

New World REVIEW

**PROFITS
AND
SOCIALISM**

•
**Prof. Liberman
of Kharkov
University
Answers
His Critics**

END U.S. WAR ACTIONS!

**WEST GERMANY:
THREAT TO PEACE**
Holland Roberts

A COMRADELY COURT
Jessica Smith

**BRITAIN:
LABOR PARTY POLICY**
Gordon Schaffer

**EAST GERMANY:
JAZZ AND CULTURE**
Heinz Stern

JUNE 1965

Special Supplement:
AMERICAN-SOVIET FACTS

35c

NEW WORLD REVIEW

JUNE 1965

Editorial	3
Helsinki World Peace Congress	8
Profits and Socialism <i>Yeusei Liberman</i>	10
British Labor Party and the Choice Before It <i>Gordon Schaffer</i>	19
Soviet Youth Looks to the Future <i>Deana Levin</i>	23
West Germany Threatens the Peace <i>Holland Roberts</i>	26
Guitar Combos and the Question of Culture <i>Heinz Stern</i>	31
A Comradely Court in Irkutsk <i>Jessica Smith</i>	36
American-Soviet Facts <i>Richard Morford</i>	44
The McCarran Act: 1965	62

BOOK REVIEWS

<i>Russia at War 1941-1945</i> , by Alexander Werth - Murray Young	63
<i>Vietnam: Inside Story of the Guerrilla War</i> , by Wilfred Burchett - Kumar Goshal	65
<i>Russia and the Soviet Union</i> , ed. by Paul L. Horecky	67
<i>Russia's Hawaiian Adventure</i> , by Richard A. Pierce	67

JESSICA SMITH, *Editor*
MURRAY YOUNG, *Managing Editor*
CLIFFORD JAY
Circulation
ESLANDA ROBESON
*UN—Colonial and
Negro Questions*

Vol. 33, No. 6, June, 1965. Second class postage paid at New York, N. Y. Subscription \$3.50 per year; \$1.25 for 5 months (Canadian, and foreign \$4.50 a year. Draw money orders or checks payable in New York.) Published monthly by the N.W.R. Publications, Inc., Suite 308, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York 10, N. Y. indexed in Bulletin of the Public Affairs Information Service. Phone: CHelsea 3-0666.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

To Our Readers

The extraordinary nationwide discussions—"teach-ins"—on our disastrous policies in South Vietnam attest again to the vigor, integrity, and purposefulness of an important section of the American people.

Here is the very voice of democracy. These discussions must expand to cover every aspect of our domestic policy and our foreign relations. They must be heard on every campus in the land.

Peaceful coexistence, disarmament, meaningful foreign aid, a strong UN, East-West cultural and scientific exchanges on the widest levels—these vital subjects must become a basic part of the discussion.

NWR has a real contribution to make to this re-examination. But for this contribution to be really useful we shall need your help. And this means that we are again asking you to send a monetary contribution—large or small—so that we can enrich the magazine and see to it that more and more readers can come to know it in this crucial period of the re-evaluation of America's goals and purposes.

Please send in your contribution today.

RATES

1-year sub—\$3.50	4 month trial sub—\$1.00
<i>Canadian and Foreign</i>	
1-year sub—\$4.50	4 month trial sub—\$1.25

NEW WORLD REVIEW
SUITE 308
156 Fifth Avenue
New York, N. Y. 10010

I enclose \$.....for.....1-year
sub; for.....4-month trial sub.

Name

Address

City

Zone State

END U.S. WAR ACTS!

THE all-day teach-in on Vietnam held in Washington, D. C. on May 15, was a significant and heartening event. It added a new dimension to the surging peace movement which is merging now to a great extent with the militant civil rights movement.

The vast academic protest movement against the war in Vietnam, and now also against the intervention in the Dominican Republic, is deeply thoughtful, serious and well-informed. The professors and students who have been coming together in fifty or more colleges in recent months, since the teach-in was initiated at the University of Michigan, are motivated by a deep moral concern and a determination to get at the facts instead of the myths whereby the Administration has tried to justify its policies.

The professors presented their case against government policies at the Washington teach-in with a solid background of knowledge of history and current events and unassailable logic. They exposed the myth of outside aggression charged by our Government and showed that the United States has no legal or moral right for its escalating intervention in the civil war in Vietnam.

From nine in the morning until midnight they brought the truth about current U.S. policies to the 5,000 who attended in Washington, 150,000 others who listened through direct hook-up on college campuses and millions of other TV and radio listeners.

The Inter-University Committee for Public Hearings on Vietnam organized the teach-in as a real confrontation with Administration representatives. They went to great lengths to give the government side a full and fair hearing. A number of speakers defended government policies, but at the last moment McGeorge Bundy, the President's adviser on national security matters, scheduled to be the main Administration spokesman, cancelled his appearance to debate with Prof. George Kahin, Professor of Government and director of the Southeast Asia program of Cornell University. The "government business" that kept Mr. Bundy away, as later became known, was his hasty mission to try to settle the mess created by U.S. military intervention in the Dominican Republic. A very poor impression was created by the fact that neither a text of his speech was sent nor a substitute government spokesman. Since a member of the Administration had recently spoken of the "pompous ignorance" of its academic critics, this would seem to have been a good opportunity to educate them if the government felt it had a strong case.

Great credit is due to the many people at the teach-in who helped clarify the issues for the American people. We must note particularly the important contribution of Prof. Hans J. Morgenthau of the University of Chicago, who carried a large part of the burden of the critique of the Administration's policy.

We welcome the fact that this teach-in movement is continuing to challenge and discuss U.S. foreign policy and that it has been decided to give it some permanent form, whereby it can to some extent take the place of the organized political opposition so lacking in our country. So far, it is true, this great and growing opposition movement has not succeeded in bringing about

any fundamental change in U.S. foreign policy. But in the measure that it grows and affects ever greater numbers of people, this may in the end be achieved. But time grows short!

The five-day cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam, after the Administration had publicly announced it had decided against such a course, can be considered a partial yielding to pressure of public opinion here and abroad, though of course it was too brief a gesture to have any meaning. Apparently its main purpose was to try to put the onus for refusing negotiations on the other side. According to newspaper reports it was accompanied by some sort of demand to Hanoi that the bombing would be resumed again within a definite time limit unless there was a halt to Vietcong attacks in South Vietnam.

This certainly was no sign of U.S. good faith in seeking negotiations and a peaceful settlement, since it assumed the same old myth that North Vietnam was responsible for the civil war in the South and could stop it at will. And meantime, during the brief cessation of the bombing, new assaults were made by U.S. planes against the National Liberation Forces in the South, and the press continued to carry stories about sending further additions to the upwards of 50,000 troops already there, plans for giving a direct combat role to American troops and other measures intensifying military activities. All these measures and the resumed bombing of the North can only stiffen resistance in both South and North.

Senator Wayne Morse said in the Senate on May 5:

I say sadly and solemnly, but out of deep conviction, that today my Government stands before the world drunk with military power. My Government, apparently has come to the conclusion that because of military power its dictates around the world will have to be obeyed.

This statement was made in the course of two speeches by Morse in the Senate opposing the \$700,000,000 appropriation for Vietnam which the President forced through Congress, manipulating the passage of the appropriation in such a way that it became an endorsement of his policies in Vietnam and in effect a blank check of authority to widen the war there further. Only two other Senators, Ernest Gruening (D., Alaska) and Gaylord Nelson (D., Wis.), had the courage to vote against the resolution, although 33 are reported to have expressed reservations of one kind or another, and the votes of five absent Senators, Fulbright, Russell, McGovern, Burdick and Metcalf, were unrecorded. The vote in the House was 408-7.

The Dominican Disaster, U.S.-Made

AT THE moment of writing no one can tell what will be the outcome of the bloody mess in the Dominican Republic except that whatever comes will be something far worse than would have happened if the United States had not rushed in over 30,000 marines, 40 naval vessels and thousands of tons of arms.

On April 25 a military-backed civilian junta, which previously had overthrown and exiled the legally elected, constitutional President Julian Bosch, was overthrown in an uprising headed by Col. Francisco Caamano Deno, in an effort to bring Bosch back.

The constitutional rebels appeared to be winning and there seemed a good

chance that Bosch would be returned. It was at this point that the Administration hysterically ordered in the marines on the basis that the rebel forces were becoming infiltrated by Communists.

U.S. Ambassador William Tapley Bennett, Jr., according to a remarkable series of articles in the *New York Herald Tribune* (beginning May 16) by Bernard L. Collier, tried to stir up hysteria against the rebel regime by telling correspondents of a terrible bloodbath being carried on by Col. Caamano, summary executions, beheadings, etc. All of which turned out to be a pack of lies. A list of some 53 supposed Communist backers of the rebels was circulated, among whom, it was discovered, several were "either dead or abroad," others merely "militant liberals" (*London Observer*, May 16).

The U.S. first backed the hated Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin, then set up its own junta headed by Gen. Antonio Imbert Barreras, former henchman and later assassin of Trujillo, who proceeded to violate the truce that had been agreed on. With the arrival of the Presidential mission under McGeorge Bundy, the U.S. reversed its policy and gave its backing to a coalition headed by Antonio Guzman Silvestre, rich landowner and former Bosch cabinet minister, turning against the Imbert junta of its own making diplomatically, while supporting it militarily. This effort has so far been unsuccessful.

"The irony," said the *New York Herald Tribune*, May 5, is that "The Johnson Administration originally claimed the rebels were Communist-dominated"—sending in the marines to get rid of those it is now backing!

The United States had forced a vote through the OAS, which passed only due to the illegal vote of the representative of the non-existent Dominican Government, for an inter-American military force, thus attempting to legalize the American military presence, although in fact it violated both the UN and OAS Charters. The United States suffered a defeat in the Security Council, called May 3 on the demand of the USSR to condemn the illegal U.S. intervention, and had to vote for a UN fact-finding mission. United States actions have, in fact, rendered the UN impotent in this situation, and it is using the OAS only as its own tool.

The net result of the rash U.S. military intervention has been complete chaos and the death of a thousand or more people of the Dominican Republic. At no time have the desires of the Dominican people been taken into account and it is not likely that there can be any stability under a regime flagrantly imposed by the United States. The demand must be for immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops.

Our military interventions in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic are deeply immoral and deeply inimical to our highest national interests. They are earning us the hatred of the world's people, alienating us from our allies, and opening deeper chasms between our country and the Soviet Union and the whole socialist world. Every day the deadly escalation continues makes any kind of negotiations more difficult.

Present Administration policies are destroying the detente that has been developing to mutual advantage between the United States and the USSR, bringing us into an antagonistic relation with the Soviet Union in all UN positions, on the disarmament question and wherever we extend our militarist policies.

The Soviet Union has been making every possible effort to avoid the escalation of the present conflict in Southeast Asia into World War III. Both the

USSR and China have shown remarkable moderation. But it must be recognized that they cannot be pushed too far. Our leaders should realize the terrible threat U.S. policies have presented to continued peaceful coexistence.

Soviet Attacks on U.S. War Policies

PREMIER Alexey Kosygin headed the Soviet delegation to the celebration in the German Democratic Republic of the 20th Anniversary of the liberation of the German people from fascism. At a meeting in East Berlin on May 7 he spoke of the tremendous significance for mankind of "the joint repulse of the forces of evil and aggression by the anti-Hitlerite coalition of the Soviet Union, Britain, the United States and France."

Kosygin went on to say that the necessary lessons had not been drawn from the Second World War. He charged that the entire policy of the Federal Republic of Germany was for revision of the result of the war. Direct responsibility for this, he said, lay with the Western powers and in the first instance the United States, for failing to fulfill their obligations under the Potsdam Agreements and for helping to build up West Germany's military and economic potential to combat the socialist countries.

Kosygin expressed full support for the manifesto of the German Democratic Republic which appealed to all peoples and governments—

... that they support a peaceful settlement of the German problem, come out for disarmament and for establishing a nuclear-free zone in Europe, against providing West Germany with the right to be in charge of nuclear weapons in any form whatsoever, for normal and equal relations with both German states and the country's unification on democratic and peaceful principles.

Turning to the world situation, he warned that the imperialists today were staking a great deal on the differences in the international communist movement:

Some maintain that only a new world war can lead to the cohesion of the socialist camp and the international communist movement. We resolutely reject such a viewpoint. We are firmly convinced that the unity and cohesion of the community of the socialist states and the world communist movement should play and will play an important part in preventing a third world war, and it is actually in this direction that we shall develop our activities.

The unity of the international communist movement and of all the anti-imperialist forces is one of the most urgent tasks of our day, when U.S. imperialism is acting as an international gendarme.

The Soviet Premier sharply assailed the United States for its efforts to "exterminate the fighters for the independence of the Congo," and for "landing their troops on the territory of the Dominican Republic," to "suppress the sovereign rights of the people." Regarding U.S. military intervention in Vietnam, he said:

Not a single nation or state holding dear the ideas of peace, freedom and independence, can remain indifferent to the events in Vietnam, for reconciliation with U.S. intervention would mean that other countries can become the victims of the same kind of interference. . . .

The anniversary of the great victory over Hitler fascism should remind those fond of military adventures that attempts to play with the destinies of peoples will inevitably lead them to a disgraceful finale.

At the victory celebration in Moscow, May 10, First Party Secretary Leonid Brezhnev deplored the deterioration of relations with the West in the postwar years, the anti-Soviet campaign, the cold war and the accelerated arms race. Stressing the consistent Soviet policy of peaceful coexistence, he said:

We are for a development and improvement of relations with the United States. But we shall never consent to the idea of peaceful coexistence being applied solely to relations between two countries. There are more than 120 countries on our planet and it is the sacred right of each that others should respect its sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity and should not interfere in its internal affairs.

Brezhnev recalled that almost immediately after the end of the World War the anti-Hitlerite coalition began breaking up:

Soon after fascism was defeated, a new imperialist striking force emerged with the United States at its head, which openly claimed "world leadership." The U.S. imperialists had evidently learned nothing from the fate of the German-fascist claimants to world domination. The entire course of international affairs in recent times confirms the conclusion drawn by the Communist Parties of the world that U.S. imperialism is the main force of war and aggression of our time.

Brezhnev then sharply assailed U.S. efforts around the world to lay down the law to other peoples as to "what kind of order they should have in their house," and then "attempt to crush by armed force those who refuse to bend to their will." Citing what happened in the Congo, what is happening in the Dominican Republic, the continued provocations against Cuba, and above all U.S. aggressive actions in Vietnam, he declared:

In the circumstances, it is a mission of honor and the internationalist duty of the socialist countries to render effective support to that fraternal country, which has been attacked by the imperialists.

The Soviet Union is rendering help to the Democratic Republic of Vietnam for its defense against aggression. If necessary this help will increase. The Soviet Union and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam have identical views concerning the measures that have to be taken to repel the imperialist invaders. Our country will perform its international duty without fail!

The U.S. Government must fully understand the seriousness of this Commitment of the USSR and its bitterness against U.S. war policies. Mr. Cyrus S. Eaton, after an interview with Premier Kosygin, brought back a grave warning which he delivered in a news conference in Detroit. According to the *New York Times*, May 25, Mr. Eaton said the Soviet leader told him the USSR would have to act with China in Vietnam "unless the U.S. altered its policy there." He quoted Kosygin as warning that U.S. policy left no alternative to the Soviet Union but to retaliate against American forces unless bombings of North Vietnam were halted. Mr. Eaton declared: "Unless some miracle occurs in the next month I fear that mankind is doomed."

The Soviet Premier expressed the hope that the American people would resist the present war psychosis, and the spirit of militarism and resume a course of cooperation.

Let us exert all our strength in what time remains to demand that the Administration stop this mad plunge into the abyss of nuclear war.

J. S., May 25

HELSINKI WORLD PEACE CONGRESS

THE FINAL call has been issued from Stockholm for the Helsinki World Congress for Peace, National Independence and General Disarmament, July 10-17, 1965. Seventy-five representatives of international and peace organizations, trade unions, women's and youth peace groups had joined forces at Brussels April 3 and 4 at the invitation of the World Peace Council, to issue the first united call to peace organizations all over the world to send representatives and to establish a preparatory committee.

Among leading peace workers present were Italian M. P. Lucio Luzzatto, Senator Raymond Guyot of France, physicist Prof. J. D. Bernal of Great Britain, Ilya Ehrenburg, Prof. Yoshitaro Hirano, Japanese jurist, the Cuban poet Juan Marinello, the Catholic priest Miguel Ramondetti of Argentina and Claude Gatignon, Secretary of the World Federation of Democratic Youth. Attending from the United States were Rev. Stephen Fritchman of the First Unitarian Church of Los Angeles, Dr. Carlton Goodlett, Editor-publisher of the Negro weekly, the *Sun Reporter*, Rev. Stuart Innerst, Quaker Legislative Representative in Washington, Mrs. Dorothy Maund, active in W. I. S. P., Mrs. Elsa Peters Morse, member of the San Francisco local of the WILPF and Carl Bloice, National Publicity Director of the W. E. B. Du Bois Clubs.

Earlier, February 28-March 3, at the invitation of the Presidential Committee of the World Council of Peace, 122 representatives of 52 national peace committees from six continents had met in Berlin to work toward cooperation between all peace forces in preparing for the Helsinki Congress. There they listened to the eloquent appeal of Mr. Duong Dinh Thao, the delegate of the South Vietnam Peace Committee and leading member of the Vietnam National Liberation Front for assistance in stopping the murderous, unprovoked invasion of his homeland by U.S. armed forces and gaining freedom and independence. There was unanimous agreement to call for massive protest actions in the streets and before U.S. embassies throughout the world. All agreed to demand withdrawal of all U.S. troops, military personnel and weapons and those of its accomplices, liquidation of all military bases in South Vietnam and settlement of their own internal affairs by the people of that country on the basis of independence, democracy and peace.

There was the further demand that "the United States imperialists end their acts of war and aggression against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam."

These actions were strongly reinforced at the special session of the Presidential Committee of the WPC in Stockholm, April 24 and 25, called to examine the escalation of the aggressive war against the Vietnamese by U.S. armed forces. They called for the strict observance, after hostilities are terminated, of the military clauses of the 1954 Agreements on Vietnam while the country is still divided into two zones awaiting peaceful reunification. In this period the people of South Vietnam should govern themselves without foreign interference. The Presidential Committee also asked all peace groups to establish an International Week of Action for the People of Vietnam, varied according to the wishes in different countries and areas.

