sitting in offices may find it "natural" to follow a mountain crest, but Tibetan herdsmen, who want to move downhill as the winter comes on, do not find it "natural" to be shut off from the area which is winter pasture; nor did the Tibetan Government in Lhasa find it "natural" when the long southern, and hence sunny, slope of the Himalayas was taken away from their otherwise bleak country, and the provinces of Lo and Takun, known as "Tibet's granary," were cut in two.

In short, the Tibetans resisted and the British never dared take it or claim it officially. That was left for India under Nehru, who expressed "sympathy for the Tibetans" as a main national policy, to do.

Nehru has claimed that China, using its new might, seeks to revive the claims of past centuries. This rather overstates the case. If Peking went back even one century the claims would be much more serious. Less than a century ago, Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim were paying tribute to Peking; but today Peking accepts the fact that these are either independent kingdoms or Indian protectorates. It will startle

Americans to know that even Gilgit, a spot in Kashmir presently held by Pakistan invaders and given to the USA as a missile base, was paying tribute to Peking less than a century ago. Peking today makes no claim to any of these places, because they were lost to British aggression in the days of the Chinese Empire, and have now been for decades administered by governments whose center of gravity lies in India or Pakistan.

The main contest lies in areas where, China claims, Britain and/or India drew boundaries unilaterally and fairly recently, justified neither by China's agreement, nor by actual seizure and administration, over any extended period. The long border falls naturally into three sections: the western end, between India's Ladakh and China's Sinkiang and Tibet, a central part between India's Punjab and Uttar Pradesh and China's Ari, and the southeastern border, east of Bhutan, where MacMahon drew that notorious line.

The western region, containing a contested area of 38,000 square kilometers, is important because it holds the pass from Tibet into Sinkiang where China recently built a connecting highway. New Delhi announced that this road crossed Indian territory. Peking replied that it did not. In September 1958, Chinese border guards encountered fifteen Indian soldiers in this area, but when these admitted that they were trespassing to do reconnaissance work, they were escorted back over what the Chinese considered the border. There was no serious follow-up by India and nobody in China seems to know just where India got the border line shown today on In-

dian maps, since the early British maps, notably one made in 1854 by a John Walker for the East India Company, follow the border now claimed by China rather than that now claimed by India.

In the central part of the border, between India's Punjab and Uttar Pradesh and China's Ari, the divergence between the boundary claimed by either side is not very wide, but is measured in natural features and populated places rather than in square kilometers. Several spots are disputed here; the oldest dispute going back thirty to forty years. At that time Britain occupied Sang and Tsungsha against the protest of the inhabitants and held them against repeated protests from Lhasa. Since 1951, however, Indian forces have gone further than the British and have seized seven additional places formerly listed as Chinese territory, namely Parigan, Chuvu, Chuje, Shiki Pass, Puling-Sumdo, Sangsha and Pathal. Peking sent notes of protest but "in the interests of peace," which meant specifically, the interests of Indian neutrality in the cold war, and Indian help in the Bandung agreements—did not announce the seizures to the world.

By far the most important contested area lies east of Bhutan where India claims—and occupies—some 34,000 square miles, the whole southern slope of the Himalayas, cutting deep into Tibet's winter pastures and the farming areas of Loka and Takun, known as "the granary of Tibet." The authority given by Nehru is the so-called MacMahon Line, which India claims was agreed to in the Simla Conference, attended by delegates from China,

Britain and Tibet and has been a valid border ever since. China replies that the British did not even dare mention it at the Simla Conference, but agreed with a Tibetan delegate "behind the back of the Central Government of China," and that it was later repudiated even by Lhasa, while the entire Simla Conference was repudiated by the Central Government of Peking. The line was therefore only a draft, never became legal, never was marked on the ground or definitely defined, and Britain never dared claim it, either in actuality or on maps, until decades later. The entire area paid tribute in taxes and labor service to Lhasa until the Indian troops entered by force in 1951.

If one asks why China did not make more effective protest when India marched into the area in 1951, one notes that not only the basic desire of China for friendship with India operated, but that when India entered this territory in February 1951, Peking had not yet signed the Agreement with the Dalai Lama by which the People's Liberation Army was recognized by Tibetans as its border army of defense.

It was therefore on the local Tibetans that the impact of the Indian occupation fell. They have come out with their accounts in the recent meetings in Lhasa.

We turn first to an aged dignitary who had personal experience of the Simla Conference. The 78-year-old Lama Shinggring Lobu, attaché to the delegation that went to Simla from Lhasa, states:

We officials of the local Tibet Government set out from Lhasa for Simla in August 1912. We took part in several

conferences but none of the documents was signed by the representative of the Chinese Government. The so-called MacMahon Line was not mentioned in the conferences; it was secretly decided by the British and individual Tibetans. The majority of the Tibetan delegation never heard of it.

Especially revealing is the statement by a nephew of the Thirteenth Dalai Lama, Namdon Kuna Wonchug, who held from 1926 to 1942 the post of "silun," the highest official under the Dalai Lama and higher than any cabinet minister. He said that all boundary questions were put in his hands and he therefore went over all documents of the Simla Conference, including the Dalai Lama's instructions to the Tibetan representative Shatra, and also Shatra's report and the Dalai Lama's subsequent repudiation of Shatra's actions by formal letter to Britain. He states:

Shatra sent from Simla a letter that the British wanted a new boundary. The Dalai was very angry and wrote Shatra not to cede an inch of Tibetan soil, and that he would be punished if he did. This frightened Shatra and he at first refused to sign but when the British offered him 5,000 rifles and half a million rounds of ammunition, he finally signed. . . . When Shatra returned, the Dalai demanded his report and then wrote to the British: "We cannot recognize the border that you have drawn." . . . Even if the Dalai Lama had recognized it, no such decisions were valid without the agreement of China and no local Tibetan decisions were valid without the calling together of the representatives of the Big Monasteries . . . the local clerical and lay officials of Lhasa. None of this was done.

We turn next to the statements of Tibetan cabinet ministers, known as "kaloons" and forming the "Kasha" or civil government in Lhasa

in more recent times. . . . Rompa Tutan Kunching, Chief Kaloon after 1943 (tantamount to prime minister) states:

The Tibetan local government never recognized the MacMahon Line but always denounced it and continued to exercise administrative power over the territory which this line claimed for Britain. . . . The whole Simla Conference was a plot to detach Tibet from China. The Chinese Government never signed it, and the Tibetan who signed the MacMahon Line had no authority to do it and never dared reveal what he had done. . . . For a long time the Tibetan Government never knew of it. . . . But in 1947 the Indian Government sent a note to the Kasha wishing to "inherit" British rights to the territory south of the MacMahon Line. This aroused indignation and the Kasha sent a firm "NO" to Mr. Nehru by wire, formally rejected the claim. Mr. Nehru should recall it.*

Testimony also comes from another former Kaloon, who held office in Lhasa from 1943 to 1949, Gasha Chuji-nima:

When Indian independence was granted, Britain wrote that the border question was now between us and India. India asked that we recognize the MacMahon Line and India sent troops to the area. The indignant local population appealed to us in Lhasa. We thereupon summoned the conference of the Big Three Monasteries and the government officials to discuss this matter and sent a formal note to Nehru refusing to recognize this illegal claim. However, in 1951 India sent more troops and occupied large areas south of the MacMahon Line and refused to let the local people pay taxes to Lhasa any more. They interned the local Tibetan officials at this time.

We next turn to actual details of India's armed occupation. Living Buddha Baso Thubten-chuji of

Ganden Monastery stated in Lhasa September 15, 1959:

I personally saw how the Indian troops invaded our territory eight years ago. I was preaching the scriptures in Tawang (mid-way in the area claimed by the MacMahon Line for Britain—A.L.S.) The Indian troops came February 7, 1951. Three Indian civilians with seventy soldiers came suddenly from the south, occupied Tawang, forced the county head to call a meeting of village headmen, and stated that they had come on orders of the Indian Government and that this area would henceforth belong to India and pay taxes not to Lhasa but to India. They gave the local officials a time limit to leave. Many villages held meetings of indignation but the Indian troops suppressed them. The lhanyer (Lhasa representative) escaped to report to Lhasa but the Indians then imprisoned his aide and flogged him. I myself was ordered to leave the district and not allowed to finish my sermons. When I left, the Indians confiscated all my personal effects and also 40 bags of barley given me as offering to the Ganden Monastery. . . . Tawang has been for centuries part of China, administered by the local Tibet Government, and we cannot tolerate this Indian invasion and seizure of our territory.

