

SOCIAL SCIENCES ✓

NOVEMBER, 1960

25¢

DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRARY NOV 12 1960

New World

REVIEW

Two Great Anniversaries

43 YEARS USSR • 27 YEARS USA-USSR RELATIONS

Special Articles on Soviet Life:

WHAT 1960 BROUGHT THE PEOPLE

KHRUSHCHEV IN HIS HOME TOWN

**ALBERT RHYS WILLIAMS
ON SOVIET HUMANISM**

TELEVISION IN THE USSR

FESTIVAL OF ART AND FLOWERS

The United Nations and Peace

Articles on Rumania, Britain, China

NEW WORLD REVIEW

NOVEMBER 1960

Two Great Anniversaries—
Khrushchev at the UN

Jessica Smith 3

What 1960 Brought the Soviet
People

Archie Johnstone 11

"To Each According to His Need"

Albert Rhys Williams 15

Summer Scenes in the Soviet
Union

Bernard Koten 18

Khrushchev in His Home Village 22

Soviet Aid in Asia and Africa 29

Rumanian Steel

Victor Perlo 33

British People Demand
Coexistence and Peace

Gordon Schaffer 37

Peking Opera in Canada

Helen Nearing 42

Soviet TV Today and Tomorrow

N. Psurtsev 44

"Plan of Action" in the Congo 52

BOOK REVIEWS

U.S.-Soviet Trade, Facts for
the Businessman's Appraisal 54

Economic Atlas of the Soviet
Union—George Kish 54

Libraries and Bibliographic
Centers in the Soviet Union—

Paul L. Horecky 55

JESSICA SMITH, Editor
MURRAY YOUNG, Managing Editor

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

Vol. 28, No. 10, November, 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.



TO OUR READERS

This November Anniversary issue of
NEW WORLD REVIEW marks 43 years
of the USSR and 27 years of Ameri-
can Soviet diplomatic relations.

Prepared during the momentous
opening weeks of the 15th UN General
Assembly—with Premier Khrushchev
himself very much in evidence among
the distinguished heads of state
gathered in New York—we hope to
provide our readers with aspects of
Soviet life rarely, if ever, reflected in
our popular press.

Dwellers upon the same planet, as
Khrushchev is fond of reminding us,
there must be in this perilous atomic
age understanding, cooperation and
peace among the peoples of the earth.

NEW WORLD REVIEW, our readers
know, strives unceasingly to forward
the growth of this necessary under-
standing. We feel that this issue will
be especially useful to those who share
our determination that cooperation
and peace must prevail.

Won't you see that the issue gets as
wide a distribution as possible among
your friends? Take advantage of the
offer below: order extra copies, give
subscriptions to your friends—and
please remember that contributions are
always needed and most gratefully re-
ceived.

PLEASE FILL OUT AND MAIL TODAY

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

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

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

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

Name

Street

Two Great Anniversaries

Khrushchev at the UN

by JESSICA SMITH

EACH year in November *New World Review*, whose main concern is East-West relations and world peace, makes special note of the anniversaries of two events of supreme importance in the history of mankind.

The first of these is the Russian Revolution of November 7, 1917, which this year marks 43 years of new life under socialism for the people of the Soviet Union.

The second is the establishment of American-Soviet relations on November 16, 1933—*sixteen years* after the first event occurred. Its importance derives from the first anniversary and from the fact that peaceful and friendly relations between the leaders of the two opposing systems in the world today are at the heart of the problem of peaceful relations for all mankind.

43rd Anniversary of Russian Revolution

For many years we found it necessary on this anniversary to stress the facts and figures of the economic growth of the USSR, demonstrating the simple fact that the Soviet Union is a stable and growing society, a great world power that is here to stay, that works, that must be reckoned with in world affairs.

This no longer needs proof. Economists who for years denied the validity of Soviet figures on progress now acknowledge that they are true.

They recognize the incontrovertible fact that the rate of industrial growth of the Soviet Union is now over ten per cent a year, while that of our industrial growth remains at two-and-a-half per cent. They know that this rate is continuing and accelerating in the Soviet Union and that there is no fantasy in the seven-year plan goals of overtaking and surpassing U.S. production in many fields by 1965, in increasing per capita production over that of the United States not long after, and achieving their goal of the highest living standard in the world. Americans today have first-hand knowledge of the efficacy of the Soviet educational system, of their great scientific achievements. They know of Soviet cultural growth through the U.S.-USSR exchange program. They know that the system of socialism has now spread to a third of the world's people, with millions of adherents in other countries.

It is almost unbelievable that in the face of this knowledge the big monopolies who control our country can still think in terms of destroying the socialist system, of an intensified arms race which can only be a pump primer to our economy, taking away the funds that could be used for constructive economic growth and continuing advances in the well-being of our people and others, and beyond that, can still conceive of the possibility of nuclear

war to destroy the Soviet Union—and ourselves too.

The only answer is an end to the arms race, and the peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition that remains the constant policy of the Soviet Union, and that alone can guarantee the well-being and progress of our own people and the peace of the world.

Unable any longer to deny economic progress, haters of the USSR now concentrate on its great cost to the people, on their "enslavement," "conformity" and so on.

Soviet progress has indeed been at terrible cost and sacrifice. The bitter heritage from the barbaric days of tsarism. The horrible human waste of World War I. The people's hopes of peace, land and bread held out by their great leader Lenin, deferred by foreign support of the White generals who sought to restore the evil old regime, and by military intervention by fourteen states *including our own*, which prolonged a civil war that would have been quickly ended into four years of bloody struggle, decimating the best and the brightest of the revolutionary leadership. The murderous famine. The blockade. The refusal of trade and normal intercourse by most of the nations of the world.

Then the long years of sacrifice to industrialize the country and collectivize the farms and lay the basis for a better life in the future. The supreme efforts in foreign relations to establish a collective security system with the Western democracies, which might have warded off the attack of Hitler against the West and the Soviet Union too, while the appeasers of Hitler sought to turn his aggression against the Soviet Union

alone. When this failed, and *only then* the *non-aggression pact* with Germany—*never an alliance*—to gain time for the attack on them that still would come.

And it came, June 21, 1941. Their country, all the building for which the Soviet people had sacrificed so much, was destroyed over an area comparable to all of the United States east of the Mississippi. Over a fourth of their national industry was destroyed. The homes of 25,000,000 people were laid in ruins. *And twenty million human beings lost their lives.* They were our honored allies in this war of which they bore the main brunt. To their glorious struggle and matchless sacrifices, to the turning of the tide at Stalingrad, we owe the lives of the flower of our own youth and freedom from enslavement by Hitler fascism.

How easily, how soon, have we forgotten all this!

On the ashes and ruins left by the war the Soviet people have rebuilt and reached the new high point of today. *They have determined never to have war again.*

Through these later years, too, the life of the Soviet people was blighted by the excesses of Stalinism, distorting and crippling with suspicion, repression and executions, what would have been the normal, humanist advance of the socialist order. This was a great tragedy for the Soviet people. Yet without trying to justify excesses which cannot be condoned, there are several things which I think must not be forgotten. One is that the Soviet people will always hold the earlier Stalin in great honor for the constructive things he accomplished, and

for his leadership in the victory over Hitler's aggression.

Another is the responsibility of the West for real efforts and plots to destroy the USSR, which continued from the day of its birth and which fed Stalin's paranoia to the point that he imagined such plots when they did not exist. And finally, the difficulties of the position of those around Stalin, who have often been blamed for not condemning his excesses earlier, partly due to their not having access to the evidence on which Stalin was presumably acting, and in hesitating to take responsibility for splitting the country apart by denouncing Stalin's actions, in the face of the terrible dangers the country faced from outside.

It is to Nikita Khrushchev's eternal credit that he finally cleared the air and told the truth. He saw that amnesty was granted to those unjustly imprisoned, and opened the way to reforms to prevent former violations of Soviet legality from ever again taking place, and for economic, agricultural and educational reforms and greater flexibility and relaxation in every aspect of Soviet life.

It is to this that the Soviet people owe the higher living standards that they are enjoying today, with better clothes, better food, more consumers' goods, more housing—more of everything.

It is these human advances that characterize the Soviet Union of today on which we are concentrating in this anniversary issue. We think it is important for Americans to understand the humanism that has become characteristic of Soviet society, the warm relations among peo-

ple, the concern for the individual. The anti-Soviet propagandists, deprived by the facts of life of many of their former arguments, keep trying to spread the misconception that in the Soviet Union the individual exists only to serve the state.

They are wrong. There are still bureaucrats, of course, numerous problems and shortcomings remain, and many of the humanist goals of Communist society are yet a long way off. But the basic aim and the largely achieved actuality of Soviet society is that *people come first*. And this is why a new war is unthinkable to Soviet leaders and people alike.

27th Anniversary of American-Soviet Relations

And what are we going to say of the second anniversary this month, and of the present state of American-Soviet relations? The high hopes we held after last year's visit of Premier Khrushchev to this country, the great expectations we placed on the Summit conference, have alas, not been fulfilled. They were blasted by the U-2 episode and subsequent events. Instead of hailing a hoped-for improvement in relations, our task on this anniversary is therefore to understand what has led to this deterioration and do our part to rectify it.

We believe that in deciding to head up the Soviet delegation to the United Nations, an initiative that led to an unprecedented gathering together of the heads and leaders of all the socialist states, and many of the neutralist and newly admitted African nations, Premier Khrushchev hoped a new start might be made in establishing conditions for the peaceful coexistence firmly ad-

vocated by the USSR, and in marshalling world public opinion behind a program for complete and universal disarmament which alone can insure the survival of humanity on this planet.

Important achievements may already be chalked up to this historic session of the General Assembly. But the dark clouds of the cold war hang over it, preventing all of its potentialities from being realized.

Let us try to examine the reasons for this.

We wish that Soviet Premier Khrushchev had found it possible to project before the members of the United Nations and the American people the warm, friendly and human image we all saw during his trip to this country last year on the invitation of President Eisenhower. The image was human, indeed! And of course circumstances of last year's trip were very different, with the spirit of Camp David then prevailing. But Khrushchev's sharp outbursts this year at the United Nations seemed at times to overshadow the warmth and friendliness he also exhibited on many occasions, especially in encounters outside the UN, and were utilized by the press and the anti-Soviet cabal to distort his purposes. It was these that were played up instead of the magnificent Soviet proposals on disarmament and on ending colonialism forever—now.

It is important to keep in mind the basic issues, the basic policies for which the Soviet Union is fighting, and not let ourselves be diverted by superficial matters of behavior from the great overwhelming issues which are a matter of life or death to the human race.

And when Khrushchev is angry, it is well to understand against what his anger is directed and what has provoked it, and to take a look at our own responsibility in this matter.

The Shadow of the U-2

First of all, the shadow of the U-2 has continued to hang over American-Soviet relations. Not only was there no admission of wrong-doing as might have been expected from any nation invading the airspace of another, but our government has continued even more strongly to assert its right to undertake such flights.

The two U-2 flights were followed by the RB-47, which the Soviet Union asserts was shot down over its own territorial waters. And just before the departure of Mr. Khrushchev for the Assembly, Soviet sources reported having information that still another U.S. plane was scheduled to fly over the Soviet Black Sea area. This flight did not take place, but Soviet authorities were convinced that it was planned. In the face of all this, our government has maintained the position that *we* are the injured party, and has continued to lay the blame for the failure of the Summit conference and worsened relations on the USSR.

In submitting the report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee which investigated the U-2 incident, Senator J. W. Fulbright (D-Ark.), said that the U-2 incident and our handling of it were the immediate cause of the collapse of the Summit conference. He declared:

Historically, the deliberate and intentional assertion by a Head of State, of the right to violate the territorial sover-

eighty of another nation has been considered an unfriendly act of the utmost seriousness.

It is quite unacceptable to any State to be put in the position in which this government put the Soviet Union last month. Although another man would have most likely been more temperate in his choice of language, *it is difficult to see how anyone could have been expected to act substantially different from the way Chairman Khrushchev acted under the circumstances which confronted him in Paris.* (Italics added.)

While holding to his position that there could be no negotiations with President Eisenhower as long as the latter held to the right of our country to violate Soviet air space and sovereignty, Premier Khrushchev gave us a new chance for negotiating by initiating a larger Summit meeting under UN auspices.

Far from taking advantage of this opportunity, President Eisenhower refused to participate in UN proceedings except for one opening address, and referred to Khrushchev and other heads of government as "trouble-makers" coming to our country. Secretary Herter called Khrushchev's idea of discussing disarmament in such a large body as the General Assembly "ludicrous," although the U.S. itself had brought it up the month before in the full disarmament committee consisting of the full UN membership.

In every possible way, Mr. Khrushchev was made in advance and during his visit to feel that he was an unwelcome guest in this country. He was restricted to the area of Manhattan, with the exception of week-end visits to the Soviet UN estate at Glen Cove, L. I. The State Department went so far as to ask TV networks to limit their news coverage of Khrushchev. A U.S. sub-

marine followed his ship, the Baltika, which had to dock at a disgracefully dilapidated, leaky pier, and which the I.L.A. refused to handle (although their planned hostile demonstration fizzled out). The press, anti-Soviet refugee groups, and even members of Congress issued provocative and hostile statements about his coming, and he was subjected to innumerable insults and attacks while here. Happily there were also numerous welcoming actions and messages—largely ignored by the press.

The Shadow of the Congo Events

The U-2 incident, we believe, gave rise to a new determination on the part of the USSR never again to submit to the *double standard* in world affairs which the United States and its allies have continually sought to impose, arrogating to themselves the right to violate any standards of international behavior and law on the ground that this was necessary in "self-defense" against a threat of Soviet aggression that does not and never has existed. The U-2 incident was the most flagrant expression of this. It could not but have stiffened the determination of the USSR never to participate in negotiations except on a basis of full equality and recognition of its sovereign rights, while pursuing the Soviet policy of peaceful coexistence based on the theory that war is not inevitable and can be averted.

Premier Khrushchev came to a world body in which the United States, its Western allies and their client states had from the beginning, both in the Security Council and the General Assembly, not only spent a great deal of their time casting obloquy and insults against the

USSR and the socialist states, but had been able to muster a mechanical majority of the votes and to defeat the Soviet Union and the socialist bloc on almost every issue for fifteen years.

But with the growth of Asian-African membership, the admission of 16 newly independent African states and Cyprus, and the increase of neutralist sentiment, a new atmosphere and new possibilities were arising in the world body.

What happened in the Congo just before Premier Khrushchev's arrival cast a new shadow over East-West relations.

We shall not here attempt to review the whole situation. (See September NWR for background, and page 52 for further details.) United States policy in the Congo was directed mainly toward getting the Russians out—not the Belgians—and keeping the riches of the Congo, and especially Katanga, in the hands of the West. In this they used UN Secretary Dag Hammarskjöld (a former banker with close ties with Western finance capital), as their instrument. Thus we saw a strange "neutrality" which made no distinction between the legal and illegal authorities, which failed to uphold the authority of the Lumumba government and the unity of the country in accordance with Security Council resolutions in which the USSR had participated, and ignored the action of the Parliament elected by the people in upholding Premier Lumumba after his illegal "dismissal" by President Kasabuvu. This "neutrality" led to the seizure of power (temporary, we may hope) by Col. Joseph Mobutu, Congolese

Army Chief of Staff, and his setting up of a caretaker government of students and university graduates, which is in fact no government at all. This non-government, just on the eve of Premier Khrushchev's arrival in this country, unceremoniously threw out the Soviet and Czechoslovakian embassies through whom much needed non-military aid was being extended to the Congo Central Government.

This virtual seizure of control of the Congo by the West, or those subservient to Western interests, and the cold war act of denying to the USSR an equal or any right at all to give aid to a newly independent African nation, obviously influenced the course pursued by Premier Khrushchev and motivated his attack on the Secretary General as representing the interests of the West alone.

Results of Khrushchev Visit

Even the harshest and most intemperate critics of the Soviet Union, having said their say about minor matters of behavior, have had to acknowledge the very considerable successes achieved by the Soviet Premier in his participation in the 15th UN Assembly, which his initiative made the most important gathering ever held in history.

