

NOVEMBER, 1961

25¢

New World

REVIEW

SPECIAL ANNIVERSARY ISSUE

44 Years USSR • 28 Years US-USSR Relations

Since October 1917

ALBERT RHYS WILLIAMS

The New Party Program

D. N. PRITT

New Frontiers in Siberia

JESSICA SMITH

Pledge of Friendship

ROCKWELL KENT

Soviet Culture Today

JOHN H. LAWSON

The World Crisis

CORLISS LAMONT

U.S. China Policy

SUSAN WARREN

Poets and People

BERNARD KOTEN

Cultural Exchanges

MURRAY YOUNG

Negotiation Not War Over Berlin!

GEN. HUGH B. HESTER

NEW WORLD REVIEW

NOVEMBER

1961

Two Anniversaries <i>Jessica Smith</i>	3
Since October 1917 <i>Albert Rhys Williams</i>	8
Living in Sunlight <i>Murray Young</i>	11
44 Years <i>D. N. Pritt</i>	16
Pledge of Friendship <i>Rockwell Kent</i>	19
Soviet Culture <i>John Howard Lawson</i>	21
Thoughts on the World Crisis <i>Corliss Lamont</i>	26
Negotiations and More Negotiations <i>Gen. Hugh B. Hester</i>	29
No War Over Berlin <i>Martin Hall</i>	33
Poets and People <i>Bernard Koten</i>	38
U.S. China Policy Goes for Broke <i>Susan Warren</i>	43
New Frontiers in Siberia <i>Jessica Smith</i>	50

BOOK REVIEWS

<i>From Yalta to Disarmament—</i> <i>Joseph P. Morray</i>	
<i>Jessica Smith</i>	59
<i>Africa, The Wonder and the Glory—</i> <i>Anna Melissa Graves</i>	60
<i>Books on the History of the USSR</i>	61
<i>A Visit on Soviet Farms—</i> <i>Charles J. Coe</i>	62

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

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

Vol. 29, No. 11, November, 1961. Second class postage paid at New York, N. Y. Subscription \$2.50 per year. \$1.25 for 6 months (Canadian, \$3.00, foreign \$3.50 a year. Draw money orders or checks payable in New York.) Published monthly by the N.W.R. Publications, Inc., 34 West 15th Street, New York 11, N. Y. Indexed in Bulletin of the Public Affairs Information Service. Phone: CHelsea 3-0666.
PRINTED IN U.S.A.

209

EVERY READER GET A READER!

We know readers share our belief that NWR should be read much more widely throughout the country.

The samples we send out to people whose names are sent in to us of course bring us new readers. But we are sure that a trial sub of 5 months (\$1.00) sent to a friend in your name would be much more likely to secure regular subscription. (Or suggest to your friends that they send in a subscription themselves.)

If complacency about world affairs has all too often been characteristic of many Americans in the past, the increasing tensions of today with the horrifying shadow of a thermonuclear war has left few people unmoved by the ghastly future that possibly faces them and their children.

What is the future to be like and is it possible for men to determine the course it shall take? Few are indifferent to these questions today.

NWR, as you know, helps its readers understand the developments of world events and thus gives them an insight which is necessary if we are to move into a peaceful future.

Send a trial sub (or a full year's subscription) to as many of your friends as you can afford. They will be most grateful to you.

PLEASE FILL OUT AND MAIL TODAY

NEW WORLD REVIEW

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

I enclose \$1.00 for 5 month trial sub.

I enclose \$2.50 for 1 year sub.

To be sent to:

Name _____

Address _____ City _____ State _____

Please indicate whether your name is to be mentioned with gift sub ☐ Yes ☐ No

Name of sender _____

Address _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

Two Anniversaries

Call for Supreme Effort to End War

by JESSICA SMITH

AS IS OUR custom in November, we dedicate this issue to two anniversaries of historic importance to all mankind. The anniversary of the Russian Revolution of November 7, 1917, and that of the establishment of American-Soviet diplomatic relations on November 16, 1933.

On this 44th birthday of the USSR, we rejoice with the Soviet people in their remarkable achievements in building a fuller and richer life here on this earth and in blazing a path toward the stars. We congratulate them on the great program they are now entering upon for the fulfillment of what Lenin called "not dreams, but future reality"—the transition to a Communist society with abundance for all of both material and cultural riches — a society where each will give according to his ability and receive according to his needs.

We wish we could also rejoice in the fulfillment of the Roosevelt-Litvinov agreement signed in the hope "that our relations may forever remain normal and friendly, for our mutual benefit and for the peace of the world."

That hope remains still unfulfilled frozen by the fierce winds of the cold war.

What can we do now to give it life again, with the fate of our countries and humanity hanging on the quivering balance of terror of ever more dreadful atomic weapons?

The megaton bombs exploded by the Soviet Union as a result of our own war measures, the arsenal of nuclear weapons possessed by our own country and the new ones being planned and tested, the preparations for equipping the West German Bundeswehr with nuclear striking power — all this sounds out the great warning to the world that *these weapons must never be used*, and must be abolished forever.

How can we accomplish this? Only now, by a supreme effort for the renewal of negotiations for general and complete disarmament under thorough control, *never to be broken off* until this goal, agreed upon by both the United States and the Soviet Union in principle, in their September 20 statement, is achieved. Only by a supreme effort to avoid war over Berlin or any other issue that could explode into nuclear war before disarmament is achieved. These are the demands which we must make of our own government, ceaselessly and with all our strength.

We believe that the statements by Nikita Khrushchev, Soviet Premier and First Secretary of the Communist Party, made at the 22nd Party Congress, show that on its part the Soviet Government is prepared to exert every effort to this end.

The actual proceedings of the Congress have largely been blanketed in the U.S. press through sen-

sational treatment of the question of Albania, differences between the USSR and China, attacks on the anti-Party group, and so on. We cannot now attempt any full report since only partial texts of the speeches are available at press time. We should only like to point out that the discussions have demonstrated beyond doubt that the basic course of the Soviet Union remains one of unswerving adherence to the policy of peaceful coexistence in foreign relations and of complete repudiation of the evil repressions and the cult of the individual for which Stalin and those who supported his actions were responsible.

We feel that the most important contribution we can make on this anniversary occasion is to review Khrushchev's opening report, in which peaceful coexistence and disarmament, the necessity and possibility of avoiding the frightful holocaust that threatens mankind, were the recurrent themes.

PEACE is essential, Khrushchev declared, for carrying out the 20-year program for the building of communism he presented to the Congress. While asserting that competition between the socialist and capitalist systems has become the main feature of world development in the present period, Khrushchev expressed confidence that this conflict would be resolved through other means than war.

The first Secretary of the Communist Party said that the world socialist system is becoming a decisive factor in the development of society and international affairs. The thesis of the Twentieth Congress that in the present epoch wars

are not inevitable and can be prevented had been confirmed. He continued:

The fact that it has been possible to prevent war and that the Soviet people and the peoples of other countries have been able to enjoy the benefits of peaceful life must be regarded as the chief result of the activities of our Party and its Central Committee in increasing the might of the Soviet state and in implementing a Leninist foreign policy, as a result of the work of the fraternal Parties of the socialist states and the greater activities of the peace forces of all countries.

The growing economic strength of the socialist state means also, he said, a strengthening of the material and moral factors for peace:

We are confident that socialism will be victorious in the competition with capitalism. We are confident that the victory will be won in peaceful competition and not through war. We have taken our stand and always shall take our stand on the peaceful coexistence of the states with different social systems; we shall do everything to strengthen peace throughout the world.

Noting the continuous decline of capitalism, Mr. Khrushchev declared that the United States had lost its absolute supremacy in world capitalist production and commerce, the positions of Britain and France had noticeably weakened, while the countries defeated in the World War, especially West Germany and Japan, had made a big leap forward. He cited divisions among capitalist states:

The struggle between British and West German imperialism is growing fiercer. French imperialism, in its struggle against British imperialism, is attempting to find support in its enemy of yesterday — the West German monopolies. This

unnatural alliance, like a marriage of convenience, is more and more frequently turning against France herself. There are profound contradictions dividing the United States and Britain and other imperialistic states.

Reactionaries, he said, were seeking a way out by increasing tensions to make it easier for them to form military blocks and arouse fears among the people of an alleged threat from the socialist countries. Weakened by the disintegration of the colonial system and the winning of political independence by 28 states in the last six years, they were trying to involve the liberated countries in their military blocs.

Mr. Khrushchev made a special point of the active role in foreign affairs being played by the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America that have freed or are freeing themselves from foreign oppression. These countries, while called neutralist, as a rule advocate peace and oppose war, and "the basic issues of world politics can no longer be settled without due regard for their interests."

Mr. Khrushchev affirmed the support of the Soviet Union for all national liberation movements in their struggles against the remnants of colonialism. While Communists, he said, believe that the age-old backwardness of peoples can be overcome through socialism, this could only come about through the creative activity of the broadest masses of the people. He emphasized Communists' opposition to "the forcible, artificial implantation of any particular socio-political system in other countries" or any attempt to bring about the triumph of socialism by interfering in the internal affairs of

other countries. He went on to say:

You cannot bring in ideas on bayonets, as people used to say in the past, or on rockets, as it would be more proper to say now.

Mr. Khrushchev stressed that Communists "are against the export of world revolution" but at the same time, "we do not recognize anyone's right to export counter-revolution."

Turning to the question of Germany and Berlin, Mr. Khrushchev declared that the threat of a new world war arising from the West German revenge seekers had compelled the Soviet Union to take steps to safeguard their country and mankind, including the resumption of nuclear tests. These he announced would probably be concluded with the test of a 50-megaton bomb, which would also test the instruments for a 100-megaton bomb—the latter however, would not be exploded. He added: "May God grant that we never have to explode such a bomb over anyone's territory."

Referring to the fact that some people in the West were interpreting Soviet measures of defense as a renunciation of the policy of peaceful coexistence, Khrushchev reaffirmed that the principles of peaceful coexistence remain the unchangeable basis of Soviet foreign policy and that it must be understood that "The Soviet Union will never be the first to start a war."

But, he went on, the Western powers, "who should be interested in avoiding thermonuclear disaster no less than we," must also show readiness to settle disputed issues on a mutually acceptable basis.

Khrushchev declared that history showed aggressors cannot be pla-

cated by concessions: what is needed is an unrelenting struggle of all peoples against those with aggressive aspirations. He recalled the important contribution made by the world's peace forces when in the early 'fifties hundreds of millions of people called for a ban on atomic weapons. All the more important is the work of the peace supporters today when the danger of a new war has increased:

In the present situation, men of goodwill can no longer confine themselves to mere utterances in favor of peace. . . . It is necessary to act resolutely and vigorously to stay the criminal hand of the warmongers in good time, before it is too late. . . .

It must be realized that it depends above all on the peoples themselves, on their resolve and vigorous action, whether there is to be peace on earth or whether mankind will be hurled into the catastrophe of a new world war . . . Vigorous anti-war action by the peoples must be launched immediately and not when nuclear and thermonuclear bombs begin to fall . . . It is the peoples who are the decisive force in the struggle for peace.

Khrushchev Urges Disarmament

Khrushchev urged action without delay on a disarmament program:

The struggle for general and complete disarmament is a major component of the foreign policy of our Party . . . We have always resolutely opposed the arms race, for in the past competition in this field not only imposed a heavy burden on the peoples but inevitably led to world wars. We are opposed to the arms race more firmly now that a tremendous technical revolution has taken place in warfare and the use of modern weapons would inevitably lead to hundreds of millions of people losing their lives. The stockpiling of these weapons, which is taking place in an atmosphere of cold war and cold war hysteria, is fraught with disastrous consequences . . .

It should be plain that the idea of our program for general and complete disarmament is not the unilateral disarmament of socialism in the face of imperialism or the other way around, but a universal renunciation of arms as a means of settling controversial international problems.

Khrushchev stated that the elimination of the remnants of the Second World War by a German peace treaty is of tremendous importance for the maintenance of peace, and that the USSR is prepared to seek a mutually acceptable and agreed solution with the Western powers through negotiations. Referring to Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko's recent talks with the U.S. Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, President Kennedy and British Prime Minister Macmillan, he said:

We had the impression that the Western powers display a certain understanding of the situation and are inclined to seek a solution of the German problem and West Berlin on a mutually acceptable basis.

He reiterated that a German peace treaty would have to be signed with or without the Western powers, and that on its basis the position of West Berlin as a free demilitarized city would be normalized. Noting that the Soviet Union had never presented any ultimatum on this matter, Mr. Khrushchev continued:

The Soviet Government as before, insists on the speediest solution of the German problem; it is against putting it off to infinity. If the Western powers display readiness to settle the German problem, the question of the time limit for signing a German peace treaty will not be so material. We shall not insist that the peace treaty be signed by all means before December 31, 1961. The main thing is to solve the question of

eliminating the remnants of World War II. This the crux of the matter.

With regard to the United Nations, Khrushchev stressed that "its machinery has grown rusty and needs improvement."

It is high time to restore the legitimate rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. As matters stand now, the most reasonable solution would be to conclude a peace treaty with both German states and admit them to the United Nations.

It is time to grant genuine equal rights in all United Nations agencies to the three groups of states that have come into being in the world—socialist, neutralist and imperialist.

Colonialism in all its forms and manifestations must be completely abolished, he declared, and disinterested aid given to underdeveloped countries.

Among measures which Mr. Khrushchev proposed for the easing of international tensions were 1. Establishment of atom-free zones, first of all in Europe and the Far East, 2. A non-aggression pact between the countries in the Warsaw Treaty Organization and those in NATO, 3. The establishment of zones dividing the armed forces of military alignments [disengagement], 4. Reduction of armed forces [military bases] stationed on foreign soil.

For Normal US-USSR Relations

Turning to relations with the United States, Nikita Khrushchev urged the normalizing of relations between the two countries as the only way of preventing a universal war of annihilation. He declared that if realistic thinking gained the upper hand in the United States,

if it would base its international relations on the idea of peaceful economic competition, this would benefit not only the peoples of the two countries but also of other countries, and world peace.

Mr. Khrushchev stressed the need of extensive business and cultural relations with all countries as an important element in peaceful coexistence. Saying that contacts with leaders of other countries and Summit meetings are an important element in Soviet foreign policy, he continued:

There is now the prospect of achieving peaceful coexistence for the entire period in which the social and political problems now dividing the world will be solved. The indications are that it may actually be possible to banish world war from the life of society even before the complete triumph of socialism on earth, with capitalism surviving in part of the world.

In the concluding part of his report, Khrushchev pledged determined efforts by the Soviet Government to achieve peace and disarmament. He closed with the words:

We call on the governments of all countries to strive toward mutual understanding and cooperation, toward the peaceful solution of outstanding international issues. It is the sacred duty of the peoples to conduct a persistent and energetic struggle, using all available means, for the preservation and consolidation of peace on earth.

Let us answer this challenge with a great drive for disarmament, the disbanding of all armies, the destruction of all nuclear weapons and missiles. This alone can clear the way for all the peoples of the earth to enter upon a peaceful, abundant and happy life.

Since October 1917

by ALBERT RHYS WILLIAMS

"IF ONLY those Russians would drop out of the headlines a while and give our minds and nerves a little respite!"

This complaint from a neighbor was not in protest against undue prominence given in the press to Berlin or the Bomb. It was evoked rather by a series of sensational Soviet exploits—which began with the trail-blazing flight of Cosmonaut Gagarin orbiting the world.

The huzzas from the cheering throngs in the streets of Britain, Cuba and Brazil had hardly faded away when the new Draft Program leaped into the headlines and into eight pages in the *New York Times*.

As the public was perusing this Manifesto, suddenly out of the sky came a voice—the debonair greetings of Cosmonaut "Eagle" to America, from his airship spinning around the globe. A spectacular, formidable breakthrough, and everywhere acclaimed — not without a touch of envy—as a magnificent triumph of Soviet science and valor. And a few voices exclaiming in awe and wonder: "Is there anything now that Man cannot do!" hailed it not

merely as another Soviet triumph but as a triumph of mankind—a gigantic stride toward the realization of that age-old dream of mankind, the conquest of space, a way to the stars.

As the furor subsided, attention returned to the Draft Program which is likewise concerned with another long-cherished dream of mankind—the creation of the good society of justice, freedom and plenty.

IT WAS to make this dream a reality that Lenin organized a Party—the devoted, disciplined Party of Bolsheviks—and enlisted the minds and hearts of the people in that most daring enterprise—the building of socialism. And now it presents a graphic report on the achievements of the past along with plans and a vision of the future in this impressive Manifesto.

All the more impressive to one who in Petrograd on that momentous October night in 1917 heard from the great Lenin—with the thundering applause of approval of the worker-soldier delegates — the portentous words committing Russia to set forth on the road to Socialism.

So with intense interest I read—forty-four years later—this report on how far the Soviets have already marched along this long and difficult road, and the plans and prospects for further advance to the

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

final goal of a cooperative, classless society.

With most editors and critics, of course, the Manifesto is more an object of derision than delight. Most often they become satirical about the goods and services that will be freely accessible to the Soviet citizen in 1980—without money and without price. "Everything free but freedom!" Or they choose to assume—on the basis of the prevailing future tense in the English translation—that all these social largesses are a matter of the future. Waxing sceptical they label the promised benefactions "Mirages," "Pie-in-the-Sky," "The reddest of red rainbows."

They have little concept of how many Soviet citizens are now enjoying certain essentials of living on a no-pay basis. Nor for that matter was I fully aware until a recent visit to Moscow revealed how extensive they already are! Education up through the university free for all. Likewise medical care and services. And in the light of the trifling rents in Russia, to the American—often paying out one fourth of his income in rent—it seems that the Soviet citizen is getting his housing for practically nothing at all.

By shortening the work-day—only six hours for nurses in the hospital where I was a patient—many workers are already enjoying another great benefaction—more time for rest, culture, sports, the amenities of life. And for the infirm, the aged, and disabled there are many grants and pensions which remove the corrosive fear and dread of want. Each year marks an increase in what Disraeli called "Those

two civilizers of life—increased leisure and increased income."

They are by no means munificent but to one who saw the incredible chaos and poverty at the outset of the Revolution, then the ordeals and sacrifices for the five-year plans in the efforts to create a surplus, it seems a remarkable achievement—especially after the terrible carnage and destruction in the last war—that there should be so many already drawing gratuitously so much from the common pool.

Pointing this out to Americans—however skeptical—they can see that the promised cost-free goods and services of 1970-80 are not "mirages" but the logical extension of those already existing. To acquire more all the Revolution needs to do is to keep to its present course and keep going.

