

NEW  
WORLD  
REVIEW

Third quarter 1969 \$1.00

THE SUPREME TASK: END THE WAR  
an editorial review

ISRAEL'S WAR

Tom Foley

MAO'S FOREIGN POLICY

Daniel Mason

THEY FOUGHT FOR THEIR COUNTRY  
Mikhail Sholokhov

THE PHILIPPINES

William J. Pomeroy

THE TWO GERMANYS

Margrit Pittman

SIBERIAN SCIENCE CITY

Jessica Smith

D. N. PRITT: THE NAZI WAR CRIMES ISSUE

DOCUMENTS: THE WORLD CP CONFERENCE • SOUTH VIETNAM  
PROVISIONAL REVOLUTIONARY GOVERNMENT PROGRAM

Reviews: Murray Young on Paustovsky • Sidney Finkelstein on *Katerina  
Ismailova* • Daniel Mason on Pomeroy • R. Salimova on Elizabeth Moos

# NEW WORLD REVIEW

THIRD QUARTER 1969

Editorial Comment	1
China's Foreign Policy <i>Daniel Mason</i>	12
Israel's War <i>Tom Foley</i>	23
The Philippines—Ties With Socialist Countries <i>William J. Pomeroy</i>	35
Nazi War Crimes <i>D. N. Pritt</i>	46
The Two Germanys <i>Margrit Pittman</i>	52
They Fought for Their Country <i>Mikhail Sholokhov</i>	57
US Philosophers and Marxism <i>Howard Parsons</i>	77
Marxism and Guerilla Warfare <i>Daniel Mason</i>	81
Siberian Science City <i>Jessica Smith</i>	86
Women of Uzbekistan <i>Khudzhuma Shukurova</i>	102
Current Documents	
World Communist Conference	107
NLF 10-point Peace Proposal	111
South Vietnam Action Program	114

## REVIEWS

<i>Years of Hope</i> , by Konstantin Paustovsky— <i>Murray Young</i>	119
<i>Soviet Education, Achievements and Goals</i> , by Elizabeth Moos— <i>R. Salimova</i>	121
<i>Katerina Ismailova</i> (film)— <i>Sidney Finkelstein</i>	122
<i>The Power of the Pentagon</i> (spe- cial issue of <i>The Progressive</i> )— <i>J. S.</i>	123
<i>Lenin, Krupskaja and Libraries</i> , ed. by S. Simsova	124
<i>A Cultural History of Russia</i> , by <i>Joel Carmichael</i>	125
Assorted Russovietalia	125

## O! To Be Young, In Love, Fancy-Free, and Reading NWR . . .

We are planning a special issue on Youth for the Fall. It feels like "here we go again" with another huge project on a complicated subject with no end!

But contributions are coming in, on problems which young minds ponder, questions as yet unanswered on their lips: What socialism offers to youth; education and job training, the arts, leisure time; is there a participatory socialist democracy?; the generation gap, alienation, relation of individual to society; views of Soviet youth on morals and marriage, sex and the family, the problem of individual responsibility; contacts with young people of other countries. Etc. Etc.

Help us meet this crying need of our young people for understanding: send us your views on what to include, especially questions asked by young people about socialism; order extra copies of the Fall issue at a special price for distribution among young people (order blank, p. 127). You will have to face their questions yourself, of course, but that's a very necessary dialogue.

And it will make you feel young again. In fact, nine out of ten NWR subscribers rated our magazine second only to the Fountain of Youth.

JESSICA SMITH, *Editor*

DANIEL MASON, *Associate Editor*

DAVID LAIBMAN, *Assistant Editor*

SARAH HORN, *Research Secretary*

CLIFFORD JAY, *Circulation*

Vol. 37, No. 3, 3rd Quarter, 1969

Second class postage paid at New York, N. Y.  
Subscription \$3.50 per year; \$1.00 a copy.  
(Canadian and foreign \$4.50 a year. Draw  
money orders or checks payable in New York.)  
Published quarterly 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: CHel-  
sea 3-0666.

PRINTED  
IN  
U.S.A.

209 

## Our Supreme Task: To End the Vietnam War

THE HOPES of the American people that their sons would be withdrawn quickly from the slaughter in South Vietnam and that the war would be halted—promoted deceptively by President Nixon and his aides—have been rudely shattered in recent weeks. It has become clear that Nixon has no intention of ending the US invasion or of carrying out a full-scale return of US troops within the foreseeable future. In announcing the withdrawal of 25,000 American GI's, he claimed that—depending upon the response of the Vietnamese fighters for liberation—he might consider the withdrawal of another 75,000 US troops before the end of 1969, and expressed a vague hope that the rest of the 550,000 land soldiers might be shipped back to the United States by the end of 1970.

It is obvious from this that the Nixon administration does not have any plans for halting the Vietnam war soon. But even this vague promise has no firm foundation. The President has attached two conditions for any massive withdrawal: that the Saigon puppet regime's army be ready to assume the main burden of fighting the war against the liberation forces, and that US air and naval support shall remain.

But the Pentagon and the US military commanders in Vietnam see no prospect that the Saigon puppet regime's army will be in any position to assume the responsibility for the actual fighting against the liberation forces. *U.S. News & World Report's* Saigon correspondent, Sol W. Sanders, writes (June 30) that US military men on the spot believe 75,000 additional troops could be withdrawn "without crippling the US effort." But for a larger number, "those making the political decisions" are bound to get opposition because of "lingering doubt about the South Vietnamese Army" by the US command.

Whether "those making the political decisions in Washington" have any different perspective than the Pentagon and the US military commanders in Vietnam is, however, doubtful. Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird declared recently that the transfer of responsibility for the fighting to the Saigon puppet regime's army would be a slow process.

It is evident from all this that, if the Nixon administration has

its way, the slaughter in Vietnam will continue for many years. But recent events indicate that the American people do not intend to let the Nixon administration have its way.

The most significant indication of the nation's impatience with the President's maneuvers to prolong the Vietnam war is the recruitment of new and powerful forces from the labor movement to the struggle for a speedy halt to the slaughter and the withdrawal of US troops. A major weakness of the movement for peace up till now has been the lack of support from the organized workers. Now a major break has occurred.

At the founding convention of the Alliance for Labor Action (ALA), held in Washington May 26-27, 1969, one of the main resolutions adopted called for an immediate end to the Vietnam war. The significance of this is obvious when one notes that the ALA consists of the International Teamsters' Union and the United Auto Workers, with a joint membership of more than three million workers. The resolution to halt the Vietnam war takes on added importance from the fact that it was not a ukase from the top leadership of the Teamsters and UAW, but was approved by more than 500 delegates representing union members from all over the country. In support of the resolution, Teamster General Vice President Frank E. Fitzsimmons (the union's acting president) declared:

We find the youth of the nation up in arms over an unpopular war in Vietnam, up in arms over the billions of dollars this country spends annually to carry on this war in the Far East, when our own people go begging right here at home. This war, the bane and plague of both Democratic and Republican administrations, must be stopped, and must be stopped soon.

How significant this action is can be gauged by the fact that in the past, as Fitzsimmons himself has said, the Teamsters have concerned themselves mainly with "bread and butter" issues and have not registered any position on national policy matters.

Within the AFL-CIO itself, where President George Meany has sought to stifle any expression of opposition to the Vietnam war, a new break was revealed recently, when President Jerry Wurf at a June leadership convention of District 37 of the 400,000-member State, County and Municipal Workers Union, demanded that all US troops be withdrawn from Vietnam immediately.

These actions by powerful segments of organized labor should be a tremendous encouragement to the peace forces in the nation, not only because of the actions themselves, but because they make it possible to add new power to the struggle for an end to the Vietnam slaughter in the communities throughout the country.

This struggle to end the Vietnam war immediately is the paramount task of the American people. The future of the nation depends on it. Never before in our history has there been such opposition in high places to government military actions and military spending. Never before has there been such public exposure of defense department activities with their wasteful and inefficient weapons systems, never such airing of the dangers we face of an unchecked arms race and the ultimate risk of a world thermonuclear war. A vast movement of the youth and all the people, however they differ on other issues, must take advantage of these opportunities and join in forging a massive antiwar movement.

### *Nixon Responsible for Continued High Casualties*

**I**T HAS now been revealed that the continued high level of fighting in Vietnam has by no means been the result of continued "enemy offensives" as maintained by the Administration. W. Averell Harriman, former head of the US negotiating team, has explained the real state of affairs in a number of TV and other public statements. The *New York Times* summed this up in an editorial on May 25: Harriman had made clear that the continued high level of casualties is due to Nixon's continuing the Johnson policy of stepping up US offensive actions during negotiations, and that this policy had hampered the peace negotiations and prevented de-escalation of hostilities.

Harriman declared that the North Vietnamese "took 90 per cent of their troops out of the two Northern provinces of South Vietnam" when Johnson finally completely halted the bombing of the North on November 1. This withdrawal enabled the US commander, General Abrams, to shift his troops from the Northern provinces to the Saigon areas, "and thus increase our offensive actions there." Thus the offensive of the other side in February came *in response to* this stepped up US pressure in the South, continued and intensified by the Nixon Administration; the clear opportunity to scale down the war at that time was lost. Harriman said the orders to General Abrams should be withdrawn; referring to the opposing forces, he said:

We can't expect to put all our pressure on them and expect them to lie down and be a dead dog . . . they are proud and they've been fighting for a long time and you can't deal with them high-handedly.

Such advice has gone unheeded by the Administration. On his return from the Midway meeting Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird described US military tactics in Vietnam as "maximum military pressure on the enemy consistent with lowest possible casualties," the first part of the statement making nonsense of the second.

Only after the National Liberation Front came out with its constructive ten-point program for a negotiated peace (see page 111 for text) did Nixon come forward with his own hastily concocted "peace plan" which proved to be no program at all but simply a continuation of the bankrupt Johnson policy. This was followed by the President's dash to Midway to placate his worried puppet President Thieu with promises of continued support and his attempts to placate and deceive public opinion with the announcement of the token troop withdrawal.

### ***South Vietnam Provisional Revolutionary Government Formed***

**T**HE NLF delegation at Paris waited patiently for a long time for some sign that Nixon was ready to enter into serious negotiations to end the war, which he had claimed to be a "first priority" matter on taking office. When no sign came, the NLF and other South Vietnamese, representing the will of the overwhelming majority of the South Vietnamese people and controlling about 85 per cent of its territory, moved ahead to convene a conference of all resistance forces in the liberated zone. The conference, meeting June 6-9, set up a Provisional Revolutionary Government, which with the full support of the DRV Government officially took over the representation of the people of South Vietnam at the Paris Conference and endorsed the ten-point NLF program. (See page 114.)

In this move, the Alliance of National, Democratic and Peace forces joined with the NLF, and members of Saigon's own government and army participated. Discussions have followed with other nationalist, patriotic and democratic groups in Saigon and Paris, with the aim of setting up a provisional coalition government under which free elections can be held. The possibility of a "peace cabinet" to replace the Thieu regime and enter into genuine negotiations on behalf of Saigon is also under consideration. According to Wilfred Burchett (*National Guardian*, June 21), "The PRG has left the coalition door open for representatives of all political tendencies in South Vietnam which subscribe to the minimum NLF demands for peace, independence and neutrality. This of course automatically rejects any top members of the present Saigon regime."

All this, of course, exposes the utter nonsense of Thieu's hysterical cry after Midway that "Never, Never!" would he join a coalition government. No one has asked him nor ever will. The Thieu-Ky regime represents no one in Vietnam. Thieu's attempt at the end of May to form a pro-government political alliance to counter the NLF in elections ended in utter failure. He was able to pull together only

a narrow-based group of reactionaries, anti-Communist war-mongers and Catholic refugees from the North. Not a single well-known popular figure was present. Indeed, the only political figures who might be called upon to broaden the base of the Thieu Government are in jail. An eight-member US study team headed by Rep. John Conyers (D-Mich.) prepared a report of their findings in Saigon, May 25-30. It describes the torturing of political prisoners—and children—which the Thieu regime has used to destroy all opposition, and the vicious religious repression carried on by the regime as well. The study team found that of 100,000 people incarcerated in South Vietnam, 67 per cent are in jail for political activities.

### ***The PRG Action Program***

**T**HE Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam announced a 12-point action program on June 11. It appealed to the whole people of South Vietnam to unite in a decisive political and military struggle, and demanded that the United States enter into serious talks with the PRG on the basis of the NLF ten-point program; called for the overthrow of the Thieu puppet government and for free, democratic general elections without foreign interference, supervised by a provisional coalition government; pledged land reform, and full civil and democratic rights with freedom of enterprise for urban industrialists and traders, and freedom of thought; advocated proper conditions for building "an independent, self-supporting economy," improving living conditions and protection of "the right of ownership of means of production," urged a struggle "against the enslaving and depraved culture and education of the American brand"; proclaimed a foreign policy of peace and neutrality, with active support for national independence movements and the "just struggle of Afro-Americans" in the United States.

