

OCTOBER, 1961

25¢

New World

REVIEW

NEGOTIATE FOR PEACE AND WORLD DISARMAMENT!

The German Crisis

GORDON SCHAFFER

Soviet Youth Speaks Out

JESSICA SMITH

Education in Czechoslovakia

ELEANOR WHEELER

Jewish Culture in the USSR

CHAIM SULLER

CHUKHRAI ON "A CLEAR SKY"

NEW WORLD REVIEW

OCTOBER 1961

Negotiate for Peace and World Disarmament	3
"How Like A God!" Murray Young	12
The Lessons of History—Back- ground of the German Crisis Gordon Schaffer	14
Facts and Opinions About Berlin Hugh B. Hester	25
The Soviet-American Institute	27
Mind And/Or Matter Archie Johnstone	28
How Czechoslovakia Educates the Very Young Eleanor Wheeler	31
Youth Has Its Say Jessica Smith	34
"Of Love, of Fidelity, of Truth" Jessica Smith	43

REVIEWS

<i>The Strategy of Revenge</i> —Ernst Henri	Murray Young 46
--	-----------------

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

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

Vol. 29, No. 10, October, 1961. 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

As we have turned to you, our faith-
ful and patient readers, many times in
the past, so we must again turn most
urgently to you for financial help.

Grave are the days through which
we are living, somber are the dark
clouds that loom menacingly between
man and the shining future that gleams
so hopefully beyond this difficult pres-
ent.

Clarity, truth, understanding be-
tween the world's people must, in this
great crisis, prevail.

New World Review has been uncon-
promising in its efforts to bring clar-
ity and truth to its readers, to keep
open the vibrant ties of friendship
and understanding.

We know that you will agree that
today more than ever our continued
publication is essential. But to con-
tinue we must have your help.

Once again—and we are aware that
neither your funds nor your patience
are inexhaustible—won't you send us
whatever you can spare so that we may
continue to bring you *New World Re-
view* regularly each month through
this crucial period?

Using the form below, please send
in your contribution as soon as pos-
sible.

Please Fill Out and Mail Today

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

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

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

Name

Street

City one State

Negotiate for Peace And World Disarmament!

WE SHARE THE sorrow of peace-loving people everywhere, including the Soviet leaders themselves, that the Soviet Government felt impelled by the intensifying war danger to resume the testing of nuclear weapons. We deplore that our own Government, which is known to have been long preparing such a step, has now announced its intention of carrying out underground tests, not excluding tests in the atmosphere as well.

With all who are concerned for peace, we continue to press for the ending of all tests of nuclear weapons by all nations, for destruction of all stockpiles and a ban on further manufacture, for an end to all military preparations, and above all for an international agreement on total disarmament.

At the same time, we must increase our demands for constructive negotiations to insure a peaceful solution of the problem of Berlin and Germany.

We can be heartened in our efforts by the latest developments. As we go to press, Secretary of State Rusk and Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko are conferring in preliminary discussions which we hope may result in top level negotiations on Germany.

On September 20, Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev voiced strong support of the September 10 appeal of Pope John calling on the leaders of East and West to negotiate their

differences and remove the threat of war over Berlin. On the same day a joint US-USSR statement was issued of agreement on a broad set of principles that may lead to resumption of disarmament negotiations. These were agreed in a series of talks which began in June between John J. McCloy, the President's special disarmament adviser, and Valerian A. Zorin, Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister. Both sides agreed that the goal of negotiations should be general and complete disarmament under thorough control, depending on the requirements for verification of disarmament measures as reviewed at each stage, to be implemented by a disarmament organization created within the United Nations. While the forum for future disarmament talks has not yet been agreed on, the agreement on principles is a hopeful step forward.

The Soviet Government's announcement of the resumption of tests showed the fullest realization of the dismay it would cause among circles who have based their hopes on an end of testing as a first step toward disarmament. It went to great lengths to explain its reasons, which all of us, whose hearts are heavy with this decision as they said theirs were in making it, must try to understand.

With the war propaganda machine in our country bringing out ever new incitements to hatred

against the Soviet Union and utilizing the test issue to drum up the war spirit further, we must examine fully the reasons that led the Soviet Union to take this grave step, take a new look at the increasingly militaristic policies of our own government, and muster all our strength to stop the mad race toward destruction.

The hypocrisy of the attacks on the Soviet Union from the very quarters in our country which were insisting on and indeed preparing for resumption of tests by the U.S. is clear. "There was a sigh of relief in military services of the U.S." over the Soviet announcement, declared *U.S. News and World Report*. It was openly and cynically stated that Washington was going to make the most of its propaganda advantage before making its own announcement—which was not long in coming. The appeal to Khrushchev by President Kennedy and Prime Minister Macmillan to reach agreement on banning of atmosphere tests cannot be considered as having been made seriously, since it offered nothing more than a partial ban which could solve nothing, and did not cover the other obstacles to agreement which had arisen during many months of negotiating at Geneva.

The opposition of sincere peace lovers to any further tests by any nation is something quite else, and it was to such people that the Soviet Government addressed its explanation. Our own opposition to all tests remains unchanged. At the same time, we are deeply convinced that the Soviet Union has no aggressive purposes in taking this step, and of the sincerity of Khrushchev's reply

of September 9 to Kennedy and Macmillan, which concluded:

Those who can squarely face the truth will recognize that nuclear tests can now be ended everywhere and forever only on the basis of general and complete disarmament. . . .

Let us direct the minds and energies of our peoples not to military preparations, not to fanning up the cold war, not to quests for spurious propaganda moves, but to getting down together to settle the main problem of our time—general and complete disarmament.

Let us seek seriously, in good faith, a solution of the question of a German peace treaty in order to arrest in time the sliding of states into the chaos of nuclear rocket war.

Soviet Government's Statement

In its announcement of August 31, the Soviet Government said it had taken the serious step of resuming tests because of the increasing aggressiveness of the NATO military bloc and threats by leading statesmen of the United States and its allies to unleash war if the USSR concluded a peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic. It said that the tragedy of the first months of Hitler's attack on the USSR when his military equipment was superior, was too fresh in the minds of the Soviet people for them to avoid taking serious measures to strengthen their security:

Being fully conscious of the importance and responsibility of this serious step, the Government of the Soviet Union deems it necessary to explain to the Soviet people and all mankind the meaning and significance of this decision, the sole aim of which is to do everything to prevent the catastrophe which a third world war would present to the hundreds of millions of inhabitants of our planet.

The statement warned that those preparing for a new war were only

sowi
cou
weap
of th
nals
war
wou
and
It
Gov
raise
plete
of m
repe
T
and
tion
the
ban
ple
ins
T
raise
disar
avoi
wen
ern
men
read
prop
inter
prop
me
me
the
T
viet
cont
time
ahea
Uni
ried
beir
[E
New
befo

sowing illusions in alleging that it could be fought without nuclear weapons. With the huge stockpiles of these horror weapons in the arsenals of the great powers any new war into which they were drawn would inevitably grow into a rocket and nuclear war.

It was recalled that the Soviet Government had been the first to raise its voice for general and complete disarmament, for the ending of nuclear tests, and had appealed repeatedly to the West:

To come to agreement to destroy once and for all and under strictest international control all types of armaments, to the last bomb and the last shell, to disband armies to the last soldier, to completely abolish general staffs and military institutions.

The question of control has been raised by the Western opponents of disarmament only as a pretext to avoid agreement, the statement went on, repeating that if the Western powers would accept disarmament, "The Soviet Government is ready to accept in advance any proposal of the Western Powers on international control," but no such proposals had been made:

The main thing in our day is disarmament, general and complete, and an agreement on such disarmament would cover the question of nuclear tests.

The statement recalls that the Soviet Union had been the first to discontinue tests unilaterally, and at a time when the West was already far ahead in the number of tests, the United States, in fact, having carried out its first tests on the human beings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

[Hanson Baldwin wrote in the *New York Times* September 7, that before the moratorium the United

States had tested up to 170 nuclear devices of all types, Britain more than 20, France 4. Soviet tests, including the present series, have been estimated by U.S. sources as upwards of 70.]

The USSR statement pointed out the long series of concessions it had made to reach agreement at Geneva on cessation of all tests, with the West continuing to insist that underground tests be excluded, which could only mean the continuance of tests. It also noted the West's refusal to accept the Soviet proposal of a control body led by representatives of the socialist, capitalist and neutralist states, and their insistence instead on a system which the West could command.

At Vienna, the Soviet statement continues, Premier Khrushchev proposed to President Kennedy that the only way to break the deadlock over tests was to link their discontinuance with the problem of universal disarmament. It charges that these proposals were distorted by the West, and responsible U.S. representatives answered only by unequivocal hints of U.S. preparations for an early resumption of tests. Reference is made to talk in the United States of projects for a neutron bomb, which would kill everything living, but leave material things untouched.

The Soviet Government noted that France, U.S. ally in NATO, had continued to make tests despite protests in the United Nations, (which the U.S. and Britain failed to support) and throughout the world, and repeated warnings by the USSR that it would be forced to resume tests if France did not stop. It was the French tests, it said, that,

in fact, had made the Geneva test negotiations meaningless. The USSR asks what would have been the position of the United States, Britain and other nations if Czechoslovakia or some other socialist country had been carrying out tests while other powers refrained. Would not they, too, have looked to their own security interests?

The statement declared that the Soviet Union is well aware of the harmful effects of tests on living organisms:

Therefore, every measure is being taken to minimize such effects. Yes, any experiments with nuclear weapons instill alarm in people, make their hearts ache. And if the Soviet Government has nevertheless decided to carry out nuclear tests, it was with a heavy heart. It was compelled to do this reluctantly, with regret, and only as a result of the most careful and comprehensive study of the situation. . . . The policy of the leading NATO powers—the United States, Britain, France, the German Federal Republic—and of this aggressive bloc as a whole leaves the Soviet Union no other choice.

The statement warns that the feverish military preparations of West Germany and its allies are reminiscent of the situation in Hitler Germany 20 years ago, with Adenauer and the forces behind him turning West Germany into a militarist state armed to the teeth, aiming for revenge and the revision of the frontiers established as a result of World War II.

The only response to the Soviet Union's determination to end World War II by a peace treaty which would be a protection against further encroachments of German militarism has, it continues, been the threat of a new world war. It charges that the dispatch to West Berlin of additional troops and

armaments by the United States and Britain, having no military significance, can only be considered a provocation. The USSR, in the face of all these threats was compelled to take steps "for perfecting the most effective types of weapons that can cool the hotheads in the capitals of some NATO powers." The statement then notes that the Soviet Union has created designs for a series of super-powerful nuclear bombs and rockets for their delivery similar to those used in the Gagarin and Titov flights. Addressing those in other countries "who might judge too severely" the decision to carry out tests of new types of nuclear weapons, the Soviet Government declares it has taken this step "in order to discourage the aggressor from criminal playing with fire." It continues:

Let all those who treasure peace know that they may confidently rely on the Soviet Union, on the titanic efforts it undertakes to bring the initiators of war hysteria to their senses and to stop the ever accelerating trend toward a new war.

Being invariably guided by the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence, the Soviet Union does not threaten anyone and of course does not intend to attack anyone. The Soviet Government solemnly declares that the armed forces of the USSR will never be the first to resort to arms.

The Soviet Union would be happy if the armaments race should be stopped, if the necessity of nuclear weapons tests could disappear forever and the peoples could free themselves for good from the heavy burden that they have had to shoulder ever since war became the sinister companion of human society.

Declaring that if the people of all nations had raised in time a massive outcry for the destruction of the military machines of all states, ending the danger of nuclear war,

this could have been achieved, the Soviet Government concludes with this appeal to all peoples and governments for new peace efforts:

To increase tenfold the efforts to implement practically the idea of general and complete disarmament and to eliminate forever the danger of nuclear weapons from the life of humanity. It reaffirms the readiness of the Soviet Union to sign at any time an agreement on general and complete disarmament that could put an end to nuclear weapons tests. . . .

The Soviet Government is confident that the efforts of the Soviet people in the struggle for the consolidation of international security will not be wasted and will merge with the efforts of other peoples directed toward the establishment of stable and unbreakable peace on earth, for the triumph of the ideas of peace and progress.

We believe that the Soviet explanation of its reasons for resuming tests should be taken at face value. Obviously, however, there are certain things that neither the Soviet Government nor any other government could disclose, regarding the exact state of its defenses. We would therefore like to draw attention to certain opinions from Washington, which, of course, remain in the realm of speculation.

A dispatch from Tad Szulc, (*New York Times*, September 6) said that high Administration officials believe that "one of the principal reasons for the Soviet Union's resumption of nuclear tests is Soviet development work on a defense system against intercontinental missiles," and that a test involving a nuclear warhead on a defensive rocket would be required to perfect such an anti-missile system. The following day, the *Times* military expert, Hanson Baldwin, indicated that a warhead ranging from 20 to

100 megatons, such as the Russians had mentioned, could be effective for this purpose. (Military experts have long argued that smaller weapons, which could be pinpointed on targets, would be more effective for offensive purposes, and that super-bombs make no sense except from the point of view of creating the largest possible area in which an oncoming missile from another country might be exploded.)

Soviet Peace Moves Rebuffed

We must, in all conscience, examine our own responsibility for the resumption of tests.

Let us not forget how Soviet efforts to reach accommodations with our country over Germany and other questions were blasted by the U-2 incident. Let us not forget the long months the USSR withheld any action on the German problem in the hope that the Kennedy Administration would embark on a new course in foreign policy, and the persistent efforts of the Soviet Government, on its part, to help create the proper conditions for this, through the release of the RB-47 flyers when Kennedy took office, its contributions toward a peaceful solution in Laos, the Vienna meeting, and other steps, such as continued reduction of its army, temporarily suspending demobilization only on August 30.

But instead of implementing the inaugural pledges to "begin anew the quest for peace," the Kennedy administration has carried forward and intensified the aggressive, militaristic policies of the previous administration.