That is what this Manifesto solemnly pledges it will do—and therein lies one of the factors which makes the Great October Revolution truly great. It has not grown tired or discouraged. Unlike most other revolutions it has never lowered its sights. In the face of all obstacles—wars, blockades, reverses and blunders—it has steadfastly pressed forward toward those goals it set for itself on that memorable October night in 1917.

NOW forty-four years later comes this Manifesto in a reaffirmation and rededication to those goals; breathing the buoyant spirit and will of the insurgent masses of those early heroic days and of their great leader—Lenin.

In the repetition of those familiar phrases, "In the name of Man, and for the benefit of Man," "One for

all and all for one," it is permeated by the great humanism of Lenin.

In its insistent call to all citizens to participate in civic affairs one hears the echo of Lenin's "Every cook should learn to run the government."

Like him, with zest, it proclaims the triumph of the Revolution, the certain end of war and of the exploitation and humiliation of man. Like him, it places complete confidence in the energy and intelligence of "the people as the makers of history."

As one senses the guiding hand of Premier Khrushchev one feels likewise the presence of Lenin in this Manifesto—much of which he might well have written himself.

Calling to mind the vigor of his speaking one can envisage—were he living today—with what verve he would enter into the discussion of every moot point in the program.

Alongside him rise up the images of a host of young friends and comrades of those grim and glorious October days: Conscripts of the dream to build the world anew, at once idealists and stern realists, who, loving life, went forth to untimely deaths by typhus, torture, hunger and in battle against the invaders.

With them likewise rises in memory that little company of Americans—devoted participants in the Revolution like John Reed, and

sympathizers like Raymond Robins—who went forth from beleaguered Russia in that first critical year of the Revolution to contend against the dark force of reaction seeking to strangle the new-born infant.

TO ALL these militant defenders of the Revolution salutations! And deep regrets that they did not live to see the Soviet infant growing up into a giant and to find the high hopes and faith they had placed long ago in the Revolution now confirmed in this Manifesto. It is dynamic, stirring and vitalizing—like a blood-transfusion—and infuses into one who has already overstayed his time on this planet the desire for a longer lease on life.

To live on in this exciting "springtide of humanity," and note what further headway the Revolution is making toward the realization of that age-old dream of mankind—the conquest by Man of space and his further journeyings to the moon, the planets, and the stars!

To live on and note his progress in that not less daring and difficult enterprise—the conquest by Man of himself—his advance on the road toward that good society in which everyone will receive according to his needs and from the Kingdom of Necessity pass into the Kingdom of Freedom.

(Written for *Izvestia*)

THE GOOD LIFE

"THE ANCIENT AXIOM of 'Love your neighbor as yourself' is embodied. . . in the valuation of what conduces to the permanent well being of the human race. Thus in the USSR there is no distinction between the code professed on Sundays and that practiced on weekdays . . . The secular and the religious are one. The only good life at which he [the Soviet citizen] aims is a life that is good for all his fellow men, irrespective of age or sex, religion or race."

Sidney and Beatrice Webb, *Soviet Communism a New Civilization*, 2nd edition.

Living in Sunlight

Four Years of Cultural Exchanges

by MURRAY YOUNG

BY THE end of the year the official Cultural and Scientific Exchange Program between the United States and the Soviet Union will have been in existence four years. Through the two two-year agreements some 600 projects or delegations will have been exchanged. Up to June of this year the United States had sent 3,431 people, excluding tourists and unsponsored groups, to the Soviet Union. In turn the Soviet Union had sent 2,606 people to this country. (Under separate agreements with Czechoslovakia, Poland, Rumania and Bulgaria some 3,000 people have been exchanged.)

Apart from people, these countries have exchanged with the United States informational and educational literature, films, radio and television programs, scientific and technical exhibits and papers.

With 37 American students going to the Soviet Union for study during the current academic year and 46 Soviet students coming to this country, the record for the four years will be: 103 American students, 109 Soviet students.

The Soviet Government had suggested for the current year an exchange of 50 students, but the American committee in charge of student exchanges felt that the difficulty of getting 50 fully qualified students in addition to the language requirement made such a large number impossible.

Of special importance this year is the fact that American students will be able to study at the Research Institutes of their choice. Hitherto they had been confined to Moscow and Leningrad Universities. The Institutes now opened to exchange students include the Vyshinsky Law Institute, the Gorky Institute of World Literature, and others under the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Agriculture, the Ministry of Education and a Library Institute of the Ministry of Culture. Also for the first time a student will be placed at Kiev University.

The American committee in charge of student exchanges was further impressed by the Soviet suggestion that regular messages be exchanged so that flaws in the operation of the exchange of students could be speedily rectified.

The exchange of professors has resulted in thirty one-month visits between Columbia, Harvard, Yale and Moscow, Leningrad and Kiev Universities. The only year-long stay so far is that of Professor Harold J. Berman of the Harvard Law School, who is spending the present year at Moscow University as a result of direct negotiation with Premier Khrushchev.

This summer the splendid exhibition of Soviet children's books in New York, Cleveland and Denver was in exchange for an exhibit of American plastics in Kiev, Moscow and Tbilisi.

The Soviet medical exhibition that opened in Chicago in October is an exchange for a United States transportation exhibit which opened in Kharkov the same month. After its stay in Chicago the medical exhibition will go on to Minneapolis.

Among the equipment on display at the exhibition was an apparatus for detecting cancer and other diseases by beaming inaudible ultrasonic waves into living tissue, and another, called a sleep machine, which by sending a slight electric current into the patients brain induces sleep with the effect of a tranquilizer. The sleep machine is widely used in the Soviet Union in the treatment of mental illness.

Dr. Viktor Zhdanov, who is in charge of the exhibition, told reporters that there were now 400,000 doctors in the USSR and that they were graduating 25,000 annually. He further added that life expectancy had been raised from 32 years in 1913 to 69 for men and 72 for women.

A group of nine Soviet highway officials have been here this fall inspecting road construction projects. Earlier this year a group of engineers made a tour of inspection in the Soviet Union.

The Juilliard String Quartette, the first string ensemble to visit the Soviet Union, opened its tour in Moscow in October. Compelled to give four encores by the audience, the quartette's playing of works by Mozart, Schubert and Bartok was praised with the greatest enthusiasm by the critics.

Emil Gilels and Igor Oistrakh, like his father David Oistrakh a violinist, are both to come for concert tours this winter. The splendid

soprano Galina Vishnevskaya, who sang here as soloist with the Moscow State Symphony, has been announced to sing at the Metropolitan in the course of this season.

Dorothy Kirsten, of the Metropolitan Opera, will sing this winter at the Bolshoy, appearing as Violetta in "La Traviata" and Marguerite in "Faust."

It has also been announced that the Leningrad Philharmonic Orchestra will make its first American tour in the fall of 1962. Its three concerts in the new Philharmonic Hall at Lincoln Center will be the initial appearance of a major foreign orchestra there.

The Robert Shaw Chorale and Orchestra will go for its first tour of the Soviet Union also in the fall of 1962.

In the spring the Ukrainian Folk Dance Company is to come here for its first tour of our country. And having completed their New York engagement the Kirov Ballet Company is now touring major cities. Rarely does the opportunity present itself for seeing dancing of such perfection—we hope our readers will make every effort to see these superb young dancers.

KONSTANTIN Simonov, distinguished novelist, whose novel *The Living and the Dead* is to be published in this country by Doubleday, spent a month here this year with three other writers, Vera Panova, the novelist, Elena Romanova, literary critic and secretary of the Writers' Union, and Eduardas Mezhelaitis, the Lithuanian poet, one of whose poems appears on page 25.

In an interview, Mr. Simonov

spoke of the pleasure he and his companions derived from talks with American writers. A poet as well as a novelist, Mr. Simonov spoke particularly of his pleasure in meeting Robert Frost. Mr. Simonov spoke also of the happiness Soviet poets and the Soviet public would have in inviting American poets to come to the Soviet Union for Poetry Day, held yearly throughout the country, when hundreds of poets read their verses in halls and bookshops.

Eduardas Mezhelaitis in an interview after his visit to our country spoke of meeting, besides Robert Frost, some of the "beatnik" poets: "Allen Ginsberg read his verses to us, spoke enthusiastically of Esenin (a contemporary of Mayakovsky's), with whose poetry he had just got acquainted, questioned us eagerly about the Soviet Union and told us of his intention to visit our country. Ginsberg is a representative of that section of the younger generation of poets in America who, seeking neither wealth nor fame and despite their anarchistic lack of restraint, really want to see a better and more just life."

Mr. Simonov and the other writers with him felt that one of the best ways of developing understanding between our two countries was in the publication of each other's books. Mentioning the fact that he planned to work on an anthology of modern American poetry in Russian translation, Mr. Simonov suggested that American writers should take upon themselves the task of urging the publication in this country of translations of contemporary Soviet novels and poetry.

A group of ten Soviet journalists spent several weeks here in late

spring as guests of the American Association of Newspaper Editors (a group of American journalists are to visit the Soviet Union sometime this fall). Meeting with leading editors and newsmen in various cities across the country, with TV appearances in Chicago and Los Angeles, their tour was climaxed by a meeting with President Kennedy in Washington.

Daniel Kraminov, a member of the Soviet delegation, wrote after his return to the Soviet Union:

In all the numerous conversations we had with groups of journalists as well as with individual newspapermen, other professional businessmen, and public leaders, the emphasis was laid on the desire for closer cultural and economic relations. The U.S. journalists evinced a keen interest in cooperation with their Soviet colleagues. Some suggested exchanges of visits not only by delegations, but also by individual journalists who would spend some time working on each other's newspapers.

FINAL negotiations for a third exchange agreement are to be completed this month. In general there seems evidence that the new agreement will not cover less ground than the other two—indeed in certain areas there may probably be a considerable widening. However, the present tension in political relations between the two countries gives no assurance that any considerable advance will be made.

Throughout the four years the political climate has very much influenced many aspects of the exchanges. This has been especially marked in the radio and TV programs and it has very much lessened the potentiality of exchanges in the field of medicine and science.

(The termination this summer by the U.S. Government of the final negotiations for direct air lines between New York and Moscow to be shared by Pan-Am and Aeroflot, the Soviet air service, was a widely publicized "accident of the cold war.")

It is, of course, in the field of science and medicine that the effect of narrowing exchanges is most immediately serious. In his State of the Union speech President Kennedy said that the U.S. would be willing to join with the Soviet Union and the scientists of all nations in furthering the work of space exploration which grew out of that remarkable cooperative effort, the International Geophysical Year (July 15, 1957 through December 31, 1958). The achievements of this historic year, carried out on a world scale, pointed the way forward to great new advances in man's knowledge of the world about him—particularly in the field of space exploration.

In 1958, as a consequence of the I.G.Y., the Congress established the National Aeronautics and Space Administration which today cooperates with some thirty-five other countries in carrying out its research. But so far the planning of really momentous research programs has not been undertaken. At the Twelfth World Congress of the International Astronautic Federation held in Washington in October, both this year's president of the Federation, Dr. Leonid I. Sedov, chairman of the Interdepartmental Commission of Interplanetary Communication in the Soviet Academy of Sciences, and Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, deputy director of the National Aeronautics and Space Ad-

ministration, pleaded for greater international cooperation in the exploration of space. Dr. Dryden said that such exploration could "contribute to friendship and understanding among nations" and make "substantive scientific contributions."

Dr. John P. Hagen, also of the N.A.S.A., in the *New York Times*, October 8, in an article on the achievements to date of the N.A.S.A. pointed out that certain conclusions are inescapable:

The achievements of the past and the promise of the future make it clear that space exploration is a field for not one nation alone, not for a select group of nations. It is a field in which international cooperation in its broadest sense must be exercised. . . .

In concluding the article, Dr. Hagen, looking into the future and seeing space exploration in its fullest perspective, writes:

As we look far into the future and see man sending his emissaries on missions taking months and years to perform, exploring the moon and visiting the planets, it is difficult now to see how this could be done by or for one nation alone; how or why it should be done by nations in competition, but only that it should be done by all men for the benefit of all mankind.

INTERNATIONAL conferences and symposia in many scientific fields have inevitably become characteristic of our time. This summer some 2,000 delegates from 64 countries attended a conference called by the Pacific Science Association in Honolulu to consider problems of science, culture and economy of the whole Pacific region.

In August the International Astro-

nomical Union met in Berkeley, California, and elected as the new president of the Union, Dr. Victor Ambartsumian, head of the Armenian Academy of Sciences. Dr. Ambartsumian spoke warmly of the continued exchange of ideas in research between the United States and the Soviet Union.

In September an international conference on diseases prevalent in countries with hot climate, organized by the Soviet Union with the backing of the World Health Organization (UN), met in Tashkent with delegates from some 50 countries. The current No. 1 problem of the W.H.O. is the universal abolition of smallpox. Iraq, it was reported at the conference, after a careful campaign to combat this disease, had not a single case in 1960-61. India reported on a program to abolish smallpox in the next few years with the help of 250 million doses of dry vaccine from the USSR.

These international conferences are outside the official scientific and cultural exchange agreements but they are inseparably a part of that essential cooperation which the rapid development of science has shown us is the only way forward for mankind.

"IT IS astonishing how much they (the Russians) and we have in common," Brooks Atkinson wrote recently in the *New York Times* (Oct. 10). "In the sphere of the classics we read many of the same authors, see many of the same plays and ballets and listen to much the same music. Our knowledge of the mind and the soul has been permanently enriched by the Russians."

Tolstoy, Dostoyevsky, Chekhov, Tchaikovsky, Mr. Atkinson calls "our golden names." He might have added Shakespeare, Mark Twain, Walt Whitman, as *theirs*. For such is the nature of art and science that the towering achievements in either field become the possession of all men against whatever vain barriers are set to separate them into hostile groups.

The continuation and expansion of the cultural and scientific exchange program is a part of the great struggle for a future not of moles living in animal fear underground, but of fully conscious men and women living in the life-giving sunlight of a peaceful world.

(For further details on the Exchange Program see the January, May, June, August and October 1961 issues of NWR.)

JOHN MARTIN SAYS "SPASIBO" TO THE KIROV BALLET

HERE IS THE true and glorious substance of the ballet—the traditional roots and flowering—still in living and healthy beauty. It has long since been given up for dead. . . . Now it comes with the brightness of revelation that the art needs no restoration; it has existed through wars and revolutions, physical and political horrors, isolations and ideologies, without loss of substance or principle, grandeur, consistency or sheer esthetic beauty. The gap has been bridged over the transient experimentalism of the Diaghileff interlude, and we have found again the roadway to continuity. Here indeed, is where experimentation can start once more, on solid ground and with sure footing.

New York Times, October 15

44 YEARS

The New Program of the Communist Party of the USSR

by D. N. PRITT

THE forty-fourth year of the life of the new Socialist State has been remarkable for many things, of which the most generally noted has perhaps been the flights of man into space; but I would for myself like to write of my impressions of the new Program of the Communist Party.

I happened to be in Moscow when the draft program was published (as well as when Herman Titov spent twenty-five hours in orbit around the world), and of course both events made a great impression on me. As I write this article, the program is still a draft; but I expect that by the time the article is published the Twentieth Congress will have adopted the draft without much amendment.

The first thing that struck me about the program, since I live in the capitalist world, was that its confident looking-forward formed a vivid contrast to the unhappy and bewildered state of the crisis-ridden capitalist world. There are few pundits in that world that would care to prophesy in what sort of condition it will be in twenty months' time; and here is a socialist state confidently planning the broad lines, and even much of the detail, of where it proposes to be in twenty years!

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

My next impression was that of the Soviet people's confidence in peace. Outside the socialist world, too many people are—understandably enough—worrying about the risk of war, and the appalling expense of preparing for it, to feel any sense of reality about forward planning for development and prosperity, except on a short-term basis. But here is the USSR, devoted to peace and yet accused by some people of threatening war, showing such tremendous confidence in its capacity to preserve peace, and setting itself at great labor to plan exactly how it will spend the next two decades in peace, building up the most prosperous country in the world.

I had, also, a more general impression, that of pride and happiness. I have been a friend of the USSR since very early days; my friendship has brought me a strange mixture of affection, hatred, boycott, rewards of most kinds (except financial), and experiences; it has brought me much pride and satisfaction, and no regrets; and, as I study this program in detail, I feel almost as if the USSR was saying to me: "Well, old friend. You have always been saying that our country can achieve anything, however remarkable; now, we will prove you have been right the whole time; look just at what we are planning in this program and say to your skeptical acquaintances in Britain: 'I told you so.'"

I feel that way about it, since I find in the program, put forward by a party that is apt to keep its feet on the ground on behalf of a people who do not like to make vain boasts, not only the assertion of the categorical triumph of socialism, but also a clear picture of the great morally-uplifting mission and mighty economic leap forward that are involved in the contemplated transition to communism of the present generation of Soviet people.

FOR those who may be puzzled by the phrase "transition to communism," thinking that Russia is a communist state already, let me explain that, in terms of the economic structure of societies, there is a great difference between a socialist state of society and a communist state of society.

In a socialist state, one tries to live by the principle: "From each according to his abilities, to each according to his *work*," and in a communist state of society—when one comes into existence—the principle will be: "From each according to his abilities, to each according to his *needs*." It is plain that the latter will be much more pleasant, much more Christian, if you like, and will call for a much higher moral outlook on the part of its citizens.

The USSR is still living in a socialist state of society, but it is led by its Communist Party, so that many people refer loosely to it as a communist state, which it is not; it is a socialist state, led by its Communist Party, and intending to become a communist state.

The adoption of the New Program means that the leaders of the

Soviet Union are convinced, on the basis of full knowledge, that the material and economic conditions essential to the success of that tremendous transition already exist or will be brought into being, as they come to be needed, in the immediate future. It seems, too, that they are equally confident that the great increases in production and in living standards, coupled with the reduction in working hours (planned, of course, to give men greater leisure, and not as an emergency measure to reduce the number of jobless!) that are set out in the program can equally surely be realized. And it warmed my heart especially to see how, in this connection, the Party wisely and confidently calls upon the Soviet peoples to show the skill and energy, and the high morale, necessary to make the transition effective. The appeal to morale, the call for a high standard of moral conduct, as a part of the contribution of all the citizens to the great enterprise is most impressive.

Then I come to consider the economic and other advantages of life under socialism that are envisaged in the program; it is on these that it is based, and on these its success depends. The purely economic advantages are so great as to enable the transition not merely to be planned, but to be realized at a sensational tempo. They are best to be understood in their concrete terms of higher wages, shorter hours, free housing, free transport, free education at all stages, and the many other benefits set out.