The Administration and its Paris team tried to shrug off the establishment of the Provisional Revolutionary Government as meaningless and have insisted that nothing has changed. Nevertheless, they had no choice but to agree to its seating at the Paris talks in place of the NLF delegation. Huynh Tan Phat, well-known Saigon architect and NLF Secretary General, has been named PRG President, Tran Buu Kiem, previously NLF delegation head, has become minister without portfolio in the new government, attached to the Paris negotiating team, and Mme. Nguyen Thi Binh, formerly deputy head of the NLF delegation, and now PRG foreign minister, has moved into first place in the PRG delegation.

As of this date (June 26) twenty or more governments have been

reported as recognizing the Republic of South Vietnam, as the PRG calls itself. They include the USSR, China, Algeria, Syria, Cuba, Romania, Poland, North Korea, Congo (Brazzaville), Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, the German Democratic Republic and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam.

### ***Upsurge of Congressional Opposition to Vietnam War***

**T**HE MORATORIUM vouchsafed President Nixon on criticism of his Vietnam war policy has come to an end. Senator William F. Fulbright (D-Ark.) announced over TV on June 22 that new hearings to evaluate US policy in Vietnam would soon be held by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which he heads. He said that he and other Democrats had held their fire during the early months of the Nixon Administration "with the hope that the President would make some movement . . . towards a change in the war and de-escalation or stopping it, but nothing happened." He said he and other like-minded Senators had become disillusioned after Nixon's bellicose Airforce Academy speech and the Midway meeting, and were now preparing to speak out forcefully.

Senate opposition to the Vietnam war was further expressed by the Senate resolution passed June 25 by a 70 to 16 vote calling on the executive branch not to commit US troops or financial resources to foreign countries without the express approval of Congress.

This grew directly out of the White House's commitment of the nation to war in both Korea and Vietnam, in defiance of the constitutional requirement of a declaration of war by Congress.

The resolution was aimed at preventing any recurrence of such tricks as President Johnson's ramming through the Tonkin Gulf resolution in 1964. While Congressional authority "to take all necessary measures" to reply to any "armed attack" on our forces in Southeast Asia was given on the basis of a specific retaliatory action, Johnson took the resolution as a green light to launch a full-scale undeclared war in Vietnam, which Nixon now carries on, in violation of the constitution.

While the resolution is not binding upon the executive branch, it "represents a reaction against the whole trend of postwar foreign policy, which has seen a global extension of American commitments" and indicates that the Nixon Administration will be under pressure to give greater weight to Congressional opinion in future foreign policy decisions. (*New York Times*, June 26.)

President Nixon had expressed sharp opposition to any such resolution on the ground that it might "tie the hands" of the President.

### ***People's Opposition to the Vietnam War***

**U**NITED STATES peace forces, in temporary disarray because of expectations that something would come of the Paris talks, are on the move again. We have already noted the tremendous access of strength to the peace movement through the Alliance for Labor Action's strong antiwar stand.

National peace organizations are planning to step up their activities. Women Strike for Peace and the Women's International League are planning new actions; religious groups are increasing their antiwar efforts. Two days of anti-war activities were sponsored by the Clergy and Laymen concerned about Vietnam, with Dr. Benjamin Spock reading out the names of the 36,000 American dead and the names of the Vietnamese towns and villages destroyed by the war. Names of dead soldiers are also read out at one of the regular vigils organized by Quakers, a number of whom have been subjected to arrest, on the steps of the US Capitol in Washington. They have been joined in these demonstrations by members of Congress, including Mrs. Shirley Chisholm (D-N.Y.), first Black woman congressman, and Adam Clayton Powell, Jr. (D-N.Y.).

Many American women's organizations and peace groups are joining with the Voice of Women in Canada in big antiwar demonstrations on the occasion of a visit by a group of Vietnamese women.

One of the most heartening developments was the transformation of many college and university commencements throughout the country into demonstrations against the Vietnam war.

Describing these events the *New York Times* of June 15 reported that "many students wore the war resisters' white arm band over their academic robes at their graduation exercises." The dominating mood was "somber, sometimes angry." There was deep concern about the mounting deaths caused by the war. Many antiwar resolutions were read. At Harvard over half of the graduating class wore sleeve bands in protest against ROTC on campus and the war in Vietnam, and an SDS speaker was permitted to make an antiwar address. At Yale 77 per cent of the graduating class signed a strong antiwar petition; 143 graduates said they would risk jail rather than enter military service. Graduating senior William Thompson called for an end of the war and said it "is destroying not one nation but two, the Vietnamese and our own." At Princeton Michael Bernstein, valedictorian and top-ranking student among the 771 graduates, said that the United States is sick because it is "a country that uses helicopters and guns on our brothers in Berkeley, Missouri and Vietnam." Similar

antiwar sentiment and actions prevailed in many other commencement, joined by both students and faculty, and sometimes by trustees and parents as well. When Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, closest adviser to Nixon and co-architect of his war policies, was recently awarded an honorary degree at Brown University, two-thirds of the students turned their backs on him as being a symbol of a "senseless and immoral war." The new Vietnam Moratorium Committee indicates the growth of student antiwar sentiment.

At the same time, divisions and uncertainty among New Left groups have considerably hampered the progress of united, large-scale antiwar activities. In SDS this was mainly due to the influence of the Progressive Labor group, which has turned against the DRV government because of its participation in the Paris peace negotiations. With the split which has now severed the PLP from the organization, the regular SDS group is again more actively involved in the fight against the Vietnam war. One of the principal national action resolutions passed by this group was a call for a mass antiwar demonstration to be held in Chicago in October.

The National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam plans major anti-war actions in the Fall.

### *Worldwide Protests Against the War*

**W**ORLDWIDE protests have gained new impetus as it has become clearer that no new policies could be expected from the Nixon administration, only continued aggression in Vietnam and continued failure to adopt any reasonable negotiating position in Paris.

May 16-18 a three day International Conference on Vietnam took place in Stockholm, attended by hundreds of people from many countries. At its concluding session an appeal was adopted calling for a worldwide campaign in support of the 10-point NLF program, and for withdrawal of all US and allied troops from Vietnam.

The World Congress of Women held in Helsinki June 15-19, attended by 1000 delegates from 110 countries on five continents, sent a telegram directly to President Nixon asking that he seriously consider the 10-point NLF program, recognize the right of the South Vietnam people to self-determination without outside interference, meaning that US and allied troops must be totally and unconditionally withdrawn.

Richard Morford, Executive Director of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship and member of the organizing committee for the World Council for Peace, gave *New World Review* his impressions of the Peace Assembly in East Berlin on his return, June 25:

### END THE VIETNAM WAR

In my judgment the Assembly made a great contribution in uniting the forces for peace around the world. It was a serious, intensive, well-organized endeavor through four days and nights to appraise in depth the problems of building a peaceful world liberated from war, imperialism and racism, to work out the next best steps toward peace and to plan coordinated action.

Mr. Morford was particularly impressed by the fact that the Assembly of 1,000 delegates represented a forum for representatives of so many countries to take counsel together, with delegates speaking out from Ceylon and Mongolia, from Madagascar and the Sudan, from Israel, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France, Canada, the USSR and the USA. He declared that understandably our own nation came in for major criticism in the commissions on Vietnam, European security, neo-colonialism, disarmament. He declared:

Understanding the obstacles we face here, and in sympathetic spirit, yet the Assembly was compelled to tell us of our grave responsibilities in the struggle for peace. Our USA delegation of 30 brings home the resolutions of the Assembly and the proposals for actions with renewed determination to build a stronger movement for peace and with appreciation of the worldwide moral support and cooperation we shall have in doing so.

### *Appeal of World Communist Parties*

**O**F PARAMOUNT importance in the world struggle against imperialism and its present most aggressive expression in the US onslaught on Vietnam, was the meeting of the seventy-five Communist and Workers' Parties held in Moscow, and the main document adopted at the closing session on June 17 (See page 107). While some differences among the parties were fully aired at the conference discussions, and reflected in reservations on some questions of the final document by a minority of the parties, there was absolute unity on the urgency of combined action against the dangers of imperialism and its aggressive policies, and on the new opportunities for advancing the struggle by the coming together of "three mighty forces of our time—the world socialist system, the international working class and the national liberation movement."

The conference adopted a special appeal to all the nations of the world to act jointly for "safeguarding and strengthening peace:"

The struggle is going on for the main thing—for the future of the human race. In the first half of our century two world wars have taken a toll of over seventy million lives, have razed to the ground thousands of flourishing towns and villages. The sinister atomic mushroom over Hiroshima is a tragic warning against the consequences which may be brought about by a third world war if imperialism succeeds in unleashing it.

It placed the main responsibility for aggressive war and encroachments on the people's freedom on US imperialism.

It is imperialism, above all American imperialism, that steps up the arms race, aggravates international tension, fans up conflicts and local wars in different spots of the world. American imperialism, this sworn enemy of the freedom of peoples, is striving by all means to suppress the national liberation movement, is hatching reactionary coups, is foisting anti-popular regimes upon the people and propping them up.

The appeal outlined the many existing threats to peace, but in its call for action gave first place to Vietnam:

For many years now, the American imperialists have been waging an aggressive war in Vietnam with the use of the most brutal means.

To demand an end to US aggression in Vietnam, withdrawal of American troops, respect for the sovereign rights of the Vietnamese people— independence, freedom and peace for Vietnam.

The world Communist Parties called for multiplying efforts in the struggle for complete implementation of "the principles of peaceful coexistence between states, irrespective of their social systems," for easing of international issues through talks, for the banning of all nuclear weapons and destruction of their stockpiles, for prohibition of all types of chemical and bacteriological weapons and for consistent and stubborn efforts for general and complete disarmament.

A special appeal on "Independence, Freedom and Peace for Vietnam" went more deeply into the struggle in Vietnam and the threat of US aggressive policies there and everywhere, and called for making July 20, the anniversary of the signing of the Geneva Agreements, into an "international day of solidarity with Vietnam and for an end to US aggression."

#### **Administration Drives Ahead with Militarist Policies**

**I**N THE face of the sharp opposition of top scientific and political figures and the general public, the Administration continues its "positions of strength" policy by trying to push through its ABM Safeguard program, and the even more dangerous course of testing and ordering production of MIRV (multiple independently targeted re-entry vehicle). Thereby it is endangering the success of the disarmament talks with the Soviet Union which it has continued to delay, although the USSR stated its readiness for such talks a year ago and renewed the offer on the day of Nixon's inauguration.

Efforts of the Administration to justify its Safeguard program on the basis of alleged USSR "first strike" intentions are running into trouble. Defense Secretary Laird's hysterical cry that there is no doubt "The Soviets are going for a first strike capability" was followed up by a statement by General Lyman Lemnitzer, formerly Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, that the USSR represents

a "greater threat" today than when NATO was set up 20 years ago and now has the capability "to deliver a surprise attack."

But a story from Washington in the *New York Times* of June 18 showed up the fallacy as well as contradictions on which the Administration's position is based. It reported that the US Intelligence Board, presided over by CIA director Richard Helms and representing all military intelligence branches as well as the State Department, the Atomic Energy Commission and the National Security Agency, had concluded that while the Russians are moving to strengthen their deterrent forces, this falls short of a "first strike capability."

The Administration's credibility is also being strained by the escalating estimates of Safeguard costs. First estimate given Congress last March was \$6.6 billion; increased early May to \$7.8 billion (including "overlooked" costs of ABM nuclear warheads); increased May 22, by addition of other "forgotten" items, to \$10.8 billion. Dr. Ralph E. Lapp, who has been serving as informal scientific consultant to Congressional opponents of Safeguard, estimates (*New Republic*, June 21) that the initial Safeguard investment will mushroom into \$60 billion or more, huge profits meanwhile going to the aerospace industry.

Early in June a 61-page report was issued by nine US Senators and 36 Congressmen opposing the war in Vietnam, the ABM Safeguard system and continued MIRV tests and demanding reassertion of control of the military bureaucracy by Congress. It warned the American people that the Pentagon is turning the United States into a garrison state and declared that one trillion dollars of taxpayers' funds had been spent for war purposes since World War II.

The *Washington Post* on June 10 reported the action of a bipartisan group of 56 legislators urging postponement of MIRV testing pending efforts to reach agreement with the Soviet Union on limiting offensive weapons. In a related development June 16, 41 Senators cosponsored a resolution introduced by Senator Edward Brooke (R-Mass.) urging the President to seek agreement with the Soviet Union to halt testing of multiple-warhead missiles. It was not disclosed until June 26 that at that very time the Air Force had awarded an \$87 million production contract to General Electric for 68 MIRVs.

In the continuing drive in Congress for the examination and reduction of military spending much important testimony has been aired at hearings of the Joint Economic Committee headed by Senator William Proxmire, on "The Military Budget and Economic Priorities."

(Continued on page 76)

DANIEL MASON

## China: Mao's Great-Power Foreign Policy

*This article continues the analysis by NWR's associate editor, of the current developments in China and in Sino-Soviet relations, in which many readers have expressed an interest. We hope to provide further studies of Chinese political and social realities in future issues. — Eds.*

**I**N MARCH of this year, *Kwangmin Jihpao*, a Peking journal, declared that "Chairman Mao's new 10,000-year plan will prevent revisionism and will rear true successors to the proletarian revolutionary cause." This was on the eve of the Ninth Congress of the Communist Party of China (CPC), held in Peking during April.

