

SOCIAL SCIENCES

DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRARY JUL 16 1960

JULY, 1960

25¢

New World

REVIEW

TOWARDS NEW PEACE EFFORTS

New Czech Constitution

ELEANOR WHEELER

The Arts in Bulgaria

NEVENA GELIAZKOVA

Warming Up the Arctic

ARCHIE JOHNSTONE

Britain and the Summit Failure

D. N. PRITT

USSR ENDING INCOME TAX

NEW WORLD REVIEW

JULY 1960

Towards New Peace Efforts
Jessica Smith 3

British Opinion and the
Summit Failure
D. N. Pritt 11

On the Understanding of
Revolutions
Corliss Lamont 15

Czechoslovakia's New Constitution
Eleonor Wheeler 17

Glimpses of Bulgarian Culture
Nevena Geliazkova 23

Warming Up the Arctic
Archie Johnstone 27

Military Research and the
Arms Race
Robert H. Sollen 31

Poet and Audience 35

USSR Abolishing Income Tax 37

Workers' Rights in the Soviet
Union
Andrew Rothstein 43

A Tilt at Literary Windmills
O. Kovanka 46

Documentary Review 48

JESSICA SMITH, Editor
MURRAY YOUNG, Managing Editor

ISLANDA ROBESON
Our Rising Correspondent
Editorial Committee on Negro and
Colonial Questions

Vol. 28, No. 7, July, 1960. 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 All Subscribers

As a necessary economy to help us through the summer months, we must skip the August issue. But we have increased, you will notice, the size of the present issue. The next NWR you receive will be dated September. All subscribers will receive an extra issue later to make up the full 12 for the year.

Essay Contest

The announcement of the winners of the NWR essay contest on the subject "A Peace Program for Our Country" will be made in our next—the September—issue.

Summer Fund

All readers now have our summer sustaining fund appeal—the response from many has been most generous. But, alas, what we have so far received covers only a small part of our current expenses. If you have not yet sent in your contribution to the fund, won't you do so immediately to help us make up the total of \$5,000 which is absolutely necessary to get us through the summer period?

Please Fill Out and Mail Today

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

I enclose \$..... for your summer
Sustaining Fund.

I pledge \$..... monthly for your
continued publication.

Name

Street

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

Towards New Efforts For Real Peace

by JESSICA SMITH

THE bankruptcy of U.S. foreign policy everywhere and its dangers to the people have been exposed in recent months by the downfall of U.S.-supported governments in South Korea and Turkey, and the vast popular opposition to the Kishi Government in Japan. These are all of a piece with the exposure of U.S. policies in the U-2 flights which prevented the Summit conference and roused to a still higher pitch the opposition to U.S. military policies and those who support them in Japan.

The "Communist minority" allegedly responsible for the monster demonstrations that prevented Eisenhower's visit to Japan (supposedly main bastion of U.S. military strength in the Far East), in fact consisted of or were supported by all the students and youth of Tokyo and the country, the great masses of the labor movement, practically all of Japan's leading intellectuals, the socialists, the major part of the press, even members of Premier Kishi's own Liberal Democratic Party and Buddhist monks.

The terrible memory of Hiroshima and Nagasaki burns fiercely in the hearts of the people of Japan, where victims of the U.S. atomic bombs continue to die, and young mothers still fear giving birth to idiots and monsters.

The people of Japan oppose the

U.S.-Japanese military pact because it means 11 more years of occupation by U.S. troops, continued U.S. bases on their soil and the ever-present danger that U.S. policies in Asia will involve them in war. They want no more Hiroshimas and Nagasakis whose results would be a thousand times more horrible than before. They want to live in peace as do people everywhere who fear the dangers of U.S. military policies, and a stepped up arms race. The dangers of U.S. military bases in other countries have been brought home anew by their use for spy flights.

U.S. Responsibility for Paris Failure

The propaganda barrage of false statements charging Soviet Premier Khrushchev with the failure of the Summit conference cannot cover up the sorry and dangerous mess created by U.S. foreign policy.

The merest common sense should tell us that Khrushchev's angry words in Paris and later were the result of a series of U.S. cold war statements and actions culminating in the U-2 spy flight, the President's justification of them all, and his knuckling under to Adenauer's demands for the status quo in Berlin. As to the "insults" to the President, how can a few blunt words uttered out of deep disappointment that Eisenhower had been unable or un-

willing to withstand the militarist forces around him, compare with the overwhelming insult to the whole Soviet people of invading their airspace and denying their sovereignty? Or with the flood of insults unceasingly poured out on the Soviet Union and its leaders by our government officials and press? They have been called "enemies of mankind," "criminals," "murderers," so often that invective against the Soviet Union has to our shame become the common coin of our language.

Yes, Khrushchev was angry, and he had reason to be, although possibly if he were surrounded by a coterie of Madison Avenue advisers he might have tempered some of his harsher and more sarcastic statements instead of speaking his mind so plainly.

Fortunately many saner comments have broken through the propaganda barrage in this country. Commenting on Administration attempts to absolve the President of any blame and to convince the public that the U-2 made no difference in the Paris outcome, since Soviet policy had allegedly undergone a complete switch before the May 1 flight, Marquis Childs wrote in the *New York Post*, May 31:

But this is not what we were told in Paris by briefers who presumably had authoritative knowledge. It was said quite plainly that if the U-2 had not occurred, the conference would have been held.

One of the most illuminating commentaries that has appeared anywhere is an article in *The Nation*, June 4, 1960, (although this, too, had the unfortunately misleading title: "Why Khrushchev Wrecked the Summit") by Harold J. Berman,

of the Harvard Law School Faculty. First of all, he pointed out that the main issue here was not espionage, but our government's continued defense of its violation of international law in the U-2 flight and its refusal to state its regrets as it has done in past violations:

So far as I know, not a single American commentator has pointed out that it is customary in international relations for a state which has committed a violation of international law formally to apologize and to declare it will take appropriate measures to call to account the persons responsible . . .

Khrushchev's initial statement that he assumed the President was unaware of the particular flight, and his request for an apology and appropriate punishment, were not designed to insult and humiliate; they were standard operating procedure, designed to make continued normal diplomatic relations possible while taking full advantage of our embarrassment at being caught.

The President's refusal to perform this normal diplomatic act was then compounded, the writer points out, by his defense of the flights as a necessary means of protection against "surprise attack" by a "closed society," thus not only challenging Soviet sovereignty over its airspace but adding "the public accusation that the Soviet Union is a totalitarian society and that its leaders are planning aggressive war." Mr. Berman further discusses the importance of applying a single body of norms and procedures to all nations, rather than a double standard being applied to the "free world" and the "Soviet bloc."

While many admissions may be found in the press to the effect that Soviet policy remains basically unchanged, hysterical headlines and distorted news stories about some of

Khrushchev's remarks have obscured, as they have been meant to do, the actuality of the consistent and continuing peace policy of the Soviet Union and been made the basis of all sorts of wild speculations about changes in Soviet policy.

Premier Khrushchev went to Paris still hoping the situation might be retrieved with the help of Macmillan and de Gaulle, or perhaps in a private meeting with the President which the latter, whose place it obviously was to initiate it as the offending party, avoided. The Soviet Premier left the door open for future negotiations. He refrained from any action on Germany and Berlin that could worsen the situation. He has continued to stress the importance of improved relations with this country despite the setback they have received, and of extending cultural, scientific and economic interchange with the West. American visitors have continued to experience warm hospitality in the USSR. The enthusiastic acclaim for "My Fair Lady" and such artists as Isaac Stern, Van Cliburn, Roberta Peters and others was in no way dampened by the U-2 episodes. There has been special stress both by Khrushchev and in the Soviet press on the continuing position that war is not inevitable and on peaceful coexistence.

Most important of all, Khrushchev offered a new version of the Soviet program for complete and universal disarmament, (which had been prepared for presentation at Paris) containing substantial concessions to Western objections to the previous plan, and the USSR joined in both the resumed negotiations of the Ten-Nation Disarmament

Committee and the deliberations on ending nuclear tests in Geneva.

(Elsewhere in this issue we carry a review of Khrushchev speeches and Soviet documents in the post-Summit period, emphasizing points largely suppressed by the U.S. press in favor of quoting a few remarks about the President which coincide very largely with what the American people themselves are saying.)

Disarmament and Nuclear Tests

The United States has already dismissed the new Soviet disarmament proposals as "dangerous," putting Europe "at the Soviet's mercy," etc., and sticks to its original program which has little to do with disarmament. But U.S. allies do not share this viewpoint, consider the Soviet proposals hopeful and their demands for counter proposals from the West as a basis for further negotiations, justified. Wall Street lawyer Frederick M. Eaton, U.S. representative, made a trip to Washington for consultation on the allies' demands for revision of the U.S. plan.

Howard Green, Canadian Foreign Minister, said in Ottawa, June 15, that the Soviet proposals constituted a definite step forward and asked patient and searching consideration of them.

The test conference is currently bogged down again. As is known, the USSR agreed to the U.S. proposal for a treaty banning above-ground tests, with a proviso that there be a moratorium on smaller underground tests pending the working out of scientific methods to detect them. At present the United States is planning a series of underground tests, some of which the USSR believes could serve for

weapons development, (especially baby bombs exploded in deep holes) and wants guarantees against this, and inspection privileges. The United States—such a stickler for inspection—offers the USSR the privilege of inspecting the black boxes in which the devices are contained, but not the devices themselves.

It is known, of course, that the Pentagon, the AEC and people like Edward Teller violently oppose any ending of tests. The situation was well described by Marquis Childs in the *New York Post*, May 10 and 12. Writing from Geneva, he said: "The Soviets have made one concession after another, coming around time after time to the Western view." He reported that "the British believed that a treaty with adequate guarantees could have been possible any time during the last nine months if it had not been for America's delaying tactics." And Dr. Hans Bethe, physicist and member of the President's advisory committee, wrote on April 25:

The Russians have got the impression, and I think rightly, that whenever one demand has been fulfilled we make another . . . I think they are rapidly getting the impression that . . . it is impossible to get an agreement which is satisfactory to us, because we insist on a 100 per cent security in a world where there is no such security.

The Senate Hearings

The very fact that hearings were held on the U-2 and the Summit failure by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, by joint decision of Republicans and Democrats, was an indictment of Administration policies, despite attempts to white-wash them.

The American people, of course, received very limited information from the heavily censored accounts. And not a word came out about CIA-head Allen Dulles' testimony, held under the most heavily guarded conditions, with every inch of wall space checked for "bugs," and blankets over the doors. (Oh those secretive Russians!)

From the testimony of Secretary of State Herter and Secretary of Defense Gates, it appeared that while the flights in general were Administration policy, neither the President nor the Secretary seemed to have known they were taking place during the crucial pre-Summit period. Mr. Herter made clear, as every other Administration spokesman has, that the flights were discontinued solely because they had been "compromised" and could no longer yield results, without a hint that there was anything wrong with the flights themselves. At the end, all Herter could say when questioned as to what had been learned from the incident was "not to have accidents."

Secretary Herter continued the Administration justification of the flights on the ground of Soviet "secrecy" and "the danger of surprise attack." We pointed out in our last issue that Pentagon circles do not in fact believe in any such danger. On May 5 the *New York Times* carried a dispatch from Washington which began:

The army published today an analysis of Soviet military strategy in which it said the Russians were not undertaking to build the force needed to carry out a surprise nuclear attack on the United States.

Indeed, elsewhere in his testimony

Herter expressed the opinion that Khrushchev "is genuinely in favor of a disarmament program." It has been pointed out by many commentators that U-2 flights could actually serve no purpose in spotting preparations for a surprise attack, but rather could only pin-point the bases which might be subjected to such an attack.

Indeed, in Pentagon and other circles in Washington the whole idea of surprise or preventive attack by the U.S. is gaining increasing currency, under the name, now, of "pre-emptive" attack, meaning—if you think the other fellow might be going to attack, hurry and attack first. For example, in the April 29 report of a sub-committee, accepted unanimously by the House Committee on Appropriations in clearing the \$40 billion defense budget, the following paragraph occurs:

In the final analysis, to effectively deter a would-be aggressor, we should maintain our armed forces in such a way and with such an understanding that should it ever become obvious that an attack upon us or our allies is imminent, we can launch an attack before the aggressor has hit either us or our allies.

For a further discussion of this issue, we recommend a reading of *I. F. Stone's Weekly*, for May 9.

The testimony of the various officials showed clearly that to the extent any decision was made about continuing the flights on the eve of the Summit, it was felt that the information they gleaned was so valuable as to outweigh any possible adverse effect on the Paris conference, on which the peace hopes of the world were centered. Secretary Gates averred:

We were interested in these flights.

We got information on airfields, aircraft missiles, missile testing and training, special weapons storage, submarine production, atomic production and aircraft deployment and things like that.

The U-2 and the Security Council

On May 23 the Soviet Union placed its complaint against "The Aggressive Actions of the U.S. Air Force against the Soviet Union, creating a threat to universal peace," before the Security Council. Foreign Minister Gromyko presented a resolution noting that the violation of the sovereignty of other states is incompatible with the UN Charter, condemning incursions of U.S. aircraft into other states as aggressive acts, and "requesting the U.S. to end such actions and prevent their recurrence."

The resolution was voted down 7 to 2, with Poland supporting the USSR, Ceylon and Tunisia abstaining. The votes against the Soviet Union were cast by the countries allied with the U.S.

Mr. Gromyko recounted the facts of the flight (already covered in some detail in this magazine, in the previous and present issue), with considerable restraint under the circumstances and pointed out not only the danger of such flights themselves but of accidental war arising from them.

U.S. representative Henry Cabot Lodge had no defense except to make charges of Soviet espionage which had no relevance to the case. (After NBC commentator Merrill Mueller gave a straight report of Mr. Gromyko's presentation, and characterized Mr. Lodge's statements as weak, he was taken off the assignment.)

We should like to quote from the statement made by Sir Claude Co-

rea of Ceylon, President of the Security Council, as reported in the *New York Herald Tribune* of May 26 (*The New York Times* failed to report these comments):

It is a rule of international law that the air space over the territory of any country belongs to that country and could not be violated without a breach of international law. He agreed with the Soviet contention that the United States by sending the U-2 over Soviet territory had violated international law, the UN Charter and the Treaty of the International Civil Aviation Organization, signed by the United States and other countries at Chicago in 1944.

He said avoidance of international treaty obligations and laws "must be regarded as reprehensible." He rejected the argument by the United States and its principal allies justifying the U-2 incident on the grounds that espionage intelligence was needed for protection against surprise attack.

Sir Claude said: "We deprecate strongly any attempt to evade the obligations of international law and of international treaties for any reason whatsoever." He stressed Ceylon's opposition to the U-2 flight especially on the eve of the Summit Conference. He said: "It was bad enough to be detected in the act of violating the territorial integrity of another state, but it was made worse by the unhappy blunder of seeking not only to justify such violation, but also to indicate such violations would continue."

While Sir Claude urged the Soviet Union to accept the President's statement of the ending of the flights as acknowledgment that a mistake had been made, and to support the alternative resolution in the Security Council, he upheld the Soviet Union's "legitimate right to condemn the United States for violating its air space."

When the compromise resolution was presented to the Security Council by Argentina, Ceylon, Ecuador and Tunisia, the Soviet amendment

proposing a specific denunciation of incursions of foreign military aircraft inside the borders of other states as a threat to peace was lost. However, the Soviet effort resulted in the insertion into the resolution of a phrase calling on UN members "to refrain from the use or threats of force in their international relations; to respect each other's territorial integrity and political independence." Also added from the Soviet amendment was a call to continue working for general and complete disarmament under international control, discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests and negotiations on measures to prevent surprise attack. The resolution urged the Big Four to resume their discussions as soon as possible and to avail themselves of UN assistance. The resolution was passed 9-0, the Soviet Union and Poland abstaining since it did not go as far as they had wished.