In reference to the Sino-Soviet and other disputes, Prof. J. D. Bernal called for unity in his opening address:

We know a great deal of the difficulties and disagreements that have hampered our work, even with such a vital problem as Vietnam, in the past, but which it is absolutely essential should not happen now or in the future. It is not a case where we can or should count on absolute unanimity on policy. We know there are fundamental disagreements. But these do not affect the main objects for which we are met: to help the courageous people of Vietnam.

The Helsinki Peace Congress will be a working one devoting its main time and energies to a number of commissions, not only on ending the invasion of Vietnam but liberation of peoples still under colonial domination, on disarmament and the banning of nuclear tests, poisonous gases and bacteriological warfare, the ending of apartheid, racism and violation of human rights and the creation of conditions of culture favorable to the cooperation of peace organizations.

Plans have been made for the participation of 1500 peace workers at Helsinki, with 50-60 coming as delegates, observers, or guests from the United States. The per diem cost including all fees, hotel and food, will be \$10 in Helsinki. There will be a free charter flight for accredited delegates, from London or Paris to Helsinki and return. Address inquiries to World Congress for Peace, Luutsikatu 4 A.4, Helsinki, Finland; Committee for International Peace Action, Box 5503, San Francisco, Cal., 94101; or Peace Conference Ad Hoc Cttee., P.O. Box 1396, General Post Office, New York, N. Y., 10001.

BULGARIA: INTERNATIONAL BALLET COMPETITION

THE SECOND International Ballet Competition is to be held this summer at Varna on the Bulgarian seacoast, July 10 to 23. (See February NWR for story about the First Ballet Competition held at Varna in 1964.)

Open to ballet dancers of all countries, the participants must not be over thirty years of age. For further information write to: *Bulgarian Concert Bureau, Secretariat of the Second International Ballet Competition, No. 1 Benkovski Street, Sofia, Bulgaria.*

PROFITS AND SOCIALISM

by YEVSEI LIBERMAN

IN ONE of its issues in February of this year *Time* magazine carried my picture—a very remote likeness—on its cover, with the prominent caption, "The Communist Flirtation with Profits." The cover story, headed *Borrowing from the Capitalists*, has many references to my writings and statements and draws conclusions vastly different from the ones I make. For this reason, I would like to supply American readers with authentic comments on the problem in question. To do so, I shall have to begin with the substance of profits.

Two Kinds of Profits

WE REGARD profits as the monetary form of the surplus product, that is, the product which the working people are able to produce over and above their personal needs. The surplus product is, therefore, an expression of the productivity of labor. Primitive man ate or used up what he produced. As civilization and technology advanced, labor began to create not only the equivalent of the working people's means of subsistence but something more. This something more is the surplus product. It is this surplus product that supports the entire non-productive sphere, from the watchman to the banker and Cabinet Minister.

But the surplus product is also a source of the means essential for the development of society. This applies to feudal and capitalist society, and it applies also to socialism and communism.

Under socialism, products and services are produced as goods and are sold chiefly for money. Therefore, the surplus product inevitably assumes the monetary form of profits. But since profits in our country are used in the interests of society, they become less and less an expression of surplus (unpaid) labor and come more and more to express socially necessary labor.

What is the difference between capitalist and socialist profits?

The difference is not, of course, that private enterprise stands for profit while socialism "denounces" it, as certain writers in the

West claim. To make the difference clear, let us examine 1) how profit is formed, 2) what it signifies, and 3) for what purposes it is spent.

From the private entrepreneur's viewpoint, all profit belongs to the capitalist. To support this view, economists built the theory of the three factors that create value: capital, land and labor. In *The Theory of Economic Development* Joseph A. Schumpeter says that profit is everything which exceeds costs. But this "cost" includes "wages" for the labor of the entrepreneur, land rent, interest on capital, and also a bonus "for risks." On top of that, the entrepreneur reaps a profit if he succeeds, by a new combination of production elements, in lowering the cost as compared with the existing level.

What kind of "combination of elements" this is can be seen from the fact that the main part of the profit under the system of private enterprise is derived not so much in production as in the process of exchange. For instance, high profits are obtained most easily of all from the advantageous purchase of raw materials, the raising of retail prices, pressure on the payment of labor through unemployment, non-equivalent exchange with developing countries, the export of capital to countries where wages are low, the system of preferential tariffs and customs duties, the raising of the prices of stocks on the stock exchange.

All these sources of profit are excluded in the Soviet Union owing to the very nature of socialism, under which there is neither private ownership of the means of production nor stock capital; and neither, consequently, is there a stock market. The level of payment of labor depends on its productivity and is regulated by law. The prices of raw and other materials are planned; market conditions that could be taken advantage of in purchasing raw material or hiring labor do not exist. Nor can the prices of finished articles be raised by taking advantage of market conditions. Exchange with other countries is conducted on the basis of equality and long-term agreements.

In the Soviet Union profit testifies, in principle, only to the level of production efficiency. Profit is the difference between the sale price of articles and their cost. But since our prices, in principle, express the norms of expenditure of socially-necessary labor, the difference is an indicator of relative economy in production. Behind Soviet profits there is nothing except hours of working time, tons of raw and other materials and fuel, and kilowatt-hours of electric energy that have been saved. We do not justify profits obtained through accidental circumstances, for example, through excessive prices, and we do not regard such profits as a merit of the factory or other enterprise. We regard such profits, rather, as the result of an insufficiently flexible practice of price fixing. All such profits go into the state budget, without any bonus to the enterprise from them.

YEYSEI LIBERMAN, well-known Soviet economist, is a professor at Kharkov State University in the Ukraine. In this article, which we publish by courtesy of *Soviet Life*, the author explains the new system of production with which his name has been associated, which is being put into effect in several hundred Soviet factories this year.

Capitalist profit is a different matter altogether. As the reader knows very well, profits in the West can indicate anything under the sun in addition to purely technical and organizational efficiency. Commercial dexterity, successful advertising, profitable orders for military production—that is what the history of present-day big capital testifies to more than anything else. Surely it must be clear that in essence and origin profit under socialism bears only a superficial resemblance to profit under private enterprise, while by its nature and by the factors to which it testifies it is fundamentally different from capitalist profit.

How Profits Are Used

WHERE DO profits go in the Soviet Union? First of all, neither a single private individual nor a single enterprise can appropriate profits. Profits are not arbitrarily invested by any persons or groups for the sake of private income.

Profits belong to those to whom the means of production belong, that is, to all citizens as a whole, to society. Profits go, first and foremost, for the planned expansion and improvement of production, and to provide free social services for the population: education and science, health, pensions, scholarships. Part is spent on the management apparatus and, unfortunately, a rather large part on defense needs. We would gladly give up the latter expenditures if a program of general disarmament were adopted.

There is nothing new in this use of profits in the Soviet Union. Our enterprises have been obtaining profits in money form for more than 40 years, ever since 1921. It is with these profits that we have built up our giant industrial potential, and moved up to a leading place in world science and technology. We have accomplished this task without any major long-term credits from the other countries of the world.

Why has the question of profits been so widely discussed in the Soviet Union lately? Not because profits did not exist before and are only now being introduced. *The reason is that profit was not, and still is not, used as the main general indicator of efficient operation of our enterprises.* A fairly large number of other obligatory indicators have been applied in our enterprises along with profit. They have included among others, gross output, assortment, reduction of cost, number of employees, size of payroll, output per employee, and average wages. The multiplicity of indicators has, in the past, hamstrung the initiative of the enterprises. Their main concern was often to turn out as large quantities of goods as possible, since they were assessed chiefly according to gross output. Furthermore, the enterprises did not pay much attention to how they used their assets. Striving to fulfill output assignments in the easiest way for themselves, they demanded, and received free of charge from the state, a great

deal of plant capacity, which they did not always put to rational and full use.

How is that to be explained?

The Historical Background

FOR A long time the Soviet Union was the only socialist country. It stood alone, surrounded by a world in which many wanted to change its social system by force. My country had to build up its own industries and guarantee its defense at all costs, and in the shortest possible time. Such considerations as the quality and appearance of goods, and even their cost, did not count.

This policy completely justified itself. The Soviet Union not only held its own in the war of 1941-1945, but played the decisive role in delivering the world from fascism. That was worth any price. And that was our "profit" then.

But, as Lenin often said, our virtues, if exaggerated, can turn into vices. And that is what happened when administrative methods of economic management continued to operate after our country entered the stage of peaceful economic competition with the industrial countries of the West. We want all citizens, and not just well-to-do sections, to have a high standard of living, in the intellectual as well as the material sense. In other words, we want everyone to have the opportunity to develop his mental and physical energies to the full extent of his ability and individual (I emphasize, *individual*, and not *group*) inclinations and interests. We want every person in our country to be able to devote his time and energy to the field of his choice, so that in the final analysis it will not be possible to draw a hard and fast line between a person's vocation and his avocation.

But before we can attain the full flowering of people's intellectual powers we must satisfy their needs for goods and services that are of high quality and at the same time within the reach of all. These needs should be satisfied, moreover, with the lowest possible production outlays and the fullest possible utilization of all assets.

New Methods Proposed

ALL OF THIS cannot be achieved through the old methods of administrative direction and highly centralized management. We must switch over to a system in which the enterprises themselves have a material incentive for providing the best possible service to the consumer. It is clear that to do this we must free our enterprises from the excessive number of obligatory indicators. In my opinion, the work of enterprises should be assessed, *firstly*, by how they carry out their plans of deliveries (in actual products), and, if these plans are fulfilled, then, *secondly*, by their level of profitability.

I also believe that out of their profits enterprises should have to

pay into the state budget a certain percentage of the value of their assets, as "payment for use of plant." The purpose would be to spur enterprises to make the most productive use of their assets. Part of the remaining share of the profits would go into incentive pay system funds, whose amount would depend on the level of profitability. The rest of the profits would accrue to the state budget to finance the expansion of production and to satisfy the social needs of the population free of charge.

Why do I choose profit as the indicator?

Because profit generalizes all aspects of the operation of enterprises, including quality of output, for the prices of better articles have to be correspondingly higher than those of articles that are outmoded and not properly suited to their purpose. It is important to note, however, that profit in this case is neither the sole nor the chief aim of production. We are interested above all in products with which to meet the needs of the people and of industry. Profit is used merely as the main generalizing and stimulating indicator of efficiency, merely as a device for assessing the operation of enterprises.

Yet Western press comments on my writings make much of the term "profit," very often ignoring the fact that the headline of my *Pravda* article of September 9, 1962, was "Plan, Profit and Bonus." They make a lot of noise about profit but say nothing about planning.

Actually, my point is to encourage enterprises, by means of bonuses from profits, to draw up good plans, that is, plans which are advantageous both to themselves and to society. And not only to draw them up but carry them out, which should be properly encouraged by profits. It is not a question of relaxing (or rejecting) planning but, on the contrary, of improving it by drawing the enterprises themselves, first and foremost, into the process of planning. The enterprises always know their real potentialities best, and should study and know the demands of their customers.

The contractual relations with consumers or customers that we are now starting to introduce in a number of branches of light industry, by no means signify that we are going over to regulation by the market. We have better possibilities of predicting consumer demand because we know the wage fund of the urban population and the incomes of the collective farmers. Therefore, we can draw up scientific patterns of the population's income and expenditures. In our country consumer demand, in terms of total volume, is a factor that fully lends itself to planning.

However, the various elements of that volume—for instance, the color of sweaters or styles of suits factories should produce, or how best to organize their production—are not a prerogative of centralized planning. This is rather a matter on which the stores and the factories should come to terms. Thus, the taking into account of con-

sumer demand and the planning of production are not only compatible in the Soviet Union but should firmly substantiate and supplement each other.

The Contradictions of "Time"

THE *Time* cover story is full of contradictions. It admits that the Soviet people now have more money, and that there is a growing demand for better and more fashionable clothing and private cars. One would think that this pointed to an improving economy, yet the article claims that the switch-over to "profits" in the Soviet Union is a result of "unsettling prospects," of "waste, mismanagement, inefficiency, and planning gone berserk," and so on and so forth.

There are, of course, many instances of waste and mismanagement in Soviet economy, just as there probably are under private enterprise. Just think of the thousands of firms that go bankrupt every year! But in the Soviet Union we focus public attention on instances of waste and mismanagement. We openly publish and criticize them—and some Western commentators take advantage of this. The most effective way of distorting an over-all picture is to pick haphazard details out of it and present them as standing for the whole. And our over-all picture is that the Soviet Union increased output as a whole by 7.1 per cent in 1964. *Time* admits this is a very good growth rate for a highly developed economy. It is not good enough for us, however. We are used to higher growth rates. *Time* omits to mention that this growth rate, a relatively modest one for our country, was the result of the 1963 crop failure.

We are turning to profits not because we need a "sheet anchor." We are not in any danger. The fact remains, however, that we have to improve our methods of economic management. This is the substance of our debates and our searches.

The Main Function of Profits

UNDER socialism, profits can be a yardstick of production efficiency to a far greater degree than under capitalism, for in the Soviet Union profits follow, in principle, only from technological and organizational improvement. This also means that profits in the Soviet Union play an important but subsidiary role, not the main role. As money in general does, for that matter. After providing a yardstick of production achievement and serving as a means of encouraging such achievement, profits in the Soviet Union go wholly for the needs of society. Consequently, they are returned to the population in the form of social services and expanded production, which insures full employment and better and lighter working conditions for all.

In the Soviet Union nobody accumulates profits in money form—

neither the state nor the enterprises. This is an important point to grasp. If, for instance, at the end of the year the state as a whole has a surplus of budget revenue over expenditure, the surplus does not lie in the form of accumulated currency but is immediately used in two directions: 1) to increase State Bank credits for material stocks, in other words, the surplus takes the material form of expanding the inventories in production or trade, while money only measures this increase; and 2) to withdraw paper money from circulation, that is, to increase the purchasing power of the ruble on the free collective farm markets where prices are determined by supply and demand.

Consequently, profits cannot become either capital or hoarded treasure in the Soviet Union. They are not, therefore, a social goal or a motive force in production as a whole. The motive force in production under socialism is satisfaction of the steadily growing material and cultural needs of the whole population. Profit can be, and should be, however, an indicator (the key indicator, moreover), of production efficiency. It should serve as an encouragement to the employees of enterprises to improve the efficiency of their work. But it should be understood that such encouragement from profit is not distribution of the results of production on the basis of capital. It is distribution on the basis of work, which is the supreme law of distribution under socialism.

The Law of Value

THE significance of profit in the Soviet Union was formerly underestimated because of a misunderstanding of the law of value. Some Soviet economists incorrectly interpreted this law as an unpleasant leftover from capitalism and said we had to get rid of it as quickly as possible. Neglect of the demands of the law of value led to arbitrary fixing of planned prices; moreover, prices that operated over too long a period. As a result, prices became divorced from the real value of goods, while profits fluctuated greatly from enterprise to enterprise, even on some articles in the same range of goods. Under those conditions profits poorly reflected the actual achievements in production. Because of this, many economists and economic managers began to regard profits as something absolutely independent of production and, hence, as a poor guide in matters of economic management.

This is the delusion many Soviet economists, among them the present author, are now trying to expose. We do not intend to go back to private enterprise but, on the contrary, to restore the rights of the economic laws of socialism. Centralized planning is wholly compatible with the initiative of enterprises in the profitable management of their affairs. This is as far from private enterprise as the latter is from feudalism.

The law of value is not a law peculiar to capitalism but a law of all commodity production, including planned commodity production under socialism. The difference of the law in the two systems is that the goal and the means have changed places. Under capitalism, profit is the goal, and satisfaction of the needs of the population is the means. Under socialism it is just the other way around. Satisfaction of the needs of the population is the goal, and profit is a means. The difference is not one of terms but of substance.

"Time" and the Soviet Economy

SOVIET economists can only smile when they read how *Time* interprets the socialist planning system. It says: "A knitwear factory ordered to produce 80,000 caps and sweaters naturally produced only caps: they were smaller and thus cheaper and quicker to make." In other words, the factory had a freedom of choice. But elsewhere the same article says that factories are tied hand and foot by the plan, and that the plan indicates the place of each nail and electric bulb. Where's the logic?

Another example: "Taxi drivers were put on a bonus system based on mileage and soon the Moscow suburbs were full of empty taxis barreling down the boulevards to fatten their bonuses." But every Moscow schoolboy knows that taxi drivers get their bonus on the basis of the sum they collect from their fares, while empty runs are disadvantageous; in fact, there is a restriction on the mileage of empty runs. Taxis in Moscow and many other cities have radio-telephones for contact with dispatchers, the purpose being to reduce empty runs. Such lack of knowledge on the part of the *Time* staff can hardly make for an objective appraisal of the Soviet economy.

The magazine's statements on more serious matters are just as "refreshing." Experimental garment factories, it says, "showed such a resounding improvement in efficiency—and such 'deviationism'—that many Kremlinologists assumed they had contributed to Nikita's downfall."

In the first place, these factories did not show any "resounding" improvement in efficiency. On the contrary, their output dropped owing to a greater outlay of labor for more painstaking manufacture and finishing of the articles. The only thing they showed was that when given the right to plan their output on the basis of orders from stores, they can make good suits of wool and man-made fiber mixtures at a lower price. Customers readily buy those suits.

In the second place, what kind of "deviationism" is it if the entire "deviation" was in conformity with instructions issued by the Economic Council of the USSR in March 1964—without any direct participation by Professor Liberman? The Western press, without having sufficient grounds for doing so, has taken to citing me on every occasion when measures are taken to improve the Soviet

economy. My modest role, like that of many other of our economists, consists in studying methods of improving economic management on the basis of the principles and economic laws of socialism.

Rivers Don't Flow Backward

SOVIET economists have no intention of testing the economic methods of private enterprise. We hope to get along with our own means, sharpening the tried and tested instrument of material incentive in the profitability of production. This has long been one of our instruments but it has grown dull, chiefly because we made little use of it. Now we are sharpening it, and it will, I hope, serve socialism well.

But all this does not mean either that we are giving up a planned economy or are turning towards the system of private enterprise. Rivers do not flow backward. And if at high water, rivers make turns, they are simply cutting better and shorter channels for themselves. They are not looking for a way to go back.