It was to be expected therefore that the CPC Congress would deal with this "10,000-year plan" and evolve a program for at least the first few years of such a long-term plan. But the few documents and press communiques that were made public during and after the congress gave no indication that this was done. Nor did the Congress, according to the sparse information available, initiate any programs for the economic and social development of the Chinese people.

Only two documents were made public: "Report to the Ninth National Congress of the Communist Party of China" by Lin Piao, Mao Tse-tung's heir, and a new "Constitution of the Communist Party of China." Chairman Mao made two speeches, one in opening the Congress on April 2, the other on April 14, after the Congress had approved Lin's report and adopted the new constitution. No public report was made of these two speeches except a few words in the official press communique of April 14, which referred to "the extremely important speech made by Chairman Mao at the opening session of the Congress" and asserted that "at the plenary session on April 14, the great leader Chairman Mao made an extremely important and inspiring speech."

The actions of the 1,512 delegates to the congress, according to the press communiques, consisted of the following: "All the delegates received a profound education after conscientiously discussing and studying the extremely important speech made by Chairman Mao at the opening session of the Congress.

## CHINA

"All the delegates conscientiously discussed again and again the political report made by Vice-Chairman Lin Piao, paragraph by paragraph and sentence by sentence. . . . The delegates made many good proposals for additions to and modifications of the report.

"All the delegates conscientiously discussed the draft of the revised Constitution of the Communist Party of China, chapter by chapter and article by article.

"After adopting Vice-Chairman Lin Piao's political report and the Constitution of the Communist Party of China, the Congress decided to entrust the secretariat of the presidium of the Congress with the publication of the two documents after making modifications in wording."

As a final act, the delegates elected a new Central Committee of the CPC, handpicked by Mao and Lin, and dominated by military chiefs.

But while, according to information available, the congress did not project plans for solving the internal economic and social problems of the Chinese people, this does not mean that the congress was not of grave worldwide significance.

The CPC congress set up a new type of Communist Party, eliminating all the opposition to the Mao Tse-tung—Lin Piao group, an opposition which had held a vast majority in the leadership of the old Communist Party of China. In its new constitution, it established the "thought of Chairman Mao" as the guiding principle for China. It proclaimed Lin Piao to be Mao's successor, without election.

**B**UT WHAT was of even more significance for people everywhere who are seeking world peace was the fact that the CPC congress made it clear that every other objective was to be subordinated to a furtherance of China's foreign policy. Lin Piao's report and the new constitution of the Communist Party of China revealed that this foreign policy would concern itself with a power struggle against the United States and the Soviet Union for world leadership.

That this is so was partially confirmed by Edgar Snow, the American journalist, who has had a number of interviews with Mao, and who is known for his sympathy with Mao's objectives. In an article entitled "Mao and the New Mandate," which analyzes the Ninth Congress of the Communist Party of China and other events of the recent past, Snow writes:

"In the interests of China and the overwhelming majority of the world, Mao would like to halt the advance of the two great-power hegemonies. That is, to win respect for Chinese hegemony

in her traditional political-cultural sphere of influence in East Asia; in effect to revivify some of the old meaning of 'China,' which is chung-kuo, or 'central realm.' With Sino-Russian antagonism succeeding former unity on the ideological level, what remains is increasingly a great-power struggle" (*New Republic*, May 10, 1969).

This great-power struggle objective is incorporated in the new CPC constitution, which declares, in Chapter 1, General Program:

"The Communist Party of China upholds proletarian internationalism; it firmly unites with the genuine Marxist-Leninist Parties and groups the world over, unites with the proletariat, the oppressed people and nations of the whole world and fights together with them to overthrow imperialism headed by the United States, modern revisionism with the Soviet revisionist renegade clique as its center . . ."

Stripped of all the encumbering phrases, this means that the Mao-Lin grouping has set as its aim a great-power struggle against US imperialism and the Soviet Union as it is now constituted.

Lin Piao's report to the CPC's ninth congress underscores the section in the new constitution which establishes as the objective of the Mao-Lin regime to destroy US imperialism and the Soviet Union. Almost the entire section of Lin's report dealing with China's relations with foreign countries concerns itself with this. Lin quotes Mao thus:

"Working hand in glove, Soviet revisionism and US imperialism have done so many foul and evil things that the revolutionary people the world over will not let them go unpunished. The people of all countries are rising. A new historical period of opposing US imperialism and Soviet revisionism has begun."

It is within this framework that Lin Piao attacks US imperialism and Soviet "revisionism" as joint enemies of China and the entire world, and calls for their destruction.

The dangerous consequences of such a line can be seen if one recalls that Mao has said that "political power grows out of the barrel of a gun." Also Mao has written:

"The seizure of power by armed force, the settlement of the issue by war, is the central task and the highest form of revolution." (Both quotations cited by Lin Piao, in his article "Long Live the Victory of the People's War," *Peking Review*, September 6, 1965.) And Mao's statement that "war is the highest form of struggle between nations, states, classes and political blocs" (quoted by E. Sulimov, *Sovetskaya Rossia*, March 16, 1969).

The most significant aspect of Lin Piao's report in dealing with China's foreign policy is the relative space he assigns to US imperial-

ism and the Soviet "revisionists." Only one paragraph is devoted to a denunciation of US imperialism, the rest to an attack on the leaders of the Soviet Union as "practicing social imperialism and social-fascism." And he calls for their destruction in these words:

". . . All countries and people subjected to aggression, control, intervention or bullying by US imperialism and Soviet revisionism, unite and form the broadest possible united front and overthrow our common enemies."

But it is clear from Lin Piao's report that the Mao-Lin regime considers the Soviet Union as now constituted to be the main obstacle to their quest for world power and their plans call for a prolonged postponement of confrontation with US imperialism.

That is how most Western observers see the foreign policy of the present Chinese regime developing. Following the Sino-Soviet border incidents earlier this year, the *Frankfurter Allgemeine*, one of West Germany's most influential newspapers, asserted (3/11/69):

"The latest anti-Soviet campaign which is sweeping the country [China] has had definite consequences. . . . There was absolutely no doubt about the feelings of anger, fear and hatred being oriented all in one direction. What had long been in the offing became obvious: Hostility for the Soviet Union has acquired absolute priority."

In his *New Republic* article cited above, Edgar Snow writes: "As between Soviet revisionism and American imperialism—particularly since China has the bomb—Mao may now regard Russia as the greater menace. Americans are not Asians and sooner or later must go home, Mao thinks. Russia is another matter . . ."

This, however, is no new line for the Mao regime. On August 12, 1966, the Eleventh Plenary Session of the Eighth Central Committee of the CPC adopted a communique which declared:

"The Plenary Session maintains that to oppose imperialism, it is imperative to oppose modern revisionism . . ."

An article in *People's Daily* (Peking, July 21, 1967) declared: "To oppose imperialism, it is necessary resolutely to oppose the counter-revolutionary line of the Soviet revisionist clique. There is no middle road in the struggle between the two lines." On June 5, 1969, *Kwangming Jihpao* called on China "to prepare both for a conventional and a big nuclear war against Soviet revisionism."

**T**HE strategy of the present Chinese leaders' foreign policy for achieving their objective of defeating "Soviet revisionism" has four points, as revealed in recent actions and policy statements:

- To win the support of colonial, semi-colonial and newly in-

dependent third-world countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America.

- To secure as allies the countries of Western Europe and Japan.
- To come to some kind of agreement with Washington to avoid confrontation with the United States.

- To split off the socialist countries of Eastern Europe and the Communist parties of the rest of the world from the Soviet Union and to promote overthrow of the present leaders of the USSR by the Soviet people.

In pursuance of its goal of winning hegemony over the peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America, the present Chinese regime is promoting guerilla warfare in the countries of those continents, without regard for relations of political and social forces. The aim of the Mao-Lin group is made clear in a hitherto untranslated talk by Mao on "strategic dispositions," which originally appeared in *Shaosan*, a newspaper of Red Guards of the "Red Flag" tendency, and which was published in *New Left Review*, London, March-April, 1969. Mao is reported to have said:

"China should not only be the political center of the world revolution. We must give them weapons. We can now do so openly; that is, except in some special regions, we can give them inscribed Chinese weapons. We must support them openly and become the arsenal of the world revolution."

To provide an ideological base for its activities in Africa, Asia and Latin America, the present Chinese regime has developed a new theory of world revolution, in which the colonial and semi-colonial countries are the primary force and the countries of North America and Western Europe are the enemy. In this theory, there is no differentiation between the peoples and working classes of those countries and their capitalist rulers. This theory was first propounded publicly by Lin Piao, in his article, "Long Live the Victory of People's War":

"... The countryside, and the countryside alone, can provide the broad areas in which the revolutionaries can maneuver freely. The countryside, and the countryside alone, can provide the revolutionary bases from which the revolutionaries can go forward to final victory. Precisely for this reason, Comrade Mao Tse-tung's theory of establishing revolutionary base areas in the rural districts and encircling the cities from the countryside is attracting more and more attention from the people in those regions.

"Taking the entire globe, if North American and Western Europe can be called 'the cities of the world,' then Asia, Africa and Latin American constitute 'the rural areas of the world.' . . . In a sense, the

contemporary world revolution also presents a picture of the encirclement of cities by the rural areas. In the final analysis, the whole cause of world revolution hinges on the revolutionary struggles of the Asian, African and Latin American peoples . . ."

Mao and Lin appear to have transposed the unique experiences of their country's national-liberation war into a worldwide context, without any consideration of the political and social situation in each country and its relationship to world imperialism. They have set up a wall between the peoples of the semi-colonial countries and the peoples and working classes of the imperialist countries. They seem to believe that this type of division will win the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America to their side in achieving their worldwide ambitions.

For some years now, the present Chinese regime has been wooing the capitalist governments of Western Europe and Japan in an effort to neutralize them if not to win them to China's side.

In January and February, 1964, a French parliamentary delegation visited China and met with Mao Tse-tung. They reported that he told them: "France herself, Germany, England on the condition that she ceases to be the courtier of America, Japan and we ourselves—there is your Third World" (*New York Times*, February 21, 1964).

This would appear to be an entirely new concept of the Third World that Mao is projecting. The Third World has always been thought of as the grouping of the governments of the nations of Africa, Asia, Latin America, and such European countries as Yugoslavia non-committed to either the United States or the Soviet Union. But for Mao, in pursuit of allies, the governments of the capitalist countries of Western Europe are the new "Third World."

In his search for allies in this new "Third World," Mao has been assiduous in his flirtation with the rulers of Japan. In February 1964, British correspondent Richard Hughes reported that Mao had said that his bid to Japan "may help us in many respects. . . . In the political respect we must also support each other. . . . Japanese monopoly capital belongs in the second intermediate zone. Even this capital is displeased with the United States and some of its representatives openly come out against the USA. Although monopoly capital of Japan is now dependent on the USA, time will pass and it will throw off the American yoke" (*Sunday Times*, London, February 22, 1964).

On July 10, 1964, Mao met with a delegation from the Japanese Socialist Party. Japanese newspapers reported that Mao told the visiting Socialists that he supported Japan's claims to the Kurile islands, which the Soviet Union now holds. According to these same

papers, he complained that the Soviet Union had seized many areas, including Outer Mongolia and territory in Eastern Europe (D. J. Doolin, "Territorial Claims in the Sino-Soviet Conflict," Stanford 1965, Document 3, pp. 29-31).

In that same July 10 interview, in an apparent effort to show the joint character of the Chinese-Japanese territorial aims, Mao is reported to have told the Japanese Socialists: "The Russians took into their possession 100 years ago certain territories east of Baikal, including Khabarovsk, Vladivostok and half of Kamchatka. We have not yet presented our bill for this territory."

In an obvious bid to the neo-Nazis and monopolists of West Germany, Mao is also reported to have told the Japanese Socialists: "The Soviet Union split one part of Germany from the other half and millions of the inhabitants were forced to flee to the West."

In its approach to the rulers of Japan, the present Chinese regime has not been averse to using racism as an argument for uniting their forces.

In mid-September 1962, Kenzo Matsumura, a leader of the ruling Japanese Liberal-Democratic party, was invited by Chinese leaders to visit Peking. Matsumura, who was a member of Tojo's World War II cabinet, is notorious for his racist views about Japan's place in the world. Knowledge of this, however, did not deter Liao Cheng-chi, chairman of the Chinese Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee, from sending Matsumura a letter, which said: "We have studied your opinions in detail and, as we have the desire to conduct a frank exchange of opinion with you, using them as the basis, we invite you to China" (Sekai, Tokyo, June 1963).

After Matsumura's arrival, *Jenmin Jihpao*, the Peking newspaper, quoted him, without comment or criticism:

"I consider this visit portentous. It will help, step by step, to switch the relations between our two countries to the track of relations which should exist between nations having the same color of skin and the same written language. Vice-Premier Chen Yi had many talks with me, where it was said that East is East and that the Asians should change world history. We must unite and strengthen the ties between our peoples, whose race and written language are the same."