It is worth noting that when Premier Khrushchev was upbraided for threatening retaliation against any bases from which U-2 planes might take off for the USSR, he pointed out that since his country had not been able to get support from the Security Council in its complaint against the U.S. incursions, its only recourse was to be prepared to act in self defense.

The USSR will place the matter before the UN General Assembly.

Political Repercussions in U.S.

The repercussions in the national election campaign have been immense. The Republicans, of course, have lost the peace issue on which they hoped to ride to victory. What differences there are among Repub-

lican candidates turn mainly around who can be toughest with the Russians. Nixon has thrown off his Janus mask and is now running openly on this platform, while Rockefeller tries to exert his influence in the direction of still more aggressive policies.

The question now is to what extent the Democrats will make use of the peace issue in a constructive way. The Democrats of course are using the U-2 incident to the limit in attacking the administration. However, along with this, the reactionary Democrats are more and more taking the cold war line of greater defense spending and a stepped up arms race. Among the main Presidential aspirants, Senator John F. Kennedy (D-Mass.) has, indeed, declared that he would have expressed regret to Khrushchev and thus saved the Summit conference, whose failure he nevertheless attributes to Khrushchev. Yet his major Senate speech on foreign policy (June 14) concentrated on building up our country's "retaliatory" strength in nuclear weapons and missiles and in conventional forces providing the ability "to intervene effectively and swiftly in any limited war anywhere in the world . . ." rendering meaningless his pleas for a "new workable program for peace and the control of arms."

There are indeed signs of growing opposition within the Democratic Party to the Truman-Acheson cold war line. Among leading figures in the Presidential race, only Adlai Stevenson has taken a constructive and mature approach on the necessity of ending nuclear weapons tests, positive steps for disarmament, and the possibility and

necessity of continuing negotiations with the Russians.

The ground swell of public opinion and support of leading figures for Stevenson's candidacy, is the most conspicuous aftermath of the Summit fiasco.

Peace—real peace—has in fact become more than ever the central issue of the election campaign. Here is the point where the people of America have perhaps the greatest role to play ever vouchsafed them in history.

While the stock market reaction showed the monopolists', and especially the war industrialists' concern for keeping the cold war going, the people reacted differently. Their fear of war has been enhanced by the Summit conference failure, bringing home so clearly how such a flight as that of the U-2 could be taken for one carrying bombs and set off a war; by the announcement of an increased number of bomb-carrying planes winging toward the USSR in a round-the-clock alert, by the immediate pressures for increased defense expenditures.

For Greater Peace Efforts

The question of ending nuclear tests, disarmament, and constructive, honest negotiations with the Russians must be the touchstone by which the qualifications of candidates at all levels shall be judged, along with their stand on civil rights and labor issues. The failure of the Summit and our government's responsibility for it intensify the need for action, for pressure by the American people for a new foreign policy of peace.

Positive peace moves have been expressed in San Francisco's "Little

Summit Conference" on May 13-14, with wide public participation in discussion of the issues that were to have been taken up at the Summit conference, followed by a "peace walk" of several thousand persons.

On May 19, just after the collapse of the Paris meeting, the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy held an overflow meeting in New York's Madison Square Garden, summoning to greater efforts for peace. Speakers were Eleanor Roosevelt, Norman Thomas, Walter Reuther, Rabbi Israel Goldstein, Dr. Harold Taylor, Norman Cousins, Clarence Pickett, Governor G. Mennen Williams of Michigan, former Governor Alfred M. Landon of Kansas. Entertainers Orson Bean, Harry Belafonte and others added their words for peace. There was no tinge of red-baiting at this highly significant meeting, despite the anti-Communist stand of some of the members of the organization's National Committee. Walter Reuther made the strongest appeal for a peaceful foreign policy yet heard from him. Norman Thomas laid special stress on the dangers of a re-armed Germany. Special applause greeted a message from Adlai Stevenson. A peace march to the United Nations Plaza followed.

The Chicago convention of the Textile Workers Union of America, while endorsing the candidacy of Kennedy, gave its greatest applause to Stevenson's speech stressing peace and disarmament as the main goals of our foreign policy.

Most significant, and indicative of the growing new trend in the ranks of labor, was the challenge offered to the Meany line in the AFL-CIO leadership at the convention of the

Amalgamated Clothing Workers soon after the Summit conference, which reflected the largely unexpressed opposition to the AFL-CIO Conference on World Affairs last month. The convention called for new efforts to ease world tensions, urged the government to continue negotiations for a permanent nuclear bomb test ban and universal disarmament and called for the inclusion of China in such negotiations. The foreign policy resolution urged that we blaze a fresh path toward universal peace, recognizing that the world struggle today is not for supremacy but survival. Secretary-Treasurer Frank Rosenblum declared:

It is regrettable that the leadership of the American labor movement is not equal to and does not have a proper awareness of the problems. The labor movement should be among the most positive forces working for peace.

A boost in this direction should be given by the various trade union delegations scheduled to visit the Soviet Union. On June 16 Joseph Curran, President of the National Maritime Union, and an AFL-CIO Vice President, who will soon leave for the Soviet Union, accompanied by three other officers of his union, announced that Premier Khrushchev had agreed to meet with the delegation during their tour, and attacked the official AFL-CIO policy against exchange visits with the Soviet labor movement.

Nothing is more important for the development of an effective peace movement in this country and for pressure on all candidates in the election campaign, than a mighty movement of American workers for peace and disarmament. (See also page 48)

British Opinion and the Summit Failure

by D. N. PRITT

PROBABLY the first reaction of general public opinion in Britain to the breaking off of the Summit conference before it could begin was just bewilderment. High hopes had been built on the conference; it was felt that public opinion had done more work, and achieved more influence and strength, in the course of the campaign for the conference than ever before. It was felt, too, that Premier Macmillan had been brought to realize that at this conference—finally fixed after the Western Powers had delayed it in one way or another for some fifteen months, and had then done all they could, by proclaiming their determination not to make concessions on vital points and by general pessimistic utterances, to prepare the world for its failure—he simply must both work himself for success, and also use all the influence he possessed to bring the American Government to work for success too.

And then, suddenly, it was all over. After some sensational disclosures of American espionage flights over Soviet territory, and an almost incredible mixture of lies and bombast by way of denials, confessions, and justifications on the part of the American Government, Premier Khrushchev, the man who

had worked so hard for so long to bring the conference to birth—and had traveled so many thousands of miles mainly for the same purpose—said what was plainly correct, that it was impossible to hold the conference if President Eisenhower did not apologize for the invasion, undertake clearly that no such invasion would take place in the future, and deal with the persons responsible.

The British public was interested in two main points: the first, who was to blame for the collapse, and the second, what was in the end the effect of it all on the prospects of improving relations and founding peace, and what was to be done to get negotiations renewed.

On the first point, it was "quite like old times" to me, at any rate, to see a barrage of rather crude and old-fashioned anti-Soviet propaganda let loose in Britain, in the effort to rally public opinion behind Eisenhower. But this did not have the success that attended some of these outbursts which are always adopted by Western governments with a bad case in the past; and by the end of May opinion was already settling down and becoming more definite.

What was and is, in sum, this opinion? Firstly, the public was genuinely horrified by the news of the U-2 flight across the Soviet Union. It was still further horrified by the realization that the first American explanation—a very elab-

D. N. PRITT, Queen's Counsel and former Labor M.P., is one of England's most distinguished lawyers. He is a frequent contributor to *New World Review*.

orate and detailed story about weather reconnaissance on the Turkish-Soviet frontier and an oxygen failure for the pilot—had no foundation whatever, being a pure effort of imagination (which incidentally must surely render it impossible in the future for any official American Government explanation ever to be believed.) The pilot was alive, having been captured with much of his photographic and other espionage material 1,250 miles inside the USSR.

Nor was that even the worst; for Washington, which had been, as it were, offered various possible means of "get out" by Khrushchev, enabling it to disclaim the flight as an unauthorized and irresponsible act, unknown at top level, adopted an attitude which seemed to be deliberately designed to make a conference impossible. Eisenhower and Herter between them made it officially clear that such aerial invasions were part of the settled and calculated policy of the USA, and even claimed that they were justified (by international law, apparently) both because the Soviet Union was perverse enough to "conceal behind the iron curtain" particulars of its military installations and other such matters (which any country would treat as highly secret), and because it was vital to U.S. security to know whether the Soviet Union was preparing in secret to attack the USA! (This last excuse was made ridiculous soon afterwards by the publication of statements by Allen Dulles which made it plain that the flights over Soviet territory, which had been going on for some six months, were directed not to obtaining informa-

tion about alleged Soviet installations adapted for aggression against other countries but to learning as much as possible about something purely defensive, namely anti-aircraft installations in the USSR, in order to assist the U.S. Strategic Air Command if it should attack the Soviet Union!)

And Washington made things worse by keeping secret, for five days after it had been made, its decision not to continue these flights; and when the decision was finally announced it was limited to the period of Eisenhower's presidency.*

All this made the British public even more anxious than before, and helped it to crystallize roughly thus:

"Well, why on earth did they embark on such provocative flights just before the Summit? And why have they caused the maximum of friction, distrust and anxiety by all these maneuvers, and by delay in making a quick and clear promise not to do it again? And why add a demonstrative worldwide "alert" (without even consulting or informing the British Government) of all the American forces everywhere, including those on British soil? All this seems to prove what we have so often been told, namely, that there are forces inside American governing circles that are both ruthless enough and powerful enough to overrule not only the better elements in the government that do want a relaxation but also the great masses of the American people, who sincerely desire peace.

* It seems not unlikely, from various press reports, that President Eisenhower's statement that the decision to stop the flights had been made five days before he announced it in Paris was in fact untrue, and that it had been intended, up to the moment before that announcement, to continue with the flights. It is not easy to judge which of the two stories would make the worst impression.

"And if that's the case, then we understand just why an attitude was adopted which really made it impossible for Khrushchev to go on with the conference unless his conditions were fulfilled. And if that's so, we understand three more things: the first, that the forces in the USA that wanted the Summit to fail were stronger than those that wanted it to succeed; the second, that the blame for the breakdown lies squarely on the reactionary forces in America; and the third, that the USA would have made the conference fail if it had gone forward."

It is all the easier for the British public to blame these American forces because it is now quite convinced that the Soviet Union wants peace. Every conceivable propaganda effort, over the last decade and a half, to persuade it of the opposite has broken down, and it is pretty generally convinced that "the picture of a Russia longing to attack the West, and held back only by our (U.S.) possession of atomic weapons, was largely a creation of Western fantasy, against which some of us, who were really acquainted with Russian affairs, raised our voices in vain for years and years." (This is what George F. Kennan, perhaps the most intelligent of all anti-Soviet Americans, wrote in his article published in the West German paper, *Die Welt*, October 20, 1956).

And what is British public opinion thinking of the other part of the immediate problem: "Where do we go from here?"

It is of course angry and unhappy that there hasn't been a Summit conference at which world public opinion might have compelled at

least a substantial measure of success; and it is very uneasy and critical that Prime Minister Macmillan either didn't stand up to Eisenhower and his advisers and insist on apologies and undertakings that would have made it possible for Khrushchev to go on with the conference, or—if he did try to do so—was unable to make his point.

And, in that mood, the public is naturally uneasy as to the value, and the cost, of "Western unity." It dislikes and mistrusts the rulers—not the people—of America, and it dislikes and mistrusts them all the more when they behave in the unscrupulous, irresponsible, and muddle-headed fashion which we have all watched with dismay throughout this period. It grows more and more alarmed to think that airplanes carrying atomic bombs are in the air twenty-four hours a day under the control of people of such irresponsibility; it realizes that the danger of a third world war starting without any deliberate decision at top level is very real. It is not prepared to accept "Western unity" indefinitely at that risk; and, sooner or later, it will force its government to break up the facade of Western unity unless it can see clearly that it is a unity in which an intelligent and prudent policy is honestly negotiated between partners and not imposed by the larger partner on the others.

But what of immediate positive developments to follow on the collapse of the conference? I am sure that the mood of British opinion is in favor of quickly resuming the task of imposing its will on the British Government.

We can be quite certain that Brit-

ish public opinion in general and the now broad and strong peace movement in particular will soon be working as hard and as effectively as ever to compel the British Government to negotiate again at the earliest moment at which the atmosphere is favorable to a resumption.

There are of course other points on which British public opinion has strong views. One of these is West Germany and its Chancellor Adenauer, who has lately been described as the U.S. Secretary of State. The British public is beginning to realize increasingly clearly that the West German Government and ruling class are the most dangerous and aggressive element in Europe, and that they have been built up and encouraged by the American and British governments to a point where they no longer play second fiddle to America but run a stubborn and intransigent revanchist policy on their own account. The British public, which sees the great danger of this, was waiting anxiously to see whether Adenauer would either be allowed

to help make the conference fail, or would be actually used for that purpose by the other Western powers; it has not of course been able to judge what would have happened in this respect at the moment of the conference, but it is growing more conscious of the German danger, and thus more likely to compel the British representatives at the resumed conference to resist every German attempt to sabotage.

The whole incident gives us several lessons. Firstly, that public opinion, even if it be stronger and more conscious than ever before, is not yet always strong enough to defeat the war-mongering elements in high places. Secondly, that if the conference had been held, it would have been forced into failure. And, lastly, that the possibilities of success at a Summit conference, of the ending of the Cold War and the founding of secure peace, are probably actually greater than they were, as a result of the exposure of the dangers, and the consequent awakening of public opinion.

AARON COPLAND REPORTS ON SOVIET MUSIC

"THE RECENT VISIT of Lukas Foss and myself to the Soviet Union completed the first in what is likely to be a continuing series of exchanges in the composing field. Most lasting impression of the four-week tour was the strong sense I had of the cooperative spirit of all the musicians we came in contact with there. At all levels, whether at the various Composers Unions we visited in four different cities, including Tiflis in Georgia, or with the instrumentalists who performed in our concerts, there was a genuine desire to do everything possible in the furtherance of friendly relations, both musically and humanly speaking. . . .

"On my last day in Moscow I was asked to give an hour-long talk on American music for the Soviet radio public. It was the first time such an invitation had ever been extended. It made me think that we in America might profit from a similar talk on present day Soviet music, for our knowledge is confined to the music of a few famous names. It might be good for a change to know something of the music of younger composers like Galinin, Babajanian, Ter-Tetovosian, Ryaats, Volkonsky, Pyart and others. Along with their music the Soviets would do well to send the composers themselves for that is always the most effective way to make cultural exchanges."

New York Herald Tribune, May 8.

On the Understanding of Revolutions

by CORLISS LAMONT

WILLIAM Ernest Hocking, Professor of Philosophy Emeritus at Harvard University and almost 87 years of age, is, like his fellow octogenarian Bertrand Russell, still writing first-rate books and taking an active part in the cause of peaceful co-existence and the abolition of war. This latest volume from Professor Hocking's pen makes a signal contribution to deeper understanding between the United States and the Soviet Union.*

The author is at his best in analyzing the question of dictatorship and democracy in the Soviet Union. "Full freedom," he writes, "is not a valid ideal for every stage of development. The issue between the dictatorial system of the USSR and the free, individualistic order of the USA is in part an issue of ultimate ideals, but in part an issue of the stage of public development. In the worldwide effort to meet the needs of underdeveloped countries, it must be realized that a degree of dictatorship is inescapable for the first steps out of the supine psychology. A people uneducated and uninformed, devoid of the habit of thinking out their own destiny, must proceed toward self-government under responsible guidance."

Furthermore, Professor Hocking points out, the Soviet Union has been fighting for survival in a bit-

terly hostile world during the greater part of its existence; and in such a struggle a good deal of regimentation may be necessary, and even approved by the people at large—"the privates"—who want "no gentle looseness of rein but a strict and determined command," just as midshipmen prefer a captain who "keeps a taut ship." In the United States, however, "*external hostility has not been habitually assumed*, and the closing of ranks has therefore been seldom called for."