We have seen the ever increasing

growth of West German militarism (see the article by Gordon Schaffer and the review of the Ernst Henri pamphlet on page 46) constantly encouraged by our own government and its NATO allies, and the creation of an intolerable war danger with the increasing certainty of nuclear arms being added to the arsenal of Hitler's heirs.

We have seen the complicity of our government in the evil aggression against Cuba, and plans for new attempts being hatched by the military.

We have seen 6.5 billion dollars being added to our military expenditures at President Kennedy's urging, building up the hugest peacetime military budget for our nation or any other nation in history. Nearly a quarter of a million new soldiers have been authorized for our army, and our national guard and reserve forces alerted and in part already called up.

We have seen the ever-mounting influence of the military and the big monopolies supporting them in government and every phase of American life.

We have heard the reckless calls for nuclear war on the part of high Administration officials if the USSR should proceed with its plans for a separate peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic, in case its offers for negotiations for such a treaty either with all the powers Germany fought in the war, or with the United States, Britain and France go unheeded.

As recently as September 7, Paul H. Nitze, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, confirmed this policy, when he told the Association of the United

States Army that we must be prepared to use nuclear weapons in Berlin—to convince the USSR of “the certain prospect that we will back our non-nuclear forces by the use of our strategic [nuclear] capabilities should that be necessary.” His threats led to the comment by Jack Raymond that his speech:

... recalled the viewpoint of the late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. This related especially to the emphasis that Western retaliation to Soviet aggression would occur in places and timing of Western, not Soviet, choosing. (*N. Y. Times*, Sept. 8)

It has long been known that U.S. Polaris submarines were being sent out from bases in Britain close to Soviet shores. On August 29 the Soviet Government protested that foreign submarines had entered Soviet territorial waters in submerged position, maneuvered there and carried out espionage operations.

We have seen the warlike preparations in other parts of the world. Documents released by Tass showing CENTO (formerly the Baghdad Pact) plans for nuclear targets in the USSR to be hit from bases in Turkey, Iran and Pakistan, received ominous confirmation when the CENTO meeting earlier this year took measures for the establishment of new military bases in these countries, and the setting up of a joint CENTO headquarters with a U.S. general in charge, although the U.S. is presumably not a member.

We must also note the frightening growth in the United States of numerous ultra-reactionary, fascist-like groups, with connections among the military, such as the John Birch society, White Citizens' Councils, the Christian Anti-Communist Cru-

sade
Gol
thei
are
Sup
the
McC
Act
out
whi
the
the
libe
let
T
in
sive
W
diti
of t
thro
man
and
cou
dear
the
arou
F
Sov
clus
It
can
Tes
dan
tion
ing
sure
mea
men
The
T
of s
ing
peo
men
USS

sade and groupings around Senator Goldwater and Richard Nixon and their Dixiecrat allies. These groups are uncurbed, while the vicious Supreme Court decision upholding the registration provisions of the McCarran Act (Subversive Control Act of 1950) opens the way for the outlawry of the Communist Party, which, it must be remembered, was the prelude in Hitler's Germany for the outlawry of all democratic and liberal organizations. We must not let this happen here.

This internal reaction goes hand in hand with a warlike, aggressive foreign policy.

We must add the attempts to condition the U.S. people to the idea of the inevitability of nuclear war, through such efforts as those of Herman Kahn, the Rand Corporation and others to show that such a war could result in a mere 50,000,000 deaths instead of 100,000,000, and the mass war hysteria drummed up around the shelter program.

From all these developments the Soviet Union has drawn grim conclusions.

It is the clear duty of the American people to reverse these trends. Tests can be stopped again, the danger of war over the Berlin situation averted, only through developing the most massive public pressure for a negotiated settlement and meaningful new efforts for disarmament.

The Unaligned Nations

The historic Belgrade conference of 25 unaligned nations, representing almost a billion of the world's people and a fourth of the UN membership, met just after the USSR began its tests. It is significant

that conference decisions did not place the onus for test resumption on the USSR, but on the whole ominous world situation. The conference adopted an appeal to the Great Powers which was presented to Premier Khrushchev in Moscow by Prime Minister Nehru of India and President Nkrumah of Ghana, and later to President Kennedy by President Sukarno of Indonesia and President Keita of Mali.

The appeal called on the two leaders for immediate steps to suspend war preparations and for renewed and continuing negotiations to avert the danger of war, and achieve total disarmament and enduring peace.

Premier Khrushchev had already expressed repeatedly his readiness for negotiations with President Kennedy in speeches and in recent interviews with Drew Pearson and Cyrus Sulzberger, in a talk with Italian Premier Fanfani, and in *A Letter to the American People* published in connection with a booklet on the *Soviet Stand on Germany* recently issued by Crosscurrents Press, which he concluded with an expression of desire for friendly US-USSR relations, and these words:

The settlement of the German issue will pave the way for more fruitful talks on the solution of the most important problem of the day, the problem of general and complete disarmament. And a solution of the disarmament problem will also mean termination of the nuclear tests which are worrying mankind. For when general and complete disarmament has been effected there will be no further need for test explosions. There will be no more troops, no arms and no fear in the world.

Following Nehru's visit, a joint communique was issued by Nehru and Khrushchev agreeing that it is

imperative that the German question be settled through negotiations and calling for "general and complete disarmament under international control."

President Kennedy indicated he was not yet prepared to enter upon summit talks, and suggested that preliminary talks might be held between Secretary Rusk and Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko. The Soviet Foreign Minister answered immediately that Gromyko would be prepared to meet with Rusk, on the assumption that both sides would display a serious attitude and "will jointly search for a solution of the problem of the conclusion of a German Peace Treaty and a settlement on its basis of the situation in West Berlin."

The Administration has been reported as considerably annoyed at the outcome of the Belgrade Conference, whose final declaration had been close to Moscow's viewpoint on Berlin, disarmament and other problems.

The declaration placed main emphasis on the need to end colonialism and imperialist domination in all forms, and to achieve world disarmament.

It called for an end to military blocs and the cold war and for peaceful coexistence as the only alternative to nuclear catastrophe. It called for the end of all colonial occupation in Asia, Africa and Latin America, the abolition of all foreign military bases on the territory of other countries including the U.S. base at Guantanamo, Cuba, a revision of the structure of the United Nations Secretariat to achieve equitable regional representation, the admission of the People's

Republic of China as the only legitimate representative of that country in the UN. It appealed to all countries concerned not to use force in settling of the problem of Germany and Berlin.

The declaration demanded that the non-aligned countries should be represented at a world disarmament conference, that general and complete disarmament be guaranteed by an effective system of inspection and control, that an agreement on prohibition of all nuclear and thermonuclear tests be concluded and the moratorium resumed.

LET US end on the hopeful note of reports from the conference on Science and World Affairs (formerly known as the Pugwash conference) which has been meeting in Stowe, Vermont. Harrison Salisbury reported in the *New York Times* that United States and Soviet scientists had joined in a multi-billion dollar international scientific research program that "they hoped would halt mankind's race toward wholesale destruction." While the scientists met as individuals, he noted that they included top-ranking advisors to both the U.S. and the Soviet Government. Salisbury further reported (September 13) that in the discussion on disarmament, which had proceeded in a relaxed atmosphere, Soviet spokesmen had advanced new and significant proposals that might lead to exploration at the government level, and that "The Americans and Russians found themselves reaching unanimous agreement on certain specific steps that each government might take toward new and useful talks on disarmament and to elimi-

nate the danger of a sudden nuclear holocaust." He declared that the American scientists had found new Soviet ideas emerging which were both practical and promising.

The final communique registered these important points of agreement in which the U.S. and Soviet scientists were joined by colleagues from ten other nations. The statement was signed by the full Soviet delegation, headed by Vice Chairman A. V. Topchiev of the Soviet Academy of Sciences. Several of the American delegates abstained.

The proposals of the conference are being submitted at once to Washington and Moscow. One of the areas in which the Soviet representatives contributed constructive concepts, it was reported, was that of disengagement and the creation of an arms-free and nuclear-free area in the heart of Europe.

Joint continuing studies were approved to be carried out by the Soviet Academy of Science and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. It was agreed in principle that one study group, to meet part of the time in Moscow and part of the time in the United States, is to make a full-time study of arms control and disarmament. The final communique, while making no direct reference to nuclear testing, reaffirmed a declaration issued by the Vienna conference of scientists in 1958, which expressed the hope that a test ban and effective control system would be approved.

We can certainly join heartily in the opinion expressed by the conferees that a most important aspect of the conference was the fact that top-ranking American and Soviet scientists were able to reach con-

structive conclusions on some of the most sensitive East-West issues in shadow of the present world crisis.

This further underlines the importance of the McCloy-Zorin agreement on the principles of disarmament, in which it was clear the Soviet side had gone far to meet U.S. views on the matter of achieving disarmament by stages rather than holding to a fixed time limit, on the question of effective controls under the UN and an international police force.

It is to be hoped that the President's move for a special U.S. Control and Disarmament Agency, which has now been passed by Congress, will result in the setting up of a group which will give serious attention to promotion of a constructive disarmament program.

A final hopeful note—the Peace Marchers, sponsored by the Committee for Non-Violent Action, which favors disarmament, abrogation of military pacts, ending nuclear tests and peace, were welcomed with open arms at the Soviet border.

The worsened international situation calls not for pessimism and despair, but for renewed efforts to eliminate its causes and to insure that there will be peaceful negotiations, not war.

There are two demands upon our government in which we believe all concerned with peace, whatever other differences may divide them, can surely join:

Negotiations, without delay, to end the danger of war over the issue of Berlin and Germany.

Immediate and urgent steps toward disarmament, and the banning of all nuclear weapons and their testing from the world.

"How Like A God!"

by MURRAY YOUNG

AT LAST—thanks to the Cultural Exchange Program—the great Kirov Ballet Company of Leningrad is visiting our country.

Opening at the Metropolitan in New York on September 11, after three weeks the company will move for a briefer stay to the huge Madison Square Garden before setting out on a cross-country tour.

All of the critics agreed that the Kirov Company had lived up to its reputation, that its style was quite different from that of the spectacular Bolshoy Company, and that its most characteristic quality was elegance, lyricism and superb control.

Leningrad was the home of most of the great Russian dancers—Pavlova, Nijinsky, Fokine, to name only a few—who had danced in the United States in the past, and from Leningrad have come most of the important teachers of dancing still working in this country. Thus the first appearance of the contemporary Soviet representatives of the famous Maryinsky (the former name of the Kirov Theater) was awaited with special eagerness.

"In last evening's audience," wrote Walter Terry in the *New York Herald Tribune*, September 12, "there were famous graduates of the old Maryinsky, child-students in the last days of the Imperial Ballet and no doubt the floods of Russian that were being bandied about by these Russian-Americans had some-

thing to say about whether the great tradition had been preserved."

Whatever may have been the opinion of the former students at the Maryinsky of how the traditions had been kept, there was no question as to how the rest of the audience took these exquisite dancers to their hearts.

Frances Herridge, writing about *Swan Lake* in the *New York Post*, September 12, clearly defined the special quality of this company: "Konstantin Sergeyev, the artistic director of the company, is obviously less interested in drama and acrobatics than in pure dancing and the dreamy enchantment of the fairy tale. But in these respects the production is a rare experience."

Louis Biancolli of the *New York World Telegram*, commenting on the same performance, noted another quality: "The word brilliant may be misleading about this troupe. There was no hint of pride of virtuosity last night, no ostentation. The appeal was quiet, unassuming and cumulative. But the technique was as sure as steel."

John Martin of the *New York Times* who had seen the Kirov company earlier this summer in both Paris and London and had sent back glowing reports of the performances he witnessed, wrote in the *New York Times*, September 15, of the first performance of *Giselle* that it was "a sheer triumph from beginning to end. It answers every ques-

tion and satisfies every dream. Everything is of a piece, and the form of the work as a whole emerges with enormous effectiveness, building consistently to ever greater dramatic and choreographic beauty."

All of the critics have made special mention of the corps de ballet (Martin has called it "one of the real stars"). Always the least applauded part of most ballet companies, frequently looked upon as merely a tedious pause between the appearances of the leading dancers, the corps de ballet of the Kirov company, superbly trained, is an integral part of the whole ensemble, supplementing, enriching, deepening the movements of the principal dancers. For many in the audience, the performance of the last act of *Swan Lake* on the opening night seemed the first time, in their many viewings of this old favorite, that they had ever beheld the ballet in all its complex, exhilarating beauty. It was as though an old painting, dimmed and stained by time, had suddenly been restored to all its pristine freshness.

THE APPEARANCE of the Kirov Ballet in our country at this moment of world tension raises urgently the question of the continuation of cultural and scientific exchanges between our two countries.

The *New York Times*, September 17, in a front page story summarizes the whole course of the exchanges that began in 1958 and says of the opening of the Kirov ballet:

It is hoped that its appearance will symbolize the United States determination to keep open the lines of communication with Soviet citizens and performers.

There is not even a contingency plan in the Administration for any disruption in the exchanges that may result from tension over Berlin and nuclear tests. . . .

The *Times* story adds that in exchange for the current tour of the Kirov Ballet Company, the United States expects the Soviets to choose from among a ballet company, a popular swing band and a symphony orchestra to tour the USSR.

Of special interest is the increase of graduate students between the two countries for the academic year 1961-2 just beginning. For the academic year, 1960-61, just completed, twenty-two American students were enrolled in Soviet universities in exchange for nineteen Soviet students in American schools. This academic year there are to be thirty-seven American students in Soviet universities and forty-seven Soviet students enrolled in institutions here.

The 600 projects and delegations exchanged between the two countries since 1958 have helped restore the necessary contact that must be continued however sharp the issues become, however ominous the whole political climate.

The applause of the American and Soviet people for each other's dancers, singers, musicians is their way of saying with Hamlet, "What a piece of work is man! How noble in reason! how infinite in faculty! in form, in moving, how express and admirable! in action how like an angel! in apprehension how like a god! the beauty of the world! the paragon of animals!"