Highly important, though not recorded in the annals of the session, were the numerous meetings of heads of states made possible by Mr. Khrushchev's initiative, which would otherwise have taken months and years to arrange. There were the many meetings with and receptions to the members of the African-Asian group, arranged by the USSR and the socialist countries, in contrast

A LETTER FROM ROCKWELL KENT

Dear Jessica:

It is a strange and wonderful experience to have come from the discord and strife, the fears and uncertainties that are so widespread in America at this time, and from the atmosphere of hate that in New York surrounds the emissaries from more peaceful countries of the world, into a land where thoughts and hopes of worldwide peace prevail over every other thought in people's minds. And strange to have found one's self, in the space of hardly more than a few hours, among a people happy in the present and serenely confident of the great future in a peaceful world that lies before them.

Embraced as we find ourselves to be by the friendship of the Soviet people, I may speak almost as though with duly constituted authority of the unqualified good will toward us and all Americans and, in their name as well as our own, send you and the readers of New World Review—and indeed the whole American people—greetings of friendship on the approach of an anniversary in their lives that is as sacred and as dear to them as to all of us Americans is our own July 4th. Peace is on their lips and in their hearts.

May peace be with you all and, over all the earth, good will among men.

*Faithfully yours,
Rockwell*

to the perfunctory meetings with them of U.S. representatives and President Eisenhower's summoning of the new African members to Washington for a brief office interview and coffee and orange juice. There was Khrushchev's trip to Harlem to see Cuban Premier Castro; meetings with Tito which brought closer relations; special conferences with Nkrumah, Nehru, Sukarno, Touré and many others; a meeting with a delegation from Algeria that constituted "de facto" recognition. And, highly important, actual resumption of East-West negotiations in the talks with Prime Minister Macmillan, out of which came tentative agreement for a Summit meeting in the spring, after the inauguration of the new U.S. President, and a promise by Mr. Khrushchev to take no action on Berlin as long as a Summit meeting would be sure to take place.

On Disarmament

Before and during his visit, Premier Khrushchev stated repeatedly that disarmament is the cardinal question in the world today. In his opening speech he presented the Soviet draft resolution for complete and universal disarmament, containing a number of concessions to objections to the earlier version presented a year ago which the West had put forward in the course of the negotiations in the ten-nation disarmament commission. Thus the abolition of all means of delivery of nuclear weapons was included in the first stage, as well as the beginning of reduction of conventional armed forces.

Full machinery for control and inspection was recognized as essential for every stage of the Soviet program.

An international police force un-

der UN auspices, as advocated by the West to insure compliance when disarmament was in effect was accepted by the Soviet Union, although its original position had been that with complete disarmament no such police force would be necessary. To this Mr. Khrushchev added the condition that to insure a leadership of such a force that would properly represent the interests of all three main groups in the UN (socialist, Western-oriented capitalist and neutralist countries) a corresponding change in the UN Secretariat would be necessary. He later added that a change in the composition of the Security Council would likewise be needed, but indicated that he would be willing to consider other changes as well as those he suggested for any UN reorganization.

Mr. Khrushchev in an effort to get disarmament negotiations off dead center, also proposed that the tenation disarmament committee, now composed of five Western and five socialist nations, be extended by adding five neutralist nations—India, Indonesia, United Arab Republic, Mexico and Guinea. He also proposed that a special UN General Assembly session with heads of government present be held in February, March or April, either in Geneva, or if the delegates wished, in a Soviet city. He agreed that Mr. Macmillan's suggestion of a conference of experts to discuss technical questions of disarmament and control might be combined with general disarmament negotiations.

The Soviet disarmament proposals won large support from the Assembly among all socialist and neutralist nations and many of the African delegations. They were

brushed off, as previously, by the United States as "propaganda," "disarmament without controls," etc.

On October 11, when the disarmament question came up specifically during the general debate, Mr. Khrushchev proposed that it be taken up directly by the full Assembly rather than being first referred to the Political Committee. He offered to stay for such a discussion, and suggested that other heads of government who had left might return for it. Pressing for full Assembly consideration, he declared:

The question of disarmament is the question of questions . . . the cardinal problem on whose solution depends the safeguarding of stable peace. No question, however important, can compare with this question on which depends whether or not there will be a new world war. Wars can be ruled out only if agreement on disarmament is reached between states, if disarmament is conducted under the strictest international control so that no state could secretly rearm itself and again threaten other states.

Under pressure by the United States, the General Assembly rejected the Soviet proposal that the full Assembly rather than its Political Committee take up the question, by a vote of 54 against 13, with 31 abstentions. Afghanistan, Cuba, Mali and Guinea voted in favor of the Soviet proposal, along with the 9 members of the socialist bloc. Most of the abstentions were of Asian and African nations who in fact largely favor strong disarmament measures. The question, of course, remains on the agenda for discussion, and some adequate means of negotiations must be found, for there is no question that the vast majority of the people of the world are with the Soviet

(Continued on page 47)

Yor
and
but
men
for
"wi
war
ters
ind
C
whe
Uni
in i
—ha
hist
just
its
outs
this
only
num
of th
the
stru
ther
•
brac
the
•
worl
try.
ARC
USSR
the l
cow,
Briti
tion
Te

What 1960 Brought the Soviet People

by ARCHIE JOHNSTONE

ONE of my far-flung editors (they are located in London, New York, Sydney, Wellington, Bombay, and other far-from-Moscow places, but luckily for me their requirements are very much alike), asks for a November anniversary review, "with an occasional glance backwards and forwards," of various matters that "affect the well-being of the individual Soviet citizen."

One glance backwards to 1947, when I first came to the Soviet Union, reminds me that each year in its turn—but only while it lasted—has been the best in the country's history, so in that respect 1960 is just another year that has outstripped its predecessor and is fated to be outstripped by its successor. But this first year of the 'Sixties, with only two months still to run, has a number of "firsts" to its credit, each of them much more notable than all the USSR's 43 Olympic gold medals strung together. Here are some of them:

- The wiping out of tax on lower-bracket incomes as a first stage in the total abolition of income-tax.
- The introduction of the shorter working week throughout the country.

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

- The first factory-belt production of complete apartments.

- The first orbiting and re-entry of a space-ship capable of carrying a man in safety.

- The first breach (if one accepts the post-U2 "Never again" promises by various governments whose airfields had been used by American raider planes) in the undeclared and more than ten years old "siege" of the Soviet Union.

(If anyone thinks that this last item does not "affect the well-being of the individual Soviet citizen" let him imagine how his own individual well-being, and temper, would be affected if his own country were besieged in this way!)

These "firsts" do not, of course, include 1960's continued, and *increased*, increases in heavy industry, agriculture, consumer goods and—most important of all in any listing of boons and blessings—housing.

Without at least a brief backward glance this housing situation just doesn't make sense. For instance, in a 1913 survey it was found that 313,000 people were crowded into 24,500 rooms in the industrial districts of Moscow—that is, about a dozen to a room. On top of that, the Soviet Union has had to spend 20 of the 43 years of its existence in freeing its soil from invaders or in repairing the ravages of war, which included the destruction in World War II of the homes of twenty-five million people.

And can we say that that invasion period is ended while a country's airspace is being violated and the heavy burden of defensive measures is imposed on a people?

So we get one of the greatest paradoxes in the world today. In the Soviet Union "housing" (in the sense of available living space per head) is still well behind most Western countries and although in the present decade the USSR confidently expects to surpass the USA in various indices of prosperity, it is stated quite frankly that an end to the housing shortage cannot be hoped for until the first years of the 'Seventies.

In the other sense of "housing" (the provision of *new* living space) the Soviet Union sets a standard that other countries can only dream of. Despite its slow start (in 1923, for instance, only 100,000 people were rehoused), it has built 900 cities and towns literally from the ground up and in the present Seven-Year Plan period it will build 15 million apartments, the equivalent of about nine brand-new Moscovs of five million population each.

Perhaps your mind, like mine, tends to boggle at these figures, so let me give one illuminating example. An interview I had with Moscow's arch-architect, Nikolai Yevstratov, coincided with a visit from a French housing expert. The Frenchman mentioned that Paris had now reached a peak rate of 3,500 apartments a year; the Muscovite stated that the Moscow figure was now 100,000—more than 28 times as many!

A point that Yevstratov mentioned about "rents"—I have a good reason for putting the word in quotes—

makes a strange contrast with news of violent disturbances in London and elsewhere in protest against rent increases. "Rent charges in the Soviet Union," he said, "do not even meet the cost of house maintenance." So it is perfectly true to say that Soviet citizens pay for (or nearly pay for) repairs, but *they pay no rent whatever*.

The country as a whole, he said, is now building more apartments than America, Britain, France, West Germany, Sweden, Holland, Belgium and Switzerland combined. Even that does less than justice to 1960's record, for a considerable fraction of the building potential goes to the erection of new "housing factories," while in a number of existing factories men and machines are engaged on the elaboration of new techniques. But in these cases what is 1960's loss will be 1961's gain—several times over.

One of these new techniques, in which whole apartments are "laid" as a bricklayer lays bricks, is still labeled "experimental," although I have already seen it delivering the goods. The goods, delivered in special trailers riding on 28 massive tires, are in each case a rectangular block roughly 10 by 10 by 35 feet, complete with floor, ceiling, inner and outer walls, stair sections, plumbing, wiring, built-in cupboards, in fact everything but the tenant's furniture.

All this work is done at Building Factory No. 6, on the southeastern edge of Moscow. The production belt, part of it in the form of jointed sections like a tank's caterpillar that give the concrete panels the required "waffle-iron" shape, is 200 feet long and 12 feet wide. Farther along the

belt the molten concrete is vibrated, "cooked" and coated with thermo-insulating and weather-resistant paint, and the walls and ceilings are assembled. The belt is to be extended so that even the final fitting work is streamlined.

The completed apartment-unit is transported to the building site ten miles southeast of Moscow and swung into place by a 30-ton, H-shaped crane that straddles the whole building-to-be five stories high, each of 15 apartments.

Another new system, introduced in Leningrad, literally builds from the roof down. For a typical four-story block of 32 apartments with a base of 100 by 35 feet, eight support columns are built, and the roof is laid on these columns by helicopter. (This seemingly tricky business worked perfectly at the first try!) The concrete floors, each weighing 130 tons, are poured at ground level and raised into position by a battery of ten hydraulic jacks. The walls, added later, carry none of the weight of the structure; that is the job of the columns.

Leningraders claim that this is both the cheapest and fastest building method yet devised and that it has various other advantages over Moscow's apartment-unit system (which, for one thing, needs first-class roads between factory and site). But both systems are now being thoroughly studied by building constructors from all the great cities of the Soviet Union. Let the best plan win!

Now to the other items on the boons-and-blessings list:

Consumer goods produced this year (to a value of 81,300 million rubles) will be a 10 per cent increase

over 1959, 100 per cent over 1953 and 900 per cent over 1940. In the first half of 1960—that is, *before* an additional allocation of 25,000 million rubles to light industry—800,000 TV sets were produced, and, of course, snapped up. In this and other ranges of durable goods, the increase over the corresponding 1959 figure is one-third.

"Consumption" of textiles (all kinds) is now 26 square meters a year, about half the U.S. figure. The original target was 36 square meters by 1965, but with the additional 1960 allocation and possible future revisions upwards, combined with reductions of exports (already begun) parity with U.S. may be reached by 1965. There is a reflection of this trend in many other classes of consumer goods.

Any Moscow resident will tell you that shopping in 1960 has been much more fun than ever before. Almost every other day you see—or hear from keener-eyed friends who phone you to pass on the good news—about something new and exciting in the shops. There is a much greater choice of foods (thanks in part to increased imports of delicacies), of women's dress materials (especially gay cottons, against which there used to be quite a strong prejudice) and of household gadgets (in which the lag behind the West is still very pronounced).

Despite 1960's 25 per cent increase in furniture production there are still long queues for many articles. At the furniture store I can see from my window there is a constant stream of taxi-lorries taking away loads of newly-purchased goods, and I keep asking myself: How long would it take the owner of a quite small fur-

niture store in Britain or America to become a millionaire if he could sell out his whole stock every day, as often happens here? The furniture-shopping spree, fantastic though it seems, is quite natural in a city where people are *occupying 274 newly-built apartments every day.*

Shorter Hours: In mid-year about twenty million factory and office workers went over to the six- or seven-hour day (34 or 40-hour week), the smaller figures applying to those doing the harder work. These working hours will apply to all workers by the end of the year.

Income Tax: The step-by-step abolition of income-tax, begun on October 1, 1960, will be completed on October 1, 1963. It should be noted that except on such things as alcoholic drinks, tobacco and playing-cards there is in the USSR no such thing as indirect taxation which, although it is not always apparent, is in its various forms a big item in the cost of living in non-socialist countries. Even the tiny "eight-chickens-a-year" tax on the yield of a farm-worker's personal plot—which he gets rent-free—will soon be abolished, and the state's revenue

will come exclusively from state-owned heavy industry and power stations and other government enterprises.

For the last quarter of this year alone the first bracket of untaxed workers will in effect receive a wage bonus totaling 36,000 million rubles.

In my childhood, whenever I ventured to say that something was "certain" I would be countered with the old saying, "Nothing is certain but death and taxes." That needs revising. It is said that taxation is as old as civilization and that the first of the Seven Wonders of the World, the Pyramids, were built on taxes, first introduced by the Pharaohs. And now the Soviet Union—which, by the way, is creating a new wonder of the World in the land of the Pharaohs by damming the Nile—is becoming the first country in the history of civilization to abolish taxation.

Since those childhood warnings I have been chary of calling anything "certain," but I am prepared to bet that the Soviet Union will have an even better score of dramatic "firsts" in 1961 than it has had in 1960. Any takers?

SOVIET AUTOMATION TERRIFIC!—PATRICK E. GORMAN

"THE AUTOMATED PACKING PLANTS in Russia can't be matched in this country. The automation there is terrific."

These were the words of Patrick E. Gorman, secretary-treasurer of the AFL-CIO Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butchers Workmen of North America, on his return from a visit to the Soviet Union, where he inspected several meat processing plants.

Gorman reported that when he asked officials whether automation brought layoffs as it does in this country, they said it did not. They further told him that in case automation did bring unemployment they would simply cut the working hours.

After inspecting plants in Leningrad and Moscow, Gorman said: "A packing plant in each of these cities employs 14,000 people. The Russians told me that each of these plants would employ 50,000 people if they were not automated."

"To Each According to His Need"

by ALBERT RHYS WILLIAMS

We feel that nothing could be more appropriate to mark this 43rd anniversary of the Russian Revolution than this letter which Albert Rhys Williams has been good enough to give us permission to publish. Telling of the warm humanism of the Soviet people, it bursts like a flood of sunlight through the dark cold war clouds.

Mr. Williams, as our readers know, was an eye-witness of the historic days when the Soviet Government was established, and had close contacts with Lenin and other leaders. Since then, he has had long visits to the Soviet Union through the years, the latest described in this letter to the Russian doctor who was responsible for the efficient and tender care he received in a Moscow hospital. The numerous books Mr. Williams has written about the Soviet Union are indispensable to an understanding of its history and its present. Among them are Lenin, the Man and His Work; Through the Russian Revolution; The Russian Land; The Russians. He is now writing his memoirs.

DEAR Dr. Shumov:

As I receive letters and greetings from old Russian friends they always call up pleasant memories of villages and cities all over the vast Soviet land. But from these far wanderings my mind is always turning back to the center of Moscow—to the Hospital nearby the Kremlin.

The Hospital was a haven of rest and healing for me last summer, and with an ever growing sense of gratitude I remember my long but pleasant sojourn within its walls and in the courtyard-garden with its fountain and ever-changing flowers.

First of all, I am grateful to the highly competent corps of physicians—especially to those in daily attendance upon me—to Spartak Sergeyevich for his quiet, capable, painstaking care and to Olga Nikolayevna with her firm, diligent but ever gracious supervision. Not less kindly

and courteous were the members of the concilium called in for consultation—the eminent professors Kost and Dulson. Specialists in maladies of the blood, like all their colleagues, they were concerned not with just the disease but with the whole patient—with everything from diet to habits, hygiene, morale, manner of living for now and for the years to come.