Professor Hocking, then, lays down at least two basic principles for the understanding of countries that are going through a transitional revolutionary era. First is the principle of historical relativity, which attempts to assess to what extent the country in question was backward or underdeveloped in its economy, politics and culture when the revolution occurred. The second principle is that of national security, revolving around the degree to which the revolutionary nation is threatened, attacked or undermined by domestic enemies or foreign governments seeking its destruction.

I believe that these two principles are sound and can be applied uni-

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

* *Strength of Men and Nations*, by William Ernest Hocking. Harper. New York, 1959. 248 pages. \$3.50.

versally: to the American Revolution, for instance, and its treatment of the Tories both during and after the war for freedom from Britain; to the USSR, as I have already pointed out; to Communist China; and to the non-Communist Castro regime in Cuba today. The American Government and the American press are running true to form in their malicious propaganda against the Cuban Revolution, especially in their emphasis on the fact that Premier Castro is using some dictatorial methods and has not yet established complete political democracy.

"All revolution," says Professor Hocking, "is, in its nature, a *drive for freedom*." He is convinced that the Soviet Union has largely achieved its *freedom from*, its release from the evils associated with the old Tsarist tyranny, and is now well on its way to the *affirmative liberties*. (How much, I wonder, will the growing political relaxation in the USSR be set back by the incursion of the American spy plane, the break-up of the Summit Conference and the increase in international tensions?)

There are other important themes in *Strength of Men and Nations* that I do not have space to discuss. But the whole argument is aimed at lessening the distrust between the USA and the USSR, liquidating the Cold War and achieving peaceful co-existence, with far-reaching disarmament in nuclear and conventional weapons as necessary steps. To all of these issues Professor Hocking's keen philosophic mind and trenchant, often brilliant, writing, bring a flood of fresh light.

In philosophy William Ernest Hocking is an Idealist who holds

"that there is a governing purpose at work in the cosmos and history." Yet on the basic problems of international relations he arrives at substantially the same conclusions as Bertrand Russell, a Humanist. Hocking remarks: "Interesting that Russell and I, near-twins, lifelong acquaintances, sometimes colleagues, poles apart in metaphysics, should simultaneously burst out into unplanned mutual support on the world peril."

Both Professor Hocking and Earl Russell stand out as notable examples of able and energetic individuals who never really retire, but who at an advanced age maintain an unflagging interest in public affairs and keep on working for the advancement of their fellow human beings. Such men set a pattern of achievement, vigor, and public service that is a constant inspiration to younger generations.

It is hardly remarkable that Hocking and Russell, even though they adhere to widely divergent philosophies, should turn their attention to "the world peril." For today Christian Dualists, Communist Materialists and Oriental Buddhists all agree with them that the permanent elimination of war and of the horrible nuclear menace are the most pressing problems facing humanity today. To intelligent and humane men everywhere the survival of mankind has become an over-riding issue that transcends all disagreements on philosophy, religion, economics and politics.

The disagreeable question remains, however, as to whether the overlords of the Western World in Washington, D. C., are either intelligent or humane.

Czechoslovakia's New Constitution

by ELEANOR WHEELER

AT THE neighborhood meeting held to discuss the proposed new Czechoslovak Constitution, old Mrs. Pekarová got up to protest the elimination of the bus stop near her place, "since our candidate to the city's National Committee is right here to hear about it." She has brought this question up at one meeting after another, ever since the proposal was made a year ago at the municipal National Committee as one of several measures to speed up transportation in Prague.

At the amused "this is where we come in" murmur in the group, a local Communist woman leader remarked that such questions were appropriate and showed how discussion of small aches and pains is a part of the framework to the new Constitution. This illustrates, said she, how local matters will be increasingly discussed at a local level. Article 3 states that members of the representative bodies are obliged to be in constant touch with their voters, heed their suggestions, and give account to the voters for their activity and report on the activity of the body of which they are a member."

This small happening is as good a peg as any to hang this sketch of the new Constitution on. A com-

parison with the American Constitution is not too fruitful, except to point out that the principle of "checks and balances" is expressly rejected in the Czechoslovak Constitution—the legislature is declared to be the supreme governing body. And, even more important, the Czechoslovak Constitution recognizes that these basic documents differ according to the social conditions in which they are promulgated. It does not set up principles of abstract rights, but declares that it is a Constitution embodying socialist principles, the supreme law of a land governed by the working class on the road to Communism.

Perhaps it will be most illuminating to compare the proposed new Constitution with the preceding one which came into effect in June 1948, and that is the approach I shall make. But at the outset it should be noted that no constitution is meaningful without the social content. The right to work, for instance, sounds as fine in one Constitution as in another, but it means more in a social system that is not subject to economic depression than in one where the "pursuit of happiness" can be strongly affected by economic crisis.

One approach to the problem of explaining the new Constitution would be to consider the sincere or fabricated misgivings we hear from the West, and clear them up. For instance, why should the Ukrain-

ELEANOR WHEELER, a frequent contributor to *New World Review*, has lived in Czechoslovakia since 1947 with her husband and four children.

ians, Poles, and Hungarians be mentioned in Article 24 as minority groups, while the Germans are not? I asked this question of a neighbor during one of the conversational coffee breaks when our section of the May Day parade was waiting its turn to join the mainstream. He was so anxious for this to be understood that he wrote down a long explanation and sent it to me a couple of days later.

It would take up too much space to reproduce his whole elaboration of the subject, but I can give some of his points. In the first place, as minority groups the Hungarians, Ukrainians and Poles are fairly well concentrated on contiguous territory: the Hungarians in southern Slovakia, the Ukrainians in the far eastern tip of the republic, and the Poles in Moravia-Silesia, in the north. But German-speaking citizens are scattered throughout the country, in Moravia, in north Bohemia, in Slovakia, and in western Bohemia on the borders of Bavaria. This last is a key point—while the other minority groups do not border on states with revanchist aims, some of the German-speaking Czechoslovak citizens are next door neighbor to Munich Germany. *New World Review* readers need no explanation of why Czechoslovakia feels wary of the renazified western Germans.

Furthermore, German-speaking citizens have all the rights of citizens without discrimination. If a locality chooses, it may have a school in the German language. They have their own press, and one of the state-subsidized traveling theaters performs in German. Those who do not speak Czech well enough are en-

titled to interpreters in judicial proceedings.

In the National Assembly there are 253 deputies of Czech nationality, 98 of Slovak, nine Hungarian, two Polish, three Ukrainian, and three German, which roughly corresponds to their proportion of the population.

This, however, is a side road, and in discussing the new socialist Constitution we cannot afford to let Western objections drive us down too many side roads. So let's take the main route and compare, where it is enlightening, with the 1948 Constitution that this one will supersede.

The proposal for a new Constitution was drawn up by the Judiciary Committee of the present National Assembly, and to become law will have to pass by a two-thirds majority of the new National Assembly that was elected in June of this year. The final version to come before the National Assembly will be the result of many discussions, proposals that were sorted out and collated by the Judiciary Committee. Judging by the reports of discussions, these changes will be minor, and will not affect the broad lines we describe here. (This article is written before final passage.) For instance, the meeting in our neighborhood sent in their opinion that the preamble was too prosy and legal, that for an important stage in the history of this country, the poets and masters of prose should compose a more inspiring preamble. If the suggestion is taken, the change would be a matter of language and not a change in substance.

But the bare facts in the preamble are exciting enough:

People's democracy has proved itself as a path to socialism; it has led us to the victory of socialism. The Czechoslovak State, embodying the organized working people, led by the working class, is now a people's organization in the truest sense of the word—it is a socialist state. On this basis . . . we shall further improve our socialist democracy, heighten the direct participation of the workers in the administration of the state and the management of the economy, strengthen the political and moral unity of our people, vigilantly defend all liberties and revolutionary gains of the people.

The preamble also declares that this advance will be within the brotherhood of socialist nations, and base itself on the principle of peace and friendship with all nations of the world, contributing to peaceful coexistence and good relations between states of different social systems. The Czechoslovak state itself is a union of two equal and fraternal nations—the Czechs and the Slovaks.

An important feature of the new Constitution is that it no longer considers the president an independent figure, standing above party lines. This had been implicit in the interpretation of the 1948 Constitution in the course of its development. It did not even then support the fiction that prevailed in the prewar governmental structure, that the president was not swayed by party considerations. But the 1948 Constitution still bore the imprint of this ideology in that the president was to be elected separately from the legislature, could be removed only for treason, and had the power to convene and dissolve parliament. Now the president is to be elected by the National Assembly, is to be answerable to the legislative branch, present his cabinet to the legisla-

ture for approval, and, while he has the right to address the National Assembly at any time he chooses, he does not have the power to influence proceedings.

The office of president is being retained, contrary to the practice in other socialist countries, partly because of tradition, partly because the three working-class presidents, Gottwald, Zápotocký and Novotný, have shown the value of this post being held by a Marxist thinker who can rally and unify the country.

The leading role of the legislative branch is further emphasized by its placement in the Constitution. Formerly listed in Article 5, it is now moved up to Article 2, which states that the state power of the working people lies in the representative bodies elected by the people, controlled by them and responsible to them: the National Assembly, the Slovak National Council, and the National Committees at the regional, district, and municipal levels. Then follows the important provision that "the representative bodies and other organizations of the State rely in their activity on the creative initiative and activity of the workers." Then the Article 3 which we have already quoted, providing for continual contact between the representatives and the voters.

Another point of difference with the 1948 Constitution is the express declaration in the new one that the leading force is the avant-garde of the working class, the Communist Party, "a voluntary, militant association of the most active and most politically conscious citizens from the ranks of the workers, farmers, and intelligentsia." Among the mass organizations which help in

the management of the country's affairs is the trade union movement, not specifically mentioned in the 1948 Constitution. Provision is made, furthermore, for state functions to be taken on gradually by the mass organizations. Analogous to this is the later statement in the section on the judiciary that "comradely courts" are another way of shifting governmental matters from the formal governing bodies to informal citizens' organizations.

Among the rights and duties of the private citizen, the following are given: (Chapter 2, Article 18)

1. In a society of the working people in which exploitation of man by man has been abolished, the advancement and interests of each member are in accord with the advancement and interests of all of society. The rights, freedoms and duties of citizens set forth in the Constitution shall therefore serve the complete expression of the justified interests of individual citizens and the general interests of society; they shall be broadened and deepened with its development.

2. The individual can develop his capabilities to the full and exercise his justified interests in a society of the working people only through active participation in the development of society as a whole, and particularly by undertaking an appropriate share of social work. Therefore work in the interests of the community shall be the first duty and the right to work the first right of every citizen.

But here again we must go to the social framework to get the real meaning of the provisions in this second chapter of the Constitution. In both the 1948 and the new one there is provision for the right to leisure after work, as well as the right to work. But in the twelve years that have elapsed since 1948, the provisions for paid holidays, the facilities available for vacations, the

cultural facilities (such as houses of culture, the People's University, the traveling theaters and cinemas, the amateur dramatic, art, and literature groups, the expanded school system) have all grown so much that they mean something quite different now.

The insertion of the little word "gratis" by the health services gives a qualitative change to practically the same wording. And the background, not visible in the provisions of the constitution, of expanded and improved medical facilities all through the republic, in the countryside, in the schools and in the factories, also changes the content. In the same category is the provision for expanding services to enable women to take advantage of the formal equality before the law guaranteed in the previous and the new Constitutions.

Whereas the 1948 Constitution provided the standard right of citizens to petition public bodies, the new one declares (Article 28) that "Citizens and organizations have the right to address proposals, suggestions and complaints to the representative bodies and other state bodies; state bodies are obliged to make responsible reply and disposition." This is both a general principle, inherent in the first chapter of the Constitution and also part of the individual rights of citizens, as set forth in the second chapter. Furthermore, it is a style of work that permeates the following chapters that give the detailed workings of the legislative, executive and judicial bodies.

Not only is the legislative branch expressly made supreme over the other branches, but greater compe-

tence is given the lower legislative bodies than was formerly the case. For example, Article 96 states that the higher level National Committees guide and direct the activity of those on a lower level, but "They at the same time fully observe the powers and responsibility" of the lower National Committees and "rely on their initiative and experience, and carry out tasks in constant cooperation with them." The 1948 Constitution stated that the lower level National Committees were subordinate to the higher and could be dissolved by the higher if they did not perform their work satisfactorily. The new Constitution provides for recall by the voters.

The new Constitution gives legal expression (Article 89) to the expanded work of the National Committees since 1948: greater planning activities, greater cultural, health and social facilities under their jurisdiction, greater responsibility to care for the material and cultural needs of the people; they are to protect socialist property and all the gains made by the working people, as well as a socialist order in society; they are to supervise the socialist way in which people live together. The National Committees elect the judiciary at their level—the National Assembly elects the Supreme Court judges, the regional National Committee elects the judges to the Regional Courts—for a period of four years. At the district level they are to be elected by popular, direct and equal, secret ballot. Formerly the judges were appointed and removable only for misfeasance.

The professional and the lay judges are equal in their power to

decide cases, and sit as a Senate rather than as individuals. They are independent in the sense that they are bound only by the law, and not by direct instructions from the legislative branch, but they can be recalled by the voters or by the governmental body that elected them.

A new section in the proposed Constitution, absent in the 1948 one, provides for the office of "Procurator" which corresponds in a way to our Attorney General. The "Procurator" is appointed by the president, but reports on his office's activities to the National Assembly. His general function is to see that the laws are observed, supervise the activities of ministers, National Committees, courts, and other institutions, from the point of view of observance of laws.

The Procurator's Office, as well as some of the other provisions in the new Constitution, had already been put in effect through amendment of the former Constitution. Why, then, was the 1948 Constitution not continued in existence and adapted to the new situation by amendment? It was felt that a whole "new look" had to be taken at the basic legal document of a new, socialist society. The new Constitution everywhere takes note of the class basis of society, whereas the 1948 one still declared that the people in general wielded power. The new one states that the state power is based on the ties between workers of town and country, including the working members of the professional class. While rights and privileges accrue to the minority sections of the population, the power lies with the working class. The Constitution is here confirming an established fact.

Furthermore, in the provisions for greater initiative and responsibility of the mass organizations, the new Constitution looks toward the future, to a communist society. In stating that it is the government's duty to provide for greater and greater satisfaction of material needs, for higher technique and increased production, it paves the way for the day when each will contribute according to his abilities and receive goods according to his needs.

The structure of the whole population is different, too. Whereas workers and employees made up about 60 per cent of the adult population before, they are now around 80 per cent—counting employees on state farms and other agricultural enterprises. Capitalists were formerly nine per cent of the total and now (only very small entrepreneurs hiring a few workers) are 0.3 per cent. Individual farmers made up 23 per cent of the total, and now there are more cooperative farmers (over 11 per cent) than individual (under nine per cent). This last figure is constantly changing in favor of more cooperative farmers and fewer individual farmers.

An analogy can be made with

the Soviet Union. When the first Soviet Constitution was drawn up in 1918, it spoke of the transfer of land and property to the State of workers and peasants. The 1924 Constitution recorded the formation of a federal Soviet State, but the structure of the population had not changed much, and socialism was still in the making. After the two first Five-Year Plans, and the substitution of collective for individual farming, the 1936 Constitution corresponded more to the realities of Soviet life.

In both the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia (as well as the other countries in the socialist group of nations), the Constitution is not a formulation of abstract principles that apply both to the horse-and-buggy and the nuclear age (amended or ignored in the latter). The new Czechoslovak Constitution boldly presents itself as a document, representing the interests of the working people. It provides for the protection of personal property and individual rights, not against the state as such, but against malfeasance of state organs. Furthermore, it lays the basis for the elimination of classes and the transition to a communist society.

OXFORD HONORS HUNGARIAN COMPOSER

ZOLTAN KODALY, Hungary's greatest living composer, was a recent visitor to England where he was given the honorary degree of Doctor of Music at Oxford University on May 2.

The Public Orator of the University, A. N. Bryan-Brown, in presenting the composer to Convocation spoke highly of his research into Hungarian folk music. Mr. Brown pointed out that Dr. Kodaly had collected more than 50,000 folk melodies apart from composing his own orchestral and choral music.