The people of both countries have made clear that they will demand that exchanges continue and extend into every field of art and science.

The Lessons of History

Background of the German Crisis

by GORDON SCHAFFER

IN THE early stages of the Berlin crisis, Walter Lippmann gave a television interview which was seen in millions of British homes and brought a welcome touch of reality to a situation which was steadily being brought to the point of hysteria. He was asked why the Soviet Union had chosen this moment to insist on a peace treaty with Germany and he answered simply, "They are determined to act before Hitler's generals get nuclear arms."

This is the crux of the Berlin problem and of the wider problem of Germany itself. The Russians and their allies in the Warsaw Pact are convinced that when the West Germans and politicians talk about "regaining their lost territories," they mean what they say. The Russians know that such an attempt would never succeed, but it could plunge the world into nuclear war—a war in which the American bases, whether in their homeland or in the territories of their reluctant allies, would be subject to immediate attack. The question for the world is not whether two million people in West Berlin are to remain a capitalist enclave in a German state which is building socialism. That is an awkward problem, but the free city proposal is designed

to provide a way out. (If, as was proposed after the war, the Ruhr had been put under four-power control, it is doubtful if the Western powers would have accepted year after year a socialist enclave, with guaranteed rights of access by the Russians.)

The question is whether the world is to be dragged to destruction by the German militarists who twice in this century have plunged mankind into war. The terrifying fact about the present situation is that the West Germans have been even franker in their revenge propaganda than Hitler was in *Mein Kampf*. It is not only the neo-Nazi fringe in Western Germany, who talk about "regaining the lost territories"; it is members of the German Government from Adenauer downwards.

On August 12 this year, a correspondent of the *Sunday Observer* went to Luneberg (where Marshal Montgomery received the Germans' "unconditional surrender" in 1945) to meet Lt. Col. von Kleist, the Commander of the German panzer battalion to be stationed on British soil. He describes how in one of the recreation rooms, there was a large map showing West and East Germany and the territories lost after the war as "one and indivisible."

"Our hosts," wrote the *Observer* correspondent, "were genuinely sur-

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

prised and concerned when it was said politely that although the sentiments implied by the map were natural, wisdom might have dictated a less obvious appeal to irredentism." Then the correspondent added casually that "by early next year, West Germany will not only have the biggest national ground force in Europe, other than the Soviet army, but possibly the best."

On the day the first West German troops arrived in Wales, with press and television ballyhoo plugging the line that "such nice young boys cannot possibly be held responsible for the Nazi crimes," the West German Embassy in London began to distribute a booklet blatantly declaring that members of the German High Command were in no way to blame for Hitler's war and were infamously treated by the Allies after the German surrender. The booklet blames the Allies for "their stupidity in disbanding what remained of the German army, because it was obviously needed to stem further Russian advances" and quotes Dr. Adenauer for the statement: "No one must blame the professional soldiers on account of their former activity."

The *Daily Express* (Aug. 28, 1961) commenting on this latest whitewashing attempt, said, "Here is the official proof that the Germans believe they need feel no blame for the devastation and despair they caused from the moment they marched into Poland."

The corollary to the assertion that the Germans are not to blame for the last war or for the massacre of the Jews or for the murdered slave laborers or for the other hor-

rors perpetrated in every country they invaded or attacked with their air force, is that they were unjustly treated when the Sudetenland was restored to Czechoslovakia and the territories East of the Oder-Neisse line were ceded to Poland, with a small corner of East Prussia to the Soviet Union.

And that, of course, is the line of propaganda being constantly pursued throughout West Germany and by broadcasts to East Germany, where the Government of the German Democratic Republic has accepted the postwar frontiers and is doing everything possible to combat the elements who might be influenced by these appeals to aggressive German nationalism.

There was no other reason, except the belief that they would one day be able to lead the U.S.A., Britain, France and the rest of Western Europe into a war of revenge, behind the acceptance of rearmament by the West German militarists. When the West German army was first being established and the decision taken to accept into its ranks all former SS officers (the Gestapo section) up to the rank of Colonel, the London *Times* correspondent in Bonn wrote, "The British army is deployed to defend the West German frontiers, but the Bundeswehr will be equipped to advance on Berlin or Breslau or beyond. The German Defense Ministry is planning an army that would be effective only on the Russian steppes."

The *Frankfurter Rundschau* wrote, "The slogan about injustice done to the nation circulates among the troops. Officers stir up resentment, purposely or not, and awaken thoughts of revenge."

THE ordinary people of West Germany did not want to see another German army. They had learned what war meant. I talked in West Germany at that time to people in all sections of life and there was virtual unanimity that such a step would be a danger not only to Germany but the world. The peoples of Western Europe understood the danger as well. Hugh Dalton, a Minister in the British postwar Labor Government, said German rearmament was the "road to hell." Ernest Bevin, Foreign Secretary in the same government, who finally surrendered to U.S. pressure and agreed to the policy, said earlier that they were "all against German rearmament." He also told the House of Commons, "The magnates of the Ruhr financed Hitler and in two wars were part of Germany's aggressive policy. We never wish to see their like return."

The British Labor Party swept to power in 1945 with a program called "Let us Face the Future" which declared "We must make sure that Germany is deprived of all power to make war again. 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."

Walter Lippmann wrote, "A German army would wish to march and would drag all the rest of us against Warsaw and Koenigsberg."

This is the story of the Gadarene swine. The Western powers have deliberately courted a peril, which they knew from the start threatened a third world war. And now that the peril is imminent, now that in

Berlin, microcosm of a divided world, any incident can precipitate the final disaster, they try to persuade the people that the West German militarists are the defenders of freedom. They tell the American people that a nuclear war would mean 20 million dead and the American press, at least the newspapers quoted here, declare that they are all prepared to die for Berlin. They brutally tell the British people that there is no defense for them against nuclear bombs, but they are still ready to give the West German revenge seekers nuclear weapons.

How did we reach this tragic point and what are the measures necessary to save mankind from this terrible danger?

GERMAN militarism launched two world wars. The forces behind both wars were based on the powerhouse of the Ruhr and the determination of German capitalism to secure a "place in the sun," comparable to the older capitalist countries. But the first world war produced not only the defeat of Germany but the emergence of the first socialist country. The German working class was ready to follow the same revolutionary policy after the defeat of the Kaiser, but they were suppressed with the active assistance of Germany's former enemies. The war of intervention signalled the second world war before the first had ended, just as the bombs of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, directed politically at Russia, though destroying hundreds of thousands of Japanese, were the first blows of world war three.

After the first world war, the Ger-

man General Staff was illegally preserved and had a secret telephone line to the Weimar Government. The Weimar Republic rearmed in direct defiance of the Versailles Treaty. Hitler and his gangster party were the creatures of the Ruhr industrialists. Fritz Thyssen, the steel king, whose son is back in power with a bigger fortune than ever, told in *I Paid Hitler*, published in England in 1941, how the Ruhr industrialists accepted Hitler as their man, financed him and backed him to the end. Hitler was their weapon against Communism.

The money and the support of the German industrialists made it possible for the Nazi gangsters to bludgeon the German working class into submission, except for the brave minority, mostly the Communists, who went on with the fight. The money and the jobs of the Jews were the pay-off for the gangsters.

HITLER'S foreign policy was based on the same appeal to the Western nations as he had made to the Ruhr industrialists. He was the bulwark against Communism. He used German nationalism to create the opportunities for aggression. Those people who talk today as if the only solution is "self-determination and free elections" should remember how once the Nazis got a foothold in Austria they secured majority support for Anschluss. There were as loud cheers in Vienna when Hitler came in, as for Adenauer and Brandt in West Berlin. The Saar voted in a supervised plebiscite to join a Reich in which the Nazis were already dominant. The Rosenberg plan for the Germanic Union to include the

Balkans, Scandinavia and the Ukraine was the gospel of the "master race." The Western powers saw where it was leading, but they always believed Hitler would go East. The American monopolies built links with the Nazi industries, which gave Hitler the vital war materials without which he could never have built the armed forces. The story of the link-up of the trusts is told in official reports by the anti-trust division of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Neville Chamberlain handed Czechoslovakia to Hitler at Munich. One of his main lieutenants in this policy was Lord Home, now Foreign Secretary. Up till March 1939, when the Soviet Union appealed for a conference of all nations threatened by Hitler to consider collective resistance, war could have been averted. The West still trusted Hitler to go East.

During the war and with the creation of the grand alliance, which finally crushed the Nazi armies, the peoples saw that the struggle was against fascism. They demanded an anti-fascist war. Many of their leaders were just as determined it should not be an anti-fascist war. Harry Truman (then a Senator) in America and Moore Brabazon, a member of the Churchill Cabinet, in Britain, expressed the hope that Russians and Germans would destroy each other.

IN 1945, no leaders could stand publicly against this pressure from the peoples and at Potsdam measures were agreed between all the Allies to remove the danger of a revival of German militarism. There it was decided to confirm

the new frontiers agreed at Yalta and to remove most of the German speaking populations from the former German areas. It was a hard and cruel decision, but millions had been torn from their homes and taken to Germany for slave labor. To say as is now alleged that these frontiers were temporary until a peace treaty is sheer nonsense in view of this removal of the population. It must be remembered that Poland, the country principally involved, was under Russian, German and Austrian occupation for 150 years and was only re-constituted as a state after the first world war. The new Polish Government encouraged by the Western powers, joined in the war of intervention against the Soviet revolution and seized huge tracts of the Ukraine. It was inevitable that after the second world war, this stolen territory, which no one ever suggested was Polish-speaking, should go back to the Soviet Union. On the other hand, there was a mixed population to the West of Poland and there was the corridor to East Prussia created by the settlement after World War I.

The Potsdam decision was designed to remove the danger of Germany using the German-speaking populations to foment trouble. The Sudeten Germans who had paved the way for the Nazi annexation of Czechoslovakia were sent to Germany and the territory restored to Czechoslovakia.

The Potsdam conference also decided on specific measures to destroy not only the Nazi party but the causes that brought it into being. These, it should be emphasized, were not Russian decisions.

They were agreed upon by America, Russia and Britain. France accepted later, but in the early stages obstructed every move to unify the various occupation zones.

The measures against the Nazis provided for the punishment of those guilty of provable crimes against the German people or the countries invaded. It was agreed the country where the crime was committed should carry out the trial and inflict the punishment. The Nuremberg criminals (the Nazi leaders) were dealt with by an international court. Most of the other criminals, due to be dealt with in Western Germany or by the Western Allies, either received minor punishment or escaped altogether. Some on the accepted war criminal lists of Poland and other countries now hold high office in West Germany.

The harder problem was to deal with the millions who were not war criminals, but who had played an active part in the Nazi party—a later directive of the four allies stipulated that industrialists who served Hitler were equally guilty even though they were not party members. The Potsdam decision laid down that active Nazis were to be removed from key sections of the national life, including education, government and local administration, the police, the law and other jobs where they could be dangerous.

Then the Potsdam Agreement decided on measures to deal with the causes of Nazism and laid down the duty of the occupying powers to break up the trusts and cartels, carry out land reform, and a number of similar measures. It was

further laid down that the Allies would work for the reunification of Germany on the basis of these decisions.

THE inescapable fact about the post-war history of Germany is that the measures agreed at Potsdam were carried out in the Soviet occupation zone; they were not carried out in the Western zones, now the Federal German Republic. Those who argue on the legalities of the situation should remember there are arguments on both sides. In the absence of a Peace Treaty, the Potsdam Agreement was the law of Germany and it can be argued that the German Democratic Republic is the only part of Germany with a legal foundation.

But it is more fruitful to consider why the two German states have taken their different paths and what it means for the world. The Potsdam Agreement was ignored by the Western powers because it could only be carried out by vast social changes. Nazism was created by capitalism and to attack it on the lines of the Potsdam Agreement would be to undermine capitalism. That was why laws passed by the Parliaments representing the lands or provinces in the British occupation zone to nationalize their industries were vetoed by the British Labor Government on pressure from America. The province of Hesse in the American zone voted as did Saxony in the Russian zone to take over the property of war criminals—and that included most of the big industries. It was vetoed by the Americans. No serious land reform was carried out. As for the cartels, James Stewart Martin who

headed the decartelization team sent by the USA described in his book, *All Honorable Men*, why his mission failed. The men behind the German cartels were now powerful in Washington. They had even maintained contact while America and Germany were at war.

So the forces that created Hitler returned. Since then the evidence has piled up to show that hundreds of judges who administered the Nazi laws are back. The industrialists who grew rich out of slave labor, who made the poison gas for the extermination of the victims in the concentration camps, are richer than ever. And the Reichswehr Generals are not only back with a new German army, they are commanding the forces of NATO.

IN THE early years after the surrender of Germany, there was economic chaos. Money was of no value; cigarettes became a currency and sometimes fell to pieces before anyone smoked them. There was plenty of food in the countryside, but none in the towns and the economy was kept going by a form of barter. The Russians in their zone had helped the anti-Fascist forces to create a peoples' police which did something to check the all-prevailing black market, but millions in both parts of Germany were hungry.

During this period an agreement by the Allies to take part of German industrial plant as reparations was carried out. That again was a hard decision, but Russia and Poland in particular were devastated and certainly had the right to some compensation. In the Western zones, some machinery was taken away

and given to various allies, but the Americans who did not suffer war devastation were able quickly to install modern machinery.

By 1947, the cold war had begun and Germany was becoming its focal point, and before the year ended the four-power cooperation was practically at an end although the machinery still existed in Berlin. But another factor was coming into play; the USA had the monopoly of the atom bomb. Both the diary of James Forrestal, Secretary of Defense in the Truman Administration and the private papers of Senator Vandenberg confirm that in 1947, the British Government, as the price of Marshall aid, was forced to release the United States from a pledge not to use the bomb without British agreement. Forrestal's diary also records his conviction that the period of America's monopoly of the bomb were her years of opportunity, but he was "still uncertain whether the country would be resolute in the bomb's use."