I notice many broader and more general advantages than the direct economic ones. As the program clearly demonstrates, they lie in the

proof that the elimination of war, colonialism, and poverty, of the exploitation of man by man, of the inequalities, injustices, cruelties, and intolerances based on race, color, or sex, of the bad effects of class-conflicts, and of the many other evils prevalent under capitalism and because of it, can be achieved by socialism, and by it alone, and will in fact be achieved in the near future. What a beautiful world modern scientific development can give us when those plagues are things of the past!

And in addition, I was interested by the demonstration that the great advances promised can only be won if real democratic control and initiative are increasingly brought to bear on the practical problems of the new developments envisaged, drawing always more and more citizens into the work of administration and government, largely replacing the big staffs of paid personnel.

I liked, too, the firmness and clarity with which it is explained that the advances contemplated can only be won if all the citizens work conscientiously for their realization; and I was interested in the emphasis laid on the ever increasing application of scientific developments of all sorts, including electric power, and the importance of the advantages to be won thereby.

Culture is treated as one of the necessities of life for all Soviet citizens, not as a sort of luxury or side line for a small percentage of them; and leisure is not thought of as an

empty pause between work periods but rather as an opportunity for the cultural enrichment of life.

I WOULD add only two more points. The first is that it is a great tribute both to socialism and to the Soviet world that all the achievements already realized were won by a people who started their great constructive work with scarcely any material resources and without outside help; they began their great work in a war-devastated country, they endured some four years of wars of "intervention" (designed, as Winston Churchill put it, "to kill off the old hen before she hatches too many chicks"), and later passed through the trials, hardships, and devastations of the Second World War. But they have built, and built quickly, and built well. Forty-four years is not very long; when the work began, I myself had been at work in my profession for a decade, and had been married for some years.

The second of my final points is this: Think, please, what this program represents in human development. We are dealing not merely with a new economic world, but really with a new man. Modern Soviet man, a great man, is stepping on to the stage of history; other new great men, in all countries, step by step, will join him; and socialism will carry mankind forward out of the gloom and despair and anarchy of capitalism into the warm sunshine of a peaceful future.

MAJOR TITOV'S FATHER

COSMONAUT Herman Titov's father, Stephen Titov, has translated many world classics into Esperanto. He is at present translating *The Good Soldier Schweik* into that international language.

SO
tion
amo
garn
the
remi
faith
eigh
now
lette
hope
by
posit
with
TH
posi
intro
son,
tion
tells
"C
scene
Siber
shool
how
it wa
- he
He l
china
He s
ROCK
artist
Nation

Pledge of Friendship

by ROCKWELL KENT

*The merry years,
The happy days,
Like the freshets of spring
They have dashed past!*
(From an ancient Russian Ballad)

SO BEGINS Turgenev's heart-breaking story of the recollections of an aging man upon finding among his old, neglected papers a garnet cross. Letters, mementoes of the vanished past: what poignant reminders they may be of our own faithlessness! Such letters, written eighteen years ago, are before me now. Love letters? Hardly that. But letters, all of them, of faith and hope, of plighted friendship. Letters by Americans who by their high position in our country's life spoke with authority for all of us.

These letters, printed, form an imposing quarto volume; and in his introduction to them, Donald Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board (the year was 1943) tells the following story:

"One of the officials there"—the scene was an important gathering in Siberia — "came over to me and shook me by the hand and told me how much he liked Americans. But it was not enough for him to tell me — he had to do something about it. He looked around and seized a big china plate that was on the table. He said: 'When we Russians like

somebody, we break a plate like this.' And with that he raised his huge fist and crashed it down on the plate, smashing it to bits."

Then Donald Nelson—good for him! — broke *two* plates. Whereupon all present there embraced him warmly.

The introduction from which this story has been taken was, in fact, a statement made by Mr. Nelson at the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship held in New York City, November 6-7-8, 1943, in celebration of the establishment of American-Soviet diplomatic relations and the twenty-sixth anniversary of the founding of the Soviet Republic. That important Congress, eloquent of our people's heartfelt wish for everlasting peace and friendship, was held by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship — dedicated, as its name implies, to its progenitors' high purposes—and destined, as the years would show, to serve those purposes with a fidelity that was never to be shaken.

No, turning again to the volume of letters before me, and speaking, as I may, for the National Council, it is with no sense of our own failure that the letters sadden us but rather of the failure of our nation to have maintained the pledges that, just eighteen years ago, were given in our name, to the great country that was our ally in the World War against fascism. If those who spoke

ROCKWELL KENT, distinguished artist and writer, is Chairman of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.

for peace and friendship then — our statesmen of that day, our great industrialists — now, on their behalf, have changed their tune, we of the Council haven't. And with full faith in the righteousness of our cause and in its ultimate and final triumph we continue in its service. Peace will prevail.

The activities of the Council are immediately aimed at the promotion of a broader, truer understanding of Soviet life: of its social structure and institutions, of its culture, and of its effect upon the Soviet character. For friendship must be based on *human* understanding. Eloquent of the Council's progress in its work — as well, we may conclude, as of the growing counter Cold War trend of sections of our public — is the recent report of the Council's Executive Director, Richard Morford, passages from which here follow:

"In the last three years the demands for our Educational Services have increased tremendously. We have been serving thousands of students in schools, colleges and universities at the academic level — providing materials for their studies of the Soviet Union—books and pamphlets, photographic exhibits, documentary films. In the academic year just closed we have had requests from some 225 different colleges and universities; 175 public and private junior high and senior high schools; 100 public libraries. Of course, every pamphlet we publish goes immediately to 3,250 public and college libraries throughout the country.

"But this," Dr. Morford continues, "is only half the student task. We shall now make direct and personal contact with these students, bring them together on the campuses in a

program aimed at increasing American-Soviet understanding through cultural exchange. We shall also seek the enlistment of students in a program of peace action. And to this end we have put a full-time youth director in the field."

But friendship isn't learned from factual books, particularly, as in the case of the Soviet people, if the "way of life" that books are fitted to explain may seem so wrong to private-enterprisers' minds. How intolerable, for example, to us freedom lovers are the restraints on many freedoms that a socialist society, for a time at least, imposes; those cherished freedoms for whose exercise in our own land so many of us are today in jail! The proof of the pudding lies, we know, not in its recipe but in its taste. And in the matter of friendship we are not concerned with passing judgment on the principles and material accomplishments of Soviet society but with human qualities of Soviet man.

The *likeness* of the Russian and American people has become proverbial, a fact that, in the experience of many Americans, has been confirmed by travel in the Soviet land; and, one may venture, by all our people who have met and come to know the Soviet travelers and students here. Yet even more important as a means of mutual understanding are the arts, music, the dance and drama that cultural exchange has brought to both our peoples. And the literature, our own and theirs, that for generations has been available and widely read by us and them. In art we read a people's soul. Through the Soviet arts millions will know and love the Soviet people. Let us have peace.

A
dis-
—es
the
gen-
opr-
be
a g-
suff-
to s-
por-
nor-
to
cer-
M
vati-
nec-
sinc-
stri-
—an-
of
tion
T
the
bec-
its
The
Fil-
sign-
rela-
cine
JOH
thor-
boob-
Sere-
one-
defe-
the
his

Soviet Culture

Impressions of New Developments

by JOHN HOWARD LAWSON

AN EXTENDED stay in the USSR has given me opportunities for discussion with writers and artists—especially with film workers. From these discussions I have formed a general impression of recent developments in Soviet culture. It would be improper for me to go beyond a general impression. I have not sufficient knowledge of recent work to serve as a basis for a detailed report. I have not read enough books nor seen enough plays and films to form conclusive judgments concerning any specific field of work.

My best opportunities for observation and discussion were in connection with films. This is fortunate since I believe film offers the most striking illustration of the progress—and of the problems that are part of progress—in the cultural situation.

The motion picture is, in a sense, the most international of the arts because of its popular impact and its circulation throughout the world. The Second Moscow International Film Festival, held in July 1961, signalized a decisive change in the relationships of forces in the world cinema.

JOHN HOWARD LAWSON is the author of many plays, movie scripts and books. A former president of the Screen Writers Guild, he was imprisoned with other Hollywood writers for defending the Bill of Rights against the Un-American Committee. Among his books are *Our Hidden Heritage* and *Film in the Battle of Ideas*.

Critical views of the festival varied according to the politics of the critic. Yet it could not be denied that the wide representation from countries of the Far East, from Latin America, and to some extent from the new nations of Africa, gave it an international scope not achieved at commercial festivals such as Cannes or Venice. One could not claim that the films offered were of uniformly high quality, but most of them had a vitality, a sense of purpose, unusual for film gatherings.

The festival emphasized Moscow's world influence on motion pictures. By the same token, it suggested the deterioration of Hollywood's prestige. This was not due primarily to the weakness of the United States' entry. "Sunrise at Campobello" is a mild but well-intentioned tribute to the young Franklin D. Roosevelt, when he was fighting the results of infantile paralysis. It was probably the best choice that could have been made under the circumstances. The personal appearance of Elizabeth Taylor and Eddie Fisher was greeted with friendly enthusiasm by Moscow crowds.

Many of the film workers who gathered here—and especially young artists—were unconcerned with Hollywood standards but passionately concerned with the art of film; determined to use it as a means of exploring and understanding so-

cial reality. Most of the films dealt with the great movements of our time: with war and revolution and people's battles against oppression. Many came from countries whose existence is not recognized by the United States but preoccupation with social themes was also found in entries from France and Italy, from Argentina and pre-eminently from Japan.

WHAT could Hollywood offer to artists who work on this level of creative purpose? The Soviet Union offered far more than the physical setting for the event. It offered the wealth of its historical experience (Soviet film classics were shown throughout the fortnight), its technical knowledge, its deep concern with film as an art and as a social force.

All over the world artists are trying to meet the challenge of today's reality. This requires a new kind of artistic vision. Social understanding is needed but it must be translated into terms of art. In the majority of films shown at the festival, there is a gap between intention and achievement. The scenes of battle and popular struggle tend to follow a conventional pattern; the personal stories which develop against this background are also conventional. Men and women are hardened by struggle; weaklings become strong or are caught in a net of betrayal. But the link between social change and individual experience is not forged, the psychological and emotional meaning of the experience is not probed in depth.

The problem is different in different countries, depending on the

nature of the people's experience and their cultural tradition. It is a universal problem and relates to all the arts.

In the Soviet Union the rapid flowering of social progress outstrips the understanding and capacity of the artist. But there is growing recognition among creative people of the urgency and difficulty of the task that confronts them. They begin to see that old methods and techniques are not adequate. New forms and modes of communication are required to express the changing life of the people—not in terms of boasting and praise but as an emotional experience, a subtle but profound change in human character and viewpoint.

During the past fifteen years, Soviet novels and plays and films have been largely concerned with the Second World War. The sufferings and heroism of its people had a profound emotional impact on every phase of Soviet life. Countless stories have dealt with this tremendous national experience.

There is a striking contrast between Russian treatment of the war and American stories dealing with the world conflict. American writers tend to show men driven to kill by their "natural" impulses, and even to applaud the Nazis for their ruthless devotion to battle. Soviet writers show their deep hatred of violence. They deal with the war in terms of intimate human values, showing love and faith strengthened in the midst of suffering. Mikhail Sholokhov's story, "The Fate of a Man," is probably the outstanding example of this genre. "Ballad of a Soldier" and "The Cranes Are Flying" are also beautiful examples

of war stories concerned primarily with life and hope.) "The Fate of a Man" which was also made into a magnificent motion picture, directed by Sergei Bondarchuk, is a poetic affirmation of man's ability to endure and survive. The framework of the narrative, the hero's new life with the lost child, projects the story beyond the war.

In a sense, "The Fate of a Man" suggests the qualities of character that are being forged in Soviet society. But it is still primarily a tale of the past. Writers seem to find difficulty in dealing with contemporary Soviet life with depth and critical understanding.* Stories of modern marriage tend to assume conventional patterns. More effective are narratives of socialist construction, of the transformation of the land, of scientific and industrial achievements. But much of this material has a documentary flavor, and fails to turn the factual account into meaningful personal experience.

Stories of youth are noteworthy for their simplicity and warmth, and a sort of purity in dealing with love and friendship. For example, the film "Alioshkin's Love," done by a group of young film makers (directed by O. Tumanov and G. Shchukin, from a script by B. Metelnikov), tells a tale of first love with extraordinary simplicity and beauty.

IN THE Soviet theater there is a great deal of discussion concerning methods and themes. There is renewed interest in the work of

Meyerhold during the Nineteen Twenties. Young stage artists, such as the group that forms the Contemporary Theater in Moscow, call for fresh theatrical values. They conduct experiments which are sometimes crudely done, but always with enthusiasm towards this end.

A recent play, "My Friend Kolka," by A. Khmelik, deals with the problems of modern teen-agers. It is uncompromising in its attack on the dead adherence to rules, the bureaucracy and lack of imagination found among certain types of teachers and youth leaders. The play, directed with vitality on a revolving stage, has occasioned sharp arguments among educators and young people. It is being performed by young actors amateur and professional, all over the country, and has also been made into a fine film.

Even the Bolshoy, world renowned for its classical traditions, has broken new ground with the production of "City at Night" (Bela Bartok's music, choreography and direction by L. M. Lavrosky), a story of crime and corruption in the streets of a capitalist city. The dramatic pantomime, the striking music, the modernistic settings, have met with enthusiastic approval—and a good deal of controversy—on the part of Moscow audiences.

THE search for new creative values in the Soviet Union is related to the stirring of creative forces all over the world. In many lands, cultural people look to the USSR for leadership. At the same time, there is an interchange of artistic experience. The process may be illustrated by returning for a moment to the Moscow Film Fes-

* Here and in the following paragraphs, I am offering my impressions from necessarily limited reading and theater going, and from talks with Soviet intellectuals.

tival and considering the two films which shared the first prize. One was a Japanese picture, "Barren Island," made by Kaneto Shindo; the other was the Soviet film, "Clear Sky," directed by Grigori Chukhrai from a script by D. Khrabrovitsky.

"Barren Island" is the work of a young artist, functioning independently, following his own vision without receiving funds or sponsorship from the Japanese film industry. The film is a technical revelation in its use of the camera and in its total omission of dialogue. I do not mean to suggest that dialogue should be outlawed, but the film points to the way in which most pictures are overloaded with useless talk. It touches greatness in its portrayal of a peasant family. Without words, it probes the beauty and bitterness of their lives, revealing their unconquered spirit.

"Clear Sky" tells a love story of the Second World War. It is masterful in its simplicity and in the shattering fervor of many scenes. Like many recent Soviet pictures, "Clear Sky" is remarkably fluid and exploratory in its use of the camera. The significance of the story lies in its going *beyond* the war to the injustices of Stalin's last years and the great thaw that followed his death.

The clear sky of the title refers to the limitless horizons toward which the Soviet people are moving. But the film merely hints at the new perspectives. It is true, of course, that "Clear Sky" has as its theme a love story of the war and the after-years. It does not pretend to grapple with problems of contemporary Soviet society. But in this it is typical of Soviet culture today—

there is pride and high confidence in the future, without sufficient study in depth of the present life in which the future is being created.

It is the function of art not merely to reflect the external world, but to show the inner life of man as he responds to the reality which he himself is building. Soviet society is moving with such giant strides that the artist needs seven-league boots to keep pace with social change.

THERE is much talk of a new Soviet man. I believe it is literally true that a new kind of personality is emerging. The development of new moral attitudes and new psychological traits is implicit in the vast plans outlined in the Draft Program for the Twenty-second Congress of the Communist Party.

However, the portrait of the new Soviet man and woman has not yet been painted. In fact, they do not yet exist but are in process of coming into being. We can speak of certain qualities such as modesty, social responsibility, lack of greed or personal ambition—admirable qualities—but they all add up to an abstraction, not the portrait of a human being.

The writer and artist face the task of showing the real process, the inner conflicts and emotional crises, by which new traits of personality are forged. Soviet writers and artists are aware of the greatness of the task. There is no doubt that they will be worthy of the occasion, and will create works that will reflect and be a part of the changes.

This is a matter of urgent interest to us in the United States. Our dominant culture assumes that hu-

man nature is changeless and "eternally" corrupt. Those of us who have faith in our country know that the American people cannot be corrupted, that the essential qualities of their character hold the promise of future change.

The Soviet culture of these coming years, reflecting the realities of Soviet progress, will help us to understand more clearly that there are no limits to man's capacity for growth and mastery of his environment.

PATH OF STARS

by **EDUARDAS MEZHELAITIS**

That April morning was like the title of a poem
penned by my country,

and beginning a great new book.

I know I shall add no new line to its stanzas:
too turbulent my heart;

I can but remember.

The sky inverted haunts my inner gaze.

The burning attraction of its enormous stars

draws the seething blood through my veins.

So must it have been with you, my comrade,

when forth you stepped on that memorable spring morning.

So must it be with a fledgling,

first conscious of its wings,

filled with an inexplicable longing to cleave space,

to be borne along on the billow of the airy ocean.

But why,

my companion of the century,

should you spurn the Earth?

How has it offended you?

What gifts, what comforts withheld?

Have you wanted for bread,

for salt,

for fragrant honey?

For the water of sweet springs,

stabbing icily at the teeth?

Has the Earth not sung you its ancient lullaby,

plucking with the fingers of the rain at the strings

of the pines?

Or have the reckless hands on the clocks of love

neglected to measure out your portion of earthly happiness?

What is it you lack?

What is it you seek?

One thing only:

a path of stars to walk upon.

Only one thing:

the gates of the Universe

flung open.

Translated from Lithuanian by Margaret Wettlin

Thoughts on the World Crisis

by CORLISS LAMONT

AS ONE of those who has continued to believe that the Soviet resumption of nuclear bomb tests in September was a great mistake, I wish to make clear that my primary criticism of Soviet Russia at this time is concerned with the specific field of nuclear weapons. Important as this area is in connection with disarmament and peace, we cannot allow an unwise Soviet nuclear policy to blind us to the many praiseworthy actions of the USSR in the sphere of international relations, or to its many splendid achievements in social, economic, cultural and scientific life.

It would be particularly ill-advised for present critics of Soviet testing to let themselves be swept emotionally into an over-all condemnation of Soviet socialism, just as it would be unreasonable totally to damn the Kennedy Administration because it supported the thoroughly evil invasion of Cuba last April. After all, if we are ever to achieve peace in the world, the two key governments through which we must work are those of the United States and the Soviet Union, no matter what their errors, past and present.