Dr. Kodaly received another tribute to his work when a special performance in his honor was given by the London Symphony Orchestra at the Royal Festival Hall, on June 3.

The Hungarian State Symphony Orchestra will also visit England this autumn for a series of concerts.

Glimpses of Bulgarian Culture

by NEVENA GELIAZKOVA

Introduced by Rockwell Kent:

"I'M from Missouri," said Congressman Vandiver, "and you've got to show me." As these words have become memorable (and they're probably the only memorable words the Colonel ever spoke) it must be that the demand, *show me*, is characteristic of the rational American character. Ours is a vast and varied homeland. Are we content to stay at home? To learn from hearsay what the wide world holds? That we are not, the surge of all who have the means to go abroad is evidence. And yet, like Bluebeard's wives, one room—no, many rooms—are closed to us. Stamped on our passports are forbidden lands, ranging in longitude from The People's Democratic Republic of Korea in the Far East to The People's Democratic Republic of Bulgaria in the West. People's Republic: "Americans," our State Department warns, "keep out." And although restrictions upon travel in Bulgaria have recently been relaxed, it remains a country that relatively few of our people have visited and about which, in consequence, far too little is known.

Yet the limits to our knowledge that the difficulties and the cost of travel to the Socialist countries impose are largely compensated for by the cultural exchange that is in progress. We who have heard the Soviet musicians who have visited America, who have seen their folk dancers and the incomparable Bolshoy Ballet have had intimate and moving contact with the people of those lands, even as they through our own arts have come to know and honor us. Unfortunately we are still largely un-

familiar with the culture—and, it follows, with the people of the smaller East European lands. What, for example, do the American people know—and now I speak of work in my own field—of the painting, sculpture and graphic arts of, to mention two of the smaller countries I have visited, Rumania and Bulgaria? And, I must add, how *can* we know about them? Deeply impressed by the wood cuts and lithographs of two Bulgarian masters—of, incidentally, wide European fame—I concerned myself upon my return last fall with promoting an American exhibition of their work. All efforts to interest the Exhibition Department of the Smithsonian Institution were met with scant courtesy, the Director of the Department refusing to even look at the pictures tendered for consideration.

So, it would appear, if we want to experience Bulgarian culture in all or any of its manifestations, if we want to know that brave, proud people less than a hundred years emerged from centuries of ruthless Turkish rule; if we can bear to have our hearts touched by a newborn people's love of life—and by their will to make in their own lovely land the most of life—if, in short, we want to know Bulgaria, there's little we can do but go and see it for ourselves. And in such preparation for a visit as, let us say, the study of a menu would be for a feast, let us read, in the words of one who knows, what Bulgaria has to offer us.

Nevena Geliazkova, who has written the following "menu" for us, is Bulgarian by ancestry and birth and a cos-

mopolitan—almost, one might say, American—by education and experience. Following her graduation from the American College for Girls in Istanbul she attended the University of California and, after working there, was employed at the University of Pennsylvania. She knows and likes America and us; she *loves* her native land. And, passionately active in her country's affairs and in the promotion of understanding and good will between our peoples, is in charge of the English editions of the periodicals, *Bulgaria Today* and *New Bulgaria*. She was also in charge—how happily I write it!—of the promotion of the good will and understanding of two American guests last summer, Sally and R. Kent; and through her wisdom, charm and patience was so successful that, though we love our native land as she loves hers, we quickly came to love Bulgaria too.

Long ago—in 1834 to be exact—Nevena's great-grandfather established in the town of Sliven the first textile factory in the Balkan Peninsula. I'll use that basic industry, if I may, as a metaphor for the weaving of the fabric of friendship that—the shuttles moving steadily between the East and West—is now in progress. Nevena reaches out her thread to us. Come, reader, let us take it.

THAT the Bulgarian people have a passion for education is a comment offered by the Encyclopaedia Britannica. And indeed only a people with a passion for learning and culture could have survived five centuries of foreign bondage, sticking to their language and to the script they gave the other Slavs as early as the 8th century.

In the 18th century, when the Greek clergy set out to Hellenize the Bulgarians, then suffering under Ottoman bondage, a simple monk in a Mount Athos Monastery wrote the

first History of the Slav-Bulgarian People, telling his fellow countrymen of the past glory of their nation, the feats of their kings and the learning of their scholars.

Copied by hand, Paissi's history spread far and wide and small cell schools sprang up all over the Bulgarian land, where eager young people began learning to read and write.

The first reading-room was opened in 1856, followed by many others all over the country. These developed into a unique institution, around which the entire cultural life centered. It was at one of these library clubs that the first Bulgarian play was produced some hundred years ago, and at others choirs and orchestras were formed. So when Bulgaria was finally liberated in 1878 the nation was fully equipped to develop its own culture.

And what is the picture today after eighty years of independent life and fifteen years of the people's rule, which has done so much for culture and the arts? I do not propose to dwell in detail on Bulgarian education, science and the arts, with their vast achievements, problems and controversies, but would rather give a glimpse of that side of their cultural life a visitor to our country could see and enjoy during a brief stay.

Opera

Last year I went to the Sofia National Opera with a British professor, guest of the National Peace Committee. We saw *Othello*, a production of such high artistic merit that it could do credit to any renowned opera company. "I wish we could have this same production at

Covent Garden," the professor exclaimed, commenting on the fine voices, lovely costumes and extremely good acting. And in fact Dimiter Ouzounov, our Othello, has had two consecutive engagements at the "Met" since then, and Katya Popova, the Desdemona, is a regular guest singer at the Paris Grand Opera. Ouzounov and Nikola Gyaurov, our celebrated young bass baritone, recently appeared as stars at the Milan Scala with Bulgarian-born world famous Boris Christoff, while another of our singers, Nikola Nikolov, appeared at Covent Garden as Radames, and in Verdi's *Requiem*. The entire company is now (May 24) at Brussels appearing in Prokofiev's *War and Peace*, *The Queen of Spades* and *Boris Godunov*.

Bulgaria is such a gold mine of fine voices that our young people regularly win scores of prizes at many international contests. The opera of the Danubian town of Rousse is staffed with just such enthusiastic and talented young people, devoted to their work. The Plovdiv Opera Company is doing very well, and so are the operas of our famous Black Sea resort, Varna, and the town of Stara Zagora. The writing of Bulgarian operas is greatly encouraged, and several interesting productions based on our medieval history and on folk life and customs have recently made their appearance with success.

Music

On his return to Paris after a concert in Sofia, French pianist Pierre Sancan is said to have remarked that musical audiences in Sofia are no less exacting than those

of any large capital in the world and are extremely warm and receptive. We do like good music, and there are endless lines for tickets when musicians of the rank of Gilels, Oistrakh, Richter and Shafran come to visit us. It would be the same were young Van Cliburn to come here.

We have a fine Philharmonic Orchestra in Sofia which gives a good account of itself under such outstanding conductors as George Sebastian of the Paris Grand Opera, Heinz Bongartz of Leipzig, and our own Konstantin Iliyev and Dobrin Petkov. We also have twelve symphony orchestras in provincial towns. There is a Conservatory in Sofia, and there are music schools in many Bulgarian towns, as well as music courses and amateur choirs and orchestras at the library clubs and the trade union houses of culture. Many of our young musicians show great promise. Pianist Milena Mollova was classed at the Tchaikovsky Competition and the Marguerite Long Competition in Paris; and violinist Yordan Badev recently won a prize in Brussels. But it is the Bodra Smyana Children's Choir and the School-children's Symphony Orchestra which have won the warmest acclaim at home and abroad, for the sensitiveness of their interpretations and their technical virtuosity.

Theater

An interesting theatrical competition was held in Sofia last summer. Following an elimination competition the outstanding theaters in Bulgaria were asked to the capital with their best productions of classical and contemporary Bulgarian plays. In this way our finest play-

wrights, young and old, had an opportunity of seeing their works performed and the Sofia audiences were able to get a glimpse of theatrical life in the provinces.

I was quite taken by the play, "The World Is Small," written by Ivan Radoev, a young poet, who tried his hand at play-writing for the first time. The story is about the life of Bulgarians who have emigrated to Argentina, of their hardships and their nostalgia for their home in the old world. The play, in which intricate psychological problems are treated with delicacy and simplicity, is beautifully produced by young director Venelin Tsankov. The creative efforts of author, director, artist and actors have resulted in an important and up-to-date production.

While the Sofia National Theater does well in the production of classical dramas, theaters such as the Labor Front, the Youth Theaters and the Dramatic Academy Study Theater, as well as some of the provincial theaters are in search of new plays and more direct means of expression. A great many amateur theatricals are held at the trade union houses of culture and the larger library clubs, which bring the art of the theater to the working people at plants and cooperative farms. In most cases the workers are themselves the actors.

Art

One has but to enter the Jubilee Exhibition of Bulgarian Art which is now in progress, in honor of the 15th Anniversary of the country's liberation from fascism, to appreciate Bulgaria's important achievements in painting, sculpture and the

graphic arts and to see that in addition to those who had matured before the war there are emerging younger artists of unquestionable promise. Moreover a host of talented decorative artists is at work, preserving and recreating the rich cultural heritage of our people and maintaining the continuity of that inheritance by the introduction of folk patterns in fabrics, in the decoration of homes, and in the design and adornment of things of common use.

Amateur Artistic Work

Some years ago I visited a country fair in the Pirin region, where the local amateur folk song and dance groups were having a competition. The trim little town, whitewashed and beflagged, and plunged in greenery, was a perfect setting for this festival. All day long folk singers, instrument players and dancers vied with each other in the display of their arts, while in the evening artists and guests gathered in the spacious hall of the Tobacco Workers Cultural Club in its richly decorated rooms, gay with handwoven carpets and cushions. Lovely girls in attractive folk costumes sang and danced, while guests regaled themselves on cherries, cake and wine. It was such a true folk festival as many a cameraman would have liked to capture. Such festivals are not unique in Bulgaria, and such amateur song and dance groups exist in almost every village and at factories, offices, schools and library clubs. They replenish with new talent our outstanding folk song and dance companies, for which the State Folk Song and Dance Company has won a European-wide reputation.

Warming Up the Arctic

by ARCHIE JOHNSTONE

THE central-heating system that has its generating plant in the Gulf of Mexico and, in passing, saves the British Isles from a climate like Labrador's, plays some strange tricks when it reaches Murmansk, two hundred miles inside the Arctic Circle and a thousand miles north of Moscow.

Like their international colleagues, the local oceanographers—and Murmansk is an important center of oceanographic research—call this heating system the North Atlantic Drift, or its Russian equivalent, but the Murman-in-the-street calls it the *Golfshtrem*, which has a homelier, and warmer sound to my ears.

At one end of the Gulf Stream—as I well remember from swimming in it near Vera Cruz a dozen years ago—bathers, come out of the sea to cool off; at this end even stranger things happen. For instance:

- The south wind brings cold; the north wind from the Arctic Sea brings warmth—and winds can veer so rapidly that temperatures can rise or fall twenty degrees in six hours.

- The first half of a local saying runs, "Here the birds fly backwards"—a reference to the fact that the spring and autumn migrations are

in the exact opposite of the normal direction.

- Snowy days in June and rainy days in January are quite common.

- Murmansk's average temperature in December and January is six degrees higher than that of Astrakhan, 2,000 miles to the south.

- Harvesting in August (speeded up by three months of continuous daylight) goes on in fields adjoining lakes that are still frozen over.

- While Caspian and Azov Sea ports (farther south than Paris) are icebound for over two months, the port of Murmansk, (nearer to the Pole than all but the top fringe of Alaska) is ice-free all the year round.

- In winter the highest temperatures come just after midnight and the lowest just after midday.

- Murmansk has an average of only 20 cloudless days a year (that is ten times more than on the White Sea coast of the peninsula!) and only 160 days without rain or snow. But the rain is usually a fine drizzle—so fine, indeed, that I didn't notice it for quite a time!—and the yearly rainfall, excluding snow, is only 16 inches.

Other oddities, due not to the Gulf Stream but to the high latitude with its months-long winter "night" and summer "day," are so numerous that I can give only a bare catalogue of some of them.

- Murmansk's street lamps burn night and day for three months in the winter and are switched off for an even longer period in summer.

ARCHIE JOHNSTONE, former editor of the British Embassy newspaper in Moscow, has lived in the USSR since 1947, and now writes for a number of publications in Britain and the U.S. "Ivan the Not-So-Terrible," a collection of his articles, was published in 1958.

- Owls and bats hunt in the daylight.

- Partly because their "working hours" are unlimited, Murman bees give four times more honey each season than the best Caucasian bees.

- None of the wild flowers are annuals, but flowering shrubs and perennials (much more strongly scented than those in the south) cover the hills around Murmansk.

- Low-lying parts are colder than the mountains, which catch the almost horizontal rays of the sun.

- The Murman (or Kola) Peninsula — Murmansk's England-sized bailiwick—has more than 100,000 lakes, many of them 450 feet deep. ("Murman" in Lap means "land of Lakes"). There are glacier-made valleys a mile deep and great boulders have been identified as having been carried by glaciers from the mountains of northern Norway. Glaciers have shaved off the tops of many high hills.

- Although in the Siberian Arctic million-year-old carcasses of mammoths have been found, there is no trace of life on the peninsula from earlier than 7,000 years ago, when the Ice Cap retreated.

- In the south there are dense forests but in the tundra the "bushes" you walk through are, in fact, centuries-old trees, stunted to Japanese-garden size.

- There is literally "standing room only" in some bird colonies on offshore islands. Seals abound on the coast. There are many herds of wild reindeer, apart from the hundreds of thousands of deer on the collective farms. Murman wolves are more than twice the size of Siberian wolves. Only two species of reptiles exist.

- The moss on which reindeer feed is a near kin both to a certain mushroom and to a seaweed. It grows on stones, sand, tree-trunks—almost anything.

Murmansk stretches for ten miles—and keeps on stretching—along the narrow, fifty-mile Kola Gulf to the sea. Founded during the First World War, it is already many times larger than any other town within the Arctic Circle and is one of the fastest-growing cities of European Russia. Apart from the influx of workers from the south, it has one of the highest birth rates in the USSR—a point which inevitably provokes a reference to "those long Arctic nights!"

The chief industry is fishing, but much more interesting, to me at least, are the plans—many of them still in their earliest stages—for exploiting the natural wealth of the peninsula, wide areas of which are unpopulated, and not even visited by hunters and herdsmen.

One of these plans involves a problem that has challenged the ingenuity of man for centuries, has never yet been solved on a really practical scale, yet one can never dismiss it as impracticable—the harnessing of the virtually unlimited energy of the tides.

There is no doubt that the Soviet Union will, in its characteristic fashion, answer this challenge in the near future. And it would be rather appropriate if Murmansk, which already owes so much to the solar "thermal batteries" of the Gulf of Mexico could make its own lunar battery on the Gulf of Kola, its own doorstep.

Other districts with even larger inlets of the sea have advanced

claims for the first tidal hydroelectric station, but here it is insisted that the Kola Gulf is ideal both for a pilot project and economically.

It has an extremely narrow, funnel-shaped inlet; the rock foundations for the dam are perfect; there is practically no silt, and an ample "market" for electrical power is close at hand.

Since 1950 France has had, on paper, plans for "the world's first tidal dam," near St. Malo and, if the £30,000,000 can be found for it, construction will begin next year. This plan, however, involves the damming of an estuary, not a narrow gulf.

The Kola Peninsula has practically all the elements of the Mendeleev table. It has the world's largest deposits of apatite, a phosphate fertilizer that Murmansk exports to all parts of the globe. With the apatite is found titanium, "the metal of the future," and there are extensive deposits of lithium, the lightest and one of the most valuable of metals.

Apart from the fur farms, some areas of the peninsula are being turned into reservations for mink, beaver, otter and other animals which will, where necessary, have supplementary feeding and "housing" but will otherwise be in a wild state. The reindeer population is being rapidly increased, partly as a result of experiments with fodder to replace moss, which requires huge pasture areas.