THE "CATCHER IN THE RYE" ON SOVIET STAGE

J. D. SALINGER'S *The Catcher in the Rye* has been available in a Russian translation for several years and has been widely read and much admired by Soviet readers. Holden Caulfield, the 16-year-old hero of the novel with his youthful hatred of falsehood, dishonesty and all purely practical considerations, has found great sympathy, particularly among young people.

Now the Moscow Satire Theater has put on a dramatized version of the novel and the critic of *Moscow News* has some interesting things to say about the production. Complimenting the adapter on preserving the main landmarks of Holden's "wanderings" and the producer on the way in which the psychological side of the novel is stressed, the critic goes on:

"All attention is concentrated on the hero and I must say, the part of Holden, as played by young Andrei Mironov, is undoubtedly a great success. Throughout the performance the actor almost never leaves the stage. He is the center around which revolve all other characters, most of whom, incidentally, have been provided with too little material to create detailed psychological portraits.

"Mironov succeeds in conveying the complicated world of Holden's emotions, his loneliness and desire to 'open the door' to other people's hearts. His eyes roam questioningly around as if trying to find an answer to his most crucial problem: How shall I live?"

"Holden-Mironov does not feel comfortable among calculating, stupid people who disregard his thoughts about life and his searchings for truth. With his younger sister Phoebe—splendidly played by Natalia Zashchipina—he immediately becomes himself, quiet and confident, acquires faith in life, something he needs badly.

"These scenes between the brother and sister leave the greatest impression and reconcile the audience to the various shortcomings of the production."

THE LABOR PARTY

And the Choice before It

by GORDON SCHAFFER

ONE OF the first acts of Harold Wilson, when he became prime minister of Britain's Labor Government was to promote Fenner Brockway to the House of Lords. Fenner Brockway has been associated throughout his lifetime with the struggle for liberation of the colonial peoples and during the period the Conservatives were in power, he consistently pressed for a new law to make racial discrimination and incitement to racial hatred a punishable offence.

Today, less than seven months after the government took office, Fenner Brockway is leading a campaign against the Government's policies in Vietnam, Malaysia and other areas of the world. And he is doing so as chairman of the Movement for Colonial Freedom of which Mr. Wilson and Mr. Anthony Greenwood, the Colonial secretary, Mrs. Barbara Castle, Minister for Oversea Development, and other members of the Government were public supporters until they took office.

Here you have in a nutshell the paradox and the tragedy of the present situation in Britain. The left wing of the Labor Party, which created the conditions for election victory and which backed Wilson for the leadership of the party against fierce opposition by the right wing, is bitterly disappointed. They still support the Government, because if the Labor Party were to split, it would not lead to a strengthening of the left wing, but to defeat, and the coming to power of another Conservative Government, which, on all the evidence, would be even more reactionary than the last. Their hope is that by pressure from below, the policy will change.

How has it come about that, in so short a time, the Government has gone back on many of its pledges and so sadly disappointed its most active supporters? First, it must be remembered that the Labor Party is a loose coalition of many different sections. There has always been a ceaseless internal struggle and an uneasy external alliance between the left and the right. This has been most acute in reference to question of foreign policy. The most bitter struggle of the postwar years was over German rearmament, and the right wing's narrow

GORDON SCHAFFER is president of the British Peace Committee. Mr. Schaffer was awarded an International Lenin Peace Prize for 1964.

victory on this issue set the pattern for the division of Germany and Europe and the intensification of the cold war.

The creation of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament with its demand for unilateral renunciation by Britain of nuclear arms was the next phase. Gradually the trade unions who dominate the Labor Party and have the majority of votes at the Labor Party conference were persuaded to take up discussion of the CND demands and eventually a majority for them was secured. That was the point where Hugh Gaitskell, the former Labor leader, refused to accept the democratic decision of the Labor Party conference, relying for support on a majority for the right wing among the Labor M.P.s.

When Gaitskell died unexpectedly, the right wing was in disarray. It is the Labor M.P.s. who elect the leader of the party. The right had no candidate able to command the loyalty of the party and Wilson, backed by the left, eventually won. But he did so with all the other leaders, who made up the parliamentary committee or "shadow cabinet," voting against him.

AFTER Wilson became leader, a compromise platform of foreign policy was worked out. It was agreed that a Labor Government would abandon any claim to be a nuclear power, but the second point of the CND program, backed by the national conference, that Britain should cease to be part of any alliances based on nuclear weapons, was dropped. So Labor's election policy, while renouncing national control of nuclear weapons still pledged support to NATO, CENTO and SEATO.

As a way out of this dilemma, the plan for an Atlantic Nuclear force was devised. Wilson, not able to repudiate all policies based on nuclear weapons, was trying to put Britain's nuclear force into America's lap, and at the same time trying to persuade the West Germans to adopt the same position as Britain of a non-nuclear power relying on America. The West Germans were not interested; their aim is to secure some measure of control of nuclear weapons and nuclear policy to back their threats against the German Democratic Republic and their claims to the territories lost as the result of Hitler's war.

The other principles for a European settlement set out in Labor's election program—a nuclear-free zone in Europe and disengagement on the lines of the Rapacki plan—have also been put into cold storage in face of West German hostility. To put it bluntly, the Labor Government, having tied itself to NATO, is powerless to make the breakthrough to peace and disarmament to which it is pledged.

THE Labor Government is thus increasingly in the grip of what we call the "establishment"; that is, the entrenched interests in industry, finance and the diplomatic service and their related groups in the defense services and among the arms manufacturers, who

exert overwhelming influence in every section of national life. It is the equivalent of the "industrial-financial complex" which President Eisenhower denounced in the United States.

This situation was intensified by the vulnerability of the Government in the economic field. During the last months of the Conservative Government, the adverse balance of trade mounted. Sterling was under heavy pressure. The question of devaluing the pound had to be faced immediately Mr. Wilson took office. There is a wealth of evidence that the bankers pressed for a policy of deflation as an alternative to devaluation; that is, they wanted cuts in social services and state expenditure on capital equipment like schools and hospitals and concerted efforts to reduce wages.

Wilson resisted, saying that he had been elected on a policy of economic expansion and he intended to stand by it. Because devaluation of sterling would have hit the dollar and the other "hard" currencies as well, the international banks came to the rescue of sterling and, coupled with some very heavy additional taxation, the situation is easier. But Britain is still vulnerable.

THERE are some more hopeful features in the situation. The Government has banned arms supplies to race-hating South Africa. It has refused to be intimidated by the white racialists of Southern Rhodesia. It has halted the monstrous expenditure on the TSR2 aircraft and, so far, has resisted the pressure to buy alternative war planes from the United States. It is trying to forge some links with the USSR and the other socialist countries.

It has also gone forward with measures to improve the very low standards of old age pensioners, abolished the charge for medicines under the national health service and taken steps to improve standards in the schools. It is also standing firm on its pledge to take the steel industry under state control. Fenner Brockway's bill making racial discrimination illegal in certain aspects of public life and providing punishments for incitement to racial hatred is being put before Parliament with government support.

So you have the situation that on these domestic issues, the Government commands the united support of Labor M.P.s. and the rank and file in the country against the most bitter Conservative opposition. When it comes to most foreign affairs questions, the critics are all on the Labor benches of the House of Commons, while Conservatives rush in to offer their wholehearted support to the Government.

THIS position cannot continue. No one doubts that within the Government itself there is fierce discussion. In the country, opposition to British backing for U.S. policies in Vietnam is mounting. The Easter peace march, which looked at the beginning of the year as if it would be only a shadow of those of previous years, was the biggest

ever. More trade union, Labor and Cooperative contingents took part and the slogans were particularly directed towards Vietnam.

The Cooperative Party conference, which had four members of the Government as guest speakers, accepted unanimously a resolution condemning the American attacks on North Vietnam, demanding a government in Vietnam based on the choice of its people and insisting that the South Vietnam Liberation Front should participate in negotiations for a peace settlement. This resolution was sponsored by the party leaders, who are very close to the Labor Party leadership.

The Union of Retail Trade Workers by an overwhelming majority, and against the advice of the union leadership, demanded evacuation of all foreign troops from Vietnam. Both the conferences evoked any multilateral force giving Germany control of nuclear weapons. These demands will be repeated at trade union conferences during the summer.

Moreover, the steady escalation of the war by the USA is bringing into being a movement of protest stretching beyond the Labor movement. The *Evening Standard* published a report following an interview given to its correspondent by high officials of the Pentagon saying that the U.S. would not hesitate to press the button for the use of nuclear weapons. This has not been denied. The only qualification from Washington has been the statement that there is no question of the use of nuclear weapons at this stage. But this completely sweeps away the facade that nuclear bombs are only regarded as a "deterrent," not in any circumstances to be used except to counter a nuclear threat. Nothing is more calculated to expose the Americans more completely or to isolate them more clearly from world opinion.

Thus there can be no doubt that the British Government will be under increasing pressure to come out openly, as France has done, in condemnation of the U.S. position. Equally the pressure for cuts in defense expenditure as the essential condition for economic survival and for the carrying out of Labor's pledges of social advance will grow. It is too early to predict the outcome.

If Wilson has the courage, he can override the right wing on these issues, because they are utterly isolated from the overwhelming feelings of the rank and file. If he has the courage, he could face any financial pressures from Washington or Bonn, at least with the knowledge that the great mass of the British people would back him and that friends could be found elsewhere in the world.

If he does not have the courage, if he goes on supinely backing the American Government, at a time when in the U.S. itself the movement of protest embraces a larger section of opinion than ever before, he will destroy all the hopes which Labor's victory has aroused and pave the way for defeat. The realization that these are the stark alternatives is clear to many members of Mr. Wilson's Government as well as to the majority of his supporters in the country.

SOVIET YOUTH LOOKS TO THE FUTURE

by DEANA LEVIN

AT WHAT age does one begin to be a "young person," and when does one no longer belong to that category? I think that there are many "young people" still at school in the Soviet Union, just as there are here, and there are also a great many, between the age of sixteen and, say, twenty-two or twenty-three, who are at work, and I met a great number of both, in groups and individually. I must say that I feel very hopeful for the future of the Soviet Union as a result, because the vast majority of them are fine people.

I was invited by two young people to an evening for young Communists of the October district in the large hall in the Central Pioneer Palace in Moscow. The hall seats over a thousand, and it was quite full of young people from sixteen to the early twenties. They had come to take part in a program called a "living newspaper," followed by a concert. This "newspaper" had nothing to do with politics. First item, an account of a visit to East Germany by a young man from the Moscow Radio. Then an archaeologist told about a dig he had taken part in. He was deluged with written questions. Then a trio from a drama school told how they put on a Brecht play; they also were plied with questions from all over the hall. The interest was intense.

In the interval a jazz orchestra played in the foyer. It was obvious that this evening was what the young people wanted.

I went to a play at the Theater of the Lenin Komsomol, a theater for young people. I felt like Methuselah's wife, as all the packed audience except me seemed to be under twenty-two. It was a problem play about family relationships and judging by the discussion going on in the interval, was of controversial interest to all.

During my stay in the Soviet Union, I traveled widely. In Kaunas, in the Republic of Lithuania, I met many young people from the top forms of schools. Not only did they have some interest outside school to which they seemed passionately attached, but they all did some kind of "social" work. They ran clubs in their schools for younger children, they were Pioneer leaders, they spent their summer holidays

DEANA LEVIN is a British specialist on Soviet education. Her book *Soviet Education* was published in this country by Monthly Review Press. She has recently been traveling in the Soviet Union gathering material on the facilities available for the leisure activity of Soviet children.

helping to run camps for Young Pioneers, or at agricultural camps where they helped with the harvest. They were happy youngsters, too, not too serious, obviously enjoying life.

In the bookshop near my house in Moscow all but one of the salespeople are under twenty. I often went into this shop, which sells stationery as well as every kind of book, and I got to know several of the girls there. They were either working out their two years before going to some higher educational institution or attending an evening trading school, as they intend to make trading their career. I found them all very knowledgeable about books. Two of them knew a lot about art and art reproduction; I bought a number of books from them. Like the hundreds of young people serving in shops, they brought a certain standard to their work, they have finished ten or eleven years at school, that is, they are well educated, and I think that this has made a great difference in the way they treat the customer. They stand out, in contrast to those who left school earlier, after the seventh or eighth year.

The young waitresses in the Moskva Hotel, the young women on the underground platforms, the young brigades of conductors on long distance trains, all take their work seriously and do it well. The young waiter at my table in a hotel in Riga was studying in the evenings to be a lawyer, the young girl of eighteen who sold me a dress in a shop in Gorky street was waiting to go to the Institute of Foreign Languages and was meanwhile attending evening classes in English; her friend in the same shop went every other day to the trading institute as she wanted to be the manager of a large store. At the shop she works double shifts on alternate days. These, I maintain, are typical of young workers today, and the vast majority of them over sixteen are attending "schools for working youth," and have lessons three times a week for four or five hours at a time.

One can have interesting discussions on art, literature, the twist, politics, anything, with young people. They do not mind saying what they think and they *do* think. They like fashion, they choose their clothes with care, and have definite ideas on hair styles. And they *can* choose these days. They have not known, and I hope they will never know the hunger and suffering that their parents went through. It has been natural up to now for them to have looked to the West for fashions and material things, because they did not have these things themselves. Now that the Soviet Union is catching up, the young people there will very likely be setting the trends for the West!

Of course there are young people who are cynical, some who drink too much, some who are delinquents; the headquarters of the Komsomol (Young Communist) organization of the U.S.S.R. is well aware of the great need to provide for leisure time and to provide what young people want. What do they want?

In the Baltic republics thousands of them belong to song and

dance ensembles which take part in the festivals every year; in other places there are youth theaters on a semi-professional basis; millions of young people go in for skiing, skating, athletics, football, tennis; some take up mountaineering, skin-diving and other types of adventurous sports.

Youth cafés are springing up everywhere; I visited them in Baku, in Tbilisi, in Sumgayit (Azerbaidzhan), and there are holidays available in special camps in many beauty spots where swimming and sunbathing can be combined with discussions on all of life's problems.

My feeling is that young people in the Soviet Union are getting all these things because they themselves are organizing them. They are not waiting for older people to do it for them. They are doing these things for themselves, but they also do a lot for others at the same time. As I said at the beginning, I feel very optimistic about Soviet young people.

Courtesy, British-Soviet Friendship

USSR WOMEN APPEAL TO WOMEN OF USA

AN extraordinary session of the Presidium of the Soviet Women's Committee was recently held in Moscow to take action on the crisis in Southeast Asia.

Protesting what were called the "continuous U.S. aggressive actions in Vietnam," the Soviet women expressed their unity with and support of the Vietnamese "in their just struggle for freedom and independence." Concrete measures were taken to provide moral and material assistance to Vietnamese women and children.

They adopted unanimously an appeal to the women—wives and mothers—of the USA in which they said in part:

Soviet women, like the entire nation, are greatly alarmed at the dangerous course of developments in Indochina. The tragedy of the Vietnamese people causes great pain in our hearts. Millions of Soviet women are deeply perturbed. . . .

Thousands of women have been left widows. Tens of thousands of children have been left orphans. Soviet women are indignant to hear that gases, phosphorous bombs and napalm are being used against the Vietnamese people.

We know that you American women are also affected by the brutal war. . . . American soldiers; your husbands, children and sons, who have been sent thousands of miles from home to fight the Vietnamese, are being killed in this mad adventure.

We call upon you, the women of the USA, persistently to seek from your government

- an end to the wanton U.S. air raids and the use of chemical weapons
- an end to the war in Vietnam, to bring about the withdrawal of U.S. troops and equipment from that country
- an honoring of the Geneva agreements on Indochina

We hope that our Appeal will find response in the hearts of American women.

WEST GERMANY THREATENS THE PEACE

by HOLLAND ROBERTS

1965 may be the Year of Decision and not only in Southeast Asia. Twelve divisions of well-drilled German troops under the direction of Hitler's generals are poised today on or near the borders of Czechoslovakia and the German Democratic Republic. In less than two hours travel time these motorized, winged, trained killers could be destroying and murdering the peaceful residents of the villages, cities and countryside of their neighbors as their precursors did in France, Poland, Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union when they secretly launched World War II. In our absorption in the struggles to stop the dangerous swiftly spiraling attack on Vietnam and in our efforts to restore independence and peace to the war-mangled people of the Congo and Cyprus it is vital also to remember that the half-million armed Bundeswehr are there in West Germany every waking and sleeping hour, and that they are unreconstructed, calculating enemies of peace.

Every one of our 122 delegates from 52 nations had the danger of the Bundeswehr engraved deeply in his consciousness at the recent March Conference of the World Peace Council in Berlin. Our friends in the German Democratic Republic Peace Council know how hard it is for peace workers from far away to grasp the fact that the half-million Bundeswehr is an Army of 266,000 men, a modern Air Force of 9,400, a Navy of 28,800, a Territorial Defense group of 31,800 backed up by 170,000 skilled civilian workers and more than 600,000 trained reserves. They pointed out that in the Bundeswehr today every third service man is an N.C.O. and every fifteenth an officer ready to transform the reserve into battle-ready new units for a sudden attack. By the year's end this trained reserve will swell to 700,000 and by 1970 to a powerful army of 1,800,000. This murderous force is supported and strengthened by another half million armed police, border patrol, civilian defense and auxiliary units attached to foreign armies on the Rhine. The total active force today is close to a million—plus the reserves.

PROF. HOLLAND ROBERTS has just returned from his third recent visit to the German Democratic Republic. He was formerly on the faculty at Columbia, New York, Stanford and other universities and is now President of the American Russian Institute, San Francisco, and a member of the World Peace Council.

We stood at the Wall and looked across to the West as I had done three years before, after the Moscow Peace Congress. In that brief time Bundeswehr ground forces had become the chief NATO army in Central Europe, the refurbished Luftwaffe had become NATO's leading air power, and West Germany the only nation whose navy is under the direction of NATO in peacetime, entrusted with organizing and leading the Joint Naval Baltic Command of Danish, Norwegian, (and in war time) British and American fleets. France, of course, refused to be a party to such a dangerous scheme and withdrew French Naval officers in April, 1964. Today there are 1,500 West German officers and 30 generals in NATO. Hitler's General Speidel, who was in command of NATO Forces in Central Europe, has been replaced by Hitler's General Kielmannsegg. West German forces are strategically placed today in the leading West European countries. Portugal and Holland provide air bases, Turkey and Greece arrange air space for paratrooper practice, Belgium offers military storage depots and Britain and France have training grounds for the Bundeswehr's use.