The same solicitude for the well-being of the patients seemed to animate the whole personnel of the Hospital. For the most part, with full-hearted devotion they went about their tasks as if they really enjoyed them. "I had rather be doing this work here," said an orderly as he went about his humble chores, "than anything else in the world."

Alert and ever ready in response to the calls of the patients—and often to their whims and caprices—their radiant cheerfulness was like oxygen

to the spirit and created an atmosphere more like a home—and a happy one at that—than a hospital.

This was especially true of those gentle bouyant light-footed ministers of mercy—the nurses. Intent on becoming doctors themselves, many were studying hard on off days and in spare moments. Weaving in and out of our rooms, or gathered in little groups along the corridors, their pleasant Russian voices in low whispers and light laughter blended into a gentle harmony—a hum of happiness.

In this they were often joined by the charwomen and orderlies—among them an old-time *babushka* very wrinkled but with an ever beaming smile on her face and sunbeams in her hands. She might long ago have retired on a pension, but she still had a vast fund of sympathy and affection for the sick and ailing. Especially for the lonely ones from far away lands—dumblike creatures that we were—making strange inarticulate sounds in our talking. During the long watches of the night she would slip into our rooms, calling us “little doves,” “golden suns” and other terms of endearment, laying caressing hands or kisses upon our foreheads. A comforting form of therapy—but be it noted—it was confined to the seventy-year olds or older.

Like *babushka* most of the personnel were strong, distinctive individuals. So many different tempers and temperaments! So many occasions for conflicts and clashes. If ever they occurred they were well concealed, for during my ten weeks residence I never heard a harsh word, never saw an unkind look or gesture.

What a lot of discipline and di-

plomacy in adjusting the differences of so many differing individuals, in coordinating their multifarious activities—to merge them into a harmonious, effective force devoted to the one common objective—to getting the patients well, and likewise just as intently—to getting them to stay well. “The treatment of the whole patient for the whole of his life.” For their concern for the patient did not stop with his dismissal from the hospital but went with him out into the world.

In my case it was in the form of *Recommendations*—not just the proper medication but the right mode of living—hours of work, rest, climate, social contacts—all set down precisely in order and in detail. Such injunctions from doctors are usually more celebrated in the breach than in the observation. My recommendations were so deeply impressed on me by repeated explanation, admonition and exhortation, that I find myself involuntarily adhering to them—and thereby adding to my span of life quite probably two or three years.

So for this and many other reasons, I look back on my long summer sojourn in the First Moscow Hospital with a high degree of satisfaction. One element in this satisfaction is the knowledge that these medical services are not reserved for the favored few but are available to every person in the Soviet Union, thanks to the farflung network of hospitals, clinics and rest homes. While their staffs may not be so large as in the Moscow Hospital nor their facilities so extensive, nevertheless from all reports, they are generally adequate and steadily becoming more all-embracing every year.

Looking from my window in the hospital across the street to the Lenin Library, I often recalled how Vladimir Ilych's concern for the health and welfare of other people—even for my own on my second meeting with him—runs like a red thread through his conversations and his letters. How delighted he would be to see this concern for others written into the Soviet Constitution as the inalienable right of everyone in the vast Soviet land. Without awaiting the coming of the full-blown society of Communism . . . in this realm of health and healing every Soviet citizen is already "receiving according to his need."

With the peoples in one-sixth of the world enjoying these privileges—giving rein to the imagination—one envisages a time when all the peoples of the world will likewise enjoy them.

While this may sound fantastic and far away, at any rate one important prerequisite for its realization is already existent. This I discovered in my recent travels around the circle from New York to Paris, Moscow, London and back again to New York. From all contacts with the medical fraternity—doctors, scientists, specialists—in the various countries there always emerged a sense of solidarity, camaraderie, a high respect and generous appreciation for one another's work.

To begin with, in New York my doctors pointing to an article in *The Times* in praise of Soviet medicine, suggested that the hematologists in Moscow might have something new for my blood, adding jocularly—"some new kind of borsch to shoot into your veins." After read-

ing the same record of my case at the Moscow Polyclinic, the doctors there said that the Americans had done very well by me, and they could scarcely hope to do more. But they did a great deal more as I have already indicated, and on my leaving for London, suggested a visit to McLenson, the discoverer of the anti-Duffy factor in the blood. He was pleased to hear of this recognition of his work and sent me to the eminent hemotologist Britton of Harley Street—the street of physicians widely known to readers of Bernard Shaw and Conan Doyle. From a group of British doctors returning from a tour of the USSR came a tribute to preventive medicine in Russia—"the best place to live if one wished to avoid having a disease."

In a similar spirit they paid tribute to the epochal American achievements in the curbing of epidemics that once ravaged the world. No cold war among doctors. No narrow nationalism. But a warm, cordial spirit of cooperation reaching out to embrace all countries, all peoples.

From this world-wide outlook, pausing for the moment, my mind flashes back again to the Hospital in Moscow—to the gay colors of the flowers and song-birds in the garden, the soft splashing waters of the fountain, the sharp clicking of dominoes on the tables, the pleas of the nurses to keep on my hat or keep out of the sun . . . A very pleasant place to stop this rather long-drawn out letter.

So with best wishes for this year and all the coming years to you and your staff. Most gratefully and sincerely yours,

Albert Rhys Williams

Summer Scenes in the Soviet Union

by BERNARD KOTEN

THE DAY we arrived in Moscow late this summer we were greeted by a sputnik flying at us right through the streets—dog and all. But a sputnik made of flowers! The Moscow Flower Festival was under way. The streets were gaily decorated with potted flowers and flower tapestries and flowers in huge vases and squares of flower and plant displays. Down Moscow's main street, Gorky Street, came a parade of flower plants, passing by for hours. These were floats representing all the peoples of the Soviet Union in native costume surrounded by the flowers of their republics, characters from folk and fairy tales in flower costumes, tractors fashioned from flowers and electric power stations and moving flower fountains spraying water to all sides and paintings executed in flowers and just flowers. And singing. And lights, and shooting sputniks made of flowers all along the line. Moscow's first flower holiday. And so a new tradition is born. And we all thought out loud when great big rockets all along the line of the parade began periodically firing bouquets of flowers: So guns can shoot off pleasant things too. Flowers not bombs!

BERNARD KOTEN is Curator of the Library for Intercultural Studies in New York City, and Instructor in Russian at New York University. He has led a number of tour groups in recent years to the Soviet Union.

And when we got to Kiev some weeks later we were again "pelted" with flowers but this time with fruit too. Kiev was celebrating harvest time with a tremendous display of flowers and fruits covering the area of an entire park facing the Dnieper River. Among the exhibitions were not only state and collective farms, horticultural organizations and agricultural institutions, but amateur flower fanciers too. Just simple displays arranged with an eye to color, taste, and touch too. The young women in charge of the various stands went out of their way to play hostess to a few foreign guests and had us pick up and handle and taste the apples and pears and plums and grapes and tomatoes. And everywhere the slogans laid out in flowers and in green plants: *Peace and Friendship*.

IN MOSCOW we saw another kind of display. For some years now the city of Moscow has renewed the traditional old Yarmaka or Fair. We were just in time for it this year. Stands and stands of colorful food. Consumer goods. What was new this year was the number of imports: men's and women's suits and coats from England and Italy, shoes from Czechoslovakia and England—knitgoods from England and Yugoslavia, crockery from Germany, plastic goods from the newly expanded Soviet chemical industry. Little food and refreshment stands everywhere:

shashlik on skewers instead of hot dogs, champagne instead of coca-cola. And a run-way through the center of the fair grounds along which paraded, to the music of a little jazz combo ("Moscow Nights" in jazz tempo) mannequins in the latest Soviet men's and women's fashions. Simple fashions for work, for school, for parties. The models—some short and plump—looked more like ordinary people than those we are accustomed to. Many of the clothes modeled were on sale at the stands. Such crowds—everyone buying.

IN THE CITY itself in the sprawling yellow and white building called the Manège, that used to house the Tsar's stables and now houses art exhibitions, a Russian Folk and Applied Art Exhibition was being held. Here too all the beautiful folk creations on display were available for purchase. What impressed us most was the new furniture with its simple lines in the applied art section—to our taste a wonderful departure from the former ornate style. The remarks about the furniture were interesting. Many seemed to feel it would take a long time to get used to this modern style and argued about it with other visitors. One elderly woman visitor, an artist it turned out later, lectured her neighbors long on the advantages of this new simplicity.

A new shop calling itself an Art Salon and situated a few steps away from the big department store on Red Square, GUM, was in the same way a form of art propaganda. No souvenir-like trash here. Only the finest folk art from all over the USSR on display—vases, pottery, dec-

orative boxes, sculpture, carvings, paintings, hand-made jewelry, hand-woven throws, spreads, curtains and scarves. Sharp colors and muted colors. And a very busy line at the cashier's window.

We found such busy art shops in Latvia and Lithuania concentrating on the local art forms. They'd all do well on Fifth Avenue or Madison. The prices all seemed right too. Articles from \$10 to \$20 that sell here for \$80-\$100. Original paintings as low as \$25.00.

The new hotel just being finished in Vilnius, the Neruga, is a fine example of this applied modern art. Furniture, hangings, rugs, paintings, all made in Lithuania in, to our mind, the best of modern taste. It will be a pleasant place to visit next year.

WHEN WE WERE invited to visit the Engels Fishing Co-op outside of Riga in Latvia, we accepted with great enthusiasm. We had already visited all kinds of factories and collective farms and schools and cooperatives, but not yet a fishing collective. It was just a short bus ride to the coast and the fishing co-op. The chairman proudly showed us their ships and boats, their repair shops, their nets. We found they had 200 of their own small boats and the use of 35 sea-going ships owned by the state and for the use of which they paid yearly taxes to the Latvian Government. The canneries were very close by but were owned not by the fishing co-op but by the state which contracted with the co-op for their catches.

The average monthly income of the co-op members truly impressed us—3,000 rubles (as compared to the

average Soviet monthly wage of 800-900 rubles). And so we went to the village to see how they lived. We found a village with well-built small garden apartments and individual dwellings, schools, playgrounds, sports fields, well-stocked co-operative stores and a big cultural center under construction. Not far away is a large cultural club serving all the fishermen of the area and their friends. A tremendous building with a fish for a weather-vane, it contained auditoriums, gyms and club rooms. A very liberal capitalist had built it before Soviet times in Latvia and the co-ops had taken it over.

It wasn't until just before we left that we learned that this was Vilis Lacis' birthplace, his native village of Rinuzhi. Vilis Lacis is the famous Latvian writer and statesman. Some of us may have read his *Fisherman's Son* in English, an autobiographical novel about this fishing village. His father had been one of these fishermen. His mother still lives in the village.

IT MAY BE just my very subjective reaction but more and more Soviet plays seem to be taking up universal rather than peculiarly Soviet problems. A few short weeks ago I attended the premier of a new Soviet play: Volodin's *Visiting and at Home* at the Ermolova Theater (the building of the old Meyerhold Theater).

The play tells about two women one of whom, Klavdia, widowed in the war and left with two children, has chosen to lead what on the surface, seems like a self-indulgent life, more concerned with her career as head of a print shop and her love affairs, than with her children. Her

children in their late teens, one a student and the other a worker, leave home because they think they are in the way and go to stay with their mother's girlhood friend Irina. This friend has given up a promising singing career to become a housewife. But her home lacks the understanding and love we observed in Klavdia's household. Irina seems bent on showing Klavdia up as self-indulgent and self-centered in all her activities. The children see through this and see too that their mother is concerned with living her own life, but for the sake of love, not just caprice, and is equally concerned about their growing up to full maturity. The man she loves, a great scientist, is afraid of breaking up the peace of his bachelor's life (actually he is a widower who loved his wife just as Klavdia very much loved her husband). She leads him to a proposal of marriage to prove to her children (and to the world and maybe herself) that this is not just a flighty affair but the real thing, only to refuse him because she does not believe they can make a go of marriage with all of their problems.

But at the play's end the children came back, Irina's real nature is shown up and the play leaves the audience with the feeling that the marriage will take place, and all's well that ends well.

The sets and A. V. Efros' direction are very modern. The stage is a revolving one. Above the sets are three screens that are used for movie shots to carry over from scene to scene, to give flashbacks, continuity, mood.

The problems are real and you identify yourself with the play's

characters. The plot is absorbing and there is sustained interest in its development. The play could be put on anywhere, it seems to me, because the themes it deals with are universal.

This is only one of a number of plays like *Irkutsk Story*, dealing with real people, their problems and conflicts, which are playing to packed houses.

WE KNOW there are many children's summer camps in the Soviet Union and children are wonderful there as they are everywhere in the world. But there is something contagiously exciting about the great adventure of growing up stage by stage. So an invitation to visit a children's camp outside of Leningrad was most welcome.

The camp was on the road to Viborg and on the way there we unexpectedly stopped at a place famous in Soviet history: Lenin's hideout, after his return to Russia, in the critical days before the October Revolution. The little straw hut where he lived as a woodsman in the simple disguise of shaving his beard, still stands, as does the stump on which he sat and wrote. A memorial has been built on the spot in the shape of the hut and a fine little museum tells the public about Lenin's work of directing the Revolution from here.

After this historical interlude—on

to the living youngsters at camp. Here we shared the kids' swings and their lunch (it filled us up so we couldn't eat our dinner later). The children showed us their room, how they make their own beds, their play rooms and their arts and crafts work, their playgrounds and their library. But what impressed us most was the enthusiasm of the counsellors and the administrative workers and the dining-room workers and the maintenance people. They loved children and loved working with them.

Each child got special attention, each was known and treated as very much an individual. With us they were free and easy and still very polite. Each one seemed to consider himself or herself as host. They asked us many, many questions about home and with their questions showed us they were not unacquainted with America. They sent warm greetings to our kids in America. A lot of the counsellors and teachers were children during the war; some had gone through the siege of Leningrad and reminded us what that had meant to children and how much they want and need peace for their children—and asked us to please carry their message home.

You hear this peace message over and over again but never does it seem hackneyed. People say it with such quiet determination. You know they mean it.

AMERICAN BALLET THEATER IN MOSCOW

THE AMERICAN BALLET THEATER opened an engagement in Moscow at the Stanislavsky Theater on September 12 with the great Galina Ulanova of the Bolshoy in the audience.

According to *The New York Times*, September 14, "The verve, youthful good looks and originality of the Ballet Theater pleased the spectators, among whom was Mme. Nikita S. Khrushchev, wife of the Soviet Premier. The Russians were alternately delighted and puzzled with the cowboy ballet "Rodeo."

Khrushchev in His Home Village

The American people have lately been seeing a good deal of Soviet Premier Khrushchev in action on the world stage. We believe our readers will be interested in reading something of his intimate relations with his own people and his detailed knowledge of their problems.

Nikita Khrushchev was born in a village in the Ukraine that has now become the Kalinovka Collective Farm. Recently united with a neighboring village, the farm now covers over 5,000 hectares of land. It specializes in cattle, hogs, meat and milk. This kolkhoz has pioneered in Khrushchev's favorite project of increasing the use of corn for silage. With the Premier's encouragement Kalinovka has doubled crop yields in two years and increased animal husbandry and products even more, as well as greatly improving the living standards of the collective farmers.*

The Soviet Premier makes a practice of visiting his birthplace as often as possible. His visit this year took place August 26-27, and was reported in Pravda. The account begins with the report of the kolkhoz chairman, V. V. Grachev, on progress during the past year. Mr. Khrushchev congratulates the farmers and expresses confidence that other farms can reach the same level. The account continues:

"SOME people believe," Nikita Sergeyevich said, "that you are living well because Kalinovka is the birthplace of the Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. I know there was even one person who came here and tried his best to find out whether you were building a sound collectively-owned establishment by yourselves or whether you were receiving assistance! He later became

* 1 hectare = 2.47 acres.

convinced that all that you received was the result of your own work.