We sum up the Tibetan case in the words of Ngapo Ngawang Jigme, executive secretary of the present Tibetan Government:

The MacMahon Line was never discussed at the Simla Conference but signed outside it illegally by irresponsible parties and not even revealed for twenty years. China repudiated it; so did the Thirteenth Dalai Lama for Tibet. Britain did not dare publish the claim and for twenty years nobody even knew about it in Tibet. . . . In the 1940's British troops marched into Mon Tawang and were resisted by the local people, and the Lhasa Government made many protests. In 1957 when India became independent, she asked Tibet what we agreed to and Tibet called a conference of all responsible organizations and officials

* Nehru, asked in press conference in New Delhi if he recalled, replied that he had a vague memory of some telegrams but not of their contents.

and formally repudiated the MacMahon Line . . . informing India to that effect. However, when Chando was liberated in 1950, India poured troops into the area between the old boundary and the MacMahon Line and seized it. . . . This year, 1959, India goes even further. Indian troops press even beyond the MacMahon Line and seize hitherto unclaimed parts of Tibet.

The chiefs of the Military Area of Tibet give further details of recent Indian seizures in 1959, which they trace to Indian support of the Tibetan rebellion. The recent Indian advances are given in Chou En-lai's letter to Nehru September 8. He lists the previous incursions of Indian troops and adds:

Despite repeated invasion by Indian troops the situation remained fairly good until after the rebellion in Tibet. At once after the flight of Tibetan rebels into India, Indian troops began pushing forward across the eastern section of the Sino-Tibetan border . . . changing unilaterally not only the existing border as far as the MacMahon Line but even beyond it. The border currently drawn on Indian maps in places goes further than the MacMahon Line and the Indian troops went even beyond this. . . . They invaded Longju and occupied it, intruded into Yasher and are still in occupation of Shatze, Khinzebane and Tardamen, shielding armed Tibetan bandits in these areas. The Indian troops unlawfully occupying Longju launched armed attacks on Chinese frontier guards at Migyitun, leaving them no recourse but to defend themselves.

This was the first and so far the only recorded instance of an armed clash. According to Chou En-lai, this first clash was launched by Indian troops.

The ominous thing is that Nehru has chosen to make his claim, not among experts in a boundary-fixing commission, but by accusations in

parliament and the world press, and by the march of troops into Tibet. This suggests that he seeks not territory—he already holds the disputed territory, having seized it in 1951—but a propaganda triumph over China, to strengthen his internal struggles against both the right wing and the Communists.

The question then becomes: Whither Nehru? He has three possible paths.

He may choose to stand pat where he now is, asserting loyalty to the Bandung ideals while also insisting on the boundary as India unilaterally draws it, thus seeking to draw support in the coming elections both from the right and the left, and prevent the rise of more Communist states like Kerala. He may agree to a boundary commission without advance limitations, but this would draw furious attack from the right. He may, however, himself be moving to the right, as shown by his action in Kerala, and may stir attacks on China to cover his own move towards the West.

That, I think, is the real question, whose answer the future may unroll.

Peking in the meantime is in a delicate position. China cannot recognize a British scheme that flopped thirty-five years ago. But neither does she wish to give any grounds for an Indian move to the right. She will probably continue to assert her claims by drawing her maps as they have been drawn for decades, and making at need some firm but courteous statement like that on September 8 by Chou En-lai, while awaiting a formal definition of the boundary by a joint commission or by some future act of history.

National Council of American-Soviet Friendship

by RICHARD MORFORD

Director of the Council

THE new situation is an exciting one for all who believe in international friendship and peace. Everybody, it seems, wants to know more about the Soviet Union. Did you ever see such widespread interest as was exhibited in the Khrushchev visit? Millions of Americans watched TV steadily during the ten days. Friends pounced upon friends to repeat the newspaper accounts of what the Soviet Premier said and did, forgetting in their eagerness that those to whom they spoke themselves had read every story.

The Khrushchev visit marks the high point in an interest that has been growing at a rapid pace in recent years and months. This interest is made concrete in the phenomenal renewal of requests for the services of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.

Schools, colleges and universities call for everything that's written in English. Last school year the high schools of the country used as their debate topic, "Resolved, that the U.S. should adopt the essential features of the Soviet educational system." Teacher coaches and student debaters the country over besieged the Council for help. We made collections of materials—books, pamphlets, magazine articles, photographs, films. A sizeable packet was the answer to every request. State teachers' colleges were the equal of the high schools in requests concerning Soviet education.

Happily, we are equipped this fall with a new authoritative and comprehensive pamphlet on Soviet education by one who spent six weeks a year ago in first-hand observation of Soviet schools in operation and discussions with Soviet educators. The pamphlet is "Soviet Education: Today and Tomorrow" by Elizabeth Moos. This pamphlet has been placed in the public library of every town in the U.S. with 10,000 or over in population. And in every college and university library where the institution's enrollment is 400 or more. And in the hands of 300 selected educators—a total of 3,500. We expect the remaining 6,500 of this printing to be called for rapidly.

The current publications program of the Council schedules other major pamphlets: First, a historical record of American-Soviet relations by Dr. Harry F. Ward; then a manual "Basic Facts of the USSR"; another "Peoples of the Soviet Union" (to describe the people of the various republics and deal with the Soviet Union's handling of minorities); yet another on "Soviet Trade Unions." All, of course, to be written by Americans who are experts in these fields.

A project evidently popular with the public libraries these days, judging by the numerous inquiries, is an exhibition of pictures and books of the Soviet Union in the entrance foyer. To meet these requirements,

the Council has 100 sets of up-to-date photographs, each set containing from 25 to 75 pictures and covering a different phase of Soviet life and activities. These picture sets are also widely used in classrooms. Available for borrowing are books and pamphlets of Soviet authorship, translated and published in English, embracing the various types of literature and covering many subjects—science, education, culture, the family, etc.

Best of all educational media are documentary films. Thousands of Americans each year will go to see the Soviet Union for themselves. For many other thousands in general audiences, students in college, women in the church societies, sixth grade boys and girls doing a special project "Learning About Other Countries," the films provide even more extensive glimpses of Soviet people at work and play than most travelers enjoy. A film in color, showing the life of one of the Republics, serves well to increase understanding and appreciation of the Soviet people and their accomplishments. The Council maintains a library of Soviet films available on loan. This fall again there is a steady flow of "bookings" from every direction.

Infinite are the possibilities in the field of cultural exchange. No diplomatic negotiations and resulting political agreements can be more significant factors in keeping the peace than a wide cultural intercourse between the peoples of the two countries.

A new period of interchange began in 1955, notwithstanding the cold war, when Iowa farm leaders invited Soviet farm leaders to come to our

country. They came. Next year Iowa farmers were in the Soviet Union. Both sides liked it. This back and forth continued each year until Premier Khrushchev was invited to visit Iowa on his recent trip. He accepted gladly and there came into closer contact with American people than anywhere along the road.

President Eisenhower has spoken of the desirability of people-to-people exchange. We would like to see the rapid development of American travel to the Soviet Union, including more farmers but, most of all, of men and women employed in our industries. It is the working people of the country who can bring about an acceptance and implementation of a policy of peaceful coexistence. We want our people to "see the sights" in the Soviet Union, as tourists. But much more we want them to meet the Soviet people personally. This is difficult of arrangement but we believe that Soviet leadership will try increasingly to make this possible. In turn, we wish the Soviet Union to permit its ordinary citizens to come here in great numbers. To see the sights, yes, but also to meet our people. We believe the American people will welcome them into every part of their daily experience, and take them into their homes—Americans are incurably friendly.