At the end of 1947 the London Conference of Foreign Ministers broke down when the Russians pressed for the drafting of a peace treaty with Germany and the Western powers said that the character of its government must first be determined.

Then followed a sequence of events which culminated in the final division of Germany. In January, 1948, according to the public testimony of Wilhelm Elfes, former Lord Mayor of Cologne and a close colleague of Adenauer, the Americans told Adenauer plans were being prepared for a "preventive war" against Russia.

On March 5, 1948, General Clay,

American commander in Berlin, sent a telegram to Washington, reproduced in his diary, saying he had a "feeling war might come with dramatic suddenness." The telegram continued, "I cannot support this change in my own thinking with any data or outward evidence in relationships except to describe it as a feeling of a new tenseness in every Soviet individual with whom we have official relations."

On the basis of General Clay's "feeling" the USA was alerted for atomic war. Gradually the four power machinery for the administration of Germany was folding up. The Western zones of Germany had been incorporated in a Western Europe now under the Marshall plan. Then in June came the announcement of the formation of a West German state and on June 18, the separate currency reform in Western Germany.

THE ISSUE of a separate currency, printed months before by the Americans, in Western Germany, meant the final division of the country. The decision to do so was made at the very moment a four-power committee had reached agreement on all the main points for an all-German currency reform.* I was in Berlin that week-end. The Russian commander in Berlin, Marshal Sokolovsky, went on the air as soon as the decision to change the money the following day was announced. He warned that this was an irrevocable step. There was no reply from the West. The Russians, taken by surprise, mobilized printing works

* An example of the distortion of history now prevalent. The *London Times* of August 29 says that the Russians "refused to agree to the currency reform the Western Powers eventually introduced."

to produce stamps which could be gummed on to the old notes. The economy of the whole Eastern zone was threatened with disruption from the repudiated currency in the West which could still be used in the East. That was the origin of the "blockade" of West Berlin, where contrary to a specific pledge by the Americans, the new Western currency was also issued. The Allies knew the Russians would have to take measures to protect their zone. Out of it came the airlift.

Back in Washington, the U.S. Cabinet decided to send more B-29 bombers to Germany and to ask the American Ambassador in London to explore the possibility of sending bombers to Britain. The Forrestal diary records that somewhat to the surprise of the Americans the British agreed and the Ambassador was instructed to ask Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin whether he had "fully explored and considered the effect on British public opinion, and the implications and inferences."

The editor of the diary spells out the "inferences." Quite bluntly he explains that they "would bring the atom bomb within striking distance of Moscow."

Forrestal wrote in his diary after the British had agreed to more bombers, "We have the opportunity now of sending these planes and once sent, they will become an accepted fixture."

By July 21 Clay was pressing for permission to send an armored convoy through to Berlin and expressing the view that the French would fight and that twenty good divisions would hold the Russians on the Rhine. But as the diary points out, there were not 20 divisions available.

That was why war did not come in 1948.

There you have the starting point of the policy to rebuild the West German military machine. John Foster Dulles confirmed it in the winter of the following year in Paris in an off-the-record talk leaked to the *National Guardian*, New York, in which he said that the airlift should not be called off until Western Europe had agreed to the necessary forces. The Americans could atom bomb Moscow, but they could not defend Europe and the only manpower they could rely upon must come from Germany.

Step by step this policy has been worked out. The Labor Party in Britain betrayed every principle it professed by backing this rebuilding of an army officered by the men who fought Hitler's war and by bludgeoning the West German Social Democrats who had stood out against it.

IT IS a long story, but it is impossible to understand the present situation without examining this background. When Germany was divided by the currency changes, the Russians agreed to the setting up of the German Democratic Republic in their zone. Two states began to build their own lives, with different economic systems and social ideals. But the East Germans consistently called for discussions on reunification and when the different economies reached a point where they clearly could not be merged, for a federation. This policy changed only when the rearmament of Western Germany became an established fact and when it became perfectly clear that the West intended to take no

measures against the restoration to power of Hitler's generals.

This is the reason two separate states are going their own different ways.

But as the West German army has grown in strength its threats have become more blatant, not only general threats but specific plans for aggression. In mid-1960, two high officers of the West German army, Major Bruno Winzer, who was public relations officer to the Southern command and Captain von Gliga, who was adjutant to the Inspector General of the Air Force, went over to the German Democratic Republic with detailed plans and maps showing that a lightning war against the GDR was being planned. The idea was to use an incident either real or faked in the GDR to launch the attack, to occupy the territory and proclaim that an internal German question had been settled. The calculation was that the Warsaw powers faced with a *fait accompli* would not launch world war to restore German territory to the former government. The Government of the German Democratic Republic made these plans public, invited the Allied commands in Germany to inspect the documents and in conjunction with the Soviet Union made clear that the Warsaw powers could be counted on to defend their ally.

The GDR is not only threatened with direct aggression. It is the constant target for sabotage and other attempts to disrupt its economy. In West Berlin, the offices of organizations openly seeking to undermine the socialist states flaunt their aims. One office is publicly aimed at the Soviet Union. From West Berlin, accessible without any control from

West Germany, agents of these organizations could formerly move into East Berlin without any hindrance and since East Berlin is the capital of the GDR it was very difficult without using a vast machinery of inspection to prevent them getting to the rest of the Republic.

In Berlin two different social systems live side by side. There is much to be said for either, but there is nothing to be said for allowing the racketeers to get the best of both. And that is what happened until the sector boundaries were closed by the Government of the GDR with the support of their Warsaw allies. In East Berlin necessities, transport, bread, fuel and light and, above all, rents are cheaper than in West Berlin. You get a better meal in a good restaurant in East Berlin for say 9 East Marks than you get for 9 West Marks in the West. On the other hand certain goods, particularly luxuries, are cheaper in West Berlin. The East German economy is planned and the priorities are the necessities. Yet until the sector borders were closed there was a black market exchange of between four and five East Marks to one West Mark. In a small degree, this was assisted by East Berliners, who were willing to accept the rate so as to get luxury goods in West Berlin, but in the main it was maintained by the considerable sums put into West Berlin by the Western powers. The East Germans made a rule that identity cards must be produced in the East Berlin shops and only citizens of the GDR served, but there were plenty of people willing to buy on commission for the West Berliners. Then there were many thou-

sands who worked in the West, often at cut wages because they were living in East Berlin at low rents, with very much better social services and could change their West money for East at the blackmarket rate.

These economic factors, costing the GDR economy millions of dollars a year, were a bigger factor than the refugees in determining the GDR decision to close the sector boundaries.

WHAT IS the truth about the "refugees"? First it must be stressed that there has been a considerable flow both ways. Moving from one part of Germany to another is not like emigrating and family and domestic reasons have been responsible for quite a lot of the movement. Many have come to the GDR from the West because conditions are better, particularly in regard to rents, health services, education and kindergarten facilities for women with families. In other cases skilled workers have been offered jobs in the West German industries at higher rates of pay.

But there is a great deal of evidence to show that the West Germans have been offering inflated wages to skilled workers, doctors, scientists and others as a deliberate weapon to damage the economy of the GDR. One example I heard of personally was a printing firm which recruited printers months in advance and banked their wages, so that there was a nest egg waiting when they came across. Most of the young technical and professional workers received free training at the expense of the East German workers. It is not surprising that there was anger when many of those who had accept-

ed public money to become trained went over to the West. We in Britain would be equally angry if we trained teachers or doctors and they promptly went to America.

There are also many who do not like the hard job of building socialism. There are millions of well-paid jobs in a capitalist economy—advertising agents, salesmen, stockbrokers and the like who are just not wanted in a socialist economy. In addition, there were also psychological mistakes on the part of the officials in the GDR. Parents felt aggrieved when their children did not make the grade for some form of education on which they had set their hearts—just as they do in Britain—but they might well have relatives in the West willing to pay for the training. Cases like this and others involving bureaucratic decisions were often not treated with the understanding they needed.

Then there has been the ceaseless propaganda, some of it broadcast from Berlin, appealing to the worst elements in German nationalism. We must also remember that the GDR had to deal with a population poisoned by years of Nazi propaganda, a population which would have responded to appeals for the return of the former territories and would have accepted the declarations that they bore no responsibility for Hitler's war, just as readily as many of the Germans in the West. It is in the light of all this that the measure of their achievements must be judged.

THE PEOPLES in the West, who suffered twice this century from German militarism and will assuredly perish if it succeeds in launching

war again, should be eternally grateful that one German state exists which accepts the frontiers with its neighbors, which combats ceaselessly the efforts to revive aggressive German nationalism and which has proposed a treaty of peace which would end the build-up of arms in both Germanys and take them both out of their respective alliances.

One thing is certain. There can be no settlement unless both German states are recognized and brought into the negotiations. There can be no reunification of Germany

while the men who served Hitler rule in Bonn. There can be no peace while Hitler's generals dominate the Western alliance and if we commit the supreme folly of giving them nuclear arms, the world will go on living under the shadow of nuclear annihilation.

The best service we can give to Germany and the world is to support those Germans in the East and the West—and there are many in the West—who are resisting this revival of German militarism and are seeking to save their country from disaster.

WALTER LIPPMANN ON BERLIN NEGOTIATIONS

WALTER LIPPMANN in his column of September 11 (*New York Herald Tribune*) said that the physical partition of Germany had become a fully accomplished fact and that this fact had been acquiesced in by the whole of the NATO alliance. What, then, is there to negotiate with Khrushchev, he asks?

"The answer, I would say, is that we can and should negotiate the following: A reaffirmation of the access between West Berlin and the outer world. A reaffirmation of the right of West Berlin to political, economic and cultural self-determination. The future place of West Berlin while Germany remains divided, perhaps as an international city which would become the seat of the European section of the United Nations. An agreement for the elimination of nuclear weapons and elimination of conventional weapons in some considerable area of Central Europe." (*Mr. Lippmann's suggestions embody the substance of Premier Khrushchev's offers on a Berlin settlement.—Ed.*)

JOHN CROSBY SAYS BERLIN IS NEGOTIABLE

"MR. KENNEDY says Berlin is not negotiable. Why isn't it? Why isn't anything negotiable rather than a thermonuclear war?

"Are we going to wipe out two-and-a-half billion years of slow biological improvement in a thermonuclear war? Over what—*Berlin*? I agree with Nehru that to go to war under any circumstances for anything at all in the world in our time is utter absurdity. In any case, to start dropping hydrogen bombs on our former allies over a half a city of our former enemies on extremely dubious legal grounds in which the Russian position is by no means all wrong and ours is by no means all right is lunacy.

"I think Berlin is negotiable and, as a matter of fact, Khrushchev is not even asking very much. In the last tussle over Berlin, the Russians backed down all the way. Did this destroy their position all round the world as the jingoists say that any concessions will destroy ours this time?"

—From John Crosby's column, *New York Herald Tribune*, Sept. 15.

FACTS AND OPINIONS ABOUT BERLIN

by **HUGH B. HESTER, Brig. Gen., U.S.A. (Ret.)**
Food and Agricultural Administrator
U.S. Zone of Germany 1945-47

THE WEST BERLIN government is not free; it is not democratic. Democracy and freedom had nothing to do with its establishment, or with its continuance as a part of West Germany, 110 miles inside the present German Democratic Republic. It was created by the British, French and U.S. Governments (especially the latter) for use as a weapon against the Soviet bloc, and continues to be maintained for that purpose.

West Berlin is not a "showcase"; it is not an example, as claimed by Western propaganda, of what private enterprise can accomplish. It is a kept city; kept initially by the generous use of U.S. taxpayers' money and now largely by that of the West German people. Without this massive assistance, West Berlin could not have been established initially, and without the continuance of this program, at least half of West Berlin's populace would be hungry within a few months. The "showcase" is completely artificial. With a much smaller largess the slums of the largest city in the U.S., or any city anywhere else, for that matter, could be completely removed, and the city made into a "showcase" of what general welfare funds could accomplish.

Britain, France and the U.S. have no moral or legal rights in West

Berlin. They have only power "rights." Even if the amoral, anarchistic nation-state system were a moral and legal system, which it is not, both of these rights, however valid initially, would have been destroyed by the creation of a bi-zonal organization (UK-US) with headquarters in Frankfurt, 1946, only to be superseded a little later by a tri-zonal organization (France added), with headquarters in Bonn. It was Mr. James Byrnes, then Secretary of State, who scrapped the Potsdam Agreement and destroyed all the theoretical rights thereunder, in a speech before a German audience, August 26, 1946, at Stuttgart. In this speech, he demanded the unification of Germany under U.S. terms.

So long as the United States held preponderant military power in the world, which it did until recently, the propaganda shibboleths about freedom and democracy, legal and moral rights, were viable, that is, they could be proclaimed where there were none, and possibly maintained, without disastrous results to all mankind. But this is no longer true, for military power has shifted from preponderance to parity.

With the splitting of the atom and the achievement of power parity by the Soviets, the resolution of disputes between East and West by military means, also, became impos-

sible without disastrous results. This means that war is no longer the ultima ratio in international disputes as formerly. Since this is so the leaders of nations must now use the power of facts or persuasion for the settlement of disputes between them. They must negotiate, not drop bombs or launch missiles.

What are some of the facts or fictions about West Berlin? First, it is geographically located 110 miles inside the German Democratic Republic. Ex-President Eisenhower has termed this abnormal, Khrushchev absurd, and most would agree that it is anomalous. Second, it has certainly served at times as an espionage base for the subversion of the Soviet Union and her socialist allies by both the Western powers and the West German Republic. Our opponents believe, or claim to believe, that the activities of the notorious Gehlen gangs are typical of its use for that purpose. Finally, the incorporation of West Berlin in West Germany as a part of NATO, they claim or fear, would mean the establishment of a Trojan Horse permanently inside the socialist bloc. If true, this would pose a serious threat to the vital interests of the Soviet Union and her allies. This is impermissible under the nation-state system. The continued insistence upon this by the West, whether the charge is true or not, can only lead to war.