"Every year the collective farmers allot one-third of the farm income to indivisible funds. With this money you build new houses and cultural centers and improve your community. This is correct. The welfare of the collective farmers is composed not only of what they earn for their workdays. The well-being of the collective farmer means a good club, public bath, creches and kindergartens, a boarding school, running water in the village and many other things making life easier and more comfortable. And all this can be achieved if you constantly increase accumulations in the indivisible funds, strengthen the collectively-run establishment, and produce more."

In his talk to the farm's leading personnel and conversations with its rank-and-file members while inspecting the fields and animal husbandries, Khrushchev repeatedly stressed the necessity of directing a farm creatively, of looking to the future, of constantly expanding output with the least expenditure of labor.

Nikita Sergeyevich advised a more careful consideration of the question of what crops should be best planted and in what proportion.

"More thought should be given to introducing pea cultivation," he said. "And this refers not only to Kalinovka. I expressed this view

at the Plenary Meeting of the Party Central Committee. Peas are a high-yielding crop and a high-caloric food. I do not know whether pea pies are now baked in Kalinovka. But in the old days such pies were considered a delicacy. True, being a creeper, it is a crop difficult to harvest, but that can be overcome.

"Why don't you try cultivating kidney beans? They are a high-caloric legume, and good both for soup and pies. There are climbing beans, but I recommend the bushy variety. Some Ukrainian collective farms plant corn, kidney beans and pumpkin on the same field, and actually obtain two to three crops a year. I do not say that you, too, should go in for combining crops. I have only mentioned this to show how highly peas, kidney beans and some other crops are valued by leading Ukrainian collective farms. I can't understand why you ignore kidney beans. Don't they grow well on your land? Plant beans on good soil, cultivate them well, and you will get good yields. It will be good for the state if you sell beans; at the same time you will get a good product for your table.

"We should increase the variety of foods for the table of the worker and collective farmer. When I get back to Moscow, I shall ask specialists for data on the yields of different varieties of beans and a comparison of their merits with those of other crops, and have this material published in the press in order to arouse interest in the cultivation of beans.

"You used to have good yields of buckwheat. And I would advise you to start experiments in planting it in wide double rows permitting be-

tween-row hoeing when there is not enough rainfall. Bear in mind that the state pays more than three times as much for buckwheat as for wheat.

"Isn't that an inducement? I am sure that you can grow splendid buckwheat and will have plenty of buckwheat grits. We Russians, you know, like buckwheat kasha. In the old days, I remember, they used to buy buckwheat grits to make kasha with milk for the shepherd. After a good helping every housewife would ask him to take better care of her cow. And he would promise to do so. Buckwheat is an excellent food. And do you remember harvest time? The peasants used to come to the fields with their families and have kasha for lunch.

"In the old days buckwheat kasha was a holiday repast. Today the collective farmers can grow enough buckwheat for both themselves and for the state, so that buckwheat kasha could become an everyday food. It is, however, necessary to undertake the planting of this crop sensibly. I'd like you to try it. If the new method is successful I shall strongly advocate its cultivation by this method in other districts also, I will say: look, Kalinovka has done it, surely you can do the same; you need only to use your brains. Will you support me?"

Voices: "We will!"

"Next year I'll come again and see how you have kept your word!

"I'd like to call your attention to something else. For some years you have been growing potatoes for fodder, and are doing it without manual labor. That is good. But it is necessary to consider what is more profitable: potatoes or sugar beet?

"Your dairy husbandry and hog breeding are developing well. And they should be developed still more. But what fodder is best for fattening hogs? In Byelorussia, they use potatoes; and in the Ukraine, potatoes and corn. Now the question is what will produce higher yields in your conditions: potatoes or beets? I have asked Comrade Grachev and he said that it is easier to obtain 400 centners of beets per hectare than 200 centners of potatoes. Perhaps it would be better to fatten hogs with sugar beets than with potatoes: one hectare of beets would thus equal 3 to 4 hectares of potatoes. True, sugar beets take a little more labor to cultivate than potatoes, but sugar beets repay the labor put into them 3 to 4 times more than potatoes. Here you have another latent reserve and another source of wealth. Think about it and check it in practice. All you have to do is to take a small number of pigs and feed them with potatoes and feed an equal number of other pigs with sugar beets. Keep a record of their weight gains and you will see which is more profitable to fatten hogs on.

"You already know how much labor it takes to grow a centner of beets and a centner of potatoes. The crop that proves the more profitable is the one you should use. Have you thought about this?" Khrushchev asked.

Voices: "No, we haven't."

"It is necessary to figure out what is profitable and what isn't, because the same crop can be profitable in one place and unprofitable in another. If there is a sugar refinery nearby, it is obviously more profitable to turn the beet into sugar,

but if the sugar refinery is far away then it is best to use the crop for fattening the livestock."

In his intimate talks with the Kalinovka folk, Khrushchev touched upon questions that concern literally every farmer.

"You, in Kalinovka," Khrushchev remarked, "should think about advancing to a higher stage of collective-farm life. Some time ago you sold your private cows to the collective farm and found that in a highly developed economy this is advantageous and convenient. Though you don't keep any cows of your own, you have enough milk for yourself and sell more to the state than previously.

"You should also develop collective production to provide your members with vegetables: I have said before and I want to say again: the time has come for you to have a good collective truck garden to fully provide the collective farmers with the most varied vegetables. Comrade Grachev here said that the collective farm supplies its members with cucumbers, tomatoes and cabbage. That is a very meager choice of vegetables. For the future you should think about building a small factory to process garden crops; you should have your own storage houses amply stocked with the most diverse vegetables, both for the canteen and for the collective farmers to take home.

"Not every housewife, you know, can pickle cucumbers well. One housewife does it so well that you can't tear yourself away from her pickles and sauerkraut, while another fixes them so that you don't even want to taste them. When the collective farm stores these products

it will be able to employ specialists for this work.

"I was told," Nikita Sergeyevich continued, "that a vegetable specialist came to you this summer and was asked to go home until the spring, as vegetables do not grow in the winter. That's not the way to look at vegetable growing. If good work isn't done in the winter, there will be no vegetables in the spring. In the winter it is necessary to build hotbeds, prepare fertilizer and seeds. Kalinovka should set an example in vegetable production.

"But vegetables should be properly treated not just in any old way. If cabbage is chopped with an axe, it is simply unpalatable. I was given egg-plant paste for breakfast this morning. It was simply delicious. And you can grow plenty of egg-plant.

"Select capable young people, invite vegetable specialists, train your own folk so that they will be able not only to grow vegetables but also to process them ready to serve. Don't stint on expenses, they will be well repaid. New crops should be started in the collective gardens. When the farmers see how good they are, they themselves will do their best to boost collective vegetable production."

Nikita Sergeyevich called the attention of the collective farmers to the need for expanding fruit production.

"I don't know who your gardener is, but you should by all means get people well versed in fruit-growing. An orchard is a complex business. You plant an orchard on an area of 200 hectares. This is quite a large area for your farm. You must consider the fact that trees live 50 years

and longer. Hence, an orchard is planted not for one year or two, but for half a century. Here everything must be well thought out.

"I asked your management what apple varieties you have in your orchard. They mentioned Antonovka. It is a good variety which has been known for dozens of years. But I am not sure that it is the best apple variety. Before planting an orchard it would be well to consult the Michurin Institute, fruit-growing specialists. They will advise you what assortment of saplings should be selected so that you won't be sorry later. For it may turn out that you have raised an orchard that produces poor quality apples. I therefore would like you to consider this question thoroughly and see that Kalinovka has the very best orchard, and the most delicious apples for yourself and for sale.

"When we were kids even wild apples were good enough for us. While pasturing horses in the woods, we would pick sour fruit and eat it. Now, however, we must plant cultivated varieties and grow fruit for which people will be grateful.

"Yours isn't the only collective farm that suffers from poor orchard management. Other collective farms, are in this respect also groping in the dark, so to speak. Today orchards are being planted throughout the country on hundreds of thousands of hectares. The Ministry of Agriculture should work out zonal recommendations and advise what fruit varieties should best be planted. It should also take measures to set up nurseries in various zones of the country."

Inspecting new livestock buildings, Mr. Khrushchev highly praised a

cow barn built by the collective farmers themselves from earthblocks, and advised the engineers to popularize this method in the newspapers. But observing a cow barn without stalls, and a granary built after a standard layout of the Ministry of Agriculture, he said it wasn't rational to build such premises one story high. "Look at this building," Nikita Sergeyevich said, "It has a solid foundation and a strong roof. With a little more money the walls could be raised higher and on the upper loft you could have storage rooms or keep poultry."

While highly praising Kalinovka's achievements in animal husbandry, Khrushchev made important suggestions regarding the location of the animal husbandries.

"I think it is wrong," he said, "to have all the livestock collected in one place. There are, perhaps, among you people who worked for the landlord Shaufus in the old days. I don't remember exactly how much land he had, but I think it was about 5,000 hectares."

Voices: "Right!"

Khrushchev continued: "The landlord had a central estate, in Khomutovka, and five small villages: Kalinovsky, Dmitriyevsky, Fyodorovsky, Yelizavetinsky and Alekseyevsky. And the livestock was distributed in five places. You now have almost as much land as he had, but you concentrate your livestock in one or two places. Livestock should be distributed with a view to shorter distances for the transportation of fodder to the barns and manure to the fields. Everything must be economically calculated and the best system found for housing the livestock. . . . Think it over. A sen-

sible farmer keeps the livestock nearer to the fodder and the manure nearer to the fields.

"And this principle does not at all contradict the task of building modern villages. I am for moving the peasants from the small villages and settlements to beautiful villages with modern homes and good streets with sidewalks, and for providing them with all amenities for cultured living: schools, a hospital, a maternity home, nurseries, etc. In future, collective farmers will go to work in the fields in cars. At the animal husbandries there should be dwellings for the people who tend the livestock. The milkmaids and workers who supply fodder for the livestock should, obviously, live there."

In his conversation with the collective farmers, Khrushchev touched on rural construction. Kalinovka has in recent years built many dwelling houses, a school, a club, a boarding school, a public bathhouse, and a kindergarten.

"Your cottages," Nikita Sergeyevich said, "are very well built. I like them. They are comfortable, but they are too costly for the collective farm, and they do not solve all municipal improvement problems. I am harboring an idea and I am weighing the question of whether I should tell it to you. I am not sure how you will take it. But let me say this: wouldn't it be better to build apartment houses, not higher than five stories, instead of small cottages. I see that you are not very keen on this proposition."

A voice: "It suits us."

Khrushchev: "I hear the voice of Comrade Alyuskin. He, evidently, speaks this way as an old friend of mine.

"I appreciate that you cannot make up your minds on this proposition at once. Much has to be considered here. But if you feel that it might suit you, try it. Several of our collective farms have already built apartment houses. In big houses you will live not worse, but better than in small ones. First of all, the peasants will be freed from worries about fuel, water and many other things. A big house will have running water and central heating.

"Secondly, with such houses fuel expenses will be lower, and less funds will be required for building sidewalks, roads, sewage and water systems. It is time you had all the necessary amenities. Think it over well and don't say that Khrushchev has come and wants to drive us into a common house. I don't want to drive anyone, I only want to advise you how to live better. If you agree, all right; if you disagree, don't take my advice.

"I think it is in this direction that our villages will develop in the future. The apartments will have running water, sewage disposal, electric lighting—all the amenities a city dweller has. The village streets will be lined with trees.

"Here, in your village, the main road is a good one. But just take one step off it and you land in mud. Today you tolerate this, but years will go by and the people will find that these standards no longer suit them. If in Moscow anyone coming out of his apartment stepped into a puddle of mud, he would say that it was impossible to live like that. That is because he is already accustomed to other living conditions and you are not yet used to such conditions.

"But be sure you don't build new houses close to roads and motor highways—the children will have no place to play—and dust and fumes will get into your houses!"

Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchev thoroughly inspected the Kalinovka corn fields. It is no exaggeration to say that corn is Kalinovka's pride. The farm's progress is associated with this crop. When it had no corn, it had no fodder and no livestock to speak of. Just a few years ago, Kalinovka produced only 42 centners of milk and 8 centners of meat per 100 hectares of land. It had only a few dozen lean cows. Now it boasts of 700 well-fed cows, and their number will soon grow to 1,500. Today it produces 700 centners of milk and 170 centners of meat per 100 hectares of land.

Corn has brought an abundance of fodder. This has meant a high output of milk and meat. That is why Khrushchev so carefully watches the Kalinovka corn. On his advice corn was first planted here in 1954, for silage, by the square-pocket method. Since then the Kalinovka farmers have become expert corn growers. They have never had a crop failure. And from year to year they have been reaping 500, 600 and 700 centners of corn per hectare (stalks and cobs).

This year, too, Kalinovka has raised a good corn crop. It will run into at least 500 centners of silage per hectare. And the area under this crop now covers 785 hectares, or 20 per cent of all the farm's arable land.

Nikita Sergeyevich walked into a corn field and his feet sank into the soft earth. There were no weeds: it was all clean corn. And he remarked that when the field had been

harvested a winter crop might be sown on it without plowing, so well was the soil prepared.

The examination of the corn crop, however, brought not only joy, but, unfortunately, also disappointment. Nikita Sergeyevich noticed that in some spots the corn was too dense. There were hills with four or five plants. Here the stalks were thin and the cobs small.

Khrushchev sharply criticized the farm's management for failing to adhere to the advanced corn cultivation practices which they knew perfectly well.

"What shall we do with you? Well, we'll have to shame you publicly so that you won't do it again. The tractor drivers have planted the crop well, in correct squares. Consequently, they are not to be blamed. They got wrong instructions. They were directed to sow densely. If you had told the tractor drivers to plant 1 or 2 grains per hill with a view to 100 per cent germination, they would have done so and the collective farm would have obtained a rich harvest."

Khrushchev said that Kalinovka should step up its corn yields: "For you, 500 to 600 centners of corn per hectare is too little. Like many other collective farms in Kursk Region, Kalinovka can raise 800 to 1,000 centners of stalks and ears per hectare. Such yields are obtained by the well-known agronomist Otto Strube, Director of the Schwaneberg Volkseigenes Gut (state farm) in the German Democratic Republic. He never gets less than 900 or 1,000 centners per hectare. And you, too, can do the same."

Bidding goodbye to the collective farmers, Khrushchev said:

"Dear comrades, I thank you, my fellow-villagers, for the good sentiments you have expressed with regard to me and, chiefly, with regard to the Communist Party and its Central Committee, and with regard to our government, who are all the time constantly thinking and doing everything to raise higher the living standard of the people.

"It is a pleasure to me to visit you now and again. Last year I was unable to come, but this year I decided to drop in. First of all, I like to meet you, as my fellow-villagers, to visit the village where I spent my childhood. Secondly, I am interested to see how our Soviet countryside is progressing. The first time I visited you was after an absence of nearly 25 years. That was in 1945, immediately after the war. The collective farm then was in a bad state.

"You see how Kalinovka has been transformed. Now I am eager to visit you and I am pleased each time I come here. I am pleased that Kalinovka has for many years been an example to the collective farms of the Soviet Union and elsewhere.

"I wish you, dear comrades, success in your work. And, as you see, one has to work well; one has to work better today than he did yesterday, and tomorrow better than he does today, because that is how you want to live: tomorrow better than today. And this better life can be created and insured only by your own work. Work is the most noble thing, work enriches man, work creates better conditions.

"I wish you, dear fellow-villagers, to keep aloft the banner of Kalinovka. Only don't get conceited; otherwise others will get ahead of you!"

SOVIET AID IN ASIA AND AFRICA

Throughout Asia and Africa educational institutions, iron and steel mills, hospitals, theaters, power stations and observatories are being erected by Soviet workers and engineers. Among these structures a major place is occupied by school buildings, educational centers, polytechnical and technological institutes. A number of these institutions are being built free by the Soviet Union. Below are statements by Soviet architects working on plans for these institutions.

INDONESIA

by Victor Bondarenko

Chief Architect, Technological Institute Project, Ambon, Indonesia

UNTIL recently I was busy designing a number of higher schools located a few hours' ride from Moscow. Among my latest projects were the Kostroma and the Gorky agricultural institutes. But in January of this year the terms of distance in which I was accustomed to think had to be completely put out of my mind. I was to undertake a long voyage to the "land of a thousand islands," as Indonesia is called, to choose a site on the Island of Ambon, in the town of the same name, for the construction of a technological institute, and make the necessary preparations for its designing.