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

As for the Soviet Union, we ought to remember that starting long before the Second World War, when Maxim Litvinov was constantly submitting plans for drastic reductions in armaments to the League of Nations, Soviet Russia has taken the lead in far-sighted proposals for disarmament. Its latest proposal is complete disarmament in both conventional and nuclear weapons. The United States and the West in general have tended to treat Premier Khrushchev's speeches on this subject as mere propaganda. But I am convinced that he and his colleagues in the Soviet Government are sincere. Russia suffered far more in two terrible world wars than any other Great Power; and the successful functioning of socialist economic planning in the USSR today is in no sense dependent on armaments expenditures.

Moves toward peace never cause any slump in the Soviet economy. In contrast, on September 26 *The New York Times* ran the following choice item about capitalist America: "The stock market reacted to President Kennedy's disarmament plea yesterday with the sharpest decline since Premier Khrushchev made a similar plea a little more than a year ago. *The New York Times* Combined Average dropped 5.89 yesterday to 384.19. This was the sharpest drop since Sept. 18, 1960, the day of Mr. Khrushchev's disarmament proposal on his arrival

to attend the United Nations General Assembly when the average fell 8.73 to 328.39."

To return to the Soviet Union's resumption of nuclear testing, I still find inadequate the various reasons and justifications offered for it. The Soviet action seems to me downright incomprehensible, especially since I cannot see that it brought any substantial gain to the USSR. On the other hand, it resulted in a loss of good will toward the Soviet Republic throughout the world, both among those who are sympathetic to socialism in general and among less radical individuals who have been impressed by the Soviet Union's initiative year after year in efforts to abolish the testing, manufacture and stockpiling of nuclear weapons.

I deplore, too, the United States Government's resumption of underground nuclear tests in response to the Soviets'. Only a short time previously, President Kennedy had announced that the American armed forces already possessed sufficient nuclear weapons for defense or for any international crisis.

Everyone knows that the United States and the Soviet Union have ready for use in their arsenals enough nuclear weapons to destroy and depopulate each other ten times over. This is the meaning of "overkill." In ordering the resumption of tests, Kennedy threw away the moral superiority that the Soviet Government had handed over to us and gave renewed impetus to the armaments race. Yet a little while later, in his address before the United Nations, he was saying: "In a spiraling arms race, a nation's security may be shrinking even as its arms

increase." The President could have halted the spiral.

What every American must understand today is that the perilous international situation stems from the tension over Berlin. While there have been provocations from both sides there, I believe that the crisis has been blown up artificially by the West and especially by the United States Government. The Kennedy Administration has repeatedly hurled accusations that the Soviet Union and its allies intended to block the West's access to Berlin, whereas there was nothing in Soviet proposals to support such a charge.

I have felt all along that President Kennedy, smarting from loss of prestige over his Administration's involvement in the abortive invasion of Cuba, has played politics with the Berlin crisis in the sense of purposely building it up so that he might recover status by appearing to the American people as a great, bold leader who "stands up to the Russians." This dangerous game seems to have worked, for press and popular support of Kennedy's attitude has been overwhelming. The Cuban fiasco is being forgotten in the excitement and renewed anti-Communist fanaticism aroused by the German imbroglio.

And when the United States Government negotiates a settlement of the Berlin question, as I think it will, Kennedy will probably say, "You see, my toughness forced the Russians to negotiate," although the Soviet Union was in favor of negotiations all the way through.

Yet in the tense situation that still exists at this writing we must realize that there is a chance, through acci-

dent or the power of reckless extremists, for a horrible nuclear war to break out in which a majority of both the American and Soviet people could be annihilated, and terrible carnage wrought in Europe and the Orient. How many million Americans, I wonder, have been asking themselves, as I, during the past two months whether they and their families will be alive tomorrow or next week?

The truth is that the United States now stands in the greatest peril that has ever confronted it. Not only military defeat, but also our physical extermination have become possibilities. Many observers have noted a mood of fatalism in the country and a feeling of "Let's get it over

with." What we need instead is a mood of unyielding resistance to the drift towards war, a willingness to work and sacrifice as never before in the cause of peace. Bertrand Russell in England has given the example to fighters for peace throughout the world. I had the privilege of talking at length with Lord Russell last August, and was enormously impressed by his alertness and vitality. At 89 he has been willing to risk jail (where he recently spent a week), health and life in order to demonstrate effectively against nuclear weapons. If a man of this advanced age displays such heroism, the least the rest of us can do is to be equally militant and courageous.

HONOR TO BERTRAND RUSSELL

"When Bertrand Russell went to prison to express his protest against nuclear weapons, his action illuminated the age in which we live, and shamed forever the rulers of Britain. No matter the differences on political tactics. No matter that he mixes Macmillan and Kennedy and Khrushchev in one hat. No matter that he fails to see the difference between the openly proclaimed Western strategy of launching nuclear war first and the battle of socialism, while maintaining defense, to banish nuclear weapons forever.

"What matters, what stands to his eternal honor, is that this veteran hero of eighty-nine years of age, this world renowned philosopher and mathematician, who could have with justice chosen ease and retirement after a lifetime of service, who served his first sentence of six months' imprisonment forty-six years ago for his courageous stand against the first world war, should now in his ninetieth year have offered his frail body up to prison again, because he understands with all his wisdom and knowledge the horror which a nuclear war would mean, and because he cares—he cares for human beings and for the future life of humanity."

R. PALME DUTT,
Labour Monthly, October 1961

Negotiations and More Negotiations

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

My primary purpose in preparing the following broadcast for KPFA radio station, Berkeley, California, was the need for informing as many Americans as possible of the danger of war over Berlin and in the continuance of the arms race. The Berlin crisis can only be solved by negotiations and nuclear war avoided only through general and complete disarmament, as distinguished from arms control. Unless the people can be convinced of this nothing can stop the drift toward war.

•

"Our world faces a crisis as yet unperceived by those possessing the power to make great decisions for good or evil. The splitting of the atom has changed everything save our modes of thinking, and thus we drift toward unparalleled catastrophe."

In these prophetic words Albert Einstein, the great scientist, described today's world shortly after Hiroshima.

Berlin is such a crisis, it is a lighted fuse threatening war, and has been since 1946: sometimes burning brilliantly as during the airlift, 1948-49, and again now; at other times faintly, as between repeated crises, but always burning. This fuse was lighted by Mr. James Byrnes, then U.S. Secretary of State, when he demanded the unification of Germany on U.S. terms, in a speech at Stuttgart, August 26, 1946, before a German audience and a few invited British, French and U.S. guests.

This was a clear repudiation, in the opinion of many competent students, of the Agreement signed by Truman, Attlee and Stalin at Potsdam, Germany. This Agreement of the Big Three pro-

vided for denazification, demilitarization, decartelization and democratization, as well as the unification of Germany. Not a single one of these has so far been achieved.

The *raison d'être* for putting British, French and United States military forces in Berlin at the end of the war was the planned use of it as the capital of a new purified and united Germany, after the previously mentioned objectives had been achieved. And since no other than the originally agreed upon purposes could be substituted without unanimous consent of the original signatories to this basic Agreement, all subsequently alleged or assigned reasons for maintaining the forces of the Western Powers in Berlin became invalid, save in the context of military might and power politics.

The immediate result of Mr. Byrnes' repudiation of the Potsdam Agreement was the establishment of a bi-zonal organization (UK-US), in early 1947, with headquarters in Frankfurt. This was replaced less than a year later by a tri-zonal organization (France added), with headquarters in Bonn. As Chief of Food and Agriculture for the U.S. Zone of Germany and quadripartite representative for these same matters, with headquarters in Berlin, 1945-47, I strongly opposed this policy. I feared it would light the fuse of another war and so stated at the time.

A VERY dramatic act, however, was required to end officially this fictitious facade of great power cooperation. The Berlin airlift supplied this. Earlier portents of this existed, however, and a

few of them are recounted here for the purpose of showing how and why wartime cooperation ended.

Mr. Leo Crowley, chief administrator of the Lend-Lease Program, canceled Soviet participation in this program immediately the war ended in Europe, May 8, 1945. This was done to no other ally. And the State Department conveniently "lost" a Soviet request for a 2 billion dollar loan for rehabilitation purposes, also shortly after the war ended. Incidentally, the Soviet Government proposed to pay 4 per cent interest.

George F. Kennan, temporarily in charge of the U.S. Embassy in Moscow, urged an end to wartime cooperation with the Soviet Union in a secret message to the State Department early February, 1946. This was only eight months after the war ended in Europe. The nature of this message—containment and eventual destruction of communism—was first disclosed to the public in *The Forrestal Diaries*, edited by Walter Millis, and later by Mr. Kennan* himself in an article in *Foreign Affairs*, July 1947, signed Mr. "X." The Containment Policy was actually adopted by the Truman Administration in January, 1947. On March 5, 1946, Winston Churchill made his famous, or rather infamous, "Iron Curtain" speech at Fulton, Mo., while a guest of President Truman, and presumably with his approval.

Less well-known, however, is the statement of a former President, Mr. Herbert Hoover, to a small German audience in Stuttgart, January 30, 1947, that the United States expected German support in the coming struggle with "the atheistic barbarians of the East." Mr. Hoover was making an economic survey of Western Europe for President Truman, and as head of our food program for Germany, I had invited Mr. Hoover so that he might hear the food requirements directly from the Germans.

* Those who persist in the belief that communism can be contained by economic and military means, should note that the author of this policy has long since abandoned this concept and now strongly favors cooperation.

In July, 1947, the Marshall Plan, named for the then Secretary of State General George Catlett Marshall, was announced. At the time it was presented to the public as a substitute for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Program, more popularly known as UNRRA. This marked the official end of U.S. economic cooperation on a non-political basis. (Cooperation actually ended almost a year earlier when the U.S. Government decided to discontinue support for UNRRA.) The Soviets, as hoped and expected, denounced the Marshall Plan as economic imperialism, designed to chain all participants to the U.S. economic chariot.

Shortly before I left Germany, November, 1947, a principal advisor to the U.S. Military Governor informed me that the West was planning to introduce a new currency into the three Western zones of Germany and, also, into the three Western sectors of Berlin. When queried about Soviet participation, he indicated conditions would be imposed by the West which would make this impossible. The new currency was suddenly introduced in the Western sectors of Berlin (1948), 110 miles inside the Soviet zone, while "negotiations" on this subject with the Soviets were still in progress. The immediate result was the well publicized Berlin blockade.

THE subsequent rearmament of West Germany constitutes, in my judgment, a betrayal of those who served our country in World Wars I and II, for the alleged purpose of bringing the German Power Elite under control. And it also ties, I fear, all of Eastern Europe to the Soviet chariot. A high-ranking member of the Polish Foreign Office confirmed this in a conference in Warsaw, 1957. All East European nations and peoples (many in the West also) fear a rearmed Germany much more than they fear communism, and the leaders and people of the Soviet Union are probably much more concerned with the West's rearmament of West Ger-

many than with any other thing that the leaders of the West have done since 1945.

The Soviets have not forgotten that the Germans destroyed more than 10 million Russians in World War I and some 20 million more in World War II, and an incalculable amount of Russian resources in both wars. They also fear that the West's insistence upon retaining "rights" in Berlin is not for the purpose of establishing democracy and freedom as alleged. They still remember the Berlin operations of the notorious Gehlen gang, organized and financed by the West, which engaged in every form of subversion, including murder. They also fear and believe, and with considerable justification, that U.S. insistence upon retaining a foothold in Berlin is part of the over-all "roll back" plan of the late John Foster Dulles. Mr. Khrushchev has expressed this fear to many, including this speaker.

This policy may have made some sense, although I doubt it, when the West had a preponderance of military might, but as soon as the Soviet Union achieved power parity, it becomes completely irrational. Walter Lippmann, James Reston, and other perceptive students of international relations have repeatedly pointed this out and have urged a revision of United States policies more in line with the current facts of power.

It is extremely important that the American people know who the present Power Elite of West Germany (now our trusted allies) really are. The answer is, they consist of the same groups that brought Hitler to power in 1933: that is, the owners of the great landed estates which include the Church, the manipulators of the cartel-industrial-complex and the officers of the German General Staff. U.S. interests have heavily invested in this new cartel-industrial-complex. (For full details of how decartelization failed in the U.S. Zone of Germany, see Dr. James Martin's book *All Honorable Men*.) West Ger-

many and its federal judiciary, reportedly, are honey-combed with former Nazis, and all the present general officers of the West German military forces are believed to have served Hitler loyally and well until his defeat became obvious to all the world.

VICE PRESIDENT Lyndon Johnson has pledged "our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor" to the West Berliners. This sounded like a declaration of World War III, with results that no sane person could wish. If it should come, it will probably mean the end of man's great adventure, his final Odyssey.

The present position of West Berlin is completely anomalous and constitutes at this moment the greatest threat to world peace. The best solution of the Berlin problem, I believe, would be the unification of a disarmed and neutralized Germany, outside NATO and the Warsaw Pact, and the disengagement of the hostile military forces in the center of Europe, possibly along the lines of the Rapacki Plan.

Germany cannot be united inside NATO, with or without free elections, any more than it can be united inside the Warsaw Pact. Neither bloc has the military power to do so. Democracy, freedom and self-determination have nothing whatever to do with it, and the leaders of the West should stop the hypocritical pretense that they do.

A former U.S. Ambassador to Indochina told this speaker that the United States could not agree to "free" elections in Vietnam, as provided at Geneva in 1954, because Communist North Vietnam had a larger population than South Vietnam. It is for this very same reason that the Soviet Union cannot agree to "free" elections in Germany and Korea; the so-called capitalists have larger populations in both of these divided states. It is as simple as that. Power, not morality, determines the policies of nations when "the balance of power" is at issue. This has always been true. De-

plore it we should, but accept it we must until international law replaces international anarchy.

Probably the best 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, information and cultural exchanges with all on a non-discriminatory basis, and guaranteed by all.

The Berlin crisis can, in my opinion, be resolved by the recognition of both the Federal Republic of Germany (West) and the German Democratic Republic (East) by all other governments and by each other. Both are *de facto* governments, and sound policy demands the recognition of this fact, however unpalatable it may be to some. If this is done, Berlin need no longer be an issue, provided West Berlin is set up as a free city.

I PROPOSE we tell President Kennedy and his associates that, much as we deplore the Soviet Union's decision to resume bomb testing, it was a predictable reaction, which many foresaw, to his earlier call-up of many additional thousands of draftees, National Guardsmen and Reserves, and the increase of the U.S. military budget, already the highest in the world, by many billion dollars more.

What, we might ask, would the President and his associates have done had the situation been reversed: send Mr. Khrushchev and Co. flowers? The answer is, of course not. President Kennedy, no doubt, would have met this action with counter-action, as he has now met Khrushchev's resumption of tests by resuming our own.

And so the arms race rolls along "like Ole Man River," but without protecting dikes. This has been the usual result, as every competent first-year graduate student of international relations will attest, of the operations of the two-dimension-minded men in politics; that is, those who see our side as lily-white and our opponent's as jet-black. His-

torically, the leaders of the sovereign states have acted within this distorted frame of reference.

It was within this frame of reference that President Kennedy announced early in his administration he was "arming for peace" that is, his "beefing up" of U.S. forces was intended solely to impress the Soviet leaders with U.S. military might and his willingness to use it for peaceful purposes. Again in the same frame of reference, according to Drew Pearson, Prime Minister Khrushchev stated the Soviets were resuming bomb testing for the sole purpose of bringing the Western leaders to their senses on the Berlin issue and to the conference table in order to achieve world peace.

The issue is not bomb testing, dangerous as a resumption of these tests may prove to human health. The issue is not arms *control*, for this has proved impossible of achievement even when military forces were equipped only with conventional weapons.

The issue is general and complete disarmament, for this is the only program free of espionage and, therefore, the only one which can be properly inspected and enforced. Mr. Khrushchev has repeatedly stated that the Soviet Union would accept the strongest controls the West could devise, provided the West accept general and complete disarmament.

So long as a single thermonuclear bomb remains in the hands of any sovereign state the security of all will be threatened, and so long as any nation, with the will to drop the bomb remains free to use its knowledge of how to make and drop it, the safety of the world will remain in doubt.

It is now too late for competition in arms between the polar powers. Co-operation must replace conflict. The USSR and the USA can, through honest and persistent negotiations, build a world of peace with plenty for all. The only proper role for either of these giants in the atomic age is negotiation and more negotiation at every level.

No War Over Berlin!

by MARTIN HALL

"**O**F THE many causes I should not prefer to die for," wrote Critic recently in *The New Statesman* in London, "I should give priority to the reunification of Germany." That sentiment is certainly shared by millions in Europe and, I should like to think, even in the United States.

Gordon Schaffer in these pages has given a thorough historical background to the present crisis over Berlin which needs no reiteration. Nobody can take seriously the official Western talk about the "legal rights" which the Allies claim to have in Berlin. India's Nehru has, in a public statement which created consternation only in the United States where the public is notoriously misinformed, declared that there are no such legal rights for the West in Berlin, and as calm an analyst as James Warburg in a recent article in *The Progressive* characterized the postwar policy of the West as an "almost incredible series of errors of omission and commission" and listed the fact that the West never at any time had asked or received a written guarantee from the Soviet Union of "free access" to West Berlin "the worst of these omissions." If an a-

greement can be reached on a peace treaty with Germany and if in such a treaty free access for the West to West Berlin would be guaranteed, as Mr. Khrushchev has indicated he would be willing to do, the West would actually get something tangible which it has not now.

If President Kennedy talks about our "right of conquest" on which he bases our "right" to station troops in Berlin, he overlooks the fact that the battle for Berlin was fought and won by the Soviet Army and not by Western troops. If he talks about the Potsdam Agreement, he talks about something that has been a dead letter ever since the Western Powers decided to combine their three occupation zones and to form a separate West German state. Berlin was never, after the end of Hitler's rule, considered a part of West Germany, not even West Berlin, and to have made this enclave deep in the territory of the German Democratic Republic a hotbed of espionage and subversion and an outpost for Bonn's revanchist policy against Eastern Europe is the main reason why we have a Berlin crisis.

It is the West which has made the situation intolerable. If the Soviet Union now seeks to normalize a decidedly abnormal situation by signing a long overdue peace treaty with Germany without, to quote Chairman Khrushchev, "in any way jeopardizing the legitimate interest of the West in West Berlin," and if he has announced that he will sign a

MARTIN HALL is a German-born U.S. citizen and veteran of the anti-Nazi underground movement. He has lectured widely around the country at universities, colleges and forums and has contributed to such magazines as *The Nation*, *The Progressive*, *Monthly Review*, *The National Guardian*, *The New Statesman* in London and many others.

separate peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic if no agreement with the West has been reached by the end of this year,* nobody in his right mind can make out of this position an "ultimatum", let alone a "threat to the peace" that could justify the part-time mobilization, and the many warlike measures taken by the Western Powers in regard to Berlin.

