

SCIENCE
December, 1961

DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRARY DEC 2 1961

New World

REVIEW

THE 22nd CONGRESS - ITS MEANING FOR PEACE

Picasso

ILYA EHRENBURG

Report from South Viet Nam

ANNA LOUISE STRONG

What We Know about Cancer

DR. NIKOLAI BLOKHIN

Soviet Music and Art

BERNARD KOTEN

FACTS FROM KHRUSHCHEV REPORT

NEW WORLD REVIEW

DECEMBER 1961

Focus on Reality	Jessica Smith	3
Facts from Khrushchev's Report		6
Picasso	Ilya Ehrenburg	16
Aspects of Soviet Art and Music	Bernard Koten	20
The Real Struggle in Viet Nam	Anna Louise Strong	24
The Road to Rome	Gen. Hugh B. Hester	30
What Do We Know about Cancer?	Dr. Nikolai Blokhin	33
Our Two Great Tasks		38
Gromyko Reports on Soviet Foreign Policy		42

REVIEWS

The Achievement of Soviet Medicine — L. Fridland	Murray Young	46
A Summer to Remember		
Soviet movie review by	Maurine Austin	47

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

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

Vol. 29, No. 12 December 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

AN URGENT MESSAGE

to Every Reader

Towards Peace on Earth

We are grateful to all of you who have again contributed so generously to help keep NWR afloat in the rough seas of these times.

Now there is one more thing we urge you to do—

EVERY READER GET A READER!

We must reach more people if we are to do our part in combating the hysteria of hate and fear that drives us ever nearer to the brink of war.

Promotion by mail on a large enough scale to be effective is a costly business. *The answer is for every single reader to get one more reader.* Surely you can manage to help spread the word of peace on earth and friendship among the nations in this coming Christmas and New Year season.

Will each of you, please get at least one person to send one dollar for a 5-month trial sub or \$2.50 for a year. Or give a subscription for a Christmas or New Year gift to a friend. The coming year may be a decisive one in human history. This is one small deed you can do to help turn the tide in the affairs of men towards peace.

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.....

FOCUS ON REALITY

The Real Meaning of the 22nd Congress

by JESSICA SMITH

IT IS ESSENTIAL to clear away the clouds of propaganda that obscured the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union that took place October 17-27, to get its proceedings into proper focus, to get a sober understanding of their real meaning for the Soviet people and for the rest of the world.

The Congress recorded remarkable changes in the life of the Soviet people and improvements in their well-being in the past five years. They showed the tremendous economic advances that are taking place under the seven-year plan. On the realistic basis of what has already been achieved, they charted what can be said without exaggeration to be the most stupendous program in the history of mankind for advances in every phase of life in the next twenty years, in material goods, in education, science and culture, in an expanding democracy in which the people increasingly take over the functions of government.

At every point the absolute necessity of peaceful conditions to carry out this program was stressed.

In this society of ours where we are given no goals but only the negative motivation of anti-communism to guide our lives, only a conditioning to the idea of the inevitability of war, we'd better find out just what this communism we are summoned to fight against really is. No one is trying to impose commu-

nism on us. The question is simply whether it is worth a nuclear war to try to keep others from having it, and whether there isn't some other way of life for us than the sterile way of anti-communism, which is the main characteristic of the American way of life today, some other future prospect than the underground suffocation our shelter-mongers are preparing for us.

The proceedings of the 22nd Congress are the best guide for us on what communism really means. Not what you read in the press—but what really happened there.

Unfortunately, the essence of these proceedings has been almost completely obscured by certain accompanying events.

First of all, the attention of the world was centered largely on the Soviet resumption of nuclear tests and the 50-megaton bomb exploded during the Congress.

We are dealing with this question more fully elsewhere. Here I wish only to urge that we should not let the matter of testing obscure the fact that in the proceedings of the 22nd Congress we have the guarantee that the Soviet Union is committed to a policy of peace in its international relations, and to an internal policy of building a communist society which absolutely requires peace for its fulfillment.

The other matters which received publicity of a sensational type that

obscured the real meaning included the dispute with Albania and the defense of Albania by the Chinese People's Republic, the attacks on the anti-Party group, the removal of Stalin's body from the side of Lenin, and so on.

We shall report more fully on these matters later. At this time I want mainly to emphasize their overall significance to the cause of peace, and to the purification of socialist development.

It must be pointed out that a main factor in the differences within the socialist camp is in the appraisal of the possibilities of peaceful coexistence between the capitalist and the socialist states, the possibilities of avoiding war, and the possibilities of peaceful transition to socialism. The significance of what happened at the Congress for the rest of the world is that the present policy of the Soviet Government and the Communist Party under Khrushchev's leadership, is based on a positive appraisal of these possibilities, and was shown by the Congress to have the unanimous support of all the Soviet delegates and the overwhelming support of the representatives of the Communist Parties of other countries.

The common interests of the Soviet Union and the Chinese People's Republic are basic and permanent, and there is no doubt their differences will be worked out in time. China, of course, has joined in supporting a policy of peaceful coexistence. If any reservations it may have on the possibility of achieving peaceful coexistence and avoiding war are to be removed, the best way to accomplish this would be to give People's China its rightful place in

the United Nations, throw out the Taiwan usurpers, and to remove the U.S. forces which are occupying its territory and patrolling its shores.

The further revelations about the abuses of power by Stalin and other leaders, also have a bearing on questions of peace. For one thing, the anti-Party group opposed many of the foreign policies of Khrushchev and the Central Committee.

P. A. Satiukov, editor of *Pravda*, in his speech of October 26, disclosed that just before the opening of the Congress, Molotov had sent a letter to the Central Committee attacking the new Party program as pacifist, and as failing to take into account "perspectives of socialist revolution on an international scale." It followed from Molotov's views, Satiukov declared, that communism could not be achieved "without most serious political conflicts with the imperialist countries, in other words, without war." Reaffirming the Party's stand for the Lenin policy of peaceful coexistence, he continued:

The question is, what is Molotov trying to do in attempting to steer us away from the policy of peaceful coexistence? He is trying to steer us on to a road of adventures, a road to war.

During the Congress, Khrushchev and numerous others frankly revealed that under Stalin's paranoid suspicions and repressions, "thousands of absolutely innocent people perished. . . many Party leaders, statesmen and military leaders lost their lives." New details were added by many speakers of additional shameful facts that had come to light since the 20th Congress. Khrushchev and others said that the mass reprisals had begun after the assassination of Kirov, and that great

effort
out v
It w
and
were
comp
but
fears,
one
tiativ
come
Th
of M
Voro
Sabu
the r
and
abuse
foun
for n
and
They
social
entire
lands
indus
tend
lics, i
the p
In 19
to se
defea
It
Khrush
expos
meth
time
may
Th
tics
strate
discu
Cong
only
nation
a pro
a cor

efforts were still required to find out who was to blame for his death. It was emphasized that the terror and repressions of the Stalin regime were not only evil themselves and a complete negation of socialist ideas, but in spreading suspicions and fears, in fostering the glorification of one leader alone, had stifled the initiative of the people and had become a brake on socialist progress.

The anti-Party group, consisting of Molotov, Kaganovich, Malenkov, Voroshilov, Bulganin, Pervukhin, Saburov and Shepilov, had resisted the revelations at the 20th Congress and later, and the corrections of abuses. They themselves had been found to be personally responsible for many of the repressive measures and the death of innocent people. They opposed all measures to restore socialist legality. They resisted the entire program to open up new lands, reorganize the management of industry, improve agriculture, extend the rights of the Union Republics, improve the living standards of the people and expand democracy. In 1957, they themselves had tried to seize power, but were decisively defeated in the Central Committee.

It had been absolutely necessary, Khrushchev and others declared, to expose the disgraceful events and methods of leadership in Stalin's time "to insure that such practices may never recur."

The determination that such practices should never recur was demonstrated in all the reports, speeches, discussions and resolutions of the Congress. The delegates agreed that only on the basis of complete elimination of all traces of such practices, a process of moral purification, could a communist society be built.

Sober commentators are recognizing that this aspect of the Congress, the complete victory of the present policy of Khrushchev and the Central Committee following the 20th Congress, are a victory for peace. Drew Middleton writing from London in the *New York Times*, November 9, said that as a result of the complete defeat of the anti-Party group demonstrated at the Congress "qualified sources said that the danger of nuclear war had receded."

I think the point should also be made that the repudiation and correction of former policies is also a contribution to peace in opening the way to greater understanding of and friendship for the Soviet people in our country. It deprives the anti-Communists of much that has been grist to their mill. Of course there would have been an anti-Communist campaign without these past evils. But it could not have made such inroads into the minds of the American people had there not been such distortions of socialism as occurred in the past.

Stripping away the sensationalism with which the new revelations at the Congress were treated in the press, it becomes plain that they were absolutely necessary to clear the road for present achievements and future advances.

Khrushchev's report to the Congress on behalf of the Central Committee of the Party, was an account of the results of carrying out the policies of the 20th Congress in 1956, and the advances so far made in fulfilling the seven-year plan adopted by the 21st Congress in 1959. The first part of his report covered this five-year period. The second part of his report reviewed the 20-Year Plan

for the development of communism. The draft of this program was published in the Soviet Union on July 30. An unprecedented discussion followed in which not only the entire Party membership, but most of the population of the country took part. Some 500,000 meetings were held to discuss it; 300,000 letters were received about it. While its general lines were approved by the people, many suggestions were made which were incorporated in the final program and adopted at the Congress.

As the fullest and best source of information on the great country which our government considers an "enemy" but which for our own sake and in the name of humanity we must make instead our friend, we feel that the entire proceedings of the Congress, the reports of Khrushchev and others, the discussion by delegates, the new Party program, are required reading. No summary can replace them. In our September issue we published a resume

of the program to which we refer you pending the publication of the full program as adopted. In our last issue, we published excerpts from the first section of Khrushchev's report dealing with Soviet international relations since 1956, in which the necessity for avoiding war and establishing peaceful coexistence among the nations is the recurring theme.

The final resolution of the Congress, adopting the reports and the 20-year program for building communism, stressed general and complete disarmament under the strictest international control as the foremost international issue to be settled, and declared that the question of peace "remains the most burning issue of our time."

In the following pages, we have culled the high spots from Khrushchev's report on the advances in the internal life of the country.

This is the reality on which attention should be focused.

Facts from Khrushchev Report

Industrial Growth

IN THE past six years, Khrushchev reported, Soviet industrial output has grown almost 80 per cent, with food and consumers' goods production increasing at a higher rate than ever before. (See table on next page for the figures he presented.)

In the period between 1956 and 1961, state investments in the national economy amounted to 156 billion rubles—more than the total investments in the entire Soviet period up to the 20th Congress—and more than 6,000 large scale enterprises have gone into construction.

This year the 1955 level of labor productivity has been exceeded by 43 per cent in industry, by 60 per cent in construction.

The seven-year plan (1959-65), called for an annual 8.3 per cent growth in industrial output for the first three years. The actual growth in this period has been about 10 per cent annually. Targets have been raised in iron, steel, electric power, machine building, metal working and especially consumers' goods.

The USSR now accounts for almost a fifth of the world's industrial output. Some ten years ago

Pig
Steel
Rolled
Coal
Oil
Gas
Electr
Chem
Output
d
Cemen

Meat,
Butter
Whole
Veget
Granu
Fish
Cloth
Leath
Texti
W
Radio
Dome
Furni

Sovie
30 p
amou
Amer
now
tion
ducti
ment
com
tiles,
ber o
tured
KH
ing s
ment
new

LEADING ITEMS IN INDUSTRIAL OUTPUT

	Produced in 1955	Expected '61 Output	1961 Output as % of '55
Pig iron (000,000 tons)	33.3	51.1	153
Steel (000,000 tons)	45.3	71.0	157
Rolled goods (000,000 tons)	35.3	55.0	156
Coal (000,000 tons)	391	513	131
Oil (000,000 tons)	70.8	166	234
Gas (000,000,000 cu.m.)	10.4	59.5	575
Electricity (000,000,000 kwh)	170	327	192
Chemical industry output (000,000,000 rubles)	3.7	7.5	205
Output of machine-building and metal-working industries (000,000,000 rubles)	17	38	224
Cement (000,000 tons)	22.5	51	226

OUTPUT OF CONSUMERS' GOODS

	Produced in 1955	Expected '61 Output	1961 Output as % of '55
Meat, industrially processed (000,000 tons)	2.5	4.5	178
Butter, factory-made (000 tons)	463	794	171
Whole milk products (000,000 tons)	2.6	9.0	345
Vegetable fats (000 tons)	1,168	1,730	148
Granulated beet sugar (000,000 tons)	3.2	6.5	200
Fish (catch—000,000 tons)	2.7	3.7	136
Clothing and underwear (000,000,000 rubles)	6.0	9.2	152
Leather footwear (000,000 pairs)	271	443	163
Textiles (000,000 sq.m.)	5,543	6,661	120
Woolen textiles (000,000 sq.m.)	321	452	141
Radio and TV Receivers (000)	4,044	6,345	157
Domestic refrigerators (000)	151	731	380
Furniture (000,000 rubles)	491	1,280	261

Soviet industrial output was less than 30 per cent of the USA's; it now amounts to over 60 per cent of the American output. The USSR has now outstripped the USA in extraction of iron ore and coal, coke production, prefabricated concrete elements, heavy diesel and electric locomotives, sawn timber, woolen textiles, sugar, butter, fish and a number of other foodstuffs and manufactured items.

Khrushchev was unsparing in listing shortcomings along with achievements. He cited instances where new technology was being intro-

duced too slowly. Some executives permit routine methods, stagnation. Conservatism in technology must not be tolerated—"You can't clear high jumps on an old nag." Everything obsolete in technical equipment must be replaced.