The best solution of the Berlin problem would be the unification of a disarmed and neutralized Germany, outside NATO, and the disengagement of the hostile military forces down the center of Europe along the lines of the Rapacki Plan (Rapacki is the Foreign Minister of Poland). Germany cannot be united inside NATO, with or without free elections, any more than it can be so united inside the Warsaw Pact.

Neither of the blocs has the military power to do so. Democracy, freedom and self-determination have nothing whatever to do with it, and the leaders of both blocs should stop the hypocritical pretense that they do.

Probably the best possible solution at the present time would be a West Berlin, detached and independent of either the East or West, but with freedom of travel, trade and cultural exchanges with all, and guaranteed by all. More is unlikely and less, I fear, will prove fatal.

Khrushchev has repeatedly offered, and still is offering, to negotiate a more rational future along these lines for West Berlin. "We will never know," according to George F. Kennan, "whether the Soviet leaders will go through an open door until we stop trying to push them through a closed one." Present U.S. policies on West Berlin would "push them through a closed one."

2,659,000 RUMANIAN SCHOOL CHILDREN

RUMANIAN SCHOOLS opened on September 15 with an enrollment of 2,659,000 children. The total of last year's enrollment was 2,438,406. New text books printed for this year amounted to 18,000,000 copies. This year students from the first to the seventh grades will receive their text books free of charge—some 15,000,000 copies.

A
cow's
with
and
ican
Th
ing S
the U
ship
Cour
1958
Its a
with
coun
for p
about
has
forei
are s
and
as A
Chin
Gree
nesia
Swe
and
amor
socie
coun
own
In
pron
speci
and
teres
thea
engi
liter
It
goo
Unit
Frie
whic
pate
that

THE SOVIET-AMERICAN INSTITUTE

A SOVIET-AMERICAN Relations Institute was established in Moscow's Friendship House on August 31, with the aim of strengthening peaceful and friendly relations with the American people.

The Institute was established by leading Soviet figures, under the auspices of the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural relations with Foreign Countries. The Union was established in 1958 as a successor to the former VOKS. Its aim is to acquaint the Soviet public with the way of life and culture of other countries and to provide opportunities for people of other nations to learn more about the Soviet Union. The Union has established ties with over 80 foreign countries. Affiliated with it are special Soviet societies for friendship and cultural contact with such nations as Austria, Belgium, Britain, People's China, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Japan, Norway, Poland, Sweden and other countries in Europe and Asia, Africa, Latin America and among the Arab nations. Corresponding societies for friendship exist in all these countries. Each Soviet Republic has its own friendship societies.

In addition, there are sections which promote relations between people of special vocational interests in their own and other countries, including those interested in architecture, the graphic arts, theater, film, music, medicine, science engineering, agriculture, biology, law, literature, photography and children's art.

It has long been hoped by people of good will in both the USSR and the United States that an American-Soviet Friendship Society could be formed in which leading Americans would participate, lifting to a higher level the work that has been carried on for many years

in this country by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. The step that has now been taken in Moscow is an indication of the desire of leaders of Soviet public opinion to overcome the present tensions in US-USSR relations.

The meeting on August 31 was opened by Nina Popova, President of the Union of Soviet Societies, who said:

The establishment of the Institute is an expression of the Soviet public's desire to help solve the major problems of our time. We extend the hand of friendship to the American people and call upon them to work together with us for removing the danger of war.

N. N. Blokhin, President of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences, and well-known cancer expert, has been chosen the President of the new Institute of Soviet-American Relations. In his report to the founding meeting, Dr. Blokhin spoke of the special responsibility of the peoples of the United States and the Soviet Union in the maintenance of universal peace.

The public of our two countries can and must play a great role in bringing the Soviet and American peoples closer together. . . . We call upon the Americans, upon all people of goodwill on our planet, to work together with us for general and complete disarmament, for peace and friendship among the peoples.

Leading people in Soviet public and cultural life attended the founding meeting, and supported the new Institute. Among its 16 vice presidents are Mme. Nina Khrushcheva, Academician L. I. Artobolevsky, film director S. A. Gerasimov, G. A. Zhukov, Chairman of the State Committee of the USSR Council of Ministers for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries.

Mind And/Or Matter

by ARCHIE JOHNSTONE

A FIFTY-YEAR-OLD woman patient in a Leningrad hospital awoke from a sound sleep, sat up in bed and complained to the nurse:

"What sort of a place is this? You're starving me to death. They told me I musn't eat until I had my operation, and what happens?—Nothing to eat and still no operation."

She had been brought into hospital a few days earlier for a major operation. Her heart condition ruled out a general anesthetic, and extensive surgery while she was fully conscious was unthinkable.

"But you've *had* your operation," the nurse told her. "They did it while you were sleeping."

Now she is going about completely cured and, I have no doubt, saying to any acquaintance she meets: "Let me tell you about my operation."

Not that she has much to tell. She didn't get even the normal patient's brief glimpse of the operating theater—she was sound asleep when she was wheeled in. And the full account of her case is told in a journal of psychiatry, not in a surgical one, although she was in no sense a "mental case."

Before the operation, while she was still in her bed in the ward, she was literally "put to sleep" by a

leading Soviet psychiatrist, Dr. Pavel Bul, and during the long and serious operation he acted as "anesthetist" by keeping her in a deep, hypnotically-induced sleep.

At this point I must take a leaf out of Dr. Bul's book and sound a note of caution. He insists that in the present state of scientific knowledge of a notoriously "mysterious" subject, hypnotism cannot encroach much further on the province of conventional anesthetics or on conventional medical practice in general.

To drive home that warning (especially, I gather, to laymen journalists and their readers) he criticizes a Soviet newspaper report of one of his cases, that of a woman whose sight was restored after eight months of blindness brought on not by any organic condition but by witnessing an accident that horrified her. The report, he says, raised false hopes in other blind people who could not possibly be helped by hypnosis—as any non-specialist doctor could have told them. In other words, anyone who thinks that his particular illness can be helped by some dramatic-sounding treatment should not be influenced by what is said by any journalist (and this, please note, includes myself) but should *consult his doctor*.

In any case, the chief value of hypnotism to Dr. Bul and to quite a large body of Soviet researchers is that it provides another avenue of approach, or at least a side gate, to

ARCHIE JOHNSTONE'S articles on various aspects of Soviet life are a regular feature of NWR. Former editor of the British Embassy newspaper in Moscow, Johnstone has lived in the USSR since 1947.

a subject about which we know much less than we know about things far above our heads and far below our feet—man himself, the workings of his brain and nervous system, the boundaries (or, perhaps more correctly, the lack of boundaries) between mind and matter and the physics, so to speak, of thought-processes and feelings that may eventually be fully explained in terms of currents or impulses or rays or waves.

The work of these researchers has been commented on frequently abroad. Some American authorities admit they are markedly bolder than their U.S. colleagues; others describe them as more "wildly imaginative." One typical point of difference is a Soviet theory that growing blood-cells emit rays in the ultra-violet range and that the shutting off of these rays diagnoses the presence of a cancer cell. Another is the theory, borne out to some extent by experiments on cats who survived more-than-lethal doses of poison while under anesthetics, that germs or poisons entering the body do not set up an active disease until the nervous system reacts to them, and that anesthesia can hold off a disease by, so to speak, cutting off the current.

Here are some further examples I have been given of Soviet trends as compared with Western trends: more emphasis on the mental or nervous factor in a widening range of diseases; more extensive experimenting with sleep therapy, hypnosis, suggestion and auto-suggestion in such diverse matters as high blood pressure, stomach ulcers, asthma, alcoholism and "psychoprophylactic preparation" for painless childbirth; a closer observance of the principles

of Ivan Pavlov, the "father of Soviet physiology" (a branch of science which, here at least, seems to extend quite naturally into neurology and psychology).

Many of the techniques I have mentioned are still cautiously labeled theoretical or experimental, but I had the good luck to witness one dramatic demonstration of "nerve-power" which can hardly be treated as theoretical. A radio mechanic whose arm had been amputated below the elbow had an artificial hand and wrist made for him. I saw him carrying out a delicate wiring job on a piece of radio equipment with truly expert skill and speed. He simply had to *think* the movements and the artificial fingers obeyed the orders of his mind, just as ordinary fingers do. The impulses that went from his brain down the nerves of his arm to near the stump were picked up by small transformer-amplifiers that activated his artificial sinews.

If we describe that as amazing, what can we say about the Russian dog that had a second head grafted on him—a head that really lived and functioned exactly like its "twin" for a whole month?

Only eight months ago I was complaining in an article about the dearth of popular writings on mind-and-matter matters. That complaint is no longer valid. For instance, four articles in the current number of *Knowledge Is Power* deal with different aspects of this general subject and the recently-coined term *biotokee* (bio-currents) crops up repeatedly.

One heated discussion centers on the question, can these *biotokee* be transmitted from person to person?

In other words, is telepathy possible? A professor of philosophy, V. Tugarinov, attacks as definitely wrong the "definitely-no" attitude of another professor, B. Birhkov, in an earlier article. Professor Tugarinov contends that there is nothing anti-materialistic in assuming that some new "lines of communication" for thought-transference can be found, some ray or wave that is just as non-otherworldly as radio waves or a telegraph wire.

I find it hard to believe that *bio-tokee*, (or *bio-talkie-talkie*?) will ever be used as communication between, say, a cosmonaut and his ground station, but much of the recent research in the borderlands of mind and matter has a direct bearing on Soviet man-in-space efforts.

It is worth noting that Professor Piotr Anokhin, who has been closely associated with the psychological "conditioning" of the Soviet team of cosmonauts, worked for many years with Pavlov.

Professor Anokhin stated recently that he had lectured in thirty universities abroad and he noticed that although many of his foreign colleagues reject the Pavlovian label, their actual research work was firmly based on Pavlov's principles.

How this influences the training of America's still-unorbited spacemen I cannot tell, but it is safe to say that Gagarin and Titov owe more of their success to the measurable conditioned reflexes of Pavlov than to the shadowy inferiority complexes, archetypes and ids of Adler, Jung, Freud & Co.

CORNELL PROFESSOR ON SOVIET EDUCATION

IN THE NEW YORK TIMES magazine for August 27, Urie Bronfenbrenner, a professor of psychology and child development at Cornell University, wrote about the Soviet system of character education on the basis of observations during a trip to the Soviet Union last summer. The system, he believes, leads on the one hand to a "pervasive conformity to group norms," reinforced by social criticism, which he believes is largely due to the influence on Soviet education of the teachings of Anton Makarenko, whose writings (all available in English translation) have profoundly affected the whole theory and practice of education in the Soviet Union.

"Makarenko," he writes, "was able to create a sense of commitment to the work program and code of conduct he had laid out." (Is that bad? it might be asked—"We can hardly claim we are doing as much for our own value system," Bronfenbrenner comments later on.)

He cites as an example of "conformity" the fact that such "deviant" behavior as tossing a scrap of paper on the pavement is reprimanded as "*nyekulturno*" by the nearest passerby. But he admits another side to this same picture:

"There is a common commitment to values, goals, ways of life. As I observed, listened and talked to many Russians, I was surprised by the strength and pervasiveness of what appeared to be genuine pride and faith in their system. . . .

"Finally, it is entirely possible that the recent Soviet achievements in industry, education, sports and science are merely the first fruits of an equally potent social technology which renovates not only things, but men themselves."

HOW CZECHOSLOVAKIA EDUCATES THE VERY YOUNG

by **ELEANOR WHEELER**

IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA education goes with you from the cradle to the grave. Even just to sketch the picture we will need a series of articles. The first installment will begin at the cradle; or rather, in the up-to-date metal cribs in the home or the nursery school.

We have never had personal experience with the first level, or crèche, so I set out last week with a couple of visiting pedagogues to see what I could report. Besides, things develop so fast here that I was glad to refresh my knowledge of the kindergarten stage where our youngest started her education.

First we stopped at the Town Hall to get a brief picture of the set-up from Mrs. Lupinková, an inspector in the Department of Education, and Dr. Kazimirová, head of the largest children's hospital in Prague. They then went along with us, pointing out what was typical and what was characteristic only of the particular establishment.

Every working mother in Czechoslovakia gets 18 weeks paid maternity leave, which she can take as she chooses. Most of those I know have preferred to work up to confinement and then have over four months'

paid leave with their baby. This period can be extended without pay, also, if the mother chooses, and she finds her job waiting when she goes back, any time up to one year.

Although the child may be placed in a crèche at the age of three months, the feeling now is, says Dr. Kazimirová, that they develop better if they stay with their mother until they are six months old. One proposal is that part of the pension period be applied at the time when the woman is needed by her infant. The present age for eligibility to pension is 55, and some advocate that this be extended to 57 and the two years' pension be applied to maternity leave. This is still in the discussion stage.

When the mother decides to return to work she has the absolute right to put her baby in a crèche. One must be found either near her home or near her place of work. She has the choice of three types. Either she can leave the child any time after six in the morning on her way to work and pick him up any time up to six in the evening (she is urged not to call for her child more than an hour after finishing work, because it is felt that the longer the child is with his parents, the better the relationship in these early years. If the mother works irregular shifts, or if living quarters are cramped, she may leave the child Monday morning and call for him Saturday

ELEANOR WHEELER, who has lived in Prague for over a decade with her husband and children, frequently writes articles for *NWR* about life in Czechoslovakia.

afternoon. Furthermore, there are boarding schools if conditions require this. Parents are encouraged to visit these schools often and take their children on excursions.

There are orphanages (called "children's homes") for children of broken homes or whose parents have died. These, like the above-mentioned nursery schools, are divided into the establishments for children from three months through three years, and those for four-year-olds up to the time to enter elementary school. Then come the children's homes for those of elementary and secondary school age. They are run on the same principles as the crèches, nursery schools, and regular schools for children with families.