Look at another kind of exchange that can and should be multiplied. The Director of a private Nursery and Kindergarten called the other day. "What are the chances," he inquired, "of securing paintings and drawings done by quite young Soviet children?" He thinks it good to begin to introduce our American

children very early to children of other countries. Said he had special interest in art; thought it a good place to begin. Of course, he would gladly send the drawings of the children in his school to a school in the Soviet Union. "Can you put me in contact with nurseries or kindergartens over there which might like to exchange?" Well, of course, we can and we did!

Rockwell Kent, the Council's distinguished National Chairman, returned this fall from a second visit to the Soviet Union with a plan for another type of art exchange: a collection of representative American paintings and graphic drawings to be presented to Friendship House in Moscow, the home of the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries. This art might hang in Friendship House during President Eisenhower's visit to Moscow next spring. In turn, may it not be possible to find a home in our country for a continuous exhibition of Soviet art, with an opening to take place simultaneously with the display of American art in Moscow?

Consider the possibilities in a full-scale city-to-city exchange. Let there be chosen an American city and a Soviet city with common interests, be it their industrial life, the fact that each is a center of an agricultural region, that each has extraordinary educational institutions, or other similarities. In the American city let a nursery school, a library, a factory, a trade union, a high school class, an amateur theatrical group take the initiative in communicating with a corresponding set-up in the Soviet city. Each will tell the other about itself, of

its functioning and the people joined in it. Photographs can be exchanged; exhibits can be prepared. Letters between leaders will discuss common problems. Suppose that in the summer of 1960 a representative group from the American city goes to the Soviet Union. They would go to many places of interest but, at some point, the Americans would be received as guests in the Soviet city with which the exchange had already begun. In 1961 the Soviet city would send its delegation to the U.S. Can you see what splendid possibilities the idea has? We vote for the continuation of the exchange of delegations of specialists chosen on a national basis. But we think that city-to-city exchange can involve more people, indeed, as it develops, the entire community becomes partner to this enterprise of international understanding and friendship.

It is our hope that in the next two months a new official governmental agreement between the USA and the USSR for scientific and cultural exchange can be consummated—an even broader agreement than the original one of January, 1958, renewal of which is now being negotiated. But beyond all official plans there is a large place for unofficial projects of exchange such as those outlined above. The National Council will continue to promote exchange, bearing down heavily on that kind which offers opportunity for community initiative and involves the most people.

However important the circulation of information and the promotion of cultural and scientific exchange, we must tackle directly the political and military problems that

divide the USA and the USSR and endanger world peace.

There is a wide distance between here and the summit even now. Moreover, Premier Khrushchev speaks wisely: to settle the political and military problems, more than one summit conference of major powers will be necessary. We cannot afford dragging feet on either side; nor can we permit one try with a conclusion: "It's no use." Since American-Soviet relations have been the Council's business for the nearly seventeen years of its existence, we feel we have a responsibility in the present situation. We must do our part to win public support for a policy of negotiations—in bi-lateral meetings, in summit conferences, in the United Nations—and more negotiations until agreement has been reached.

Premier Khrushchev again put the challenge to disarm squarely before the world. In recent years the largest amount of discussion and negotiation to a point of near-agreement have gathered around the issue of stopping bomb tests. This is a crucial starting point on the road to disarmament. The two heads of state think that an agreement is not impossible. But clearly this will require a lot of pushing. Who is doing the pushing here? Principally the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy which finds its larg-

est measure of cooperation through the Peace Section of the American Friends Service Committee and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, which, in turn, pursue their own programs to the same end. But what of their outreach to the masses of American citizens? Not anywhere near what it must be. And not geared as decisively as it must be to action—to direct influence upon Washington where decisions are made. Agreement to end the tests and to take the next required steps to avert world-wide destruction by bombs must start with agreement between our country and the Soviet Union. Therefore, the National Council will work with its friends throughout the country in the ensuing months, fortifying them with information, our best appraisal of the situation, and practical action recommendations. We shall count on these friends to renew their efforts to bring about wide-scale local action that touches the entire citizenry.

We began by suggesting that the present interaction between the U.S. and the S.U. is *exciting*. We end by saying it is also *promising* in terms of the development of international friendship and a world at peace. The National Council is proud of its continuing engagement in this exciting and promising business.

DEBUT OF A POLISH PIANIST

RYSZARD BAKST, a Polish pianist who came here through an exchange arrangement between the National Music League and a Polish Government agency, made his debut in New York on October 8.

His all-Chopin program, according to the music critic of the *Herald-Tribune*, October 9, revealed a thorough technical command in playing which gave a sense of poise and experience and a deep understanding of the composer's music.

Khrushchev Across America

A FEW additions on the first part of the visit of Premier Khrushchev (see October NWR) should be mentioned. Congress, as we know, had rushed through its last minute business and gone home just before Mr. Khrushchev arrived. Perhaps a few of its members had the grace to be embarrassed at facing the visitor with a record of no progress at all on the vital civil rights issue, and with passage of the worst labor legislation in U.S. history to their discredit.

"Peace, peace, peace, peace"

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee, headed by Sen. J. W. Fulbright (D., Ark.), however, invited Mr. Khrushchev and some of his associates to lunch at the Capitol. At this session most of the questions concerned not American-Soviet relations but other countries, which the Soviet Premier did not feel free to discuss. Some interesting details have since been made available by Senator Wayne Morse (D., Ore.) in an interview in *U.S. News and World Report* (Sept. 28). Senator Morse said the main burden of Khrushchev's remarks was "peace, peace, peace, peace," and indicated that he and others were impressed with his sincerity. He noted that while some of the Senators present did not have an especially friendly attitude toward Mr. K, all were impressed with the fact that they were dealing with "an exceedingly able man," and all without exception wanted his autograph! Senator Morse mentioned the fact that frequently other members of Khrushchev's party stood up to answer questions before the Premier himself said anything, and that the attitude in the Soviet group gave the impression of Khrushchev as "chairman of a po-

litical committee rather than a dictator."

As an aftermath of the rude heckling that had occurred during the Economic Club Dinner in New York, President Herbert D. Woodman sent a letter of apology, and Mr. Khrushchev replied that he was aware that those who tried to mar the meeting with unfriendly comments "do not represent the opinion either of the business circles or of the American people." On his departure from New York, Mr. Khrushchev said he had formed the conviction that the city's leaders, businessmen "and especially its people" do not want war. He expressed regret that there had not been an opportunity to meet more working people, since as an old worker and miner he felt more at home among them.

In Los Angeles and San Francisco

The beginning of the Khrushchev trip to the West (accompanied by hundreds of the press, photographers, and security men) was not at all auspicious. The plane landed at a remote, unannounced part of the Los Angeles airport, with the public excluded. Mr. Khrushchev and his party were whisked in a closed car over a secret empty route. Mayor Poulson offered the curtest of greetings on his arrival and started off the civic dinner that night with a crude reference to the "we will bury you" remark (which Khrushchev had previously explained had meant not physical burial, but simply his conviction that the socialist system would supersede capitalism just as the latter had superseded feudalism.) The Mayor was quoted in the local press and TV as having said, previous to Khrushchev's arrival: "I am going to have my fist out, but it is going to be covered with

velvet. And under the velvet I am going to have a long sharp knife, and I am going to shove it in."

The first engagement was a Hollywood luncheon, with Eric Johnston, President of the Motion Picture Association, and Spyros Skouras, Twentieth Century Fox President, as hosts. All Hollywood had vied for invitations. "Never," said the press, "was there a bigger or more shining collection of movie stars, not even for Academy Awards or the swankiest premiere." Mr. Khrushchev kept up a running fire of good humored debate with Mr. Skouras, spoke seriously of the importance of motion pictures, and angrily about being excluded from a visit to Disneyland for "security" considerations, and then was treated to an exhibiton of a can-can dance from a 20th-Century Fox film. The vulgarity of this, though they watched politely, shocked not only the Khrushchev party but the French star of the film, the State Department and many others. Later Mr. Khrushchev declared, "Humanity's face is more beautiful than it's backside—and that's what they showed me."