Historians who study this strange spectacle of the German revanchists taking over through diplomacy and blackmail strategic areas whose liberation cost the lives of millions of allied soldiers will ask with some of us, "Who won the war?"

More sharply pointed to the living and to our hope for future generations is the question: What can we do to stop the West German drive to European and world domination through World War III?

AT POTSDAM, at the close of World War II, our country joined with the great powers who had destroyed Hitler to prevent what we are now doing. We pledged our word to see that "German militarism and nazism will be extirpated and the Allies will take, in joint agreement, *now and in the future*, the other measures necessary to assure that Germany will never again threaten her neighbors and the peace of the world." (Italics added. H. R.)

As those of us who have studied the situation by on-the-spot observation know, all the basic features of the Potsdam Agreement have been carried out in the German Democratic Republic, by the USSR and the other socialist countries of Eastern Europe, and it is, all the informed world knows, a scrap of paper flagrantly flouted by the United States and Western Europe. The violation of the Potsdam Agreement by the West from the day it was concluded, was the first major sign of the new drive for war. The eruption of many such signs today should alert every man, woman and thinking child who loves peace and life.

On November 3, 1964 the West German Civil Commissioner for the Armed Forces, ex-Admiral Hellmuth Heye, was forced to tender his resignation. In late October he had called for the reduction by one half of the Bundeswehr's 500,000 forces. On June 21st, 1964, he

had written in the West German magazine, *Quick*: "There is an unmistakable trend for the Bundeswehr to become a state in the state, a law to itself. Our army is equipped with the weapons of tomorrow, but trained in the spirit of yesterday; it is taking a dangerous path."

There was no American protest at his firing in the American press. What shall we say when the warning of an Admiral appointed by Hitler against the remilitarization of West Germany is passed over in silence by our American defenders of freedom in the Fourth Estate and the guardians of liberty in our establishment?

Along with this action we have the Atom Mines Plan produced by Hitlerite General Trettner, Inspector General of the West German Bundeswehr, a plan to lay a belt of atomic mines along the West German border fronting on Czechoslovakia and the German Democratic Republic. In commenting on this proposal presented in Washington last November by West German Minister von Hassel, the *London Times* of December 17, 1964 noted that if atomic mines were exploded on German soil the prevailing wind would spread radioactive fallout like a shroud over Western Europe.

Physicist Prof. Max Born, in his protest, pointed out that this nuclear threat is not an isolated lunatic proposal but part of a carefully woven pattern:

The atomic mines are merely the culmination of a regrettable trend of development which began with the rearmament of the Federal Republic. There is barrack drill and bullying of recruits again in the Bundeswehr; former Nazi generals again occupy leading posts. Emergency legislation which aims at removing all possibility of controlling the government is again coming into force. All housewives are to store iron rations. All these measures are extremely expensive and have no meaning unless war is expected. (Italics added. H. R.)

War is expected in Bonn and in NATO where it is being planned.

The one-day April 7, 1965 meeting of 400 West German Deputies to Parliament in West Berlin's Congress Hall, a short half mile from East Berlin, signalled a new stage in the Cold War. It was their first plenary session in seven years—a denial of the right of the German Democratic Republic to exist and a provocation answered by the low-flying Soviet jets crisscrossing the sky over the sessions, by temporary shut down on the autobahn and the rails and restrictions in the air. The U.S. State Department called in Soviet Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin to deliver its protest against these warning actions "in the strongest terms." West Germany was serving notice to the world, with American backing, that it intends to make Berlin the capital of a united Germany under its control as a step in their drive to the East and their third bid for the world.

How far their megalomania is carrying them they made clear on February 21 in Kampala, Uganda, where both West Germany and the German Democratic Republic were represented at an Inter-

national Trade Fair. The West German representative demanded that the GDR representatives take down their flag and when they refused he closed his exhibit. The West German Weekly *Stern* commented:

This is the first time in history that a state has proclaimed: "If I decide not to recognize a state, then you may not do so either." Even mighty America does not do this. But the Federal Germans lay down such regulations, for the whole world, without realizing that they are thus expecting the world to take orders from Bonn.

THE LOGIC of *Deutschland Uber Alles* refuses to bow to any reason except its own deep assumptions built on the concept of the master race. It has formulated its position in the Hallstein Doctrine developed by the State Secretary of Foreign Affairs under Adenauer's government, Dr. Walter Hallstein: "West Germany will break off relations with any state which recognizes the German Democratic Republic." Naturally they have made an exception for the USSR and now since Nasser's welcome to Walter Ulbricht, there will be others if West Germany is not to lose the profitable trade built up with the socialist nations and many others moving swiftly toward socialism. The Hallstein Doctrine is defeating itself.

There was the same miscalculation based upon illusions of grandeur in the recent West German effort to protect the war criminals by establishing a statute of limitations. More and more murderers of the millions who died in Hitler's murder factories are being uncovered within the Bonn state apparatus. Worldwide protest prevented the State Department from playing partners in this plot to safeguard the dependable Nazis on whom they have learned to count in their plans to unleash new wars. Bonn was for the time being forced to give up its plan to safeguard its hidden Nazi war criminals and bring them out of their hideaways.

Siemens, Flick, Klöckner and the dozen other war-hungry monopolies that have their representatives at the controls of the West German State are now concentrating on placing atomic weapons in the hands of the Bundeswehr. They have every reason to believe the United States will provide them under the cover of NATO and the MLF (Multi-Lateral Force). To get them they will readily sign any agreement that gives the United States or other nations the veto power over the use of nuclear weapons. To them it is only "a scrap of paper." Who can stop the Nazis and revanchists once they have their fingers on the button?

On May 29, 1963 Federal Defense Minister von Hassel agreed that in the beginning:

... the American President should have the right of veto. But as soon as it becomes clear that the multilateral force has actually become a military instrument, it will become possible to abolish the American partner's right of veto and to apply the principle of majority vote in deciding the question of the political and military use of the force.

"Majority vote" to Hitlerites means whatever they want it to mean—once they hold the thunderbolts of A and H bombs in their hands and again feel the exhilaration of supermen striding among the lesser breeds of mankind. For most Americans and for normal people throughout the world it is almost impossible to grasp what British Foreign Secretary, Sir Edward Grey, called the "Germany of War Maniacs."

Maximilian Scheer, well known member of the World Peace Council, has offered us this first-hand insight in his *The Generals Game of Death*:

They have sat down with their Ministers and said:

"Eichmann was made responsible for Auschwitz. It took him years to murder about six million people. What a fumbler! We can do it in a few seconds. And more than that. Our deceased Fuehrer needed nearly six years to produce 50 million war dead. We can do better than that easily. We can send 50 millions to death in a matter of seconds with our atom mines."

"Either a Greater Germany or a desert in Central Europe!" Said the generals of the Bundeswehr to their Ministers in Bonn. And none of the Ministers sent for a doctor. Oh, no! They nodded and clapped their hands.

What is to be done?

All those people and nations who want to live must put these madmen in straitjackets and oppose the crazy people in Bonn with a sensible policy.

It is quite clear that these madmen are a danger to the entire peaceable world

Probably one of the mass murderers is to command the mine belt. That sounds fantastic. But it is frighteningly possible.

Why is Bonn moving so urgently now? What is it that heightens the danger of a West German attack with every passing day?

First, Bonn's frustration by the swift growth of the socialist lands. Second, recognition that only a major war can stop the worldwide movement to socialism in the uncommitted countries of the world and even within the capitalist countries.

Today those monopolists in West Germany and the U.S. who feel the sand slipping out from under their feet are urging those who are in more secure positions to face the danger to their profits and power and strike now—or perhaps never. They see that even such limited coexistence as we have today endangers their profits and is bringing a steady decline in their power. So far their war fever has been held in check by the peace forces and sober minded realists among the business leaders who are not ready to gamble "all or nothing," but Cuba and Vietnam show that the war maniacs are daily pushing closer to the control of decision-making power.

THE SUCCESS of the German Democratic Republic maddens the revanchists and all who like Churchill want to strangle socialism. They know that the GDR is today the sixth industrial power in Europe and now has the highest per capita production of all the

socialist countries. They see the steady rise in the standard of living and the increasing stream of young German workers returning or coming over for the first time from West Germany to escape the high spiraling rents, enjoy the free education and full free health service, cheaper food, public services and security of the German Democratic Republic. The Wall has worked. Nearly 60,000 people have moved over from West Germany since the closing of the frontier in Berlin, August 13, 1961. Interviews with 125 of those who have crossed over at the reception centers at Blankenfelde and Saasa revealed that they chose the GDR because they expected to find better prospects for advancement through education and at work. The "Golden West" had turned to tinsel, so they were taking advantage of the decree passed by the GDR State Council in the summer of 1964 restoring the citizenship of those who had left if they were not involved in crime. The exodus Westward has practically stopped.

Now 20 years after the war the celebration of the 15th anniversary of the German Democratic Republic provides an opportunity for the world to study what socialism can do in an advanced industrial economy. Although it is just beginning to emerge from the terrible social catastrophe of Nazi rule and the ruin of the war, a walk down Karl Marx Allee to Lenin Allee opens up some of the new architectural beauty that is planned for the future—the Berliner Hotel, the Moscow Restaurant and the Congress Hall among others. The lovely modern new stores are full of a wide variety of goods and shoppers. Back of this swift rise since my last visit in 1962 lies not only the industry, skill and discipline of the German people but the support and cooperation of the socialist countries around them. The chemical and oil industries supplied by the new pipe line from the Soviet Union are flourishing. A second Soviet pipe line will soon be built to send production and power into a new upward spiral. Of course the swift rise in socialist industry, education and culture in the GDR could not take place if it were not for the defense aid provided by the USSR. Yet of the 1965 GDR budget of 60.9 thousand million marks, only 4.6 per cent are allocated for National Defense. In West Germany 35 per cent of the 63.9 thousand million marks budget goes for armaments.

The war hawks in the U.S., Bonn and elsewhere, have clear-cut plans for a lightning attack to destroy the socialist countries by a war on two fronts—with West Germany the spearhead in Europe and the U.S. in Asia. We forget or ignore this at our peril. The great war on the drafting boards of the war gamblers coolly counts on the immobilization or absorption of the Soviet forces by Bonn's Bundeswehr while the attack is mounted in Asia. As usual they are miscalculating. It was the miscalculation of these same Nazi generals and their industrial and banking partners that cost 50 million people their lives in World War II. So long as West Germany carries

weapons to murder her neighbors, sudden death through World War III threatens us all. There are guns at our heads day and night. The scrap iron we shipped to Japan in 1939 came back to us at Pearl Harbor. Will atomic arms for the Bundeswehr return to New York?

WHAT CAN we do to stop the war in Vietnam from spiraling into World War III? Key steps in the West are a German Peace Treaty now 20 years overdue, full recognition of the two German states and their later peaceful reunification. Walter Ulbricht, chairman of the German Democratic Republic State Council put it compactly:

The price of reunification is disarmament, renunciation of revanchism, establishment of a democratic order in West Germany in which no one would be expected to live with atom bombs and murderers. The price is restoration of normal relations between the two German states and peoples. This price corresponds exactly to the terms of the Potsdam Agreement on abolishing Nazism and militarism.

World peace, prosperity and the security and happiness of the people depends upon carrying out the pledge we made at Potsdam to extirpate Nazism and German military rule over the German people. In the meantime it is essential to develop a mass world movement for peaceful cooperative, competitive coexistence, national liberation and equality of nations and peoples.

THE ALLIED VICTORY: 20th ANNIVERSARY

A MEETING in Town Hall, New York was held on May 11 to celebrate the 20th Anniversary of the Allied victory over Nazi military forces in World War II. The occasion, under auspices of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, was dedicated "to joint action by the peoples of the USA and the USSR to bring an end to all war *beginning now in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.*"

The two speakers on the program were veterans of the Second World War. The Soviet spokesman was the Hon. Alexei Stepunin, First Secretary for Cultural Affairs of the Embassy of the USSR. The United States' veteran was Carl Marzani, president of Marzani & Munsell, publishers, and the author of "We Can Be Friends," supporting the conclusion that it is necessary, desirable and possible for the Soviet Union and the United States to be friends. This conclusion was also the heart of his speech.

Mr. Stepunin likewise expressed the hope that the "friendship built up and tempered during wartime between the Americans and the Soviets, a friendship which brought us to common victory over Nazism, should be preserved and remain forever. We must join our efforts, put forward all our strength and ability, and demand an end to all kinds of hostilities. We should declare that there will be no other world war."

The audience unanimously supported a telegraphic resolution to President Johnson which concluded: "... This deadly escalation moves us inexorably into ever-widening war. It divides us from our wartime allies and threatens to open a deep chasm not only between us and the Soviet Union but the entire socialist world. Renewed American-Soviet cooperation can prevent a new world conflagration. We join in the plea that this needless killing stop. Take the initiative for peace negotiations while time remains."

GUITAR COMBOS *and the Question of Culture*

by HEINZ STERN

A DANCE is due to start in the youth club at 7 p.m.; well before 6 p.m. groups of young people have begun to collect outside, the girls with their high-heeled shoes in shopping bags. The crush is not simply an expression of the popularity of dancing; it is largely due to the fact that this evening "The Butlers" will be playing.

The Butlers are one of over 20 guitar dance combos which sprang up in the Leipzig district at the height of the "Beatle Wave."

As soon as the music starts the dance floor resembles a sea; the rhythmic music from the amplifiers drives the waves. I sat and watched the whole evening; what I learned at dancing lessons 25 years ago no longer suffices. This is a different generation dancing here, with different rhythms. But everything is very decent. Dance is today merging with gymnastics. The young people enjoy the movement, the rhythm, the life. The atmosphere is clean and decent—much more decent than it was in some Leipzig bars during the Trade Fair a few weeks ago.

At 11:30 p.m. the group ends its performance with a really gripping number: "Butler's Boogie."

The members of the group began making music because they liked to, four, five, or six years ago. One year ago they came together in their present composition. Their first "stage" was provided by the streets of Berlin, during the Whitsun Peace Rally of 1964. They made themselves heard here—and not simply because their music was loud. They were invited to take part in a radio program, and in the meantime their first gramophone record is in preparation.

"Did you model yourselves on the Liverpool boys?" I asked Klaus Jentzsch, 22, the chief of the group, who plays the bass guitar. "It started like that," he said. "We got together as a guitar group and the Beatles were the obvious model. But our Beatle period did not last long. We soon cut our hair again, and we have tried to develop our own musical style. We don't exclude Big Beat, but we are turning more to Blues and Old Time jazz. Two guitars improvising simultaneously—that's Dixieland."

Like the Beatles, the Butlers write their own music and lyrics. Hans Joachim Richter, 25, described the method: "One of us brings a tune that he has written at home. Then we improvise together, vary the melody and the accompaniment, try out various rhythms, until

we have the feeling that it's right." The four young men take an enormous amount of trouble. They rehearse almost daily, sometimes until two in the morning.

I asked them how the group had got its odd name. "We mean it in the original sense of the English word 'Butler'; we want to serve our public," they say. And their public is highly satisfied. Wherever the Butlers appear the halls are crowded to the doors.

The members of the group have patiently answered my questions; now they want to ask some. "How do you like our music?" they ask. I tell them it is good, but a little loud. They nod in agreement and explain: "We have tried playing softer, but then the boys and girls start asking: 'What's the matter? Are you sick?'"

The technical equipment for a modern dance group is very important. When the Butlers have given a show, they draw 5 marks each for a beer and a snack; the rest of the fee goes to pay off their equipment. Together they have invested up to 20,000 marks in special guitar amplifiers and so on. They love their music and their instruments, and they can't afford to squander their money on drink. They had to part with their former first guitar, although he was a fine musician, because of his affinity for girls and alcohol.

THE relations between the Butlers and the young people of Leipzig could not be better. But what about relations with official circles? Holger Retny, deputy chief of the Cultural Department of the Leipzig City Council, has had quite a lot to do with the Butlers; there was, for instance, a lot of argument before they were given proper recognition as an amateur dance group, since to get this recognition all the members had to show they were in regular work. But this has now been satisfactorily settled. Two of them work in a brewery; the leader of the group Klaus Jentsch, is salesman in a musical instrument shop; and Hans-Joachim Richter has been studying mathematics for five years at the Karl Marx University. He has been getting good marks, and when he completes his studies very soon he will start work as a mathematician in the Leipzig Telecommunications Equipment Factory.

Now that the legal hurdles have been overcome, states Herr Retny, the Cultural Department of the Leipzig Council will give the group its full support. The support will include further musical training for group members. The Butlers are also supported by the Leipzig district organization of the Free German Youth; the Leipzig city youth organization is more hesitant. "They have not found the courage to put on a big show with the Butlers in Leipzig," said Christian Berger, a member of the district leadership.

Does it really demand courage to do this? Well, some people in Leipzig recall that a local government official in the Eilenberg district recently refused to allow a similar guitar group to appear in

public. "Because their music is not in accordance with the principles of socialist cultural policy" was the explanation. And no discussion tolerated.

IT WOULD be possible to laugh about the odd interpretation of the principles of socialist cultural policy in Eilenberg if it were not for the feeling that such "objection in principle" to modern dance music is likely to cause confusion about the youth policy of the Socialist Unity Party.

For my part I believe it is impossible to divide dance music up into "imperialist" and "socialist" music; the only permissible distinction is between the waltz, the tango, Big Beat, and so on.

Music of the sort which the Butlers play accompanied the freedom marchers of Alabama from Selma to Montgomery; in the Leipzig district the people who dance to the music of the Butlers (and the Butlers are members of the Free German Youth organization) are workers in socialist labor teams, and members of the People's Army; after an evening of dancing to the Butlers they do their work next day just as well, or better.

This article first appeared in *Neues Deutschland*, organ of the Socialist Unity Party of the GDR. We reprint here the English translation that appeared in the *Democratic German Report*.

MOISEYEV DANCERS ROCKET IN

WHO DOES THE most spectacular leaps, hurdles, spinning turns, bounces and countless other extraordinary physical feats in the course of a single dance program? The Moiseyev Dancers, of course, and it's a pleasure to report that they rocketed into the Metropolitan Opera House last night (May 18) with all arms and legs and colors flying in fine style.

ALLEN HUGHES, *N. Y. Times*

Standing in the lobby of the Metropolitan Opera House last night, as a capacity crowd was pouring in to cheer the return of the Moiseyev Dance Company to New York, impresario Sol Hurok was asked whether there were any diplomats in the audience.