The crèches and nursery schools average 45 to 60 in enrollment and generally have six assistants with some training in health work, two general helpers, and the services of a district doctor and psychologist. The doctor makes regular visits three times a week. The psychologist comes once a week to look over the records of behavior problems and of the general development. He advises the staff and the parents. When the children are brought in on Monday in the week-long nursery or each day in the day nursery the admitting nurse has a word with the parents about child-training and passes on any recommendations the psychologist may have.

AT THE crèche we visited in Prague 3, they have the practice of having the doctor on hand when the children are leaving for home on Friday evening. Then he

can advise parents about any problems that have come to his notice.

The general thesis is that even imperfect parents are better than an institution in helping the child to develop. Personal attention is given the children in the nurseries, to keep them from getting an "institution attitude," a passive nature that is familiar in institutions everywhere. The nursery on Market Garden St. in Prague 3 was making a comparative study of their 60 children and 60 taken at random in families. So far they have found that those raised in the home have more neuropathic disorders, but develop faster in speaking and walking. The director told us that they were working on methods of individual care which they hope will result in better development of their charges.

The nurseries are also fighting the problem of infectious respiratory diseases. They inoculate where this will prevent disease. They undress the children completely when they are admitted each morning or each Monday, and they leave their complete outfits in lockers. Then the children are dressed from skin out, from top to toe, in the clothes they wear "at school." Everything is identified with a picture marker, the child's socks and towel, his cup, spoon, and plate, his galoshes and toothbrush—everything he uses while in the crèche or kindergarten.

Toys are put out handy for free play. Directed play is aimed at developing walking, speaking, observation, and later—music, rhythm, and collective play. Unwillingness to share is not considered an inevitable character trait. Games, individual attention, puppet plays—all

are used to stress the value of sharing and of acting as a group.

The nursery for three-month infants to three-year-olds was especially built for that purpose, with the admission rooms, the isolation rooms for children with suspicious symptoms (big windows for observation from outside), built-in cupboards, efficient kitchens and play areas. The nearby kindergarten, on the other hand, was an adapted large home, so the kitchen was not quite right, the dining room was crowded.

THE SUDDEN demand for pre-school care was so immense that the adapted buildings are so far in the majority. But in all new housing developments new nurseries, as well as new schools, are being built on modern lines.

In both the modern and the adapted housing, however, there was a garden for free play outdoors, and for the five- and six-year-olds little garden plots.

When we admired her set-up, the director of the modern crèche-nursery said, "The best place cannot replace loving care. We consider the most important thing is for the whole staff, even including the furnaceman, to love children and be interested in their welfare."

The staff of these pre-school institutions feel that they are now for the first time able to apply the principles of the great 17th century Czech educator Comenius (or Komenský, as he was called in his homeland).

Comenius preached the value of using all five senses in teaching, and in making school a pleasure rather than a torment. His ideas were known around the world, but in his own country the rather rigid system of the Austro-Hungarian regime had the chief influence even up to the pre-war Republic. In the next installment we shall stop to tell about this remarkable man before going on to describe the elementary and middle schools.

ARMENIAN HEADS WORLD ASTRONOMICAL UNION

DR. VICTOR AMBARTSUMIAN, president of the Armenian Academy of Sciences in Erevan, was elected the new president of the International Astronomical Union at the end of its 11th meeting in Berkeley, California on August 25.

Dr. Ambartsumian headed the Soviet delegation of 45 scientists at the Berkeley meeting of the IAU.

In an interview with a California paper Dr. Ambartsumian said that the largest telescope in the Soviet Union is at the Byurakan Observatory in Armenia. Dr. Ambartsumian added further that the Armenian Academy of Sciences has, in addition to Byurakan Observatory, more than 30 institutes covering many fields of study and research, including mathematics and mechanics, physics, organic chemistry, pharmaceuticals, micro-chemistry, history, archeology and language research. The academy also has jurisdiction over the Erevan Polytechnic Institute and the University of Erevan. Some 2,000 scientists and intellectuals work on research in Armenia.

"The astronomers of the United States and of the Soviet Union are on very congenial terms and have always had a constant exchange of ideas. They cooperate in carrying on research in the field for the benefit of mankind," Dr. Ambartsumian said at the conclusion of the interview.

YOUTH HAS ITS SAY

by JESSICA SMITH

DON'T LET anyone tell you the young people of the Soviet Union are regimented, "conditioned" from childhood to respond to everything that happens just as the Soviet Government wishes them to, lacking in initiative, in creative thinking, in blazing new trails into the future.

They talk, argue, raise questions about everything under the sun—and beyond it too. They read poetry and essays and discuss them in public squares, have bull sessions on all kinds of problems in students' and workers' dormitories and clubs, on construction sites, and in the wide fields of the virgin lands.

One of the ways in which free expression of opinion is fostered, we learned from Yuri Voronin, the slim, handsome, dark-haired editor of *Komsomolskaya Pravda*, official paper of the Communist Youth organization, which plays a leading role in the guidance of Soviet youth.

Voronin led us into a large room where he sat at a vast, cleanswept desk, my husband and I at the long conference table perpendicular to it. As an editor myself, albeit of a paper with a much smaller circulation (his is about 400 times larger!), surrounded always by stacks of periodicals, clippings, proofs, manuscripts etc., I simply marveled that Voronin's desk was unmarred by a single piece of paper. "Don't be silly," said John, "didn't you see his regular working office as we

passed? His desk looked like any other editor's." So at least this Greek-god-like-looking young man was human!

First, Voronin informed us that *Komsomolskaya Pravda* is the third largest newspaper in circulation in the USSR. *Pravda* comes first, with around 6,000,000, *Izvestia* next with about 4,000,000 while the youth paper has 3,300,000 readers. The only limit to its circulation is newsprint (just wait until those Siberian forests are turned into paper!) While the main age range of the readers is 17 to 30, the paper is very popular among adults as well. (Our interpreter commented that his grandmother would read no other paper.)

"The purpose of our paper," said Voronin, "along with our regular function of covering the news, is to create a forum where the youth of our country may express themselves. Of course we try to bring out all that is best in our youth, their heroism, their enthusiasm, the ideals for which they struggle. But at the same time, we want to give them the opportunity to speak frankly about everything that hinders their forward progress, to criticize freely, to say whatever may be on their minds. We make a special point of publishing minority opinions, and soliciting comments on them. At the end of the year we hold a readers' forum which brings us many criticisms and suggestions about how to make the

paper more responsive to the needs of youth. We study these carefully, and try to follow them."

The tradition of the paper, from the very first number, he went on, had been to involve the readers themselves. There has been a constant increase in reader participation in the last five years. In 1955, the paper received 86,000 letters from readers, in 1960, 230,000. During 1961, they had been receiving over a thousand letters a day, so that the total for the year would probably reach 400,000 or more.

Voronin kept jumping up to point out items in files of the paper kept in large leather binders.

"Our policy is to take care of every letter that comes in in one way or another," he told us. "When some local example of bureaucratic mismanagement or even criminal behavior is brought to our attention, we follow it up, get action if the facts are verified, and publish the results. Sometimes we give our own answers to letters that come to us, sometimes we leave the answers to others. When special emotional or psychological problems of youth are involved, we get doctors or psychiatrists to answer."

Right now they were tackling the problem of trying to make the paper more interesting to some of the adolescent readers, whose problems were different from those which the older age groups were discussing. Voronin showed us, as an example, a discussion around the question of the first manifestations of young love in school children, which brought out the need of a sensitive and understanding approach on the part of their teachers.

Sometimes, he said, they would

simply publish a letter with which they did not agree, to see what kind of a discussion would come of it,

"For example, a couple of months ago we received a letter from a young worker asking whether it isn't too early to start to flirt with the moon. He asked why we should bother sending so many rockets into outer space when so many things are not yet settled here on earth. Instead of answering ourselves, we asked the workers of the *Serp i Molt* factory what they thought about it. They held a meeting and sent an answer summing up their views which sharply disagreed with the young worker's. After we published their answer, we received about 4,000 letters of which only 13 supported the original letter. Most of them pointed out that all human progress has depended on the outreach of the human imagination and genius far beyond the levels that mankind has already achieved.

"We feel that the letters we receive are the pulse with which we can test our paper. If the number of letters drops, then we know that our material is not interesting enough."

Voronin recalled the letter Ilya Ehrenburg had received from a young girl a couple of years ago about her problem with Yuri, the young man to whom she had become engaged, who was interested only in engineering and science and had no use for her love for art and poetry. The paper published Ehrenburg's reply, which pointed out that art and science complement each other. Thousands of letters poured in. While some supported the young engineer, ten to one felt that the world needs science and poetry both.

A young girl wrote: "A spaceman should carry a spray of lilac into the cosmos with him." One of Yuri's defenders answered: "The only reason for anyone in outer space to think of a spray of lilac would be the instinct of reproduction inherent in all living creatures." This moved Ehrenburg to write still another piece on the role of the arts in cultivating the sensibilities and arousing the finest emotions in people. He suggested a discussion on how to make such callous young people more human, which has gone on to this day.

"Here," said Voronin, leafing through some back issues, "we began the discussion with an article on problems of morals and ethics, under the title 'In What Does the Beauty of Man Consist?'—6,500 replies came in!"

Komsomolskaya Pravda prides itself on raising many matters of state importance, criticizing government departments when they feel it necessary and helping to influence legislation through the opinions of the young people. For example, it was this paper which first raised the question of reintroducing universal coeducation, as was later done, and on other questions about education which had contributed to the law on school reform.

Last year they started a discussion on the need to change a law passed due to wartime exigencies, according to which the father was not always held accountable in the case of an unmarried mother, as had formerly been required, and hardship had resulted for children whose father's names were not recorded. A change in this law, Voronin told us, was now being worked out as a

result of the discussion in their columns.

"How You Gonna Keep 'em Down on the Farm?" was the theme of another discussion. Some young people educated at the expense of collective farms were going on to more adventurous projects instead of returning and giving their skills to the development of the farms. This discussion brought out lags in some areas in providing sufficient cultural and recreational facilities for the young people, in mechanization of work and so on, and stimulated greater efforts toward the goal of eliminating the differences between town and country, and bringing to the countryside the amenities of city life.

Besides stimulating discussions of all kinds, the paper promotes various competitions through which its young readers may find expression for their talents. A department "Letters and Diaries of Our Contemporaries" stimulates articles from readers about their lives and any unique exploits. There are poetry and short story contests. Words and music of songs not published elsewhere are solicited. They received 700 of these, and have published a number of the best. A panel of 16 composers and lyricists helps in selection; the best work will receive prizes, and go into general publication.

Last year *Komsomolskaya Pravda* started an Institute of Public Opinion. Voronin showed us the first questionnaire issued on the question of war and peace. Will humanity be able to avert war? YES or NO, was the way the question was put.

"We considered very carefully how to get the best cross section," the

young editor told us. "For our first experiment, we decided to take the first ten workers encountered in certain factories and collective farms, and then all houses with the address No. 10 in various sections of the city. Of the thousand polled, 96.8 thought war could be averted. The answers showed the passionate concern of our people for peace."

The second questionnaire was on changes in the standard of living—whether higher, unchanged or lower. In what way is this expressed, how do you explain it? What is most important: working hours, consumer goods, housing, services, food, wages, wider network of children's establishments? What would you suggest for the quickest solution? Profession, age, sex, how many work in the family.

"Again," Voronin said, "the question of how best to test average opinion was discussed. Sixty-six trains come in every day to Moscow, with people going and coming to and from all parts of the country. We distributed the questionnaires to the conductors, and asked them to get answers from the people in one car of reserved and one car of unreserved seats in each train. We got back 1,388 replies. It was a real cross-section. There were people from all fifteen republics and all the regions of the Russian Federation. They represented all groups of the population, all ages—workers, engineers, employees, demobilized men, students, pensioners etc. 834 were women.

"The majority, 73.2 per cent, said that their standard of living had risen. Of those who gave a negative answer, some said 'standard of living lower, mood higher'—meaning that

a child had been born to them, increasing family expenses. The answers also showed that the standard of living of higher paid workers had fallen, while that of the lower paid workers had risen. In some cases, lower standards of living had been due to lack of responsibility on the part of local authorities who had failed to apply requirements in the new legislation that there should be no reduction in wages in connection with the reduction of the working day to seven hours."

In the majority of cases, housing was given as the most important aspect of the standard of living.

Along with the answers, many proposals for improvements were received, most of which were published. Summaries of the answers and of the criticisms were sent to the various ministries concerned, for answers and action.

Answers to a questionnaire of last January on moral and ethical concepts of the present generation were still being analyzed at the time of our visit. To insure a wider coverage, the questionnaire was printed in the newspaper itself as well as being widely distributed separately. The questions went like this:

What do you think about your generation, are you satisfied with it? Yes or no; what is the basis for your answer? What in your opinion are the best features of Soviet youth today, how are they revealed? Are there widespread negative features? What is the basis for your opinion? What is the most characteristic feature of your generation? Has it any aim, or no aims? Do you have a personal aim in life? Yes or no, or haven't you thought about it—what is it? What must you do to

achieve it? What have you already done? Do you think you'll achieve it? Basis for your opinion—finally, age, education, what do you do, how long have you worked independently—sex, address—and name if desired.

At the time of our visit, some 27,000 answers had been received, and tabulated—and the answers were still coming in. About 96 per cent of the replies made a positive appraisal of the young generation. They showed the passionate love of life, the manifold bright goals of today's Soviet youth, most of them saying their highest wish was to be a human being worthy of the name, stressing the need for study, study, study, for concern about other human beings, the collective, and the need above all of peace to achieve their aims.

The paper had made a point of publishing the negative answers that came in, along with the overwhelmingly positive ones. One disillusioned young factory worker of 19 said she felt that young people were only living from day to day, she had lost her faith in people, felt that they had no aim, cared only for their own comfort and well-being, her own aim was only to marry a rich young man with money! She said she was sure her letter would not be published, but begged that she be convinced of the incorrectness of her views.