At the dinner that evening, Mr. Khrushchev paid a graceful tribute to California and its pioneering spirit, similar to that of the Soviet Union:

There is much in common between the peoples of the USSR and the United States. The meetings I have had convince me that the American people value and love peace. I notice quite a few other points of resemblance between our peoples. These are industriousness, the quest for the new, the quest for knowledge, for technical progress and finally, such good human traits as frankness, a sense of humor, good will and love of their country.

Following his prepared address, from beginning to end an appeal for peace, Mr. Khrushchev turned to Mayor Poulson and asked why he had brought up again this question of "burial." "Why do you get up on this favorite horse of

yours and proceed in the same old direction, which can only lead to a continuation of the arms race?" He went on:

I am talking seriously, because I have come here with serious intentions, and you try to reduce the matter simply to a joke. It is a question of war or peace between our two countries, a question of life or death of the people.

We are extending the hand of friendship—if you accept it, then you should manifest a reasonable approach to matters. One should not play upon words. We hold positions of too much responsibility and the consequences of a play upon words can be too sad for our peoples.

He then said that President Eisenhower had shown statesmanlike wisdom in inviting him to this country, and an understanding of the importance of reaching agreement, but that if others didn't agree, and if his reception was to be unfriendly, then he could simply fly home again.

Mr. Lodge and the State Department were aghast, press and people questioned deplored the Mayor's departure from the California tradition of hospitality and good manners.

On his return to Moscow, Mr. Khrushchev revealed that he had that night asked Minister of Foreign Affairs Gromyko to tell Mr. Lodge "that if things were not righted I would not find it possible to continue the trip." All this, he said, produced its effect, and next morning everything had changed.

Big friendly crowds greeted Khrushchev as he got off the train at Santa Barbara and San Luis Obispo, on the way to San Francisco, joyously he mingled with the people, embraced the children. He called the encounter his "liberation" from the huge security forces that had guarded him everywhere, and told the press:

Today I won my freedom. I was able to meet real live Americans and look them in the eye. I'm happy that the house arrest I was placed under has been

lifted. . . . I've always had a high opinion of the American people. It seems they are as good as our Soviet people. I want to use all the opportunities I have to meet Americans. I am not only a leader, I am a servant of the people. My strength is in my ties with the people. To lose that is to lose all influence. All the people, whether they are Soviet people or American people want the same thing. They all want peace.

As the crowds surged around him Mr. Lodge had to lock hands with Soviet security agents to help Mr. Khrushchev keep his balance. Disappearing into the train again, Mr. K. yelled over his shoulder, "Save Lodge!"

The welcome swelled as Khrushchev and his party reached San Francisco. There were warm cheers along his route and a crowd of 10,000 to greet him uproariously as he reached the Mark Hopkins Hotel, and later spoke from the balcony.

Under the caption "Not So Weird, Mister," the *San Francisco Bulletin* carried an item next day about the astonishment some of the newsmen in the entourage displayed at this reception. One turned to a well-dressed matron clapping enthusiastically as Mr. K. entered the hotel: "Say, you sure got a weird bunch of people out here!" "We are trying to save a world for our children to live in," she answered hotly. "If that's weird, I plead guilty!"

Encounters with Labor Leaders

In sharp contrast to everything else that happened in San Francisco was the shameful behavior of the seven AFL-CIO vice presidents, headed by Walter Reuther, UAW President, and James Carey of the IUEW, who invited Premier Khrushchev to a private dinner on September 20, the night of his arrival in San Francisco. George Meany, AFL-CIO President, had earlier refused the suggestion of the State Department that the Soviet Premier be invited to attend the annual convention, which opened

September 18 with a bitter denunciation by Meany of the Soviet Union, and later passed anti-Soviet resolutions, trying to line up the labor movement of the United States with the most reactionary elements in our country and the world. No one challenged these positions from the floor, yet many of the delegates privately voiced their disgust to others, and it is certain the rank and file of U.S. labor does not share these views so contrary to their own interests.

Evidently Walter Reuther and others who arranged the private dinner simply wanted to show that they were better red-baiters than Meany, in their own way. First, they made the rude gesture of releasing to the press just before the dinner a list of the sharp questions they intended to ask of Mr. Khrushchev. Afterwards Mr. Reuther called a press conference giving his own version of the affair, at one point quoting Khrushchev as having said "I am the dictator," so that Joseph Curran, NMU President, who had been present, felt impelled to go over to him and remind him that Khrushchev had said nothing of the kind. Curran and Emile Rieve, of the Textile Workers Union, later called Reuther's report "a lot of nonsense." The summary of the session issued later by the labor leaders themselves was quite different from Reuther's report, but it too was so distorted that Soviet reporters present later issued a fuller account, which was published in the Soviet press (a translation was printed in *The Worker*, October 11). In any case, it is clear that most of the trade union leaders present baited Mr. Khrushchev rudely (some of them, it is reported, were quite drunk) that Khrushchev quite naturally was angered by some of their statements, but that he gave much fuller and franker answers than they reported, and sought to turn the discussion in the direction not of differences, but of common interests and peace.

Everywhere else in San Francisco Mr.

Khrushchev and his party had a wonderful time. There were warm greetings for him at the ILWU hall from President Harry Bridges as well as from the head of the employers, PMA President J. Paul St. Sure, and hundreds of longshoremen, with one of whom Khrushchev changed hats, proudly wearing the white worker's cap, complete with union button, throughout the day. "Here I feel at home. Here are the workers," he said. "May I here, as is the custom in the Soviet Union, address you as comrades?" "Yes!" roared the crowd, "Yes, Comrade Khrushchev!"

At the IBM plant there was also a warm welcome from President Thomas J. Watson, Jr., and hundreds of workers whose cafeteria luncheon Mr. K. shared. There was sightseeing around Golden Gate ("May our merchant ships go through, both ways!"), an ovation at a supermarket, and another warm welcome at a Civic Dinner where Mayor Christopher presided graciously, and the Soviet Premier outdid himself in the warmth of his remarks. Harrison Salisbury wrote next day in the *New York Times*:

Premier Khrushchev, in an address glowing with warmth, expressed hope tonight that war and its consequences would never again be visited on mankind and that the friendship between the two people should be "as warm and unextinguishable as your California sun."

Mr. Khrushchev indicated he considered the Los Angeles incident to be closed, and invited both Mayor Poulson and Mayor Christopher to come to the Soviet Union (unless this would hurt the latter in his current election campaign!). Presented with a gavel, he said he would like to strike it "after the signature of a treaty of friendship, non-aggression, and eternal love between the peoples of the Soviet Union and the United States."

In farewell he said, paraphrasing a Russian song, "All the cities I visited in the United States are good, but San Francisco is best of all!"

Iowa—Des Moines and Coon Rapids

Another hearty welcome awaited Mr. Khrushchev and his party in Des Moines, Iowa, where he was greeted enthusiastically by the largest crowd ever known to have turned out in that city (the friendly majority tore the hostile banners from the hands of a few Hungarian refugees from New York). Governor Loveless and Mayor Iles made warm speeches, at the official dinner that evening, the latter challenging the City of Krasnodar in the North Caucasus to compete with Des Moines in civic betterment, and farm products and proposing an exchange of ordinary citizens of both cities, an idea which the Soviet Premier took up. Mr. Khrushchev paid tribute to the high mechanization and labor productivity of U.S. agriculture and described Soviet agricultural achievements:

We can learn many useful things from each other, I am sure. . . . Some people think of our Seven-Year Plan as a threat. What is wrong with our wanting to compete with you. . . . We, for instance, are not inclined to think of the farmers of Iowa as aggressive people on the ground that they are now producing much more corn and meat than the farmers of the Kuban Valley. We are challenging you to a competition in the production of meat, milk, butter, consumer goods, steel, coal, oil so that the people can live better. This competition is more useful than any race in the stockpiling of hydrogen bombs or any other weapons. Let there be more corn and more meat and let there be no hydrogen bombs at all!