Now that our three months' stay in Indonesia is behind us, my colleagues, Lyudmila Menshutina and Olga Kashintseva, and I, bending over the designs for the future institute in our Moscow office, see in our mind's eye the banks of the bay of Ambon Island in all its beauty,

covered with lush tropical vegetation. It is on a section of this bank that one of Indonesia's largest educational institutions will rise.

The technological institute in Ambon will train shipbuilding engineers, engineers and technologists for the fisheries and the fish industry. The departments of the institute will be housed in a three-story building. Here too there will be an auditorium with a 500-seat capacity. One-story buildings are being equipped for the laboratories and the workshops. Near the institute will be houses for the teaching staff and the students. The group of structures also includes a power station and a water supply system for the institute. Ambon is an island of volcanic origin subject to earthquakes. This has been taken into account in the designs for all the buildings.

The project for the technological institute is still in the design stage. The group of architects and designers working on it are trying to complete this stage of the work as soon as possible. We know full well how impatiently our Indonesian friends are waiting for the construction of this institute to begin.

ETHIOPIA

by Mikhail Nozdrukhn

Chief Engineer Technical School Project Bakhar Dar, Ethiopia

The construction of a technical school for 1,000 pupils will be launched this year in the town of Bakhar Dar. A group of Soviet

architects, engineers and designers has completed work on the building plan for this school, which will train power specialists, chemist-technologists, technologists for the textile and woodworking industry, technicians and agricultural experts.

Such a wide range of specialists has made it necessary to design spacious workshops with complete sets of technical equipment. A pavilion for agricultural machines and a laboratory for testing engines will be erected on the campus. Here future technologists and mechanics will acquire theoretical knowledge and the practical know-how needed for operating new machines. Apart from the various workshops, the technical school will have at its disposal a large academic building with classrooms, study rooms, laboratories, a 500-seat auditorium and a student canteen. The project provides for the construction of sports facilities: a football stadium; volleyball, basketball and tennis courts, and others.

Built and equipped at the expense of the Soviet Government, the construction of this group of academic buildings will at the same time serve as a school for training Ethiopian citizens as builders. With this end in view it is scheduled to set up a building organization on the spot and supply it with modern building machinery.

GUINEA

by Yevgeni Ribitski

**Chief Architect, Polytechnical
Institute Project, Conakry,
Republic of Guinea**

According to an agreement on technical cooperation signed between the USSR and the Republic of

Guinea, a polytechnical institute, the first technical higher school on the soil of this young African state, will be built in Conakry, capital of the country, with the help of the Soviet Union. The institute will train the building engineers, road-building experts, geologists, amelioration experts, agronomists and various other specialists which the still undeveloped industry and agriculture of the republic need.

The polytechnical institute project in Conakry provides for the construction of three buildings to house the lecture rooms, study rooms and laboratories, a library of 170,000 volumes, a 600-seat auditorium, reading-rooms and other facilities. All the equipment for the laboratories and machine shops are to be Soviet-made. In designing the buildings due attention is being given to the conditions in which the students will have to study, chiefly the humid tropical climate with its year-long fairly high temperature. Various devices for keeping out the sun, a northern exposure, and ventilation and air-conditioning systems will help to keep the buildings cool.

Apart from the various sports structures on the campus, a sports stadium seating 25,000 persons will be built near the institute, fully adapted to the holding of international sports contests. There will also be a swimming pool with fifty-meter lanes and an indoor gymnasium. African sportsmen will be able to hold contests here for continental championships.

Our designing work on the polytechnical institute and the sports building is nearing completion. Construction will begin in Conakry this year.

DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM

by Suren Airapetov

**Architect, Polytechnical Institute
Project, Hanoi, Democratic
Republic of Vietnam**

While we here in Moscow are considering a model of the Hanoi Polytechnical Institute, its chief architect, Yevgeni Budnik, is in the capital of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam familiarizing his Vietnamese colleagues with the results of the work of our group.

The Polytechnical Institute in Hanoi will be built in close proximity to a number of other higher schools of the capital, in a district known as Bak Mai. Engineers of 15 specialties will be trained in its five departments. This educational establishment, the country's largest, will have facilities for an enrollment of 2,400. The project provides for the construction of student dormitories, apartment houses for the teaching staff, medical, cultural and public utility buildings.

BURMA

by Pyotr Kuznetsov

**Chief Architect, Technological
Institute Project,
Rangoon, Burma**

Burma's largest technical higher school, built by the Soviet Union as a gift to the Burmese people, has been completed. The equipment brought from the Soviet Union is already being set up in the laboratories of the institute. When its doors open, thousands of Burmese students will fill the classrooms.

The three-story house of the principal academic building, with adjoining laboratory, forms the center

of the institute community. The floor space of the academic facilities alone covers 15,000 square meters. Students from other parts of Burma will be provided with dormitories and have at their disposal the services of many utility establishments, a polyclinic, and sports facilities. A community for the teaching staff is being built near the institute.

It is interesting to note that in the course of the construction of this institute many Burmese have become experienced machine assemblers, electricians, crane operators, truck drivers, plumbers and plasterers. No doubt they will be able to put their experience to good use at other construction sites.

We print below an article from Soviet Weekly, September 15, that presents further aspects of Soviet aid in Asia and Africa.

THE SOVIET UNION is at present helping to build more than 250 different large-scale projects in Asian and African countries.

It has aid and technical cooperation agreements with India, Indonesia, the United Arab Republic, Iraq, Afghanistan, the Republic of Guinea, Ethiopia, and many other countries.

All work under these agreements is financed by long-term loans granted by the Soviet Government.

In most cases these loans, on which merely nominal rates of interest are charged, will be repaid in goods, not in currency—which in itself is a great help to the country concerned in developing its industry.

IRAQ

A large group of Soviet experts will soon leave for Iraq to work on the Baghdad-Basra railway which is to be built with Soviet assistance.

The Soviet Union will also build and

supply equipment for an automatic telephone exchange in Baghdad, serving 10,000 subscribers.

YEMEN

Big ships are already docking at Port Hodeida on the Red Sea, Yemen's sea gate which will be completed early next year.

The project got under way in 1958, when Soviet equipment and 350 technical experts and workmen arrived on what was virtually a bare, sun-scorched shore.

Already completed are a six-mile approach channel for sea-going ships, several docks, a housing estate for port workers, a restaurant and hotel.

When completed the highly mechanized port will have well over 1,300 feet of docks for dry cargo ships, and a dock for tankers on a man-made island where a large oil depot is going up.

More than 2,000 Yemeni—brick layers, plasterers, carpenters, fitters, turners, electricians and crane operators and so on—are now working on the project.

They are trained by Soviet experts—no easy task in view of the shortage of Arabic interpreters.

This entire project has been made possible by a low-interest Soviet loan, after terms offered by other foreign companies had been rejected by Yemen as being too unfavorable.

SYRIA

The Soviet Union will provide technical help in the construction of the 480-mile Kamyshli-Aleppo-Latakia railway line across Syria.

Also to be built with Soviet help in

that part of the United Arab Republic is a nitrogenous fertilizer plant with a yearly capacity of 110,000 tons.

The U.S.S.R. will also help extend the scope of Syrian prospecting for oil and other minerals.

PAKISTAN

A group of Soviet experts are in Pakistan to discuss what credits that country will need to pay for Soviet equipment and the services of Soviet geologists; and for the training of Pakistani personnel for mineral prospecting.

Welcoming their arrival, the *Times of Karachi* points out that Soviet credit is granted at only 2½ per cent interest, while the western powers demand five or six per cent.

GUINEA

A 1961-65 agreement with Guinea just signed in Moscow grants most favored nation treatment to both sides in trade, navigation and other economic relations.

Under the agreements the Soviet Union will extend the economic and technical aid it is giving to Guinea's three-year plan.

MONGOLIA

The Soviet Union has granted an additional long-term loan of over \$154 million to Mongolia to assist that republic to fulfill its third five-year plan, and has deferred payment of earlier loans.

The Soviet Union will provide technical assistance in building 15 industrial enterprises, high voltage transmission lines and city power grids, and supply agricultural machinery, motor vehicles, pedigree livestock and building materials.

BELAFONTE ON SOVIET LIFE

HARRY BELAFONTE, a recent visitor to the Soviet Union, was quoted by the Tass news agency as saying, "The life of the Soviet people is so rich and varied and their hospitality so boundless that one wants to stay whole months and years among them."

Rumanian Steel

The first in a series of articles on the economic development of Rumania

by VICTOR PERLO

CERCEL drove westward for hundreds of kilometers past the mountains of the Bucegi and Fagaras massifs, through the modern city of Sibiu, alongside rolling plains dotted with stacks of grain, past red-roofed, steeped Transylvanian villages which became even more appealing as the light softened late in the afternoon.

Ruthlessly tooting the horn of our Zim, Cercel forced aside the innumerable horse or oxen-drawn wagons, returning heavy-laden from the day's work in the field, driven by men in tightly belted white national costumes with dark vests. Usually their wives sat alongside them, and often their children rode in the hay behind.

It was 8:30 when we reached Deva, too dark to see the historic fortress on the dominating hill to the west. Vasile — our interpreter-arranger — found out quickly enough that there was no hotel in Hunedoara, our destination, and that the regular hotel in Deva was really filled up—so much so that even our Academy of Science credentials, which usually opened all doors and created luxurious suites everywhere, were of no

avail. It took him an hour and a half of telephoning to the factory director in Hunedoara and negotiating with local officials to get us placed in the modest lodgings maintained by the local executive committee and Party organization. By eleven, tired but relieved, we were sitting with a Deva official in the restaurant, accepting his welcoming toast.

Early the following rainy morning we arrived at Hunedoara, and spent three hours going through the main sections of the iron and steel mill with our engineer guide, who was one of the most efficient factory-exhibitors I have run into.

Our first stop was at blast furnace No. 6, the newest and largest. Shortly after we arrived the 70 cubic meter giant was tapped and the hundreds of tons of molten metal, which were smelted in one heat, flowed in fiery vermilion streams down the metal runway, then over the floor edge, making a flaming liquid iron-fall into the waiting cupola below.

All seven of us watched—my wife and I, our two boys, Vasile, Cercel, and the engineer. Just then a group of about 40 teen-agers came from behind the blast furnace and joined us in watching the flow. This pleased me very much, because I had frequently encountered the attitude that a factory is no place for a youngster, in relation to my own kids, but here, there was no such idea.

VICTOR PERLO is the author of *Empire of High Finance*, published by International Publishers. His most recent book, *USA and USSR: The Economic Race*, was also published by International. He has just returned from several months in the USSR and the Eastern Democracies.

Then to the blast furnace control room with panels of the latest Soviet instruments for automatically regulating the flow of hot and cold air into the furnace, the furnace temperature, the mix of coke and ore in loading buckets and the charging of their loads. Also there were the constantly changing indicators on the electronic chart from which the engineer could instantly obtain all key data concerning the regime within the furnace.

This and a smaller automatic blast furnace provide more than half of the iron of Hunedoara, which is today the main primary metal factory of Rumania's industrialization. There are in addition four old furnaces which still function. The modern furnaces were erected with extensive technical-engineering assistance from the Soviet Union. The key instrumentation and much of the other equipment in the Hunedoara complex come from the USSR. Many of the engineers received their training in the USSR, and many still do.

Realizing the vital role this factory plays, and observing the pride with which Rumanians regard it, one can begin to understand why the alliance with the USSR is so highly valued in Rumania. I have read of the traditional friendship between the two Slavic countries, Bulgaria and Russia, but I saw for myself how strong it has become between Rumania and the USSR, not too long after Rumania was an unwilling ally of Hitler in World War II.

We visited the other major sections of the factory, the coke ovens, the banks of open-hearth furnaces, and the blooming mill, with a section for rolling structural shapes and

tube blanks. We also visited the special laboratory of the coke department, where young scientists are working enthusiastically to find the way to produce high-quality coke from Rumania's low-quality coal.

Then we had a two-hour session with the director, Nikolai Catana. The small but diversified, philosophical-political, personal library he maintains by his desk differentiates him sharply from the all too typical domestic executive who is "too busy" and never reads a book. Catana won my statistical heart by doing something no other factory director did—he brought out his books of production and cost records and invited me to look at what I wanted and take what notes I wanted. I commented favorably on the teenage group we had met. He told me there are 2 or 3 large groups every day. So far this year 6,000 children, and 2,000 adults from many countries have visited the Hunedoara steel *combinat*. Thus, it is not only producing the country's steel, but playing a significant part in the education of its people.

And especially of the 13,000 employees. I made a quick calculation and observed that labor productivity at Hunedoara was still about one-third that at the more advanced American iron and steel installations. He readily agreed. Most of the workers, he said, were peasants, and have been trained at the factory. At the start, more workers are needed to compensate for their inexperience, but as their qualifications increase, the number declines. Since 1956, the number of workers needed has fallen 20 per cent, while production has risen sharply. During the next two and a half years steel produc-

tion will double, while employment falls further.

He illustrated this process with an example. There are two old steel furnace sections that employ 700 workers and produce 750 tons per day. The new open hearth sections employ 300 workers, and produce 1,200 tons a day. That is, labor productivity in the new sections is almost four times as high as in the old, and when the entire plant is modernized, labor productivity will approach American standards.

The old steel section, Catana said, is called the school section, for here workers and engineers and students are trained.

In doubling output, new equipment and installations of the latest type will play a key part. Moreover, the capital requirements will be much less than formerly, because of the maximum use of low-cost efficiency devices. Oxygen installations will be introduced into the open-hearth furnaces, providing a hoped-for rise of 20-25 per cent in yield. New open-hearth sections will be erected near the blooming mill, from which molten steel will flow directly into the blooming mill, obviating intermediate solidification into ingots, and the subsequent stretching and cutting up of the ingots. With some small modifications, the capacity of the blooming mill will be doubled, eliminating the need for construction of a huge new blooming mill. A continuous mill will be installed for production of wire and steel strip, besides a full assortment of structural shapes.

In a few years Hunedoara will produce two million tons of steel per year. But it will no longer be Rumania's main steel plant. A new

combinat, twice as large and with a more diversified rolled product mix, will be installed at Galati.

By 1970—in just ten years—Rumania expects to have a steel production of 7.5 million metric tons, or 360 kilograms per capita. That is about equal to the per capita production of the advanced Western countries, and about 70 per cent of average per capita production in the United States in recent years. *In ten years, if not sooner, Rumania will be among the top ranking world industrial powers, in relation to its size.*

This is Rumania, which before World War II was significant economically only as a source of export oil and grain, and had only the most primitive industry.

Already this past is far behind. Rumania's industry has gone through its early development stage. Now it is significant in total size, in diversification, in international markets, and has attained a considerable degree of internal integration.

The logic of its industrial development is indicated by four factories I visited. Hunedoara supplies basic steel. The Republica factory in Bucharest, using Hunedoara steel, makes pipes for the petroleum industry, as well as for other purposes. The First of May factory in Ploesti uses these pipes, and metal in many other forms, to make a complete assortment of petroleum equipment. Many oil wells using this equipment could be seen from the roads near Ploesti and Pitesti. And the refinery I visited at Ploesti transforms the oil into compounds suitable for final use.

All this was built from very little. Pre-war Hunedoara had a few primi-

tive workshops. The Republica factory was founded in 1938 by Malaxa—the Rumanian equivalent of Rockefeller or Morgan—to make a variety of industrial machines, motors, wagons, etc. It has been completely transformed into its present special function, and its production is 6-7 times larger than in 1940.

The First of May factory, before World War II, was owned by the Franco-Belgian Concordia Co., and engaged exclusively in the repair of oil equipment. Only the refinery was a substantial establishment before the war, and it also has been enlarged and to a considerable extent modernized.