Dr. Fred Warner Neal, after World War II a consultant and later chief of foreign research on Eastern Europe for the State Department, who is now teaching international relations at Claremont Graduate School in California, in a recent speech at Claremont said:

I am profoundly convinced there is no conceivable justification for considering that Berlin today rationally involves the question of peace or war . . . The truth is that our vital interest and our security are not involved in Berlin and that the Russians are not "pushing us around."

Yet, official statements in Washington, London and Paris sound like the last warnings before World War III, more and more troops are called up, billions are added to the war budget and, based on a deliberate misinformation of the public, a general war hysteria has been built up which in itself constitutes an added stumbling block to any possible acceptance of a negotiated compromise. Worst, and most regrettably of all, testing of nuclear bombs has been resumed and not only the political, but the physical atmosphere as well is being poisoned all over the world.

Valuable time for negotiation has

* Khrushchev has now withdrawn this time limit, if the West agrees to negotiations.

been lost in deference to the West German elections, during which we did not want to do anything that might be embarrassing to Chancellor Adenauer. He lost the election anyway and maybe this fact will make possible an American policy less dictated, and often even vetoed, by the old Chancellor who had a fantastic hold over the State Department.

WHAT is needed is the courage to face the facts. One of these facts is that in reality nobody today wants unification of the two Germanys and that therefore any realistic policy must be based on the recognition of the existence of two Germanys. The West is not willing to accept a neutralized, disarmed, united Germany because without West German participation in NATO this alliance would lose any effectiveness it may now have. The East, and with it millions in Western Europe, will not and cannot accept a united, rearmed Germany within NATO because such a united Germany would constitute militarily and politically the dominant power on the European continent. If West Germany were, on top of this, to receive atomic weapons as well, as it now openly demands, a united Germany would be put in the position to play West against East and vice versa.

As this is being written it begins to look as if gradually some of these facts are being realized even in Washington. Gen. Lucius Clay, the "hero" of the Berlin blockade in the eyes of the West, the man who wanted to send an armored column through East German territory to break the blockade, now has reminded the West Germans that they

will have to accept the fact of the existence of two German states. The embarrassed denials in Washington that this represented a new U.S. policy have convinced nobody and the general consensus in Europe about the episode was summed up in a leading London newspaper which called it a "calculated leak."

Statements by men like Senator Mansfield, and others along the same line, were apparently trial balloons on the part of the Kennedy Administration to find out how they would be received by public opinion.

President Kennedy himself in his speech before the United Nations intimated that we would and could do nothing if the Soviet Union should actually sign a separate peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic, something which only a month ago had been presented by Washington as utterly unacceptable.

Kennedy's United Nations speech was a strange mixture of saber-rattling and conciliation. While he did imply that he would accept a separate peace treaty and even mentioned that we might conclude an agreement barring the sharing of atomic weapons with any nation which does not already possess them, the President revived the supposedly dead notion of a policy of "liberation" of the Eastern European countries when he talked on the "right to self-determination" of these countries, much in the vein as the late John Foster Dulles used to talk about his policy of "roll-back."

Perhaps nowhere are the contradictions of U.S. policy so glaring as they are in regard to the Eastern European countries. On the one hand Washington tries to encourage

what it hopes to be a tendency of some of these countries to become more independent of the Soviet Union, a policy which is reflected in a somewhat different attitude on the part of the United States to economic aid for countries like Poland. On the other hand we still refuse stubbornly to recognize the Oder-Neisse line as the permanent East-West border line, a policy which keeps alive the very real fear of these countries of an attack by West Germany to recover the "lost provinces" and the conviction that only the closest coordination of their policies with those of the Soviet Union can protect them from such a danger.

There can be no doubt that Kennedy is under strong pressure not to make any concessions at all, from what one might call the war party in Washington. One should not underestimate the entrenched power of those who either have become desperate enough to want a showdown now, or at least feel that their economic interests are best served by a continuing tension that "justifies" the increased spending for the arms race without which they fear a collapse of the economy. The only reason why we have today a more or less constant unemployment of from 6 to 7 per cent rather than the 15 to 20 per cent of our labor force which we had in the Thirties, is the fact that the Federal Government spends more than 40 billion dollars yearly for war. More, not less, such spending would be needed just to keep us where we are, and that demands a policy of continued tension.

Nothing has contributed more to the essential weakness of the peace movement in this country than the fact that the national labor leader-

ship, with a few exceptions, fully shares this fear of peace which they consider a threat to their jobs. That is not to say that even within the existing system some measures could not be taken to soften the blow to the armament industry in the case of real relaxation of tensions. But these steps would have to be planned well ahead of time and no such plans seem to be in the works now.

THERE is another difficulty which the Administration faces if it really wishes to reach a peaceful agreement on Berlin and perhaps even on the larger problems of Europe, disarmament etc. That problem they have created themselves. It will take a careful step-by-step re-education of the public so that a reasonable compromise would become acceptable to public opinion, which has been systematically prepared to view any compromise as a "sell-out" and anyone who suggests a reasonable agreement based on give and take as an "appeaser". Therefore much that the President says at a moment like this is for home consumption and should perhaps be taken with a grain of salt. But the question is whether we will have time enough for such a slow and gradual return to a minimum of sanity, or whether the forces that have been set in motion will not gain a momentum of their own that cannot be controlled even if we assume that there exists the will to do so.

Nevertheless, there are some encouraging signs. Secretary of State Rusk's talks with Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko seem to be opening some doors and might lead to top level negotiations over Berlin before

the year is out. The very fact that even proposals like that to transfer the seat of the United Nations to Berlin can be seriously discussed is significant. While it may be too much to hope for a more or less permanent solution of the German and Central European problem along the lines of the Rapacki Plan, or at least some not so different proposals such as those made by George Kennan or Senator Mansfield, a solution for Berlin based on de facto recognition of the German Democratic Republic and perhaps even a recognition of the Oder-Neisse border, may not be out of the question.

The outcome of the West German elections in which Adenauer's Christian Democrats lost their absolute majority in the Bundestag, and the fact that the Free Democrats, who now hold the balance of power, seem to be unwilling to join a coalition if Adenauer remains Chancellor, could bring about a more flexible attitude on the part of the Bonn Government regarding its relationship with the German Democratic Republic. There are certain industrialists in the leadership of the Free Democrats whose business ties with East Germany might make such a more flexible policy desirable from their viewpoint. If Adenauer steps down, one of the main stumbling blocks to a realistic East-West policy regarding Germany would have vanished.

THAT much is clear. If the West wants peace, if the West realizes that to force a showdown over Berlin would mean the catastrophe of nuclear war, if the "power elite" in Washington has not reached the degree of desperation that Samson

reached when he decided to pull down the temple over himself as well as his enemies, then we must realize the facts of life.

They are: (1) the continued existence of two Germanys and therefore the necessity of recognizing this double existence, (2) the need for security of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union against the threat of West German revanchism through a recognition of the Oder-Neisse line and an iron-clad guarantee that West Germany will not get nuclear weapons. Details regarding free access to West Berlin and non-interference in West Berlin's political life can and must be worked out, and it is obvious that the German Democratic Republic must be part of these negotiations. There will be no loss of face for the West in

such a solution, unless we consider giving up a policy of provocation, subversion and espionage directed from West Berlin, deep within the territory of the German Democratic Republic, such a "loss of face."

Chairman Khrushchev in an interview after Kennedy's belligerent talk to the nation on the Berlin crisis said:

Let's sit down around a table and negotiate. . . . Let's not create hysteria. Let's clear the atmosphere; let's rely on sense and not on the strength of nuclear weapons.

President Kennedy repeated before the United Nations his pledge from his inaugural Address:

We will never negotiate out of fear, but we will never fear to negotiate.

ONE CHINA — TWO GERMANYS

FIELD MARSHAL MONTGOMERY, British military leader in World War II, speaking in Peking at a dinner given in his honor by Vice Premier Marshal Chen Yi, stated: "I would like to make it clear that when I say China, I mean the People's Republic with its Government in Peking, and not the Taiwan set-up, which is in no way qualified to represent China and never has been. I have always considered that Taiwan is part of the People's Republic."

Decrying the vast sums being spent on armaments, which might well be devoted to raising the standard of living of the world's population, and the lack of progress toward a more peaceful world, Field Marshal Montgomery outlined his plan for easing world tensions, as follows:

"Now to simplify the problem, I believe that we should agree at once on three great fundamental principles on which all future actions should be based. Firstly, there should be one China, which everyone recognizes. Secondly, there should be two Germanys which everybody recognizes. And, thirdly, all armed forces everywhere should withdraw to their own national territories.

"Following agreement on these principles, discussions must begin on detailed methods as to how they can be carried out and that will take a long time. . . .

"I believe that agreement on these principles is vital and must come soon in order to break the present deadlock between East and West. There will of course have to be solid agreements about no aggression being carried out beyond the legal frontiers of nations.

"To conclude, I would like to repeat again the three principles. Firstly, one China, which all will recognize. Secondly, two Germanys, East and West, which all will recognize. And, thirdly, all the armed forces everywhere to withdraw back to their own national territories."

Poets and People

Vignettes of Soviet Life

by BERNARD KOTEN

WEDDING IN BOKHARA

IT WAS MY first visit to the fabled city of Bokhara in Soviet Central Asia. I had known Bokhara through the stories about that beloved 14th century legendary Robin Hood of Central Asia, Nasreddin. And after wandering through the ancient narrow streets of the city for some days, and looking at the beautiful old mosques and mausoleums, universities and libraries of the ancient past, kept in a perfect state of restoration, I came to the conclusion that here was one Soviet city untouched by time or ideology. The streets are still full of men and children dressed in the beautiful silken robes of ancient Bokhara, heads capped with the many-colored skullcaps which I also wore as the best protection against the broiling sun of the Middle East.

In the center of the city we stopped to rest at the ancient, tree-surrounded *khauz* — or pool — relaxing in the shade, an oasis within an oasis. The narrow streets (we learned that the very logical reasons for their being so narrow were to keep out the sun and in the past to keep out the enemy horse) are connected by the domes of old (twelve in the city), almost each one of

which is a center for its ancient trade specialty.

Near the money changers' dome is the local bank, but under the dome are a number of pastry shops. But the skullcap dome still sells skullcaps and the book sellers' dome sells books — and the jewelers still function under their own dome as do the cutlers and the shashlyk makers and the many others.

The heat had forced us to reorganize our usual day's activities to permit us to take an afternoon siesta and go sightseeing after the sun went down. As a result supper was always late, and over even later.

One night (it was after 10 P.M.) we walked out in front of our hotel for a breath of air after our shashlyk party. Just as I hit the street I became aware of a torch light procession within running distance of the hotel, and run I did — with a crew of our little ladies hanging onto my arms or flying behind, looking for all the world like a Chagall painting — because in Central Asia a torch parade at night means a wedding.

We joined the wedding procession, walking behind the groom who was surrounded by his friends, his

face covered as tradition demands by his skullcap, and walked, and walked — through fields, over gulleys, past doors open in welcome — until we reached the bride's home, where we were invited to join the wedding party. (In its sixth day incidentally.) But first I, along with all the other men, had to jump over the bonfire of torches set up before the entrance, while the women were permitted to walk around it.

And so we passed through the narrow doorway of one of the seemingly bleak, whitewashed clay walls and into a fairyland of garden, pools and verandas piled high with beautiful rugs. Our Tadzhik hosts (Bokhara is in Uzbekistan but has a large Tadzhik population) received us warmly and indicated we would have to follow the Moslem tradition of the men sitting separately from the women. So I joined the men, who squatted around a large carpet spread beside a pool, and drank tea ceremoniously with them, while an orchestra of national instruments played folk music on a raised dais and individual men and boys got up to do Tadzhik dances.

Everything was very idyllic but womanless, when all of a sudden a beautifully dressed Tadzhik woman burst in on us (the men and women were in adjoining gardens separated by a wall) and beckoned to me to follow her. She announced to me that she was the bride's aunt and loved her people and their traditions, but enough was enough! And from then on I was made to realize that Bokhara was not untouched by time and ideology.

My companion led me over to where our American women were sitting. "I am not only Tadzhik, but

also Soviet," she told me. "And I am a new woman." She wanted the men and women to mix, and she showed me that at the party were Tadzhiks and Uzbeks and Bokhara Jews and Russians and, with us, even Americans.

Our bride's aunt informed us that she was happily married, had three children, and was a textile worker active in her trade union, and she was as proud of the present as of the past. "Do your women get equal pay for equal work as our Soviet women do? Do your women work in all fields and do they have good care provided for their children?" She took me by the arm and said that if she wanted to she could walk arm in arm with me, a strange man, and proceeded to do so before the others. The men who had joined us by then applauded approvingly and after much banter, food and entertainment provided by professional women's folk orchestra, singers and dancers, all of us joined the men in their entertainment.

The women — ours and theirs — were warmly received. As we sat drinking tea together, the parents of the bride and bridegroom came over to make sure we were comfortable and to tell us proudly that both the bride and the groom were students in their last year at the university, the bride in medicine, the groom in engineering.

We never did get to see the bride. She was in traditional hiding, and would come out veiled to join the groom in the final ceremony late that night. But for us it was already late at 2 A.M., and we returned to our hotel accompanied to the door by twenty of the wedding guests — our new friends.

EUGENE YEVTUSHENKO - POET

MY GOOD friend, the young Soviet poet Eugene Yevtushenko, had just recently returned from Cuba—a poet sent to report on Cuba for *Pravda* in poetry—and he insisted I must stay for his report and to hear him recite his new poems about Cuba and some other new poems. Of course I stayed.

Poetry declamation is an old and most popular form of art among the Russians, dating back to Pushkin and beyond. In Soviet times Mayakovsky carried on the great tradition. Today there are Yevtushenko, and Voznesensky, and many more of the young poets who continue the tradition. On Poetry Day — a great holiday in the Soviet Union — the popular poets recite from platforms set up near the Mayakovsky statue in the large square bearing his name. Poets and the people bring flowers and verse as offerings.

Poets recite in clubs and at institutes and universities, in halls and theaters, and especially at the Polytechnical Museum where Mayakovsky once recited his poems.

Eugene Yevtushenko's poetry evening was to be held at the Polytechnical Museum. The day the posters went up and tickets were put on sale, they were immediately all sold out. People milled around for blocks. And on September 16, the night the poet himself was to recite his own poetry, (more regularly recited by professional readers), we went to the Museum an hour ahead of time to avoid the crush, but the crowd was already there — bubbling with an enthusiasm that was conta-

gious. I realized all of a sudden that my friend's fans were as excited about poetry as our Pat Boone fans are about his singing.

The audience was made up in large part of young people — workers, students, poets, artists, actors, engineers, scientists — but there were plenty of gray heads about too. All were intently listening, throwing up flowers, sending up endless notes of commendation, criticisms, requests — in Russian fashion. The love for young Cuba shone out, went in electric charges from speaker to audience and back again, but that is another story. I want now to tell you about the second half of the program, more particularly the second poem of the second half of the evening.

The poet began simply and starkly: Babi Yar — There are no monuments at Babi Yar . . . and he went on to pour out his sympathy for the Jewish people murdered in Kiev by the Nazis in the Second World War and buried at Babi Yar, buried in a mass grave they themselves were forced to dig. He reminded his audience of historic instances of anti-Semitic persecution and gave all anti-Semites notice that he would not keep quiet as long as there was one anti-Semite on earth. He praised his land and his people for their innate goodness and called on them as good Russians to wipe out what remnants of anti-Semitism there might still be lurking, even in some seemingly innocent anecdote.

The poem ends with the point that while such implacability makes

him an object of hate for the anti-Semites of the world, in his mind this same implacability makes him a true Russian!

As the poem ended, there was complete quiet in the hall; and then came a thunder of applause that lasted ten or fifteen minutes. Bouquets of flowers were thrown at the poet's feet; cries of "Thank you!" rang out. And the young non-Jewish poet stood quietly erect and thanked his audience, non-Jewish also for the greater part. Pleas to repeat the poem were answered with the information that it would soon be published and could then be read in the press. (*The Literary Gazette*

printed the poem on September 19.)

Yevtushenko had only been back from Cuba a few days when he went down to Kiev in response to an invitation from the young people of Kiev to read his poetry there. While in Kiev he visited Babi Yar and was so moved by what he saw, by the memories the mass grave evoked, that the Babi Yar poem surged up in him. He wrote it down on his return to Moscow and some days later, on the 16th, recited it as one of his new poems — his monument to Babi Yar.

He was visibly as moved as was his audience by the reading of the poem.

YOUTH AND THE PARTY PROGRAM

MY FRIENDS saw me off in many ways. Some made parties, some family dinners, some took me to the theater. My young student friends just got together with me for a farewell bull-session. Among them were future geologists, philologists, journalists, actresses, engineers, specialists in various areas of the world. They sang current student songs for me, and their favorites among the popular songs. They played jazz to listen to and to dance to. And then we eased into chairs and onto couches, or lolled on the floor, and began talking about the newly drafted Party Program which is to usher in Communism — a twenty-year plan to be acted on at the 22nd Congress of the CPSU.

For my student friends it was an exciting but practical plan, though they did wonder how carefully you could blueprint the future. We discussed and analyzed, and criticized and praised. But what excited them

the most were two points for discussion around the program at the Congress that I had not really noticed much. These were the return to the Party maximum and the question of non-inheritability of non-movable property (house, garden etc.).

The "Party maximum" would put a ceiling on the income of Party members no matter what their job. This is a return to an old Communist principle. Non-inheritability of non-movable property would limit accumulation of wealth. To my young student friends this meant a purification of communism and Communists — a purification they urgently want and greet with enthusiasm — because there is a feeling that a type of bandwagon communism has grown and needs to be wiped out.

All the talk after this question was brought up was about pure communism and pure Communists. Com-

munists should live modestly, should be an example of simple living. And the future? What would the future be like?

In the midst of our excited discussion, I remembered that all twenty of these young people had worked before entering the university. This they had done, by the way, before the educational reform had required such work experience for college entrance. Some had worked on the virgin soil; others on far-off state collective farms. Still others had joined geological expeditions as ordinary laborers. By now they had been students for two or three years. The summer before, instead of going off on vacation, they had consti-

tuted themselves an entertainment group, written their own material, created their own sets and costumes, and gone out to perform at state farms, virgin soil camps, mainly, of course to entertain the youth.

I had seen them on their return from their tour just before their return to classes, and they had put on a full performance of their little skits for me. What I remember best were their attacks on bureaucracy and their appeal to the idealism of young people.