In Des Moines, Khrushchev visited the John Deere Implement Plant, and a packing plant where he sampled American hot dogs and found them good. "Are you tired?" a weary reporter asked him and the answer came: "I have no right to get tired. I sleep eight hours a night. A person who sleeps eight hours a night sleeps 20 out of 60 years. How can you get tired with 20 years' sleep?"

The visit to Roswell Garst's farm in Coon Rapids (returning a visit of Garst to the Soviet Union) was described by the press as "one of the warmest and most folksy" of the visit. Khrushchev looked and listened, took a genuine interest, admiring the corn and the huge cornfields. Mr. Khrushchev was interested in the extent of mechanization, but thought Soviet corn just as good, and felt that the corn was planted too close to get the best results. The day held a carnival mood, with some 5,000 out-of-town visitors, press and photographers, in addition to the neighbors invited by the Garsts, making a shambles of the place. Mr. Khrushchev obviously enjoyed mixing with the milling crowds. Later he visited Iowa State University, heard a lecture on hog-raising and met the home economics students.

Talk with Stevenson

During the visit to the Garst farm, Mr. Khrushchev held a farmyard conference with Adlai Stevenson. They spoke of the question of disarmament and of the need for a joint research program on heart disease, cancer and other medical matters. Mr. Khrushchev declared:

I think Governor Stevenson is as conscious as I am of how our nations can live in peace without war. . . . Stevenson told me he was a "politician in retirement" . . . but in politics it often happens that a person retires today and tomorrow he may be in the first rank. It all depends on the people . . . one must never be discouraged.

Later Stevenson issued a statement declaring he felt the visit a "hopeful omen" of peace. Of the Soviet Premier, he said:

He is extremely smart. I feel better about him as a result of this talk with him than I did after talking with him in the Soviet Union a year ago. . . . I think he is serious and wants to reduce the danger of armaments step by step

with simultaneous inspection and control appropriate to each step. At least his proposals should be carefully considered and not dismissed as propaganda.

Khrushchev in Pittsburgh

In Pittsburgh, great steel and mining center, where some had feared there might be trouble from the large number of refugees, Mr. Khrushchev and his party were met with the most spontaneous, heartwarming reception of the whole trip.

There was an official civic luncheon, another affair at the University of Pittsburgh, a visit to the Mesta steel plant—and a view of the empty struck plants of the U.S. Steel Corporation.

Homer Bigart wrote in the *New York Times* (Sept. 29), "Pittsburgh liked Premier Khrushchev and Mr. Khrushchev liked Pittsburgh." He reported that the huge throngs gathered in the downtown districts and the 15,000 in front of his hotel when he arrived gave him the warmest reception of the tour, and that Mayor Gallagher said they were the biggest crowds he had ever seen in the city. Given the key to the city, the Soviet Premier remarked he hoped he would not be blamed if any homes were broken into that night. At the luncheon, presided over by Governor Lawrence of Pennsylvania, the Soviet Premier said the city reminded him of his own distant past when he worked in the coal industry, that he liked serious-minded people, the efficiency of Americans, and the high level of U.S. industrial development. He urged that the two countries use their steel for peace, end the cold war, and live like good neighbors. Speaking of the prayers which preceded the lunch, he said:

I wish to extend my gratitude to Bishop John Wright, who has, I am told, appealed to all the believers of the city to welcome me and show themselves as good hosts to promote the improvement of relations between our countries. I also give thanks for the prayer we heard

before we commenced this lunch, because this was also a prayer for peace and better understanding between all nations.

Mr. Khrushchev spoke of his joy in meeting the children of Americans—"we too love our wives, our fathers, our children, just as much as you do." He continued:

Your country is a rich one and your people are living a good life. I have said jokingly at times and I want to repeat this—please do not judge me too severely for it—but I am making use of the expression sometimes current in your country, for example when you declare a week of prayer for the slaves of communism. To that I reply: Come to our country and see how the slaves of communism live. I have come to see how the slaves of capitalism live and I see that their life is not a bad one at all!

May I say we too will catch up and we will lead as rich a life as you are leading. . . . We want to overtake and surpass you by our physical and spiritual efforts, by the creative powers of our people. . . . You love your way of life, your system; we love our system and our social order. You believe yours to be better; well, live under those conditions until you become convinced of the opposite, but let us not hinder one another. . . .

Back in Washington

Mr. Khrushchev returned from Pittsburgh to greet his guests, fresh as a daisy, a few minutes after his arrival at the reception at the Soviet Embassy, and that evening to meet with businessmen to talk of trade at a dinner given by Eric Ridder, publisher of the *Journal of Commerce*, where Khrushchev told his fellow guests that disarmament and willingness to trade were the tests of whether the United States wanted peace or war. Then the historic talks at Camp David (already reported on), a luncheon by Secretary of State Herter, Khrushchev's final press conference and TV address and his departure.

Before leaving, Premier Khrushchev held a news conference (September 27)

at the National Press Club in Washington. He opened it by addressing his "esteemed fellow-traveling journalists," explaining that after he had traveled with them through the United States he looked upon them as "my fellow-travelers—my sputniks." He expressed his thanks that the majority of them, though this had not always been the case, wrote their stories in a friendly manner and tried to be objective. He said he had "enriched himself" by all that he saw and heard "in your great country."

Speaking of the pleasant talks he had with Eisenhower and how much in common there was in their understanding of the need to improve relations he said that the burdens that had piled up during the cold war years could not so easily be done away with, that much effort and patience and desire to improve relations on both sides were required. He declared:

I have no doubt whatsoever that the President is sincere in his desire to improve relations. . . . I must say that I believe the President faces more difficult conditions than I do. Apparently there are yet in the United States influential forces which are opposed to an improvement in relations. . . . My meetings with the representatives of the business world of your country show that there is mutual interest in the revival of the relationships and the ties which would be beneficial to both countries. . . . I would like to say a great deal about my meetings with the workers and farmers, the students and intellectuals of your country. I like your people. They, like the Soviet people, have one desire, to bring about peace and the prevention of a new war.

Answering a question as to whether he felt his visit will result in increased peaceful trade, he spoke of the great industrial capacity of the USSR, and continued . . .

If there is any intention to sell sausages or shoes to the Soviet Union you would not find a market for those goods in our country. But we are prepared

to develop trade with you, to buy what we need to buy and to sell to you what you need to buy from us, and that includes both industrial and consumer goods.

To a question as to whether a summit meeting was now assured, he commented that he could not now say that everything had been done to assure such a meeting, but that the Soviet Government felt the time was ripe for one.

A correspondent asked whether Russia would allow foreign observers on its soil at the precise moment the proposed disarmament program began. The Soviet Premier replied:

We believe that in the process of disarmament, each stage of the development of disarmament should be accompanied by inspection and control. That is to say that in accordance with each stage of disarmament, there should be introduced the appropriate inspection and control, and this throughout the whole process of disarmament. When the disarmament becomes general, the observers should certainly remain in order to make sure that the agreement is fully observed. . . . Then anyone could go anywhere, see anything, except the places which a housewife would prefer him not to see.

Farewell to America

In his farewell TV address the same day, the Premier reiterated his warm feelings for the American people and greater hopes for peace as a result of his trip. Speaking of his disarmament proposal, he declared:

If we are not planning to fight, why do you and we need all these armaments? I am told that your country every year spends an average of more than 40 billion dollars for armaments. As for us, I won't conceal that we spend about 25 billion dollars a year for the same purpose. Surely a better use for the people's money could be found.

He explained the Soviet Union's concern for ending the vestiges of the last war by a peace treaty with Germany,

and why for the present, with two Germanys, neither of them willing to give up their own social system, the Soviet Government felt that the only solution would be to sign a peace treaty with each German state, which would also ease the situation in Berlin, leaving it to the German people themselves to work out the question of eventual unification.