Wherever I went I paid special attention to the quality of labor, the interest of workers in their jobs, and their knowledge of its requirements and potential. In Hunedoara, as in every other Rumanian factory I visited, the impression was excellent. The workers are all comparatively new—the factory only started to produce six years ago—and as in most Rumanian factories, youth predominates. But everywhere there was the appearance of interest, speed, and application to the job at hand. And whether it was the blast furnace tenders, or the crew climbing under the rolls to repair one that was not functioning, or their mates who used tongs to move the huge many-ton ingots past the bad roll, or the men who moved the levers in the control-tower of the blooming mill, manipulating giant, red-hot pieces of metal, and the forms which shape them deftly and surely—these workers were obviously masters of their jobs.

Our driver Cerčel embodied many of these progressive characteristics of

Rumanian labor. I was annoyed with him for refusing to take us up some dirt mountain roads (I still think he was unreasonable about it) and puzzled by his slowing down when going uphill, using only a fraction of the reserve of the powerful Zim motor.

But as the automobile took us over a long stretch of dirt roads (mostly under construction) which reminded me of some of the worst back roads of Montana; as it completed over a thousand kilometers of driving with never a bit of trouble from its smoothly purring motor, I realized that Cerčel was babying that car because it was his most important personal responsibility, the apple of his eye.

And he told me its history. For five of its six years, it had been the personal car of the President of Rumania. *It had already driven over 500,000 kilometers* (with one motor change), and its body was in condition to go another 500,000 kilometers.

Certainly Cerčel and all the previous drivers of that car deserve a collective award for their skill in handling and preserving the vehicle, all the more important because Rumania as yet has no auto and only a small truck industry and vehicles are still far too scarce. Traffic in Bucharest is so light that in the evenings people promenade on downtown streets. The supply of trucks and cars must be multiplied to keep pace with the rapid growth of industry and agriculture.

Rumania's economic planners have this in mind in framing their long-term 15-20-year plan, which will be discussed in the second article of this series.

BRITISH PEOPLE DEMAND COEXISTENCE AND PEACE

.. *Significance of the Labor Party Conference*

by GORDON SCHAFFER

BEFORE the British Labor Party conference met at Scarborough in October, there were frantic behind-the-scenes efforts to secure a compromise between the Executive Committee and the Transport Workers Union, which was leading the anti-nuclear weapon campaign. One Executive member, Tony Wedgewood Benn, who opposed the majority policy, resigned as a protest against the refusal to hold such a meeting.

Mr. Wedgewood Benn's attitude was a perfectly realistic one. The Executive Committee, under heavy pressure from the membership, had prepared a statement on defense policy, which was a big advance on all their previous documents. It affirmed the party's intention to press for international agreement on disarmament; it opposed nuclear arms for Western Germany, insisted on political control of NATO and resisted U.S. missile bases in Britain. The Transport Workers resolution went further and called for the complete rejection of any defense policy based on the threat of the use of nuclear weapons, the cessation of their manufacture and the stopping of U.S. H-bomb flights over Britain.

If Mr. Gaitskell and his supporters seriously intended to implement

the policy set out in their own Executive statement, they would have welcomed discussion with the Transport Workers Union, for one thing is perfectly clear, the policy of the Executive itself can only be carried out by drastically curtailing the authority of the generals and forcing far-reaching concessions from the Americans. In other words, the Executive Committee's policy, equally with that of the Transport Workers, which was eventually accepted by the conference, meant fighting the government on defense questions. But to fight political battles involves having a leadership, which believes in its cause. And Gaitskell and his main supporters showed in the debate at Scarborough that they had no belief in their cause and no intention of fighting.

They talked of the concessions to left wing opinion made in the Executive statement as if they were playing some minor game of tactics instead of dealing with issues on which the survival of mankind depends. And then towards the end of the debate the real picture emerged. John Hind, M.P., one of the leaders of the campaign to re-arm Western Germany, supported the nuclear arms race. He claimed that peace was only preserved by the balance of nuclear power. He even said that the possession of the bomb by both sides stopped the wars in Korea and Indo-China and unfortunately

GORDON SCHAFFER, former assistant editor of the London *Reynold's News*, is the Chairman of the British Peace Committee.

no one in the debate reminded him that it was pressure of the peoples for peace which stopped MacArthur from using the bomb in Korea and Dulles authorizing its use in Indo-China. Then he assured the conference that the ex-Nazis in the West German Government were now fully reformed and true democrats.

Hugh Gaitskell stressed all the progressive points in the Executive policy in the early part of his speech—acceptance of China to her rightful place in the United Nations, disengagement in central Europe, no Thor missile bases in Britain. But then came the real emphasis. In his attack on those who wished Britain to reject all nuclear strategy, he compared the unity of NATO against the Soviet Union as the type of alliance which could have been created before World War II to stop Hitler's aggression.

There you have the real issue between the opposing forces in the Labor Party and indeed the fundamental political issue in Britain. Shall Britain be part of an anti-Soviet military alliance or shall she play an independent part in trying to bridge the differences between East and West and to create peaceful coexistence.

The significance of the Scarborough decisions, when the Executive statement was rejected, and the party accepted a new foreign policy based on the abandonment of nuclear arms, the repudiation of nuclear strategy and pressure "for the reopening of discussions between nations at the earliest possible moment as the means by which world disarmament and peaceful coexistence can be most readily achieved," was that it repudiated at

the same time the anti-Soviet attitude which has dominated the leadership since 1945.

When the Labor Party waged its successful election campaign in 1945 and was returned to power with an overwhelming majority, it declared in its election manifesto, "It must not be forgotten that in the years leading up to the war, the Tories were so scared of Russia that they missed the chance to establish a partnership which might well have prevented the war." The manifesto also pledged steps to ensure that "Germany is deprived of all power to make war again."

Steadily those pledges were repudiated and the leaders in the postwar Labor government bear a heavy share of the responsibility. It has led to a position when Mr. Gaitskell in pursuing his anti-Soviet policy must accept and defend the ex-Nazi generals and welcome Franco as an unofficial ally. But it did more than that. It gave away Britain's freedom to decide on issues of peace and war and handed our island over to the U.S. military leaders.

The story of how this was done has been told in memoirs of the American leaders. The biographer of Senator Vandenberg in (*The Private Papers of Senator Vandenberg*, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, page 359) tells how "in the late spring or early summer of 1947, Vandenberg and Senator Hickenlooper were startled to discover that Mr. Roosevelt had agreed that the United States could not use the bomb against any country without the consent of the British. The senators promptly got in touch with President Truman, Secretary of State Marshall and Defense Secretary Forrestal to express their

surprise and opposition to any such arrangement and to urge the necessity of an immediate rectification of the agreement."

The book goes on to tell how both senators told the U.S. Government they must reach a satisfactory conclusion on this question of the use of the bomb before there was any action on the Marshall Plan (the scheme for aid to Britain and other countries). The British Government surrendered and in the words of the Vandenberg papers, "the final decision on the use of the bomb was left in the hands of the President."

So when the first atomic bombers came to Britain, it was with the knowledge of the British Labor Government that they had already handed over any control over American actions. And yet labor ministers proclaimed Marshall aid the "most selfless act in history" and the right wing leaders of the TUC and the American CIO walked out of the World Federation of Trade Unions because the rest of the organization would not accept that there were no strings to Marshall aid.

The diary of James Forrestal goes further. It says (page 455, U.S. edition) that the Americans were surprised at the prompt acceptance of U.S. bombers by the British in July 1948, and actually instructed the American Ambassador in London to ask whether the British had considered the implications of this action. The editor of the diaries explains that the "implications were that the bombers were known throughout the world as the atomic bombers and to put a strong force of them into British bases would bring them within striking distance of Moscow."

This anti-Soviet hatred on the part

of the right-wing leaders of the Labor Party and the Trade Unions is the thread that runs through the whole postwar story—as indeed, it does in the story of the earlier years until the conclusion of the alliance with the Soviet Union ensured the defeat of Hitler.

These policies were enforced year after year at the annual conferences of the Labor Party by the votes of the trade unions with massive right-wing majorities. Organizations like the British Peace Committee which sought to rally the latent peace forces in the movement were banned and maligned. But slowly the demand of the peoples for peace became stronger and then three years ago the creation of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament crystallized the growing revolt.

The campaign focussed attention on the bomb and the policy of mass suicide, which lay behind the acceptance by the Government and Labor Party leaders alike of military alliances in which Britain is regarded as an expendable base. For the first time since the war the young people were in action. The rank and file in local Labor Parties and trade unions alike found a new inspiration. And gradually the trade unions themselves were won over for new policies of peace. So it came about that at Scarborough, the votes of the trade unions which had been used for fifteen years to bludgeon into silence the opposition to the right-wing leaders and their policies, were cast for new policies of peace.

The right-wing leaders, far from accepting democratic decisions, have announced their determination not to operate the party's new policy and to seek to have it repudiated at the

next conference. The three organizations which make up the broad Labor movement—the Trade Union Congress, the Cooperative Congress and the Labor Party are now all committed by the democratic decision of their members to policies involving the unilateral abandonment of nuclear arms by Britain and the complete rejection of a NATO alliance based on nuclear strategy. But the majority of the leaders of all three bodies are against these policies and in favor of the cold war military alliances.

The Parliamentary Labor Party, which is made up of Labor M. P.s and Labor members of the House of Lords is predominantly right wing.

This is the body which elects the leader of the party. The right-wing majority intends to re-elect Mr. Gaitskell and to refuse to operate the decisions of the conference. The left-wing M. P.s, on the other hand, intend to fight on the new policy and to mobilize still wider support for its principles.

But the real struggle will be waged in the country. The Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament will be meeting soon to draw up plans for an even greater march from Aldermaston next Easter than the one this year.

The campaign of the British Peace Committee for a "notice to quit" to the American occupying forces is being waged all over the country. Pressure will mount behind the demand for new disarmament talks, with the participation of all powers.

It will be a bitter fight. All the newspapers with the single exception of the *Daily Worker* with its small

circulation, will move into the attack on the new policies. And in this respect, the story of the *Daily Herald* is worth telling. The *Daily Herald* originated as a paper supporting the Labor movement and was kept going with the active work of humble supporters. Then the leaders succeeded in handing the paper to Oldhams Press, a vast printing business with the proviso that the *Herald* should support decisions of the Labor Party conference. A few weeks ago, on the plea that the paper was losing money, Oldhams secured complete control. Had the old agreement remained, the *Herald* would now be bound to support the new policy. As it is, it tried to save Mr. Gaitskell by publishing figures on the eve of the debate purporting to prove that the majority of Labor supporters wanted to keep the bomb and it is now taking the lead in the campaign to repudiate the conference decisions. (Under its previous editor, who was forced to resign, the *Herald* ran articles backing nuclear disarmament and reported that thousands of letters backing this policy were received and hardly any against.)

At the Scarborough conference, there was much talk about the unity of the Labor movement being threatened. The truth is that the decisions taken at the conference could produce genuine unity and the enthusiasm which alone can give promise of electoral victory. The unity which was shattered at Scarborough was the unity on cold war policies between the Labor leaders and the Conservatives. The cold war has destroyed the normal machinery of democracy in Britain. Electors at the last three elections have been able to decide whether they want water

supplies to be owned by the state or private companies and other similar questions, but not whether they were in favor of German rearmament, nuclear bases in Britain or any of the other matters on which their very survival depends. Those electors who had the chance of voting for a left wing M. P. could vote for new policies of peace but the national choice was between two parties both pledged to the arms race and the cold war. Thus the fight in the Labor movement for the policies which won at Scarborough is the fight for democracy, for the right to express opposition to this sinister coalition, which has led us so far along the road to war. It is the same problem in America where two advocates of the cold war confront each other. With the agreement on foreign policy between the C.D.U. and S.D.P. in Western Germany, it will be the same there.

But the peoples faced with questions of life or death forge new weapons to assert their will. The Japanese people have done it and the British people are doing it, just as are the people in the countries still subject to colonial oppression.

In Britain, the issues have now been clearly stated. The battle is broadly between the advocates of the military alliances which they openly accept as combinations backed with nuclear weapons and directed against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, on the one side, and on the other side the supporters of peaceful coexistence based on friendship with all nations including those building socialism.

Unfortunately there are many who are still confused and who do not see this sharp division. Some

are angry with the Gaitskell leadership but nevertheless believe the Executive statement on foreign policy, if sincerely carried out, could begin to break down the cold war. Others like Philip Noel-Baker believe sincerely that there is more chance of successful disarmament negotiations if Britain remains armed with nuclear weapons, even if they are American.

But the real issues will emerge as the struggle develops. The Labor Party has no hope of contesting an election and bidding for power for four years. In the interim the effect of the Labor Party's decisions and the struggle to enforce them will be seen in the pressure that can be exerted on the government and the inspiration it gives to the peace forces throughout the world.

However much the newspapers seek to deny the mass support for the Labor Party decisions, Prime Minister Macmillan and his Cabinet colleagues know that only a deep feeling among the mass of the people could have created such a change of opinion in the Labor movement. The sound of the marching feet from Aldermaston was heard in the Cabinet room as well as Transport House, the home of the Labor Party. It was heard at the White House in Washington as well.

No British statesman from now onwards can go into international negotiations without taking into account this feeling of the people. The task of the British people after the victory at Scarborough is to mobilize all their strength to ensure final measures to end the arms race, to end the occupation of their island and impose their demand for coexistence, friendship and peace.

Peking Opera in Canada

by HELEN NEARING

Scott and I and Henry and Anita Willcox traveled 15,000 miles and saw Peking Opera in Peking. Because the U.S. State Department canceled our passports and refused to let us return to Peking, we travelled 1,500 miles (back and forth from Connecticut via Maine) to see Peking Opera in Montreal, Canada.

After three years of fandangling, the Canadian Government, more lenient, liberal or far-seeing than the U.S., was persuaded by Nicholas Kondriavtzeff, President of Canadian Concerts and Artists, to book this outstanding company for the current season. The Peking Opera group has spent the last month in a triumphal tour traveling through seven major Canadian cities, from Vancouver to Montreal, giving an exhibition of magnificent acting and dancing, incredible acrobatics, and sumptuous costuming, to tens of thousands of enthusiastic Canadians—if the jam-packed, wildly applauding audiences of 2,500 in the Montreal theater were any sample.

The U. S. State Department is stupid enough, biased and backward enough, to deny U. S. citizens the chance to witness this unique spectacle of perfection in art and drama. That we can see it neither in China nor on our own shores is our loss.

HELEN and SCOTT NEARING, frequent contributors to NWR, told of their visit to People's China and the USSR in their book, *The Brave New World*.

But as Hsu Tan Lu, Sub-director of the Chinese Classical Theater, told us in Montreal, "These arbitrary measures will go. Interchange is necessary and natural in the world today. If we cannot interchange completely, we will do what we can. From our performance you can see whether we are living a happy, abundant, progressive life. Eventually even your government will see the light. We do not despair."

Henry, Anita, Scott and I were only some of the Americans who traveled hundreds of miles from the eastern seacoast to see these fascinating performances. The half-dozen or more friends and acquaintances we saw and spoke to in our section of the vast audience were well aware of the worth of their trip, and applauded the prodigious and explosive acrobatic leapers and tumblers, and the delicate and subtle singers and dancers, as enthusiastically as the Canadians.

We met some of the 90-member team in a private (Chinese) home in Montreal before the performances, and also back-stage after the shows. A simpler, more dignified, sweeter, more human group of people it would be hard to find in the acting or any other field. They told us that they are only one of the 16 opera groups doing Peking Opera; that there are 3,500 drama and theater groups in all of China (singing and dancing groups not included); 34 theater schools or drama institutes, and 7 conservatories for musi-

cians. Four Peking Opera groups have been busy on the road this year—one to East Europe, one to Africa, and one to the Far East,—with this particular team visiting Cuba as well as Canada.

When the Peking Opera group was in Paris, the critics wrote: "We have just been to the most exciting production! Quick, quick, buy your tickets, for it is something you will see only once in a lifetime! These Chinese actors bring theater to its highest formula and perfection." "People said to us: you must go. Well, it is true. This spectacle, at least two centuries old, is the newest of the new this season." "For a century people in the West have had to dream of Chinese theater. Now we are ravished by seeing it. The spectacle is fascinating for the eye as for the ear. One wishes this ensemble could stay a whole year."