Another letter came from a young militia man pessimistic about youth because his work had brought him into contact with drunkenness, hooliganism, empty-headedness, egoism. His own aim—to be an artist: "Nature brings more joy into my life than anything on earth. How I love the dear river banks, the end-

less steppes, the ancient forests of my beloved native land! How I would like to see among them only beautiful people! I know that the beauty of nature can wipe out all evil from man. I am painting, studying in my leisure time to achieve my aim. Only an accursed atomic war could interfere. But I am sure the forces of peace can conquer war!"

But those who stressed the negative aspects of youth were only a minority. Most wrote of the unending curiosity, the optimism, the sense of responsibility, and of comradeship, the striving of Soviet youth for definite goals.

Words and enthusiasm about the paper's projects and the discussions it was stimulating kept pouring out of the young editor, bursting with energy and new ideas.

"Now," he said "we have started a special department, a Reader's Forum, where we solicit comments on what we publish or any new problems our readers want to raise. Here, for example"—turning to some recent issues,—“is a discussion about the value of receiving high marks in exams as against the value of the student as a human being. The original letter in this discussion told of a young man who received only excellent marks, but at the same time was lacking in important human attributes. He majored in literature, always got good marks in it, but it turned out he really didn't care for literature and preferred to speculate on the black market. His public face and his private face were contradictory. You know we set a great deal of store by high marks in studies—but the comments on this letter showed a concern that human values and consideration for

other people and for the collective must not be sacrificed in the process of learning.

"Out of all these discussions our paper has started a club called 'Myself and the Times' which has had meetings in various cities."

Our readers may remember that in our July issue this year we carried a report of a meeting held in April at the Pedagogical Institute in Leningrad, where the young people discussed a series of questions distributed by *Komsomolskaya Pravda* on "The Psychology of Modern Youth." In far places I visited while I was in the Soviet Union, including a workers' Palace of Culture in Bratsk, I learned that similar discussions had been held among the youth, and the special youth paper published in Tselinograd, in the virgin lands of Kazakhstan, had also stimulated such discussions.

"We already have branches of this club in many cities" Voronin went on. "They not only take up the questions we propose, but initiate many of their own. They discuss problems of philosophy, literature, science, movies, jazz—or some particular local problem that agitates the young people. Now we are raising the question of establishing special youth cafes, where the young people can meet, discuss their problems freely, and dance too."

Some of these cafes, he said, had already been established, and the youth were clamoring for more of them. He showed us an attractive architects' plan for such a youth cafe which had been already built in Izmailova, a wooded park in Moscow. It was a large airy structure, with glassed in sections for various age groups, which could be

turned into open-air cafes in the summer.

Everywhere we went we were deeply impressed by the vigor, initiative and independence of Soviet youth. They are ready to talk about and criticize anything freely. There is no doubt of the acceptance of the vast majority of them of socialism as the best way of life. But they are impatient of anything that goes wrong under socialism, with what they consider the conservatism of some of the older people. We were talking with a young woman finishing a course as a cinema producer, already producing herself, about Soviet TV, of which she was very critical. "There are a lot of bureaucrats sitting up there," she said, "they don't worry about good programs, because they know they have a captive audience."

The youth of the Soviet Union have no intention of being anyone's captive audience. If a common commitment to the values and goals of a socialist society on the way to communism is conformity, to this extent they are indeed conformists. But within such conformity are the endless diversities and interplay of opinion on which all human progress must depend. The spirit of Soviet youth can best be summed up in the words of the young worker who answered the questionnaire about the present generation with these words:

"I love the powerful energy of the sun, I love life! With each new spring I feel that I am fully a part of the awakening of nature. Youth is the springtime of humanity! Our youth can achieve its aim if there is no war—there must not be another war!"

Jewish Culture in the USSR

by CHAIM SULLER

Mr. Chaim Suller of the Jewish Morning Freiheit has written a long review answering false allegations in the recent book, The Jewish Problem in the Soviet Union—An Analysis and a Solution, by B. Z. Goldberg. The review was published in the Freiheit in three issues during August. With the author's permission, we are publishing a section of the review dealing with developments in Jewish culture.

ON THE QUESTION of Jewish culture in the Soviet Union, Mr. Goldberg does the same thing that he has done on other questions. Ignoring a whole review of important matters, he takes a number of facts, adds to them a number of half-truths, several facts 'made out of whole cloth,' mixes all this up together, until he gets the kind of brew he desires.

He reiterates continuously the facts about the years 1948-1953, when many Jewish artists and cultural workers were criminally annihilated; when Jewish cultural institutions were closed administratively. And then he tries to "prove" that now things are not much better. He dismisses, with a wave of the hand, such things as the publication in Yiddish of the classics of Mendeleyev, Peretz and Sholem Aleichem. He maintains that this is done for foreign consumption. He questions the fact that they are not publishing the works of contemporary Yiddish writers. Yes, he admits that Yiddish concerts are taking place; that Yiddish phonograph records are being made, but he considers these very trivial things. What is the truth?

The above-mentioned editions of the three Yiddish classicists were published, each in an edition of 30,000 copies! Yes, these books were sold abroad. However, I myself saw them on display for sale in the very largest bookstore on Gorky

Street in Moscow, in the book kiosks of the lobbies of the Bolshoy Theater. This was also true of Leningrad. I saw these books in Jewish homes that I visited in the Soviet Union. These books are beautifully illustrated, and very attractively published.

Incidentally, the *Jewish Day*, of which Mr. Goldberg is a staff writer, also published the works of Sholem Aleichem. Let him inquire in the office, how many copies of each volume were distributed, including those that were sold on the foreign market. I am sure, that it is far, far less than 30,000 copies! The management of the *Day* would be very well satisfied if they sold as much as 10,000 copies!

And this is of the works of Sholem Aleichem—the most popular Yiddish writer! The works of Mendeleyev and of Peretz cannot in America, where there are twice as many Jews as in the Soviet Union, reach a distribution of a tenth of the number published in the Soviet Union.

B. Z. Goldberg doesn't mention a single word about the beautiful illustrations made by the Soviet Jewish artist, Tanchem Kaplan, for the publication of the *Bewitched Tailor*, which appeared in both the Yiddish and Russian text. At the same time Goldberg also fails to mention that Kaplan's illustrations are not only of a highly artistic caliber, but were drawn in the truly Yiddish traditional style. Such a fact must not be mentioned, because this would not fit into his thesis that Jewish life in the Soviet Union is bare of any Yiddish content. At the same time B. Z. Goldberg also fails to mention that a new work of art, created by Tanchem Kaplan is about to be published, based on Sholem Aleichem's work, "Tevye, the Dairyman," with a foreword by Ilya Ehrenburg.

These are not the only "incidentals"

that Goldberg fails to mention. He fails to mention a word about the publication of a collection of the work of David Bergelson, of 762 pages, published in an edition of 30,000 copies, and of a book of all of the poems (in Yiddish) by Osher Shvartzman in an edition of 10,000 copies! And it is also well-known that editions are being planned in Yiddish, of the work of Itzik Feffer, Aaron Vergelis and others.

Before B. Z. Goldberg's book was published, it became known that a magazine, published in Yiddish, called *Soviet Homeland*, was being planned, under the editorship of Aaron Vergelis, with a personnel of co-editors and the cooperation of 130 Yiddish writers. This magazine, in a large format, was being planned as a bi-monthly for this year (1961) and that beginning with January, 1962 it would appear every month.

The *Morning Freiheit*, a progressive Jewish language daily, appearing in New York, has already published many reports from its correspondent, S. Rabinowitz, in the Soviet Union, giving details about the publication of the above-mentioned magazine *Soviet Homeland*. The *Jewish Day-Morning Journal* and the *Forward* have both come out already attacking this publication, both editorially and in a series of articles, but B. Z. Goldberg doesn't mention a word about it.

Here we must point out that, according to all reports, it looks as if *Soviet Homeland* is more than a magazine; that it is a Jewish institution in the making. Still, there is not a single word about it in B. Z. Goldberg's book—as well as in the publicity concerning the book, probably, because the publication of this magazine does not fit in with the pattern which B. Z. Goldberg tries to bring out.

Another point which Mr. Goldberg barely mentions in his book, is the publication of Jewish works in Russian, Ukrainian and in other languages of the Soviet Union. Sholem Aleichem was also published there in the English language.

In translation, the classicists have been published, as well as the present-day Soviet Jewish writers. Many of these works are on Yiddish themes. The editions are published in tremendous numbers! A number of Sholem Aleichem's works appeared in a quarter of a million copies.

To list all the writers whose works were published in translation, would take up too much space. In my own library these works occupy a number of shelves, and I am far from having a complete collection of the books of all the writers.

It is, however, important here, to mention a number of them who are of special interest: a book of poems by the deceased Israeli writer, Chaye Kadmun; an anthology of Hebrew poetry, under the editorship of the Israeli writer, Alexander Pen, in a Russian translation. These are works which are to be published shortly, or have already appeared. In this category, it is also important to mention the work of the Polish-Yiddish author and historian, Ben Mark: *The Uprising of the Warsaw Ghetto*.

As you can see, B. Z. Goldberg keeps on continually "forgetting" and "overlooking many important things.

B. Z. Goldberg says:

There is no Jewish body or any agency concerned with Yiddish theater. And there does not exist a single Yiddish theater. But the Trade Union Culture Department, which fosters amateur theatrical groups among the other cultural activities of the workers, has organized, or permitted the organization of, three Yiddish amateur acting groups in Leningrad, Vilna, and Riga. Like other amateur groups, they give a few performances a year, primarily dramatizations of stories by Sholom Aleichem, whose work is politically safe.

It would be very interesting to know why Sholem Aleichem is more "politically kosher" in the Soviet Union. . . .

And what about Mendele and Peretz? Were their works published, even

though they weren't politically kosher? And in connection with dramatic presentations, the Vilna Troupe has produced "Butra" by Moische Kulback; "Freilechs," "Hershele Ostropolier" and also "200,000" by Sholem Aleichem.

It so happened that I was fortunate enough to see a production of the last-mentioned play on my visit last year. If it is a production by an amateur group, I wish we could have many more such amateurs, both here in America as well as in the Soviet Union! It is true that these productions are not played daily—but appear quite frequently—and always to packed houses.

B. Z. Goldberg does not say a word about any of these things. He doesn't mention that both in Vilna and in Riga there are Jewish choirs; that the dramatic and choral groups of these two cities frequently exchange appearances as well as make appearances on tour to many cities. He also makes no mention of the fact that there are dramatic groups in Dvinsky and in Chernowitz, as well as Leningrad. It is also a fact that singers and actors travel through the length and breadth of the Soviet Union and appear as artists before millions of people annually. Among them are many professionals—singers, actors and reciters. Folk songs are sung, as well as modern songs; and many of the contemporary writers and composers write songs and music for them. The same is true of actors. Among these singers are Michael Alexandrovitch, Nechameh Lifshitz, Sidi Tal, Emile Horowitz, Marina Gordon and many, many others.

To all the above-mentioned, one must add the many literary evenings and lectures which are organized in many cities by the writers' organizations in Yiddish as well as in other languages. Most of these evenings are arranged in connection with the birthday of a Jewish writer or other Jewish artist. To this we must add the millions of phonograph records that are being produced of song, dance and the drama and are

being distributed throughout the Soviet Union.

It is also important to mention the many gigantic celebrations which took place throughout the Soviet Union in connection with the rooth Birthday Celebration of Sholem Aleichem. (Especially B. Z. Goldberg should have made mention of this). On that historic occasion, only three countries throughout the world commemorated the occasion by issuing special Sholem Aleichem stamps. They were: the Soviet Union, Rumania and Israel. In Israel, moreover, Sholem Aleichem's works were not published in Yiddish and no celebrations were held.

Let us also at this time mention the publication of a book of Yiddish folksongs, collected and put together by the well-known folklorist of Kiev, Beregovsky; the Jewish music of Dmitri Shostakovitch composed on the musical theme of nine Jewish folksongs. Let us note, too, the big productions in the important theaters of Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev and other cities of Sholem Aleichem's "Tevye the Dairyman," "200,000" and works of other writers in Russian and Ukrainian.

It is true that there is still a justifiable dissatisfaction with the way Jewish culture is being revived in the Yiddish language. As we have previously mentioned, even though a great deal is being done in connection with this, there is still felt the serious lack of a central professional Yiddish national theater, a Jewish newspaper, classes in the Yiddish language, history and literature. But, at the same time, we must recognize progress already made in the field of Yiddish culture! From 1956 till now, much has happened! Jewish books are being published; a Jewish magazine is being issued; there are highly developed amateur-groups and dramatic circles. Numerous Jewish concerts are being held. Millions of Jewish phonograph records are being produced—the Yiddish songs are being heard and sung!

GR
with
at the
tival
in the
I was
It im
ample
realis
ing t
acteri
ple to
of life
and c
pictur
of a
avoid
hero"
conce
jective
plot
of the
realiti
they
At
rai an
their
I had
his ow
"Clea
sensit
than
from
"Balla
of the
more
He
recept
count
showi
had b
press
angle

"OF LOVE, OF FIDELITY, OF TRUTH"

GRIGORI CHUKHRAI'S "Clear Sky," which shared the Grand Prix with the Japanese film "The Island," at the Moscow International Film Festival in July, was showing everywhere in the Soviet Union during June, while I was there. Audiences were enthusiastic. It impressed me as an outstanding example of a new direction of socialist realism in the arts which, while retaining the basic optimism which is characteristic of the mood of the Soviet people today, faces boldly the dark aspects of life which have to be lived through and overcome. In this, as in his earlier pictures "The Forty-First," and "Ballad of a Soldier," Chukhrai completely avoids the stereotype, the "cardboard hero" of an earlier period. He is deeply concerned with the emotions, the subjective reactions of his people, and his plot unfolds through the development of their inner lives within the objective realities of the socialist society in which they live.

At an informal meeting, with Chukhrai and his lovely young wife, expecting their second child, and a few friends, I had an opportunity to learn directly his own feelings and purpose in making "Clear Sky." He is a handsome, vibrant, sensitive person, who looks younger than his 39 years. He had just come from receiving the Lenin Prize for "Ballad"—but said that the response of the people to his work meant even more to him than the prize.