But how do people from the south manage to adjust themselves to Arctic conditions? I put this question to Zinaida Falkova, the deputy chairman of the Murmansk Regional Committee, and she told me:

"The only conscious adjusting I remember doing when I first came here fifteen years ago was to buy heavy curtains to shut out the midnight daylight when I went to bed. After a week or two I forgot to draw them.

"Young people coming here hate at first to go to bed while it's still broad daylight. They play volley-ball late into the night—but soon nature catches up with them.

"It surprises some people to learn that we have no illnesses due to lack of ultra-violet rays or anything 'Arctic.' And we have fewer colds—except when we go on trips to the south!

"Still, we have our own problems. Because of frozen ground, the need for greater heat insulation and so on, house-building—which goes on all the year round—costs 40 per cent more than in Moscow, and pipe-laying even more. But the extra cost doesn't affect the rents.

"Thanks to the 'Arctic bonus,' wages are from ten to eighty per cent higher, depending on years of residence. And every worker gets thirty days of paid holiday each year.

"Every year we have more and more summer visitors from the south—most of them hunters and anglers, who swear that nowhere else is there the sport you can get here."

For myself I would prefer a series of Murman-style river trips, on the lines of one I had along the ice-covered Tuloma. The team of four reindeer harnessed abreast had competed in the "Arctic Olympics" only a week earlier and they kept up a steady 25 miles an hour, with occasional bursts of 35 mph—though the spray of ice particles thrown up by the reindeer's hooves made it seem

twice as fast to me as we sped along.

Besides being the USSR's only northern ice-free port, Murmansk is the home port of the atomic ice-breaker *Lenin* and the western terminal of the Northern Seaway that stretches nearly halfway round the "top of the world" and has four great branches, the White Sea Canal, with its access to the Baltic, and the Ob, Yenisei and Lena waterways stretching southwards for thousands of miles and serving river ports deep inside the land-mass of Siberia.

The *Lenin*—to be joined later by other atomic icebreakers—opens the Northern Seaway a month earlier than was previously possible and keeps it open a month longer at the end of the navigation season.

About a century ago the governor of Archangel province reported to the Tsar that the Murman Peninsula "could only support two cocks

and three hens." If he were alive today he would (to quote the well-known Irishman) turn in his grave. He would see not only fast-growing mechanized industries; he would see also how rationally they are linked together in a planned economy that embraces everything—even his precious chickens. Here is just one example of that linking system:

Fish caught off the Newfoundland and West African coasts are brought home by Murmansk's great fleet of modern fishing vessels; the waste products of the fish canning and preserving plants feed the thousands of mink and blue fox in the fur farms; the carcasses of these animals are turned into poultry food.

And that explains the full version of the local saying I mentioned earlier—"Here the birds fly backwards and the chickens eat the foxes."

THE SMELL OF DUST AND LILACS

SIR CHARLES SNOW, the distinguished English novelist, and his wife, Pamela Hansford Johnson, also a well-known writer, recently visited the Soviet Union as the guests of the Writers' Union.

"It is simply amazing," Sir Charles said, "how much people here know about our contemporary literature and how interested they are. It was very gratifying to me to find out that they would like to start publishing my novels in the Soviet Union with the first volume of the *Strangers and Brothers* sequence.

"We knew about your country, of course, but we are amazed at what we are seeing now. As for Moscow, anyone who has a future in his eyes cannot but love it. Only twice in my life have I smelled lilacs and dust together. In London in April 1941 when the smell of lilacs was mixed with that of the dust of buildings crashing under the German bombs, and in Moscow in June 1960, when it is mixed with the dust of buildings going up."

CORRECTION

IN OUR JUNE ISSUE we failed to indicate that the essay by Victor Perlo entitled, "Economic Consequences of Disarmament," was a chapter from *Disarmament and the American Economy*, a symposium edited by Dr. Herbert Aptheker. Published by New Century, \$1.00 for the paperback edition, \$2.00 for cloth, this book is an important contribution in the central issue of our time—the struggle for peace.

Military Research and the Arms Race

by ROBERT H. SOLLEN

THE American Friends Service Committee apparently knew what it was doing—it usually does—when it included speakers from two major military research centers at its Seventh Institute of World Affairs at Santa Barbara, Calif., on April 29 and 30.

But one couldn't be blamed for pre-conference apprehension. The institute topic this year was "Is Disarmament the Road to Peace?" and it seemed unlikely that the men of RAND and TEMPO were going to say it was.

RAND is a Santa Monica (Calif.) firm that does war and weapons research, most of it for the Air Force. Its name is an abbreviation for research and development, but its activities are exclusively research. TEMPO is General Electric's Technical Military Planning Operation, in Santa Barbara. It conducts military research and some related economic study.

These agencies have studied war clinically, and have related their findings in technical and statistical terms, almost totally avoiding human and political values. They press for constant military buildup, particularly in weapons systems of the greatest possible destruction—"deterrence," they call it—and have or-

dinarily sneered at or ignored suggestions for political settlement. This has been considered not only outside their sphere of activity, but beyond reality.

The most striking phenomenon is not that they have advocated a continuation of the arms race to achieve eventual peace and security, but that their own findings prove the futility of this approach.

The fact that this was pointed out at the Santa Barbara conference was one advantage of having RAND and TEMPO men participate.

Amrom Katz, reconnaissance and intelligence group leader at RAND, explained the many difficulties facing efforts for disarmament, and the dangers involved in the arms race.

He said there will come a time—maybe we've already passed it—when too many bombs and missiles will have been stored to make an inventory in which anyone will have any faith. Added to this difficulty, he said, is the constantly increasing area that must be inspected for a disarmament plan inventory. This includes not only greater land areas, but virtually limitless expanses under water and in space.

He said dangers in the quest for security through military means are increasing because of:

- Constant development of almost inconceivably devastating bombs;
- The increasing number of nations obtaining nuclear weapons;
- The increasing probability of

ROBERT H. SOLLEN is a free-lance writer who has contributed articles to the *Nation*, *New Republic*, *Christian Century*, and the *Progressive*.

starting a war by mistake as weapons systems progress outstrips improvements in defense and warning systems;

—The decreasing probability that "limited" wars can be contained;

—The development of faster delivery systems;

—And the possibility of "storing" bombs in orbit to be called down on order.

"The problems," Mr. Katz said, "are getting tougher faster than we are getting smarter. I used to think we were getting smarter, but we're getting smarter on obsolete problems."

There was a difference in Mr. Katz' presentation and the proposals heretofore provided by the men of TEMPO and RAND. Mr. Katz did not advocate an indefinite projection of the arms race. Some of his proposals for ending the arms race were unwieldy and even dangerous, but the significant fact is that they were made at all.

Among his less helpful suggestions was to develop America's ability to absorb a nuclear blow and withhold its decision to retaliate until it is determined whose bombs hit the United States, and whether the attack was deliberate or accidental. This, Mr. Katz said, would prevent America's having to retaliate immediately and perhaps needlessly or against the wrong power.

He also advocated some "first steps" toward disarmament which he said would facilitate more substantial steps later. First steps, he said, would include ending nuclear testing, ending the fear of surprise attacks with a system in which both major power blocs would have confidence, and breaking down Soviet

secrecy to permit adequate inspection.

James P. Warburg, noted author of several post World War II books on foreign policy, said in a later address that "first step" efforts are fruitless until both sides decide and agree on "first steps toward what?"

Mr. Warburg said it must be agreed by both sides that the ultimate goal is complete and universal disarmament. Until both sides agree to, and define, complete and universal disarmament, negotiations on this issue will serve only to reduce the most extreme international tensions at best, Mr. Warburg said.

Mr. Katz' proposal for ending Soviet secrecy was the most unlikely of his suggestions. The United States, he said, should threaten to give nuclear weapons to several other non-communist nations if the Soviet Union does not open its nation to disarmament inspection teams. Mr. Katz admitted that this threat would be only a bluff; that the United States should NOT give nuclear weapons to other nations because this would compound the disarmament control and inspection problem. But he thought the threat would be enough to bring the Soviet Union to American terms. Diplomacy by bluff and deceit is extremely dangerous in addition to being totally immoral. Mr. Katz' profession, however, is war, and in military maneuvering, bluff and deceit are not thus viewed.

As Mr. Warburg commented after Mr. Katz' address:

"Mr. Katz as a military man is doing his job to establish a military policy as best he can. But the trouble is that military men are dominating foreign policy."

Again to Mr. Katz' credit, however, must be mentioned his proposal, twice stated during the two-day institute, for much greater technical research on how to achieve disarmament and maintain security. He referred not only to research for a "position of strength" to dictate disarmament terms, as is so fruitlessly proposed by so many "peace" advocates; he urged establishment of major peace research groups, including one to study the possibilities and practicality of unilateral disarmament, a measure he personally views as "folly."

The United States, he said, should adopt dramatic but practical policies for taking the initiative on peace and disarmament.

"We need a gigantic moral equivalent to war," he concluded.

Mr. Katz was not the only military research agency representative to support peace planning. Philip Lever, TEMPO economist, commented briefly on an address by George H. Hildebrand, chairman of the Institute of Industrial Relations at the University of California at Los Angeles.

Mr. Lever said he agreed with Mr. Hildebrand that there is far too little planning for a peacetime economy, and advanced some ideas along this line. He proposed a big government public relations program to support research for peacetime projects, such as health research. He observed that it is not so easy to whip up popular enthusiasm for peacetime projects as it is for war preparations.

During a symposium, I asked Mr. Katz if there has been a recent shift of emphasis in RAND-TEMPO thinking from balance-of-terror "se-

curity" to a desire to find means of beginning disarmament. He said he could not speak for TEMPO, but that RAND had been interested in the disarmament problem for two years. This could be questioned by observers who remember that it was a RAND report on underground nuclear test detection last December that caused the American delegation in Geneva to change its mind about signing an agreement with Britain and the Soviet Union on the detection problem.

Many observers, including the British delegation at Geneva, believed an agreement then, with whatever risks it involved, would have been a step toward world security. The objective of RAND-TEMPO-AEC-Pentagon research appears to have been to prove that underground nuclear test detection is unworkable, rather than to devise methods to make the tests detectable.

Mr. Katz appeared to recognize the injustice of such one-sided research. I asked him if it were not significant that research on disarmament and peace proposals was conducted largely by the Pentagon, the AEC, and agencies directly or indirectly under Pentagon or AEC contract. It was in answer to this that he repeated his proposal for non-military research establishments to study technical problems of peace. He voiced his support of Sen. Hubert Humphrey's "peace agency" bill, and proposed that a research group be established to study unilateral disarmament.

The major military research agencies have not reversed themselves, nor are they leading the way toward disarmament and peace. They are still publishing terrifying proposals

for "scaring" Russia into "peaceful" behavior, and for threatening to start a war if the Soviet Union does not satisfy demands deemed justified by men of RAND-TEMPO mentality.

But there may be second thoughts among staff members of these groups. At any rate it was well for several reasons to invite them to participate in the Santa Barbara institute on disarmament.

It brought military researchers and their ideas into the open with contending men and ideas. This tended to break down the semi-secret status military research agencies have preferred, partly on the stated assumption that the average citizen is not capable of understanding complex issues of military weapons, strategy and psychology.

It also subjected the military planning ideas to questions and opposing premises. And while most anti-militarists at the Santa Barbara institute failed, I think, to present any definite alternatives to the arms race, they did demonstrate rather well that the arms race and continued military development in the current vein is not only futile but probably catastrophic.

It forced military researchers to try to answer the premise expounded by pacifist-activist Robert Pickus, that the very methods proposed by agencies such as TEMPO and RAND are the cause—rather than the cure—for the lack of international security. Mr. Pickus is director for Acts of Peace, a group coordinating the activities of about 10 peace groups in California.

Pointing out that the bigger and faster the military build-up, the more international security is jeopardized, he proposed unilateral dis-

armament by the United States. This, he said, would evoke a more cooperative response from Russia than threats and words and "positions of strength" proposals. He had little support from other speakers, but he had the most definite program of any of the institute faculty members, and he heavily outdrew Mr. Katz when they headed separate and simultaneous symposia. Many of those who attended Mr. Pickus' panel on "What Can We Do About It?" were high school students who said they wanted to refute all-seeing observers who believe American youth today is totally committed to apathy or a pro-military stand on the war and peace issue.

Mr. Pickus insisted that peace and disarmament cannot come about by following a policy which goes both ways at once; America must decide, he said, if organization for war is still rational. If it is not, then all efforts toward that end must cease. Unfortunately, he said, RAND and TEMPO work on the assumption that organization for war is still rational. He said the tragedy of RAND and TEMPO is that they have staffs of so many brilliant and talented men working on a false assumption.

"I don't think that the men engaged in the quest for security through military means have any faith in these methods—they feel they are stuck with them, because they don't know what else to do."

Inviting these men to participate in peace and disarmament discussions with men of opposing viewpoints may influence them to propose more rational alternatives in the future.

Th
velle
half
"Sov
tions
are p
by a
write
tract

Y
to re
One
a m
the
cow
the
ers
outs
ties;
the
the
who
train
and
grea
T
all
mor
cuts
the
the
ing
wer
eng
A
firm
be
est
wer

Poet and Audience

Translated by AMY SCHECHTER

The French magazine La Nouvelle Critique for March devotes half the issue to a section entitled "Soviet Humanism 1960." Translations from Soviet novels and stories are presented, with an introduction by a group of French critics and writers from which the following extract is taken.

YOU have to be there when a poet meets his followers face to face to realize the excitement generated. One of our number was present at a meeting of this kind recently, at the Museum of Literature in Moscow. Six hundred were packed into the hall like rush-hour subway riders while a crowd milled around outside. They were in their twenties; their vivid youth spotlighted the few tottering oldsters caught in the flood, visitors to the Museum who had come there to see its portraits of Mayakovsky and his posters and renew their memories of the great days.

These young people were not at all the "zazous" type; you can see more pony-tails and duck-tail haircuts at a classical concert. Nor did the purely literary set seem to be in the majority; judging by those taking the floor, a good percentage were plant technicians and young engineers.

An exacting public, and one firmly resolved not to let themselves be taken in by words. At the slightest doubtful formulation speakers were mercilessly panned. Criticism

addressed to the poet himself (often unjust) turned on the critic's belief that in such or such a verse he had used empty rhetoric, or sentiments that were "not in the least novel," or facile effects.

It was also a highly informed public with a thorough knowledge of the author's work, quite sure what it liked and what it disliked. But in spite of this jealously critical spirit and the conscious connoisseur's erudition displayed, a public reacting sensitively, vibrant with a remarkable sense of authentic poetry. And when the audience did decide on applause this was no polite gesture: they brought the house down, their surrender was complete.

The poet was young too. He was Yevgeny Yevtuchenko, now the great man of his generation. There is nothing of snobbism in this cult, however. If Yevtuchenko attracts this kind of audience it is because they recognize him as a true poet. And, if they recognize him as a true poet it is solely because he has been able to put into words the things they feel, because he has been able to give expression to their vision of life—to the deep Communist conviction of these young people, who, mercilessly opposing cut and dried ideas, believe with their whole being in that which constitutes their country's grandeur.

This demanding attitude towards poetry among the youth is not at all limited to Moscow and the big university towns. Andrei Voznessen-

sky, another very good poet, also of the latest batch, pointed out recently that he found the largest and most ardent audiences out at the great construction sites, or at Siberian plants "... two steps away from the bears. . . ."

When he was asked to explain this phenomenon, his answer was substantially the following: "You see, we are living in such an extraordinary epoch that poetry has become the mode of expression most capable of conveying directly its exceptional features. For the young people of my generation it is poetry that renders most faithfully the grandeur of our century—the century

of atomic fission, the century of the sputniks, of rockets fired into space. And do not forget, either, that all these young people are Communists in spirit, that their's is not a Communism in which vision is frozen, fashioned rigidly along hand-book lines, but is their reason-for-being, their profound vocation. And poetry, through the life which it breathes into the world of ideas, is more responsive than any other art form to this immense *elan* of the heart. . . . I would almost say that it is only today, in our land, in a society rid of the lying illusions of Over There, that poetry is at last finding its true place."