Mr. Khrushchev then gave an exposition of the nature of the Soviet Union as a state of the working people, their reasons for pride in their economic and cultural advances, and for expecting to surpass the United States in the next ten or twelve years in physical and per capita production, and in agriculture. He spoke of the great plans for increased housing under way, of education and health measures, of the lack of unemployment, of the plan to abolish all taxation of the people in the near future.

In closing, he expressed gratitude to the President and to all those who met him in a friendly way, and wished the American people prosperity and happiness:

And to express the hope that our visit to the United States and the forthcoming trip of President Eisenhower to the Soviet Union will be regarded, not only by the American and Soviet people but everywhere in the world, as the beginning of joint efforts in the quest for ways of bringing our states closer together and strengthening general peace.

Of Khrushchev's return to Moscow (see report of speech earlier) Max Frankel, Moscow correspondent, wrote to the *New York Times* (Sept. 28) that tens of thousands of people lined the road:

The goodwill was such that persons riding in American cars in the long official procession also received the plaudits of the crowds. Khrushchev looked tired, but appeared and sounded extremely relaxed and good humored.

"Okay!" said Khrushchev as he got off the plane, and according to the *Times* correspondent the rally that followed

was "awfully close to being a Soviet-American friendship meeting." Edward L. Freers, Chargé d'Affaires of the U.S. Embassy during the absence of Ambassador Llewellyn G. Thompson Jr., in the United States, was surprised by an invitation to join the Premier on the dais. Mr. Frankel continued his report:

While the Premier's listeners enjoyed the now expected barbs at America, they applauded most lustily his praise of President Eisenhower and other references to his warm reception in the United States. The cheers were especially loud when he concluded his talk with "Long live American-Soviet friendship!"

We believe, as the Women's International League declared in its Fall

Bulletin, that "the hard road toward disarmament and peaceful coexistence has been smoothed by the historic talks between Soviet Premier Khrushchev and President Eisenhower," and, with them take courage from the departing words of the Soviet leader as he left our country:

May God give us strength to solve matters by reason and not by force. That is what the people are expecting from us. If our two countries, instead of distrusting each other, establish relations of trust and pool their resources in the struggle for peace for themselves and for all, we shall be supported by the people of the whole world. PEACE, NOT WAR, IS THE NATURAL STATE OF MANKIND.

WE FALL IN LOVE WITH MRS. KHRUSHCHEV

SPACE, UNFORTUNATELY, HAS NOT PERMITTED US to report on the other members of Premier Khrushchev's party who came with him, distinguished personages in their own right, including the leading Soviet writer, Mikhail Sholokhov, and his wife, and the members of Khrushchev's family who accompanied him. These were his wife, Nina Petrovna Khrushchev, two of his daughters, Rada and Julia (Yelena remained in Moscow, where she is a student) his son Sergei (another son, Leonid, was killed in World War II) and his son-in-law, Alexei Adzhubei, editor of *Izvestia*. (Rada, Yelena and Sergei are Mrs. Khrushchev's children—the others those of his first wife, who died.)

Nina Petrovna Khrushchev charmed all who met her both in formal press conferences and informal conversations. The press was full of tributes to her as "serene and self-possessed," with a "lovely, warm face," "sympathetic and cordial," "well versed in American history," "highly intelligent," full of "graciousness and charm," "humor, tact and motherliness." "Her warm feeling for children was evident wherever she saw them"—everywhere she brought out pictures of her six grandchildren to show with pride, as any American grandmother might do. "People who have come in contact with her have found her kind, thoughtful, considerate, witty and possessed of beautiful manners."—"Nice American policeman," she said, patting the arm of one who rescued her from a smothering crowd—(the photograph was published widely).

"I guess people are the same the world over," was one of her remarks to the press.

Asked before her departure what she had liked best about America, she answered:

"Most definitely, in the last hours of my visit, as on the first days, what I like best are the Americans themselves. They have chosen a nice place and created beautiful things and they themselves are a noble, good-hearted people. I hope my husband's mission will serve the cause of peace, as everybody expects it to."

Inside the Khrushchev Era

Reviewed by MURRAY YOUNG

Inside the Khrushchev Era, by Giuseppe Boffa. Translated by Carl Marzani. Marzani & Munsell. New York 1959. 226 pages. \$5.00.

GIUSEPPE BOFFA was the chief Moscow correspondent for the official Italian Communist paper *L'Unita* from December 1953 to the beginning of 1959. These were decisive years in the Soviet Union, still too little understood outside the country. Mr. Boffa calls them "the years of the 20th Congress," marked by the death of Stalin, the Congress itself, the Sputniks, and the great reforms that have profoundly changed many aspects of Soviet life.

Mr. Boffa watched the development of these years with close and sympathetic attention, bending his full energies to understand what was taking place throughout the society. He has much fresh observation on the two years leading to the 20th Congress. 1954 he calls the year of the "thaw"; 1955 the year of "decision" leading directly to the historic Congress of February 1956. Here is presented the immediate background that in part prepared the Soviet people for the impact of the Congress.

The broader significance of the Congress is shown by an examination of the origin of the "cult of the personality" that ranges back over the whole history of the Soviet regime, moving on to a consideration of the years of the war and of the vast problems to be solved when victory had come. This historical review, necessarily brief, presents important material essential to a real understanding of the development of Soviet society and to a comprehension of its conflicts.

The 20th Congress, the author believes, was a conscious solution, sure and coherent, of these conflicts, that had

been too long delayed. His admiration for Khrushchev in leading the changes both before and after the Congress is very great indeed. "This extraordinary man" he calls him. But he feels that "the greatest merit in what has happened is that the energies of a whole people have been stimulated."

It is these energies of the mass of the people, Boffa maintains, that are the factor always left out in any consideration of the Soviet Union by the capitalist world. "The Revolution released these energies, the energies of free men, each with his capacity to think and act, moving forward as a solid phalanx in full consciousness of their common goal. This is the true, authentic, political chain reaction of modern times." This same force, he believes, was the source of the great changes signaled by the 20th Congress.

But the release of these energies, this compelling force, the author insists, arose from one specific fact—the nature of the Revolution:

Often the West has written that the construction of socialism in the USSR has been a gigantic "violation" of the Russian people by a small vanguard, a violation of Russian "character" which is mystical, apathetic, introspective, individualistic, and anarchic. What nonsense! Maybe the answer should be that no other people could have done it except the Russians *because* of their "character"—its capacity for self-sacrifice, its high idealism, its insatiable thirst for justice, its revolutionary fervor. As Ehrenburg said, perhaps it all began here "because we had more heart and less bread." But, of course Marxists don't argue on these grounds. What about the Chinese and their "character"? No, the essential thing is the nature of the Revolution; without a *Socialist* revolution, nothing would have been possible.

The second half of the book is called "The Open Road" and here the effects of the great changes in science, agriculture, education, industry and most of all in the renewed political life of the people are described with great brilliance. The significance of the reorganization of industry, the sale of tractors to the collectives, the school reorganization, the opening of the virgin lands and the many other changes in Soviet life not very widely grasped outside the country are shown in all their meaning for the future. This section is essential reading for anybody interested in the Soviet Union. And who is not?

In his conclusion the author sums up the present situation by saying:

Today, whether one does or does not believe in the superiority of the USSR, one fact stubbornly remains. The Soviet Union is a reality. It will not disappear. To understand the USSR has become a necessity for everyone—friend or foe. To understand this country means to understand its past, its turns and twists, its problems and its contradictions, as well as its achievements and its triumphs, not the least of which is the Twentieth Congress. To criticize certain aspects of the USSR is useful when it is done in a friendly spirit without a shadow of condescension. The Soviets welcome this help, although usually they discover their own problems and their own solutions. What is impermissible, even to the enemies of socialism, is ignorance concerning what the Soviets have accomplished.

The Story of the Bolshoi Ballet

The Bolshoi Ballet Story, by Y. Bocharnikova, Mikhail Gabovich, Yuri Slonimsky and Galina Ulanova. Heller & Heller. New York, 1959. 126 pages. 16 plates. \$1.25.