He began by telling me about the reception of "Clear Sky" in some of the countries where it had already been shown abroad, and how disturbed he had been that in some cases the foreign press had stressed only the sensational angle of the film.

"If I were asked what I made the film about," he told me, "I would answer, 'Of love, of fidelity, of truth.' I didn't strive for any sensational revelations. This is not a film about the cult of personality. That is a complex question that must be solved not only in politics, but in films, in literature and art, from many angles. There will be much more about it. But it is not the main question in my film. I wanted to show a love of a completely self-sacrificing kind. The events of the film took place against the background of the injustices of the Stalin period. Not to have shown them would have been glossing over reality. And I wanted to show not only personal love and fidelity, but the fidelity of the people in the picture to the true ideas of communism, which were being distorted at that time."

The picture is laid in wartime and the period that followed. It reflects the war, in which Chukhrai himself fought from beginning to end, in its effects on the lives of the Soviet people, rather than in war scenes. To tell the story briefly, a young, unsophisticated girl, Sasha Lvova, falls in love with a famous flyer, Alexey Astakhov. In five days which the flyer had expected to be a brief interlude before he returns to the front, the comic little girl becomes a mature woman and the two become bound together in a strong and enduring love. Later, as Sasha is at work in a factory, Alexey's death in an air battle is announced. Sasha has borne his child, and after the war, still true to Alexey's memory, refuses marriage with an old school friend, which could have made life easier for her and her child.

Then Alexey returns. He had not

been killed, but gravely wounded, and semi-conscious, had been taken prisoner by the Germans, and lived through the horrors of a German concentration camp.

The joy of their reunion is soon marred as Alexey falls victim to the unjust suspicions of that period against those who were taken prisoner by the Nazis instead of putting a bullet through their heads. He had no proof of the state he was in when he was captured. Party bureaucrats, seated symbolically under a statue of Stalin casting a dark shadow on the proceedings, expel him from the Party, and refuse him permission to fly. Knowing he is right, yet trying to hold on to his faith that if the Party acts this way it must be right, there is terrible doubt and confusion in his mind, and for a while he takes to drink. Sasha's love and faith in him never waver. She insists that he must continue to fight for his vindication.

Word comes of the death of Stalin. Then there is a scene of the mighty breaking up of ice in a frozen river, the clearing of the dark skies the picture has shown before, the rolling back of the clouds, the beginning of the buds of spring. Astakhov goes to higher Party headquarters to plead his case. Sasha waits outside not knowing what his fate will be. At last he emerges pale and shaken, with Sasha still in agonized suspense. Then Alexey opens his clenched right hand, and within it lies the Gold Star of the medal—Hero of the Soviet Union.

Like "Ballad of a Soldier," "Clear Sky" utters a deep protest against war. In the opening of "Ballad" there is the unforgettable symbolic scene of the tiny figure of Alyosha running this way and that to escape the monstrous Nazi tank bearing mercilessly down upon him, later the heart-rending brevity of the meeting with his mother he has come so far to see. The human agony of war is again brought home in "Clear Sky" not through battle scenes, but through the sufferings it

brings to people. There is an almost unbearable scene on a railroad station platform. The women of the town have heard their men are coming through on their way to the front. With their children they rush to meet the train, hoping for a moment of farewell with their loved ones. The train approaches, thunders past, unrecognizable faces of soldiers flash by, the unbelieving, tortured faces of the woman yearn upward and then onward as the train rushes away into the distance.

Chukhrai's purpose was not only to show the evil of the war, but evils that came afterward, that had to be eradicated.

"The suffering and the tragedy that followed for Sasha and Alexey also expressed the reality of that period, and had to be shown. Astakhov returns to a wife and child who adore him. It seems that now they have everything that should make them happy."

But the unjust suspicion that falls on him because he was taken prisoner prevents this. Chukhrai was concerned that the nature of Astakhov's inner conflict should be understood. He explained:

"When he is suspected, he cannot think that the Party and the State are wrong. He has been fighting all his life for them. Here it must be understood that all the strivings of the Soviet people, all our ideals, all we fight for, are linked up with the idea of communism. To us, the main meaning of communism is that its goal is social justice. In the situation the picture portrays, social justice was lacking. That is why the experience these people lived through was so bitter. That was the source of Astakhov's deep internal conflict—what the Party meant to him, and the injustice in what he was going through—the formal approach in that period that if you were in a prison camp you must have collaborated with the enemy.

"But what must be understood is this. First, that Alexey was so convinced that

there
Part
almo
guilt
dista
place
I
with
had
sent
in to
in th
They
ques
well
sacre
out t
could
term
"C
tion,
the
beca
of t
were
liber
dece
neces
a tru
"A
the r
was
Our
gress
legal
comp
taken
angle
say
social
violat
great
been
really
raisin
that
legal
pines
and
Ch
of let
85 p

there could be nothing wrong in the Party's attitude toward him, that he was almost ready to believe in his own guilt. Second, he was not aware of the distortions of justice that were taking place under Stalin's regime."

I mentioned that some of the people with whom I had discussed the film had expressed the feeling that it presented the questions of the Stalin period in too over-simplified a way, particularly in the thaw scene after Stalin's death. They said it was such a complicated question, there was so much good as well as bad in that period . . . it was a sacred matter, which they had to work out for themselves, on many levels, and could not be presented in such stark terms. What did he think about this?

"Of course it is a complicated question," he answered thoughtfully, "but the fact is that after Stalin's death, it became possible to raise the question of the fate of so many people who were innocent, to restore to them their liberty, their feeling of righteousness, decency, personal dignity. This was necessary both from a humanitarian and a true Party attitude.

"Alexey's vindication is a reflection of the reality that took place. Social justice was restored, that is the important thing. Our country has made tremendous progress in the restoration of socialist legality. In the picture I, as an artist, completely support this process that has taken place. I don't take up any other angles of the cult of personality. I simply say that for a period there was not socialist legality, that there were grave violations of it, that caused harm to a great many people. This process has now been stopped, reversed. I am surprised, really, that I have been criticized for raising this question. No one can deny that there were violations of socialist legality. I wanted to show that happiness is not possible without justice and without truth."

Chukhrai told me that of the hundreds of letters he had been receiving, about 85 per cent were from people whose

hearts were full of gratitude that he had raised this question, people who he said, "approached it from a humane point of view, reacting that way because like most of our people, they cannot live without the truth."

A very small percentage of the letters, he said, upbraided him bitterly, taking the position that the Stalin era was not as he portrayed it, that time would prove that Stalin had been a hundred per cent correct.

Certain others criticized the film from the point of view of esthetics, saying that it was uneven, not unified. With much of this criticism, Chukhrai himself was in agreement. He told me that in the process of filming certain inadequacies in the script by Khrabrovitsky had come to light.

"I had to some extent to improvise as I went along" he said "so in many ways the film was a gradual development, not wholly mastered in advance. For example, I wanted to be sure our heroine did only what her heart told her—thinking over this, and the question of those who did only what their reason told them, brought me to the basic question of what is good and what is evil, which had to be developed more in the process of making the film."

Chukhrai, despite the international acclaim his first two pictures had brought him and the Lenin prize his "Ballad of a Soldier" brought him, and its author, Y. Yoshev, was extremely modest about his work.

"I think," he concluded, "that half the shortcomings of this film would be enough to kill any other picture! I am really amazed that it is alive. I have asked myself why the picture appealed. I think the explanation is that it has meaning for the people, no one can be indifferent to it. I believe cinematography is not a medium simply to show your own mastery of the subject, the nuances of the situation, your own ingenuity and inventiveness. All this is necessary—but it is only the means, not the end of the picture. Actual-

ly the task of the director is to share emotions, thoughts, opinions, with his audience. And despite the shortcomings of 'A Clear Sky,' the public seems to overlook them, and finds in it something that answers the questions they themselves have raised, questions of the meaning of love, fidelity, integrity and truth."

I hope Americans will have an opportunity to see this picture, and the fine portrayals of Sasha Lvova by the young stage actress, Nina Drobysheva, making her first film appearance, and of Alexey Astakhov by Yevgeni Urbansky.

—JESSICA SMITH

THE REVENGE SEEKERS

by MURRAY YOUNG

The Strategy of Revenge, by Ernst Henri. New Century. New York. 1961. 46 pages. 25 cents.

MANY OF OUR READERS will remember Ernst Henri's two important books, *Hitler Over Europe* and *Hitler Over Russia*, published in the 1930's, that brought home to many people the real aim of Hitler's rearming of Germany.

Henri's important pamphlet under review should serve equally as a warning in the present foreboding world situation.

Only 16 years separate the defeated German army of 1945 from the armed Bundeswehr, now a leading part of NATO.

Mr. Henri traces the steps of this terrifying emergence and, delving deeper, reveals the full strategy of the German General Staff which President Eisenhower at the end of the Second World War said, "must be utterly destroyed. These wars of Germany's have been, from the standpoint of the General Staff, merely campaigns—merely incidents. They [members of the German General Staff] started back in 1806, under Scharnhorst, and they have determined to rule Europe."

Pointing out that almost all German generals in the past 150 years came from the General Staff, Henri shows that the continuity is unbroken to this very day: General Heusinger, builder of the Bonn

Bundeswehr, is a former Operation Chief of the Army General Staff, and is at present Chairman of the NATO Military Committee in Washington; General Speidel, formerly Rommel's Chief of Staff, is at present Chief Commander of NATO's European Army. He further points out that 81 of the present generals and admirals of the Bundeswehr were members of the General Staff by the end of World War II.

Henri makes clear that the General Staff does not revolve in its own orbit—it is appointed by the ruling class, lives at the cost of this class, and carries out its orders. This is true whether the ruling class consists of Junker landowners and feudal lords or industrial monopolists. Under a monarchy, a fascist state or a republic, they dominate the war machine. The one social system they will not tolerate is socialism.

Even as the Locarno Pact of 1925 was being signed by Germany, France and England, the General Staff, Henri states, was methodically preparing a Blitzkrieg against Germany's co-signers, in line with its unchanging policy of not recognizing documents of capitulation, disarmament commitments and treaties aimed at strengthening peace.

Henri quotes a secret memorandum of General von Stupnagel, Commander of the German forces in occupied France, written at the end of 1944 when it was clear that Germany had been defeated: "Our defeat in the present war must be

regarded merely as an unfortunate occurrence in Germany's victorious advance toward the conquest of the world. . . ." Stupnagel's former subordinate is General Heusinger.

According to Henri, the Bonn General Staff has five principal aims:

(1) To create an army that is the strongest in Western Europe, both numerically and as a striking force; (2) to equip that army with the most modern weapons of mass destruction; (3) to convert all Western Europe and part of Africa into the hinterland of that army; (4) to wrest the NATO leadership out of American hands and turn NATO into a Bundeswehr auxiliary organization; (5) to compile an effective strategic plan for a new aggression, selecting the time, place and method.

In 1958 the strength of the Bundeswehr was 125,000, today it is 350,000, accounting for 43 per cent of NATO land forces under Speidel's command. Conscriptio is being planned for the Federal Republic and its army hopes to be given hydrogen weapons soon. "From the standpoint of the German militant, Heusinger has thereby regained a good part of what Hitler lost."

During 1960 the Bundeswehr was busy negotiating either to build bases in, or conclude military pacts with, among others, Greece, Italy, France, Norway, England, Spain, Switzerland, Portugal and various African countries. (By this time a number of these negotiations have been successfully completed.)

And early in 1961 the most important post in NATO went to General Heusinger.

Henri quotes the defense minister of West Germany, Strauss, as saying in an unguarded moment, "When the Bundeswehr is ready for action we shall talk to the crazy people who visit Moscow in the proper way, in the German way, and we will show them who the real leaders of NATO are."

Along with the startling successes already achieved by the Bundeswehr,

there is the new form of the old Blitzkrieg—better known as the "Super Blitzkrieg." Henri quotes from an article in a semi-official Bundeswehr journal:

In view of the long range of atomic weapons . . . blitz campaigns as formerly conceived will scarcely be possible. . . . New forms of blitz must, therefore, be planned. . . . The assault must have as its target . . . centers where the enemy's man power and material resources are concentrated. In general, the first use of the atomic weapons is decisive. If the blow is dealt at decisive targets in the enemy camp he will have no opportunity to reply at that stage of the battle with either atomic or conventional weapons.

The article then goes on to point out that the targets to be attacked are Moscow, the Urals, Soviet oilfields and oil pipe-lines. "Fear is a bad counsellor in wartime," the article, concludes, stressing that there should be no fear of using atomic weapons.

Instead of the days and weeks of Hitler's Blitzkrieg, the timing now is in minutes and hours.

Read in the light of the present situation, Henri's pamphlet—only the main points of which have been indicated in this review—gives depth and chilling clarity to many aspects of the complex relation of forces that makes this such an ominous period. The Soviet resumption of nuclear bomb testing is seen in a different perspective after reading this important analysis. It should be read widely—you will want extra copies to give to your friends.

NOW READY

Bound Indexed Volumes of
NEW WORLD REVIEW, 1960

\$4.00 each

Index alone, 35c

Order through NWR

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

A FREE SAMPLE 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 below: (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 _____

JUST PUBLISHED!

FREEDOM: Promise & Menace

By Scott Nearing

An Analysis of the Cult of Freedom. A Review of Freedom in Practice.

An evaluation of the role of Freedom in a power-age community.

A book that challenges the basic assumptions of U.S.A. big business.

Clothbound 208 pages \$3.50

SOCIAL SCIENCE INSTITUTE
Harborside, Maine

SOVIET FILMS

NEW RELEASES

The Queen of Spades
The Sun Shines For All
Mumu and the Colt
Lullaby
The Train Goes to Kiev

Coming:

The Gordeyev Family
Moscow Documentary
Sergei Prokofiev

Released by:

ARTKINO PICTURES, INC.
723 Seventh Ave., N. Y. 19, N. Y.
Telephone: Circle 5-6570