**T**HE THIRD point in the strategy of China's present foreign policy of defeating "Soviet revisionism" is to seek agreement with Washington to avoid confrontation with US imperialism. This was made clear by Foreign Minister Chen Yi in an interview with Scandinavian newspapermen in May 1966. Chen Yi is reported to have declared: "It

is dangerous for China to have bad relations with the United States when her relations with the Soviet Union are also not very good" (*International Affairs*, Moscow, February 1969).

In pursuance of this aim, despite public denunciation of "US imperialism," the present Chinese regime has been carrying on secret negotiations with Washington for many years in Warsaw, and through Hong Kong and Tokyo.

In an article entitled "Changes in Peking-Washington Relations," Dr. Brezaric, a Yugoslav foreign affairs expert, writes: ". . . the dialogue between the USA and China has been marked by steady contact over the past thirteen years. From the standpoint of statistics, the number of over 130 meetings [in Warsaw] between the Chinese and American ambassadors is an impressive figure . . ." (*Review of International Affairs*, Belgrade, April 20, 1969).

While Brezaric admits to the difficulty of arriving at an accurate estimate of these talks, he asserts that "a more complete analysis suggests that the balance may be qualified as positive." The Yugoslav writer adds:

"The positive side to the contacts so far certainly lies in their having influenced both sides to show more realism in confrontation, and not to err in their calculations, which was of particular importance during the most critical periods of the Vietnam War. There is no proof that an agreement of the following substance was achieved: that if China did not send her troops to Vietnam, the USA would not attack China—but would it be so strange if it happened to be the truth?"

In this connection the interview given Edgar Snow by Mao Tse-tung in Peking, January 5, 1965, takes on special significance. In answer to a question as to whether there would be war between China and the United States over Vietnam, Snow reports Mao as saying "that could occur only if American troops came to China. They would not really get much out of it. That simply would not be allowed. Probably the American leaders knew that and consequently they would not invade China."

When Snow speculated that Washington didn't understand Mao, he reports Mao as commenting: "Why not? China's armies would not go beyond her borders to fight. That was clear enough. Only if the United States attacked China would the Chinese fight. Wasn't that clear?" (*New Republic*, February 27, 1965).

It should be recalled that barely a month later, February 7, 1965, President Johnson began the vast escalation of the Vietnam war.

With the acceleration of its campaign against the "Soviet revision-

ists," the present Chinese regime has stepped up its efforts for an agreement with Washington. As soon as Richard Nixon was elected President last November, Peking sent a message proposing a Warsaw meeting for February 20, 1969, at which the Chinese and US ambassadors would discuss moves for a detente between the two nations. This did not come out of thin air. As Brezanic pointed out:

"The Chinese were the first to show signs of good will and interest in breaking the ice with the new administration. They proposed continuation of talks in Warsaw. President Nixon accepted, which meant that both sides had let their attitude regarding contacts be known . . ."

Harry Schwartz, a member of the *New York Times* editorial board, wrote: "There is some reason to believe that they [the Chinese] are using Japanese contacts to pass the word along to Washington that they, too, are interested in doing business with the new occupant of the White House."

On February 18, 1969, Peking canceled the February 20 Warsaw meeting, ostensibly because of the defection in Holland of Chinese chargé d'affaires Liao Ho-shu. But that does not mean the end of negotiations with Washington. As Genevieve Tabouis, the noted French commentator on foreign affairs, wrote: "Although the Warsaw meeting has been postponed, there will be far more productive secret contacts."

**T**HE FOURTH point in Peking's foreign policy strategy is efforts to destroy support for the Soviet Union in the working class of the other countries and to promote the overthrow of the present Soviet government by its people. It has set up splinter groups everywhere to challenge the Communist Parties. It has begun negotiations with the governments of Yugoslavia, formerly its biggest focus for attacks on "revisionism," and Romania.

The *Washington Post*, commenting on this in an article entitled "Chinese, Yugoslavs Healing Rift," suggested that "though they certainly reject Chinese ideology, East European Communists might eventually find that Peking is a useful lever against Moscow" (Quoted in *New Times*, Moscow, March 26, 1969).

The latest indication of Peking's efforts to subvert the Soviet people appeared in Lin Piao's report to the Ninth Congress of the Communist Party of China in April. He said:

"We firmly believe that the proletariat and the broad masses of the people in the Soviet Union with their glorious revolutionary tradition will surely rise and overthrow this clique consisting of a handful of renegades."

Washington and the other centers of the capitalist world have welcomed openly the shift of Peking's foreign policy and see in it the possibility of threatening the Soviet Union from both Europe and Asia. The Sino-Soviet border clashes in March were the signal for expressing these views.

The *New York Daily News* said that Washington likes "the confrontation policy carried on by Peking as regards other Communist countries." The *Washington Evening Star* sees Peking's recent moves as an effort "to open an anti-Soviet front in the Far East" (both quoted by *Pravda*, March 14, 1969).

On March 8, the *Economist*, organ of British big business, advised Washington to hold up on any detente with the Soviet Union because of Peking's conflict with the USSR, saying that it should "explore the greater flexibility that might emerge from a balance maintained, not on a seesaw but on a triangle. . . . Better relations with China might encourage the Russians to negotiate seriously."

But what was really in the minds of the *Economist's* editors was revealed on March 22, when it advised Mao to turn to the Soviet borders if it wanted territorial expansion. The *Economist* declared that if Mao wanted "quick results," "the southern door will remain effectively locked to him . . . there remains only one exit to the box; the one to the north."

The *Paris Nouvel Observateur* made the point bluntly, when it declared that "by stepping up his activity on the Eastern frontiers, Mao puts the Western frontiers in question too." Writing in that newspaper March 10, Albert-Paul Lentin sees West Germany as the western focal point for the two-front attack on the Soviet Union. He wrote:

"The West German leaders are closely following developments in a conflict between two countries, one of which—the USSR—remains their chief adversary, while the other—China—is in process of becoming a most interesting commercial partner. The prospect of seeing China call in question . . . all the 'arrangements' reached in the world after World War II, indisputably strengthens in the Federal Republic the camp of those politicians who, despite growing pressures from allied capitals, refuse *de jure* recognition to the Oder-Neisse frontier."

That Peking's anti-Soviet plans fit in with the program of the West German regime was made clear by Franz-Joseph Strauss, its Finance Minister, in a book entitled *A Program for Europe*, published in 1968. Strauss, who represents the extreme right wing of the ruling Christian Democratic Union, and is expected to be the next Chancellor, wrote:

"In its political aspect, the Russian-Chinese conflict is not disadvantageous to Europe; on the contrary, it is advantageous because to

us Europeans the 'red peril' will always seem more dangerous than the 'yellow peril,' especially as it is not China but the Soviet Union that rules over European territories. . . . Red China is interested in the existence of a power on the western frontier of the Soviet empire in Central Europe while we are interested in the Russians being more strongly engaged on their eastern border in Asia" (p. 8).

The most elated people in the West over the Chinese foreign policy strategy are the neo-Nazis of West Germany. Following the March Sino-Soviet border clashes, the *National Zeitung*, organ of the neo-Nazis, headlined the front page in its March 21 issue: "*China Rettet Deutschland*" (China Saves Germany). It hailed Mao as "China's Great Man" in another headline, and declared China would save Germany if Mao continued in his present attacks on the Soviet Union. The *National Zeitung* called for a Washington-Bonn-Peking axis.

---

"ON THE ONE hand, the Chinese leaders assert that war is inevitable as long as imperialism exists, and put forward the view that international tension and the cold war are a boon. On the other hand, they say that if world war does break out, nothing terrible will happen, because half of mankind will remain alive anyway, and will build an even more wonderful future.

"If you couple these views together, you will see clearly that they do not deal at all with what will happen if the imperialists unleash war, in spite of all the efforts of the forces of peace. Nothing of the kind, such talks are a means of camouflage. In reality the stand of the Chinese leadership looks quite different. The war variant of the development of events is regarded by it as inevitable and even more desirable than the peaceful variant.

"With all this in the background, it is hard for the Chinese leaders to present themselves as the champions of peace and of peaceful co-existence.

"The core of the matter, however, is not only in the quotations and statements but in the fact that in recent years the Chinese leaders have been carrying out in practice a policy which leaves no doubt of their desire to undermine peaceful coexistence between states of differing social systems.

"Having no faith in the possibility of preventing thermonuclear world war, the Chinese leaders are putting themselves in the path of carrying out the measures proposed by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries to lessen international tension. Every time that, thanks to the efforts of the socialist countries and peace-loving peoples, a relaxation of tension has taken place in recent years, the Chinese leadership has left no stone unturned in order to undermine such a relaxation."

From Soviet Government statement, September 21, 1963.

TOM FOLEY

## Israel's War: Six Days and Two Years

*"War is never an isolated act. . . . War is a continuation of policy by other means. . . . The political design is the object, while war is the means, and the means can never be thought of apart from the object."*

KARL VON CLAUSEWITZ, On War.

**T**HE MIDDLE EAST war of June 5-10, 1967, can be seen in isolation, or it can be seen as a continuation of a political design, whose pattern is woven into the context of world political relationships. Certainly, it is hard to conceive of the Middle East in isolation from the rest of the world. It is the center, the hub of three continents, and the midway point between them. It is the area where more than 65 per cent of the world's proven petroleum resources lie, 70 per cent of them owned by the United States, which has over \$3 billion invested in them. It is an area where the Arab national-liberation movement could threaten those investments and also threaten US dominance in Asia, Africa, and Western Europe. The Middle East is the source of Western Europe's oil supply, and modern industry and armies run on oil.

The idea, then, that the 1967 Mideast war was a momentary aberration, having no connection with wars in Southeast Asia, southern and Western Africa, wars of national liberation, and sharpening conflict between the socialist camp and imperialism, seems unbelievable. It was no "isolated act," but rather a "continuation of policy by other means."

Two years have passed since the Israeli army inflicted a stunning military defeat on the armies of Syria, Jordan, Lebanon, Iraq, and Algeria. But this Israeli victory over the past two years has slowly

---

TOM FOLEY studied as a Ford Foundation Fellow at the University of Teheran in Iran, 1960-62. He was an Assistant Professor of History at California State College, and is now a staff writer for the *Daily World*.

evaporated. Israeli soldiers still remain on territories conquered from the Arabs, from Syria's Golan Heights to the north all the way down to the east bank of the Suez Canal to the south.

Israel lost slightly under 700 men killed in the 1967 war. The number of Israelis killed in the past two years since then is slowly, day-by-day, inching up toward that wartime figure. The armies of the Arab states, so badly smashed up in 1967, have been built up to the point where they once again have a defensive capacity. The economic losses caused by the war have been made up to a great extent. The progressive Arab governments in Syria and the United Arab Republic have not fallen.

The Israelis still hold Syrian territories containing the headwaters of the Jordan River. They still block the opening of the Suez Canal and control all of Sinai, with its producing oil fields at El Morgan, on the west coast.

But most important of all, Israeli military occupation extends over 300,000 Arabs in the Gaza Strip and 600,000 Arabs in the West Bank area of the old British mandate of Palestine, annexed to Jordan in 1951, who were refugees from the Palestine civil war of 1947 and the Arab-Israeli war of 1948-49. These, together with the other Arabs under Israeli occupation, brought the total up to 1.5 million Arabs—compared to 2.4 million Jewish Israelis.

The conquests of the 1967 war meant that the Jewish population of territory under Israeli control dropped from 89 to 55 per cent. Before 1967, the 270,000 Arabs in Israel formed 11 per cent of the total population and were in no position to do anything except lead quiet lives. Today, the situation is totally different.

Nearly 70 per cent of Israel, mainly the area south of Beersheba, is to all intent uninhabited. Israel's pre-1967 population of Jews was 75 per cent urban, closely concentrated in the north, in the cities of Tel Aviv-Jaffa, Haifa, Ramat Gan, and the Israeli-held sector of Jerusalem. Nearly a third of the total population lived in Tel Aviv-Jaffa alone.

Arab guerilla movements existed before 1967, but they were ineffectual in both a political and military sense. They operated to a great extent in sparsely-settled areas, and they had no mass base to create a resistance movement within Israel.

Today, the Israeli population has 26,000 square miles of additional territory to take care of, inhabited by 1.5 million Arabs who are implacably opposed to Israel and always have been. The mass base of resistance is there, in the occupied territories, among the Arabs who live there, and whatever strength the various Arab guerilla organiza-

tions have today, it is derived from that mass base. If it ceased to exist, the guerillas would go right back to their pre-1967 state of helplessness and ineffectuality.

The point should be clear: as long as Israel remains in the occupied Arab territories, Arab resistance will intensify until it reaches the level which typified Algeria in 1954-62. And the French nation outnumbered the Algerian Arabs four or five to one.

**I**SRRAEL could end the Arab resistance overnight if it pulled out of the occupied territories, as the UN resolution of November 22, 1967, demanded. At the same time, it would remove the greatest single threat to its internal security it has ever faced. And it would prepare the basis for a lasting peace with all the Arab states.