Emphasizing that electrification plays the main role in technical progress, he enumerated the great network of huge hydroelectric stations being built and planned.

The question of questions is capital construction. The seven-year plan envisaged 197 billion rubles in investments. The average

planned annual growth of investments of 8.6 per cent actually reached 11 per cent in the past three years. But while they were building better and more quickly than before, there were still shortcomings, and some enterprises were going into production later than technical possibilities warranted. Therefore, announced the Soviet Premier, no new projects will be started for one year, to permit concentration on completing those already begun. A ruthless war must be waged against waste of raw and other materials and electric power. Financial control must be stricter, a regime of economy must be carried out in all things, planning practice and organization of production must be improved.

Situation in Agriculture

Khrushchev described in detail the big efforts made to overcome past mistakes and shortcomings in agriculture. From 1956 to 1960 investments in agriculture were almost double those of the previous five years, and the collective farms received 747,000 tractors as against 427,000. The reorganization of the MTS (Machine and Tractor Stations), putting the land and the machinery in the same hands, has resulted in a better use of the productive forces. The development of huge tracts of virgin land has both increased grain production and opened the way for increased livestock development. Three thousand new state farms have been set up, bringing their total to 8,000; their cultivated area has grown from 15 to 18 million hectares (1 hectare = 2.47 acres).

The new system of planning, com-

bining state guidance with the creative initiative of the people, and the restoration of material incentives, has resulted in an increase of total agricultural production by 43 per cent over the preceding five years. The living standards of collective farmers have risen.

In this period, 41,800,000 hectares of new land have been cultivated, and now provide over 40 per cent of the grain purchased by the state. The virgin land regions formerly produced an annual average of 22,700,000 tons of grain; between '56 and '60, their output averaged 55,100,000 tons a year.

The livestock sector had been neglected. The fodder problem had to be solved first. In 1953, the area under corn was 3,485,000 hectares; today it is almost 26,000,000 hectares. From 1955 to 1960, the number of cattle increased by 29 per cent, pigs by 73 per cent, sheep by 29 per cent, chiefly on collective and state farms, which have become the decisive factor in supplying the country with livestock products; their share in meat sales last year was 87 per cent, in milk 93 per cent.

Sales of meat and meat products to the population increased from 1,757,000 tons in '55 to 4,158,000 tons in '60; of milk and whole-milk products from 1,980,000 tons to 8,214,000; of butter, from 330,000 tons to 613,000 tons. Meat, however, is still in short supply. The rate of growth in agricultural production is still lower than in industry, and does not meet the growing needs of the population, which has increased by 20 million since 1955 (it is now 220,000,000) and which has a total income of 24 billion rubles more in 1960 than in 1955. We

must make sure that agricultural production is always ahead of the demand, said Khrushchev.

Due to slackening of attention to agricultural problems by some Party and Government organizations during 1959 and 1960, the rate of output of meat and milk fell short of the seven-year plan targets. This made necessary new measures to overcome shortcomings in agricultural management. This year, in spite of unfavorable weather conditions, the total grain harvest is larger than last year's. (Mr. Khrushchev gave a detailed picture of agricultural conditions and needs in various republics and areas.)

Measures to be taken for further improvement of agricultural production include replacing "indiscriminate application" of grass-rotatable rotation in new lands by correct crop rotation; especially, correcting the dominant one-crop system in Kazakhstan by expanding the fallow row-crop area, and providing suitable machinery; adding 8,000,000 hectares to the new lands, bringing the total up to 50,000,000; increasing the output of corn, legumes and sugar beets; replacing farm officials who have grown "dry as dust"; insuring higher labor productivity in all branches of agriculture.

Khrushchev declared that the aim of outstripping the U.S. in per capita output of livestock products will be achieved. Increased grain production would help solve this problem. Stressing the need for more bacon and butter, he said, "A dry spoon will scratch the tongue."

Cotton harvests in the remaining years of the seven-year plan must be increased by nearly half, and cot-

ton-growing areas must also increase livestock farming.

Living and Cultural Standards

The main aim of the Communist Party as set forth by its First Secretary, is to raise the people's living standards and meet ever more fully their material and spiritual requirements. Under socialism, the greater the national income, the higher the standard of living. In the USSR three quarters of the national income goes for the personal needs of the people. In 1960, the national income was 50 per cent above 1955. In that period the real incomes of factory, office and professional workers per person increased by 27 per cent, of collective farmers by 33 per cent—and all incomes will be increased by 40 per cent under the seven-year plan. In the next few years salaries of teachers and doctors and of minimum and average paid workers will be increased. By 1965 the population will be entirely tax free.

In 1960 the volume of retail trade through state and cooperative shops was 50 per cent above 1955. Yet the popular demand for consumer's goods is still not met; along with quantity, quality and attractiveness must also be improved.

In 1960, all factory, office and professional workers went over to a 7 and 6 hour day, with no reduction, but even increases, in wages. In 1962, a 40-hour week will be introduced for all now on a 7-hour day.

State expenditures on pensions increased from 3 billion rubles in 1955 to 7.6 billion rubles in 1961. The average amount of old age pensions has been more than doubled, and other pensions increased. Further

increases are planned before 1965.

More houses have been built in the past five years than in the preceding fifteen. Nearly 50,000,000 people, almost a quarter of the population, have moved into new homes. Housing remains an acute problem. In the remaining four years of the seven-year plan, about 400 million square meters of housing will be built in the cities, over 4,000,000 houses in rural districts, the latter with modern conveniences often lacking in the past. All carelessness and defects in construction must be eliminated, and priority given to those in greatest need.

Proclaiming the Party policy as "everything for the sake of man, for the benefit of man," Khrushchev said the plans called for better communal services, more modern, well-equipped shops, canteens, restaurants, service establishments to aid housekeeping and good food factories.

Gains of Soviet citizens are reckoned not only by higher wages and lower prices, but in receiving an ever bigger share of material and cultural benefits through public funds.

In 1940, payments and benefits to the population through public funds were 4,200,000,000 rubles; in 1960, 24,500,000,000 rubles; by 1965 they will reach 40 billion rubles. These funds cover education, science, culture, free public health service, social insurance and social security. They maintain pensioners, cover scholarships and maintenance of students in higher, secondary, vocational and technical education establishments, and in boarding schools, provide benefits for mothers, contribute towards vacations, sanatoria and rest

homes and summer camps for millions of workers and their children.

The school reorganization introduced in 1959 has resulted in giving pupils more thorough grounding in the fundamentals of science and linking schools more closely with life and production—although there have been cases of a bureaucratic attitude in its application. There are now 1,500,000 children in boarding and extended day care schools. By 1965, there will be 2,500,000 pupils in boarding schools alone.

Universal compulsory eight-year education is now a fact; the next task is universal compulsory secondary education. There must be more trained teachers, more schools, shifts must be done away with. In 1965, almost 43,000,000 children will be in school. [Education of all kinds, at all levels, is completely free.]

Over half of the day-time students enrolled in higher educational establishments this year have practical production experience; about half a million specialists with higher education have been graduated by evening and correspondence institutes in the past five years. The USSR trains three times as many engineers as the U.S.; there are now over 20 million brain workers.

The Soviet Union now has over 350,000 scientific workers and 4,000 research institutions. The latter have grown especially in all Union Republics in the past five to six years. The Siberian branch of the Academy of Sciences plays a major role in development of research in the Eastern part of the country. Soviet scientists have made great achievements in all fields. Their work on peaceful uses of nuclear energy, cooperation with scientists

of c
exp
won
So
cine
won
The
and
ciali
side
O
Khr
s
est
to
tas
ma
a f
of
hor

**Hun
Dem
Indi**

In
20th
repor
paid
ment
those
mun
"the
betwe
oped
relati
ship
Un
"From
to ea
been
intro
"From
to ea
the n
basis
peopl
tree
Cha

of other countries and successes in exploration of outer space have won wide recognition.

Soviet writers, composers, artists, cinema and theater workers have won prestige throughout the world. The thriving of national culture, and the international unity of socialist cultures, are being developed side by side.

On the question of esthetics, Khrushchev said:

Serious attention should be paid to the esthetic education of the Soviet people, to moulding their artistic tastes. Lack of taste should be resolutely combatted, no matter what form it takes, whether it is a fad for formalism or a vulgar concept of "beauty" in art, in life and in the home.

Human Relations, Soviet Democracy, Freedom of the Individual

In carrying out decisions of the 20th Congress, the Soviet Premier reported, great attention has been paid to the question of the development of socialist social relations into those that will prevail under communism, which he described as: "the most perfect type of relations between free, harmoniously developed and socially conscious people, relations that are based on friendship and fellowship."

Under socialism the principle "From each according to his ability, to each according to his work," has been put into effect. In order to introduce the communist principle, "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs," the necessary material and technical basis must be created, and the Soviet people must have reached a high degree of consciousness.

Changes are already taking place

in the attitude toward labor, which is increasingly considered not just a means of earning a livelihood, "but a social calling, a moral duty." Khrushchev gave the example of textile worker Valentina Gaganova, who left an advanced work team for one lagging behind, and whose example was followed by many others. The Party attaches great importance to the Communist Labor Brigades, whose aim is "to work and live in a communist way."

Socialist production relations, he said, are leading to the gradual obliteration of the distinctions between town and country. The working class and the peasantry are drawing closer together, as the peasantry develops in skills and working conditions, in cultural and technical standards. Similarly, the basic distinctions between mental and physical labor are being eradicated on the basis of technical progress and higher cultural and technical standards of the working people. Forty per cent of the country's workers and over 23 per cent of its collective farmers now have a secondary or higher education. "Nowadays it is often difficult to distinguish the front-rank worker from the engineer, the front-rank collective farmer from the agronomist."

Socialist democracy is expanding, drawing near to the goal set by Lenin of enlisting all citizens in the work of government. Tens of millions of people take an active part in administration of the country through the Soviets, trade unions, cooperatives and other mass organizations. More and more government functions are being handed over to people's organizations. Persuasion and education are gradually becoming

ing the principal method of regulating the life of Soviet society, using the power of public influence along with the power of Soviet law.

In everyday life, said Khrushchev, we strive for relations of friendship, fellowship, mutual assistance and collectivism:

Real freedom and the all-round development of the individual, the harmonious combination of personal interests and the interests of the whole of society, are possible only in a socialist society, on the basis of the new relations between people.

The Role of the Party, Collective Leadership

Turning to the question of the role of the Party in the period under review, the First Secretary emphasized measures that had been taken to correct the violations of socialist legality, abuses of power, arbitrary acts and repressive measures "committed at the time of the cult of Stalin's person." This at first had to be done in the face of fierce resistance by the anti-Party group, who had been defeated in 1957, since when the reforms have gone forward.

Khrushchev declared that the Party would adhere to the course of collective leadership, collective discussion on every major issue of domestic and foreign policy, and the taking of all decisions on the basis of collective consideration by the Party. "It has now become the rule for the whole Party membership and the whole people to discuss all questions submitted for consideration to the Central Committee and the Supreme Soviet of the USSR."

[Later, Khrushchev said that while he thanked those who had stressed his own role, nothing took

place on the basis of anyone's personal instructions, and credit for all achievements should go to the Central Committee of the Party and its Presidium and the Soviet people. He made clear that his reports and statements to the Congress were all the result of collective consideration.]

The Central Committee has taken special care, he said, to insure regular convening of all Party elective bodies. During the Stalin era there had been no Party Congresses for almost fourteen years, and few plenary meetings. Now there are regular Congresses every two or three years and regular plenary sessions. Fulllest criticism and self-criticism at all levels are being encouraged, all wrong methods of the past being combatted. The Party has no place for careerists or time servers, for "all the sycophants, hosanna singers, falsifiers of reports, violators of legality." It has been necessary to expel some 200,000 people from the Party in the past six years for various reasons.

At the same time, the growth of inner-Party democracy has strengthened ties with the people, and membership has increased from 7,215,505 at the 20th Congress to 9,716,005 on October 1, 1961. Among the members 40.7 per cent are factory workers; 22.7 per cent collective farmers; 35.6 per cent office and professional workers; 1 per cent students. [Student membership would be for the most part in the Communist Youth organization.]

Party leaders, Khrushchev stressed, should have all-round knowledge in the field entrusted to them. The role of lower organizations must be enhanced. The main thing is live con-

tact
the
bus
ner
exa
form
ern
in t
red
will
ind
leve
ing
is r
sim
of
plan
arro
peo
It is
bin
lead
one
keep
of
man
reau
all
clar
Su
of
veri
dec
be
criti
the
and
acti
stan
ante
be
F
righ
uni
fect
ests
Wit

tacts with the people, concern for their needs, "no matter on what business they come to us." The inner life of the Party must be an example in developing more perfect forms of communist public self-government. The number of workers in the paid Party apparatus is to be reduced, unpaid Party functionaries will increase. More initiative and independence must be shown at all levels, actions taken without waiting for "orders from above." There is no place for Party leaders who simply wish to live at the expense of the state, try to get production plans reduced, get swell-headed and arrogant. The initiative of young people must be further encouraged. It is necessary to find a proper combination of old and experienced leaders and new, energetic young ones. "We must daily and hourly keep a finger on the throbbing pulse of the huge Soviet land, eliminate manifestations of red tape and bureaucracy, note in time and remove all that delays progress," he declared.

Supervision by the general public of Party and Government measures, verification by the people of the way decisions have been carried out, must be stimulated, and the people's criticisms heeded. The activity of the Soviets, with 2,000,000 deputies and over 2,000,000 people working actively as volunteers on their standing committees, is the best guarantee of Soviet democracy, and must be expanded further.