SHIRLEY GRAHAM GREET'S INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S ASSEMBLY

THE FOLLOWING STIRRING words are quoted from a message sent by Shirley Graham Du Bois to the International Assembly of Women in Copenhagen, April 21-25, and read there by Mrs. A. C. Bilbrew, from Los Angeles:

"We hail you, Sisters of the World, who come together on the Fiftieth Anniversary of organized struggle to win fundamental human rights for women everywhere. We share in honoring pioneers of the women's movement, we draw courage from past victories and join with you in unswerving efforts to win complete equality and peace for all women, for all children, in every land. . . .

"Yet, my Sisters, we would solemnly call your attention to the fact that there is war in the world today. We cannot talk of *maintaining* peace while war is being waged against the native and indigenous peoples of Africa. . . . Even as you gather in Copenhagen, the Government of South Africa proclaims its unalterable course of apartheid. . . . Today black men, women and children are being dragged from their miserable huts, clubbed and flogged into mines and ditches and fields. . . . Death is the kindest fate being handed to many women and girls. The voices of children are being stilled in terror. There is no laughter, there is no singing in South Africa, in Angola, in Southwest Africa. AND THERE CAN BE NO WORLD PEACE UNTIL THE AGGRESSORS IN AFRICA ARE HALTED. . . .

"But the amount of bloodshed depends on the extent of world indifference to the fate of Africa. Just as the sparks of freedom 'fly from each to each' so the sparks of war fly from country to country, from continent to continent. . . .

"Such world conflagrations must be prevented. I appeal to the International Assembly of Women to call upon all Governments to realize that the course being followed by the Government of South Africa is a grave threat to peace. South Africa must be condemned, not only by words, but by ACTIONS. Economic sanctions, boycott of all South African goods are some peaceful means. . . .

"The dark peoples of the world want peace. We demand freedom and the opportunity to work, to make our contributions toward man's progress and development—freedom to walk with dignity in the lands of our birth!"

USSR Abolishing Income Taxes

The meeting of the Supreme Soviet, May 5-7, was called to consider three important matters relating to the welfare of the Soviet people: abolition of taxes, completion of the transfer of all workers to a seven- and a six-hour working day during 1960, and changes in the monetary system.

Unfortunately in the gathering storm of the U-2 incident (Premier Khrushchev's two speeches on the shooting down of the U.S. plane and the capture of its pilot occurred during the sessions of the Supreme Soviet) the decisions passed went generally unnoticed in the press.

We print below excerpts from an article by the USSR Minister of Finance, V. Garbuzov, which appeared in Izvestia, June 3. This article was written in answer to questions sent into the newspaper by its readers.

We also print in full the two laws passed by the Supreme Soviet on the abolition of taxes on wages and on the shortening of the working day by 1960.

The Abolition of Taxes

THE abolition of taxes, which is being carried out in accordance with the decisions of the 21st Congress of the CPSU, has been prepared for by the great successes attained in the development of the national economy, by the rapid growth of the national income, and the consolidation of the financial strength of the state on this basis.

At the present time our state finances are more stable than ever before. They fully ensure the necessary means for the uninterrupted financing of economic and cultural construction.

In the Soviet Union and other socialist countries the budgetary resources are assigned chiefly to the

development of the national economy and culture, while the revenues are based on the steadily growing accumulations of the socialist enterprises. In the 1960 State budget of the USSR, the receipts from socialist enterprises and organizations account for more than nine-tenths of all the revenues, whereas taxes levied on the population equal only 7.4 per cent.

On the initiative of N. S. Khrushchev, the Central Committee of the Communist Party and the Soviet Government have drawn up and are consistently implementing measures to lower taxes and other payments made by the population. In 1953, the agricultural tax was lowered by 60 per cent, which increased the incomes of the collective farmers by six billion rubles a year. Following this, obligatory deliveries to the state by the collective farmers of meat, milk, eggs, and other agricultural products were abolished. A part of the factory and office workers were released from payment of income tax in connection with a higher untaxed minimum wage-level.

A sharp decrease has taken place in the number of people paying the tax on bachelors, single women and small families. Since 1958, the state loans distributed among the population by subscription have no longer been floated. The reduction in taxes and the discontinuation of the floating of loans have resulted in the population gaining about 30 billion rubles a year.

In the next few years the Soviet state will become the first state without taxes in the world. The finances of our state will be based entirely on the constantly growing accumulations of socialist enterprises and organizations, and their planned distribution and application in the interests of the whole of society. This means that the functions of the Soviet state, connected with the collection of taxes from the population, will disappear entirely. The economic and organizational activity of the state in mobilizing and distributing the accumulations of socialist enterprises, according to the national economic plan, will increase.

The abolition of taxes on factory and office workers will be introduced gradually, as the revenues of the state budget from the socialist economy grow. The abolition of taxes immediately, in the course of one year, would make it necessary for the state to reimburse these from other revenue sources, or to cut the assignments for the development of the national economy and raising the living standards of the people, envisaged in the plan. Such a decision would not have been in conformity with the potentialities, or with the tasks of economic development, it would not have been in keeping with the vital interests of the population and the state.

The abolition of taxes is being carried out differentially, provision being made that the wages of the relatively lower-paid categories of factory and office workers should be the first to rise. Hence, the introduction of this measure will, in its turn, promote the fulfillment of the task, set by the Party, of raising the wages of the lower- and medium-

paid categories of factory and office workers, and will help to narrow the gaps between the different wage categories.

According to the Law, the abolition of taxes is to commence October 1 of the current year, and to be completed in October 1965. This will give the necessary financial resources (replenished by the growth of accumulations of the socialist enterprises) with which not only to reimburse the reduction in revenue due to the abolition of taxes, but also to carry out all the measures for the further economic development of the country and improvement in the living standards of the people.

As a result of the complete abolition of taxes the incomes of factory and office workers will increase by approximately 75 billion rubles by 1966. In accordance with the decisions of the 21st Congress of the CPSU, other taxes will also be abolished within the next few years, with due regard for the interests of the population and the state.

With the abolition of taxes the nationwide struggle for revealing internal resources and increasing accumulations, which will be the only source financing the increased reproduction and the improvement in living standards of the people, will acquire still greater significance.

Monetary Changes

Of great importance for the further development of the socialist economy is the decision of the government on rescaling prices and replacing the money now in circulation by new units, which was unanimously approved by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

[The new units are based upon a recalculation of the ruble according to the ratio 10:1. New banknotes will be issued in the denomination of 1, 3, 5, 10, 25, 50 and 100 rubles; new coins will be issued in the denomination of 1, 2, 3, 5, 10, 15 and 20 kopeks, as well as coins of 50 kopeks and one ruble denomination.]

In the USSR, in connection with the repeated retail price cuts, the purchasing power of money has increased more than 2.3 times in the postwar years.

The rescaling of prices is called for by the needs of the rapidly growing national economy. If before the war the volume of gross output of industry and agriculture, the dimensions of retail trade, the national income and the monetary incomes of the population, and the state budget amounted to billions and tens of billions of rubles, then at present, the corresponding indices are calculated in hundreds of billions, or even in trillions of rubles.

The rescaling of prices should be regarded not only from the aspect of the present day, but also in the light of the prospects for the further development of the national economy, and the utilization of commodity-cash relations. In the next few years, in connection with a further considerable increase in social production and growth of trade, the role of money as a material incentive for labor productivity, for strengthening cost-accounting, and implementing the regime of economy must be increased. The consolidation of the ruble now being carried out answers to these tasks.

The consolidation of the ruble means a ten-fold decrease of all

wholesale, retail and purchasing prices, as well as of payments for public services, as compared with the present. At the same time, all the monetary incomes of the population will be recalculated in the same ratio, that is, ten to one. Thus, with their wages and other incomes the working people will be able to purchase the same amount of goods as they purchased previously, and to benefit by the same amount of paid services.

A great deal of work has to be done in recalculating all prices and scales. By October 1, 1960, new price lists and scales have to be published, to ensure that, beginning with 1961, trade will be conducted in the new prices throughout the country.

Wages and salaries, scales and rates, and other forms of payment will be recalculated at all enterprises and organizations, so that every worker will know beforehand and be able to check the correctness of the recalculation of the wage rates and his other incomes.

With the introduction of the new price scales, the gold content of the ruble rises.

In connection with this change, the debts of foreign states, under credits granted by the Soviet Union, as well as current debts in rubles under foreign trade operations will also be recalculated. This recalculation will not involve any losses for either the Soviet Union or other countries.

The higher exchange rate of the ruble will strengthen it in settling international accounts, and will promote the further development of economic relations between the USSR and other countries.

Law on the Abolition of Taxes on the Wages of Factory and Office Workers

The following is the full text of the Law on the Abolition of Taxes on the Wages of Factory and Office Workers which was approved by the USSR Supreme Soviet on May 7:

The Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics notes that in accordance with the decisions of the 21st Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and on the basis of the successful fulfillment of the national economic plans, an extensive program for raising the standard of living of the Soviet people is being carried out in the USSR. The transfer of factory and office workers in all branches of the national economy to a seven-hour working day, and of workers in the leading trades employed underground to a six-hour working day will be completed in 1960; measures for increasing and adjusting the wages of factory and office workers are being carried out in a planned manner; there is a considerable increase in the output of consumer goods and an improvement in the cultural and public services for the working people; housing construction is developing on an ever-increasing scale.

In recent years measures have been carried out to lower taxes on the population: the agricultural tax has been reduced by 60 per cent; collective farmers and a considerable section of the factory and office workers have been exempted from paying the tax on single persons, persons living alone, and citizens of the USSR with small families; and the minimum wage exempted from taxation has been raised.

At the present time measures for developing the national economy and culture and for improving the people's well-being are being carried out in our country mainly at the expense of the accumulations of socialist enterprises. As the Seven-Year Plan is fulfilled, there will

be a corresponding steady growth of these accumulations.

With the aim of further improving the material well-being of the working people, the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics resolve:

ARTICLE 1:

To discontinue the levying of income tax and the tax on single persons, persons living alone, and citizens of the USSR with small families, on factory and office workers receiving at their main place of work wages:

- Up to 500 rubles per month—
as from October 1, 1960.
- Up to 600 rubles per month—
as from October 1, 1961.
- Up to 700 rubles per month—
as from October 1, 1962.

ARTICLE 2:

To reduce the existing rate of the income tax and the tax on single persons, persons living alone, and citizens of the USSR with small families, on the wages of factory and office workers at their main place of work by an average of 40 per cent within the following time limits:

- As from October 1, 1960, on earnings from 501 to 600 rubles a month.
- As from October 1, 1961, on earnings from 601 to 700 rubles a month.
- As from October 1, 1962, on earnings from 701 to 800 rubles a month.
- As from October 1, 1963, on earnings from 801 to 900 rubles a month.
- As from October 1, 1964, on earnings from 901 to 1,000 rubles a month.

ARTICLE 3:

To abolish completely as from October 1, 1965, the levying of income tax and the tax on single persons living alone, and citizens of the

USSR with small families, on the earnings of factory and office workers. In so doing, the levying of income tax on factory and office workers with basic wage rates or fixed wages of up to 1,000 rubles a month will be completely stopped, with cash earnings increasing by the entire amount of the tax on these rates and wages; the levying of income tax on factory and office workers with basic wage rates or fixed wages ranging from 1,001 to 2,000 rubles a month will be stopped, with the cash earnings under the basic wage rates and fixed wages increasing as follows:

From 1,001 to 1,200 rubles a month—on an average by 79 per cent of the amount of tax deducted from these rates and wages;

From 1,201 to 1,400 rubles a month—on an average by 46 per cent of the amount of tax deducted from these rates and wages;

From 1,401 to 1,600 rubles a month—on an average by 29 per cent of the amount of tax deducted from these rates and wages;

From 1,601 to 1,800 rubles a month—on an average by 15 per cent of the amount of tax deducted from these rates and wages;

From 1,801 to 2,000 rubles a month—up to 10 per cent of the amount of tax deducted from these rates and wages.

The basic rates and fixed wages of these factory and office workers shall simultaneously be reduced by the remaining part of the tax deducted from the former rates and wages.

Law on Completing the Transfer of all Factory and Office Workers to a Seven- and Six-hour Working Day in 1960

The following law on the shorter working day was approved by the USSR Supreme Soviet on May 7:

The Soviet people, carrying out the historic decisions of the 21st Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet

The levying of income tax on factory and office workers with basic wage rates and fixed wages exceeding 2,000 rubles a month shall be stopped and their rates and wages shall simultaneously be reduced by the entire amount of tax deducted from these rates and wages.

The levying of the tax on single persons, persons living alone, and citizens of the USSR with small families, on factory and office workers shall be abolished completely at the expense of the state.

ARTICLE 4:

The levying of income tax and the tax on single persons, persons living alone and citizens of the USSR with small families, on the earnings of literary and art workers, is to stop as from October 1, 1965, and the amount of royalties and other remunerations is to be correspondingly reduced in accordance with the procedure to be established by the USSR Council of Ministers.

ARTICLE 5:

In accordance with Article 1 and 3 of this Law, the last deduction of taxes from factory and office workers is to be made from the earnings for Sept. of the corresponding year.

ARTICLE 6:

This Law is also intended to cover servicemen, students, lawyers, handicraftsmen and artisans belonging to cooperatives who pay income tax under the same conditions as factory and office workers.

Union, have achieved outstanding successes in developing the socialist economy and a considerable improvement in the well-being and the cultural level of the working people.

The vast achievements in developing the national economy and in increasing

the productivity of social labor ensure the opportunity for a further gradual reduction of the working day and the working week.

The decisions of the 21st Congress of the CPSU envisaged that the transfer of factory and office workers to a seven-hour working day, and to a six-hour working day in the case of workers in the leading trades employed underground, should be completed in 1960; that the transfer of factory and office workers to a 40-hour working week should be completed in 1962, and that their gradual transfer to a working week of 30 to 35 hours should be undertaken beginning with 1964. As a result of this, the USSR will have the shortest working day and the shortest working week in the world. This will be a very great victory of the Soviet people, reflecting the basic advantages of socialist society.

The decision adopted by the Communist Party on the gradual reduction of the working day is being steadily carried out. The shortening of the working

day is being implemented without reducing the wages of factory and office workers.

The Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics resolves:

ARTICLE 1:

To approve the measures worked out by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the USSR Council of Ministers and the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions which are at present being carried out for the transfer of factory and office workers to a seven- and six-hour working day and the adjustment of wages.

ARTICLE 2:

To establish that the working day for all factory and office workers be not more than seven hours, and for workers in the leading trades employed underground, not more than six hours.

To complete the transfer of factory and office workers to a seven- and six-hour working day in 1960.

CYRUS S. EATON SPEAKS IN PRAGUE

MR. CYRUS S. EATON, during his recent visit to Prague, addressed the philosophical faculty of Charles University. He spoke of the Pugwash conferences which he had organized at which 100 scientists from more than 23 countries had reached unanimous agreement. He pointed out that these conferences showed that it was possible to bring people together from different countries with different points of view and to reach agreement. Mr. Eaton announced that the next Pugwash conference will be held in Moscow in September to discuss ways and means of freeing the world from the hazards of modern warfare and ways and means of diminishing the terrible threat of war itself.

Mr. Eaton pointed out that when American scientists want to meet with the scientists of the socialist countries "young men from the State Department tell them you are only wasting your time because scientists from the USSR and the socialist countries would never agree to anything. But we have reached several unanimous conclusions with those scientists. We have unanimously agreed that to develop a foreign policy based on force is a delusion. We have also agreed that the proposal for peace made by Mr. Khrushchev last September, calling for complete disarmament, is the one sound way for the welfare of the world."