President Gamal Abdel Nasser, of the United Arab Republic, in a February 10, 1969 interview with *Newsweek* magazine, has given what has emerged as a plan acceptable to all the Arab states for restoring peace to the Middle East. Nasser said that in return for an Israeli withdrawal, the combined Arab states would offer: "1) a declaration of non-belligerence; 2) the recognition of the right of each country to live in peace; 3) the territorial integrity of all countries in the Middle East, including Israel, in recognized and secure borders; 4) freedom of navigation on international waterways; 5) a just solution to the Palestinian refugee problem."

Essentially, this plan of Nasser's is a repeat of the UN's November 22, 1967 resolution. Nasser recently has added to it the statement that it is not a "package deal." The various proposals could be put into effect separately. The Arab demand for an Israeli withdrawal would not mean an immediate pull-back to the pre-June boundaries, but could be in stages, while both sides verified the implementation of the agreements. When Nasser was asked whether he would sit down with the Israelis after they began their withdrawal, his reply was affirmative.

The UAR President said: "I can tell you that we sat down with the Israelis after the 1948 war under the armistice agreement until the 1956 war, and that we are prepared to do so again. We had joint committees with United Nations observers and it was Israel who refused to continue this procedure after 1956."

But the Israeli government's position has not changed over the past two years. Israel's political leadership continues to demand "direct talks" with the Arab states while it occupies their territory and claims to have defeated them. It has not given any indication of what such talks might be about, other than a hint that the Arabs would be told to

**UAR-SOVIET STATEMENT**

FOLLOWING meetings in Cairo June 10 to 13, 1969, between Soviet Minister of Foreign Affairs Andrey Gromyko and United Arab Republic President Gamal Abdel Nasser and UAR Foreign Affairs Minister M. Riad, a joint statement was issued.

The statement reported that discussion had been held "on the further development of the friendly bilateral relations between the Soviet Union and the United Arab Republic," and the exchange of opinions "on the dangerous situation . . . that has developed as the result of Israeli aggression against the Arab states of June 5, 1967 and the policy of territorial expansion" by the Israeli regime since then which is "preventing the establishment of peace in the Middle East."

The statement added: The USSR and the UAR "believe that Israel's refusal to fulfill the Security Council's resolution of November 22, 1967, and its continued occupation of the three Arab states confirm its expansionist policy, are a continuation of the aggression against the sovereignty and integrity of these states and a violation of the basic principles of the United Nations charter. . . ."

"The Soviet Union and the United Arab Republic again state that the search for a peaceful settlement in the Middle East demands that the Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967, be fulfilled in all its parts and provisions and that Israel withdraw its troops. . . ."

The statement reaffirmed the Soviet Union's "full support for the just struggle of the United Arab Republic and other Arab states to overcome the aftermath of the aggression" and stressed the UAR's oft-stated "acceptance of the Security Council's resolution and its readiness to fulfill it . . ."

recognize Israel. Evidently there would be some hard bargaining about where Israel's permanent frontiers lie. Until these direct talks are held, the Israeli government refuses to take one step toward peace.

Israeli Premier Golda Meir, in an April 27, 1969 interview with the *New York Times*, said she did not expect Israel to give back the occupied Arab territories. She said the Jordanian part of Jerusalem was now "absolutely" part of Israel. These two statements mean that Israel rejects both the UN resolution of November 22, 1967, and the UN resolution of June 14, 1967 reaffirming the international status of Jerusalem.

Israeli officials dismissed as "nothing new" and as "propaganda" both Nasser's proposals and the near-identical proposals offered by King Hussein of Jordan on April 10, 1969.

Israel's government has shown that it does not consider the mission of UN special envoy Gunnar Jarring, Swedish Ambassador to the Soviet Union, to be at all useful. Jarring toured the Middle East,

sounding out various statesmen on where they might agree privately on what they could not acknowledge publicly. UN Secretary-General U Thant has "categorically" denied that the Jarring mission is over, even temporarily. The Secretary-General's unusually forceful denial was directed at the English-language Israeli newspaper *Jerusalem Post*, which had reported that Jarring had quit. The *Jerusalem Post* story was almost instantaneously picked up by US news media and spread all over the world before the story could be denied.

An Israeli cabinet decision places the Israeli government in complete opposition to Four-Power talks on the Middle East now going on in New York among the UN ambassadors of the United States, the Soviet Union, Britain, and France. Israel's official position is that it will not accept any solution "imposed" by outside powers. UN Ambassador for Israel Yosef Tekoah stated that the Four-Power talks actually blocked peace possibilities by encouraging the Arabs to resort to force.

The Four-Power talks are secret, but it is known that among the questions discussed in them is the boundary question: one proposal would set up demilitarized zones all along Israel's borders, so at no point would the Israelis and Arabs have contact with each other. The discussions were continuing over how wide the DMZ should be, according to sources close to the talks.

**W**HILE THE Israeli government has rejected every proposal for a negotiated settlement in the Middle East, its particular fury seems to be reserved for the Soviet Union. An outside observer might be forgiven for thinking that Israel is in a state of permanent military and diplomatic war with the USSR, if the intemperate and often insulting language used by Israeli officials to attack the Soviet Union were his only means of judging the situation.

When Soviet Premier Alexey Kosygin finished speaking at the emergency session of the UN General Assembly on June 19, 1967, Israeli Foreign Minister Abba Eban took the floor to denounce Kosygin, the Soviet Union, and all their works. The South African-born Israeli diplomat practically accused the Soviet Union of goading the Arabs into starting the 1967 war.

Eban was interviewed recently by the West German magazine, *Der Spiegel*, and his comments showed that his position has remained the same for the last two years. Eban said: "I cannot call the Soviet proposals peace proposals because the truth is they are intended to prevent peace." Eban said that the USSR's peace plans could not even serve as a basis for discussion: "The very fact that the proposals

emanate from Moscow makes them unacceptable to us from the outset."

This incredible anti-Sovietism was also reflected in Mrs. Meir's statement in her April 27 interview this year when she said: "I think that Russia is at least as responsible as the Arabs in the '67 war—maybe more so."

There are apparently three main points in the Israeli leadership's position: 1) refusal to get out of the occupied territories, in effect their practical annexation; 2) refusal to accept any negotiated solution, i.e., outright rejection of peace with the Arabs; 3) sharply increased and almost crusading anti-Sovietism.

If this Israeli position is merely denounced from a moralistic point of view, it cannot be understood. The Israeli ruling group is not being simply willful or stubborn because it enjoys the hostility of nearly the entire world.

**T**HE ISRAELI leadership is caught up in a trap its own decisions prepared for it over the years. A fatalist would use the Arabic term "kismet," meaning the "share" or "portion" already allotted to someone by Fate, to describe this situation. It involves two major problems: the problem of Palestinian Arabs and the problem of the Arab guerillas.

Before 1918, there was no "Palestine." The area which came to be known as Palestine under the British mandate, 1918-48, under Turkish rule was divided up into the special administrative area known as the Sanjaq of Jerusalem (Jerusalem and the Negev area) and the Vilayet, or Province of Beirut (present-day northern Israel and Lebanon). The entire area east of the Jordan river was part of the Province of Syria.

The growth in consciousness of a separate Palestinian nationality came about during the years of British rule, as part of the Arab struggle to free themselves from foreign domination.

Britain retained control over Palestine for 30 years because it was able to play off Arab against Jew. By 1947, it was able to claim with some objective truth that the two communities could not live together, having done everything possible to pit them against each other.

The UN Partition Plan for Palestine of November 29, 1947 just barely might have had a chance. But Britain sabotaged every effort to implement it. In the meantime, civil war broke out in Palestine and the British did nothing to stop it, if they did not actually encourage it.

In this civil war the Arabs, that is, the poor Arab peasants of Palestine, did not stand a chance. Those of their leaders who could manage

to get out of the country abandoned them. The peasants were unarmed. Their sources of information about what was going on were few and unreliable. At the same time, as Frank Gervasi wrote on his *To Whom Palestine?* (1946), a pro-Zionist account, the Zionists had a well-trained if not well-equipped army of perhaps 60,000, which was more than a match for all the Arabs put together. Gervasi's statements are interesting because in his *The Case for Israel* (1967), he apparently forgot all he had written in his earlier book and tried to make out that the Zionists were the underdogs in 1947-48.

Today there is general agreement that of the nearly 800,000 Arabs who became refugees in the Palestine civil war and later Arab-Israeli war of 1948-49, some left voluntarily but for the most part they were driven out or expelled as a conscious act of Israeli state policy. Both Norman Bentwich and Nadav Safran, two pro-Israeli authors who are highly respected, say as much in their books *Israel* (1965) and *From War to War* (1969).

In view of the fact that this is a much-disputed point, the statements of Erskine B. Childers, who examined the complete BBC monitoring records of all Mideast radio broadcasts in 1948 should be quoted here: "There was not a single order, or appeal, or suggestion about evacuation from Palestine from any Arab radio station, inside or outside Palestine, in 1948. There is repeated monitored record of Arab appeals, even flat orders, to the civilians of Palestine to stay put."

The Arab refugees who were driven out of Israeli-held areas were forced to live on UN handouts for the next 20 years: 1500 calories a day of food and \$38 a year (seven and a half cents a day). Israel even at that could not have afforded these refugees: the original partition plan gave the Zionists a "Jewish state" with a population of 500,000 Jews and 497,000 Arabs. Since the Arabs had a birth rate double that of the Jews, it seems obvious why so many were finally driven out of Israeli territory. It was a cold, calculated act of political inhumanity which maintained the "pure Zionist" aspect of the new Israel and incidentally the stranglehold of its political leaders on the Israeli people.

By the same token, it can be seen why the Israeli leadership persisted in refusing to carry out the UN resolution of December 11, 1948, which stated: "The refugees wishing to return to their homes and live at peace with their neighbors should be permitted to do so at the earliest practicable date, and that compensation should be paid for the property of those choosing not to return . . ."

If the 800,000 Arabs had been allowed to return, they would have had to be accommodated in the Israeli political and economic system

and might have disrupted the control of the Israeli ruling group. By not allowing the refugees to return, there were other advantages: more than two million acres of Arab land, much of it orchards, and 400 Arab villages. By 1953, then, matters had hardened; out of 370 "new" Israeli settlements, 350 were in these "old" Arab villages and areas.

But by carrying out this policy, the Israeli leadership assured the new state of the existence of groups of people permanently hostile to Israel located all around and just over the Israeli borders. It made certain that the neighboring Arab states would have in their midst constant living proof of the Israelis' inhumanity in war. And it made practically inevitable constant hostilities on the borders between the Israelis, the refugees, and the Arab states.

**T**HE policy toward the refugees implied that Israel had to be as strong or stronger militarily than all the Arab states put together for years into the future. But in 1951-52, Israel was sliding into an economic depression, since it was apparent that it was not a viable economic entity in its own right. How was Israel to finance a military program of such dimensions?

The answer even today is not entirely known, but it is known that due to a lot of US arm-twisting, West Germany agreed to pay to Israel in reparations for Nazi crimes against Europe's Jewish population \$882 million in capital goods (ships, machine-tools, etc.) over the period 1953-66.

West Germany also agreed to facilitate the payment of individual reparations to Israeli citizens of \$1 billion. Through West Germany, Israeli obtained US military equipment. Israel sent its officers to West Germany to be trained, sold West Germany arms, and in turn received arms from the West Germans. It was a very cozy arrangement and it kept Israel above water at least until 1966.

Israel also received from the United States, in private and government aid, nearly \$3 billion, more than all the Arab states put together and working out at about \$1500 for every Israeli man, woman and child.

Still, military equipment and aid was something of a problem for the Israeli leadership until 1954. In that year, Israel began to develop secret and extensive ties with the French fascist military. Col. Benjamin Kagan, of the Israeli air force, in *The Secret Battle for Israel*, writes: "The French Right saw in us a natural ally in its fight against the policy of conciliation in North Africa and was therefore prepared to arm us. . . . The only people we could really consider our

friends were the generals" who with the Rightist politicians believed "that it was in Cairo that France faced her true enemy, the enemy of *Algerie Francaise*."

By its policy toward the refugees, then, Israel was not only drawn into alliance on the side of the United States, West Germany, France, and later Britain, but also into opposition with the entire Arab national liberation movement, including the heroic people of Algeria who were battling French fascists and the Egyptian people who were recovering their national property, the Suez Canal, from the British and French capitalists who claimed to own it.

This refugee policy also led to the Israeli doctrine of "massive retaliation," i.e., sheer terrorism, against the Arabs. In the first of the raids the regular Israeli armed forces carried out under this policy, planned by then-Major Moshe Dayan, the Israelis attacked the Jordanian village of Qibya, in 1953, blowing up the houses of the village while keeping the villagers inside pinned down by machine-gun fire. Fifty-three Arabs, most of them women and children, were killed in this raid. It was only the first of a long series which caused Israel to be condemned in the UN 25 times, and led to constant armed hostilities on Israel's borders.