Following the 20th Congress, the rights and functions of the trade unions in handling all problems affecting the working people's interests has been greatly expanded. With a membership of 60,000,000,

they are the working people's school in education and management. The Party must do everything possible to draw the trade union workers more fully into management of production and of all affairs of society. The standing production conferences of enterprises must be converted into ever more effective agencies for participation of workers in economic management.

On Ideological Work

Khrushchev spoke of the influence of the Party in political and cultural life through such media as training, lectures, press, radio, TV, cinema, literature and art. In the past five years the daily circulation of newspapers in the USSR has increased by 20 million copies; more books are published in the Soviet Union than in any other country.

The inculcation of the idea of the nobility of work is a primary task of Communists. The great principle of "he who does not work, neither shall he eat" will continue to operate under communism, he said, when everyone will realize that the well-being of society and the individual depends on man's labor:

Man's beauty and his fame stem from his work, from what he does, from that which he has created and that which he has performed. The abilities and talents of people, the genius of man, are revealed in labor, the immortality of man is in his labor.

The training of man for his life's work, the steeling of people through labor, the inculcation of love and respect for labor as a vital necessity, is the backbone, the central feature, of all work in the field of communist education,

The moulding of the new man, declared Khrushchev, is a long and complicated process. The building

of a communist society requires a still more vigorous struggle against such survivals of the past as indolence, parasitism, drunkenness and rowdiness, swindling and money-grubbing, against the resurgence of dominant nation chauvinism and local nationalism, against bureaucratic methods, against a wrong attitude toward women—"These are weeds that should have no place in our field." He illustrated the complexity of the process with the following story:

One day, when the Dnieper Power Station was being built, Maxim Gorky saw how the rapids were being cleared. Workers placed explosives under the rocks, there was a dull explosion, the water raged for a time, the rocks subsided and the broad Dnieper flowed smoothly on its way. And Gorky said: "If one such explosion could remove from society all the rocks, all that belongs to the past, all that is ignorant and barbaric, how wonderful that would be!" In the reconstruction of society, however, everything is more intricate and difficult. Human society cannot be cleansed of that which prevents a happy and joyous life without a great deal of sweat and much vexation of spirit.

The shaping of a new type of citizen, a man of great ideals and high moral principles, is one of the greatest achievements of our Party.

In closing his report, the First Secretary spoke of the importance of mastering the theory of Marxism-Leninism, and of preserving its purity against the efforts of all those who try to distort it. Inveighing against its dogmatic application, he stressed the necessity of bringing up to date those formulas and propositions which have ceased to conform to new historical experience—"reality is much richer than any formulas." As examples of changes he gave the ending of the dictatorship of the proletariat, as having fulfilled its purpose, and its transformation into a state of the whole people; the recognition of a variety of forms for the transition from capitalism to socialism, including peaceful transition; the acceptance of the idea that war is not inevitable, and that there is a real possibility of preventing it in our times.

In our next issue we shall summarize the report of the Central Committee on the Twenty-Year Program of Communist Construction, delivered by Khrushchev. Meantime, we are publishing on the next page the table of growth projected for the next 20 years to provide the material base for a communist society, on the basis of present economic achievements.

A PROGRAM OF HUMANISM AND PEACE

IN INTRODUCING the new draft program of the Communist Party to the Congress, Nikita Khrushchev declared:

"The draft program is a document of true communist humanism; it is imbued with the ideas of peace and fraternity among nations. We place the continuously expanding might of our country at the service of peace and mankind's progress. Once the Soviet Union will have become the first industrial power, once the socialist system will have become fully the decisive factor in world development, and once the peace forces of the world have grown still greater, the scales will tilt once and for all in favor of the forces of peace and the barometer of international weather will show: 'Clear. The menace of world war is gone never to return.'

DEVELOPMENT OF SOVIET INDUSTRY IN 1960-1980

(in prices of July 1, 1955)

	1960	1970	1980	No. of times greater
Aggregate industrial output in wholesale factory prices (000 million rubles)	155	408	970-1,000	6.2- 6.4
<i>including:</i>				
Means of production— group "A" (000 million rubles)	105	287	720-740	6.8- 7.0
Consumer goods— group "B" (000 million rubles)	50	121	250-260	5 - 5.2
Electric power (000 million kwh)	292.3	900-1,000	2,700-3,000	9.2-10.3
Steel (000,000 tons)	65	145	250	3.8
Oil (000,000 tons)	148	390	690-710	4.7- 4.8
Gas (000 million cu. m.)	47	310-325	680-720	14.4-15.2
Coal (000,000 tons)	513	686-700	1,180-1,200	2.3- 2.34
Output of engineering and metal-working industries (000 million rubles)	34	115	334-375	9.8-11
Mineral fertilizers, in conventional units (000,000 tons)	13.9	77	125-135	9 - 9.7
Synthetic tars and plastics (000 tons)	332	5,300	19,000-21,000	57 -63
Artificial and synthetic fibre (000 tons)	211	1,350	3,100-3,300	14.7-15.6
Cement (000,000 tons)	45.5	122	233-235	5.1- 5.2
Textiles (000 million sq.m.)	6.6	13.6	20-22	3 - 3.3
Leather footwear (000,000 pairs)	419	825	900-1,000	2.1- 2.4
Domestic, household and other manufactured goods (000 million rubles)	5.9	18	58-60	9.8-10.1

PICASSO

by ILYA EHRENBURG

Picasso was 80 in October



IT SEEMS to me that history has not known any painter whose work has aroused so much controversy. Nobody speaks about Picasso with detachment. Some curse him. Others rave about him.

Hundreds of books in nearly all languages have been devoted to him. Apollinaire and Eluard have written about him; so have Mayakovsky and Aragon, Pablo Neruda and Cocteau; Raphael Alberti, Vercors and many others.

Long treatises and glowing verses have been devoted to him. Many painters, critics, journalists, have now been scoffing at him for over half a century.

In the most advanced cities of the world, in Paris and Prague, in Tokyo and Rome, in New York and Stockholm, in Mexico and Zurich, in Sao Paulo and Amsterdam, in Moscow and Berlin—exhibitions of his work became events about which there was talk not only in artistic circles but also in the streets, in the clubs, the cafés and on the subways.

Over forty years ago I was present at the première of the ballet "Parade." Picasso had done the décor and when the curtain fell a free fight began between Picasso's supporters and opponents.

In 1956 I went to Picasso's Retrospective Exhibition in Paris. On the streets adjoining the museum where the exhibition was held, people were disputing so violently about it that the police had to be called.

Republican Spain, seeking to express the Spanish people's love for Picasso, appointed him Honorary Director of the world-famous Prado Museum. People's Poland awarded him a high decoration. Hitler ordered Picasso's pictures to be removed from all art galleries.

Truman called his art "demoralizing" and Churchill—who in dilettante fashion whiles away his moments of boredom with painting—has expressed himself disparagingly about the quality of Picasso's work.

The Pallazo Grimaldi in the Antibes has been transformed into a Picasso museum. In the museums of nearly all countries there are special rooms devoted to collections of Picasso's paintings.

It is said that his work is only understood by a few. But his name is known to millions. He has many friends. He has also many enemies. Some call him a "seducer of the bourgeoisie"—others "a formalist" and still others "an artistic Bolshevik."

Some of Picasso's paintings appear incomprehensible to me. On the other hand many of the pictures which I love and understand are incomprehensible to many other people.

Here the question of comprehensibility in art arises or—if one wishes to use contemporary jargon — of "communication."

Of course, no artist deliberately aims to be obscure. After all poetry is not a crossword puzzle nor is a painting a theorem in geometry. Nevertheless, it is far from being the case that the essence of a work of art penetrates easily into the consciousness of the reader, the listener, or those who look at paintings.

Very often this is to be explained by the fact that the artist has not yet found the finished form for expressing his thoughts and feelings. Frequently it is due also to inadequate artistic appreciation in the reader or listener.

To Mayakovsky Picasso's paintings appeared to be quite comprehensible. This was at the time when Mayakovsky wrote the poem "I Love." Today this poem appears to be understood by everybody, but I remember a time when many people were worked up about it, declared it to be a mere "jumble of words." Yes, and even today not all those who are so enthusiastic about Mayakovsky can understand his early poems.

"GUERNICA" is frequently described as Picasso's masterpiece. I remember how this work of art arose. In 1937, Hitler's bombs destroyed the little town of Guernica in Northern Spain. The picture was painted immediately after and

was exhibited in the Spanish Republic Pavilion at the Paris Exhibition in the summer of 1937.

After Hiroshima and Nagasaki we realized how puny was the scale of attack on Guernica. Picasso nevertheless saw it in the beginning of the gruesome era of mass destruction of human beings. For him 1937 was what 1808 (when the French smashed the Spanish revolution) was for Goya. During his lifetime Goya frequently reproduced the horrors of war. He painted a number of scenes in which he supplemented reality with the fruits of his fantasy.

Picasso lived in new times; he saw mass slaughter, invisible and terrible.

Picasso avoids depicting this or that scene. He shows war as he thinks it is. What are the visible elements of the tragedy? No planes, no bombs, a soldier's sword, a woman in flames, leaping from a window, a calm, self-confident bull, a flaring lamp, a weeping mother pressing the corpse of her child to her bosom.

Hardly any color is used. Great geometrical planes reproduce the mechanical character of present-day massacre.

I was in Spain. I saw the burning city.

After the Second World War, in 1946, I saw "Guernica" again and I say frankly, for me "Guernica" is the most honest, realistic description of the horrors and tragedy of modern war that I have ever seen. I cannot look at this painting without excitement.

I think when I see it, of the words of Matisse about Picasso: ". . . he paints with his blood."

HIS doves fly throughout the world. I saw them in Chinese villages, in the Argentine, in India. Doves have been the symbol of peace since olden times and it is not easy to give new force to an old symbol. Picasso's doves are particularly faultless and moving; they are likewise as defenseless as children and as unconquerable as the conscience of the peoples.

In order to create them more was necessary than mere knowledge of doves. Picasso incorporated his attitude to the great problems of our time in his doves. It was not accidental that he was on the side of the Spanish Republicans. Nor was it accidental that he joined the French Communist Party in 1944.

He knew that in doing these things he was throwing down the challenger's glove to the society in which he lived. The political position he assumed was dictated by no mere passing enthusiasm but by years of experience and of deep thought.

The recent years have not been easy ones for the French Communists. Picasso placed his great virtues to the test — the test of loyalty, loyalty to himself, to mankind, to his century.

I met him at different Peace Congresses. He sat with his headphones on and listened attentively; his eyes bespoke deep satisfaction. He saw that friends, comrades, were about him. In Rome I went with him through the streets to a crowded meeting of fighters for peace.

It was held in a working class suburb. Somebody recognized the famous painter. People began to embrace him, to ask him to hold their children for a moment, to press his

hands. Of all the things Picasso had created, these people knew perhaps only of the doves which flew in their own homes.

But they understood that here amongst them, shoulder to shoulder, stood a great man and they strove to express their love as much as they could. Aragon has written:

Millions of people only knew about Picasso from slander in the yellow press, and suddenly the conventional laugh was broken off and replaced by deep, heartfelt trust.

It is said that Picasso is responsible for the success of abstract (or of "objectless," as it used to be called) art in the West. Picasso, however, always proceeded from the reality of the object, of nature and of man.

Those painters who have aped his style have confused things a very great deal. What is special about Picasso is that he is a unique and non-recurrent phenomena. He himself rejects all that is ascribed to his pupils and his followers.

BETWEEN Picasso and the contemporary exponents of abstract art there exists not only a formal difference (Picasso proceeds from the object; adherents of abstract art, however, proceed from geometrical and decorative spots).

Between them there exists an abyss of deep inner feeling. Picasso was, is and remains a humanist and what interests him most of all is Man, the history and the tragedy of men.

His creations constitute a unity—they are simultaneously not only many-sided but contradictory. Despite the inner unity of his work he

nevertheless brings to mind a museum containing the work of different masters. Certainly these contradictions arise from the painter's manner and not from his mentality.

But it seems to me that if the effort is made to assess the first half of the twentieth century by a thorough study of his work, the superficial observer would regard the paintings assembled in any room as the works of different epochs.

It is hard to say what it is in Picasso's work that so attracts the

modern generation above all. But of this I am certain: Picasso has placed his stamp on the further development of art. For me he is the living guarantee that art is living, irresistible and is not to be destroyed by bombs, by robots or by ersatz human feelings.

(The head of Yuri Gagarin at the beginning of this article was one of a series of sketches drawn by Picasso last April—in honor of the first man to fly into outer space.)

POLISH DANCE GROUP WELCOMED IN NEW YORK

NEW YORK REVIEWERS and audiences greeted enthusiastically the "MAZOWSZE" song and dance company from the Polish People's Republic, currently performing in a three-week engagement at the City Center.

John Martin, *New York Times* dance critic, wrote November 15: "A thoroughly ingratiating company it is, and when the final curtain falls you may suddenly realize that you have been sitting with a broad grin on your face all evening. . . The dancers are young and handsome, high-spirited and communicative, and the program itself is as vivacious as it is varied. . . Under the surface of the wide range of folk movements is apparent a sound technical ballet training, and an equally professional sense of performing. . . The girls are charming children and the men are wonderfully vital and engaging youngsters. . . They can be exuberant or sentimental, flirtatious or funny, but the only thing they seem unable to be is dull. . . Everywhere there are little touches of humor. . . The costumes are fabulous. . . It is in short, a lovely and an unusual evening, and if you think all folk dances are alike, it will change your mind for you."

Louis Biancolli, *New York World Telegram and Sun*: "Folk song and dance of a thoroughly charming and authentic quality were the twin keynotes of the visiting Polish company. . . Five thousand young boys and girls were auditioned by scouts touring villages. Of those, 100 were trained into the colorful and endearing ensemble."