Our talk went on and on and ended with no conclusions, but there was a feeling of excitement and anticipation as to what the future and our future talks would bring.

Mr. Bernard Koten, Curator of the Library for Intercultural Studies, has a wide and intimate knowledge of the Soviet Union. With Russian as a second language and yearly visits to the country, he is uniquely qualified to answer questions about all aspects of Soviet life.

We are therefore very happy to announce to our readers that Mr. Koten will conduct a Question Box on the Soviet Union each month in our magazine, beginning with the January, 1962 issue.

FURTHER TAX REDUCTIONS IN THE USSR

THE LAW On the Abolition of Taxes on the Wages of Factory and Office Workers, which provides for the gradual abolition of taxes up to October 1, 1965, and the complete abolition from that date of the tax on bachelors, single persons, and Soviet citizens with small families, and of the income tax on the earnings of all factory and office workers, has been in operation for the past year. (See July 1960 issue of *New World Review*.)

From October 1960, workers receiving wages up to 50 rubles a month have been freed at their main place of work from paying the income tax and the tax on bachelors, single persons and citizens with small families. The rate of taxes from factory and office workers who receive wages from 51 to 60 rubles a month has been reduced by an average of 40 per cent.

This first stage of the abolition of taxes increased the annual cash earnings of this group of working people by 360,000,000 rubles.

The second stage, which carries the abolition of taxes a step further—to the workers receiving wages up to 60 rubles a month, with a 40 per cent reduction in the rate of taxes on earnings from 61 to 70 rubles, went into operation in October, 1961. In carrying out this stage of the abolition of taxes on wages, factory and office workers will receive additional cash earnings amounting to 400,000,000 rubles.

The abolition of taxes paid by the population of the USSR is one of the measures toward the fulfilment of the Draft Program of the Communist Party.

U.S. China Policy Goes for Broke

by SUSAN WARREN

THE incorrigible gambler that "lost China" in '49 blindly persists in its folly. In the currency of both politics and cash, the United States throws "good money after bad" until its China policy now faces utter ruin and collapse. Each year since 1951 it shamelessly marshalled its voting machine in the United Nations in a device known as the "moratorium" whereby all debate on Chinese representation in the world organization was gagged. Like the inveterate gambler, the more it loses the more feverishly it plays, vainly waiting for the miracle that never happens. The Chinese People's Republic did not obligingly disintegrate. On the contrary it grew stronger and its international prestige increased. While U.S. policy remained rigidly fixed, the world and the United Nations itself changed from year to year. Calculated to isolate China, this policy has succeeded only in isolating the United States. Devised to rob the People's Republic of her rightful place in the council of nations, she is in fact a most powerful presence though absent.

In 1951 with 52 members in the United Nations, 37 voted for the U.S. moratorium. Four abstained. Last year with 98 members (Nigeria

had not yet been admitted), for all its intensive vote-jacking activities the U.S. could muster only 42 votes, 34 against and 22 abstaining.

In the past Britain has followed the U.S. lead and voted against discussion. But in February of this year her Foreign Secretary, Lord Home, declared that the "international facts of life required Communist China's entry into the United Nations." Republican Senator George D. Aiken of Vermont and Democratic Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon, in a report to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, concluded that "future United States policy must be based on the assumption that Red China could be seated in the United Nations as early as the 16th General Assembly session, whether we agree or not . . ." With the declared intention of Brazil, Pakistan and Tunisia to switch and no longer go along with the "moratorium," Secretary of State Dean Rusk was moved to concede that the tried and untrue formula would no longer "suffice." It was plain that the United States faced a humiliating defeat and that the question of China's representation would certainly come to debate in the Sixteenth General Assembly.

With that compound of frank cynicism and frustration which characterizes much U.S. political journalism in the face of repeated dead ends in U.S. policy, Max Frankel wrote in the *New York Times*, Sept. 6:

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

Especially disturbing to some officials is the possibility of a United States setback in the United Nations shortly before or after President Kennedy makes a personal appearance before the world organization. The President wants to confront the ninety-nine member forum with a broad plan for a world of law and order, for disarmament and a strong and effective United Nations. The respect his appearance should command and the authority his proposal should carry could, it is felt, be severely damaged if his presentation coincided with a United States attempt to pressure the world organization into a reluctant acceptance of one of the least popular aspects of American foreign policy.

A genuine dilemma! How to seduce the UN with sweet talk of U.S. devotion to a "world of law and order" while employing bullying tactics to "pressure the world organization"! How to call convincingly for "disarmament and a strong and effective United Nations" while using every form of political chicanery to exclude the People's Republic of China which legally and in fact represents 650 million people, a fourth of the earth's population.

THE Kennedy Administration has made it clear that it is not abandoning the basic aims of the China policy inherited from its predecessors. "You may be sure," wrote Lawrence F. O'Brien, Special Assistant to President Kennedy, in a letter to Rep. John F. Baldwin of California that "no effort will be spared to advance the *unchanging objectives of the United States on this issue* . . . this administration supports the membership of the Republic of China in the United Nations and is opposed to the admission of Communist China." But, added Mr. O'Brien, American stra-

tegy on the matter in the forthcoming General Assembly session is still under consideration.

On the China issue no less than on other important international questions confronting the administration there are differences of approach within U.S. ruling circles. In a world that has witnessed decisive changes in power relationships, and in the context of adventures launched and setbacks suffered, there are those who argue for "realistic reappraisals of U.S. policy" and for greater "flexibility." These are the advocates of heightened political maneuvering and include among them many of the very, very bright young New Frontiersmen, fresh from the ivy clad campuses, who are past-masters at draping old goals in lofty-sounding principles and slick slogans. Far from offering new solutions based on realistic appraisals, their's is the approach of a gigantic Madison Avenue operation selling the same disreputable product—but with new and elegant wrappings!

There are, on the other hand, the open advocates of the "hard line", the stand-patters who criticize the Administration for "retreats" real and imagined, who loudly proclaim their willingness to risk war and propose a wholesale return to the Dulles strategy of "massive retaliation," which even Dulles toward the end of his life felt impelled by events to abandon. The history of the Kennedy Administration thus far has been one of wavering between the two.

This teetering between two tactics is also apparent on the China issue. In an effort to escape the increasing isolation and passivity imposed by its refusal to face Chinese

and world realities, the Administration turned a willing ear to the siren song of the "two China" advocates. This "solution" has long been espoused by one-time advertising executive, and now Under Secretary of State, Chester Bowles, as well as other proponents of "flexibility."

There are a number of variations on the "two China" theme. One envisages "admitting" the People's Republic of China into the United Nations and the Security Council on condition that it undertake "not to liberate Taiwan by force." Chiang would be compelled by the United States to withdraw his troops from the islands of Quemoy and Matsu, and Taiwan would be declared "independent" and made a new member. A second formula would place Taiwan under UN "trusteeship" or "protection" for a stipulated number of years after which a "plebiscite" would be held to decide its future. Adlai Stevenson, permanent U.S. representative to the UN favored this approach in an article in last January's *Foreign Affairs*.

A singularly imaginative proposal is the attempt to create a bargain counter "one-and-a-half Chinas." Taiwan, according to this plan, would be turned into an "autonomous area" of China with the People's Republic exercising "sovereignty." As an "autonomous area" it would handle its own foreign affairs and have "independent" political representation. China would be restored to its seat in the United Nations and Taiwan would occupy a separate seat in the General Assembly. John Fairbank, Harvard Professor and former Director of the USIS in China, is credited with this

ingenious idea of "autonomous area."

Another "two China" brainstorm which is having considerable currency and is said to be authored by Chester Bowles, is based on the concept of "successor states." According to this theory the General Assembly might adopt a resolution declaring both the repudiated Kuomintang clique in Taiwan and the People's Republic of China "successor states" to the China which was a founding member of the United Nations. The great virtue of this device, in the eyes of its creators, is its ability to provide two seats in the UN without the necessity of a formal act admitting a new member, which would be subject to veto.

ALL OF these proposals, however inventive in form, seek to interfere in China's internal affairs, dismember China, detach Taiwan which is part of her territory and legalize the U.S. occupation of Taiwan. They are firmly opposed by all Chinese. But to the "flexibility" advocates they appear to open such heavenly vistas. Would it not relieve the U.S. of the charge of "ignoring the 650 million people of mainland China"? And would it not seem "reasonable" and "enlightened" to most nations and shift the onus of her exclusion from the UN to the People's Republic itself? And could it not become the basis around which to use UN representation as an element in a larger Far Eastern bargaining process? Today, runs this "logic," the United States stands dangerously alone as the sole guarantor of Taiwan. But once the U.S. is prepared to espouse the "two China" approach perhaps we could persuade our allies

and even a few Asian and African countries to make this a collective guarantee. Oh consummation devoutly to be wished!

And finally, to crown perfection and prove that you can have your cake and eat it, too. "Officials denied that the proposal, if adopted, would represent a change in United States policy on China. They pointed out that a basic element in the plan was the assumption that Peiping would turn the offer down." (*New York Times*, June 24)

But the malicious farce played itself out to its serio-comic end. The "hard line" advocates would not take yes for an answer! From powerful and articulate forces in both parties, from those who for over a decade have made support of Chiang Kai-shek a political racket and test of patriotism, from the Senator Styles Bridges, the General Wedemeyers, the Admiral Radfords, the Judds and the Knowlands — one time pillars of the sinister China Lobby and all time "Formosa Firsters", now joined by Rep. Francis E. Walter in an unholy alliance of reaction clustered around the mis-named "Committee of One Million" and the so-called "National Strategy Committee of the American Security Council"—came the tocsin of alarm against the "appeasers", the counselors of "retreat" and "compromise."

Under heavy fire from the "hard liners" the Administration characteristically beat a hasty retreat, denied (for the moment) it had been toying with the "two China" approach and ignominiously renewed its oath of allegiance to Chiang Kai-shek.

With the Sixteenth General Assembly session imminent, Washington feverishly continued to explore

ways and means. Applications of new members to the United Nations must first be passed by the Security Council. But since China is a founding member of the United Nations the question of Chinese representation is one of credentials to be resolved in the veto-less Assembly. The "moratorium" being no longer feasible, the Administration began to accept the inevitability of debate and proceeded on the theory that "if you can't beat 'em, join 'em"—and take them over in the process! Its intent was to try to insure that the question of the transfer of China's seat be judged a "substantive" or "important" one by the Assembly requiring a two-third vote rather than a "procedural" one demanding a simple majority. If this could be accomplished, it was hoped to stave off the designation of the People's Republic of China for a period of time.

Haunting Washington's policy-makers was the memory that the U.S. and its allies had been not only the firm supporters but the moving spirit behind the Fifteenth General Assembly's decision by a simple majority to accept the credentials of the Congolese delegation headed by their hand-picked President Joseph Kasavubu, while ousting the functioning and legitimate representatives appointed by the murdered Premier Lumumba. They understandably feared that someone might be indelicate enough to involve the precedent. A further pitfall was the UN rule requiring only a simple majority vote of the Assembly to determine whether an issue was "substantive" or "procedural." But what was to be avoided at all costs, was a clearcut, immediate, either/or vote

which might well end in a simple decision to seat the People's Republic of China in place of the Chiang Kai-shek usurpers.

SUCCESS in these maneuvers depended in large part on the votes of a number of new African states formerly associated with the French African Community. These votes, in turn, depended on the admission of Mauritania and the Mongolian People's Republic to the United Nations. The Chinese Nationalists, illegally ensconced in the Security Council, threatened to veto the Mongolian People's Republic, thus making certain the Soviet Union's refusal to accept Mauritania. Last year eleven of the African leaders abstained on the "moratorium." In the event of vetoes in the Security Council on the Mongolian People's Republic and Mauritania, the United States had reason to believe that they would vote to decide that Chinese representation was a "procedural" question and then go on to vote for the replacement of the Kuomintang clique by the People's Republic of China.

Playing for time in a desperate effort to avoid a swift and catastrophic defeat, Washington came up with an eleventh hour gimmick billed as a "surprise decision by the West." A shoddy ruse, it is calculated to cover all contingencies and solve nothing. A *New York Times* report, liberally sprinkled with intimations from "reliable sources" announced that the Western powers in a dramatic "shift" had decided to meet "head on" the question of Chinese representation in the UN. New Zealand, fronting for the U.S. proposed that the issue be listed on

the agenda of the Sixteenth General Assembly. According to this inspired report, the Western governments planned to introduce a resolution to establish a special committee to study the problem of Chinese representation. The committee would be empowered to consider jointly the question of "Chinese Communist membership and the question of enlarging the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council."

Since the neutral nations have long been demanding more adequate representation on UN bodies and agencies, this was seen as putting the United States in a position of championing the interests of the neutrals as well as creating a bargaining wedge in their almost solid support for seating of the People's Republic. "The United States," says the *Times* report mentioned above, "does not want the study group to report until the 1962 session of the Assembly, which would guarantee the continuation of the Nationalist Government in the United Nations for another year." And after a year? Why that's taken care of too. "Any change in the composition of the Security Council would be subject to a veto. Nationalist China would probably use its veto if the committee recommended the admission of Communist China."

Everything under control, everything polished off in a neat little package, all so diabolically clever—and all having no relation to reality whatever. Such are the vaunted "New Frontiers" and such is the stuff pipe dreams are made of. It has been well said, one may intend one's acts but not all their consequences.

On September 22, two items on the question of China's representation

in the UN were submitted to the 16th General Assembly. In one, New Zealand, setting the stage for the projected complex delaying maneuvers by the United States, asked the Assembly to consider "the question of the representation of China in the United Nations." In the other, the Soviet Union forthrightly demanded the "restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations."

THERE is a carefully cultivated myth that the American people are united in their support of the official U.S. policy of implacable hostility to People's China. It is a myth meant to create the very thing it professes exists. "If there is any one issue on which U.S. citizens are agreed," writes that tribune of the people, Admiral Arthur W. Radford in the *Reader's Digest*, "it is that we do not want Red China in the UN!" Among "the people" for whom the Admiral speaks are his fellow signatories of a report issued by the "National Strategy Committee of the American Security Council demanding that the United States deal only with Chiang Kai-shek and oppose the People's Republic in the United Nations by all means including a threat of withdrawal. Besides Admiral Radford, this "popular" roster includes Gen. A. C. Wedemeyer, Gen. Edward M. Almond, Admirals Felix B. Stump and Chester C. Ward.

The American Security Council together with the spuriously named "Committee Of One Million" are the main purveyors and organizers of this myth. An examination of the Committee's abundant literature, pamphlets and brochures re-

veals among its leaders, members and supporters many names, personalities and public figures, Congressional and otherwise, formerly associated with the notorious China Lobby and long known as "Formosa Firsters." Of the China Lobby a brilliant exposé by *The Reporter* magazine in 1952 said: "One thing is certain. Money is the most important and fascinating of the many fascinating characters in the China Lobby — a character capable of endless disguises. It is everywhere. In a massive stream it flowed from the United States to China [to the Kuomintang — both before '49 and after]. It has returned in large amounts to the United States via numberless channels to create more millions, more propaganda, more aid, more private corruption and more public confusion."

The China Lobby, by whatever other name, is with us still. A so-called "rally" sponsored by the Committee Of One Million" featured a recording by Madame Chiang Kai-shek in which she declared that "Red" China's rulers did not represent the people." Madame Chiang's ardent devotion to the Chinese people was most dramatically expressed when, in a U.S. television appearance, she advocated dropping nuclear bombs on them. Other speakers at that rally — all lovers and representatives of the people — were arch reactionary Wm. F. Buckley Jr., Senator Thomas J. Dodd, Chiang Kai-shek's erstwhile adviser, Representative Walter H. Judd, and Francis E. Walter of Un-American Activities Committee infamy.

Whereas the *Reporter* exposé listed Christian Fronter William J. Godwin as a paid China lobbyist

who,
Harr
estim
a hu
conv
supp
we l
defe
urgi
"rall
draw
"Re
T
lion
man
by
arbi
dare
icle
Chi
Kai
eth
stra
Cor
Pres
Fra
upo
the
exp
ame
whi
Chi
org

T
of
com
Ch
two
not
sop
bills
It i
of
the
T

who, in an interview with Edward Harris of the *St. Louis Post Dispatch* estimated he had entertained about a hundred Congressmen a year and converted at least fifty of them to support more aid for Chiang, today we have Senator Barry Goldwater, defender of the John Birch Society, urging in a message to this same "rally" that the United States withdraw its support from the UN if "Red China is admitted."

That the Committee of One Million is also the natural heir to the mantle of political blackmail whereby the China Lobby became the arbiter of the careers of all who dared depart from its cardinal article of faith — that on the issue of China all good flows from Chiang Kai-shek and everything else "cometh of treason"—was amply demonstrated when on September 30 the Committee in a telegram to the President demanded that Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt be called upon to resign as special adviser to the United Nations because she had expressed the belief that no disarmament agreement could be effective while the People's Republic of China remained outside the world organization.

THE AMERICAN people have in every real sense been deprived of the opportunity for any serious consideration of a truly alternative China policy. The differences between the vocal and virulent know-nothing "hard liners" and the more sophisticated practitioners of "flexibility" is more apparent than actual. It is, in fact, no more than a division of labor. Each is the soil in which the other grows.

The "realism" of the "flexibility"

policy never extends to seeing reality whole. It is confined to a recognition that the world will no longer accept the absurdity of the pretense that China is represented in the United Nations by the rump Chiang Kai-shek clique and that this pretense is increasingly making the U.S. the object of ridicule and resentment. Its mission is to rescue U.S. China policy from the impasse in which it has landed itself while regaining all the objectives of that policy.

The "two China" mirage is no less a dead end than the other which proclaims Chiang and all his works inviolable. At the heart of both is the corrosive big lie that China is an "aggressor" and the delusion that the U.S. can continue to occupy Taiwan.

The People's Republic of China will take its rightful seat in the United Nations sooner or later—and most likely sooner. It is no longer a question that the United States can decide. The decision rests with the international community and the international community now includes the changing world of Asia, Africa and even Latin America. The trend is unmistakable and irreversible.

World opinion demands that China be represented in the global organization by its actual, effective, peace-loving and truly moral government and that the curtain finally be rung down on the farcical shadow play starring the faded, tarnished puppet Chiang Kai-shek. U.S. determination to "continue present policy come what may" is the desperate act of the distraught gambler bent on self-destruction.

This is the first of two articles by Miss Warren on China and the UN.

New Frontiers in Siberia

The Great Bratsk Dam and its Builders

by JESSICA SMITH

LEAVING Irkutsk in one of the myriad planes that fill the air of East Siberia today, we flew for an hour and a half with the great winding Angara and then the trackless taiga below us, and came down at the small but busy airport at Bratsk.