THE reader of this book is taken behind the scenes into the world of the most famous of all ballet companies. With the aid of the principal of the Bolshoi ballet, Y. Bocharnikova, and its art director, Mikhail Gabovich, the education of dancers from their careful selection, through the rigorous years of their training, to the final examination and the assignment either to the Bolshoi itself or to provincial companies, is clearly presented. The dance curriculum is analyzed and the academic training that accompanies the ballet training is described. The material in this section of the book will fascinate those who saw the Bolshoi Ballet in its tour of the U.S. last spring. Here is what lies behind the superb performances so thunderously applauded by American audiences.

Yuri Slonimsky, a Soviet authority on

ballet, provides a historical background to the development of ballet in Russia and much interesting detail on the Bolshoi Company itself. His analysis of the company's repertoire and his discussion of the esthetics of ballet are particularly useful.

Rounding out the picture is Galina Ulanova's charmingly written story of her own brilliant career. Ulanova's account of her first student days in Leningrad through the years of hard training to her growing mastery of the great roles reserved only for the finest dancers, is warm and appealing. Of special interest is her description of her developing sense, particularly through the war years, of the responsibilities of an artist.

For anybody interested either in the theater or ballet this book offers a rare opportunity to see the demanding, dedicated life of work and study that makes such a ballet as the Bolshoi's production of Prokofiev's *Romeo and Juliet* such a deeply moving and memorable experience.

M. Y.

Soviet Commitment to Education

THE first official United States education mission to the USSR spent a month in the spring of 1958 traveling 7,000 miles throughout the country observing the Soviet education system. The mission, composed of education experts, was headed by Lawrence G. Derthick, U.S. Commissioner of Education.

Soviet Commitment to Education, the report of their observations, has now been published by the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare (Bulletin 1959, No. 16—70 cents). Paralleling in general the earlier report on Soviet education published by the same government department—*Education in the USSR* (Bulletin 1957, No. 14)—the present report, based on direct observation, is more in accord with the accounts of other educators who in the past two years have investigated Soviet education.

"The one fact that most impressed us in the USSR was the extent to which the nation is committed to education as a means of national advancement." Thus the report begins and goes on to say, "Everywhere we went in the USSR we were struck by the zeal and enthusiasm which people have for education. It is a kind of grand passion with them."

The main body of the report covers the whole Soviet educational system, from nurseries and kindergartens through institutions of higher education. There are chapters on the administrative system, teacher education, special schools, workers education, and extra-school activities. Throughout the book there are useful tables on curriculum plans and in the appendix a brief analysis of the plans for educational reorganization.

Finally they give specific aspects of

Soviet education with which they were impressed and other aspects which they question:

"Aside from the broad impressions we gained, we were favorably impressed by the following specific aspects of Soviet education:

- The growth and development, the management and equipment, of nurseries and kindergarten establishments.

- The clean, neat boarding schools and the industry of pupils and teachers.

- The favorable teacher load, class size, and the supporting personnel such as laboratory assistants and curriculum aides.

- Emphasis on productive work and respect for labor.

- Part-time schooling and correspondence schooling.

- Dignity and respect between boys and girls.

- Close cooperation of industry with the schools.

- The quality and adequacy of laboratory equipment and teaching aids many of which were made by pupils and/or teachers.

- The heavy emphasis and effectiveness of foreign language instruction at the pedagogical institutes and universities.

- The motivation for individual learning and enrichment provided by the work of the Pioneer Circles, which keep boys and girls constructively engaged outside the regular classroom hours.

- The close cooperation of schools with the home.

- Parent education courses and frequent parent-teacher conferences.

- The emphasis on physical education and health; the provisions for medical and nursing services in the schools.

- The education provided for the blind.

- The close articulation between the Pioneer Circles and the schools and between school and industry.

- The provision of time in the program for school excursions.

- The program of summer camps provided for Young Pioneers.

"On the other hand, we question these specific aspects of Soviet education:

- The adequacy of conversational practice in foreign language below the university level, in terms of the number of years devoted to such study.

- The uniformity of the curriculums in the general education or 10-year schools.

- The requirement that all pupils wear uniforms.

- The seeming lack of emphasis on the humanities.

(This point has been frequently disputed. For example, Dr. F. Cyril James, principal of McGill University, who investigated Soviet schools last spring on

a tour sponsored by the Ford Foundation, had the following to say on the question of the humanities in Soviet education: "I could not find any over-emphasis on the sciences. Each student is free to choose his own subject and the arts are as greatly appreciated as the sciences. As a matter of fact, every city in Russia has its own theater, opera and ballet companies subsidized by the state."—*New York Times*, May 17.—Ed.)

- The paucity of artistic training within the regular school day (except in the special schools of music, ballet and art.)

- The limited nature of home-making programs.

- The in-school provision for the gifted as contrasted with the great emphasis on pushing weaker pupils through the uniform curriculum.

- The use of examinations, aside from motivating students and as a learning experience in work under pressure.

- The lack of instruction on other economic systems and societies."

Eugene Onegin

Reviewed by SIDNEY FINKELSTEIN

THE Soviet film of Tchaikovsky's opera *Eugene Onegin*, made by the Lenfilm Studios, is one of those masterpieces which ought to be permanently available and periodically shown, so that people can continue to refresh themselves with its humanity and beauty. Tchaikovsky's opera is itself a great work, which in its modest, quiet way represented a revolutionary step in operatic history, giving the form of opera an utter naturalness in the presentation of what is seemingly ordinary life. And while New York movie critics have properly praised the cinematic artistry, the photography, the acting, and fluidity of direction that, in the words of the *New York Times*, "is almost entirely freed from the constricting confines of the stage," they seem to me to have

missed an important side of this great achievement; one basic to Soviet cultural life. It is the profound respect shown at the same time for Tchaikovsky and the work of art he created. Instead of simply looking at the opera as raw material to transform into an exciting motion picture, the Soviet film makers bent themselves at every step to be completely faithful to Tchaikovsky's conception.

This is not only a magnificent motion picture, and an outstanding example of acting, both individual and collective, in the best Russian art theater tradition. Granted a few cuts in the music and the limitation—of course a most important one—that no mechanically reproduced voices are quite as thrilling as real voices on a live stage.

this is a better presentation of Tchaikovsky's opera than one is likely ever to see on a stage, outside perhaps of the Bolshoy Theater itself.

The film makers have achieved this by taking an attitude quite different from the *New York Times* critic, who says, in the midst of an otherwise glowing review, that the story "is an overly simple, somewhat musty and archaic affair. As a tragic tale of star-crossed lovers and unrequited love, it is better tucked away with the past, along with faded, sachet-scented letters." One might similarly sneer at a film of Hawthorne's *The Scarlet Letter* on the grounds that New England is quite different today. The milieu of *Eugene Onegin* is different from anything in American life. But Pushkin's novel in verse, on which Tchaikovsky based his opera, with great fidelity, was a penetratingly realistic picture of Russian society in the early 19th century. It was one of the first great steps in the tradition which continued with the novels of Turgenev and Tolstoi, and the plays of Chekhov.

The Soviet film makers, including the scenario writer Alexander Ivanowsky and the director, Roman Tikhomirov, understand this very well. And so, for their scenic expansion of the opera and the camera fluidity, they have gone back both to the Pushkin poem and the real life with which it dealt, the basic inspiration for Tchaikovsky's music. Thus where—as in the duel scene for instance—the limitations of staging made it necessary for Tchaikovsky to compress two scenes in one, the film is able to "uncompress" the scene, making it even more realistic and psychologically true. The actors, Ariadna Shengelaya as Tatiana, Vadim Medvedev as Onegin, Igor Oberov as Lensky, not only do wonderfully in their roles but solve to perfection the added task of synchronizing their lip movements with the dubbed in singing voices. And the highly effective passages in which the actors do not seem to sing, the aria or duet appearing as an inner monologue or train

of thought, are made possible only by a deep understanding of the human and social situations which the opera portrays so unaffectedly.