Frances Herridge, *New York Post*: "The men. . . do unbelievable jumps or cartwheels in air. . . The girls spin gracefully and cleanly. . . The "Mazowsze" . . . have a festive way of starting each number with a song, then breaking into joyous movement. And the songs — melodious and enchanting — are at least half the show."

A CORRECTION

Our apologies to Rockwell Kent! The gremlins got into our November issue and scrambled some letters around so that the word *mentos*, properly spelled in the manuscript of Mr. Kent's article "Pledge of Friendship," unfortunately turned into *momentoes*.

Aspects of Soviet Art and Music

by BERNARD KOTEN

THIS WAS my annual pilgrimage to the Hermitage in Leningrad and we had spent hours and hours wandering through the halls, rich with Rembrandts, Raphaels, Titians and other Renaissance masters, and the fine collection of impressionists and post-impressionists — Picasso, Matisse, and others. In our wandering through the museum we kept noticing little arrows leading to a Guttuso exhibition. I was tantalized by the arrows not so much for the sake of Guttuso, an Italian modern whom I admire, but because I was interested in what the Soviet reaction might be to some of Guttuso's experimentation with abstract forms — with line, with color — all quite different from the traditional academic style of most contemporary Soviet painters. And so one afternoon when all my charges were out shopping I came by for another visit with two young Soviet friends, a poet and a musician, who are concerned with the modern in the arts.

First we spent a little time with the paintings and drawings that attracted us the most, then we wandered around to listen in. Here and there we had noticed knots of people, young and old, men and women, carrying on discussions which looked quite lively to the eye. My ears were itching—perhaps because the knots were around what must have been very controversial paintings for the Soviet viewers—controversial in that

they were not purely representation but experiments with form and color. As we stopped and listened, we found the discussions were indeed heated.

There were those who animatedly defended the artist's right to experiment and to experiment in every possible direction. Among these defenders many pointed to the transfer of mood from canvas to viewer. There were others who held that the artist must communicate through his canvas in a precise and unmistakable idiom. One group seemed to be listening with great respect to a young woman (who it turned out was an art history major) giving an impromptu lecture on the history of modern art and what contemporary artists in France and Italy are trying to accomplish through experimentation. They were freeing themselves, she said, from the bonds of the past, and looking for new ways of expression. All of this experimentation had helped to free them and she expressed the hope it would lead away from an art that might deteriorate into a futile competition with photography.

Every time our young lecturer paused, I noticed that a young man in the group would attack her with skeptical questions. (When the group broke up however, these two went off to one side and had a long discussion punctuated with much laughter.) Other groups were busily

engaged in arguments over interpretations of canvases, helped in these instances by attached captions.

The nudes on exhibition did not seem to be attracting any large number of viewers.

What interested me in all of the discussions was the almost universal insistence that there should be an opportunity for Soviet art lovers to become acquainted with everything that was being done in the art world abroad as well as at home. The consensus was that they didn't have to like it or approve of it, but they should be able to see it. The thick guest books echoed the same sentiments.

WHEN I got back to Moscow, I was anxious to discuss the value of these reactions with a good friend of mine, Yuri Vassiliev, the fine young Soviet artist who has been experimenting with many new forms himself. Yuri is a member of the Union of Soviet Artists and has an excellent art background and training. He has received many prizes at home and abroad. He was a great hero in the war. He is a Communist. In art, he has long felt that the artist must not be bound only by representational concepts, but must be able as well to communicate ideas and moods through color and form. He has a tremendous studio in his apartment full of all kinds of mechanical and art equipment. He uses many genres. The studio is filled with his sculpture, plaques, water colors, oils and woodcuts. He permits himself the luxury of accepting only those commissions which will allow for further experimentation.

As we looked at his new work and

talked, Yuri made the point to me that he too felt it was most important that Soviet people be acquainted with the contemporary art of the world. But he also felt that the world should take the opportunity to become acquainted with Soviet art. Just last year, photographer-correspondent Marshack had presented to the American public through *Life* magazine what Yuri and other Soviet artists felt was a very distorted image of contemporary Soviet art.

Marshack had been brought to Vassiliev's studio by official representatives of Soviet art and cultural organizations, had had a long interview with him, and had taken endless shots of his work — all very pleasant and warm. Then Marshack had gone home and presented Vassiliev's paintings to the American public as representative of an "underground" Soviet art movement.

What is true is that Soviet artists concerned with modern experimentation do not always get all their work shown. (In this connection, however, it is interesting to note that many paintings of contemporary Soviet artists like Saryan are part of the permanent collection of the Tretyakov Art Gallery in Moscow.) Still they go on painting and experimenting and much of their work reaches a high point of popularity. Vassiliev's woodcut on the theme of the Virgin Lands was featured in the Soviet press. Another of his woodcuts got a first prize a couple of years ago at the International Graphic Exposition featuring the theme of peace and brotherhood.

At a literary evening I attended at the Polytechnical Museum in September, a speaker who inveighed against conformism in the arts was

greeted with loud and prolonged applause.

My own experiences and observations leave me with the strong impression that there is nothing static in the thinking of Soviet artists, or their audiences. I found general agreement on the question of rapport and communication between artist and viewer, but ferment in the search for new forms through which the artists may communicate, and these new forms are finding expression in Soviet journals. One that never fails to excite me is *Yunost* (Youth), edited by Valentin Kayev. *Yunost* illustrations and art reproductions are fully representational in form and content, but nevertheless veer sharply away from the photographic representation we have seen so often in Soviet art.

IT IS interesting that at the time when, according to so many of our jazz enthusiasts, commercialism is killing jazz in the country of its birth, it should be becoming so popular abroad.

In the Soviet Union, too, its adherents support jazz with enthusiasm and call for a serious approach to it. In Leningrad, the first serious book on jazz has just come out.

There are attempts to create national jazz forms in the Soviet Republics. There is a Georgian jazz, an Armenian jazz, a Latvian and an Estonian jazz.

There are jazz clubs in many cities. Young people have their own little jazz combos, made up not only of young professionally trained musicians, but of amateurs who may be physicists, or factory workers, or clerks during the day. And for some little time now, once or twice a year,

jazz musicians from the whole country have been gathering in Estonia to display their skills — quartets, quintets, sextets. No prizes are given out, but the newspapers, especially the university press, carry evaluation articles, much prized by the participants, especially those praised.

This year some of my young Leningrad friends came off with highest mention and while I was there, they insisted with great enthusiasm that they put on a jam session for me after regular working hours. So one evening we sat up quite late, listening to original renditions and compositions and talking.

The music was pleasant, but to my ears somewhat naive and I was more interested in the talk. The talk was very interesting because to those young enthusiasts jazz is a serious matter—a cause they have had to defend for a long time. Jazz to them is the music of today, best expressing the rhythm of contemporary living, not supplanting any other music form, but adding to the general treasury of music. Jazz may have come from America and be best written and best performed by Americans, but it belongs to everybody, just as a Beethoven symphony or a Bach fugue or a Tchaikovsky concerto becomes the cherished possession of people in every country of the world.

They feel strongly the need for the right of the expression of the jazz idiom in music experimentation and feel further that it has an important place in the role of a cultural bridge between the United States and all peoples, particularly the youth of the world, not in its commercial form, but in its pure interpretation.

I HA
ha
made
my fir
the fir
Bokha
they v
But
were
had b
and i
rugs
had c
rugs.
and c
menia
khaba
the fir
weav
Eve
to ver
lit, sp
we v
undis
Sea
men
youn
tive

I HAD always assumed that Bokhara rugs came from and were made in Bokhara. This year I made my first trip to Bokhara and one of the first things I asked about were Bokhara rugs and could we see how they were made.

But those Bokhara rugs never were made in Bokhara! Bokhara had been an important trade center and it was thus that the beautiful rugs that were sold in its markets had come to be known as Bokhara rugs. The best of these rugs were, and continue to be, woven in Turkmenia. So when we went to Ashkhabad, the capital of Turkmenia, the first place we visited was a rug weaving factory.

Even though we were ushered into very modern, well-ventilated, well-lit, spacious workshops, we felt as if we were walking into the almost undisturbed past.

Seated on low stools before tremendous handlooms were beautiful young Turkmenian women in native dress even to the picturesque

old metal headdresses worn by the unmarried Turkmenian women.

The rug makers asked us to sit on stools next to them while they explained their art and displayed their skills in creating their beautiful designs. Very friendly young women, these, without veils, making rugs not in the confines of their homes, but in workshops as part of collective teams.

But the big surprise was their showing off their English to us unhesitatingly, though with blushing faces. They had all had ten years of schooling and further training in the workshops; many of them were going to night school, taking courses in English and other subjects, some even working for higher degrees, as was the young weaver studying textile engineering by correspondence.

Before we left, a number of the young workers took us into their exhibition room to show us some of the beautiful rugs which had won national and international prizes, and then they sent us off with a *salaam*.

QUESTION BOX ON THE USSR

Conducted by BERNARD KOTEN

We are happy to announce that this important new feature of New World Review will begin January, 1962. Send in your questions now!

Mr. Koten has agreed to take on this assignment in addition to full-time work as curator of the Library for Intercultural Studies and teaching courses in the Russian language. In view of his time and our space limitations, we ask you to adhere to the following rules, so that answers may be brief, factual and to the point.

1. Questions must deal only with the Soviet Union.
2. They must be concerned only with *internal* Soviet affairs.
3. They must lend themselves to direct, factual answers.
4. Only one question per reader at a time please!

The Real Struggle in South Viet Nam

by ANNA LOUISE STRONG

THE conflict in South Viet Nam has been described by an American correspondent as "the longest lasting war now going on in the world and perhaps the bloodiest." It is said to have cost more than ten thousand killed per year for the past ten years, and over 40,000 a year jailed or crippled by torture. It is a conflict misrepresented by the American press. It is usually painted as a "communist conspiracy" directed from Hanoi in North Viet Nam and even supplied by Hanoi with arms and personnel.

Actually it is a seven-year-old attempt by Ngo Dinh Diem, one of the world's most unpopular dictators, to subdue the people of South Viet Nam to Washington's interests, and the interests of Diem's own power and profits. The people resist Diem and the conflict grows bloodier because Washington supplies Diem with ever more arms and cash. Hanoi denies any armed participation and no such participation has yet been proved.

When I myself went south to Hanoi last April, I was still under the influence of American propaganda and assumed that Hanoi

probably intervened in the South, or, at least, that raids took place across the 17th Parallel, that temporary dividing line set up in 1954, raids possibly from both sides. I learned on the contrary, that the Parallel is about the only spot where conflicts in South Viet Nam do not occur. The Parallel is a double line with a demilitarized zone between and with each side's guards patrolling the opposite side. Hardly a cat could get through. Conflicts in South Viet Nam take place all over the countryside, and especially near Saigon, Diem's capital, which is about as far from the Parallel and from North Viet Nam as you can get.

NORTH Vietnamese are indeed deeply involved emotionally in their compatriots' struggle in the South. Strong men turned away to hide their tears when they told of the numbers killed and tortured in these past seven years. "Every day they cut off somebody's head with an axe. Every day they tear out a peasant's bowels to terrorize his neighbors," one man exclaimed with emotion. His own wife and children were in the South and he had not heard from them for six years.

There are thousands of such men in the North who came in 1954 for the "regrouping" ordered by the Geneva Agreements. They expected to join their families within a few

ANNA LOUISE STRONG, world famous correspondent and author of many books on the USSR, China and our own country, has been visiting in China for over a year. Miss Strong flew to Laos and North Viet Nam for a visit last spring.

months and certainly not later than July 1956, the date set for the "nationwide elections" to unify the country. At first they exchanged postcards with their families through the International Control Commission, also set up by the Geneva Conference, under India, Canada and Poland. But Diem's persecutions of all persons who had ever fought for Vietnamese independence against France, began with the first hour. Soon it became unsafe for anyone to get a postcard from a Northern relative. All contact stopped and now these men do not know if their families are alive or dead.

There are also thousands of children in the North whose parents sent them there for safety in the first year of Diem's persecutions, when the ICC still offered help to cross the Parallel. Most of them came on Polish ships arranged by the Polish delegate of the ICC. They are cared for in special schools. I saw hundreds of fine-looking girls between eight and fourteen years in such a school in Haiphong. I could not ask much about their families for those who were old enough to remember them, at once began to cry.

One girl of fourteen tried to tell me and when she broke down, her teacher continued her tale. She had been eight years old in a southern village when a neighbor woman ran to say: "Your mother sends word to get on that Polish ship. Diem's police have come and she is joining your father in the brush." The neighbors helped the girl to the Polish ship and she has never heard of mother, father or village again. She only knows that her parents are both "Resistance Fighters"

against Diem if they still live. She only knows of her village if it happens to be in the news as a place that Diem has bombed!

One would not be surprised if people, thus suffering, should demand that an expedition go South to "liberate it" from Diem and unite the families again. What is really surprising is that the Lao Dong Party (Workers' Party) of Viet Nam, including both Northern and Southern delegates, passed a resolution that no armed help should be sent from the North. The Party is composed of delegates from both North and South, but the Southerners are men who came North in 1954 and have not been able to get back. All these delegates, voting unanimously, decided in late 1960 that the "liberation of the South" must be done by the people living there, and the task of the North is to build a strong economic base for a united Viet Nam to share with the South when the South fights free.

All those Southerners whom I met in the North were working hard on economic tasks planned for the future of a united nation. And all explained to me in much the same words: "The North must not send armed aid to the South for this would break the Geneva Agreements by which we hold international recognition of Viet Nam as a united nation. Besides, it would spread the war in Southeast Asia, which we must never do." They added, with a bit of pride: "The people in the South are as good fighters as any in the North. They will be able to win free." They convinced me that the North does not need to intervene.