Israel's refugee policy was even more of a disaster in strictly political terms. Israel's admission to the United Nations on May 11, 1949 was gained only when the UN General Assembly went on record "recalling its resolutions of 29 November 1947 and 11 December 1948" (on repatriation and compensation of refugees). The fact that Israel ignored these strong suggestions once admitted to membership did not make its standing in the UN any stronger.

More importantly, perhaps, when the Arab states, were told by UN resolutions to open up the Suez Canal to Israeli traffic or to do other things, they always refused to do anything, asserting that since Israel had never shown any intention of acting on the December 11, 1948 refugee resolution, they were under no obligation to act until Israel fulfilled its duties as a member of the UN. However this is interpreted, there are grounds for asserting that human rights take precedence over shipping rights.

**B**Y 1966, Israel found itself in deep trouble. Arab hostility continued, while progressive Arab regimes in Syria and the United Arab Republic were growing economically and militarily stronger than ever before. West German reparations were coming to an end. Immigration to Israel that year was only 12,000, while emigration was 11,000, not enough to keep alive those light industries which supplied immigrants

with tools, furniture, etc. Unemployment in one year jumped from three to ten per cent. The balance of payments gap for Israel was \$500 million in 1966 and 17 per cent of its total national income was devoted to paying off the interest charges on debts and loans contracted earlier.

Moreover, France was seeking to recover its lost prestige in the Arab world now that the Algerian war was over and stood in little need of Israel as an ally. Britain was getting ready to withdraw "east of Suez" and was not interested in Israel either.

Only the United States and West Germany remained. The former was paying King Hussein of Jordan \$45 million a year in direct budget subsidies to keep the Palestinian refugees quiet and had moved into Britain's old place in Jordan. The United States was also violently anti-Soviet and was willing to do practically anything to undermine the Arab regimes in Syria and the UAR. The CIA had already conducted several coup attempts against Syria, using in one Col. Salim Hatum, a former Syrian army officer who fled into Jordan after his plots failed.

Through the hard work of the Syrian and Egyptian peoples and the unselfish aid of the Soviet Union, not only a new industrial sector of the economies of these two Arab states was coming into being, but also a new social force — the industrial working class. It was, in fact, only a question of time until this class would be dominant.

The old ruling groups of Syria and Egypt were extremely antagonistic to these developments — not only to the workers and peasants of their own countries, but also to the Soviet Union for helping to strengthen the progressive and socialist forces.

It is unnecessary to go into the details of the 1967 war to point out that there was a certain identity of interests among the United States and its agencies like the CIA, the Israeli leadership, and the Arab social strata hostile to the progressive Arab regimes in Syria and the UAR. During the fighting in Syria in 1967, CIA agent Col. Hatum was found in the combat zone with a list of cabinet ministers for the new government he intended to set up once the Israelis had smashed the Syrian armed forces. His friends had assured him that the Syrian government would fall within the week. Who these "friends" were we are not told. But they told Col. Hatum that they would not fail in Syria as they had in the Cuban Bay of Pigs invasion.

Similarly, in the UAR, a group of reactionary army and civil officers intended to use the smashing military defeat inflicted on UAR forces by Israel to unseat Nasser and establish a new government which would have been anti-Soviet and based on the fanatical Muslim

Brotherhood. Ever since Nasser's "Arab socialist" decrees of 1961, which nationalized more than \$1 billion in property from the Egyptian bourgeoisie and limited landholdings to 100 acres, the businessmen, landowners, and reactionary army officers had been trying to "get" Nasser and now they thought they had him.

The United States was gleeful over the 1967 war, mainly because it believed that the Soviet Union's close ties with progressive Arab states would be ruptured forever, these states would go over to the US side, and the USSR would be "pushed out" of the Mideast.

And the Israelis? They gained the sources of the Jordan River, in Syria, to use as they saw fit in developing southern Israel by pipelined water to hold a substantially larger population. The fervent (and nonsensical) appeal to the world to save Israel resulted in a huge influx of money which cancelled out the balance of payments gap of \$500 million and gave a good deal more besides. They gained 26,000 square miles of additional territory for their use, including the UAR oil fields and the best-watered part of Jordan (which gets in its north-east section 30 inches of rainfall a year compared to 2 inches in the Israeli Negev). They got a part of the Suez Canal.

But most of all, they now had total military and police control of the troublesome Arab refugees, with whom they could do as they pleased, as most military conquerers usually do. At the same time they assumed this control, they canceled out the need to take these people back into Israel — they were, after all, "inside Israel" now, but not as rightful citizens returning to claim a share in Israeli politics and economic life. Rather, they formed a kind of Arab "Bantustan" on the South African model, where the original inhabitants of the land are granted the privilege of living on a small part of it.

**N**OW IT can be seen why today, in spite of all warnings, the Israeli leadership persists in staying in the occupied territories. And its narrowed sources of outside support commit it to a violently anti-Soviet posture in order to insure that the United States and West Germany do not tire of supporting it. It is hard to imagine a more anti-national policy on the part of the Israeli ruling group, a policy that at the whim of the American and West German monopolists could cut Israel loose from all support.

Yet, at the same time, Israel has a better chance now to take advantage of the peace proposals of the Arab states if it decides to do justice to the oppressed Palestinian Arabs and to admit them to Israel with full rights as citizens, and if it withdraws from the occupied Arab territories. This would certainly not be an easy pro-

cess but it would be easier than unending war which could only result in Israel's annihilation. And it would end more than 20 years of bitter conflict with the Arabs. Israel could cease being an armed camp and a tool of US imperialism and become a vital factor in the life of a Middle East at peace.

Soviet Premier Alexey Kosygin spoke to the special emergency session of the UN General Assembly on June 19, 1967, and said: "As long as the Israeli troops continue to occupy the seized territories . . . a military conflict can flare up at any minute with new intensity."

"One may ask," Kosygin said, "why is the Soviet Union so resolutely opposing Israel? The Soviet Union is not against Israel—it is against the aggressive policy pursued by the ruling circles of that State. . . . the very recent aggressive war unleashed by Israel against the Arab countries is a direct continuation of the policy which the extremist ruling circles in Israel kept imposing on their State throughout the lifetime of its existence."

The two years since the Soviet Premier's statement have confirmed his words and underlined them. The 1967 war was a continuation of Israeli policy in every respect, not an "isolated act," and in that sense Kosygin, Clausewitz, and the facts of history agree. But the political design of Israeli policy need not—and must not—continue to be woven with the same pattern, by the same "establishment."

### SOVIET CREDITS TO MIDDLE EAST

ABOUT HALF OF ALL SOVIET CREDITS to developing countries are going to the countries of the Middle East. The USSR is now rendering economic and technical assistance to Middle East countries in the construction of over 300 industrial enterprises and other projects. A total of 170 projects have already been completed and gone into operation.

Soviet credits cover a large proportion of the capital investments necessary for the complete construction of each of these projects. As is usual in the case of Soviet credits, these are being redeemed by deliveries of staple exports to the USSR. Some countries are delivering commodities made at enterprises built with Soviet assistance.

The USSR is cooperating with countries of the Middle East in the development of important branches of industry, power engineering, agriculture and transport. In this way it is helping to meet the desire of developing countries to build up their own industries as an indispensable condition for their further development.

*Soviet News*, London, May 27, 1969

WILLIAM J. POMEROY

## The Philippines: New Ties with Socialist Countries

IN AUGUST 1968 a group of 17 tourists from the Soviet Union, mainly scientific and cultural workers, visited the Philippines for an eight-day period. Except for small much-restricted Soviet delegations attending meetings of United Nations agencies held in Manila in the past, and a brief visit in 1966 by an *Izvestia* correspondent, this was the first group of citizens from a socialist country ever allowed into the Philippines, to whom ordinary Filipinos could actually talk and listen, and who could actually be seen as human beings and not as cartooned menaces. In fact, it was the first sizeable group of Russian visitors permitted to land since the fleet of Admiral Rozhdestvenski stopped off in Manila Bay in 1905 on the way from Baltic waters to destruction at the Battle of Tsushima in the Russo-Japanese war.

This seemingly casual event had more historical significance attached to it than the unfortunate admiral's stopover 63 years previously. It was part of a major change now occurring in the Philippine policy of non-friendly relations with socialist countries that has been rigidly maintained ever since the October Revolution. As an American colony until 1946, the Philippines had no freedom to alter this situation. As a neocolonial country after independence in that year, the Philippines was compelled by American imperialist pressures to bend over backwards in an extreme cold-war anti-Communist stance that ruled out the remotest contact with any country that became socialist.

The extent to which this was carried is rather unbelievable in the present-day world. Tied to the chariot wheels of the Pentagon by military treaties, with huge American military bases on its soil, the Philippines unsurprisingly was drawn into US intervention in Korea

WILLIAM J. POMEROY served ten years of a life sentence in the Philippines for his activities with the Huk guerilla movement there. He is the author of *The Forest*, about his life with the Huks, and is working on a full-length study of US-Philippine relations. Mr. Pomeroy's most recent book is *Half a Century of Socialism: Soviet Life in the Sixties*. He currently resides in London.

in 1950, into the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) in 1954, and into sending a contingent of 2,000 troops to South Vietnam in 1966 in support of US aggression there, all in the name of anti-Communism. The Philippine Government, however, became "more Popish than the Pope" in its attitude.

While the United States, its mentor, maintained relations and trade with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in the depths of the cold war, as did its other fellow-members in SEATO, the Philippine Government was persuaded to follow unrelenting hostility to such countries. The Philippine Foreign Affairs Office had no department to compile information on socialist countries and relied totally on the distorted reports of US intelligence agencies on occasions when information might be needed. Its foreign service personnel were forbidden by specific order to attend even any social function held by the diplomats of socialist countries, either at the UN or in any country, or to speak to such diplomats at the social functions of other countries. In the UN the Philippine delegates sit next to those of Poland: they were forbidden to lean sideways to utter a word to the "Polish Communists."

Philippine passports carry the printed warning: "This passport is not valid for travel to the following countries: Russia, Poland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Czechoslovakia, Romania, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria, and the Communist-controlled territories of China, Germany, Korea and Vietnam." (Tenuous links with Cuba are maintained through a third country, but all Cuban representatives were expelled from the Philippines when Fidel Castro stood up to the United States in 1960.) Filipinos daring to visit any socialist country had their passports confiscated and were threatened with prosecution. Books and magazines from or about socialist countries were impounded by the intelligence agents assigned to the Manila post office, including scientific journals sent to the University of the Philippines. A Yugoslav basketball team, scheduled to play a world championship game with Filipinos in Manila in 1965, was forbidden entry on grounds that it might commit subversion.

Information on the extensive economic aid given to developing countries by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries was blanked out of the Philippine press, which printed instead handouts from the United States Information Service on such fairy tales as that of the "stupid Russians" sending snowplows to tropical countries. No Filipino government official, businessman, diplomat, journalist, or student, to say nothing of the ordinary worker and peasant, was allowed to acquire factual knowledge of how one-third of the world's people

were living or of the normal relations and exchanges they were having with virtually all other people. (As a political prisoner in the Philippines in the cold war 1950s, I recall being barred from reading the novels of Dostoyevsky because he was a Russian!)

**T**HIS STATE of affairs only began to alter around 1965. The change of outlook emanated from Filipino business circles that had long been feeling the restrictions and depredations of American imperialist operations. Exporters of the main Philippine products, such as sugar, copra, coconut oil and abaca (Manila hemp), made dependent on quotas in the US market for over half a century, were complaining that they were "in the position of supplicants, especially regarding price." Without alternative markets they were at the mercy of American purchasers who held back on deals until prices were forced down.

A greater restiveness came from Philippine nationalist industrial and manufacturing interests. These have developed in the past decade or more in spite of US imperialist policies aimed at keeping the Philippines an agricultural, non-industrialized country; they had been able to grow mainly because of an "umbrella" provided between 1950 and 1962 by severe Philippine exchange controls, agreed to unwillingly by the Americans but made necessary by the enormously unfavorable balance-of-payments conditions created by the neocolonial trade pattern with the United States.

These nationalist industrialists have been caught in a fearful squeeze. Not only do they have to compete with difficulty with U.S. products in their own home market, but the brainwashed familiarity of Filipinos with US brand names forces them to manufacture identical articles under licensing arrangements with US monopolies, a situation that makes it hard for them to fight US policies without risking loss of the licensing privilege. Their imported machinery, largely American, is highly priced. Credit facilities are extremely tight for them. US firms in recent years have been raiding Philippine credit sources instead of bringing in new capital from the United States. Between 1956 and 1965, 108 out of the 157 registered US firms sucked up \$410 million of Philippine funds while bringing in only \$79 million. This poses Filipino businessmen with a major problem in refinancing, and makes them sitting ducks for another imperialist scheme, the joint venture, which enables US capital to enter and to win control over Filipino companies that have been forced to the wall.