"Certainly, they're all here," replied Mr. Hurok with dignity. "But you know something—I think I'm the best diplomat in the house tonight."

HERBERT KUPFERBERG, *N. Y. Herald-Tribune*

Everyone who can should run to see these exuberant earth creatures who defeat gravity and are incredible enough to have been picked right from space by Leonov when he stepped out there recently.

HARRIET JOHNSON, *N. Y. Post*

MICHELANGELO OF THE KEYBOARD

BY SHEER GENIUS and concentration Richter brought us into a world of starlit grandeur where all was passion and poetry. With this last concert Richter leaves us dazzled by the memory of a gigantic technique and a depth and beauty second to none. The piano, as far as I am concerned, can go no further.

Sviatislav Richter is the Michelangelo of the keyboard.

LOUIS BIANCOLLI, *N. Y. World-Telegram*, May 19

A COMRADELY COURT IN IRKUTSK

by JESSICA SMITH

WE HAD been hunting for a Comradely Court everywhere. This is one of the Soviet institutions that have grown up in the developing process of turning over certain functions of government to the people. Sitings of such courts were held in factories, apartment houses and other institutions and not usually publicized in the press. It meant a lot of telephoning around to find one in session, but our friend Tatiana Ogorodnikova finally arranged for us to visit one in Irkutsk.

The sitting was held in a small room on the ground floor of one of the buildings in a big apartment project. There were only twenty or so people present, mostly babushkas with shawls on their heads and a few elderly men.

At the front of the room was a table where Klavdia Adamovna Stolyarova, the judge, presided, a man and woman on each side of her. The judge was a buxom middle-aged blonde, a brisk, energetic type, a lawyer by profession, and very glib with her somewhat formal legal language. She asked us to be seated in the front row, at the side.

First she disposed in a businesslike but understanding and kind way of several cases of tenants behind in their rent payments, in some cases for several months. Each one gave explanations of illness, husband being away, money expected not having been received, or whatever. There was no threat of eviction or anything of the sort; it was only a question of establishing whether they really did not have the money to pay, of granting an extension, and receiving a promise to pay up by a certain date.

THEN CAME the main case of the day. A good looking young woman in a light well-tailored coat and a slim young man who has brought charges against her sit together on the front bench. She holds her head rather high and haughtily, tossing it a little like a horse, uneasy in its bridle, looking off into the distance with an injured air. The complainant, dressed like a worker, rather nondescript looking, sits bent forward a little, twirling his cap, a sullen expression on his face. The judge asks the woman to stand, which she does, and to give her name, address and place of work.

Defendant: "My name is Polgurova, Nina Sergeevna." This is not

the exact name she gave, but close enough. "I work at the Regional Trade Union Committee."

"In what capacity?"

"Why do you have to know?"

"I don't insist on it, but it is important for us to know."

"It seems to me that it is none of your business." This she said with an arrogant toss of her head and a murmur of disapproval could be heard in the room.

The judge asked her to sit down, and proceeded to read the rather long complaint of the man, a garbage truck driver. It said that on August 1 this woman was bringing out her garbage to his truck, and while throwing it into the chute provided for the purpose let some of it fall to the ground. The driver asked the woman to pick it up, and she had refused in a very rude way and cursed and insulted him. The judge then asked the garbage truck driver to stand, to give his name, job and address, and to tell his side of the story. Let us say his name is Ivan Ivanovich Sergeevich.

Sergeevich: "I drive a garbage truck. When this woman, Polgurova, dumped her garbage into the truck some of it fell to the ground. I asked her to pick it up and she refused and went away. Now when I collect garbage I can't stop and pick up what people drop. People are supposed to pick it up themselves. That's not my job, I have a schedule and I couldn't keep it if I had to stop and pick up garbage when people drop it. So after she refused to pick it up, and it was lying there on the ground, and I knew I might be blamed for this, I asked people where she lived and I went up to her apartment and knocked on the door. When she opened the door, she cursed and insulted me and then slammed it in my face."

Judge: "You were insulted?"

Sergeevich: "Yes, she insulted me personally."

Judge, to the woman: "Please stand up. Have you anything to say to this?"

Polgurova, tossing her head, looking out through the window, flushing:

"I was in a great hurry. When I threw the contents of my pail into the truck, it's possible I might have let something fall. But it wasn't garbage. It was just a scrap of paper. The truck driver said rudely that I must pick it up. He addressed me informally, he said 'thou' and not 'you.' He was standing there with a shovel. He could very easily have picked it up himself. So I just went back to my apartment, that's all. Well, when he came, maybe I did slam the door in his face. All I said was, if you don't want to carry garbage maybe you should haul water, I didn't insult him."

Judge: "But he says you insulted him. You don't admit it?" "NO!"

"But if you didn't insult him, why was it that the driver asked where you lived? Why should he have wanted to come after you?"

Polgurova: (repeats what she said above) "Why should I pick up the scraps of paper with my hands when he had a shovel? Anyway, he didn't speak to me nicely. He said 'Hey, thou, pick it up.' If he's got his principles, I've got mine too."

Judge: "Do you believe that you behaved in a correct way?"

Polgurova, reluctantly: "Well . . . maybe I didn't behave properly."

Judge: "Will you apologize to him, ask his forgiveness?"

Polgurova: "It seems to me that if both were wrong, then both should apologize. If I should apologize to him, he also should apologize for the way he spoke to me. What about him? What has he got to say?"

She turns toward him. But he remains silent. "What if I had called on the Comradely Court instead of him? Everything would have been the other way round. I don't deny that maybe I didn't behave correctly. But he didn't behave correctly either. If he had spoken to me in a different way I would have picked up the paper."

The man member of the court sitting beside the judge now spoke for the first time: "If you had been in the driver's place, would you have spoken differently? The driver has to pick up garbage from 250 different apartments. The rule is that everyone must dump their own garbage into the truck. There are also regulations about keeping the street clean. If the driver had to stop and pick up any garbage that might fall, he would never get finished."

Sergeyevich, looking glum, twirling his cap, to Polgurova: "When you told me it was my business to pick up the garbage you dropped just because I am a truck driver, you were insulting me."

Polgurova, ignoring him, to the judge: "I would have picked it up if he had spoken to me nicely. But he spoke to me in a gruff voice."

Judge, to the accused: "Now, if you would just apologize, we could finish this whole business peacefully."

Polgurova: "I didn't mean to insult him. I am ready to say I am sorry, but only if he says he is sorry too." Her voice trembles, she gets more and more excited. "He says I insulted him. But I also believe he insulted me, and I demand that he apologize too."

Judge, to those present: "Does anyone have anything to say?"

Old man No. 1 stands up: "Comrades, the important thing is, why won't this woman say where she works, and what her job is? The trouble is, we don't know with whom we are dealing. If this woman is just an ordinary working woman, then it might be considered that the incident had no meaning, that she simply did not understand how to behave differently. But if she holds a responsible job in the trade union committee, if as an official in some high position she has taken an attitude of looking down on the garbage truck driver, then we have to consider her behavior in another light and it is something quite serious."

UP UNTIL this point I must say I had felt rather uncomfortable. The whole thing had seemed like a lot of sound and fury about a petty incident between a woman who might have been feeling irritable that morning and a truck driver making a big fuss over nothing. But it suddenly became clear that the real point here, whether this particular incident justified it or not, was the behavior of a woman in a higher position to an ordinary working man she considered beneath her, something considered shameful in a socialist society.

To the old man's comment Polgurova answered, some humility now mixed with her arrogance: "What my job is is my own personal business. My work has nothing to do with the case. I think Ivan Ivanovich insulted me. I'm ready to apologize. But let him apologize to me too."

Judge: "Do you admit that your conduct was not in line with the moral code of communism, that man must be to man a brother, comrade and friend?"

Polgurova: "Maybe it wasn't. But it wasn't my fault. I may have done something wrong. I have explained everything. I have said I'm sorry." Now tears sprang to her eyes, "What more do you want of me?"

The judge then called the only witness. He said he saw the whole thing from some hundred feet away, that he saw the woman and the driver arguing and heard the woman say she wouldn't pick up "those scraps of paper." But he couldn't add any details.

Sergeyevich: "I usually don't say anything when something falls out of a garbage can. But this woman just slammed her pail against the side of the truck. She didn't look what she was doing, and some of the garbage dropped. I said 'pick it up' and that was all."

Judge: "She says she spoke the way she did because you spoke roughly to her."

Sergeyevich: "I do not admit I spoke roughly. It was early in the morning. I was calm. I was not nervous or upset."

Voice from the audience: "Just because she's a good looking woman she shouldn't be so haughty and refuse to tell us what her job is."

Judge, to the accused: "When you refuse to tell us in what capacity you are working, it means you have no respect for the Comradely Court. Of course we could find this out, and bring the matter up at your place of work. But since there are no witnesses who saw and heard everything, there is no way we can force anything out of you. Maybe," turning to the audience, "the best thing would be just for the people who live here and the people where she works to talk with her and make her understand that her behavior was wrong and she must change it in the future."

First old man again, oratorically, with gestures:

"Although this woman may be pretty, she doesn't understand our Communist morality. That's clear. The way she spoke to the driver

shows this. And if she throws garbage to the ground, that shows she has no concern for hygiene. And then she wouldn't be honest with us and tell us what her work is. I therefore come to the conclusion that first, she doesn't understand many things about the way people should behave and secondly that she does not live by the moral code of a builder of communism.

"Just the same, we have to take into account the fact that she was ready to say she was sorry. That makes a difference. I agree with the judge that the best thing would be to talk things over with her some more, and try to help her to behave better in the future."

Second old man, indignantly: "Here we are living in a socialist society and building communism. And we see a person who finds it possible to keep from us who she is, and who doesn't care about keeping things clean. It's important to know whether she is a working class woman or a trade union leader. It seems to me she is probably an official, not a worker. And she puts on hifalutin airs and won't condescend to tell us who she is. Probably this is the same attitude she had toward the driver. It is insulting to the working class if she thinks she can speak this way to him just because she has a more important job. And she isn't honest with us. How can she teach others to be honest if she is not honest herself? We can't build communism that way.

"The fact that she let a piece of paper fall on the ground is not so important. But the fact that she should speak the way she did to a plain working man, that's important." Turning to her, passionately: "We're your comrades, your friends. You insult us by not being honest with us about your job. I believe we should tell the trade union people where she works about this, not because of dropping some garbage, but because of the way she spoke to the driver and to us."

Third old man, simply and seriously: "I agree that the main thing is that a person with a slightly higher position should not allow herself to speak to another Soviet person as though he were her inferior. And it is insulting to us that she will not tell us what her position is." Addressing the accused: "The duty of our Comradely Court is to educate people in the new moral code of communism. We are not here to punish you, but to tell you that your behavior is not correct in all respects. It is high time you understood this very elementary thing. Unfortunately we still come across cases where a person who occupies an important place in public life isn't the right kind of person in private life. If Comrade Polgurova hasn't realized until now that public life and private life can't be separated, then we must try to help her to understand this. I support what has been suggested, that the people where she works must be informed about this, let them discuss it, let them talk to her and try to get her to correct her behavior."

The third member of the court, a woman on the judge's left, speaks up for the first time: "I know the driver very well. I know that he often picks up things that have been dropped. He is a good conscientious worker and very polite. If in this case he asked Comrade Polgurova to pick up what she dropped, it was probably because in this case he had good reason to do so."

The accused, very red in the face, losing her composure: "I can't understand why you are all making a mountain out of a mole hill. I admit that I dropped the paper and that I didn't behave correctly. But I believe that he also behaved incorrectly. You believe what he says, you don't want to believe me. Go ahead and report to my organization. I said I was wrong. If you believe there is something more that I should do, I don't agree. You are practically accusing me of being against the Communist code of morality. I agree my behavior was wrong, but you are accusing me of too much. He spoke to me gruffly and that was wrong too. You were wrong when you said I spoke condescendingly to him because I hold a higher position—you don't even know what position I hold."

Voice from the audience: "Why don't you tell us then?"

Since no one else has anything to say, the judge and her two assistants now leave the room to consider the case. The accused talks heatedly to the driver while they are gone arguing that both were wrong and why doesn't he say so. He shakes his head obdurately.

The judge and the two others come back, and the judge reads the verdict, couched in rather formal language. The substance of it is that the Court found that Comrade Polgurova did spill some garbage and refused to pick it up, that she spoke insultingly to the driver. But in view of the fact that she admitted she was wrong and said she was sorry, the court had reached the decision that no measures would be taken except to discuss the matter with her further on a comradely basis and to inform the people at her place of work that the case had been discussed.

Polgurova, hearing the verdict, rose quickly and rushed out weeping, crying as she went: "I *did* understand that I had behaved wrongly!"

A buzz of conversation, indicating agreement with the verdict. The judge says they will now adjourn, but, at the request of Old Man no. 2, recognizes him first for a few words:

"I want to say that I think these Comradely Courts are very effective. It is activities like this which build a new social and political consciousness in people. It shows that we, ordinary people, really have a say in running the state. It is important that we should take part actively in them. But there are not enough people here today. I believe we should talk to our neighbors and make sure more of them take part."

Agreed. Adjourned.

WE STAYED behind to talk with Klavdia Adamovna Stolyarova, the judge, and her assistants. John told her he could see she was familiar with jurisprudence and she said she had had many years experience as a lawyer, and that was why she was chosen as judge, but that anyone agreed upon could hold this position, legal training was not necessary. She then answered our questions.

"This Comradely Court serves the 5,000 people who live in this area. It has twelve members who are elected at a general meeting of the residents, of whom three are sufficient to act as the court, sitting in turn, choosing their own judge.

"Our court meets regularly on Fridays. If there are no special cases before us, we just receive people for consultation on their problems. If there is to be a regular sitting, we gather all the facts we can and prepare the case in advance. Very often we are able to settle disputes between people without a session of the court. That kind of preventive work is perhaps our main function. People really hate to be brought up on charges before their own friends and neighbors and will do a great deal to avoid it.

"What are the main kinds of cases? Hooliganism, petty thievery, family quarrels—and cases like you saw today, of rent delinquency and when someone has been offended by another's behavior. The People's Court often turns over petty lawbreaking cases for us to settle. When we can take care of wrong tendencies at an early stage, this means a real reduction in crime."

We asked what were the main cases of lawbreaking, whether alcoholism was a big problem.

"Cases of hooliganism almost always are the result of alcoholism, and of course if a man drinks, this often leads to family quarrels. But there is much less of this than before. Crowded housing conditions are one of the main causes. This is improving, but it's still a problem. Trouble usually arises when several families share an apartment and have to use a communal kitchen. The main solution of course is to have an apartment for every family, and that's what we are working for.

"Usually our function doesn't go beyond discussing problems with both sides, issuing resolutions of censure, notifying the place of work when a complaint against someone working there has been found to be justified. We can impose a fine up to ten rubles if there has been property damage, and in rare cases can impose a short term of disciplinary work, such as cleaning up the courtyard—this was only added to our functions last spring."

We asked whether today's small attendance was typical:

"Sometimes there are many more—but unfortunately not enough people come. We invite the residents for every session, but usually only those come who are directly involved, and a few older people, like those today, some of them out of curiosity or because they haven't anything else to do. We are taking measures to interest more people."

John asked whether there might be cases where people would use the court to work off personal grudges, and make unfair accusations.

"No, it would be very difficult for any such personal persecution to take place under our conditions. You see, before holding a sitting, the members of the court and the local Party Committee check thoroughly on what has happened. We meet the people concerned and ask others and find out everything possible in advance. Everyone knows we do this and knows that it would be useless to bring unfair or baseless charges, and that they could only harm themselves."

We asked her to explain a little more fully how today's case had come about and why there had to be a trial.

"A case like this would ordinarily be settled without a trial. We would get the offender to apologize and that would be the end of it. We talked to this woman after the driver made his complaint, and she was very unpleasant and arrogant and refused to discuss the matter with us. We knew she worked at the regional trade union committee but she refused all along to tell us what her work was. It became necessary to take up the matter formally because she refused to talk to us. This was exceptional."

I asked whether such incidents sometimes caused lasting hard feelings among the people of the area. The male member of the court answered:

"It's true people avoid coming before the court like the plague if they can. But things simmer down quickly after cases have been considered. You know, mutual criticism is ingrained in our Soviet society. We are used to it. People will make the sharpest kind of attacks on each other, fur will fly, and the very next day you will find them sitting together in the cafe, laughing and talking!"

Stolyarova said: "The Comradely Court has other functions besides trying cases. We also give active help to people who bring their troubles to us. When things go wrong with plumbing or electricity or other services the City Soviet is supposed to provide, we try to get things straightened out. A lot of people help us—about one out of every 16 of the residents here are our 'activ'—helping us in talking to people, getting to the roots of complaints, visiting apartments to see what's wrong. We carry on constant educational work through lectures and talks and discussions to prevent problems and disputes from arising and to help people to live together harmoniously."

As we rose to go, she added, very seriously:

"You should understand that what we are really working for in our Communist society is to do away with all crimes, all criminals, all prisons! It is this noble work that the Comradely Courts are engaged in. While our little court here may seem a very modest affair to you, we feel it is a big step toward the prevention of crime and that some day there will be no need of any other kind of courts than these Comradely Courts."

american-soviet facts



CULTURAL AND SCIENTIFIC EXCHANGE

TWO SOVIET high school teachers—Tamara Sergejevna Tserva and Margarita Nikolayevna Dobronravova—spent last November and December in this country visiting U.S. high schools. Their visit was sponsored by the American Friends' Service Committee.

Wayne David Fisher of the Chicago Laboratory School and Leon George Sasonoff of Garfield High School in Seattle, Washington spent February and March visiting high schools in Moscow, Leningrad and Riga in reciprocation.

The Soviet teachers spent time at George School in Newtown, Pennsylvania, Baltimore Friends' School in Maryland, Garfield Public High School in Seattle, Washington, and Cubberly Public High School in Palo Alto, California. They also visited schools in New York and there attended a conference of the Modern Language Association.

They were impressed by the warm informality of U.S. schools and the excellence of their gymnasium and laboratory equipment as well as their well-qualified teachers and attractive buildings. They expressed surprise, however, that the usual number of years for a foreign language in this country was four. In the Soviet Union children study a language six years. Moreover they could not agree with the U.S. practice of allowing pupils to choose their own courses. In the Soviet Union all courses are prescribed.