WHAT is the fighting about then? It was a man from the South, whose name must not be given lest it endanger his family and friends, who summed up the struggle best for me.

"Viet Nam," he said, "is one nation. So have we been for more than a thousand years. In 1945 we made one united revolution; in 1946 we held one united nationwide election for a parliament that chose our President, Ho Chi Minh. Under him we made a united resistance to the French attempt to enslave Viet Nam again. We fought the French nine years until we won. In 1954 our independence and territorial integrity was recognized in the Geneva Agreements. The 17th Parallel was a temporary line for demobilizing forces and sending the French troops home. The date for a general election for a united government was set for July 1956 by treaty with France.

"Then America stepped in with Ngo Dinh Diem and took the southern half of our country for a colony and military base. And now the same people who resisted France are resisting America.

"In resisting France we people of the South did not differ from the Northerners. We created many 'liberated areas' into which the French troops were never able to penetrate. We held four whole provinces along the coast, connected by 150 miles of railway, which in nine years the French could never take. We had strong liberated areas in the Delta around Saigon, and in many other places. In all these liberated areas our People's Power was supreme. Between these and the French-held areas were the 'guerrilla areas' which

the French used by day and we took again by night.

"The peasants in these liberated areas were happier, despite the warfare, than ever in their lives before. For though the French planes bombed them, yet they elected their own village and county governments, and made women equal with men, and opened schools in our own language. They took a million acres of land from the French and their collaborators and gave these to the poorer peasants. For the first time in their lives these people owned their own land, ate their own rice, chose their own governments — defended their homes.

"There were perhaps two million people who enjoyed such freedom for five or more years. There were another five million in the guerrilla areas, who enjoyed freedom for shorter times and had to fight for it more. Now Diem comes to subdue such people, to appoint their governors and county chiefs, to take away the lands they were given. Of course they resist!"

WASHINGTON began this trouble by installing Ngo Dinh Diem in 1954 in the dying French puppet government of Bao Dai, and financing his rise to power. Diem's persecution of all who had fought in the anti-French resistance began at once. The struggle, however, developed slowly because everyone expected to get rid of Diem by the "nationwide elections" the Geneva Agreements decreed. Washington circumvented these elections easily. Diem just didn't hold them. Neither Diem nor Washington had signed the Geneva Agreements. But the U.S. said it would respect them.

When Diem succeeded in preventing those elections, his repressions against the people grew. Washington financed him in declaring South Viet Nam a separate state. Washington paid for his army. Then Diem began to confiscate the lands that the peasants had received during their Resistance Governments. The peasants resisted this.

By 1959 Diem's plan, made with his U.S. advisers, was to break up the villages of the "liberated areas" and resettle the people in special camps under military control. This was the technique the Japanese used against peasants in Manchuria and the British used against Malayan revolutionary peasants. Diem called these places "prosperity zones" but the peasants called them "concentration camps" for they were surrounded by barbed wire and guards.

By 1960 the peasants were resisting these deportations and Diem was launching "combined operations" against them, with troops, commandos, artillery and airplanes. Two thousand such operations, it was charged, were launched by Diem in 1960 against rural areas which resisted Diem. Washington supplied the planes, the bombs, the napalm and the money to pay for it all.

These actions aroused resistance not only from peasants. City workers and intellectuals and even capitalists combined against Diem. In late 1960 these forces all formed the "South Viet Nam National Liberation Front" which is now the recognized head of the entire Resistance. It has a flag, a publishing house and many periodicals and pamphlets. The flag resembles that of North Viet Nam but with a dif-

ference. The Northern flag shows a gold star on a red field; the South has the gold star but the field is horizontally divided, the upper half red, the lower half blue. The enthusiasm it arouses is said to be wide.

This flag flies over most of the countryside in South Viet Nam. It floats over meetings of 20,000 people who organize new local branches. It is carried in demonstrations in which entire counties take part. The Liberation Press claims that 96 per cent of the villages in the southern delta and 90 per cent of the hamlets in the mountains of Central Viet Nam are already electing their own governments and refusing the officials sent by Diem. Over large areas Diem has been unable to collect more than one-third of the taxes, even by sending troops.

Diem appoints provincial governors and county chiefs. These hold office as long as they have enough troops. Their power does not reach very far into the country and is even attacked at times in their own provincial capital. The Liberation Press claims that 11,000 of Diem's civil servants and 50,000 of his troops have already deserted Diem and "gone over to the people."

Many gruesome details of tortures and mutilation inflicted by Diem's special commandos are reported which I shall omit. People in the West would only shudder and not believe. One of the recently introduced techniques of humiliation is said to be that commandos not only disembowel peasants but tear out and eat the still warm liver. The Liberation Press claims more than five hundred instances of this. The notorious "mass poisoning" of Phu

Loi camp near Saigon should be mentioned, because it was claimed officially by the Government of North Viet Nam to the International Control Commission, and an investigation was asked. Diem refused to let the ICC investigate. The details are circumstantial; in a camp of 6,000 prisoners, a "poison meal" was served, from which over 1,000 died quickly and many hundreds more were sick. The Nazis maintained "extermination camps"; Diem's reputation is as bad as theirs.

WHY should Washington support and finance all these actions, the bombings and strafings of villages, the concentration camps? Perhaps we can begin to see an answer in two maps published by the Liberation Press in a book. The first map is titled: "Policy of Terror." It shows 32 "liberated areas" which cover a fairly large proportion of South Viet Nam. Special markings are put on "areas repeatedly bombed." Most of the 32 are thus marked. The map shows also big concentration camps or jails, to the number of about 100.

The other map is titled. "South Viet Nam, Base of U.S. Imperialism." It shows 57 military airfields, built by the U.S.—the French had only six—and 11 naval bases. It also shows a network of strategic highways all over South Viet Nam and connecting across Southern Laos with similar highways in Thailand. Many of these "agricultural resettlements" are located near the highways and the airfields, where the peasants, deprived of their own villages and land, can serve as labor and logistic help.

What vast sums have been spent

by American taxpayers for this strategic network covering three nations, a great war front against China and the people of Southeast Asia too. Yet this titanic structure lies over the bodies of peasants who are resisting, and resisting with much success.

At first the peasant demonstrations were rather simple. The women and children just sat down in the road to keep the trucks from taking away the people to the new settlements, and from killing men who refused to go. Then protest marches took place.

On September 28, 1960, for instance, 7,000 peasants went to a provincial capital south of Saigon to protest the deportations. Sympathizers inside the city joined them until 45,000 people converged on the governor's mansion. He refused to see them, but dispersed them by troops and with casualties. On the following day the entire provincial city staged a "market strike" in protest. This is a simple case and an early stage.

A resettlement center was being built on the high plateau in an area inhabited by national minorities. Five villages went to the center on May 21, 1961 to demand compensation for the land that had been taken from them for the center, and the buildings they had had on that land. They were dispersed by troops, who killed five and wounded 22. Thereupon 64 villages joined in a march with drums, gongs, Liberation Flags and placards demanding that Diem resign and the Americans get out of Viet Nam! This is the way the movement grows. Soldiers who had deserted Diem's army also took part.

The first armed seizure of a provincial capital took place September 18, 1961 and was described in the Western press and also in the Liberation Press, from which I quote. In a city named Phuoc Vinh, 50 miles northeast of Saigon, the provincial governor was a "famous butcher" who made "uninterrupted raids against villages" and had killed "more than 100 people with his own hand."

"The people's forces" entered the city after midnight, killed, captured or dispersed 1,700 defending commandos, killing in the process the governor and vice-governor, and the chief and vice-chief of the security police. They liberated 33 "patriotic detainees, of whom five were under sentence of death." They captured and removed from the city all weapons and military equipment, including "400 firearms, some of which were 105 mm. howitzers and heavy machine-guns, five armored cars and seven tons of 'U.S. Aid' ammunition." They left the city before dawn, taking their new arms and ammunition back to their rural base.

Such is the war between Diem's armored cities and the people of the countryside. Most serious observers agree that Diem is losing with every week. In early May 1961 Walter Lippmann stated that Diem "still holds the cities but has all but lost control of the countryside."

THIS is the struggle into which the Kennedy Administration has talked of sending American troops to fight on the side of Diem!

Vice President Lyndon Johnson rushed out to Saigon last spring

and began plans for greatly increasing Diem's armed forces and cracking down still harder on the Vietnamese peasants. A "special plan" was worked out which was said to have been read and approved by President Kennedy himself. It includes a vastly increased regular army for Diem, and much extra training in "guerrilla warfare," all at American taxpayers' expense. It includes the mobilization of all young men between 23 and 35 who have a certain amount of schooling, for quick training as officers in the new army. It includes the construction of 11 more "agrovilles" in 1962, those agricultural resettlement camps that the peasants have been fighting.

Lippmann wrote some time ago that Washington should give up those "Dulles' protectorates" in Southeast Asia, which John Foster Dulles set up to dominate that area. He was right. Not even the U.S.A. is strong enough to police the world or rich enough to finance all its despots. But Senator Jackson, and others, declared last May 14 that "We must pay whatever price it takes to hold Viet Nam."

The "price" of course, is mostly paid by those girls who weep for their families, those men who cannot join their wives and children, those millions of peasants bombed and strafed by U.S. planes supplied to Diem. But the price will be paid by Americans too.

Washington does all this in the name of "military aid" and "containing communism." Washington creates not only wars but Communists thereby. This is the way America "lost" China and the way America is losing in Laos.

The Road to Rome

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

(We print below a letter sent by General Hester to the San Francisco Chronicle which they did not choose to print.)

To the Editor of the San Francisco Chronicle:

HAVING only recently arrived in your beautiful city, I can now, for the first time, enjoy the privilege of reading the *Chronicle* regularly. At first I was surprised, and then deeply impressed, with the general tone and quality of your editorial column. On leaving the East it had been suggested that the California press was even more militantly cold-war than that of most of the press of the nation. This I could not buy in its entirety because I knew it would be almost impossible for any section of the press to excel in irrationality and warmongering generally the press along the Atlantic Seaboard. And this was also true of radio and television reporting in that area.

What has surprised me greatly is the enlightened concern, the depth of understanding, and the logical conclusions reached in your analyses of world problems such as (1) so-called civil defense; (2) recognition of Red China; (3) changes in communism.

Even a most casual study of San Francisco transportation facilities should convince any intelligent person of the fanciful character of civilian evacuation plans. The successful evacuation of large numbers of even

trained personnel, without expert and adequate logistical preparations and support, is utterly impossible.

I spent more than 17 of my 34 years of commissioned service in the regular Army of the United States, in logistical work, and I know of no competent person who really believes that mass evacuation in a thermonuclear war is possible. The whole idea is so preposterous as to place in question either the intelligence or the honesty, or both, of those advocating it.

Professor Harrison Brown of California Institute of Technology and Mr. James Real, an engineering consultant, in a pamphlet, *The Community of Fear*, prepared under the auspices of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Santa Barbara, California, make the "bomb shelter" program look even more ridiculous. Governor Meyner, New Jersey, and Senator Young, Ohio, have pointed out the cruel hypocrisy of raising the peoples' hopes of survival in a thermonuclear war by such crude improvisations.

Yet, the present Administration has recommended a massive bomb shelter construction program which the Secretary of Defense suggests might save a few million of the 180 million citizens of the United States. On what will happen to the two-thirds of the human race now without shelter, either above or be-

now the ground, in the event U.S. policy makers decide they can survive a thermonuclear war, Mr. McNamara and Company maintain an eloquent silence. Has the edge of our social conscience been so blunted by cold war propaganda that we have no concern for the welfare of the one and one-half billion people without food, shelter or clothing?

THE CHINA policies of Truman-Acheson and Eisenhower-Dulles, now apparently adopted by Kennedy-Rusk, were unrealistic, dangerous and absurd. The claim by the United States Government that Colonel Peron was the proper representative of Argentina and General Batista of Cuba in the United Nations, if made now, would be no more absurd, no more ridiculous than our continued claim that Chiang Kai-shek is the proper representative of the Chinese people in that world organization. Chiang Kai-shek does not properly represent anyone. He is a fugitive from his own country, a stooge of the United States power elite, and a menace to the peace of the entire world.

Our Chinese policies, and similarly unrealistic ones, have convinced competent students of international relations that the rulers of the United States do not want to make the necessary adjustments to inevitable change. To most of the underdeveloped peoples of the world, unfortunately, these policies have made a mockery of U.S. opposition to poverty, ignorance and bigotry and of our *proclaimed* support of a just economic, political and social order. As a result, in their opinion, we are now definitely committed to the maintenance of the status quo in a

time of universal and necessary change. This our rulers have done to us. The Communists have only benefited by these unfortunate mistakes.

United States continued insistence upon the changeless character of communism is on a par with its "Civil Defense" program and its ostrich-like attitudes toward Red China. I have been a student of Russian and Soviet history, its economic, political and social systems, for almost 50 years. Since my retirement, 1951, I have continued these studies more intensively and have recently traveled through eight of its 15 republics. During these travels I visited schools, universities, hospitals, farms, factories, homes and political meetings. I talked with Soviet citizens in every walk of life. These included a three hour conference with Mr. Khrushchev.

It is my considered judgment that no other nation and people have made greater progress in industrial development, education, health, housing and social welfare generally than have the Soviet nation and people in the brief historic span of 44 years.

This progress has been achieved despite loss of more than 20 million of their people and material losses unequalled by any other nation at any time. And given a protracted period of peace and relief from the burdens and fears of thermonuclear war, I am willing to forecast an equally spectacular growth in Soviet freedom. Nothing serves the cause of freedom among the masses like freedom from the fear of hunger and hate, and nothing serves the purposes of the dictator like the presence of these two.