Our host in Montreal, who had never before been exposed to Chinese theater, was so enthralled after

the first few numbers on the program that he said to us, "I could go every night." We *did* go every night when we were in Peking, and never had enough of it.

Here is the way the *Montreal Star* opened its review of the first night of the Peking Opera in their city: "If there was any propaganda in the performance of the Chinese Classical Theater last night in the St. Denis Theater it was entirely lost on me. I was too carried away in transports of admiration for the brilliant exposition of a theatrical art that is almost as old as China. These 'operas'—which are prime dramas with occasional dialogue—are as far above politics as the Bolshoy's performance of 'Swan Lake'."

When, oh, when, will United States authorities pull their heads out of the sand and know there is a whole glowing world about them with infinite possibilities of cooperation, coexistence, friendship and delight?

FOR THE SPECIAL ATTENTION OF YOUNG PEOPLE

AMERICAN YOUTH can establish personal contact, correspond or exchange publications with Soviet youth, by writing to the Committee of Youth Organizations or the USSR Student Council at 10 Kropotkin Street, Moscow, USSR.

To help foreign youth wishing to visit the USSR, an international Youth Travel Bureau has been set up at the Committee of Youth Organizations of the USSR which organizes tours to the USSR. The bureau's address is: 5 Spiridonovskiy Pereulok, Moscow, USSR.

At present the International Youth Touring Bureau under the Committee of Youth Organizations of the USSR and the U.S. Student Travel Council have an agreement on reciprocal tours of groups of Soviet and American youth in 1960. Young Americans who want to visit the USSR can write to the U.S. Student Travel Council. Address: 179 Broadway, New York 7, N. Y.

Information on the life of Soviet young people and their international contacts with American youth can be found in the following Soviet publications in the English language: *USSR Illustrated Monthly*, 1706 18th St., N. W., Washington, D. C.; the magazines *Soviet Union*, *Soviet Woman*, *New Times*, *Culture and Life*, and the newspaper *Moscow News*.

In addition, the Committee of Youth Organizations of the USSR issues an Information Bulletin in English on the life of Soviet young people and their international contacts. The bulletins may be obtained from the Committee in Moscow.

Soviet TV Today and Tomorrow

by N. PSURTSEV

Minister of Communications of the USSR

An Izvestia reader, N. Novoselov, recently wrote to the paper asking why Soviet TV did not give any telecasts from the XVII Olympic Games, although a number of European countries did so. What in general are the prospects of Soviet television? The letter was forwarded to the USSR Minister of Communications, N. Psurtsev. Here is his reply.

TELEVISION is developing at an exceedingly rapid pace in our country. Suffice it to say that by July 1, 1960 there were 27,000 TV sets in the Kiev Region alone (excluding the capital of the Ukraine). In the Tula Region there were approximately 36,000 and in the whole country more than 4 million sets. Ten years ago, in 1950, the Soviet Union had only 15,000 TV sets. At that time there were only two TV stations in Moscow and Leningrad. Now there are 94 big TV stations and about 160 re-broadcasting stations. During the first year and a half of the seven-year plan period, 29 TV stations and more than 70 re-broadcasting stations have been put into operation. TV broadcasting now embraces a territory populated by roughly 75 million.

TV broadcasts are now viewed by metallurgical workers in Komsomolsk-on-Amur and the cotton-growers of Ferghana, the oil workers of Azerbaidzhan and the population of the young polar towns of Vorkuta and Norilsk. Soon TV will also be organized in Kamchatka, Daghestan, the Pamirs and many other parts

of our country. All in all during the seven-year plan period some 100 new TV and several hundred re-broadcasting stations are to go up.

At the same time the technical means of TV broadcasting are being improved still further. The Soviet people want TV programs to be more diversified, more interesting, and with greater substance. They want to see not only films and theatrical productions but programs dealing with major events in the country's political and cultural life. They want a direct exchange of programs with different cities. The present standards of telecasting techniques make this quite feasible and the idea is already being successfully implemented. However, this is not as simple as it might seem. Ultra-short radio waves which are used for TV broadcasting, in contrast to long, medium and short waves, reach only within the range of optical visibility, that is roughly over a distance of 50-70 km. Therefore, in order to make possible transmission of TV programs over great distances radio relay and co-axial communication cable lines are being built.

The radio relay line consists of a chain of ultra-short wave radio stations each of which is equipped with receiving and transmitting apparatus. The signal of the primary radio station is received at the next intermediary point where it is intensified and transmitted farther as in a

relay. In order to reduce energy drops to the minimum, special strictly directed antennae are used to transmit and receive these radio signals.

The modern co-axial cable line is also a rather complicated technical installation. Here, for instance, is what the Moscow-Kiev line is like, which is used for the regular exchange of TV programs. A cable of special design ensuring good-quality transmission and minimum drops of the super-high frequency electric energy was laid over a distance of about 1,000 km. In laying the cable dozens of rivers, roads and railways as well as swamps had to be negotiated. Thousands of coupling joints had to be installed. Special work was done to protect the lead envelope and steel shield of the cable from soil, chemical and electrical corrosion.

More than 100 amplifying stations were built along the line mainly with remote electric feed for the electronic amplifiers and the telecontrol and telesignalization devices. The line is equipped with Soviet-made apparatus.

This line can be used to transmit two TV programs simultaneously. This means that at one and the same time Muscovites can view Kiev television programs and people in Kiev can watch Moscow programs. Work is now under way to join to this line the TV stations and re-broadcasting stations of certain towns lying along the route. When these operations are completed, hundreds of thousands of more people will be able to watch and listen to telecasts from Moscow and Kiev. In the future this line can be used to transmit color TV.

It must be added that when work is completed to equip this line with multi-channel high-frequency apparatus between Moscow and Kiev some 2,000 interurban telephone circuits will be put into operation. In the future this will make it possible to introduce an automatic system enabling Muscovites or Kievites having telephones at home to dial the numbers of telephones in Kiev or Moscow directly.

At the present time the programs of Moscow's Central TV studio are transmitted by radio relay and cable lines to 22 regions of the country including Ryazan, Yaroslavl, Smolensk, Tambov, Lipetsk, Voronezh, Kharkov, Rostov, and Kiev. Early next year a regular exchange of programs will be started between the Moscow and Leningrad television centers. The further development of radio relay and cable lines is to result in the establishment of a single, countrywide TV network. But it should be borne in mind that this job is much more complicated and difficult for the Soviet Union, whose territory covers one-sixth of the world, than for many other countries.

By the end of the seven-year plan period Moscow will have TV communications with the capitals of almost all the Union Republics and with many other cultural and industrial centers of our country. Baku, Kishniev, Zaporozhye, Izhevsk, Kuibyshev, Kazan, Lvov, Gomel, Nikolayev, Odessa, Penza, Saratov, Simferopol, Sochi and many other cities will be able to receive and re-broadcast Moscow's central TV programs.

The Moscow-Kiev cable line will be moved farther West so inside of two years it will be possible to ar-

range a regular exchange of TV programs with the capitals of many European countries, in particular with Warsaw, Prague, Berlin, Bucharest, Budapest and Sofia. Practically this signifies a possibility of switching in the Soviet Union's TV broadcasting network to the European system of television. And then, Comrade Novoselov, and millions of others will be able to see not only sports on their screens but many other European TV programs as well.

Construction of local radio relay lines is being expanded on an increasing scale. This creates the conditions which will make it possible to incorporate other TV and re-broadcasting centers with the television network within a few years.

Radio relay lines are also being set up for the exchange of TV programs between the capitals of the Union Republics. In 1961 this possibility will be acquired by TV centers in Tashkent, Alma-Ata and Frunze, and in 1962 by Yerevan, Tbilisi and Baku.

A powerful TV station is being built in Moscow in the vicinity of Ostankino with a reinforced concrete aerial tower more than 500 meters high. This unique engineering installation which is to become a landmark in our capital, will be completed within the next three years. Then the radius of direct

reception of transmissions from the central TV studio will be roughly doubled to 120 km. Moscow will be able to do away with the crude outdoor aerials and replace them by convenient room aerials.

A word must also be said about prospects for the development of color TV. Moscow and Leningrad have started experimental color TV transmissions. But before permanent programs are telecast many complicated problems have to be solved. To begin with it will be necessary to produce an inexpensive receiver suitable for mass production. So far receivers of this kind do not exist either here or abroad, but there can be no doubt that they will be made in the near future.

TV plans an increasingly prominent role in various spheres of science and engineering. The entire world has heard how the Soviet Union's cosmic rocket carrying the automatic interplanetary station circled the Moon and photographed its invisible side. The image produced was transmitted back to Earth by TV methods over a distance of 470,000 km. And last August TV transmissions were regularly received from the Soviet spaceship, helping scientists observe the state and behavior of the experimental animals in the cabin.

(From *Izvestia*,
September 29, 1960)

CORRECTION

IN THE ARTICLE on Social Security in the USSR in our October issue there was a typographical error in the section dealing with incomes for partially disabled workers. The sentence on page 41 should read: "The partially disabled average worker then is assured of a minimum income of 220 rubles a month, if he does not work at all, and can receive as much as 800 rubles, if he works part-time." Due to the error, 800 rubles appeared as 80.

KHRUSHCHEV AT THE UN

(Continued from page 10)

Union on this life or death issue.

Our concern must be with our own government's attitude. The conclusion is inescapable that our government *does not really want disarmament*, and has no intention whatever of giving up its militarist policies, which have been constantly intensified all during this period.

While Premier Khrushchev has strongly stood out for the position that war is not inevitable, that measures can be taken to avoid it, our government seems to be taking the position of the minority within the socialist camp who, it is claimed, believe that war is inevitable as long as imperialism exists! We have made not a single move toward real disarmament—only toward control over armaments. The whole justification by the Administration of the U-2 is based on a war policy. Both presidential candidates base themselves on a policy of building up U.S. armed might and continued cold war. Secretary Herter has under study a plan to strengthen NATO on the premise that its military forces will be needed for at least ten more years. Also under consideration is a plan to make NATO, in which West German armed forces and officers predominate, the fourth atomic power. This idea is endorsed by U.S. Gen. Lauris Norstad, Supreme Commander of NATO in Europe.

Rearming and remilitarization of Japan and West Germany are bastions of U.S. foreign policy. U.S. intervention seeks to prevent Laos from following a neutral course.

The Pentagon and AEC continue

to press for the resumption of nuclear weapons tests, which the Administration has declared it is ready to do.

Even as this is being written (October 17) the *New York Herald Tribune* tells us of a special report just issued by the Fund for the Republic which declares that disarmament is being blocked by a "military elite" emerging in the United States dedicated to "a position of perpetual hostility to the Soviet Union" and wielding "enormous political as well as military power." The report speaks of the "very high probability of war" touched off by "unidentified submarines," with 60,000,000 Americans killed in the first attack. It holds out the pleasant prospect that the only way for Americans to avoid extinction is by planning to spend most of the rest of our lives underground, and getting accustomed to live in deeper and deeper holes.

When Khrushchev in the disarmament discussion pointed out the horrible possibility of a global war if some agreement on disarmament were not reached, he was not *threatening* war, as some of our press put it—he was *warning* humanity of what could happen if the nations continue the arms race.

We had better heed that warning, and put disarmament in the first place in all our actions for peace. We can thank Premier Khrushchev for having raised the issue so sharply. His was the victory in taking this stand, no matter what the votes on the procedural issue of where and how it would be discussed; and it is up to the people of our country to see that this becomes a victory for

us all. We may draw some hope that the disarmament resolution introduced October 14 by the United States, Britain and Italy, noting the need for measures toward general and complete disarmament, will help in leading toward new negotiations.

On Colonialism

It was natural that next to the universal issue of disarmament, the question of colonialism should have had first place in an Assembly in which 16 newly independent African states (and Cyprus) were admitted, bringing the African UN membership up to 27 nations—more than a quarter of the membership.

The impact on these and the Asian nations of Mr. Khrushchev's powerful plea that all forms of colonialism should be ended forever was tremendous. The draft resolution introduced by Premier Khrushchev provided "That all colonial countries, trusteeship territories and other non-self-governing territories be granted immediately complete independence and freedom in the building up of their own national states in conformity with the freely expressed will and desire of their peoples" and "that all strongholds of colonialism in the shape of possessions and leasehold areas on the territories of other states be likewise eliminated."

Premier Khrushchev urged that the question of ending colonialism, like that of disarmament, be taken up at once in full Assembly session. The United States opposed this until one after another the African delegates took the floor in support of the Soviet position. Seeing the tide turning overwhelmingly against them, the U.S. backed down. The

vote in favor of the Soviet proposal was unanimous, a significant victory.

The question of the Congo loomed large in the session. It is important to note that a large number of delegates joined the USSR in urging full support of the government of Premier Patrice Lumumba, for admission of his delegation rather than the rival one, and in criticism of the way in which the UN had handled the situation, including Nkrumah, Touré, Nasser, Nehru, Sukarno, Castro, Tito and others as well as the leaders of the socialist countries. We wish that space permitted our quoting from the statesmanlike addresses given by many of the newly independent African nations, and leaders of Asian and neutralist delegations.

On Reorganizing the Secretariat

This question was closely linked to that of colonialism, since Secretary General Hammarskjöld's actions in the Congo pointed up so clearly a Western orientation, and lack of representation of the viewpoints of the socialist and neutralist nations in the Secretariat. Premier Khrushchev brought the matter up sharply in his opening speech, asking that the one Secretary General, in whose hands alone are UN policies between sessions of the Assembly and the Security Council, be replaced by a triumvirate, with one secretary for each of the main UN blocs. This proposal, in one form or another, won much wider support than was apparent from press comments, and emphasis on the opposition to it. More and more delegates are becoming aware that the great change that has taken place in the composition of the UN since its inception requires some sort of reorganization

if the world body is to be truly representative of all its membership.

President Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana strongly criticized UN actions in the Congo. He said the imperialists had prevented reconciliation between Lumumba and Kasavubu which might have saved the situation. He proposed a complete change in the UN Command and Administration in the Congo, to be composed of Africans only, to give complete support to the Central Government of Lumumba and uphold the unity of the Congo. He proposed the appointment of three deputy Secretaries generally acceptable to the Western and Eastern blocs and the neutralist countries, not as mere assistants but with clearly defined authority.

President Sukarno of Indonesia called for a revision of the UN and its Security Council that would bring it more in conformity with the realities of the world today, since the Western allies are still preponderant in the UN, but not in the world, and urged the moving of UN headquarters from its present seat in the United States which had brought the cold war into its proceedings. (A number of African delegates, exposed to racial discrimination here, and others, also took this stand.)

Premier Nehru of India, while opposing any move that would mean amendment of the UN charter, spoke of the need for ultimate revision of the UN, and proposed that the Secretary General appoint a group of senior political advisers from different areas. (Khrushchev said he preferred his own proposal, but would consider this.)

President Tito of Yugoslavia criticized UN actions in the Congo and

said some changes would have to take place in the world body's structure.

President Sekou Touré of Guinea, denouncing colonialist actions and supporting Lumumba, also proposed three deputy Secretaries General each "responsible for the geographical zone which recommended him."

It might be added that Republican commentator Walter Lippmann, while upholding Hammarskjöld, declared that the composition of the Security Council with the abuse of its bloc voting, is completely out of date. He wrote on October 6:

The uproar in the General Assembly, which evoked more sympathy than they found it useful or expedient to acknowledge, should be treated as an alarm bell. It should warn us that the old American hegemony, of which Mr. Lodge loves to boast, is about over. The time is now at hand when a statesmanlike reform of the UN will be imperative.

On the Admission of China

This year Khrushchev led the fight for the admission of the People's Republic of China, led in recent years by India, which still strongly supports it in spite of the current border conflict.

The debate was on the U.S. resolution asking the UN to reject the Soviet proposal to include the question of China's representation on the UN agenda, and postpone the whole question for another year. Answering U.S. charges of Peking's aggressive actions, Mr. Khrushchev noted the Chinese People's Republic's sponsoring of the five principles of peaceful coexistence in 1954, its contributions to peaceful settlements in Indochina, Korea and other Asian areas. He quoted Premier Chou En-lai's statement of August 1, 1960 re-emphasizing the Chinese policy of peaceful coexistence among all na-

tions, in which Mr. Chou declared:

We are in favor of a peaceful non-aggression pact between the Asian countries and the countries of the Pacific, including the USA, so that this entire area should become a zone free from nuclear weapons.