Another fundamental difference between the two school systems is the grouping of pupils according to ability. "We think it's a good idea to have a wide range of abilities in a class," the Soviet teachers agreed. "The poor students try to catch up with the bright ones; the bright ones are given extra work to prevent boredom."

RICHARD MORFORD, Executive Director, National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, is editor of this department.

The two teachers' command of English and their eagerness to understand our country endeared them to faculty members, students and host-families with whom they stayed.

Observance of extra-curricular activities gave them a more rounded picture of American youth. They attended school programs and off-campus gatherings of high school teenagers. Living in local homes provided them with further knowledge of the backgrounds of American young people.

The teachers also met with community groups interested in international understanding and visited museums and places of historic interest as well as plays, concerts and lectures.

In their professional capacity they were much concerned with learning more about educational methods such as the use of tape recorders, films, television, teaching machines and other devices used in U.S. schools. They were especially interested in consulting with U.S. teachers about American literature and felt that they had as a consequence important recommendations to make to English teachers in the Soviet Union when they returned.

Mary Logan Wins Competition

MARY LOGAN, a Negro clerical worker in New York City, won the annual *Moscow News* 1964 competition, "What Do You Know About the Soviet Union?"

Flown to Moscow for a one-week stay, Miss Logan's week was a crowded one visiting the sights of Moscow and meeting some of its citizens such as the actors at the Bolshoy Theater, whom she visited backstage after a performance.

Arriving in a snow storm, by the time she left a week later there was a hint of spring in the air. "In my honor," Miss Logan joked as she boarded her plane for the return flight to New York.

Collected Edition of Sinclair Lewis

THE FIRST collected edition of Sinclair Lewis is now coming out in the Soviet Union, sponsored by the magazine *Ogonyok*. This, by the way, is the first collected edition of Lewis in any language. No such edition has ever appeared in English.

The first volume came out on February 8, in honor of the novelist's 80th birthday anniversary. The total number printed of the first volume was 400,000.

Lewis has always enjoyed great popularity with Soviet readers. A great favorite of Maxim Gorky's in the twenties, he held at that time first place among all living American writers in the opinion of his Russian readers.

Writing in *Moscow News*, February 6, Boris Gilenson has the following estimate of what Soviet readers treasure in the novels of Lewis:

His novels open up whole sectors of American life for us—*Main Street* is a picture of life in provincial towns, *Arrowsmith* introduces us to the world of science, *Elmer Gantry* to that of the clergy, *Gideon Planish* describes the activities of the philanthropic organizations, *It Can't Happen Here* shows us the struggle in the political sphere, etc. Last but not least is the fact that Lewis attracts us by his great sense of social responsibility, his adherence to the cause of social justice, his calls against fascism and racism, his championing of freedom of the individual, freedom of art, and his faith in the American people.

Soviet Cultural Attache in San Francisco

MRS. Galina M. Frolova is a cultural attaché with the Soviet embassy in Washington. A specialist in U.S. history and culture, she was graduated from the Institute of International Relations in Moscow in 1956.

She has been in this country since 1963 and has spoken widely before college and civic groups in New York, Philadelphia, Chicago and Pittsburgh and other cities as well as in college communities.

Recently she spoke at a number of places in California—San José State College, San Francisco City College and San Francisco State College, and at the University of California at Berkeley. She also spoke before a San Francisco Art Institute audience on realism in art.

Interviewed during her visit to San Francisco, Mrs. Frolova said that the Soviet embassy is receiving a growing number of requests for speakers on a wide variety of topics.

"Cultural exchange," she went on to say, "is so important because it is a people-to-people approach. Americans who are quite suspicious of the Soviet Union thrill to the Bolshoy Ballet and are entranced by David Oistrakh's music, as are the people in our country. Culture is the first step to mutual understanding. We are most eager to expand it."

She pointed out the great love the Soviet people have for our writers, mentioning particularly Mark Twain and Ernest Hemingway. She said that she hoped it would not be too long before Soviet writers were as widely known and loved here.

Mutual Cultural Enrichment

ONE OF the happiest results of the Cultural Exchange Program with the Soviet Union is that American musicians have become a commonplace in the land. Almost as a matter of course their concerts are sold out even in the smallest cities, and Russian audiences come eagerly and excitedly to hear their work. . . .

"What made our tour different from others in the Cultural Exchange Program was the nature of the repertoire. . . . This was the first time that entire concerts of Medieval and Renaissance music were to be presented in the USSR.

"... The Soviet Union has, over the years, encouraged the forma-

tion and growth of vocal and instrumental ensembles that devote themselves to the performance of folk music, most of them permanent repertory companies of considerable skill. . . . Even more fascinating, however, were the concerts of traditional music given by groups other than the State ensembles. . . . What comes to my mind particularly is the day I heard an Armenian trio consisting of two duduk (double-reed instrument) players and a drummer—performance on the highest professional level and music that seemed to be completely untouched by nineteenth- and twentieth-century Western cultures.

"For me, the most fascinating experience. . . . was hearing the traditional choral music of the Republic of Georgia. . . . What we heard recalled to our ears European musical practices of the twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. . . ."

NOAH GREENBERG, Director of the New York Pro Musica, in *High Fidelity Magazine*, May, 1965.

Georgian Scientist Lectures in U.S.

DR. Vakhtang Chichinadze, Deputy Director for Research in Electronics, Automation and Telemechanics of the Georgian Academy of Sciences, recently lectured in the United States at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the Case Institute of Technology, Cleveland, the Carnegie Institute, Pittsburgh, New York University, and Brooklyn Polytechnical Institute.

Dr. Chichinadze, when he returned, reported that he had found scientists in the United States very eager to cooperate with Soviet scientists with whose work in the field of electronics the Americans are familiar.

Scientists in the institutions in which he lectured told him that the proof of the high quality of miniature electronic equipment made in the USSR was the smooth operation of the radio equipment carried in Soviet satellites and spacecraft.

Soviet Space Scientists at U.S. Symposium

SIX SOVIET space scientists attended the space symposium held in Chicago in early May by the American Astronautical Society and the Illinois Institute of Technology Research Institute.

Physicist Gennady Skuridin, head of the Soviet delegation, answered newsmen's questions at a press conference. He announced that Zond 2, the Soviet Mars spaceship, had stopped transmitting information. (U.S. Mars probe, Mariner 3, still running strong at this writing, 5/7/65.)

Dr. Skuridin (*New York Times*, May 5) "said it was wrong to make the moon race into a Russian vs. American sport when much fundamental research must first be done. Russia does not consider a lunar flight either a major feat or a major program."

US-USSR Basketball Rivalry

A SOVIET basketball team played seven games in this country during April, in San Francisco, Las Vegas, Seattle, Los Angeles and St. Louis. They won five of the games and lost two.

This is the third tour by a Soviet basketball team in this country. The first was in 1961, when they lost all the games to the U.S. team; the second was in 1962, when they won half of the games. In 1964 a U.S. team touring the USSR lost five of eight games.

In the last four Olympics the Soviet basketball teams have been runners-up to the U.S. teams. Seven members of the Soviet team touring here in April were members of the team that won the Olympic silver medal at the Olympic games in Tokyo last October.

Leningrad to Montreal

THE FIRST direct passenger link between the Soviet Union and North America is to begin in 1966. The new Soviet passenger liner "Alexander Pushkin," now being completed in the German Democratic Republic, will open the run between Leningrad and Montreal, Canada.

The "Alexander Pushkin" will carry some 750 passengers, with port calls at Helsinki, Finland, Göteborg, Sweden, and Southampton, England. The exact date when service begins in 1966 will be announced later, as will schedules and prices.

Levittown, USSR?

MASS production house-building methods so widely used in this country since the end of World War II are of increasing interest to Soviet architects, particularly in the building of frame houses for one or two families.

Professor Victor I. Kopyrin of the Moscow Architectural Institute, who has been spending four months here under the sponsorship of the Institute of Education, said, when interviewed as he toured William J. Levitt's Strathmore development at Stony Brook, New York, (*N.Y. Times*, March 3), that the Soviet Union was placing an emphasis on the decentralization of populations and factories. Small towns are being built or old ones developed around single manufacturing or business units established in outlying areas.

"While our population is increasing by four million a year, the goal is to halt the growth of big cities by concentrating on the development of hamlets and towns of up to 20,000 residents," Professor Kopyrin explained.

Mr. Levitt is well known in the Soviet Union as a pioneer in modernizing the home-building industry, the professor explained, as he continued to take photographs, commenting with enthusiasm on the progress of the tract's development—roadways, utility lines in-

stalled and crews of craftsmen moving in standardized operations over the building site.

Professor Kopyrin later explained that he was in charge of the development of a small group of duplex apartments on a collective farm outside of Moscow. Although he professed great interest in all types of building in the United States, he was chiefly concerned with such developments as those in the Levitt projects.

SOVEREIGN PERFORMERS:

Sviatoslav Richter

"CARNEGIE HALL was much the same last night as when Sviatoslav Richter last appeared there almost five years ago. Again the hall was jammed to the rafters, including stage seats; again there was the electric tension in the air as Mr. Richter made his audience wait a few extra moments before loping onto the stage; again there was the kind of excitement that is provided by few sovereign performers in any generation."

Alan Rich: *New York Herald Tribune*, April 16

Cleveland Symphony Orchestra

THE Cleveland Symphony Orchestra, under the direction of George Szell, was given an enthusiastic reception here [Moscow] today in the opening performance of a five-week Soviet tour.

"The 106-member orchestra was kept on the stage of the Moscow Conservatory for half an hour after the scheduled part of the concert to play four encores . . .

"The conductor said he had found the Russians 'so entranced and transported' by the music that they required time to return to reality before applauding. United States audiences, by contrast, he said, break out immediately into applause on the last note."

New York Times, April 17

Grant Johannesen

"MOSCOW police had to erect metal barriers to contain the crowd of people who couldn't get into the Moscow Conservatory last night for the Cleveland Symphony Orchestra's second concert.

"The 1,500 concert-goers who did get in gave pianist Grant Johannesen six curtain calls for his performance of Mozart's Concerto in C Minor."

New York Herald Tribune, April 18

Issac Stern

"ISAAC STERN was applauded as an old friend last night as he gave the opening concert of a Soviet tour before a capacity audience in Conservatory Hall.

"The first United States concert artist to perform in the Soviet Union after Marshal Stalin's death, the violinist visited this country in 1956 and 1960 . . .

"Tomorrow he will appear in Tchaikovsky Hall with an orchestra under the direction of David Oistrakh."

New York Times, April 29

"Plisetskaya Dances"

"GREATEST dancing to be seen anywhere" is the way the *New York Post's* Frances Herridge described the present premiere ballerina of Moscow's Bolshoy Company, as seen recently in the film "Plisetskaya Dances" shown at the Cameo Theater in New York. The film shows some rare early shots of Plisetskaya in training as a young girl, some interviews with her and rehearsal scenes, but mainly gives excerpts from all the actual ballet performances that have made her famous. Other New York critics were equally enthusiastic. "Sandu Follows the Sun," the accompanying short, is a charming and sensitive picture of a five-year old's wanderings, called by one critic "a poem to the joy of living."

PROGRESS AND PROBLEMS IN THE U.S.S.R.

Signals from Another Civilization?

THE question mark must remain for the time being, Soviet astronomical scientists have admitted. But earlier they had started a story which had reverberated around the world when one of their number, Dr. Nikolai Kardashev was quoted by *Tass*, the USSR news agency as saying "a super civilization has been discovered." *Tass* headlined the story "Signals from Another Civilization." Period.

What had been noted by a team of scientists at the Sternberg Astronomical Institute was an unprecedented cyclical pattern of signals from a small star which is known as CTA-102, a designation applied to it by the California Institute of Technology. Observations of the signals, when compared with those from other radio stars, show that CTA-102's emissions grow strong and faint over 100-day cycles, like signals from a revolving beam of light.

Besides Dr. Kardashev, the scientists who appeared at a hastily called press conference (4/13/65) in Moscow to explain their findings and, figuratively speaking, restore the question mark at the point where *Tass* put the period, were Prof. Iosif S. Shklovsky, chief of the Department of Radio Astronomy, a scientist of world reputation, Nadezhda Sleptsova and Dr. Gennady Sholomitsky. Data on which the *Tass* story had been constructed had been gathered in late March and early April.

CTA-102 is the smallest known source of radio signals in the universe and its beacon-like pattern is so far unique. It is a star believed to be in our earth's neighborhood, cosmically speaking. An accumulation of data does provide basis for scientific argument that the signals of CTA-102 are the products of intelligent beings. Professor Shklovsky and Dr. Kardashev (formerly a Shklovsky student) have developed lines of reasoning from theoretical propositions originally put forward by an American scientist, Dr. Freeman Dyson of the Institute of Advanced Study in Princeton, New Jersey.

It appears that what would be the most revolutionary discovery in the history of humans on this planet requires more definitive proof. This, Professor Shklovsky declared at the news conference, has not yet been presented. But a new series of observations are now being conducted.

More Autos in the Future

THE NEXT Five-Year Plan of the Soviet Union will provide for the production of more automobiles, Premier Alexey N. Kosygin has announced.

Up to now trucks and buses have made up two thirds of all Soviet motor vehicle production. In 1964, 418,000 trucks and buses were turned out, admittedly far short of the need. In 1964 only 185,000 cars were produced. Premier Kosygin, in making his announcement, alluded to a previous policy of opposition to ownership of private cars (attributed to Mr. Khrushchev) with everyone expected to ride buses. Premier Kosygin said this policy was impractical. Mass production of cars should reduce costs but presently Soviet cars are by rough comparison priced two to three times higher than in the West.

Higher Wages and More Consumer Goods

THIS IS the forecast for the Five-Year Plan 1966-1970 now being drafted by the State Planning Committee in line with directives of top government officials. Premier Alexey Kosygin told the Committee that the Plan should be designed to "insure a more rapid rate of improvement of the people's living standard.

"Wages must be placed in direct relationship to increases in labor productivity and growth of production," the Premier said. It is reported that wage increases have been almost at a standstill in the last five years, although a minimum wage of 40 to 45 rubles a month (\$44.00 to \$49.50) went into effect January 1 of this year in those industries where it had not already been introduced. The average industrial wage is believed to be about 100 rubles a month (\$110) although very few statistics on wages are published.

Wage comparisons are misleading since in estimating the real income of Soviet wage earners account must be taken of the wide range of nearly free services like education, medical care, transportation, vacation subsidies, etc. together with the low rents.

Nevertheless, the emphasis now is to be placed, says the Premier, on increasing the people's purchasing power and the output of consumer goods "to insure a more balanced satisfaction of the demands for all goods and normal money circulation in the country."

Rents Are Low

A FINNISH correspondent stationed in Moscow declares that rents in the USSR are the lowest in the world. (Article in *Trud* 8/14/1965).

The formulae for computing rents are carefully drawn but complicated because so many factors are considered. Basically the rent is figured by the square meters of the living room, not of the whole apartment. The highest rent per square meter in government housing was 16.5 kopeks.

To enable his readers to understand, the Finnish correspondent cites the example of a family he knows (he says he has visited scores of families, always inquiring about their rent). The Ilya Elkin family of three persons live in a new apartment No. 39 in house No. 12 in the Medvedovka section. This family has an income of 200 rubles per month. They occupy a two-room apartment. Rent, including hot water, central heating is 11 rubles, 22 kopeks a month. Electricity and gas average 2 rubles a month. Thus, their total housing expenses are just over 13 rubles. This is slightly under seven per cent of the family's monthly income. Says the Finnish correspondent "were they to live in Helsinki they would have had to spend about 25 per cent of their monthly income on rent."

How can rents be so low? A major portion of the housing is government-constructed and paid for. Rent is applied toward maintenance costs but Moscow housing officials, for example, estimate that rent covers only two-thirds of the upkeep—the state makes up the difference. The cost of central heating averages 40 per cent of the rent for a meter of floor space. Another factor of course, is the size of many apartments, relatively small.

The Soviet Union Went to the Polls

MARCH is the month of regional elections in the Soviet Union. Elections of the people's deputies to the Soviets, as they call their governing bodies, in rural areas and townships, in towns and cities, in autonomous areas within the major republics.

Published statistics tell us there were at the time 142,069,501 voters in the USSR. To conduct the elections 2,216,789 election commissions were set up.

Significant in reporting the outcome was the announcement that in 187 electoral areas for election of members of the rural Soviets, in 14 areas for township Soviets, three areas for election to the city Soviets, and four areas for regional Soviets—the candidates did not

receive the absolute majority of votes and were, therefore, not elected as Deputies. New elections must be held in all these areas.

The number of Deputies elected to all these regional Soviets total 2,010,300. Of this total 56.6 per cent were elected for the first time. The total of women deputies elected was 856,866. Those elected who were members of the Communist Party totaled 906,090 or 45.1 per cent. Non-Party people were 1,104,213 or 54.9 per cent. The percentage of those elected who were either workers or collective farmers was 62.2 per cent. (*Pravda*, March 28)

Soviets Tackle Wide Range of Agricultural Problems

AS A starting point in wide-ranging reforms in agriculture, the Soviet leadership announced on April 20 a cancellation of debts the collective farms owed the State Bank, equivalent to more than \$2 billion. A joint decree of the Government and the Central Committee of the Communist Party also wrote off or delayed payments on amounts the farms owed for purchase of equipment or on advances against delivery of produce.

The government is prepared to *double* its present investment in agriculture in the next year—instituting improvements of farm lands—drainage, stump clearing, liming of infertile soils, along with big increases in chemical fertilizer and irrigation already under way.

A vast area in the north and central European section of the Soviet Union which has been neglected in recent years because the government chose to make heavier investment in the region of the fertile black earth belt to the south, is now to receive a boost. The area includes the Baltic Republics, Byelorussia, the Ukrainian part of the famous Pripet Marshes as well as north central European Russia. Heavier moisture prevails in this area than in the south lands and large scale application of lime to reduce the acidity of the northern forest soils promises to help in producing good harvests. Not alone does the government look forward to a better grain yield in this area but also to larger production of potatoes, hogs, sheep and goats. Yet another reform decree raises by 70 per cent the prices to be paid for sheep and goats raised in the northern zone.

Altogether it is hoped that the farm recovery program will bring new investment into the nation's 40,000 collective farms of six billion rubles a year *by the farms themselves* in addition to the increase in the Government's investment.