I AM WILLING also to make a further and final prediction. If the present arms build-up continues and expands as President Kennedy apparently intends and the fear and hate campaigns intensify and enlarge as currently planned by the Fred Schwarzers, the John Birchers, members of the Institute of American Strategy and their allies and fellow travelers, the most perfect and powerful police-military-garrison state of history will develop in the United States, and as a result, a thermonuclear war will erupt and terminate the Odyssey of Man. Each of these may be expected to happen, and, I believe, will happen within the next decade unless the thinking of the U.S. power elite can be changed fundamentally, the present outdated leadership replaced and current policies reversed.

There really is no alternative to peace, and in the thermonuclear age there can be no substitute for honest and serious negotiations. So far there has been none of the latter.

The approved increase of U.S. draftees by "X" thousands, the call-up of Reserves by "Y" divisions, and the increase of the military budget by "Z" billions will only increase our peril, not our security. These can and will be matched, probably exceeded by the opposition and so the rat race runs without hope of being checked.

All of these are exactly the policies we should have avoided at almost all costs. They have been tried many times before and have always failed, even before the splitting of the atom. They will, in my judgment, only prove the fears of Albert Einstein well grounded when he wrote: "The splitting of the atom has changed everything save our mode of thinking and thus we drift toward unparalleled catastrophe."

Senator Cato was accustomed to regale the Roman Senate daily with the demand: "Carthago delenda est," meaning Carthage must be destroyed. Well, Carthage was finally destroyed and so was Rome.

HOUSE OF KRUPP OBSERVES ITS 50th ANNIVERSARY

AT POTSDAM, July 17, 1945, the Big Three agreed on "The complete disarmament and demilitarizing of Germany and the elimination or control of all German industry that could be used for military production," and the elimination of "the present excessive concentration of economic power as exemplified in particular in cartels, syndicates, trusts and other monopolistic arrangements."

At Essen, Germany, Nov. 20, 1961, the House of Krupp celebrated its 150th anniversary, in the presence of leaders of the Bonn Government. According to the *New York Times*, Nov. 21, "Everyone who spoke had kind words for the House of Krupp . . . Dr. Heuss [former West German president] said "nothing basically sinful should be seen in the manufacture of arms in the past" . . . The Krupp Company is Germany's second biggest industrial enterprise. . . . [it] expects gross receipts this year of at least \$1,250,000,000 . . . Alfred Krupp . . . served six years as a war criminal because of the Krupp role in arming Hitler and exploiting thousands of slave laborers. . . . Now the House of Krupp is bigger and richer than ever . . . the 1951 Allied order requiring Herr Krupp to sell his coal and steel holdings has never been enforced . . . With the support he received today, it seemed clear he would not have to sell them."

What Do We Know About Cancer?

*An interview with Dr. Nikolai Blokhin,
President, USSR Academy of Medical Sciences*

The problem of cancer — past, present and future — was discussed by Dr. Nikolai Blokhin, president of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Medical Sciences, when he met journalists at a recent gathering arranged by Nedelya, the weekly supplement of the newspaper Izvestia.

“YOU SEE,” Blokhin said in the course of the interview, “very often absolutely incorrect opinions are expressed on the problem of cancer. And not only by laymen, but even by doctors and other medical workers. On the one hand, it is often said that nothing at all is known about cancer, that its causes are obscure, and that there are no known methods of diagnosis and cure; if anybody is cured, then it is a pure miracle.

“On the other hand, we sometimes hear quite contrary opinions which are just as far from the truth. Where does the truth lie?

“The problem of cancer is an extremely important one. Recently it has become of special interest to scientists in all countries for the very reason that nowadays this disease has become one of the main causes of death all over the world, second only to cardiovascular diseases. According to our statistics, for instance, one death in every seven is caused by cancer.

“But we must be more explicit here. It would be wrong to create

the impression that a cancer menace is impending.

“It is true that formerly there were more deaths from other causes. But if there are more deaths from cancer now, it is not because this disease has spread, but because many other illnesses, chiefly infectious diseases, have been wiped out.

Diseases of Middle Age

“For instance, we may recall that quite recently, within my memory, statistics showed that tuberculosis was the main cause of death in our country. And today, if it has not been entirely abolished, its incidence has dropped greatly. So it happens that people who in the past might have died of children's diseases, tuberculosis or other infectious diseases at an early age, now survive all these dangers and live to a more mature age.

“And at that age they are threatened by other diseases, the diseases of middle age: sclerosis of the blood vessels, infarctions, apoplexy, that is to say, cardiovascular diseases, and, finally, cancer.

“To be more or less accurate we must say that the whole history of oncology, the science of tumors, dates from the end of the past century, although tumors as such are quite an ancient disease.

“We find traces of malignant bone tumors even in Egyptian mummies, which means that malignant tumors

were already known 4,000 years before our era. We find descriptions of cancerous diseases in Hippocrates' writings, and descriptions of cancer operations in books belonging to the first century of our era. Naturally, at that time the true nature of cancer diseases could not yet be understood; the rudiments of the science of oncology only began to emerge with the appearance of powerful microscopes, when it became possible to study the structure, reproduction and growth of cells.

"Since then much has been done. In particular, we can now produce malignant tumors in animals at will. You may ask why I emphasize this. It seems to me that this is substantial proof of the fact that we already possess a certain amount of knowledge of the nature and the causes of cancerous diseases. For when we have no knowledge whatsoever of the causes of a disease, it is usually impossible to produce it artificially."

Living Conditions

Dr. Blokhin explained how cancer can be produced and spoke about the chemical cancerogenic substances, radioactive radiation and viruses causing cancer. He stressed that the virus nature of cancer applied only to animals; in man it had not yet been proved.

"Cancer is not a fatal disease resulting from unknown causes," he said. "It is connected with living conditions.

"Otherwise we would find the same type of cancer all over the world. In reality, however, every country has its own prevalent type of this disease, depending upon the life and habits of the people.

"For instance, till recently the

form of cancer most prevalent among men in Western Europe and the United States was cancer of the stomach. In recent years, this has yielded place to cancer of the lungs. The latter is most frequent among all types of cancer affecting men in the United States. What explanation is there for this? Apparently, excessive smoking.

"In America many more cigarettes are smoked than in the U.S.S.R. and it is probable that the different admixtures and the aromatic substances used to impregnate the cigarette paper play a certain role. The pollution of the atmosphere in big cities by combustion products of coal and petrol is also of importance."

Dr. Blokhin gave yet another example:

"In our country," he said, "cancer of the liver is very rare. But in Central Africa, in the colonial countries, 40 per cent of all the cancer cases affect the liver. Why? It appears that the very bad food, the total lack of animal proteins, is responsible for this."

Influence of Diet

Describing an interesting experiment made on mice, he said that the animals, if kept on a poor diet, developed a liver tumor much sooner.

The fact that parasites were very widespread in Africa undoubtedly also had a certain influence.

He pointed out that cancer of the stomach is most frequent in Japan, which is connected with the monotonous diet of coarse food in that country. The Japanese consume large quantities of different kinds of seafood: seaweeds and fish, the latter

being eaten raw in some cases. The Japanese habit of drinking hot spirits probably also has a bad influence. In general, very hot food has a definite influence on the growth of tumors.

"Does that mean that our habit of drinking chilled vodka is not harmful from the oncological aspect?" one of the correspondents asked.

Dr. Blokhin joined in the laughter to reply:

"Yes. But it would be still better not to drink it at all, or, at any rate, drink it abstemiously. In the U.S.A., for instance, cancer of the stomach is decreasing. Perhaps, that is due to the fact that they never drink their whisky neat, but add soda.

"In general," he went on to say, "food plays an important part.

"In India, for instance, cancer mostly affects the throat and upper half of the esophagus. Indian food is very sharp and spicy. In the stomach it is diluted by the gastric juices, but the upper parts of the gullet, which have no such protection, are affected."

Describing the forms of cancer which affect women, Dr. Blokhin noted an interesting fact; it has been established that in such countries as Japan, for instance, where they do not have abortions but bear many children and nurse their babies themselves, cancer of the mammary glands is very rare.

"In short," said the scientist, summing up, "we have quite a fair amount of knowledge about the causes of cancer, and we know that it depends upon certain conditions, such as the climate, working and living conditions, and the general way of life."

Dr. Blokhin was asked many questions concerning anti-cancer measures in the Soviet Union.

Cures

"We cannot agree with assertions that cancer today is an incurable disease," he said. "There are thousands of people in the Soviet Union who have been cured of different forms of cancer. If we regard objectively all cancerous ailments — then there are some which we can cope with easily nowadays, others which we find it hard to treat, and still others against which we are simply helpless.

"Cancer of the skin, for instance, was once just as terrible as all the other forms. At present, 95 per cent of all the cases are being cured. These are the official statistics. It is cured with the help of X-rays and radioactive irradiation, and by a special ointment.

"Deep carcinomas, like those of the cervix uteri or of the mammary gland, are harder to treat.

"All the same, if treatment is started in time, up to 80 per cent, of the cases can be completely cured.

"The hardest cases from the viewpoint of treatment are gastric cancer, carcinoma of the esophagus, and lung cancer. These tumors are extremely difficult to get at. While skin cancer can be removed by a scalpel or cured with an ointment, gastric cancer will only yield to surgical operation — at least today. Irradiation is of no avail, as the affected organs lie too deep."

Referring to chemicals as a potential means of curing cancer, Dr. Blokhin noted that the way chemotherapy of tumors had been progressing was convincing the investi-

gators more and more that cancer was not a single ailment. In fact, it was a cover name for a large number of diseases. That much had been proved by the fact that a preparation effective against one form of cancer would fail completely when applied to any other form.

"Up to now, several dozen drugs have been developed in various countries to treat individual forms of cancer," he said. "Some of them have been successful. If I had been asked some 20 years ago whether I believed in the treatment of cancer with medicines, I would have called it sheer fantasy and said cancer could only be removed by excision. For I am a surgeon. Drugs were viewed sceptically at that time. Nevertheless, a series of preparations have been obtained since then which are effective against some types of cancer.

"Oncology is a field which can only be plowed up by the joint efforts of physicians, chemists, physicists, biologists and nuclear physicists, for no single person can any longer keep all knowledge in his head—the times of Lomonosov are long passed.

"It is a hard and fast rule with us to draw various specialists into research on cancer. A special committee on cancer has been set up at the Academy. Apart from medical men, it includes physicists, chemists and nuclear physicists. At present we are working on an integrated treatment of cancer involving the use of surgical, irradiation and chemical techniques.

Early Detection

"Work is also well ahead on the prevention and early detection of

cancer. I believe that when we have unravelled the enigma of some tumors occurring in man, we shall be able to find a more efficient way of controlling the disease. I look at it optimistically.

"In our efforts to control cancer, we are using all methods that come our way. At one time we relied on ultrasonics. We started the project somewhere around 1952 and continued it for several years. With what results, you may ask. Some tumors can be eradicated. The principle is the same as with irradiation, but the cost is much greater. For one thing, the equipment is more expensive. Secondly, treatment is extremely painful. In fact, we had to apply narcosis.

"It is our firm belief that ultrasonics is a very intricate and painful procedure which offers no advantages over the other methods. The opposite is rather the case."

Asked what he thought of antibiotics, Dr. Blokhin said:

"We take great interest in antibiotics. There is a laboratory at our institute specializing in anti-tumor antibiotics. Every year brings several more antibiotics which can be used with effect. They are studied in detail, tested on animals, and then handed over for use at clinics. But it should be noted that both Soviet and foreign antibiotics are not yet active enough: we haven't efficient enough antibiotics which we can use with confidence."

"If cancer were a virus disease, could it be a contagious disease?" one of the correspondents wanted to know.

"If virus is meant as a causative agent finding its way into the body from without, this question would

be
"Ho
tagic
cate
are p
meet
tract
"P
tran
Such
say,
viru
usua
Mic
the
the
mot
her
ill
glar
in
stat
No
A
to
"
mar
con
"
bin
tha
har
upe
anc
app
the
in
the
dis
or
life
a
vir
be
tic
fee

be appropriate," was the reply. "However the very notion of contagious disease is extremely complicated. There are diseases which are passed on like this: two persons meet, shake hands, and one contracts the disease from the other.

"But there are diseases which are transmitted in a more involved way. Such are virus diseases. If you take, say, tumors caused in animals by viruses, they are transmitted in unusual ways. I will cite one example. Mice often suffer from cancer of the mammary gland. The virus of the disease is passed on with the mother's milk, when she is feeding her litter. The adult mice may fall ill with cancer of the mammary gland. In fact, the virus is present in them all their lives in a latent state."

Not Infectious

Asked whether this applied only to mice, the scientist explained:

"I cannot say anything about human beings. But as far as mice are concerned, this has been proved.

"The disease is caused by a combination of certain factors, rather than by the virus alone. When harmful environmental factors act upon the body, they damage tissues, and sources of pre-cancer ailment appear in the body. This is where the virus begins to be felt. While in mice the virus is introduced in the first days of the animal's life, the disease shows up only a year later, or in the middle of the animal's life-span. Similarly, if a tumor in a human being happens to be of a virus nature, it need not necessarily be contagious in a direct sense—practically speaking, cancer is not infectious.

"The proof is simple: cancer specialists spend almost all their lives at the bedside of cancer patients, but they fall victim to the disease no more often than anyone else. Such are the statistics."

Tell the Whole Truth

"We journalists are sometimes called upon to write about cancer. In effect, we are between two fires—the readers, some of whom are ill with cancer, on the one hand, and the scientists, on the other. What do you think our attitude should be?" the journalists asked.

"Scientists often ask themselves how people should be educated on the question of cancer," Dr. Blokhin replied. "Some of them believe the cancer problem is formidable enough, and people are too scared; therefore the danger inherent in the disease must be played down. Others say it is necessary to scare people so as to make them consult their doctor in time and not overlook trifles. Their line of action is to tell people: 'Look how people die! You will die, too, if you don't take care of yourself.'