A warm and friendly group met us, thrusting into my arms great bouquets of gold, purple and red forest flowers—that lovely way the Russians have of welcoming their visitors!

We drove twenty-five miles to the new town of Bratsk that has arisen around the construction site of the hydroelectric station. The late June air was clear and bright with the special freshness and purity of a frontier land, the tall Siberian pines rose high along the road into a radiant blue sky, their straight, austere columns, branching only at the very top, intermingled with birch, fir and other trees. Here the trees were thinner than in the usual taiga country, since the area had been burnt over. Fragile birch trunks, whose tops had been blown off by strong winds, gleamed whitely among the ruddy pines, as though marking their own graves. The roadside was brilliant with the same many-colored flowers I held in my arms. Here and there, where wider areas were cleared, felled trees lay around like matchsticks—so rich the wealth of timber that it could not all be used.

We passed the original old town of Bratsk and some of the tent colonies—log foundations with canvas tops—where the first workers had lived when they came to start work on the mighty dam in the depths of the Siberian winter at the end of 1954.

The normal winter temperature, my hosts told me, is -50° (F), but it sometimes goes to 70 below, and on the coldest days the workers are released, while still receiving their pay. Before work on the dam could begin, a 375-mile swathe had to be cut through the forest for the electric lines bringing power from the Irkutsk station, an epic of human heroism in itself. It was almost impossible to keep the workers supplied with enough gloves, and when they wore out, hands had to be wrapped in heavy rags, yet it had been difficult to persuade even workers with frozen hands to leave their jobs and go back to Irkutsk for treatment. In summer, there were forest fires. Great trenches had to be dug in the frozen ground where the workers had to bury all their equipment and themselves too until the fire swept by or was brought under control by chemicals sprayed by squads of paratroopers. Summer, too, brought dense clouds of Siberian midges (now largely exterminated, in the open spaces at least) which necessitated wearing heavy veils, and mosquitoes which, like everything in Siberia, are bigger

and stronger than anywhere else in the world. This epic was being repeated, as new lines were being built to carry power from Bratsk back to Irkutsk, and eventually link it with the mighty universal power grid planned for the whole USSR.

I was not prepared for such a large town as the new Bratsk turned out to be. It has 60,000 inhabitants, about 15,000 of whom work on the dam and its subsidiary enterprises, and is the center of a township of 150,000, where there had been only wilderness and taiga and a few hunters six years before. We drove through settlements of wooden workers' houses, then through the center of town, where the government and official buildings are, and where alone there are yet paved streets, and came to a charming wooden house with high peaked roof, one of a series of guest houses, surrounded with trees and gardens, which line the river bank.

I was led to a large room on the second floor, its front a great bay window with a breathtaking view of a wide stretch of the aquamarine Angara which lay below in shining splendor.

"Now" said my too kind friends, "you will get settled and have a little rest."

Rest! Did they think I had come all these thousands of miles to where a new world was being born for that? I finally convinced them, and they agreed to come back and show me around in a few minutes. The kindly housekeeper bustled in and asked which of the two twin beds she should prepare for me. (My husband John, alas, had been called back to America in connection with the Supreme Court decision on the

McCarran case, and I was making the Siberian part of the trip alone, with an interpreter.) Not thinking it mattered, I indicated one of the beds. The housekeeper looked at me reproachfully.

"But Nikita Sergeyevich slept here!" she announced, pointing at the other. So of course I chose that one.

(That man has been everywhere. Not a town or a collective farm can you visit but they will tell you "Nikita Sergeyevich was here!" and always full of advice and jokes and praise for good work and scolding for bad.)

Soon we were rushing around the town, bumping over rough roads, uphill and down, passing cement and concrete works and bulldozers and cranes and giant walking excavators and all manner of other machinery where enterprises connected with the dam were working, swerving out of the way of huge trucks, the lords of creation here, who will give way to no one as they go about their business. My guide pointed out the site where work had begun on a huge industrial complex to use the inexhaustible timber wealth of the area on the spot, transforming it into cellulose, paper, chemical products, synthetics, textiles, furniture, homes. Later, a great new aluminum plant would be built, using a large part of the new station's power. In areas nearby, they told me, rich in iron and non-ferrous metals, great new metallurgical and engineering industries would also rise. And everywhere was evidence of the tremendous construction of workers' houses, clubs, movies,

libraries, hospitals, schools, stores etc. that had gone up in connection with the building of the dam. This aspect of Bratsk will have to await a later article.

First of the great dam itself, which I anticipated with the awe that any great miracle of human achievement inspires. For Bratsk tops any taming of a mighty river yet attempted by man. The capacity of the electric station when completed will be 4,500,000 to 5,000,000 kilowatts, more than double that of Grand Coulee. And it is only one of a cascade of six stations on the Angara, three of which have already been completed. (Even this giant will be outstripped by the 6,000,000 kilowatt station on the Yenisei, already under way, and the projected Lena River station with a 20,000,000 kilowatt capacity!)

So it was with intense excitement that I alighted next morning on the half mile temporary bridge over the dam, spanning the river between the sheer granite sides of the gorge, which would later be connected by motor road and railway. Above us was the mighty crane which had built the bridge, and would stay in place as part of the framework of the hydroelectric station itself, on which construction had already started. It could lift 475 metric tons. It was made in Leningrad, after U.S. firms refused. From a distance the great structure had seemed to be rising without human hand, but now, below us, we could see a multitude of small figures of men and women scurrying about or working quietly among the grand design of steel and concrete structures which made up the dam, its spillways, the great pipes leading into the big

round holes for the twenty turbines and generators which turn the great river's flow into electricity to power mighty industries and bring light to great new areas. Two of the turbines were being readied to put in place. All around was a huge movement and sound of machinery, trucks, cranes, sirens.

We had a date to meet the chief engineer. But our hosts had insisted on a big breakfast (with toasts, too!) so we were a little late, and the engineer had been called off on an urgent problem. They took me instead to Ivan Stepanovich Galkin, Secretary of the Party Committee of the construction workers, whose office was on the site. He, they said, knew as much about all the details of the work as the engineer himself.

Galkin welcomed us cordially, and asked if I minded his going on with his work while he talked. Workers off shift were sitting around a table, filling out applications for membership in the Party, making complaints or recommendations, paying dues. In words and photographs and charts, Galkin told me the whole story of the construction from the clearing of the forest, the first damming in September 1957 on the left side, draining of the water, the demolition work, the laying of concrete, at first through ice holes, in the bitter cold, the building of the bridge and the sluices, and then the repeating of the same process on the right side.

The work on the dam requires the laying of 4,500,000 cubic meters of concrete, of which 2,500,000 had been completed at the time I was there.

Earlier difficulties, with ice forming first at the bottom of the river in

wint
above
gene
are c
stat
like
to n
the
into
tivel
water
ervoir
over
alone
I
me s
built
of w
"V
wond
comp
-ma
He
const
about
of se
gency
they
avera
mont
high
every
in
plans
from
Brats
vacat
cause
and
may
Unio
are p
are r
tion
or sa
cent
paid

winter because of the swift flow above, had now been overcome. In general, Galkin told me, conditions are especially favorable for a power station here. The Angara, which like most Siberian rivers flows south to north, is the largest tributary of the mighty Yenisei, which empties into the Arctic Ocean. It has a relatively even flow because it takes its waters from the inexhaustible reservoir of Lake Baikal, into which over 300 rivers flow, the Angara alone flowing out.

I asked Galkin if he would tell me something about the people who built the dam and their conditions of work and their spirit.

"Work boils!" he said, "We have wonderful workers here who accomplish feats of heroism every day — make world records in their work."

He told me the average age of the construction workers on the dam is about 25. They work in three shifts of seven hours each. When emergency overtime work is required, they have an extra day's rest. Their average wage is about 200 rubles a month — 150 the lowest, 350 the highest. In addition, practically everyone receives additional money in premiums for over-fulfilling plans. They have paid vacations of from one to two months a year. Bratsk workers are all given 12 days vacation over the usual norm, because of the especially hard work and conditions. Once a year, they may travel to any part of the Soviet Union they wish. Travel expenses are paid, and days spent in travel are not counted against their vacation time. If they go to rest homes or sanitariums, they pay only 30 per cent of the cost. Travel expenses are paid when new workers come, and

travel fare home if they do not wish to stay after their contract expires. Special help is also given in bringing their families to live with them.

Introducing me to one of the young workers who had just come in, a Bashkir Tatar, Galkin told me that the workers came from all over the Soviet Union, their imaginations fired by the vast scale of this pioneer work, and that altogether 56 different nationalities were represented among Bratsk workers.

"And this," he said, introducing another, "is Victor Krasnoyarchuk, from the Ukraine who has worked here since March of last year. His mother keeps writing him, begging him to come home — instead he's trying to get her to come and settle here. He is 24 years old, and came to us after being demobilized from the army. After the reduction of our army, a great many demobilized men came here, and were are expecting 5,000 more soon. It would be good if our whole army could be demobilized! There is so much construction work to do, so many new industries to build. We plan to build beautiful cities here. Over on the right bank a whole new workers' city is rising. We plan to make Bratsk itself more beautiful — then there will be Zheleznogorsk, where iron ore deposits will be worked, and Leninogorsk—"

I wanted to know what was the role played here by the Communist Labor Brigades who everywhere I had visited were taking the leadership in Soviet enterprises both in production goals and in setting an example in their personal lives.

"They are our mainstay," he said. "In this section of 1200 workers

where I am in charge of Party work, we have 104 Party Members, 475 Komsomols. Two teams have already won the title, 8 are competing for it. The only ones not yet competing are new workers who have been here only a month or so and are not yet fully organized. The teams are made up of 90 to 100 workers each. Our best team is headed by Vladimir Kazmirchuk. It was he who first proposed the competition to put the station into operation ahead of schedule. Now the whole enterprise is pledged to have the first turbine and generator in place to greet the 22nd Party Congress in October, and the second aggregate by the November 7 anniversary when the first electricity will be generated. This means pouring a million more tons of concrete, completing the railway across the Angara, finishing the Bratsk-Irkutsk line, starting to fill in the reservoir of the Bratsk Sea, which will be 375 miles long when completed. And it means resettling thousands of people, too. We'll do it all! We fulfilled the plan by 131.4 percent in the first five months of this year."

I asked him what characterized the Communist Labor Teams beside their production work. "Here," he said, taking me to a bulletin board where various scrolls were hung, "this is the pledge taken by Kazmirchuk's team. See for yourself." This is what it said:

• *Let us imagine that our dream has become a reality, that we are already living in a Communist society.*

• *We have decided not to reject any kind of job, whether profitable or not, whether easy or difficult. We will undertake this job from the bottom of our hearts, willingly. We shall consider our la-*

bor as a need and a joy, not just an obligation.

• *In whatever kind of work we do, we shall exert our initiative, think out how it may be done better. Our work must not be mechanical, but creative, with thought behind it.*

• *The brigade must live by the rule, one for all and all for one. It should be remembered that one lazy person brings shame to the whole brigade. If someone doesn't show up for work, it hurts us all. One piece of work of bad quality reflects on the whole brigade.*

• *We must not keep all our experience and knowledge within ourselves, we must share it with others. If you find someone lagging behind, help him. Or, if you can't do something yourself, don't be arrogant, ask a comrade for help.*

• *Don't just waste your time after work, use it in a cultural way. Schools, technical courses, institutes are awaiting you. If you have a free minute—read. Study so that you can be more useful to the people of your country.*

• *Take care of your cultural level. Put an end to swearing, bad behavior, and hard drinking.*

• *Never pass by hooliganism. If you see someone has been offended and do nothing about it, you too are at fault.*

• *Have respect for old people, in the streets, at home, in the family. Be polite, sociable, tactful.*

• *If you break these obligations, you cannot be a member of the Communist Labor Brigade.*

Other statements listed specific production obligations undertaken by the brigade as a whole, and by individual members.

I gasped. "Do you really mean to say," I asked Galkin "that you actually have whole brigades of young workers who live up to all this?"

"Well," he said, "our young people are neither angels nor prudes if that's what you mean. Life is hard here, and some allowances have to be made, young people need rest and recreation, and we try to provide for that through our clubs and

dance
lute
these
care
falls
are to
older
only
close
unde
I
awar
was i
ers o
went
brig
datic
by th
izatio
Th
stepp
find
me t
A
ing
struc
Vlad
may
him
trod
into
ther
ing
V
old.
wor
blon
ing
H
near
and
hon
smi
a te
"ask
"

dance halls. No one expects absolute 100 per cent fulfillment of all these things. The young people take care of each other when someone falls out of line, and sometimes they are tougher with each other than the older people are with them. But only those get the banner who come close to living up to all they have undertaken."

I asked him how the titles are awarded. He told me that the matter was first considered by all the workers of the department together. They went over the records of the various brigades and made their recommendations, which were then acted on by the trade union and Party organizations.

The shifts were changing, and we stepped outside to see if he could find one of the brigade leaders for me to meet.

A group of workers were climbing up out of the bowels of the construction, coming off shift. "There's Vladimir Kazmirschuk himself — maybe you would like to talk to him." He called him over and introduced him to me. We climbed into the bus that had brought us there to get out of the hot sun beating down on us.

Vladimir, I learned, is 27 years old. He was dressed in strong denim work clothes, a gray cap over his blonde hair, bright blue eyes shining out of his strong tanned face.

He had been born in a village near Krivoi Rog, had been orphaned and was brought up in a children's home. There he learned the locksmith's trade, and graduated from a technical school in Krivoi Rog.

"What brought you here?" I asked.

"Well, first I worked in the virgin

lands, as tractorist and combine driver. I went there at the time of the first call, in 1954. After a year there, I had to do my army service. When I was demobilized in 1957 I felt the work in the virgin lands was well under way, I wanted to be a part of something new, heard about Bratsk, and came here."

His brigade includes workers of different trades, concreters, iron workers, assemblers, repairmen. It had been awarded the title of Communist Labor Brigade in 1959. Kazmirschuk had been the assistant of Boris Geimulin, who headed it, "He is a famous Hero of Socialist Labor," Kazmirschuk said proudly. Geimulin had been injured, had first been treated in a local hospital and then sent to Moscow for further care, and last November Vladimir had been elected in his place. In addition to his work as brigade head, Vladimir has special trade union responsibilities, which include checking up on labor protection requirements.

THE brigade has 100 members, seven of them girls. In addition to the general obligations their team has undertaken (the ones I had read on the bulletin board) to "live in a Communist way," they were now competing for a special banner for the opening of the 22nd Party Congress in October. Their obligations, in addition to fulfilling the plan ahead of time, consisted mainly of economy in the use of material, rational utilization of machinery, organizing everything so that there would be no stoppage, for example, taking care of repair of equipment in the course of work so that nothing would be held up. The

brigade makes its own decisions about taking on new members. They get acquainted with them, watch their work, and make their recommendations to the trade union committee.

"Do you plan to stay in Bratsk permanently?" I asked him.

"My main job is construction. When the dam and station are completed, other types of workers will be needed. Our whole brigade has become experienced, steeled in our work — so most of us may go on together to some new construction site, wherever we are needed most—perhaps to Ust Ilym, 150 miles down river, which will be the same size as Bratsk."

It was easier to get details about his work from Vladimir, than about himself. I discovered, however, that he was unmarried — a most unusual situation for a Soviet young person of his age. Indeed, I had been told that the Bratsk marriage bureau does a land office business on week ends, and that the highest Bratsk production index was in babies! Vladimir told me that one of the activities of his brigade which kept them quite busy was arranging wedding parties for its members. "And why not a wedding party for yourself?" I asked.

"Oh, I just haven't the time now — maybe later after my studies are finished," he answered. "Women demand a lot of attention, and I've got too much else to do right now."

He finally admitted shyly that he knows a very nice girl, but they live at opposite ends of town, too far away for them to spend much recreation time together. Besides, he wants to study evenings, while she wants to go dancing. He had taken a corre-

spondence course with the Moscow Power Institute for two years, had to stop that for lack of time, but he was still taking special evening courses to increase his qualifications. Soon there would be a division of the Irkutsk Polytechnical Institute in Bratsk, and he planned to finish his higher education there.

I asked him how they handled any cases of misbehavior among brigade members, whether they had the Comradely Courts I had heard so much about in other places.

"We try to take care of everything among ourselves," he told me. "This is a large brigade, and of course there are some cases of misbehavior. Just this morning, for example, one of our workers didn't show up. We found out that he had been celebrating a friend's birthday, had drunk too much and overslept. Since this was his first offense and he's a good worker, we decided that for this time we'll just give him a friendly warning. If it happens again, we'll have to call him on the mat and talk to him more strictly. If anyone continues misbehaving repeatedly, we exclude him from the brigade, but we do that only in incorrigible cases, it's only happened once. Usually one or two warnings are enough. We have elected a Comradely Court, but it has no job—we can manage without."

More and more workers had gathered around. Heads were craning through the door of the bus, truck drivers had drawn up and were leaning through their cabs to listen. "Amerikanka! — She's an American!" They were telling each other. "Your Harriman was here," one of them called out. "He said we would never be able to dam this river

— wh
I was
Harr
he'd
proof
bited
laugh

VL
have
Sovie
comp
I t
the
on i
shool
"I
cans
want
watch
They
how
trici
powe
out a
the r
how
war?
Ag
"I
lectu
ple,
work
destr
not
gane
the
cour
Am
wor
spea
be
buil
any
buil
to c

— what does he think now?" I said I wasn't in a position to know what Harriman was thinking, but that he'd also said recently there was no proof that Gagarin had really orbited the earth. They roared with laughter.

VLADIMIR asked me: "Why don't the American people have a better understanding of the Soviet people, of our aims and accomplishments?"

I tried to explain something about the kind of propaganda that went on in our country, and why. He shook his head.

"I can't understand why Americans ask such stupid questions. They want to know whether we can make watches—when we make sputniks! They say do you have electricity — how can they think we have no electricity when we are building huge power stations like this? They reach out and feel our shirts to see whether the material is good. But worst of all, how can they think we want to make war?"

Again I tried to explain.

"I'm not talking about the intellectuals, but about the common people, the workers. Don't American workers understand the tremendous destruction war will bring? We're not interested in making propaganda for socialism. We only need the truth should be told about our country and our people, and that the American people should believe the words of the Soviet people when we speak of our peaceful aims. It can be seen everywhere that we are building only for peace. How could anyone think that we would be here building this great dam if we wanted to destroy anyone, which would only

mean all this would be destroyed too?"

The blue eyes were blazing now as he leaned toward me. The others drew closer, nodding their heads.