Around 1965 Filipino nationalists from these groups gained a foothold in the Philippine press and began to agitate against the

## CHINA

neocolonial relations with the USA. Articles began to appear on the extensive trade of the Soviet Union with capitalist countries and, more interesting, on Soviet trade and aid agreements with developing countries like the Philippines. This was a revelation to Filipino businessmen, who learned for the first time of socialist trade that does not undermine a country's foreign exchange position, of fixed non-fluctuating prices paid by the Soviet Union and others for raw materials of the type the Philippines produces, of low interest rates on loans (one-half to one-fourth of those demanded by American banking agencies), of shipping rates on Soviet cargo vessels 15 to 25 per cent lower than those of capitalist shipping lines, of prices for machinery 20 to 40 per cent lower than those charged by American manufacturers, of socialist readiness to supply entire factories in exchange for Philippine products or for Philippine pesos.

Under pressure from these groups, the Philippine House of Representatives passed a resolution in its second session of 1967 creating a committee to "reexamine Philippine national policy toward communist countries." The main body of the resolution read:

Whereas, while the United States, Great Britain, France, West Germany, Japan, Italy, Canada, India and many other democracies of the world have diplomatic, trade and cultural relations with communist countries, the Philippines has adhered to its policy of maintaining no relations at all with communist countries;

Whereas, the main reason of the Philippines in adhering to this policy is the fear that the establishment of relations with communist countries may lead to internal subversion and aggression by such countries;

Whereas, history has shown that generally diplomatic, trade and cultural relations existing between many democracies of the world and communist states have been found mutually advantageous to both parties;

Whereas, if it is true, as we maintain, that democracy is a superior way of life than communism, then there should be no fear that the establishment of relations with communist countries may, in any way, adversely affect the stability of our democracy, our respect for the dignity of the human person, and our devotion to human freedom;

and Whereas, on the other hand, the establishment of such relations may open new markets for our products, broaden our knowledge, enrich our culture, promote understanding and cooperation between our nation and nations with which heretofore we have had no relations. . . .

The resolution then set up a special committee, appointing as its head Representative Manuel S. Enverga, chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and an advocate of an independent foreign policy. From July 12 to December 22, 1967 his committee visited most of the Eastern European socialist countries as well as the Soviet Union and China. Its report was made public in July 1968.

When published, the Enverga Report, recommending full-scale trade and diplomatic relations with socialist countries, had a consider-

## PHILIPPINES

able impact on both government and private circles in the Philippines. It stated that "Socialist Europe is a vast export area for Philippine products of all sorts, and trading patterns and habits do not offer any serious obstacle to the Philippines, seeking to develop products for so huge and varied a market." The committee found that the whole range of Philippine exports and potential exports, both raw materials and processed products, had a ready market.

A special study was made of the Soviet Union's relations with other developing countries, especially India, and the Report stressed the extremely favorable "economic exchange" arrangement in the case of India: capital goods and technical assistance provided to India are paid for in rupees, the balance in favor of the Soviet Union being retained in India as a portfolio against which the Soviet Union imports products from India, thus preserving Indian gold exchange reserves. This was particularly impressive to Filipinos, who have to endure a dollar drain in trade with the United States and a chronic balance-of-payments deficit.

In its summarized findings, the Enverga Report asserted that: "In any relations which may materialize [between the Philippines and the socialist countries], the Mission is convinced that whether it be loans, technical aid, exchange of goods, or cultural exchanges, there is absolutely no danger of (a) the Filipinos suffering any form of exploitation, and/or (b) their having to worry about the subversion of the Philippines' constitutional institutions or processes." In elaboration on the latter point, the Report said: "Marxism is now part of the literature of world civilization; its principles and teachings (from which socialism is derived) are in the open market; it is all up to the student or intellectual how to take Marxism."

The proposals in the Enverga Report were underwritten by formal resolutions of recommendation by the Chamber of Commerce of the Philippines, the Philippine Chamber of Industries, and the Philippine Chamber of Agriculture and Natural Resources. In the Chamber of Commerce a special Committee on Communist Trade was set up in September 1967. In March 1968 this committee succeeded in having its proposals on communist trade accepted as the main resolution at a large National Foreign Trade Convention held in Manila. Within ten days of this convention President Ferdinand Marcos declared as a matter of national policy the immediate exploration of channels of trade with socialist countries.

Among the recommendations of the Enverga Report that were approved by the House of Representatives were: "For Congress through the proper legislation to establish, or cause the establishment

of a well-manned division in the Department of Foreign Affairs, said division to concern itself mainly, in its studies, researches, labors and functions, with affairs in all countries of the Socialist world"; and, further, "For Congress through the proper legislation to establish or cause to be established in the state universities at least, if not in major private universities of the nation, institutes for the study of the language and histories of the socialist countries."

Opponents of the trade move sought to place legal obstacles in its path, pointing to a relic of the cold war, Republic Act No. 4109, which prohibited exports to or imports from any country without formal trade relations with the Philippines. A bill sponsored by Enverga and approved by the House of Representatives amended this Act and specifically allowed trade with socialist countries.

Commented the weekly *Graphic*, a Filipino magazine that had taken the lead in clamoring for a change in policy: "There is no question about the many opportunities that are now being presented to the Marcos government to help him wake up to the new exigencies of international developments and events. For the Philippines, a policy of nationalism and independence is the only answer to our present requirements. Besides, something ought to be done about our image abroad as a 'puppet state.'"

ONCE the long-closed door had been set ajar, it was pushed further open by a two-way traffic. A stream of Filipino journalists, legislators, businessmen and students went to socialist countries, especially the Soviet Union and China. The 17 Soviet tourists in August 1968 put relations on a popular level; furthermore they were received by President Marcos himself, who discussed cultural exchanges with them. In September 1968 the noted Philippine dance group, the Bayanihan, performed in Moscow, Kiev, Leningrad and Riazan (where it was overwhelmed with a 40-minute ovation). Their tour was reciprocated by a visit of a group from the Bolshoy Ballet to Manila in March 1969.

Many of the Filipinos, particularly the students, who went to Moscow or Peking at this time did so in defiance of their government's ban on such free travel. In 1967 alone there were over 50 cases of defying the ban. The Foreign Affairs Office attempted to halt the increasing trend by issuing a rule making it mandatory to obtain prior permission. Passports were confiscated and prosecutions threatened but the FAO retreated from these actions under strong press criticism, and the ruling has continued to be flouted or evaded.

Approval of the Enverga Report recommendations was soon followed by what amounted to a rush to jump over the remaining ob-

stacles to trade. In October-November 1968 two Philippine missions, one governmental, one private with the endorsement of President Marcos, journeyed to socialist countries. The governmental mission, headed by Undersecretary of Commerce Fernando C. Campos, held discussions in Moscow with a team of the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Trade, and on November 4 agreement in principle was reached on trade procedure and on a tentative list of commodities to be exchanged. Rice, copra, coconut oil and abaca were Philippine products initially approved for Soviet import, while the Soviet Union agreed to supply the Philippines with a wide range of machinery, equipment, industrial raw materials and technological assistance. It was agreed that a seven to ten year economic and technical cooperation arrangement could be entered upon without formal diplomatic relations having been reached.

At the same time, the private mission, a 20-member delegation from the Philippine Chamber of Commerce, visited all European socialist countries, except Albania, to discuss specific agreements or proposals for trade and aid.

Two days before this delegation left for its tour, the West German ambassador to the Philippines called on its head, Teofisto Guingona, Chamber president, and threatened that if a visit was made to the German Democratic Republic, as planned, the West German Government would feel compelled to withdraw aid from the Philippines. The delegation's information officer reported this publicly:

"This was brought to the attention of the members of the mission whose reaction, expectedly, was one of indignation. The best argument why we should insist on going to East Berlin was the attitude of the ambassador and his own argument that we should not go there, they said. Let us find out, they added, whether West Germany would really cut her aid to the Philippines." (It did not.)

This trip resulted in the first act of trade with a socialist country: the sale of 500 tons of cocoanut oil to Bulgaria, by the Legaspi Oil Co., the vice-president and general manager of which, Dominador Lim, was a member of the Chamber of Commerce delegation. Delivery of the cocoanut oil was made in December with the approval of the Marcos administration.

Among the offers made during the tour to the delegation, which recommended their acceptance, were:

from Czechoslovakia, the establishment of fully-equipped tractor plants in a number of regions in the Philippines;

from the GDR, assistance in shipbuilding, including the creation of a merchant marine fleet and a fishing fleet;

from the Soviet Union, the building by Soviet engineers of a series of "Aswan-type" dams for hydroelectric power and irrigation, in Pangasinan, in Cagayan and in Mindanao, as well as the construction of new highways;

from Romania, the sending of an oil exploration team, an offer of particular interest to Filipinos who have long suspected that American oil monopolies have located oil in the Philippines and are withholding the knowledge in order to maintain secret reserves;

from Poland, the building of a small arms plant, another offer that has aroused much interest because the United States has stalled on repeated Philippine requests for such a plant in order to keep the Philippine army dependent on US arms.

The prompt following up of the Enverga Report recommendations brought an expected reaction from US imperialist circles in the Philippines, where half the daily newspapers are owned by US money. These attacked the two missions for trying to shift Philippine trade "away from traditional markets." However, the experience of the West German ambassador made it plain that any overt interference by the United States could arouse strong nationalist feeling. Instead of blocking the moves entirely, US tactics were to slow them down.

It soon became apparent that private US pressure had been applied on President Marcos, who faces reelection in 1969 and has to contend with powerful US influence in his country. Although he had given personal approval to the two missions, he announced on November 25, 1968, a few days after their return, that he was in favor of relations with only *certain* socialist countries, and not with the Soviet Union or China. Since these are the countries most able to aid or give relief to the Philippine economy, the US objective was plain.

On November 27 the Philippine Foreign Policy Council, to which Marcos referred the question, met and formulated a policy of trading with only "selected" socialist countries. The three selected were Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria, the former two chosen for their alleged "independent spirit," the latter because a Bulgarian trade deal had already been approved. On the surface this may have seemed like a retreat from the tentative agreement discussed by the Campos delegation in Moscow. Actually, for the first time the Philippine Government and its Foreign Policy Council (where US and reactionary Filipino interests are well represented) had officially approved trade and diplomatic relations with socialist countries; with the precedent set, the exception of the Soviet Union and China could hardly be expected to endure for long.

Filipino nationalist demands, however, continued to rise, and on

January 2, 1969, when a newly-appointed Philippine foreign affairs secretary, Carlos P. Romulo, made a formal statement of policy on assuming office, the new trend was given a firmer statement. He said:

"If we are to begin to act with dignity and self-confidence as Asians, and if we are to pursue a free and independent course of friendliness, of openness to those who would be our friends and collaborators, what should be our attitude to our relations with socialist countries and, in particular, with the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China? The logical answer is, of course, a positive one; no exception should be made to the general principle, provided, as we said, that each case should redound unequivocally to our national interest. The only question is one of implementation. . . . Through economic diplomacy we shall remove barriers to our economic growth which the constraints of an obsolescent political diplomacy erected. We cannot allow unreasoning fear and prejudices to turn away business where business is good."

Among the first steps taken by Secretary Romulo in his new office were the issuing of an instruction to Philippine foreign service personnel removing the old ban on friendly social relations with socialist diplomatic staffs, and a memo that abolished the use of the terms "Red China" or "Communist" China customarily used in Philippine government offices, substituting for them "People's Republic of China."

Inch by inch, the doors were opening and barriers were being taken down.

**W**HILE this process has been going on in the upper levels of government and of business circles, the Filipino people as a whole have been learning for the first time of life under socialism. The contrasting informational differences in the viewpoints of Filipino and Soviet people toward each other after their long artificial separation was indicated in the experiences of Konstantin Vishnevetsky, the *Izvestia* correspondent who was in the Philippines in 1966. The three main questions asked of him by Filipinos were: Is it true in the Soviet Union men are allowed to have six wives? Is it true that religion is banned in the USSR? What is the difference between communism and democracy? When he spoke to Soviet audiences about the Philippines on his return home, he was asked these: Why are there no relations between the Philippines and the USSR? What are Filipinos doing in Vietnam? Isn't there a progressive movement in the Philippines? Would it be possible for Soviet students to visit the Philippines? Do Philippine university students receive stipends from the state? How modern is Philippine society and how is it developing?

Such a major change in Philippine foreign policy had had to be accompanied by an informational campaign, and many Philippine newspapers and magazines have been carrying long series of articles detailing minutely the observations of Filipino journalists sent to the unknown regions. The most remarkable thing is that after decades of the most virulent anti-communist propaganda, with nothing favorable printed about a socialist country, the readers' columns in the Philippine press have been filled with congratulatory letters, welcoming the removal of the blindfold.

In June 1968 an article by my wife (a Filipina) describing a visit to the Patrice Lumumba Friendship University in Moscow, and telling of its free enrollment of students from developing countries, appeared in the Manila *Sunday Times Magazine*. In the space of two months over 150 Filipino youth applied for entry to Lumumba University. This was in spite of the fact that reactionary Philippine postal officials tried to discourage the sending of their letters to Moscow on the false grounds of lack of formal diplomatic relations.

Interestingly, many of those who applied came from Catholic schools, where anti-communist propaganda is heaviest, and nearly half were young girls (in a country where equality of the sexes is still greatly curtailed by feudal attitudes).