Asked in the question period what he thought of the consequences of disarmament on the economy, Mr. Eaton replied, "If we can get rid of the burden of taxation in the United States where 50 billion dollars a year are spent on armaments, then there will be very much greater employment and prosperity than now."

Workers' Rights in the Soviet Union

by ANDREW ROTHSTEIN

TWO broadcasts from Moscow by visiting British trade union leaders shocked the London *Daily Telegraph* very much recently. They were "in sharp conflict" with the opinions of most British trade union chiefs, and "entirely contrary to T.U.C. policy," it said. Considering that most British trade union chiefs have not been in the Soviet Union, while those that have been have all said much the same—and that the T.U.C. has not had a delegation there for at least fifteen years—the *Daily Telegraph* was taking too much upon itself, to put it mildly.

What was it that the trade unionists said? Mr. E. J. Hill, General Secretary of the Boilermakers, said that the Soviet trade unions were adequately protecting the workers; that their way was "very democratic" and balanced "in favor of the workers every time"; and that he "would be very happy to have the same opportunities" for his shop stewards. Mr. J. K. Dutton, General Secretary of the Scientific Workers, said that "the idea that Russian trade unions are simply organs of the State is unfounded."

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

Horrible! Incidentally, a similar verdict was rendered by an official delegation of the British Trades Union Congress General Council in 1925 and of the American Congress of Industrial Organizations in 1945. Such testimony, at such long intervals—and there is plenty more—cannot be brushed aside as easily as the *Daily Telegraph* would like.

Now comes impressive new information.

For very many years—since 1922, in fact—relations between managements and workers in the USSR have been regulated by the Labor Code, a law originally drawn up for the Russian Federal Republic (the largest of the fifteen making up the USSR) and later adopted by the others. In this Code were included a number of principles for which the labor movement in all countries had been fighting for many years. Thus (among other things) it laid down that:

- trade unions are not liable in their property for breaches of collective agreements; and don't have to be registered by the state;

- transfer from one job to another in the same factory, or from one place to another, is allowed only with the agreement of the worker concerned and (up to one month maximum, and in cases of temporary necessity) at his previous average wage;

- output quotas or time taken over a job (norms) must be agreed

by management and trade union to be valid;

—overtime must be paid at time-and-a-half for the first two hours, and at double-rate thereafter (and for work on holidays): and then only with trade union sanction;

—young people from sixteen to eighteen work a six-hour day but are paid as for eight hours: and get "the rate for the job";

—workers elected to public or trade union posts must be guaranteed their previous (or similar) jobs on relinquishing these posts; and their average wage while performing public duties in working time.

—workers absent sick have their jobs guaranteed at their average earnings for at least two months, or on maternity leave four months.

—a maximum working day of eight hours (seven hours on night-shift, paid as eight hours): young people under 18 not to work nights.

—a *minimum* annual paid holiday of a fortnight for all workers (one month for youth under eighteen);

—pregnant and nursing mothers not allowed on night-shift; and maternity leave of eight weeks before and eight weeks after childbirth, with time off twice daily to nurse infants, without loss of pay;

—factory committees elected by the workers to have full recognition by management, with free premises, lighting, heating and right of inspection;

—members of factory committees cannot be dismissed without sanction of the union concerned;

—social insurance is non-contributory—i.e., the amount to be paid to insurance fund (calculated as a percentage of the wages bill) may not be deducted from wages.

Even earlier than the Labor Code, women were guaranteed equal pay with men for the same job.

Many younger people don't realize that such of these provisions as apply nowadays in other countries (and very many provisions don't, as yet) only began to be introduced when it began to percolate that even such a poor country, as Russia was then, had made these truly revolutionary changes!

Over the years, however, life has become easier and more abundant. The Soviet workers have become an educated class. Their experience of managing industry themselves, of public service and of trade union activity is very much bigger than it was thirty-seven years ago. Many improvements and additions have been made to the Code, or to laws issued under it. Now the time has come to redraft the Code as a whole.

The Standing Committees on Bills of the two Houses of the Supreme Soviet—the Parliament of the USSR—have published a draft Bill, *Principles of Labor Legislation of the USSR and the Union Republics*, in the fortnightly journal of the Soviet trade unions, and in a number of others, for discussion by the public. *The Bill was drafted by the Central Council of Trade Unions.* Soviet citizens are invited to send in their remarks and suggestions to the committees at the Kremlin, Moscow. After the discussion, the Bill is to be submitted to the Supreme Soviet for endorsement; and once it has thereby become law, the Labor Codes—of the country as a whole and of the fifteen union republics which make it up—will be brought into strict keeping with its terms.

What is the effect of the Bill?

Fi
every
about
ber
which
The
list.
It
hour
to ta
and
Fi
estab
requ
seven
Satur
other
Th
the
dism
mon
U
for r
W
ing
Fo
worl
than
page
worl
50 p
Ev
publ
dedu
thir
In
prov
be v
refer
sion
tion
N
start
the
A
pro
wor

First, it confirms or improves every one of the points set out above; and secondly, it adds a number of new and important rights which the Soviet workers possess. The following is not a complete list.

It establishes a maximum seven-hour day and 40-hour week—the first to take effect by the end of 1960, and the second in 1962.

Five days of eight hours may be established where special conditions require it; otherwise, five days of seven hours, with five hours on Saturdays. Teachers, doctors and others have a shorter day.

The period of sick leave, before the management has the right of dismissal, is increased to four months.

Up to two hours may be allowed for meal breaks.

Wages are to be paid during working hours.

For spoilage not the fault of the worker, he is to be paid not less than two-thirds the rate: for stoppage of production not due to the worker, he will get not less than 50 per cent of his rate.

Even if he has caused damage to public property through negligence deductions are not to exceed one-third of his monthly wage.

Internal regulations must be approved by the factory committee to be valid. Breaches of these may be referred by management to discussion by the workers' own organizations.

No factory or department may start operating without sanction of the trade union factory inspector.

A new section: *Training and Improvement of Skill*, lays down that workers taking a general education-

al course in the evenings or free shifts have a shorter working day or week, if progressing in their studies; while those taking a higher course of study (evening or correspondence diploma or degree course) get special leave and other privileges to prepare for examinations, etc.

Disputes arising in the factory are examined by a union-management committee in the first instance: if there is "failure to agree," or if the worker is dissatisfied, the factory committee decides: if the worker is still dissatisfied, or the management considers there is a breach of law (only in that event), the matter goes to the local court.

The factory committee now has the right to take part in drawing up all the factory's plans, to "express its opinion" about people put forward to managerial posts, and to "raise the question with the appropriate organizations" of sacking managers who don't carry out the collective agreement, break labor law or behave bureaucratically. (If a union executive committee or trade council acts on such a complaint, experience shows that it is always successful.)

Workers elected to trade union posts, factory committee members, shop stewards and voluntary (shop) spare-time factory inspectors may not be dismissed or transferred without the agreement of the union.

No worker may be dismissed without the sanction of the factory committee.

It is not true that strikes are prohibited in the USSR. But who wants to strike with all these rights?

Reprinted through the courtesy of British-Soviet Friendship

A Tilt at Literary Windmills

by O. KOVINKA

THE author of *Love at First Sight?*, a new Soviet novel which is bound to find a lasting place on innumerable bookshelves throughout the country, is a powerful writer in many senses of the word.

Quite apart from his basic achievements of having written this monumental work of 992 pages, there stands to his credit the even greater achievement of having it published in an edition of some tens of thousands of volumes.

This requires a word of explanation. Life itself, it has been said, demands that our publishing houses work to an annual plan. One can only speculate in wonder at the strength and, more important, the nature of the force expended on getting a volume of this stature squeezed into so tight a program.

The author faces up boldly to the fact that the interrogation mark in his title implies a question and that a question demands an answer. Boldly, too, and clearly, he gives his answer: Yes, love can come at first sight! Even more boldly, he accepts that there are two sides to every question, and to this second side, he gives the unequivocal answer—after an interval that saves any confusion in the reader's mind—that, No, there can be no love at first sight.

Now the opportunity for achievement passes from writer to reader. One pictures this reader in his lonely log-cabin, the blizzard howling outside, snowbound . . . but, to return to the book itself.

What first holds our attention is the masterly, almost brusque, way in which the author brings us, without any formality of introduction, into what has been so truly and so often described as the inner, spiritual and/or emotional life of his characters. His opening words are:

"At a conference of agricultural workers Petro gazed for the first time upon Galina; Galina's shining eyes returned the fond glance and, lo,—they were in love."

There it is in all its unwavering directness, limpid clarity and—in the widest, deepest and richest sense of the term—contemporaneity. Not for this author the slow awakening of love at a dance in the *kolkhoz* clubhouse or by the well-worn willow or the locally-colorful, lonely birch tree. No, he brings his Ukrainian lovers together at a conference in which the tender emotions have to fight against the all-absorbing problems of soil-conservation, stockbreeding and crop rotation.

As we make our way deeper into the text we find the lovers—now in the throes of emotion too deep for them or the author to express—being "borne on the wings of Spring" straight from the conference to a windmill.

A windmill! There we have the hallmark of the truly creative innovator. A writer of less originality would have taken his lovers to the well-trodden rushes. Perhaps, too, our author was, so to speak, tilting at *Windmills in Ukrainian Literature and Life*, in which the schol-

arly but gloomy Slovenko implies, by his silence on the subject, that these hallowed features of our countryside have no image-value in our literature and no tryst-keeping and troth-pledging significance in our lives. Indeed, could it not be said in these days of fast-spreading powerlines that the new function of these windmills in their present state of disrepair is the grinding of literary corn?

At this point—a point fixed by long-established precedent—I must say a word about the author's not inconsiderable shortcomings.

We read, for example: "It was the hour of twilight. The first stars in the darkening sky were twinkling merrily. In the dusk someone was being chased by an infuriated bull and from a field close at hand could be heard the popping of ripe squashes."

Why does the author withhold from us the full, many-faceted glories of what was beyond doubt a truly magnificent twilight landscape? And who or what persuaded the author to suppress the name of the person pursued by the bull? Was it a *kolkhoz* chairman who had neglected to stock the silo with the succulent produce which bulls expect as their due?

This chair-warming chairman should be named and exposed. The most cursory investigation would, one feels sure, show that it was he too who failed to gather the squashes before they reached the popping state.

We have the right to know the outcome of a situation so pregnant with dramatic possibilities, with social significance, with grave agricultural implications and with mat-

ters of deep concern to animal-lovers everywhere. Readers would rather learn about the end of this chase—if it has, in fact, ended—than read the pages devoted to Petro's she-loves-me-she-loves-me-not vacillations when it is obvious even to the author that Galina is hopelessly in love with him.

When things are going well, they kiss. That is as it should be, and it would be indeed a churlish critic who demanded that they restrict the number or the duration of their kisses, either in public or in private. But these young persons *kiss in print*, and in print a reviewer is within his rights to suggest norms. The present reviewer's suggestion (without prejudice to any score they may put up out of print) is: Let them kiss for 2 and a half to 3 and a half pages; 62 pages is excessive.

Earlier in the book (p. 613) we are told, "And so, for the first time, their lips met," but it is not explained whether this important event occurred before or after the harvesting. There is a similar Olympian casualness (p. 670) in the author's use of the phrase "milking the sheep." One *herds* sheep, one *shears* sheep, and the fact that some excellent cheeses are made from sheep's milk gives one food for thought; but some explanation is called for.

To sum up, this is not one of those books that is here today and gone tomorrow. It is a book that is *bound* to endure.

The binding is excellent.

Translated from Ogonyok, Soviet illustrated magazine, by Archie Johnstone.

DOCUMENTARY REVIEW

Khrushchev on U-2, Summit Failure and Soviet Policies – New Disarmament Plan

TO redress the balance of distorted Administration statements and press accounts about Soviet policies, and to give a clear view to the peace forces of the United States of the solid basis for continued peace efforts, a careful study of the full text of Khrushchev's statements and Soviet documents in the post-Paris period is required. Summaries cannot replace this—but perhaps the following review will help promote an understanding of the realities.

First, a word about that final May 18 press conference in Paris. The press outdid itself in its lurid accounts, but those who watched it saw something quite different, and sober viewers were impressed by the way the Soviet Premier handled an unprecedented sort of occasion. It was indeed, rather a free-for-all. Everyone came, whether legitimately accredited as press correspondents or not.

Premier Khrushchev found himself confronted by a motley crowd containing some of the riff-raff of European fascist groups who, the last people who had wanted the Summit to take place or succeed, booed and interrupted him for supposedly having "wrecked" it. While it might have been better had the head of a great state not been exposed to such a performance, it was hardly surprising that he hit out at the boosers as he did. But that was only a small part of the conference. Its real import lay in Khrushchev's

elucidation of the position of his government.

Khrushchev expressed deep regret that the refusal of the United States to make public acknowledgment of the insult inflicted on the Soviet Union by the U-2 plane's infringement of its sovereignty had made negotiations impossible, and explained why the President's statement on the suspension of flights was not enough:

What the President of the United States promised is not renunciation of an aggressive policy but merely temporary "suspension" of flights till January, 1961. But international relations cannot be built on the term of office of this or that official, for what then would be the worth of any international agreement?

If we followed the American President's logic, it would be impossible to negotiate on, say, disarmament. An agreement may conceivably be signed today but lose force tomorrow and be thrown into the wastepaper basket because the person who signed it might leave his post.

Restating basic Soviet foreign policy, Khrushchev declared:

I repeat, gentlemen, the Soviet Union is firmly for peaceful coexistence, for talks, for reaching of reasonable, mutually acceptable agreements . . . and we should like to believe that the Western leaders will also strive toward this end, that within six or eight months we shall again meet with our partner in a new, more favorable atmosphere.

This can happen sooner, but only if everybody realizes that no one will be able to intimidate the Soviet Union, the socialist states, by any provocative actions whatsoever! . . . Negotiations with us are possible only on the basis of equality, without threats or blackmail.

Khrushchev in Berlin

Widespread speculation that Khrushchev would immediately force the issue on Germany and Berlin was blasted by the Soviet Premier's speech in East Berlin, capital of the German Democratic Republic, on May 20.

Premier Khrushchev spoke of the Soviet Union's intense preparations for the Summit meeting, of the hopes held till the end that something might come of it, despite all the alarming signals from the West. Reiterating the USSR's willingness to enter into a new conference when the dust should settle, and his belief that there are good people in America who strive for peace, he said, "We will not do anything that might aggravate the international situation."

Premier Khrushchev expressed his agreement with GDR leaders on the need for a peace treaty with the two existing German states and the end of the occupation regime of foreign powers in West Berlin, situated right in the middle of the GDR, thus putting an end to the remnants of World War II. He noted that the United States had signed a separate peace treaty with Japan, and asked whether the time had not come to sign one with the GDR. However, he continued:

Under present conditions it is worthwhile to wait a little longer and try to find by joint efforts of all four victorious powers a solution to the long-since ripe question of signing a peace treaty with the two German states which in reality are now in existence. . . . We had better wait, and the matter will get more mature. Therefore, with regard to the German peace treaty, including the West Berlin issue, the existing situation will apparently have to be preserved until the heads of government meeting which,

it is to be hoped, will take place in six or eight months.

Mr. Khrushchev advised Chancellor Adenauer not to be overjoyed at the fact that he had "succeeded in worming his way into the post of Secretary of State of the United States." This could not last forever, and the time would come when the American people would understand the real situation. Warning of Adenauer's new attempts to end all restrictions on the rearmament of West Germany, he added that neither the Soviet Union nor the GDR would wait endlessly for a favorable wind with regard to the question of a peace treaty with Germany and an end to the occupation regime in West Berlin.

Khrushchev's Report to his People

It was significant that Khrushchev chose the All-Union Conference of Leaders in the Emulation of Communist Work Teams and Shock Workers for his full report on the conference, on May 29.

"You are the foremost people in our society," was the way the Soviet Premier addressed these leading workers in Soviet industry and agriculture.