One hopes that the rising interest in cultural interchange will permit this remarkable motion picture to be seen in theaters over the country, instead of in the few obscure theaters which now occasionally show Soviet films. For this film can be a great asset to American cultural life. First, like every great work of art, it enriches the minds of those who know it. Secondly, musicians are attempting today to convince the American people that opera is not some staged artificiality but is basically absorbing music drama, a necessary part of a country's musical life. And nothing proves this better than this motion picture of *Eugene Onegin*, so beautiful in music and so absorbing as drama. There are also, incidentally, enough English titles to enable any onlooker to follow the story easily.

New Recordings

A RECORD called *A Modern Russian Concerto Festival* (Monitor MC 2030) shows four Soviet composers moving somewhat off the beaten track in their choice of solo instruments. These works do not aim at any big or profound statements, but try to charm the ear, and do this very well. Reinhold Gliere, who died in 1956, uses a wordless soprano voice for the solo part. Alexandra Pakhmutova, born in 1929, uses the solo trumpet. Alexander Manevich, born 1908, turns to the clarinet. Otar Gordeli, born 1928, takes up the flute. Outstanding to me is the melodious and whimsical work by Manevich, which should find a place in the international repertory, for there are few works around of this calibre for solo clarinet and orchestra.

The Gordeli concerto is played by a remarkably fine flutist, Alexander Korn-

eye, and on another Monitor record (MC 2037) devoted all to Bach, he provides a masterful account of the solo part in the famous Suite in B minor for flute and strings. Then he takes one of the two solo flute parts in the Fourth Brandenburg Concerto, with the solo violin part played by none other than David Oistrakh. The Third Brandenburg Concerto, for strings, rounds out an extremely beautiful record, in which the Moscow Chamber Orchestra is conducted by Rudolf Barshai. It is Bach playing at its most tasteful.

A solo disc by Sviatoslav Richter (Monitor MC 2034) confirms the impression given by Richter's previous discs; namely that this great Soviet pianist seems to have a crusading spirit for the "underdogs" or neglected works of the repertory. Here he offers Tchaikovsky's Grand Sonata in G major, Op. 78, which most of the concert world seems to have written off as not worth any attention. He proves it to be a solid work with many beauties, certainly worth knowing, and on the reverse side offers Prokofiev's Sonata No. 9, which is one of the composer's most intimate, reflective and troubled works. The playing is inspired as always with Richter.

Those who heard Emil Gilels' notable cycle of Beethoven Piano Concertos in New York can refresh their memory of these magnificently pianistic and musical performances on two Monitor records. One (MC 2033) contains the Fifth "Emperor" Concerto, and the other, the Fourth Concerto in G major, along with two Scarlatti sonatas (MC 2032). The orchestra in both performances is the Leningrad Philharmonic, conducted by Kurt Sanderling.

On the lighter side, a disc called *The Volga* (Monitor MF 319) has a captivating sheaf of folk songs and songs in the folk vein, all inspired by the Volga River, and not neglecting, of course, the famous "Boatmen." The performers are a youthful group, the Song and Dance Ensemble of the Volga formed in 1953, and they carry out in

their singing and playing something of the spirit of the young Moiseyev Dancers; namely a blithe, exhilarating freedom which still has its roots in authenticity. Quite different is a record called *Moscow Nights* (Monitor MC 5903) in which varied groups of performers present the urban "popular song hits" of the Soviet Union. The selections range from the song "Moscow Nights," which thousands heard at the Soviet song and dance festival at Madison Square Garden, to a jazzy "St. Louis Blues" in which some of Louis Armstrong's "hot licks" on the trumpet are transmuted into guitar figures. Finally, three most interesting folk music records present various ethnic groups in *Folk Songs and Dances of Yugoslavia* (Monitor MF 312), *Moldavian Folk Dances* (MF 314) and *Folk Music of Czechoslovakia* (MF 313).

SIDNEY FINKELSTEIN

ANNUAL RALLY FOR PEACE AND FRIENDSHIP

*Observing the November
Anniversaries*

Sunday Evening, Nov. 15

7:30 P. M.

CARNEGIE HALL, New York

Admission \$1.00

**ROCKWELL KENT
CORLISS LAMONT
MISS CAROL BUHR
DR. NORMAN J. WHITNEY
UKRAINIAN DANCE GROUP**

National Council of American-Soviet
Friendship

114 East 32nd St. New York City 16

SONG OF PEACE

a beautifully designed and deeply moving book that combines drawings and words by

Walter Lowenfels
and
Anton Refregier

Foreword by Linus Pauling

"Let us raise our voices, with Walter Lowenfels and Anton Refregier in a song of peace that will be heard around the world!" LINUS PAULING.

\$1.35 paper back \$5.00 cloth

ROVING EYE PRESS

37 W. 8 Street, New York City

Order from NEW WORLD REVIEW



OF MEN AND MOUNTAINS

by
ROCKWELL KENT

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

ILLUSTRATED BY THE AUTHOR

Price \$1.00 Postpaid

Order through

NEW WORLD REVIEW

34 West 15th St., New York 11

STATEMENT REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AS AMENDED BY THE ACTS OF MARCH 3, 1933, AND JULY 2, 1946 (Title 39, United States Code, Section 233) SHOWING THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, AND CIRCULATION OF NEW WORLD REVIEW published monthly at New York 1, N. Y. for October 1, 1959.

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Signed) JESSICA SMITH

Editor

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 28th day of September, 1959.

(Seal) IRVING MENDELL

(My commission expires March 30, 1961.)

SOVIET HIGHLIGHTS

A new monthly journal of selected Soviet articles in English translation surveying Soviet thought and development.

Articles from leading Soviet publications covering the following fields: literature, art, music, science, politics, economics, education, current events.

SOVIET HIGHLIGHTS is the *only* monthly journal exclusively devoted to first-hand information on Soviet developments through translation.

50¢ per copy (prepaid);
\$6.00 per year (12 issues)

BOOKLETS BY SOVIET AUTHORS IN ENGLISH TRANSLATION

Higher Education in the USSR
by Vyacheslav Yelyutin, Minister
of Education of the USSR \$1.00

The Soviet Standard of Living:
Social Benefits by A. G. Zverev,
Minister of Finance of the USSR .25

On Peaceful Competition and
Cooperation by N. S. Khrush-
chev .35

Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchev:
On the Occasion of His Visit to
the United States .15

The Soviet Economy: A Statisti-
cal Handbook 1.50

Gains in the Soviet Standard of
Living Under the Seven-Year
Plan by Viktor Zhukov .50

(Note: Any order \$1.00 or less
must be prepaid)

INTERNATIONAL ARTS AND SCIENCES PRESS

33 W. 42nd Street, New York 36, N. Y.

The Bolshoi Ballet Story

An unique narrative by the School's
Principal and its Art Director. A short history
about the school and its methods by
Yuri Slonimsky and an autobiography by the
world's greatest dancer Galina Ulanova

16 plates — 126 pages
Paper \$1.25—Cloth \$2.50

Order through

HELLER & HELLER

550 Riverside Drive, N. Y. 27, N. Y.

DISARMAMENT

A Call to Peacemakers:
Distribute New Pamphlet
Among Your Neighbors

TOTAL DISARMAMENT IN FOUR YEARS

Address of N. S. Khrushchev
at UN General Assembly

and

Text of Soviet Disarmament
Proposals

Single copy	10¢
10 - 100	7 1/2¢ each
100 - 500	5 1/2¢ each
500 and up	4 1/2¢ each

Published by

National Council of American-Soviet
Friendship

114 E. 32nd St., Suite 707, N. Y. C. 16

NEW SOVIET FILMS

EUGENE ONEGIN

(Operatic version with
Tchaikovsky's music)

THE CAPTAIN'S DAUGHTER

Dovzhenko's

POEM OF THE SEA

THE HOUSE I LIVE IN
SOVIET RUSSIA TODAY

Artkino Pictures, Inc.

723 SEVENTH AVE. NEW YORK 19

Telephone: Circle 5-6570