Mr. Khrushchev spoke of the extraordinary reserve the Chinese Government was exerting with regard to their island of Taiwan, now occupied by Chiang Kai-shek, with the aid of American military forces. This, he said, was a matter for the Chinese people and the Chinese Government, in which he had no wish to interfere. He made a strong point of the fact that there could not be any disarmament without China, no normal work of the United Nations without China.

In this losing game, the U.S. carried its resolution 42 to 34, with 22 abstentions. Last year the vote was 44 to 29, with 9 abstentions. The gap is narrowing. The U.S. lost five votes this year, and hardly anyone thinks it can win next year. The general view is that there will be a majority for the admission of the real China in the next Assembly, with the help of the new African members which abstained this year, but probably will not again.

On Improving US-USSR Relations

Despite sharp U.S. and Soviet exchanges in the UN, Premier Khrushchev took every opportunity to stress the need for the improvement of American-Soviet relations.

In his arrival statement, September 19, urging peace and disarmament, he recalled his warm feelings from meetings with the American people on his trip last year and expressed his conviction that the situa-

tion would improve, and "warm, friendly relations between our great countries will come about." He reiterated these sentiments on his departure, saying that he had never doubted the friendly feelings and striving toward peace of the American people. He brought them into all the warm and witty impromptu "balcony" and sidewalk conferences with the American press, with whom he talked freely.

The plea for good relations came again at the luncheon tendered to Mr. Khrushchev by Cyrus S. Eaton on September 26, attended by representatives of business and public circles of the United States and Canada. In his speech, answering the warm welcoming address of Mr. Eaton, Mr. Khrushchev again outlined the Soviet disarmament program, emphasizing that there must be strict international control, saying that "As a statesman and as a human being I can tell you that this is one of the major goals of my life and of the work of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and of the Soviet Government." In view of difficulties encountered in East-West disarmament negotiations he proposed as an experiment that businessmen, journalists, lawyers, scientists and others from all countries meet and help the governments come to an agreement on disarmament.

Agreeing with Mr. Eaton's remarks on the importance of improving relations between our two countries, Khrushchev noted that trade without discrimination between the two countries would foster peaceful relations between the two countries. He proposed that there should be peaceful competition "in who will produce more and cheaper steel, oil, ter

arm, bread, coal; who will build more great houses, schools, scientific and cultural institutions so that people may become more prosperous, better off materially and spiritually."

Mr. Khrushchev let it be known that he was willing to hold a meeting with President Eisenhower while here. At a reception at the Czechoslovak delegation (September 27) he said he was ready to sit with President Eisenhower in a locked room as long as necessary to achieve agreement on disarmament. Referring to an American Indian peace pipe which had been presented to him, he said he was all prepared to give the traditional signal of white smoke by which the Cardinals, from *their* locked chamber, announced that a decision had been reached when they met to choose a new Pope.

On the "Open End" program on October 10, Mr. Khrushchev made the categorical declaration that "the Soviet Union will never start a war." Bombarded by Mr. David Susskind with an extraordinary series of loaded questions, all prefaced by long propaganda speeches attacking Soviet policies, Mr. Khrushchev exhibited a warm and cordial attitude. He maintained his equilibrium even when a note informed him that the breaks for commercials were being used for anti-Soviet propaganda. Deciding the program should be broken off, Mr. Khrushchev made a good-night statement declaring that his main reason for coming to this country was to promote "the peace and friendship which the Soviet people and government want above all else" and urged his listeners to do their utmost to bring about better relations between our countries.

The shocking use of the interludes for viciously hostile commercials directed against the USSR and the socialist countries by Radio Free Europe, brought in such a storm of protests that WNTA-TV subsequently publicly apologized, and Mr. Susskind tendered his personal apologies through Soviet Ambassador Menshikov.

To all possibilities for a meeting, to all friendly overtures, President Eisenhower turned a deaf ear, unwilling to admit any degree of regret for the U-2 incident, but making his own conditions that the pilots of the RB-47 plane must be freed. Nor did the intercession of a number of neutralist leaders who called for an Eisenhower-Khrushchev meeting in the interest of promoting better U.S.-USSR relations and improving the world situation move him.

Mr. Eisenhower immediately rejected the proposition. Mr. Khrushchev, while indicating that he felt the opposition of the United States did not augur well for such negotiations, and that nothing much could be accomplished during the election campaign, left the door open for them.

When the leaders of India, Indonesia, Ghana, Yugoslavia and the U.A.R. introduced their draft resolution for such a meeting in the Assembly, U.S. opposition and maneuvering resulted in its watering down by the omission of the names of Eisenhower and Khrushchev, leaving a vague suggestion for resumption of contacts (which have never been broken off). Nehru then angrily withdrew the resolution. Newspaper accounts reported that the United States "won a costly victory," alienat-

ing many African and Asian delegates who supported the original proposal.

But neutralist and world concern over American-Soviet relations as the key to world peace cannot be downed. On October 17, the General Assembly unanimously approved 91 to 0, a resolution sponsored by 28 nations, mainly of Asia, Africa and Latin America, urging all nations to refrain from actions likely to aggravate international tensions and also "immediate and constructive steps in regard to the urgent problems of the peace of the world and the advancement of its people." (Both the U.S. and its allies and the socialist bloc joined in voting for it. The missing votes were absentees, not abstentions.) The resolution was offered by India's delegate, V. K. Krishna Menon, in the closing address of the general debate. Though couched in general terms, it represented according to the *New York*

Times, "a renewed effort by non-committed states, and principally India, to express concern over worsening relations between the United States and the Soviet Union."

This resolution, we believe, applies to all of us, to all the peoples of the world, as well as of the United Nations membership.

Thus the great positive results of Khrushchev's visit here were to focus attention on this question, as well as colonialism, disarmament and peace and to open the way to a new Summit conference.

Let our efforts, on this 17th anniversary of American-Soviet relations, once again be directed to carrying out the wish of President Roosevelt in establishing diplomatic ties, and returning to a course in which these relations "may forever remain normal and friendly, and that our nations henceforth may cooperate for their mutual benefit and for the peace of the world."

"Plan of Action" in the Congo

THE *Wall Street Journal* published some stark facts about Western and UN action in the Congo in two stories by John R. Gibson, August 30 and September 29.

The first story said the UN would have to take "drastic steps, perhaps of doubtful legality" in order to keep control of the Congo's "uranium, diamonds and other raw material riches which have hitherto been helping support the military and industrial might of the West." And that Dag Hammarskjöld was "in constant consultation with the U.S. State Department and other nations trying to work out a plan of action."

The "plan," it is made evident, was to get rid of Lumumba and the Commu-

nists. It would involve maneuvers to create a situation where the UN would have stronger legal ground for declaring that Mr. Lumumba "is no longer head of the nation," dealing instead with "the weak-willed President Kasavubu and other politicians" and asserting its armed power. The writer complains that the UN is "hobbled" in its policies by the number of nations involved and the participation of Communist nations in its deliberations. Fear is expressed that if the demand of Katanga chieftain, Moïse Tshombe, for a loose federation goes down the drain "it will be a major defeat for the West," since only such a loose federation "could preserve Katanga's copper and other minerals for the Free World" (not, be it

noted, for the Congolese). A fearsome picture is painted of what would happen if the Reds had their way in upholding a centralized government.

The second article chortles over the success of "U.S. and UN maneuvering," on the basis that "what's legal is often what you can get away with." Mr. Gibson writes "The State Department began needling Mr. Hammarskjold for action and took steps on its own." In their efforts to get the Russians out, U.S. diplomats sent around "full reports on Communist subversion," and "State Department officials kept in constant touch with Mr. Hammarskjold as well as African diplomats." "The scheme's key-stone was disarmament of part of the *Force Publique* loyal to Lumumba, thereby depriving the Leftist premier of the muscle to maintain his grip on the country." African resistance forced diplomats to wait for a legal excuse. Then:

Suddenly that semblance of legality appeared in the form of Congolese President Kasavubu. After weeks of inactivity, something induced him to fire Premier Lumumba on Labor Day and ask the UN

to mollify things. Almost immediately the UN swung into action. Its troops silenced Radio Leopoldville, blocking the persuasive Mr. Lumumba from rallying followers outside the capital, and the UN took over the Congo's airports. . . .

Only a few days later, Force Publique leaders ordered a cease-fire in Lumumba's civil war against secessionist Katanga province. *It just happened that all this occurred the same day the UN paid the troops for the first time in weeks.* (Italics added.)

By ordering these decisive moves, Mr. Hammarskjold gambled he could get away with liberally stretching his powers. Helping him cash in on this risk, U.S. diplomats and other Western officials discreetly argued the Secretary General's case: Ambassadors called on foreign offices abroad, State Department aides in Washington maintained contacts with embassies there and diplomats here persuaded other diplomats. Influential diplomats from Ethiopia and Tunisia were among those who figured in the talks.

Thus the *Wall Street Journal* on UN "neutrality" in the Congo. It ought to know what it's talking about, since it represents U.S. interests which have a big stake in the Congo's riches.

"WE BELIEVE IN LIFE . . . AND PEACE ON EARTH"

"WE ALL LIVE ON ONE PLANET and, therefore, must seek ways to normalize relations between all states, to establish equal cooperation. It is the United Nations that must become the forum, the place where such cooperation in the interests of the maintenance of peace should be practiced on the largest possible scale and in the most equitable manner.

"When the Soviet Government raised, for example, the question of reorganizing the Secretariat General, this only bespeaks our concern in the necessity of the normal functioning of the United Nations in such a way as to reflect the interests of the peoples of all countries and not the interests of one group of countries or even certain sections . . .

"We are ready to do our best for peace to prevail on earth, and not only peace, but friendship among nations. The Soviet Government will go on working honestly in this direction, like a sower who works so that man may have a good harvest. . . . We believe that if some of our seeds will fall on stony ground, not all of them will perish, because these are sound seeds, the seeds of human truth, and they are sown in the name of truth and the life of man.

"We are convinced that these seeds will grow, will reach the life-giving soil, and a strong, powerful tree of life will grow. We believe in life, and are fighting for life, for the triumph of peace on earth."

Khrushchev at the UN, October 3

FACTS AND FIGURES

The following reviews are of books that mark a healthy change from those studies, so characteristic of the past fifteen years of the Cold War, which purported to "interpret" the Soviet Union. For the most part these books give useful facts and figures and thus serve the purpose of helping communication between our two countries.
—M. Y.

U.S.-SOVIET TRADE

U.S.—Soviet Trade, Facts for the Businessman's Appraisal. Trade Research Associates. Box 5616, Cleveland, Ohio. 1960. 230 pages. \$18.50.

THIS is a report prepared by eight graduate students at the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration. In their foreword the authors state: "Our objectives are to provide the American Business Community with a factual description of (1) the Soviet business structure; (2) U.S.—Soviet trade relations: past, present and future; (3) existing trade procedures and practices, and (4) recent trade experiences."

The book is divided into four sections accordingly. The first section deals with all aspects of Soviet business structure, beginning with a description of the geography of the USSR, planning, finance, internal and external trade, a comparative analysis of U.S. and Soviet business, and legal aspects of U.S.—Soviet trade.

The second sections deals with U.S.—Soviet trade in the past, with the present situation, and with the prospect of trade between the two countries in the future.

Section three is concerned with the actual procedures of exporting goods to or importing goods from the Soviet Union, taking up in detail U.S. regu-

lations on trade with the USSR, contracts, methods of trade, etc.

The final section gives the experience of some American business men who in the recent past have established trade relationships with the Soviet Union. The cases given are those of Robert Castle of Herkimer, N.Y., exclusive distributor of the Soviet automobile "Moskvich" in this country; the Ealing Corporation, importers of Soviet Scientific educational apparatus; and Romain Fielding and Associates of Los Angeles, exporters of commercial laundry equipment to the Soviet Union.

There are also useful maps, charts, graphs, throughout the book, as well as much useful material in the way of data and statistics.

Invaluable for anyone interested in U.S.—Soviet trade, the report throws revealing light on a crucial area of American-Soviet relations.

SOVIET ECONOMY

Economic Atlas of the Soviet Union, by George Kish. University of Michigan Press. 1960. 96 pages. \$10.00.

THE MAPS which make up this handsomely presented atlas give a graphic picture of the economic structure of the USSR.

Five general maps give the physical features of the country, the various vegetation zones, the administrative divisions, air transportation and population distribution.

Sixty regional maps are divided into groups of four, each group devoted to one of the fifteen main economic regions, covering agriculture (crop combinations, stock raising, forests, food-processing centers), minerals (major deposits, pipelines, refineries), industrial location

(major and minor branches of production), transportation and cities (railroads, population, administrative boundaries).

The text is minimal and confines itself strictly to the facts available to the author.

This is an informative and useful book.

SOVIET LIBRARIES

Libraries and Bibliographic Centers in the Soviet Union, by Paul L. Horecky. Indiana University Press. 1959. 287 pages. \$3.00.

THIS STUDY provides an immense amount of information about the libraries and bibliographical institutions in the Soviet Union, presenting in detail Soviet methods of classification and cataloguing, the training of librarians, information about the legal deposit copy

system and the organs of bibliographic registration, the description of library buildings and equipment, with detailed description of the State Lenin Library in Moscow, the Saltykov-Shchedrin State Library in Leningrad, as well as various science and technical libraries and other special libraries in the country.

The second half of the book is especially useful with its statistical charts, presentation of specific library rules and regulations, bibliography and directory of the principal Soviet libraries, bibliographic centers and library schools.

Unfortunately the author has not been content to amass this invaluable material; he has felt it necessary to "interpret" the political aspects of the Soviet library system for the reader. Happily the wealth of his impressive factual information so outweighs his "interpretation" that no very serious harm is done to an otherwise useful book.

STATEMENT REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AS AMENDED BY THE ACTS OF MARCH 3, 1933, AND JULY 2, 1946 (Title 39, United States Code, Section 233) SHOWING THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, AND CIRCULATION OF NEW WORLD REVIEW published monthly at New York, N. Y., for October 1, 1960.

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

2. The owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding 1 per cent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a partnership or other unincorporated firm, its name and address, as well as that of each individual member, must be given.) N.W.R. Publications, Inc., 34 West 15th Street, New York 11, N. Y.
Frederick V. Field, Calle de Londres 7-201, Mexico 6 D. F., Mexico.

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

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

5. The average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the 12 months preceding the date shown above was: (This information is required by the act of June 11, 1960 to be included in all statements regardless of frequency of issue)—6500.

(Signed) JESSICA SMITH

Editor

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 21st day of September, 1960.

(Seal) IRVING MENDELL

(My commission expires March 30, 1961.)

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 _____

From the Top of the World—

—come these first-hand accounts of
Tibet, its people and their problems
by a woman who was there—

WHEN SERFS STOOD UP IN TIBET
1960 - - - \$2.00

TIBETAN INTERVIEWS. 1959 - \$1.50
By Anna Louise Strong

Order from your local bookstore, or from:

CHINA BOOKS & PERIODICALS
334 W. Schiller St., Chicago 10, Ill.

Please send payment with orders. Prices include
postage and handling.

*Write for our free Catalogue of Books in English
Imported from the People's Republic of China.*

BOUND VOLUMES NEW WORLD REVIEW

1949 to 1958

\$2.00 per volume

(State clearly the
year, or years, wanted)

Order Through

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

NEW SOVIET FILMS

Mussorgsky's Opera:
KHOVANSCHINA

IN THE LAND OF THE SOVIET

EUGENE ONEGIN

LILEIA (a new ballet)

JOURNEY BEYOND THREE SEAS

THE CAPTAIN'S DAUGHTER

THE HOUSE I LIVE IN

THE FLYING CARPET

Artkino Pictures, Inc.

723 SEVENTH AVE., NEW YORK 19

Telephone: Circle 5-6570