And at the end he told them how he rejoiced to see so many wonderful people, innovators, people of bold creative thought:

The day is not far off when the entire working class and all the collective farm peasantry of our country will be highly educated people. We already have scores of factories, plants and state farms where all people study, where the differences between people of mental and physical labor are being obliterated.

Answering those who charge that

the forces of revolution are always destructive, he said:

No, it is not the kings and the millionaires that built the cities, plants and canals, that create the machines, cultivate the orchards and take in the harvest. All this is done by the working people, the real makers of all the beauty that has been created on earth.

Mr. Khrushchev told of the hopeful and serious preparations the USSR had made for the Summit conference. These included the successful pursuance of the Seven-Year Plan to advance the economy and steadily raise the living standards of the Soviet people—a plan that could only win its objectives through a policy of peaceful coexistence—by the plan for complete disarmament, the unilateral reduction of Soviet armed forces by one-third, an action that could not have been taken by any state planning to resolve disputes through war. The recent decisions on the elimination of taxes for all workers and shorter working day were also, he said, actions for peace, since preparations for war must always place heavier burdens on the shoulders of the people.

Forces Against the Summit

Turning to the situation in the United States in the period preceding the Summit conference, the Soviet Premier declared:

When I met and exchanged views with President Eisenhower and other American statesmen in the United States, I gained the impression that President Eisenhower indeed wished for peace and an improvement in the international climate. I must say that I still believe that the President himself now too wants peace. But evidently the well-meant intentions of the President are one thing and the foreign policy of the American Government another. . . .

Mr. Khrushchev recalled that on his return home from the United States he had reported that there were forces supporting a continuation of the cold war and the arms race, and it was not yet clear whether these would prevail or the forces standing for a relaxation of international tension. The internal struggle that developed in the United States between these two groups was reflected in the wavering policy on the banning of nuclear tests, with steps taken under public pressure towards facilitating agreement, followed by backward steps, and then President Eisenhower's declaration that underground tests would be resumed on May 7, just eight days before the Paris meeting.

Then came the cold war speeches on the eve of the conference by Herter, Dillon and Nixon, which received Eisenhower's endorsement, and Adenauer's attempts to render the Summit abortive on his trips to Washington, Paris, Rome, Tokyo and London.

Most of all, declared the Soviet Premier, U.S. intentions were made clear by the intrusions of American spy planes, on April 9 and May 1. After the shooting down of the second U-2 plane, Khrushchev continued:

We seriously considered the ensuing situation and decided not to undertake anything that would hamper the U.S. President from getting out of the awkward position into which he had fallen. We even declared that the President could hardly have known or have approved of such actions and that, seemingly, it was the hotheads of the Pentagon and Allen Dulles, that professional spy, who were guilty.

But Eisenhower did not take advantage of the opportunity afforded him

and declared that the espionage flights had been approved by him and had been conducted with his knowledge.

I still hold that the President did not know about these flights, but, as President, he felt it would be uncomfortable to admit that he did not know what was going on in the country, because otherwise the people of America, the whole world would think . . . then a war may start without the President's knowledge.

In the light of all this, said Khrushchev, the question arose "Whom do we have to deal with? . . . What kind of state is it that refuses to be guided by generally accepted international standards?" It was clear that the aim of such aggressive actions could only be to torpedo the Summit, to incite a war psychosis—an aim further revealed by the worldwide alert of U.S. combat forces and bases as the conference was about to open.

Nevertheless, Khrushchev reported, the Central Committee of the Communist Party and the Soviet Government resolved to display self-control to the last and take advantage of even the smallest chance to save the Summit conference, hoping the President might still find the courage "to denounce the aggressive actions against the Soviet Union." In preliminary meetings with Macmillan and de Gaulle, Khrushchev said he gained the impression they were both interested in going ahead with the Summit meeting, although as U.S. allies they had no great freedom of independent action. Khrushchev said he was astonished to be rebuked by Eisenhower for not seeking a meeting with him, when it was quite obvious it was Eisenhower's place to take the initiative since it was the USSR that was the insulted

party, and so acted as any self-respecting government would do.

When Eisenhower declared that the U.S. had suspended the spy flights and would not resume them, American propaganda, said Khrushchev, raised a great clamor, saying, "What else do you want? You must be satisfied with this." He continued:

But, firstly, the U.S. President himself said that the flights were suspended only for the period while he stays in the White House, that is, till January 1961.

And, secondly, even this decision was not presented as a renunciation of the aggressive policy of penetrating into the air space of our country and not as a condemnation of this policy, but as a certain concession made by the American President to the Soviet Union. . . . The President with his own hands burned the bridges leading to the Summit conference.

In his May 25 speech, said Khrushchev, President Eisenhower had again justified the spy flights, expressing regret only that the Powers flight had failed, and declaring that since the Soviet Union had previously known about the flights, its position must be due not to them but to something else. Khrushchev explained why he had decided not to bring up the flights at Camp David:

I did not mention the flights for a simple reason: we protested more than once against the flights of American planes over our country, but the United States denied the facts . . . We had no material evidence of such incursions . . . We do not deny that there was a time when we could not shoot down such planes . . . [But on May 1] the very first missile struck the American plane at a height of 20,000 meters [over 60,000 feet]. That was the last day spy-planes could be sent into our skies with impunity. . . .

The U.S. Government is now seeking to justify its disgraceful practice of violating other nations' sovereignty by getting its spying activity legalized. It is to this end that the Eisenhower-Nixon Administration has put forward once again its old "Open Skies" plan. The United States wants the failure of its spying activity to be made up for through permission for the American intelligence service to launch its illegal activity in this country under the cloak of the United Nations.

Noting that the U.S. position was for control, meaning espionage, rather than disarmament, Khrushchev asserted that the USSR will continue to press for genuine disarmament; it will also seek a ban on nuclear and all other weapons of mass destruction, but if the United States continues to obstruct the final decision on the ending of nuclear tests, which is all but agreed on, and resumes such tests, the Soviet Union would also have to resume tests. But the USSR does not wish matters to take this course and consequently proposes:

That all means of warfare and, consequently, all means of attack, should be scrapped, and that dependable international control should be established so that no one could arm himself in preparation for attack on other countries . . .

The Soviet Government considers that President Eisenhower's statement in his speech of May 25 that the United States should maintain businesslike relations with the Soviet Union with respect to outstanding issues can be of positive value if the United States strives for it in deeds rather than in words . . .

How Would You Feel, Mr. Garst?

Addressing himself to those people who really wanted the Summit conference to succeed and were disturbed by its failure, he said:

We understand their disappointment

because we too very much wanted the conference to take place. More, we had worked hard for this for many years.

Khrushchev recounted how some people had come to him in Paris suggesting that he "have pity" on Eisenhower, who must himself be regretting what had happened, and had asked him whether it would not have been better to agree to the Summit without an apology from the U.S. Government, which would find it a "terrible thing" to apologize, because "they are so haughty." He had explained to them that if he had sat down at the conference table without receiving such an apology:

This would mean that we recognized their spy flights over the Soviet Union as lawful . . . We told them firmly: the Soviet Union cannot and will not take part in a meeting where we would be placed in a position of inequality.

He also referred to his "old friend," that "good American farmer" Roswell Garst, who felt that President Eisenhower had been insulted in Paris. He said he had not been offended, and understood these feelings, but that important international events should be guided not by feelings but by reason. He asked:

Just suppose that during the night someone carries away the whole harvest from your cornfield. You come to the field and find it empty. Finally, you succeed in catching the thief. You want to take him to court, to sue him for damages. But he strikes an attitude and declares: I like your corn, Mr. Garst. I have stolen it in the past, and I shall steal it in the future too. How would you feel in such a case, Mr. Garst?

He then reminded Mr. Garst of how he had defended the sovereignty

of his own farm when the journalists and photographers had trampled over it during Khrushchev's visit, now he had thrown cornstalks at them, kicked one of the correspondents in the seat of the pants and finally called on neighboring farmers to come on horseback to his defense!

Role of Other Nations

"We know that all the peoples, the Americans included, want peace," declared Khrushchev, but emphasized that this wish must be backed by intensive activity, and pressure for the principles of peaceful coexistence. He remarked that public opinion in the West was increasingly stressing the abnormality of the situation that the seat of People's China in the United Nations is still occupied by Chiang Kai-shek's man, "a political corpse," and that China is left out of important conferences concerned with international issues. He proposed that future heads of government conferences should invite the great powers of Asia to take part:

For the future of the peoples of all countries to be unclouded and to provide the conditions for truly peaceful development, the Western powers must normalize relations with People's China without any further delay and to invite the People's Republic of China, India, Indonesia and, perhaps, some other nations to take part in future negotiations.

Khrushchev expressed gratification over the fact that the Government of Norway, evidently realizing the danger of foreign bases on its territory had protested the fact that its territory was being used for incursions against the Soviet Union. He deplored the fact that Pakistan, while lodging protests with the Gov-

ernment of the United States, still took a half-hearted position in trying to deny that the Powers flight actually took off from its territory.

Referring to the fact that the Soviet Government had long sought better relations with Turkey, Khrushchev declared that the provision by the latter of bases from which U.S. planes could operate against the Soviet Union had not improved relations, and he hoped the new government would take a new course.

With regard to Italy, he said the U.S. planes based there were intended for espionage activities mainly against the countries of Eastern Europe with which the USSR is linked by Allied commitments which it would honor.

Regarding Japan, he said it is deplorable that this country has blocked any peace treaty with the Soviet Union, instead concluding a new military treaty with the United States "aimed, above all, against us and our friend—the great Chinese people." He warned that if spy flights were undertaken from U. S. military bases in Japan over the territory of the Soviet Union or People's China, "The Soviet Government will be compelled to take the most resolute measures." He extended this warning to all countries which have American military bases on their territories.

Referring to U.S. claims of support against the Soviet Union, Khrushchev quoted the saying: "Tell me who your friend is, and I will tell you who you are," and mentioned the "rather curious company" of U.S. friends, including Franco, Ex-President Syngman Rhee of Korea, Chiang Kai-shek, Prime Min-

ister Kishi, who is not supported by the Japanese people, the Shah of Iran, to whose aid the U.S. is pledged to come in case of "direct or indirect aggression," former dictator Batista of Cuba, and others of this kind in Asia, Europe and South America.

The United States, he said, seems to feel some sort of danger threatens it from Soviet rockets; but if there is any threat, it comes rather from economic competition and in conclusion he challenged the United States again to confine trials of strength to the economic field, and concentrate on peaceful economic competition.

New Soviet Disarmament Proposals

On June 2 the Soviet Union submitted a revised proposal for general and universal disarmament to the members of the Ten-Nation Disarmament Committee and to all UN members. The proposal contained substantial concessions to the Western objections to the previous Soviet plan. It gave a detailed, comprehensive program for control and inspection.

The document pointed out that the USSR had always taken the position that the first necessity was the elimination of nuclear weapons. However, their September 18 proposal had taken into account the Western view expressed in previous negotiations that the USSR's superiority in armed forces and conventional armaments made it desirable that nuclear disarmament measures should be deferred to the last stage. Since, during recent negotiations, France and other powers had held that disarmament should

begin with prohibition of vehicles for the delivery of nuclear weapons, the USSR now proposed:

That agreement should be reached to begin the process of general and complete disarmament with the prohibition and destruction under international control, from the very first stage, of all means of delivering nuclear weapons to their targets, and the simultaneous liquidation of military bases on the territory of other states.

(In presenting this new proposal at his June 3 press conference, Premier Khrushchev stressed that the USSR was prepared to abolish missiles in the first stage despite the fact that Soviet superiority in this field was generally acknowledged.)

Such measures as prohibition of nuclear, biological and chemical weapons, destruction of all stockpiles of such weapons and cessation of their manufacture could be carried out during the second stage along with a substantial reduction in armed forces and conventional armaments. The third stage:

... Would be marked by the completion of general and complete disarmament, the disbanding of all armies, war ministries and general staffs, the abolition of compulsory military service and of the military training of young people, and the complete discontinuance of expenditures for military purposes.

The previous plan had specified that the entire program should be completed within four years, the revised plan added "or some other agreed term."

The revised program also took into account the Western nations' insistence on some sort of international police force under the UN proposing:

... An undertaking by states to make police (militia) units available to the Security Council whenever necessary, in

order to insure the maintenance of peace. Needless to say, such police (militia) units would be available solely for the purpose of maintaining peace between peoples, and not for the purpose of suppressing peoples fighting for independence and social progress or for the purpose of intervention in the internal affairs of states.

The control apparatus and measures in the revised proposal, according to UN correspondent Thomas J. Hamilton (*New York Times*, June 3) "would go as far as anything publicly suggested by the Western powers at any stage since disarmament negotiations began in 1946." Except in especially provided cases, decisions of the Control Council on questions of substance shall be taken by a two-thirds majority, on questions of procedure by simple majority. Regarding its composition and duties:

The control organization shall have its staff in all countries party to the agreement, such staff being recruited on an international basis with due regard to the principle of equitable geographical distribution . . . The control organization shall post its inspectors in the territories of states in such a way that they can proceed to carry out their functions as soon as states begin to put their disarmament measures into force. Each party to the treaty shall be required to allow the control officers and inspection teams in their territories prompt and free access to any place where disarmament measures subject to control are being carried out or to any spot where on-the-spot inspection of such measures is to take place.

Control and inspection measures are spelled out in greater detail in connection with the carrying out of each stage of the program. Thus international teams would supervise the withdrawal of troops from foreign bases, the destruction of missile-launching installations, inspect all

undertakings of any kind engaged in the manufacture of all types of arms and their delivery and, by mutual agreement, "permanent control groups may be set up at certain plants and installations." Aerial reconnaissance to determine compliance with the three stages of disarmament would be permitted. However (with obvious reference to the U-2 plane):

From the very beginning of the first stage until the final destruction of all means of delivering nuclear weapons, the launching into orbit or the placing in outer space of special devices, the penetration of warships beyond the limits of territorial waters and the flight beyond the limits of their national territory of military aircraft capable of carrying weapons of mass destruction shall be prohibited.

After completion of the program of general and complete disarmament permanent surveillance would be exercised by the control organization over fulfillment by all states of the obligations assumed.

The Soviet Government expressed its readiness to reach agreement on the implementation of disarmament, and expressed the hope that other states would act in the same way:

The essential point is to reach an agreement and proceed, at last, to the general and complete disarmament for which the peoples of the world are waiting and which is called for by the United Nations.

Asked at the June 3 press conference how he viewed the present world situation, Premier Khrushchev said he still felt sure the cause of peace would triumph. He declared that although Soviet relations with the United States had been impaired, he felt they would improve, and the USSR would do everything possible to this end.

A FREE COPY FOR YOUR FRIENDS

Through the generosity of a reader
you may now send a free copy of **NEW
WORLD REVIEW** to your friends.

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

Please send a sample copy of **NEW
WORLD REVIEW** to the persons be-
low: (add other names on separate
sheet if you wish.)

To _____

Address _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

To _____

Address _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

To _____

Address _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

To _____

Address _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

To _____

Address _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

Sender _____

Address _____

SPECIAL OFFER

We have available bound copies
of **NEW WORLD REVIEW** from
1949 to 1958

at the special price of:
\$2.00 per volume

ORDER QUICKLY
SUPPLY IS LIMITED

SONG OF PEACE

Walter Lowenfels
and
Anton Refregier

Foreword by Linus Pauling

\$1.35 paper back \$5.00 cloth

ROVING EYE PRESS

Order from **NEW WORLD REVIEW**
34 West 15th St., New York 11, N. Y.

NEW SOVIET FILMS

EUGENE ONEGIN
LILEIA (a new ballet)

JOURNEY BEYOND THREE SEAS

THE CAPTAIN'S DAUGHTER

THE HOUSE I LIVE IN

THE FLYING CARPET

Coming:

IN THE LAND OF THE SOVIET

Mussorgsky's Opera:
KHOVANSCHINA

Artkino Pictures, Inc.

723 SEVENTH AVE. NEW YORK 19

Telephone: Circle 5-6570