"I believe that scientists must tell people the whole truth and nothing but the truth, for the truth will never do any harm.

"I think journalists would be well advised to follow the same line, to cover the state of science on the basis of the truth, with complete objectivity, without laying it on thick or thin."

Concluding, Dr. Blokhin said that cancer is related to nucleic acids and that this has led research deep into the cell, its biochemistry and biophysics.

Courtesy of Soviet News, London.

Our Two Great Tasks

STOP PRESS! As we go to press, the interview given by President Kennedy to *Izvestia* editor Aleksei Adzhubei is published in full in the USSR and the USA. There is space only to say that in some aspects it lifts our hopes for fruitful negotiations on Berlin and improved American-Soviet relations.

WITH the question of disarmament now under discussion in the United Nations, we have before us the great two-fold task of bringing pressure to bear on our government to do everything in its power to bring about the resumption of disarmament negotiations; at the same time it is essential to press for negotiations on immediate urgent issues like Berlin to keep them from exploding into nuclear war before progress toward disarmament is made.

The resumption of testing by the Soviet Union, followed by the underground tests in our country and preparations for atmosphere testing as well, must serve as a clarion call for the greatest efforts we have ever made for complete and universal disarmament, banning these monstrous weapons and their testing forever, removing war from the life of mankind.

We discussed the question of nuclear tests, the reasons given by the Soviet Union for resuming them, and our deep regret that it felt impelled to do so, in our October issue. We should like to refer those readers who have written for further information on this subject to the October issue of *Monthly Review* which has a valuable section on the Resumption of Testing. Very significant, too, is the article by A. J. Muste in *Liberation*, for October. A pacifist, who opposes all testing and advocates unilateral disarmament, Mr. Muste makes a very important con-

tribution to an understanding of the reasons that led the USSR to resume testing, especially German rearmament.

However deep our distress at the nuclear arms race and the testing, we believe the USSR must have made this serious decision only because it was convinced that it had no alternative, especially after President Kennedy's July 25 address summoning the American people to prepare for war. Faced with the failure of its long efforts for a disarmament agreement, and the West's resistance to a peaceful solution with Germany, the constant growth of West German rearmament and preparations to add nuclear arms to its arsenal, the Soviet Union could hardly have been expected to risk continuing a position of nuclear inferiority resulting from the voluntary moratorium it had itself initiated.

And we have to recognize our own responsibility for having failed to create a sufficiently massive public opinion in time to have prevented our government from building up a German military machine to threaten the peace of the world for the third time in a century in which mankind has already suffered 60 million deaths from war. Forgetting the lessons of World War II, our country has proceeded on the same course as before of building up German military might.

If you believe there is no danger of war from a resurgence of militarism in West Germany, we ask you

to read the pamphlet *The Strategy of Revenge* by Ernst Henri, (reviewed in our October issue). Read, too, *U. S. Foreign Policy and the Soviet Union*, by Fred Warner Neal, former *Wall Street Journal* correspondent and now professor of international relations and government at the Claremont Graduate School. The pamphlet was published by the Fund for the Republic's "Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions." Professor Neal declares that the *status quo* in Berlin is by no means vital to U.S. interests. He urges that we seek an alternative, declaring:

The Berlin impasse is a source of instability—and therefore of danger—for the whole of Central Europe. There is, therefore, nothing unnatural about the Russians' view that such instability is a danger to their whole position generally. . . . Unless we are prepared to risk war in a vain attempt to preserve something that does not exist and where no vital U.S. interest is involved, some compromise is essential. Several possibilities present themselves. Demilitarization with the present division is one. Joint East-West condominium is another. United Nations supervision is a third, and there are others.

If you do not believe in the terrible dangers arising from the growing control of our own country by the military, read the frightening revelations in "Juggernaut: The Warfare State," by Fred J. Cooke, in *The Nation*, October 28.

If you are unable to believe that there are any groups in America who really want war, read the statement of policy adopted by the Air Force Association at its meeting in Philadelphia, September 20-24. (See *I. F. Stone's Weekly*, October 16.) Calling for a course that would mean total war and a perpetual arms race,

it bristles with such statements as these:

Complete eradication of the Soviet system must be our national goal. . . . We therefore petition the President to declare a National Alert. . . . We are determined to back our words with action, even at the risk of war. . . . National policy must make it abundantly clear that the U.S. will not hesitate to employ its nuclear strength. . . . We must be willing and able to risk war. . . . We are convinced that the people are ready to work toward, and fight for if necessary, the elimination of Communism from the world scene. Let the issue be joined.

If you believe that the threat of war over Berlin exists only in the minds and words of some hot-headed generals, we ask you to read again the July 25th address to the nation by our President which raised the threat to government policy, and which may well have been the final deciding factor in the Soviet resumption of tests which came only a little over a month later. It was in this speech that President Kennedy, calling West Berlin "the great testing place of Western courage and will" summoned Americans for preparedness to "defend our rights at all costs" for readiness "to resist with force," announced massive new military preparations and additions to our military budget bringing the increase for this year up to more than 6 billion dollars, called on all Americans for sacrifices "if freedom is to be defended," promised preparation and stocking of shelters and information to every citizen about "steps he can take to protect his family in case of attack."

Referring to this speech in his column of November 14, Walter Lippmann said that it was the direct cause of breeding the present war

psychosis and panic among the American people, and the corruption of their morale through the spreading of the idea of each family for itself and the devil take the hindmost. The President's bad mistake, according to Lippmann, was in encouraging the nation to believe that at their Vienna meeting seven weeks before, "Khrushchev had delivered a six-month ultimatum to Kennedy, and that since we rejected the ultimatum firmly, a thermonuclear war was quite possible by the end of December."

We have covered the issues at stake in Germany and Berlin in articles in our recent issues. Here we would like to emphasize again that there never has been any ultimatum on Berlin. For *three years* Premier Khrushchev has been asking for negotiations on a peace treaty with Germany and a demilitarized status for West Berlin. He has never threatened the use of force to achieve this, but only said that if the West would not agree to negotiations, the USSR would make a peace treaty of its own with the German Democratic Republic, the deadline for which he has several times postponed. In his report to the 22nd Congress he said the latest deadline of December 31, 1961, was not important if the West would agree to serious negotiations, which he said they seemed now inclined to do. Recent dispatches from Moscow indicate that the USSR is prepared to make substantial concessions about the method of negotiating an agreement for a new statute for West Berlin guaranteeing the freedom of its people and access from the West (which has always been part of the Soviet proposals).

On the eve of his visit to the United States to confer with President Kennedy on these issues. Adenauer declared that NATO "should be able to order the use of atomic weapons without the prior authorization of the President of the United States." This is necessary, he said because a situation could come about in which "an immediate decision has to be taken when the fate of all could be decided in one hour and the President of the United States cannot be reached." (*New York Times*, November 17).

Are we willing that "the fate of all could be decided in one hour" by decision of former Wehrmacht generals like Heusinger and Speidel who now have a controlling role in NATO affairs?

Not Adenauer's revanchist aims, not former Hitler generals, but the national interests of the American people should determine our policy.

There is also a great danger from within to which the American people must be alerted and which requires unprecedented counter-measures for peace. While the activities of the Birchites, the Christian anti-Communist Crusade, the Minute Men drilling in secret, the proliferating ultra-rightists and outright fascist groups are of course not countenanced by our government, nevertheless its own anti-Communist policies have created fertile ground for the growth of these evil weeds.

Still worse is the encouragement to them and all reactionary forces in our country in the McCarran Act, upheld by only 5 of the nine Supreme Court Justices, with its unconstitutional attempts to outlaw the Communist Party, and its unconstitutional penalties against the Party,

its offi
regist
al cri
USSR

Wh
our tr
Right
rible
Have
lawry
the e
was f
demo
our r
own
fight
Amer

For
have
streng
Many
joine
move
Wils
brou
by w
Nove
Frien
tiated
Peace
many
Inter
a dr
traliz
The
Sovie
inter
tests
tion
a pe
Berl
New
ized
weap
again
been
tions

its officers and members for failing to register as agents of "an international criminal conspiracy" led by the USSR.

What are Americans who cherish our traditional liberties, our Bill of Rights, doing to oppose this terrible blot on our country's name? Have we forgotten that Hitler's outlawry of the Communist Party was the enabling act for fascism, that it was followed by the outlawry of all democratic groups? If we cherish our right to fight for peace and our own democratic liberties we must fight for the voiding of this anti-American law.

Fortunately, the American people have been speaking out with new strength for peace in recent weeks. Many thousands of women have joined the great "Strike for Peace" movement sparked by Mrs. Dagmar Wilson of Washington, D.C., which brought into being demonstrations by women in twenty-five cities on November 1st. The American Friends Service Committee has initiated a nationwide Turn Toward Peace movement, already joined by many organizations. The Women's International League is conducting a drive for negotiations for a neutralized and demilitarized Germany. The National Council for American Soviet Friendship has called for an international agreement to end all tests, ban nuclear weapons, resumption of disarmament negotiations, for a peaceful solution on Germany and Berlin. The Conference of Greater New York Peace groups has organized demonstrations against nuclear weapons and their testing and against war over Berlin. There have been impressive peace demonstrations in San Francisco, Los Angeles

and other American cities. Many pacifist groups are demonstrating against testing, against all nuclear weapons, for disarmament. There has been wide response to the call of 200 professors of the Boston area to replace conditioning of the American people to acceptance of nuclear war through the hysterical shelter program, by a "positive program for peace with freedom."

All these and other peace actions need to be stepped up a thousand-fold, joined by millions upon millions of Americans. You can join those of your choice. Whatever you do, do not fail to write or wire to the President at once urging constructive negotiations on Germany and Berlin and the setting up of an effective disarmament negotiating body in which neutral nations will have adequate representation.

In the example of the successful negotiations in the UN for the election of U Thant of Burma as Acting Secretary General, in which both the United States and the Soviet Union made considerable concessions, we have a clear demonstration that negotiations can be successful when both sides wish them to be.

(Since the above was written, the Kennedy-Adenauer agreement has been announced on a "negotiating position" which, accompanied by increased military measures for NATO and further strengthening of West German armed forces, seems, in fact to provide little basis for negotiations.

It is noteworthy that the USSR agreed to the Western proposals to reopen test ban negotiations, and that it voted for two resolutions, passed by the UN General Assembly over U.S. protests, one banning the use of nuclear weapons and another that would make all Africa a de-nuclearized zone.)

—J. S.

GROMYKO REPORTS ON SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY

PEACEFUL coexistence among the nations for the sake of all mankind and peaceful conditions for the building of a communist society — these were the main goals of Soviet foreign policy set forth in the report on October 25 of Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko to the Twenty-second Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. This policy, he said, had prevented the danger of war from being many times greater than it is today, and had won wide support:

More than forty neutralist states hold positions on fundamental issues of international life which basically coincide with the foreign policy of the socialist countries and keep, as we do, to the policy of peace and peaceful cooperation.

Mr. Gromyko said that the policies of the Soviet Government on colonialism and disarmament coincided with the needs of the majority of the world's people:

Last year our country, speaking from the UN rostrum through the head of the Soviet Government, called upon the governments and peoples to break colonial chains and fling open the doors of independence and national freedom before the peoples who have borne these chains over many decades. We are entitled to take pride in the fact that the overwhelming majority of states declared their solidarity with the ideas expressed in the proposals of the Soviet Government, and all this brings nearer the last day of colonial oppression. . . .

As is generally known, N. S. Khrushchev, head of the Soviet Government, advanced from the UN rostrum a num-

ber of other proposals, including a program for general and complete disarmament. This was a new major landmark on that historic highroad which was inaugurated by the Soviet delegation at the 1922 Genoa conference, on the direct instructions of Lenin, which advanced the proposal of general disarmament. Today, just as in Lenin's time, our country is in the vanguard of the peoples waging the struggle for disarmament and peace.

The Threat of German Militarism

The Soviet Foreign Minister, speaking of the grave continuing tensions in the world situation, pointed to the events in the Congo and Laos, the colonial war in Algeria, the intervention against Cuba and the attack on Bizerte. He stressed above all the present threat to the security of the peoples of Europe and the Soviet Union from German militarism, which has already unleashed two world wars:

That is why the Soviet Government, so strongly and acutely, raises the question of the necessity of carrying out measures to bridle militarism, which is raising its head in West Germany, by signing a German peace treaty.

Just look at the direction in which West Germany is developing. Compare the policy which is today pursued by the FRG (Federal Republic of Germany) leaders with the policy of Hitler Germany, and you will see that there is only a small difference, if any.

In what way do the present Bonn appeals for paring the territories of neighboring states and for changing existing borders in Europe, and their chauvinistic slogans, differ from those

appeals years p
German
imperi

Mr.
the U
build
forgott
repres
fifteen
Soviet
to de
fascist
of the
Taylor

Ge
will
Nazi
their
part
of G
ever
edly
port
Reic
plun
pool
have
cont
who
and
who
from

Th
out h
out to

Th
lies
Hitle
Nazi
officia
throu
—the
mine
—Agai
smok
which
robber

appeals which were advanced during the years preceding World War II from the German Reichstag and from Hitler's imperial chancellery?

Mr. Gromyko asked whether those in the United States who are helping rebuild West German militarism have not forgotten too soon the warnings of U.S. representatives at the Nuremberg trial fifteen years ago where, together with the Soviet representatives, they condemned to death the chief war criminals of fascist Germany. He quoted the words of the U.S. prosecutor, General Telford Taylor, who said at that time:

German militarism, if it rises again, will not necessarily be under the aegis of Nazism. The German militarists will link their fate with that of any man or any party that gambles on the restoration of German military might. They calculate everything in good time and cold-bloodedly . . . The German militarists supported Hitler and created the Third Reich with him . . . With him they plunged the whole world into the whirlpool of war and brought terror and havoc to the peoples of the European continent. They struck a blow at the whole of mankind . . . a blow so savage and cruel that the conscience of the whole world will not be able to recover from it for many years.