An income tax has been levied on the collective farms as is the case with all businesses in the USA. New measures provide for easing these taxes. Under the new rules, a 12 per cent tax will be levied only on net income *above a profit* of 15 per cent.

Collective farmers will now be able to get home-building loans from the State Bank. Earlier, economies had been sought by building large apartment houses for farm dwellers but this plan met with

resistance. The State Bank announced that collective farmers can obtain seven-year loans of 700 to 1,500 rubles (\$770 to \$1,650) to build their own single family homes but loans may not exceed half of the total construction cost.

The implementation and coordination of the new farm program is in the hands of V. V. Matskevich, Minister of Agriculture of the USSR. Many U.S. Middle-Westerners will remember Mr. Matskevich's visit in 1955 as head of a delegation of Soviet farmers. Newspaper reporters found him a congenial down-to-earth farmer who made a favorable impression everywhere he went. It was subsequent to the 1955 U.S. trip that he became Minister of Agriculture—for the first time. Later Mr. Khrushchev replaced him. The new leaders of the Soviet Union have returned Mr. Matskevich to his post. He is responsible for meeting the perennial problems of agriculture in the Soviet Union but with broader powers of action than before.

(For further details on agricultural reforms, see Brezhnev report in April *NWR*, p. 54.)

A Banner Grain Crop in 1964

AN ALL-TIME high of 15.1 million tons of grain were harvested in 1964, according to the hand-book "The USSR in Figures in 1964," just published.

In 1962 the grain yield had been 140.2 million tons but in 1963 it had slumped to 107.5 million tons. The index on wheat is the most significant: 1962—70.8 million tons; 1963—49.7 million tons; 1964—74.2 million tons. The poor wheat crop of 1963 forced the Soviet Union to purchase 12 million tons abroad.

The booklet reports that new criteria and classifications for reporting harvests are now to be applied so that the true state of agricultural production may be more accurately reflected, free of all inflation, intended or otherwise.

Industrial Gains Extend into 1965

APRIL FACTS reported that the output of all branches of material production in the USSR increased by 7 per cent in 1964 over 1963.

Now come the figures for the first quarter of 1965. Total industrial output in the first three months of 1965 was nine per cent higher than in the corresponding period last year.

But Soviet statisticians figure closely and insist upon taking note that last year was a leap year and that the first quarter of 1965 contained two fewer working days. So they tell us that actually the increase for the first quarter is closer to 11 per cent on daily average.

Steady increases have been made in the key industrial commodities of heavy industry: iron and steel, electric power, oil and gas. But ordinary citizens, whether in the Soviet Union or the United States, look first at so-called consumer goods. Figures show a recovery from

the 1963 crop failure as reflected in the production of butter. For the first quarter of 1965—142,000 tons as compared with 88,000 tons last year. Correspondingly an increase in meat output—893,000 tons in the first quarter 1965; 776,000 same period last year.

There were substantial increases in 1965 over 1964—the first quarter—in television sets, washing machines and refrigerators.

The complete data on industrial output is presented in an official report of the Central Statistical Board of the USSR Council of Ministers. It is reported that government, business and industrial circles in the United States examine these reports with care.

The Charges that Jews Are Persecuted

FEARFUL that American-Soviet relations would be affected adversely, the State Department until recently withheld support for a Congressional resolution condemning alleged Soviet persecution of Jews. The Department withdrew in April its opposition, in a letter to Senator J. W. Fulbright, (D., Ark.), Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee (*N. Y. Times*, April 16, 1965.)

The resolution, introduced the last three years by Senator Abraham A. Ribicoff (D., Conn.), condemns alleged religious persecution of Jews in the Soviet Union and calls upon the Soviet Government to permit the free exercise of religion and cultural pursuits by the Jews, was approved by the Senate May 14 without debate 68-0.

The letter stated that the Department "still has no good reason to believe" that the resolution "will have any significant beneficial result." It said, however, that there now appeared to be "less likelihood" that the resolution would "harm those we seek to help" by provoking the Soviet Union.

The Embassy of the USSR in Washington has made verbal rejoinder to the Department of State letter, declaring "This cannot be appraised otherwise than as actual encouragement of attempts to interfere in the domestic affairs of the USSR and to spread allegations having nothing to do with the real state of affairs . . . persons of Jewish nationality enjoy equal rights in the Soviet Union with all other peoples."

April FACTS reported ("Matzoh at Passover Time") that plans were being carried out to provide adequate quantities of matzoh for the Jewish observance of Passover in the principal areas of the Soviet Union where Jewish religious communicants reside. This report can be supplemented with a news note: Zvi Leib, head of the Marina Roshchi congregation in Moscow, mentioned in the April FACTS story, wrote to the Israeli rabbi and librarian, Dr. Zvi Harkavy at the first of the year that a *Megilas Esther* for Purim and a *Hagada* for Passover were then already on the press.

A few events in the literary, educational and art field may be added here. Two books in *Yiddish* have appeared in recent months, pub-

lished by the literary magazine *Sovietish Haimland*. The first, "Azoi Lebn Mir" (How We Live), was issued in 15,000 copies. The second is titled "Horizontn" (Horizons), a 530-page collection of poems by 50 contemporary Soviet Yiddish poets. Six more Yiddish language books are scheduled for publication in 1965.

On January 25 the Pushkin Fine Art Museum in Moscow opened an exhibition of modern Israeli graphic art under sponsorship of the Israel-USSR Cultural Relations Society.

It is reported that the number of science teachers and researchers in the Soviet Union has doubled in the five years from 1958-1963 (from 284,038 to 565,958). Next to Russians and Ukrainians, the Jews provide the third largest number of scientists. Although the absolute number of Jewish scientists increased in this period, the percentage dropped from more than ten per cent to eight per cent.

[News concerning life and activities of Jewish people is gathered by Editor Morris U. Schappes and published monthly in brief notes in the magazine *Jewish Currents*. Not all items, as those chosen above from the magazine's columns, are positive. Included are reports of an event here or there of an anti-Semitic character (for which, most times, there is an official rebuke). Readers of FACTS are urged to weigh carefully the allegations of anti-Semitism appearing in the press. What are the facts? Are all the facts reported? What conclusions may properly be drawn?—Ed.]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

"Trade with the Soviet Union"

Panel Appointed by President

TAKING the first step in fulfilling his promise to American business men to recommend to Congress the expanding of U.S. trade with Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, President Johnson appointed a 12-man Presidential Committee to study the possibilities and make recommendations.

The panel, composed of outstanding business and industrial leaders, educators and foreign policy specialists, is headed by J. Irwin Miller, Board Chairman of the Cummins Engine Company of Columbus, Indiana. Mr. Miller is a leading churchman, former president of the National Council of Churches and a member of the executive committee of the World Council of Churches.

It includes a representative of organized labor, Nathaniel Goldfinger, director of research for AFL-CIO. Readers of FACTS will remember a story in the April issue in which AFL-CIO top-man George Meany expressed opposition to the idea of expanding trade with the Soviet Union, apparently supported by a resolution of his executive board.

Besides Mr. Miller and Mr. Goldfinger, the committee members are:

Eugene R. Black, chairman of the Brookings Institution and former president of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; William Blackie, president of the Caterpillar Tractor Company; George R. Brown, chairman of the board, Brown and Root, Inc.; Charles W. Engelhard, Jr., chairman of the board, Engelhard Industries and director, Foreign Policy Association; Dr. James B. Fisk, president of Bell Telephone Laboratories and a past member of the President's Science Advisory Committee; Crawford H. Greenewalt, chairman of the board, E. I. duPont de Nemours & Co., and chairman, Radio Free Europe Fund; William A. Hewitt, chairman of the board, Deere & Co.; Dr. Max F. Millikan, professor of economics and director, Center for International Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and president of the World Peace Foundation; Charles G. Mortimer, chairman of the board, General Foods Corporation, and trustee, Committee for Economic Development; Dr. Herman B. Wells, chancellor, Indiana University, and former United States delegate to the United Nations General Assembly. (New York Times, April 5, 1965)

On May 6, the White House released a report by the Commission suggesting some easing of curbs on Soviet trade and Eastern European countries to "help promote American foreign policy objectives." A dispatch in the *New York Times*, May 7, said of the report:

... The group urged that the President be authorized by Congress to relax or tighten such restrictions on trade in non-strategic commodities and equipment depending on the state of U.S. political relations with the Communist bloc. The report also recommended, however, that "the United States should in no case drop its controls on strategic items that could significantly enhance Communist military capabilities. . . ."

It said the only basis for its proposals was to make possible some "hard bargaining" by the United States for political advantage. Ordinary motivations, such as for economic or financial gain, have no place in trade relations with the Communist countries, it said . . . in any case, the volume of trade and the profits involved would be "negligible," the study group found. . . .

Judgment as to whether the limited and conditional recommendations will mean any constructive expansion of trade must await examination of the text of the report and Congressional proposals.

Professors for Easing Trade Curbs

THE Chase Manhattan Bank conducted an opinion survey among economics professors in U.S. colleges and universities and found (*Report on Western Europe*, Feb.-March, 1965) that 82 per cent of the 375 who replied favored an easing of restrictions on trade with the Soviet Union and Eastern European countries. And 62 per cent thought that U.S. restrictions against trade with mainland China also should be eased.

Wall Street Journal writer A. L. Malabre says that the easing of U.S. restrictions would yield business benefits. "With some increase in East-West trade contacts, some easing of Cold War tensions might ensue. And a source of irritation in diplomatic dealings between the U.S. and its major allies would be removed."

USSR Asks End of Trade Discrimination

APPEARING before the UN Trade and Development Board, K. G. Tretyakov, Soviet delegate, urged that priority be given to the elimination of discrimination in trade, a study of international stabilization of agreements, and granting of state credits to developing countries at a maximum rate of three per cent.

Mr. Tretyakov recalled the Soviet decision to abolish customs charges on goods from developing countries, and said the Soviet Union was exporting industrial machinery to those countries. He said that India was now the chief trading partner of the Soviet Union outside Comecon, the Communist nations' trade organization.

In the course of his speech the Soviet delegate accused the U.S. of violating principles adopted by the Geneva conference by allegedly applying a blockade against Cuba, and establishing restrictions on shipping to that section of Vietnam occupied by rebel forces in the Gulf of Tonkin. (*Associated Press*, April 13, 1965.)

Soviet Merchant Fleet Expands

THE *Times* of London has called for "a united front" against the "threat" to western shipping circles from the expanding Soviet merchant fleet. The newspaper suggested that the Soviet Union wanted to establish 100 per cent carriage of its foreign trade, both imports and exports, in Soviet ships, and so would be intruding into western shipping markets.

Reply to the charges has been made by Victor Bakayev, USSR Minister of the Merchant Marine in *Za Rubezhom* (Life Abroad) which also published *The Times* article. Mr. Bakayev wrote that the Soviet Union possesses a merchant fleet of over seven million tons. He said it now occupies sixth place in the world after Britain, U.S., Norway, Liberia, Japan. Replying to the charge that the Soviet Union intends to dominate world shipping, Mr. Bakayev wrote:

The actual situation is as follows: during the past ten years the volume of Soviet foreign trade has risen by 170 per cent and the tonnage of its merchant fleet by 150 per cent.

Soviet foreign trade is developing and the carriage of its goods by sea is increasing, and not only in Soviet ships.

In 1958, for example, 13,500,000 tons of Soviet goods were carried in foreign ships and in 1964 the figure was 49,600,000 tons.

Foreign ship owners, therefore, have no reason to complain that their fleets are not sufficiently used for the carriage of Soviet cargoes.

Moreover, he goes on, the carriage of Soviet cargoes in foreign ships will grow since, as a result of the rapid economic expansion of the USSR, Soviet foreign trade, according to the most conservative estimate, will increase four-fold by 1980.

AMERICAN-SOVIET RELATIONS

Russia, the U.S. and Vietnam

WE HAVE the urge to reproduce completely articles which seem of extraordinary significance in the discussion of American-Soviet relations. But the scheme of FACTS is brevity. We give you, the reader, the source, hoping you will pick up the challenge.

Two articles by Hans J. Morgenthau, Professor of Political Science and Modern History at the University of Chicago should be read; one is entitled "Russia, the U.S. and Vietnam" in the *New Republic* (May 1, 1965); the other "We Are Deluding Ourselves in Vietnam" in the magazine section of the *N. Y. Times* (April 18, 1965).

Profoundly apprehensive over U.S. policy which endeavors to stop and contain communism by force of arms, the articles are of extraordinary significance because Prof. Morgenthau serves as a consultant to the State and Defense Departments. Quotations below from the *New Republic* article perhaps best pose the gathering crisis in American-Soviet relations stemming from U.S. military involvement in Southeast Asia:

Having just returned from Moscow after talking to American diplomats, to representatives of allied and neutral countries, and to Soviet officials, academicians and military men, I carry with me two major impressions: the hopelessness of a negotiated settlement of the war in Vietnam under present conditions and the likelihood of Soviet military intervention. . . .

The Soviet attitude toward American policy is one of despair, alarm and exasperation. The despair is most keenly felt by those who have been identified with Khrushchev's policy of peaceful coexistence and of mitigating the conflict with the United States. They declare themselves to be fighting with their backs to the wall, barely holding their own against the growing influence of the faction that favors the hard line of the Chinese. It is not necessary to take such statements at face value in order to recognize the dilemma in which the Soviet Union finds itself and the impossibility for the Soviet Union to remain indefinitely a passive bystander in the face of the progressive destruction of North Vietnam by American military power. It is likewise easy to see why the Soviet Union would take an active part in the hostilities only with the greatest reluctance, being forced by American policy to take a course of action it would not have taken if it had had a choice.

The dilemma the Soviet Union faces stems from the fact that on the one hand, the Soviet Union has a vital interest in avoiding a direct military confrontation with the United States and that, on the other hand, it cannot remain indifferent to the fate of another Communist country and ally, such as North Vietnam, especially as it must compete with China for the control of the world Communist movement. However anxious the Soviet Union is to avoid a direct military confrontation with the United States, it is not willing to buy that avoidance with its abdication as leader and protector of its Communist allies. . . .

We are moving closer and closer to that military confrontation which nobody wants but which nobody knows how to avoid.

US and USSR See Gains in Settling UN Dispute

CHIEF Soviet delegate Nikolai T. Fedorenko said (April 24, 1965) he thought progress was being made in efforts to settle the dispute over UN peace-keeping operations. The speeches (16 in two sessions) that week in the Special Committee of 33 he found "objective and constructive."

A U.S. source, when told of Mr. Fedorenko's remarks, said "We also are pleased with the spirit of cooperation in the Committee."

It is recalled that the committee was set up last February by the General Assembly when a deadlock over applicability of Article 19 of the Charter had virtually paralyzed the Assembly's operations. The U.S. insisted that the Article be applied to the S.U. and other members. The S.U. and others contended that they were not in arrears on contributions since assessments for peace-keeping operations had been voted by the Assembly and not by the Security Council which alone, they argued, has the authority for dealing with these matters. The result was an agreement to try to overcome the impasse by finding a solution to the over-all problem of peace-keeping by the UN.

The Committee has been instructed to submit a report to the Assembly not later than June 15. (Sam Pope Brewer, *New York Times*, April 25, 1965.)

Coexistence

THE reader will recall that April FACTS contained excerpts from the addresses at the *Pacem in Terris* Convocation in New York of Mr. N. N. Inozemtsev, Deputy Chief Editor of *Pravda*, USSR, and The Honorable George F. Kennan, former U.S. Ambassador to the USSR and Yugoslavia, now at Princeton. A central topic at the Convocation was Coexistence. Below we print portions of statements on this subject from eminent participants in the discussion.

Senator J. W. Fulbright, USA (Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee)—A condition essential for coexistence between the Soviet Union and the United States is a clear understanding by each of both the power and the limits of its own ideas and a better understanding of the other's attitudes. . . . We must strive to induce the world's great nations to adapt their ideologies to the human requirements of a changing world. . . . The most vital condition of coexistence is the cultivation of a spirit in which nations are more interested in solving problems than in proving theories and more interested in helping people to be happy than in forcing them to be virtuous. . . . Both sides today are showing at least intermittent awareness that their ideologies are as great a source of danger as they are of strength.

His Excellency Paul-Henri Spaak, Belgium (Vice Premier and Foreign Minister)—Today, when we want to speak of coexistence, we feel compelled to take as a basis of our reflections two messages that have come from two different corners of the earth and given by men that obviously had very little in common—the encyclical of the Pope and the doctrine of Mr. Khrushchev. The fact that these two documents should come to similar conclusions is a fact that is impressive and should be very much borne in mind by us all. . . . I do not see how one can impugn the reality of peaceful coexistence. It would mean that we reject the possibility of settling disputes and problems in peace

... which would be both a stupidity and a monstrosity. We must not reject this challenge if we have faith in the political and moral principles of our way of life, if we have faith in our system of democracy, liberty and freedom. . . . To practice peaceful coexistence, we must renounce war with no restrictions. . . . But this will only be possible when a universal organization such as the United Nations is strong enough to establish law and have it respected.

Dr. Adam Schaff, Poland (Member of Central Committee, United Workers' (Communist) Party)—Peaceful coexistence means relations between nations and people belonging to different social, economic, and political systems. It renounces "hot war," but ideological conflicts not only continue but even increase. If somebody does not like it, it is well to remember that it is better we throw on each other's heads ideologies rather than atomic bombs. The oversimplified view that coexistence means the absence of ideological conflict is an enormous mistake. What would this mean? You Americans would have to drop your ideals and what you call the American way of life. The Christians would have to drop their ideals. Are they prepared to do so? Not at all. Now why do you think that the Communists should be prepared to do so? We are not. Nobody is, and nobody should. Coexistence is a fight, a competition, but a very noble one, a competition for the hearts and brains of people. Coexistence, however, requires tolerance, coming closer together, knowing each other better.

It also requires cooperation. If we Communists are stressing that there is no coexistence in ideology, remember that at the same time we are telling something much more important, namely, that we can and we do have the wish to cooperate in all fields.

Dr. H. Stuart Hughes, USA (Professor of History, Harvard University)—I am impressed by the great amount of agreement on coexistence. Five years ago we would not have had this much agreement. But the hardest problem we face is wars of national liberation. We claim that the USSR and China are exporting revolution. They claim that these are spontaneous revolts and that we are exporting counter-revolution. In a way both cliché statements are correct. But if we are Americans of good will, we can try to locate the point at which our efforts, which we say are in defense of freedom, cease by imperceptible stages to be that and become instead the export of counter-revolution, as our Soviet friends suggest.