"We want you to know the truth about us, and we are only interested in the truth about America. We know very well that your standard of living is higher than ours. Khrushchev tells us very frankly about this, all sorts of lecturers that come here speak about it! Why don't your people also tell the truth about us and our aims? We are still lagging behind you in meat and dairy products but we will reach the American level. That is our aim and they should know about it. But we won't reach that aim through war. Why isn't there more pressure for peace on your government? Americans should know about our rockets, our strength, too — but we don't want to use them unless we are forced to. Don't the Americans understand what a catastrophe war would be for all humanity? Why don't they accept the very simple Soviet plan for complete and universal disarmament? Khrushchev proposed to Kennedy in Vienna that this be started immediately. Why are the Americans against it? If they don't want to listen to us, why don't they listen to the neutral countries, who also want it?"

What could I say? I tried to tell him about the many Americans who agreed with him. To my sorrow there was little I could say about any effective mass peace movement, least of all of any mass medium through which the truth could be brought to large sections of American workers who still do not understand—though some are beginning to—that

their only future security lies not in arms production but in production for peace

"**M**ORE of your workers should come here and report the real facts about us!" A Georgian, Shota Chaneishvili, who was sitting beside Kazmirchuk, spoke up. "I was at the Yalta conference, working as a guard. We met your American soldiers there. We could tell the difference among them. Those who had wealthy backgrounds didn't have anything to do with us. Those who were workers had a friendly, brotherly attitude. We spent our free time together. They had heard that Russians are rough people, and were surprised that they could have a good time with us. They said, you have the same kind of hands that we do—working hands — you are the same kind of people."

"Yes — let more American workers come and see for themselves that we can be friends!," another spoke up. "And we'd like to know them better — we can't learn to know about the American people only

from your motion pictures." And another — "Tell them Siberia isn't just a place where bears roam around, but human beings like ourselves are working here!"

It was lunch hour, and I felt we had no right to keep the workers longer, so I said we had better be going. I thanked them all, and asked Kazmirchuk what message he would like me to take back to America.

"Tell your people it's our sincere desire to know them better and have them know us better. Peace and friendship are our main concern. We had great hopes from the meeting of our Khrushchev and your Kennedy in Vienna. But it was only a beginning. We want it to lead to something more. If our countries could only agree on disarmament, all the world would breathe more easily. Under modern conditions of such highly developed science and technique, mankind can be assured the happiest lives in history if we can live without war!"

This is the word I bring you from the workers of Bratsk. How shall we answer them?

FIRST BRATSK GENERATORS INSTALLED!

BRATSK, OCTOBER 3. Installation of the first two generators of the Bratsk hydroelectric station is being rushed to completion in time for the forthcoming 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the USSR. Each of the generators has a capacity of 225,000 kilowatts. This completes the harnessing of one of the world's biggest rivers. A concrete dam blocks the kilometer wide bed of the mighty Angara River between the Padun Cliffs.

The new reservoir, sea-like in size, is rapidly filling up. It has been in existence for just over a month and already holds 4,000,000,000 cubic meters of water. The dam which towers over the reservoir resembles an enormous ship with red flags flying at full mast on the 150-meter-high concrete laying cranes. Hundreds of lorries are kept busy removing the earth dug up by the super-excavators working near the power plant building. Last minute preparations for the start of operations are in full swing.

Moscow News, October 10

LOOKING AT THE RECORD

From Yalta to Disarmament, Cold War Debate, by Joseph P. Morray, Monthly Review Press, New York, 1961. 368 pages. \$8.50.

THIS IS ONE of the most important books on the basic issues of American-Soviet relations that has been published in this country. It is essential reading for anyone who wants to understand the background of the present world crisis and to do something about it. It illuminates the reasons that impelled the USSR to take the grave step of resuming tests of nuclear weapons, despite its reluctance and full knowledge of what its effect would be on world public opinion.

The book is a documentary record of the positions of the two main protagonists in the cold war debate that has torn the world asunder in the past sixteen years.

It begins with Franklin D. Roosevelt's report on the Yalta Conference agreements and his appeal to the American Congress and people to support them as the only way to insure the building of a permanent structure of peace. It shows how the common ground for peace achieved at Yalta was undermined by Roosevelt's successors and split apart by Winston Churchill at Fulton, Missouri.

The bulk of the book is devoted to the record of disarmament negotiations, beginning with the 1946 Soviet proposal for arms reduction and the U. S. opposition to disarmament agreements expressed in response. Mr. Morray demonstrates that the Baruch plan presented by the U.S. to the United Nations was never intended to ban atomic weapons, but constituted rather an attempt to subordinate the sovereignty of the USSR to an international organ controlled by the United States. Also set forth is the Soviet counter plan to prohibit the use of atomic weapons in any circumstances

whatever, to ban their production and destroy existing stockpiles, a position consistently pursued after the USSR itself had the bomb.

Subsequent negotiations on disarmament are followed through to the end of 1960, with thorough documentation on the partial U.S. proposals with primary emphasis on control, and on the Soviet position at each stage, culminating in the proposal for complete and universal disarmament with control at each stage and eventually complete control, as the only solution. The author shows from the evidence that each time the USSR accepted U.S. proposals in order to facilitate agreement, these proposals were withdrawn and new ones less likely of acceptance put forward. Negotiations on ending nuclear weapons testing are also covered in detail, setting forth fully the positions of both sides.

Mr. Morray is a graduate of the United States Naval Academy and the Harvard Law School. He has practiced law, served as a naval officer in World War II, and as Naval Attache in U.S. embassies. He has recently been teaching at the University of California at Berkeley, first on the law faculty and then in the College of Letters and Sciences, where he studied and discussed many of the documents on which this book relies with a group of students. His previous book, *Pride of State: A Study in Patriotism and American National Morality* (Beacon Press, Boston, 1959), dealing with the whole question of patriotism in the light of the McCarthy era, throws much light on the motivations of U.S. policies as revealed in the present volume.

In *From Yalta to Disarmament*, the author's legal training and practice determine his method of relying on the evidence and the mutual confrontation and cross-examination of the principal antagonists to find the truth. His read-

ers will draw their own conclusions from the record. His own judgment is presented in the last two paragraphs of the book:

A close study of the negotiations over the past sixteen years can lead to only one conclusion: the Soviet Union wants our divided planet to be disarmed; the NATO governments do not. This conclusion must be faced with all its alarming implications. The deeply rooted fear of Communism is going to be tapped by Western governments and directed against anyone who argues for the acceptance of the Soviet proposals. This obscurantist tactic is already being employed, and more must be expected. Anyone who wants to enter into the struggle to force the NATO governments to accept disarmament will be helping the Communists achieve a priority objective. He must be prepared, therefore, to hear the charge of "Communist" leveled against himself by those who cannot meet the issues on the plane of reason. In a society permeated with emotional and unexamined anti-Communism, where the freedom to be a Communist or to agree with the Communists hardly exists or at best is granted only on the severest terms, this charge is bound to be dreaded, if not for oneself, then because of hardships to family.

Nevertheless, the cause of disarmament is the cause of humanity. As the peoples of the Soviet Union and of the Western world have a common interest in keeping the nuclear bombs from falling, so they have a common interest in eliminating

the possibility of their falling. They therefore have a common interest in discovering which parties in the crucial negotiations are really trying to hold on to the bombs and the means of their delivery and which are trying to have them destroyed. The judgment, if reached accurately and in time by enough people all around the world, can save mankind the awful suffering of another war. This is worth fighting for.

This is the lesson of the book. Testing of nuclear weapons by any power cannot be condoned. But greater than the danger to humanity from radioactive fallout is the ultimate disaster of nuclear war. Sincere opposition to the testing of nuclear weapons has always been based on the fact that tests are not only abhorrent and harmful in themselves, but that they represent a continuing arms and nuclear weapons race and an increasing threat of war. Therefore the end of testing has been seen not just as an end in itself, but as a first step toward absolute banning of nuclear weapons and disarmament. What is now needed is world pressure for disarmament on such a massive scale that it will be irresistible to the forces that fear disarmament more than nuclear war. Mr. Morray's conclusions show the special moral responsibility of the American people in the fight for disarmament.

J. S.

THE GLORY OF AFRICA'S PAST

Africa, The Wonder and the Glory, by Anna Melissa Graves, Baltimore, Md. 1961. 43 pages. \$1.00.

THIS IS a most timely reprint of a section of the author's book, *Benvenuto Cellini Had No Prejudice Against Bronze*, originally published in 1942. This material on the rich inheritance of the peoples of Africa is of special interest in this period when the African nations are at last coming into their own in world affairs.

In a review of the book written at the time of its appearance, Dr. Leslie Pinck-

ney Hill wrote of the section covered in this pamphlet:

The first value of the book is in the revelation of the antiquity of that contribution which luminous individuals of the Negro ethnic group have made to the advance of culture through the centuries; and also the revelation that a culture compounded of the contribution of members of a great ethnic group — the Negroes of the Sudan — in many fields, is precisely of the kind and quality that has distinguished the history of all great peoples.

The pamphlet is appropriately dedicated "To a wonderful and glorious Afro-American, Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois."

THE USSR - PAST AND PRESENT

Archaeology in the USSR, by A. L. Monogait. Translated and adapted by M. W. Thompson. Penguin. Baltimore, 1961. 320 pages. \$1.45.

The author of this popular, scientific outline of the development of archaeology in the Soviet Union is senior scientific Fellow at the Institute for the History of Material Culture of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. It contains material of very great interest, particularly its accounts of the discoveries from medieval Russia.

Outline History of the USSR. Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1960. 447 pages. \$3.75.

A concise outline history from prehistoric times to 1960 with many illustrations and a useful chronology of important dates.

Russia at the Dawn of the Modern Age, by George Vernadsky. Yale University, 1959. 347 pages. \$7.50.

This fourth volume of Professor Vernadsky's *A History of Russia* covers the period of the ascendancy of Moscow as the center of the Russian Empire in the 15th and 16th centuries.

The First Russian Revolution, 1825, by Anatole G. Mazour. Stanford University, 1961. 328 pages. \$6.75.

A reprint, with bibliographical supplement, of the 1937 edition. A detailed account of the Decembrist revolution of 1825, reissued because of requests from libraries and students.

Nicholas I and Official Nationality in Russia, 1825-1855, by Nicholas V. Riasanovsky. University of California, 1959. 296 pages. \$5.00.

A history of the reign of Nicholas I and a study of the doctrine of Official Nationality as well as a portrait of the reigning Tsar.

Alexander Herzen and the Birth of Socialism, 1812-1855, by Martin Malia. Harvard University Press, 1961. 486 pages. \$10.00

A biography of one of the founders of Russian socialism from his birth until 1885, and a study of the growth of social and political ideas in Russia of the period covered.

Roots of Revolution, by Franco Venturi. Knopf, New York, 1960. 850 pages. \$12.75. (Translated from the Italian.)

Franco Venturi is Professor of Modern History at the University of Turin. Much of the research for this history of the Populist movements in 19th century Russia was done in Soviet libraries. Covering the period 1848-1881, this study contains a wealth of quotations from memoirs, rules of revolutionary organizations and other contemporary documents not hitherto available for the non-Russian reader, as well as biographical and detailed analyses of the philosophical and political ideas of the principal Populist leaders.

Russia on the Eve of War and Revolution, by Sir Donald MacKenzie Wallace. Random House, New York, 1961. 528 pages. \$1.45.

First published in 1877, this is a shortened version of the third edition of 1912. Based on wide observation of Russia in the period following the emancipation of the serfs in 1861, this is a book of exceptional interest.

Dilemmas of Progress in Tsarist Russia, Legal Marxism and Legal Populism, by Arthur P. Mendel. Harvard University Press, 1961. 310 pages. \$7.00.

A study of certain aspects of conflicting social, political and economic theories in late 19th century Russia.

The Bolshevik Revolution, 1917-1918, Documents and Materials, by James Bunyan and H. H. Fisher. Stanford University Press, 1961. 735 pages. \$10.00.

A reprint of the collection first published in 1934. Decrees, manifestoes, reports by participants, observers and the contemporary press of the first six months of the Revolution.

Ten Days that Shook the World, by John Reed. Random House, 1960. 439 pages. \$1.45.

John Reed's eye-witness account of the Russian Revolution is a classic record of those historic days.

History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, prepared by a group of writers. Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1960. 766 pages. \$2.25

A new edition of the official history that first appeared in 1938 extensively revised and brought up to date.

The Soviet Industrial Debate, 1924-1928, by Alexander Erlich. Harvard University Press, 1960. 214 pages. \$6.00.

A study of the debate in the 1920's about the projected industrialization of the Soviet Union.

Socialism in One Country, 1924-1926, Part Two, by Edward Hallett Carr. Macmillan, New York, 1960. 493 pages. \$7.50.

The sixth volume of Professor Carr's projected ten volume history of the Soviet Union. A detailed study of the political conflicts and historic decisions during the crucial years under study.

Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism, prepared by a group of authors. Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1960. 891 pages. \$2.25.

Written with great clarity and using many contemporary examples and illustrations, this is a comprehensive exposition of the Marxist-Leninist world outlook.

—M. Y.

SOVIET FARMS

A Visit on Soviet Farms, by Charles J. Coe. Special illustrated issue of *Facts for Farmers*, published by Farm Research, Inc., New York.

WE HIGHLY recommend this special issue of *Facts for Farmers*, written by the editor, Charles J. Coe, on the basis of a visit this summer to Soviet collective and state farms.

Mr. Coe reports that he was given the opportunity to see everything he wished at the Soviet farms he visited, and to snap whatever pictures he cared to take. The photographs make a vivid accompaniment to the article.

Mr. Coe gives some of the background of Soviet agricultural developments, describes the organization of Soviet farms and changes that have taken place in recent years. He discusses Soviet farming methods and presents interesting statistics. His knowledge of U.S. agriculture gives rise to some interesting comparisons. In addition to reporting on crops, cattle, cows and chickens, he also has interesting material on living standards, housing, child care, and social and cultural activities.

While of special interest to those concerned with farm problems, this factual on-the-spot report will also appeal to anyone seeking information on the broad general organization and development of Soviet society.

A Visit on Soviet Farms, 1961, with on-the-spot photographs, by the editor of *Facts for Farmers*, Charles Coe. Send only 20c for a sample copy.

Name.....

Address.....

Facts for Farmers, 39 Cortland St.,
New York City 7, N. Y.

FREE PRESS? FREE COUNTRY? FREE WORLD?

Three weeks before **FREEDOM: PROMISE AND MENACE** was published we sent review copies to more than thirty papers and magazines, including the *Christian Science Monitor*. The Monitor carries a literary section, weekly, in two editions. On September 23 we mailed them the following copy, requesting display ads in both editions.

Just Published

FREEDOM: PROMISE & MENACE by **SCOTT NEARING**

A book which challenges the basic theoretical assumptions of the American Way of Life

Clothbound 208 pages \$3.50
SOCIAL SCIENCE INSTITUTE,
Harborside, Maine

On September 28 we received an answer from the MONITOR's New York office: "In regard to placing advertising for your book **FREEDOM: PROMISE AND MENACE** in our columns, we very much appreciate your consideration of our newspaper and it is therefore with regret that we shall not be able to accept this advertising. It has been our policy for a number of years never to give reasons for declining advertising. Please do understand these matters are given most thoughtful consideration and are intended to be of mutual benefit."

We would like to know why an "International Daily Newspaper" (as the *Monitor* styles itself) refuses to print a paid advertisement of a scholarly book dealing with one of the most important theoretical and practical questions facing the American people.

WOULD YOU ALSO LIKE TO KNOW? READ THE BOOK

SOCIAL SCIENCE INSTITUTE, Harborside, Maine

STATEMENT REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AS AMENDED BY THE ACTS OF MARCH 3, 1933, JULY 2, 1946 AND JUNE 11, 1960 (74 Stat. 208), SHOWING THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, AND CIRCULATION OF:

NEW WORLD REVIEW, published monthly at New York, N. Y., for October 1, 1961.

1. The names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are:

Publisher, NWR Publications, Inc., 34 West 15th St., New York 11, N. Y.

Editor, Jessica Smith, 34 West 15th St., New York 11, N. Y.

Managing Editor, Murray Young, 34 West 15th St., New York 11, N. Y.

Business manager, none.

2. The owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a partnership or other unincorporated firm, its name and address, as well as that of each individual member, must be given.)

N.W.R. Publications, Inc. 34 West 15th Street, New York 11, N. Y. Frederick V. Field, Calle de Londres 87-201, Mexico 6, D.F., Mexico.

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

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

5. The average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the 12 months preceding the date shown above was: (This information is required by the Act of June 11, 1960 to be included in all statements regardless of frequency of issue) 6,100.

JESSICA SMITH

Editor

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 22nd day of September, 1961.

IRVING MENDELL

Notary Public for the State of New York
(My commission expires March 3, 1963.)
(SEAL)

BOOKS FROM CHINA

SELECTED WORKS OF MAO TSE-TUNG 1945-49

Articles and speeches (many never before published in English) of the crucial period 1945 to 1949.

460 pages

Cloth boxed \$4.25, paper \$2.75

UPSURGE IN CHINA,

By Hewlett Johnson

The Dean of Canterbury's account of three recent visits to China—with additional material by his wife and daughters who accompanied him.

373 pages

\$2.00

Order from your local bookstore, or send payment with order to:

CHINA BOOKS & PERIODICALS

334 W. Schiller St., Chicago 10, Ill.

(Send for our catalogue)

Read Jessica Smith's review of

FROM YALTA TO DISARMAMENT

by J. P. MORRAY

Published August 23 at \$8.50

XMAS SPECIAL

\$5

UNTIL
DEC. 31
ONLY

Send your order, with
payment enclosed, to

MONTHLY REVIEW PRESS

333 Sixth Ave., New York 14, N. Y.

Main Report to the 22nd Congress of the Soviet Communist Party

The Soviet Stand on Germany

9 Key Documents including diplomatic papers and major speeches by Khrushchev; Proposals for a German Peace Treaty; With A Letter to the American People from Nikita S. Khrushchev.

Program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Draft)

EACH \$1.00

CROSSCURRENTS PRESS

156 Fifth Ave., New York 10, N. Y.

Please send me the publications checked below. Enclosed is check or money order for \$..... (All orders must be prepaid. New York City residents add 3 per cent sales tax.)

☐ Germany ☐ Draft Program ☐ Report

Name

Address

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

SOVIET FILMS

NEW RELEASES

The Queen of Spades
The Gordeyev Family
The Sun Shines For All
Mumu and the Colt
Lullaby

Coming:

Moscow Documentary
Sergei Prokofiev

Released by:

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