The Soviet foreign minister pointed out how these warnings are being borne out today:

The industrial and finance monopolies which supported and guided the Hitlerite clique, the surviving generals, Nazi judges and diplomats, the high officials and politicians who have passed through the school of the Third Reich—these are the people who now determine the political face of West Germany. Again the stacks of the Ruhr plants are smoking night and day, the same plants which forged the weapons for Hitler's robber hordes, and the territory of West

Germany is being covered by proving grounds, military airdromes, barracks. What is the aim of all these preparations; for what purposes have the West German youth been driven to be trained by Hitlerite generals and officers? In Bonn they no longer make any special secret of this: to seek revenge for the smashing defeat which they suffered in the Second World War.

Mr. Gromyko said that the Soviet Union knows too well both the ways of German militarism and the nature of NATO to take seriously the arguments of the Western powers that West Germany will never be able to violate the peace of Europe because its military preparations are carried on within the framework of NATO. Answering those in the West who say that the USSR is animated merely by a "theoretical concept" in raising the question of a German peace treaty, Mr. Gromyko said that Soviet security was not a question of theory, but what Western statesmen called "vital interests" where their own countries were concerned. He continued:

If the German question is a purely "theoretical concept" for certain statesmen of the West, for us it stands for millions of lives of our compatriots who fell for the freedom of their country and for the liberation of Europe from fascist barbarism; this is a question of our security and the security of our allies.

Mr. Gromyko repeated Premier Khrushchev's assertion that recent talks with the Western powers had left the impression that the latter are now inclined to seek a settlement of the question of Germany and West Berlin on a mutually acceptable basis. The Soviet Union will continue its efforts, therefore, to seek a common understanding with the West for a German peace treaty and the normalization of the situation in West

Berlin by converting it into a demilitarized, free city.

On Relations with the United States

The Soviet Foreign Minister stressed the efforts of the Soviet Government and the Party to develop friendly relations "with all countries, big and little, near and far," and especially with the big powers of the West. Noting the importance to the USSR of friendly ties with Britain and France, he went on:

But while our country has paid and continues to pay serious attention to the establishment and development of relations with the major powers of Europe, it attaches particular importance to the state of relations between two giants, the Soviet Union and the United States of America.

If these two powers would unite their efforts in securing peace, who then would dare and be able to break it? Nobody, no such force exists in the world.

Should you ask any American on the streets of New York or Washington, "What is necessary to preserve peace on earth and who, first of all should come to an agreement on this?" no matter who he is, a worker, clerk, or businessman, he will unhesitatingly reply that Moscow and Washington, that Khrushchev and Kennedy, should reach an agreement.

Indeed, why when they met on the Elbe in 1945 were the Soviet and American soldiers and officers able to extend their hands to one another, whereas now, 16 years after the war, they must stand on either side of the same Elbe, opposite one another and with their arsenals packed with most lethal weapons?

The Democratic Party now holds the reins of government in the United States. President Kennedy is a representative of that party. Roosevelt also was a representative of the Democratic

Party. A party, which was linked closest of all with the name of Roosevelt, apparently, would find it easier to restore the fine traditions of that great American in the development of Soviet-American relations.

That is why Khrushchev, in his address to Kennedy right after his election as President, expressed the hope that during Kennedy's term of office relations between the USSR and the USA would follow the same channel as during the Roosevelt Administration. It is a reliable and strong channel. It has been tested and leads only to peace.

Mr. Gromyko spoke hopefully of the agreement between himself and Secretary Rusk, on how great a contribution Premier Khrushchev and President Kennedy might together make to the peace of the world:

In one of his recent talks with us the U.S. Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, voicing the views of the U.S. Government on the situation in Europe and Germany, declared: We all understand the position of Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Kennedy in not wishing to go down in history as statesmen presiding in the time of a world catastrophe. Therefore, questions of world security in equal measure concern the Soviet Union and the United States, as the world's two greatest powers.

This is a good and sound remark. In reply to this, we, on behalf of our Central Committee and the Soviet Government, said:

If we would be able, on a basis acceptable to the Soviet Union and the United States, to settle the question of drawing a line through the Second World War as well as questions stemming from this, it would be a great contribution to the cause of peace and development of relations between our powers. The Soviet Government urges that Khrushchev and Kennedy preside over a great turn in the world situation toward the re-

moval
damen
relatio
Union
all the
deeply
states
the fr

Mr.
these
ment
Ameri
hope t
univers
the gr
have a
Washi
This
if acti
will p
only v

Mr.
U.S. I
fact th
to the
comm
doom
obstac
Soviet
ued:

T
E

a
U
w

to
d
G
th

th

G
d
to
n

removal of the danger of war and a fundamental change in Soviet-American relations. The peoples of the Soviet Union and the United States, and of all the other countries as well, would be deeply grateful to the leaders of our states for this, because they would reap the fruits of a great victory.

Mr. Rusk declared that he fully shared these aspirations of the Soviet Government for peace, and, on behalf of the American Government, expressed the hope that ways would be found to secure universal peace. We, he said, really are the greatest and mightiest powers. We have allies, but much depends on what Washington and Moscow will do.

This, too, is a correct comment, and if actions of the USA in foreign policy will proceed in this direction, we can only welcome it.

Mr. Gromyko deplored the fact the U.S. leaders seemed to believe that the fact that Soviet leaders make statements to the effect that the future belongs to communism and that capitalism is a doomed social system, creates the main obstacle to the establishment of normal Soviet-American relations. He continued:

We believe in the fathomless possibilities of our socialist system, and believe that the dispute between socialism and capitalism will be settled in the field of peaceful competition, peaceful coexistence. It is exactly this line, this policy of peace that is expressed in the draft of the new Program of the CPSU.

Mr. Gromyko said ideological questions could not be settled by force of arms, and must be separated from interstate relations, and that therefore in its foreign policy the Soviet Union rejects attempts to base relations on what separates states and not on what brings them nearer together.

The Soviet Foreign Minister concluded with a plea for disarmament:

We say to those who are responsible for the present race in nuclear-missile armaments and who themselves are scared now by the latest achievements of Soviet military equipment: Let us break the military machine of the states, effect general and complete disarmament, draw the final line through the past war, and then your nerves can relax. Then—and this is the most important thing—the danger of a new war will be removed.

ERICH FROMM ON OUR POSITION ON BERLIN

THE WELL-KNOWN psychoanalyst and teacher, author of *The Sane Society*, Erich Fromm, wrote in a letter to *The New York Times*, October 25:

"The real question at the moment is not the freedom of Berlin and the free access to the city, about which there is no serious disagreement with the Soviet Union. The real problem is whether West Berlin will be a neutral city or will serve as a center of West German propaganda against East Germany.

"As far as we and our allies are concerned, we have the moral obligation to guarantee the life of a free Berlin. We have no such moral obligation to demand the existence of West Berlin as a beachhead of an aggressive West Germany. Is it German pressure which is the main motive for our adopting this West German demand as our own position?"

Answering fears expressed by James Reston that the Germans might "make their peace with Russia," he asks:

"But does the assumption of such danger fit into the picture of the new Germany which can be relied on as the staunch defender of democracy? If this danger existed, it would be all the more worth considering that it is preferable to curb German military strength now, rather than support it and thus made us increasingly the captives of German irredentist aspirations."

THE ACHIEVEMENT OF SOVIET MEDICINE

Reviewed by MURRAY YOUNG

The Achievement of Soviet Medicine, by L. Fridland, M.D. Translated from the Russian. Edited with a Foreword by W. Horsley Gantt, M.D. Twayne Publishers New York, 1961. 351 pages. \$6.50.

DR GANTT, who is Director of the Pavlovian Laboratory at the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, says in his introduction that Dr. Fridland has done for the popularization of medical science in the Soviet Union a somewhat similar task to that achieved by Paul de Kruif in presenting on a popular level the accomplishments of American medicine.

Much that the book contains will be new to Americans, Dr. Gantt points out, even to the medical profession and to specialists in their field. As an example he mentions the difference in the concepts of cardiac disease in the two countries: "In the United States, the chief emphasis is on diet, while the Russians think that high blood pressure and cardiac failure are primarily a matter of conditional reflexes, and that the deposits in the walls of the arteries are secondary to the changes in the central nervous system."

With special emphasis on the application of Pavlovian concepts, the book covers a wide range of Soviet experiments and achievements in protecting and lengthening life, in the treatment of such diseases as cancer and heart ailment, in grafting of vital organs, in the use of sleep as therapy in treating epilepsy and ulcers. (This listing only covers a portion of the subjects treated in the book.)

Since both knowledge and interest in Pavlov have been so slight in this country, the numerous suggestions and examples of the application of Pavlovian concepts given in the book will serve a

useful function in acquainting more Americans with Pavlov's important contributions.

That Pavlov's concepts — explained with admirable clarity by the author of the book—have had such wide application in Soviet medicine will come as a surprise to many readers. See, for instance, the chapter on the search for the clue to longevity, or the chapters on blood transfusions and the cause, prevention and cure of cancer.

Written for the layman, the book presents no problem for those without technical knowledge. The presentation is lively and simple and as much of the material is quite new, the book is full of unexpected and stimulating ideas.

American readers will also be interested in the concern for the care and treatment of patients so clearly shown in the course of the discussion of medical practice. This is particularly evident in the description of the wide-ranging preventative measures, from the beginning so characteristic of Soviet medical practice.

"Everything for Man"—the meaning of this Soviet slogan is nowhere more clearly demonstrated than in the unceasing solicitude for the health of the people that lies behind the bold experiments, the creative research, and the brilliant achievements that Dr. Fridland has described so clearly and so simply.

The book was written of course for a Soviet audience and—except for two chapters — translated into English in Moscow. As an example of popular writing in the field of science, Dr. Fridland's book will raise the hope that many more Soviet books treating various aspects of science in a popular, non-specialist manner will be translated and become available for readers in this country.

A SUMMER TO REMEMBER

Reviewed by MAURINE AUSTIN

Screen play by Vera Panova, Georgy Danelia and Igor Talankin, based on Seryozha by Vera Panova; directed by Georgy Danelia and Igor Talankin. A Mosfilm Studios production with the following:

Seryozha	Borya Barkhatov
Korostelyov	Sergei Bondarchuk
Maryanna	Irina Skobtseva

A SUMMER TO REMEMBER is more than a movie. It is an experience. We live for a magic hour in the world of a five-year old boy, a world realized with amazing delicacy, unmarred by adult sentimentality.

Seryozha is the five-year old who faces the future with anxiety when his mother marries again and his new father comes to live with them. He is soon won over, however by the understanding love and consideration of the father, chairman of a nearby collective farm. But then a baby brother is born and anxiety returns, mounting to the final crisis when his parents have to move on to another assignment in an undeveloped area and plan to leave Seryozha behind with his grandparents until the Spring.

These emotional crises lend suspense to the story, but they do not convey the essence of *A Summer to Remember*, which encompasses a child's whole world—not just the tough spots—a world of discovery, of invention, of friendships and fun, and of wonder. You see that world through Seryozha's eyes, which seem to take over the role of the camera. You hear its sounds—music or sea shells, or the strident reprimands of a distraught foster-mother berating a pal—with his ears. You share his excitement and his temptations and feel his embarrassment or hurt and, to quote Paul V. Beckley (*N. Y. Herald Tribune*, Nov. 7), because of the "concentration on emotional truth, even small effects be-

come large, frights and joys and triumphs are more exciting because genuine."

The movie penetrates the complexities of human relationships, and though we are made aware of these through Seryozha's senses, we are also conscious of the depth of understanding, the skill and creative genius which integrated all the elements of picture making into a sensitive work of art which won prizes at the Stratford and Karlovy Vary film festivals, and of which Bosley Crowther says (*N. Y. Times*, Nov. 12), "Indeed, it might well serve as a model for use by child-study groups, so intelligently does it give examples of how children react to certain things, such as punishment and sibling rivals, and what parents should be careful not to do."

The acting is superb with even the minor characters fully realized. All the children from Seryozha to the gawky 14-year old boys were right: they were simply children in a Soviet village, untouched by the professional "cuteness" of Hollywood "child actors."

The uncluttered settings, simple and evocative, presented the unexplored and hence rather unknown world of a child with exceptional skill. The camera worked its magic of perspective as the music worked its magic of mood, each a part of the total experience.

Alton Cook (*World-Telegram*), describes it as "a completely captivating idyll of childhood, told with a feather-light charm." Archer Winsten (*N. Y. Post*) says it "does justice to childhood in ways that are wholly delightful." And Brendan Gill of the *New Yorker* writes, "*A Summer to Remember* is the best picture for children I've seen in years, and about the best picture for grownups to sit through with children that I've ever seen."

12.

A FREE SAMPLE FOR YOUR FRIENDS

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

NEW WORLD REVIEW

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

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

To _____

Address _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

To _____

Address _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

To _____

Address _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

To _____

Address _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

To _____

Address _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

Sender _____

Address _____

SOVIET FILMS

NEW RELEASES

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

Coming:

Spring Maiden
Sound for Life

Released by:

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

NOW READY

Bound Indexed Volumes of
NEW WORLD REVIEW, 1960

\$4.00 each

Index alone, 35c

Order through NWR

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

Gagarin Speaks From Outer Space!

The voice of Major Yuri A. Gaga-
rin, recorded during his historic
flight in Outer Space is now avail-
able on an LP recording.

Price: \$1.00

Order through:

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

Y.

ga-
ric
il-

Y.