Dr. Fred Warner Neal, USA (Professor of International Relations and Government, Claremont Graduate School)—We have a tendency to avoid thinking about the specifics of coexistence. There is even a group in the government that doesn't like to use the word, in part because it is used by the Soviets for propaganda purposes. One part of our policy is based on the idea that we face the threat of Soviet military aggression, and the other part of it is based on the idea that most revolution is exported. If Mr. Kennan is correct that these ideas are false, and if Mr. Inozemtsev is correct in stating that the USSR feels no present international conflict cannot be settled by negotiation, then I think we must start thinking about what coexistence means in specific terms.

DEAN OF SOVIET PAINTERS IN N. Y. EXHIBITION

"DRAMATIC portraits and figure compositions in the grand operatic manner of Boris Godunov, by the 73-year-old dean of Soviet painters, Pavel Korin, provide one of the most fascinating exhibits in town. . . . Not only a master craftsman, but evidently a profound mystic and humanist, Korin endows his dark, elongated and majestic portraits of bishops, nuns, beggars, blind men and famous artists with a powerful and deeply tragic presence."
N. Y. Herald Tribune, May 13, 1965

THE McCARRAN ACT: 1965

LAATEST developments in the McCarran Act litigation reflect the tense and dangerous situation which the United States has created by stepping up the scale of its intervention in South Vietnam and launching armed aggression against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam (North).

In February, 1965, coincidental with the first bombings of DRV territory, the Department of Justice secured a second indictment of the Communist Party for refusing to register. The original indictment was based on a failure to register for each of eleven days in 1961. The new indictment makes a similar charge for each of eleven additional days in 1965. At the Department's request, the court ordered the two indictments to be tried together and postponed the trial from March to October. This action was taken over the protest of the defendant which demanded the right of a speedy trial.

Similarly, the Supreme Court postponed adjudication of the constitutionality of the Communist-front provisions of the Act when, on April 26, it decided the cases against the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade and the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born. The Court evaded the constitutional issues by finding that the evidence against both organizations was "stale" and directing the Subversive Activities Control Board to take evidence of their current activities. As a result, it will be several years at least before the cases again reach the Supreme Court.

Dissenting from this decision, Justice Black stated:

The [McCarran] Act has borrowed the worst features of old laws intended to put shackles on the minds and bodies of men, to make them confess to crime, to make them miserable while in this country, and to make it a crime even to attempt to get out of it. It is difficult to find laws more thought-stifling than this one even in countries considered the most benighted. Previous efforts to have this Court pass on the constitutionality of the various provisions of this freedom-crushing law have met with frustration on one excuse or another. I protest against following this course again. My vote is to hear the case now and to hold the law to be what I think it is—a wholesale denial of what I believe to be the constitutional heritage of every freedom-loving American.

Obviously, the Johnson administration and a majority of the Court are motivated by considerations quite contrary to those voiced by Justice Black. Their objective, it is evident, is to postpone facing up to the constitutional issues and thus to keep the McCarran Act suspended, like a sword of Damocles, over the heads of Communists and progressives and as a deterrent to the gathering movement of mass protest against an aggressive and adventurist course that threatens the ultimate disaster of nuclear war.

As this is written, the Johnson administration has sent 30,000 troops to rescue the counter-revolutionaries in the Dominican Republic on the pretext that that country is threatened by a "Communist take-over." The future of the twenty year struggle for the restoration of political liberty in the United States is inseparable from these ominous developments in the Caribbean and Southeast Asia. It threatens to be as prolonged and difficult as the struggle to restrain and defeat the forces of aggression in the United States and compel acceptance of a policy of peaceful co-existence.

THE GREAT PATRIOTIC WAR

A review by MURRAY YOUNG

Russia at War 1941-1945, by Alexander Werth. E. P. Dutton & Co., New York, 1964. 1110 pp. \$10.00.

IT HAS taken twenty years for such a book as this to appear, setting down for us in English, in broad, sweeping outlines and vivid, unforgettable detail, what World War II was like for our great ally. The war is always known to the Russian people as the "Great Patriotic War," Mr. Werth reminds us again, and its cost to them was beyond measure in sacrifice, agony and death.

In this twentieth anniversary year of the war's end it would be well if this book were widely read: much we never knew about the struggle in the East is revealed, much we have forgotten is again brought to our attention, and much that was distorted through the cold war years is set straight. "It was the Russians," Mr. Werth reminds us Churchill said in 1944, "who tore the guts out of the German army."

From his unparalleled experience of observing at first hand through the four terrible years the Russian people fighting, starving, dying in the besieged cities of Moscow, Leningrad, Stalingrad, Sebastopol, and in the vast desolation of the battle-swept countryside, Mr. Werth reaches the heart of Soviet resistance and the reason for its final triumph when he concludes:

I never lost the feeling that this was a genuine People's War; first a war waged by a people fighting against terrible odds, and later a war fought by a fundamentally un-aggressive people, now aroused to anger...

Arriving in the Soviet Union—where he was born and had part of his education—July 3, twelve days after the start of the Nazi invasion, Werth observed the war from its catastrophic beginning to its victorious end. He was in constant contact with the people, the soldiers, the high-ranking officers, the foreign diplomats. Much of the material is drawn from notes written down on the spot. We hear the workers talking in a Leningrad factory ceaselessly under bombing from the Germans; we listen to soldiers talking in the ruined buildings of Stalingrad; we hear the words of Soviet housewives telling of the Nazi soldiers billeted in their homes sentimentally celebrating Christmas with traditional songs, gifts, and drunken toasts to "the folks at home." We attend diplomatic receptions in the Kremlin; military press conferences; interviews with captured German generals. We hear Stalin on November 6, 1941, speaking in a station of the Moscow subway and on the next morning, at the November 7 rally in Red Square, addressing the troops, even as the German guns could be heard booming in the distance. (After the brief speech and ceremony under the snowy sky the soldiers march directly to the front.) Above all, we hear the voices of the magnificent, waiting Russian women singing through the long, dark years Konstantin Simonov's famous wartime song:

Wait for me, and I'll return, only wait very hard.

Wait, when you are filled with sorrow as you watch the yellow rain;

Wait, when the winds sweep the
snowdrifts,
Wait in the sweltering heat,
Wait when others have stopped
waiting, forgetting their yesterdays.

Werth's description of Moscow in the autumn of 1941 recalls the somber city that Simonov has portrayed in his superb novel *The Living and The Dead*. But it is his account of Leningrad in the dreadful winter months of 1941-1942 that conveys to the reader the greatest intensity of feeling. Werth sums up the experience of that beautiful and heroic city:

There can really be no comparison with London; the blitz was terrible enough, though it was not comparable to what German cities got a few years later. The bombing of London was really worse than the bombing or shelling of Leningrad, at least in terms of casualties. But only if one imagined that everybody in London was starving during the blitz winter, and ten to twenty thousand people were dying of hunger in London every day, would it be possible to put an equation mark between the two. In Leningrad the choice lay between dishonorably dying in German captivity or honorably dying (or, with luck, surviving) in one's own unconquered city. Any attempt to differentiate between Russian patriotism, or revolutionary ardor, or Soviet organization, or to ask which of the three was the more important in saving Leningrad is also singularly futile: all three were blended in an extraordinary "Leningrad" way.

Werth is skeptical of a good many aspects of the official Soviet version of the war, but about Leningrad—as the quotation above shows—he will countenance no divisive opinion. Between October 1941 and January 1942 some million citizens of the city perished of starvation and when

the summer came a third of the depleted population were too ill and weak to work.

Deliberate starvation was one of the chief methods used by the Nazis to exterminate the Russians—a fact far too little known in the West. Rosenberg, Hitler's "philosopher," told General Keitel that of the 3,600,000 Soviet prisoners held at the beginning of 1942 only a few hundred thousands were fit to work. Of the more than five million Soviet prisoners taken in the course of the war, three to four million appear to have died in captivity, either through starvation or the mass executions the Nazis practiced throughout Soviet territory.

The story of the deliberate murder of the Russians, both soldiers and civilians, is a story second only to the Nazi slaughter of the Jews. How many people in the West are aware of the true scale of this massacre? All told, some 20,000,000 Soviet people died during the war—of whom 7,000,000 were soldiers. (Other estimates put these figures—particularly for civilians—much higher.)

The brutal termination of all Lend-Lease by Truman in 1945—even before the Japanese surrender—and the subsequent rejection by the President of all loans, must be seen against this death toll, unprecedented in mankind's history.

The descriptions of Stalingrad, of Kharkov just relieved of its first occupation by the Germans (it was to be occupied a second time), of Kiev, Odessa, of numberless villages ruined under the blanket of snow that did not altogether hide the decaying bodies piled in the mass graves, or conceal the gallows from which corpses still hung when the city, village or area was retaken by the Soviet soldiers; the almost unbearable

description of the Maidanek prison camp where some 1,500,000 people were murdered and incinerated in two years—all bring these ghastly statistics alive and close to the reader.

Mr. Werth attributes the swift recovery of the country after the shattering first months of the war to three factors: the rapid restoration of the command in the army; the move of industry to the East; the moral unification of the people in their resistance of the invader. For this last, Werth gives full credit to Stalin.

By June 6, 1944—the day the Allies began their invasion of France—the Soviet army had liberated three quarters of its territory. Two weeks later began the great, final Soviet offensive that was in some ten months to bring the Soviet army triumphantly into the smoking ruins of Berlin.

With the dropping of the first atomic bomb on Japan it was dismayingly clear to the Soviet people that the bomb had been aimed primarily at them, not at the Japanese

who had already made it known they were ready to give up. For all of their monumental sacrifices of the war years, a new and most ominous period was opening for them. This fact also has never been really understood in the West.

Many parts of Werth's account will be questioned, disputed; new evidence will bring new interpretations, new facts new estimates of men, of motives, of events. But for now, here is the first detailed account of the war on the Soviet front. It should be read, pondered, understood in the light of present grave conflicts. Mr. Werth ends his account on a note of warning:

Already it almost seems an historical epic of a bygone age—which can never be repeated. To the Russian people the thought of another war is doubly horrifying; for it would be a war without its Sebastopol, Leningrad, or Stalingrad; a war in which—everywhere—there would be only victims and no heroes.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM

A review by KUMAR GOSHAL

Vietnam: Inside Story of the Guerrilla War, by Wilfred Burchett. International Publishers, New York, 1965. Illustrated with photographs by author. 245 pp. \$4.95.

THE American public, UN Secretary General U. Thant said not so long ago, has not been told the whole truth about the war in Vietnam. Washington rebuked U. Thant, then proceeded to corroborate his contention by making daily statements even wider of the mark than those made before. President Johnson himself made astonishing statements about the Vietnam war when he said at his April 27, 1965 press conference:

Independent South Vietnam has been attacked by North Vietnam. The object of that attack is total conquest. Defeat in South Vietnam would deliver a friendly nation to terror and repression.

In the three sentences quoted above, the President turned an incredible number of facts on their head. South Vietnam is not an independent country in the sense the President meant. North Vietnam has not attacked it, and American troops are not in South Vietnam to drive any invaders back. The people of South Vietnam are far from being friendly toward the U.S. soldiers and the government they

represent. The terror and repression the South Vietnamese suffered under U.S.-supported governments actually provoked the civil war in which the United States has become involved.

The Geneva Conference of 1954, which ended the French war in Indo-China, divided the former French colony into three independent states: Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam. Vietnam itself was temporarily divided into North and South Vietnam, and Ho Chi Minh's forces were persuaded to relinquish a lot of territory they occupied south of the 17th parallel, to save France's face and to allow the French troops to retire gracefully after their disastrous defeat at Dienbienphu. The Geneva Agreement emphatically called for a united Vietnam under one government to be elected in July, 1956.

The United States intervened in South Vietnam in violation of the Geneva agreements which forbade military alliances by and foreign-controlled military bases in Vietnam. It was the U.S.-supported Diem government which refused to hold elections in 1956, as provided in the Geneva agreement.

American intervention has brought the South Vietnamese a series of short-lived, unstable and unpopular governments, and untold suffering from Washington's use of South Vietnam as a laboratory for testing new weapons and training American soldiers in guerrilla warfare. The training has been a failure, the U.S.-equipped South Vietnamese troops have generally tried to avoid clashes with the National Liberation Front guerrillas, and the FLN at present controls some three-fourths of the country.

Most Western correspondents, including the Americans, have candidly reported that the United States has suffered a military defeat in South

Vietnam. Why the world's mightiest power has been defeated thus far by the guerrillas and why it would continue to suffer defeat unless it is ready to obliterate the country, would be clear to anyone who reads Wilfred Burchett's latest book on Vietnam. For this book tells from personal experience what makes the South Vietnamese guerrillas tick.

Burchett is no stranger to this part of the world. This is his second book on the war in Vietnam. It is the result of a visit to the areas under FLN control and the battlefronts of South Vietnam during late 1963 and the first three months of 1964. There is an Epilogue describing his return visit in November, 1964 and January, 1965. Burchett traveled with the Liberation Army, shared their food, walked most of the time and sometimes rode a bicycle; talked with villagers, guerrilla fighters and FLN leaders, including Nguyen Huu Tho, President of the FLN. He traveled with guerrilla forces to the very outskirts of Saigon. He interviewed American POW's.

The book has a wealth of material to satisfy those who desire statistics and those who wish to become acquainted with the ordinary Vietnamese by learning of his daily life, his joys and sorrows, how he struggles at present and what he hopes and fights for.

From this book there emerges a picture of South Vietnam totally different from what the American press has described; for, even the most sympathetic American correspondent has been largely confined to the big cities and, on the rare occasions when he has visited a hamlet, he has seen only the face the villagers turn to a stranger whom the village felt it could not completely trust.

The FLN controls the greater part of South Vietnam. "It is a govern-

ment in everything but name," Burchett writes, "with Committees of Military Affairs, External Affairs, Public Health, Culture, Information and Education, Post and Telecommunications, Economic Affairs and others functioning as ministries, with their various departments and sub-departments." The people in Burchett's book, under the FLN administration, are alive and vigorous, full of earthy humor despite their grim struggle. And the struggle is described in detail and thoroughly documented. Burchett also shows how the villagers naturally identified themselves with the Liberation Army, whose members mostly sprang from the villages and peasant families.

Burchett does not neglect any aspect of the war in Vietnam. He describes, for instance, the American "gifts" an FLN fighter possesses:

Attached to his U.S. webbing are: the tiny bottle lamp already mentioned and in which U.S. cartridge cases play a vital role; his U.S. nylon hammock which is standard sleeping equipment, with parachute cords for hitching it to trees; a water bottle with a big U.S. stamped on the cloth container; a cluster of hand grenades made in the Front's own workshop, and finally the round bomb of rice—a 24-hour ration—wrapped in U.S. parachute nylon. His standard arm is the U.S. carbine, but a percentage of his comrades-in-arms will be carrying Garands, tommy guns, 37mm machine guns, a variety of bazookas and mortars, and in battalion-sized units, a few highly appreciated 57mm recoilless cannon.

Anyone who reads this book would be convinced not only of the urgent necessity for peace negotiations but of FLN participation if the negotiations are to be successful; one would also see why military victory in South Vietnam is beyond the reach of the United States.

BOOKS ON THE USSR

Russia and the Soviet Union, A Bibliographical Guide to Western Language Publications. Paul L. Horecky, editor. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1965. 473 pp. \$8.95.

ACCORDING to the introduction to this guide, some 9,000 books and articles on Russian and Soviet affairs were published between 1956 and 1962—alone! This compilation—a companion to *Basic Russian Publications: An Annotated Bibliography on Russia and the Soviet Union*, also edited by P. L. Horecky—was drawn up by experts in the fields covered. It will be found of great usefulness to serious readers, students, and librarians who must find their way through the ever-increasing amount of published material on Russia and the USSR.

The bibliography covers publications in the Western languages with emphasis on English. The concise annotation of the separate entries, the efficient organization and the careful editing, make this guide, like the earlier bibliography of publications in Russian, an invaluable aid.

RUSSIA AND HAWAII

Russia's Hawaiian Adventure, 1815-1817, by Richard A. Pierce. University of California Press, Berkeley, 1965. 245 pp. \$5.50.

THIS is a collection of instructions, letters, reports, treaty texts and other documents concerning a little-known episode in the history of Russian expansion in the Pacific in the early 19th century.

The introduction by the editor guides the reader through the documents reprinted, which present interesting material on the early history of the exploration of Hawaii and Alaska,

PUBLICATIONS ON THE USSR

We have purchased the following booklets from Crosscurrents Press and offer them to readers at half price, as follows:

	Cents
A Society of Abundance	.25
These Are Our Ideals	.15
Man, Society and the Future, by Acad. Stanislav Strumlin	.30
A Scientist's Responsibility, Vas- sili Yemelyanov	.25
Government and Administration of USSR	.15
Population, Geography and Climate of USSR	.15
Communism and the Family	.25
Program of the CPSU (as adopted)	.25
Documents of the 22nd Congress Vol. I and II.	.25 each
The Soviet Stand on Disarma- ment	.50
The First Man in Space (Gagarin)	.25
Gherman Titov, (autobiography)	.25
Statement of Soviet Govern- ment on China, Sept. 21, 1963	.25
Two Major Soviet Statements on China	.25

Packet of the entire group \$3.00

Order from:

New World Review

Suite 308 156 Fifth Ave.
New York, N. Y. 10010

SOVIET FILMS

Now in Release:

Plisetskaya Dances
Sandu Follows the Sun
When Trees Were Tall
Tchaikovsky's Opera "Yolanta"
Nine Days of One Year
The Duel
Dimka
Cavalcade of Ballet and
Folk Dance

Released by:

ARTKINO PICTURES, INC.
723 Seventh Ave., N. Y., N. Y. 10019
Telephone: Circle 5-6570

People Come First

by JESSICA SMITH

Now available at \$5.00 (cloth)

For some time we have not been able to fill requests for the above. We have now secured some remainder copies and can fill orders at this reduced price (originally \$2.75). Written following a visit in late 1945, the book has permanent value in its record of what World War II meant to the Soviet People.

Order from

NEW WORLD REVIEW

Suite 308
156 Fifth Avenue
New York 10, N.Y.