"I believe that the absence of diplomatic relations between our country and the Red countries should not serve as a hindrance to the study of Filipinos in Russia, and I agree that friendship surmounts all obstacles," wrote one girl, Nenita, aged 18. "I'm very eager to join other foreign students in Lumumba University. If possible, I would like to share with them our culture."

So great was the popular interest in the group of 17 Soviet tourists who visited the Philippines in August 1968 that even the most conservative politicians and businessmen hastened to invite them to dinners and receptions. When it turned out that one of the tourists, Igor Podberetsky, was a scholar of the Philippine language, Tagalog, and spoke it fluently in its classical form, Filipinos greeted him with extreme delight. In their 70 years of dominance in the Philippines, American officials have never deigned to learn the Filipino language, and the Philippine press took pleasure in contrasting Igor Podberetsky with the average American official's indifference to Philippine culture. When Igor walked in the streets of Manila, small children followed him, pointing to "Igor, the Russian who speaks Tagalog." There was a flurry in the US Embassy, where a crash course was reportedly introduced to teach a smattering of Tagalog to its personnel.

Filipino audiences, accustomed to the visits of glamorized Ameri-

can film stars or pop music artists, have been equally impressed by the visit of Bolshoy Ballet dancers in March 1969. Wrote the "society" editor of the Manila *Daily Mirror*:

"If the Russian ballet artists are captivating on the stage, they are certainly even more charming in 'real life' off stage. Filipino dancers who performed with them all say they are wonderful to work with—so understanding, so encouraging, so devoid of 'snootiness' considering their stature as ballet artists. The prima ballerina, far from being a 'prima donna,' in its adverse connotations, always puts them at ease and gives them pointers in a way that precludes any doubt that they are intended to instruct and encourage, not to make them feel inadequate or amateurish."

The general popular acceptance of the need for relations and friendly contacts with socialist countries has had another effect that goes deeper in Philippine life. For decades the American propaganda about the external "Red menace" has been coupled with the policy of outlawing the Communist Party of the Philippines and popular movements allegedly having Communist influence. In fact, the severe Anti-Subversion Law in the Philippines, which provides the death penalty for certain of those convicted under it, specifically asserts that Filipino Communists or members of the Huk movement are agents of a foreign power "under international direction" and working to establish "a totalitarian regime subject to alien domination and control."

A feeling has grown that it is inconsistent to do away with restrictions on relations with socialist countries while maintaining restrictions on democratic rights that are allegedly superior to those known under socialism. Furthermore the implication in the Anti-Subversion Law that Filipino Communists are under the direction of countries with which the Philippines is now seeking friendly relations has caused some Filipino leaders discomfort and has led them to argue that it is an obstacle standing in the path of friendly agreements.

As a result, some Filipino Congressmen, including Manuel Enverga, have formulated a bill setting aside the Anti-Subversion Law and declaring legality for the Communist Party of the Philippines. Arguments for such a bill have called it a necessary corollary to trade and diplomatic relations with socialist countries. Terms in the bill are still far from being acceptable to Filipino Communists, and it has not yet won support generally in the Philippine Congress, but it is viewed as a significant step in a trend, a trend that has had a profound effect in the Philippines even before its goal of formal relations has been reached.

D. N. PRITT

## Nazi War Crimes:

### Prosecution or Statutory Limitation?

**O**F RECENT years, public opinion has been only insufficiently and intermittently drawn to the question of the punishment of Nazi war crimes and crimes against humanity. Thus there has been too little attention to the attempts of the West German Government and its courts to "drag their feet" in the investigation and prosecution of such crimes and to apply the domestic laws of their state—the Federal Republic of Germany to the prosecutions.

The legal position of such crimes is clear. They are crimes created by international law, and by Article 25 of the FRG Constitution the provisions of international law are part of the law of that State, and take precedence over its domestic laws; these international crimes are thus punishable by West German law.

These crimes were various, terrible, and numerous. They were brought about by the Nazi state as part of its policy, and carried out on its behalf by hundreds of thousands of its military and civilian citizens, from the highest to the lowest. The horrors of these crimes, and their sickening brutality and ruthlessness, could be related at almost any length, but space permits only brief mention of some of them, by way of example. They included plans, worked out by high officials in full detail, for the extermination of all Jews, the extermination or enslavement of the Polish people, the indiscriminate mass-murder of members of allegedly "inferior" races, especially Slavs, and the literal working to death of millions of slave laborers. To give one concrete illustration of the operation of these crimes in practice,

D. N. PRITT, Q. C., is one of England's most eminent lawyers, with an international reputation for defense of civil rights, political independence, and peace. He served in Parliament for 15 years. His books on the Soviet Union and activities on behalf of international understanding are well known. He is a member of the British-Soviet Society and the World Peace Council.

The third volume of D. N. Pritt's autobiography, entitled *The Defense Accuses*, was published recently in England.

### MILLIONS CRY FOR JUSTICE

"REMEMBERING THE crimes against peace and humanity perpetrated by the German and other fascists and the German militarists in World War II; serving as reminder of the sacrifices made to free the nations from Hitlerite tyranny; and concerned for the maintenance of peace and security in Europe and throughout the world for the present and succeeding generations,

"We, lawyers, political and public figures and scientists participating in this Conference believe it our duty to call once again for the determined exposure and punishment of all nazi war criminals in conformity with the universally acknowledged principles of modern international law . . .

"The memory of millions of victims of nazism demands this. The peaceful future of all nations demands this."

Appeal of International Conference on Prosecution of  
Nazi Criminals, held in Moscow, March 25 to 29, 1969

I mention that the number of Poles killed by the Nazis, averaged over the period of the war, works out at 2,900 per day.

When the war ended, the victorious Allies made the most effective provisions possible for the prosecution of the guilty criminals before international courts, the courts of the anti-Hitler countries, and German courts.

Before the international courts, those of most of the anti-Hitler countries, and those of East Germany—the German Democratic Republic—the work has been and is being well done; but in West Germany it has been and is still being done so inadequately that it is in effect being sabotaged.

The methods of this sabotage are various and varied. Incidentally, West German criminal procedure lends itself to sabotage in that it is extremely slow and cumbersome (although it can be effectively applied, and is in fact being so applied to several hundred thousand political prosecutions of the progressive forces). Let me study the sabotage. To begin with, the work of seeking out the criminals and of investigating the evidence of their crimes has been and is being carried out slowly, incompletely, haphazardly, and less than half-heartedly. Then, in very many cases where such investigation as has been made discloses evidence amply strong enough to insure conviction, the prosecuting authorities drop the proceedings on the false assertion that the case is too weak. Next, when cases are actually brought to trial, the judges often acquit obviously guilty men, and even if they convict them they impose ludicrously inadequate sentences. Finally, when men are actually sentenced to substantial terms of imprisonment, the government itself steps in and releases them after a short interval.

I can sum up the position by stating that, of 77,000 criminals investigated in West Germany in the years 1945 to 1968—77,000 seems in itself a substantial number, but it is quite a small percentage of the crimes known to have been committed—51,877 (or 67 per cent) were never sentenced, and very few of the remainder stayed very long in prison. The estimates of the number of prosecutable war criminals at freedom in West Germany today vary greatly, but the lowest estimate is 27,000.

This attitude and behavior hampers not only proceedings in West Germany. Other countries, especially Poland, for the effective prosecution of war crimes committed in their territory require the delivery up of "wanted" men who are in West Germany as well as documents and witnesses to help in proving their cases. But when they apply to West Germany for such assistance, the state fails to meet their demands and thus frustrates many prosecutions.

**W**HY DOES West Germany behave in this disgraceful fashion, in sharp contrast to East Germany? It is of vital importance to the peace of Europe and of the world that the answer to this question should not be concealed or obscured by West Germany's present allies, Britain and the USA, for such motives as securing West German support for the entry of Britain into the European Common market, or for any other reason. *The answer is that the government of West Germany today is, by its nature, composition, and policies, almost as great a danger to the world as the Nazis were in the middle 'thirties.\**

West Germany is today ruled by the same greedy and aggressive ruling class which governed the Weimar Republic from 1919 to 1933, and then created the Nazi State and governed it from 1933 to 1945. And today its openly declared policy is to secure what can plainly only be secured by war: the restoration of its rule over all the territories (largely non-German) which it ruled at the end of 1937 (and even more, for it claims Sudetenland and Austria). Its application of this policy to the particular case of the German Democratic Republic is to reconquer that country by force, and in support of that policy it refuses to recognize its existence, and does its best to withhold recognition from any state which recognizes the German Democratic Republic. The serious danger of these policies is emphasized by the

\* I can use the word "almost" not because of any merit in the FRG government but for two very encouraging reasons: the first, that the strength of the unquestionably anti-Nazi countries lying to the east of West Germany is now far greater than it was thirty years ago, and the second, that one-third of the German people, in the German Democratic Republic, stand firmly on the anti-Nazi side. West Germany is thus far less able than the Nazis to bring about war in Europe.

fact that, realizing that they are awakening much resistance within their own country owing to the danger of war they carry with them, the West German Government has recently passed elaborate legislation enabling it to set up at any moment a complete dictatorship modeled on that enacted by Hitler in 1933.

What we have to realize is not just that a state with such an outlook and policies is sure to "drag its feet" when called on to prosecute its own citizens for war crimes, but—a much more serious evil—that to carry out such policies a ruling class with that outlook and policies desires and needs, as it did in the Nazi period, the services of just the sort of criminal who in the service of the Nazi state committed the very war crimes and crimes against humanity with which we are concerned. And, therefore, this ruling class has naturally maintained, and still maintains, in the apparatus of its government—including the armed forces, the judiciary, the educational system, the Foreign Office, and even in the highest governmental posts—many thousands of men with evil Nazi pasts. Thus, it is "all of a piece" that the prosecution of war crimes should be sabotaged in West Germany, and that thousands of Nazi criminals should be left unmolested, while a fair proportion of them are not merely unmolested but hold high positions in the government apparatus. When a judge acquits a war criminal, or gives him a light sentence, investigation of that judge's past might well show him to be a war criminal himself, for there are today still at work in West Germany 800 judges who sat in the infamous "special courts" established by Hitler, and passed hundreds of death sentences for trivial offenses.

It is part of the same picture that West Germany should seek to apply its own statutory limitation to prosecution for war crimes. In law, the inadmissibility of any such application is clear; only international law could provide for any limitation on the prosecution of internationally-created war crimes, and it has made no such provision. Nor are these crimes of a nature to attract or merit limitation; they were not crimes committed by individual citizens against their state, but were crimes planned and organized by that state, and carried out by its citizens on its behalf and in fulfillment of its policy. That the West German state, which claims to be the successor state of Nazi Germany, should seek to apply limitation to such crimes is in effect for the guilty to pardon the guilty.

The position has been placed beyond any real doubt by the "International Convention on the non-applicability of statutory limitations to war crimes and crimes against humanity" adopted by the UN General Assembly on November 26, 1968, from which I will quote:

The States Parties to the present Convention . . .

Noting that none of the solemn declarations, instruments or conventions relating to the prosecution and punishment of war crimes and crimes against humanity made provision for a period of limitation. . . .

Noting that the application to war crimes and crimes against humanity of the rules of municipal law relating to the period of limitation for ordinary crimes is a matter of serious concern to world public opinion, since it prevents the prosecution and punishment of persons responsible for those crimes,

Recognizing that it is necessary and timely to affirm, in international law, through this Convention, the principle that there is no period of limitation for war crimes and crimes against humanity, and to secure its universal application,

Have agreed as follows:

*Article 1:* No statutory limitation shall apply to the following crimes, irrespective of the date of their commission:

(a) War crimes. . . .

(b) Crimes against humanity. . . .

*Article 4:* The States Parties to the present Convention shall undertake to adopt . . . any legislative or other measures necessary to ensure that statutory or other limitations shall not apply to the prosecution and punishment of the crimes referred to in Article 1 . . . of this Convention, and that, where they exist, such limitations shall be abolished.

**I**N SPITE of the clear legal position, the FRG Government has attempted to apply its own domestic limitation to these prosecutions. When the date arrived of May 9, 1965, at which the longest period of limitation under West German law would apply if international law permitted it so to do, there was acute controversy over the announced intention of that government to apply limitation. It was a substantial triumph for world public opinion, including progressive opinion in West Germany itself, when the government was forced to legislate, not unfortunately to remove any suggestion of limitation, but at least to prolong the period to December 31, 1969. That date is now approaching, the controversy has again arisen, and in particular it was developed at a conference held in Moscow March 25-28, attended by eminent lawyers from almost every state in Eastern and Western Europe (including West Germany itself). In its "Appeal," adopted at its final session, the conference called on the governments of all countries to adopt the Convention I have described above.

It is interesting that, within a month of this Conference, the West German Government brought in a Bill in the Bundestag to abolish the application of statutory limitation not to all such crimes but to those falling within the description of "murder and genocide." One must wait to see the final form of the legislation, but it is something of a triumph for public opinion that this step has been taken, and taken so swiftly. This is no doubt due partly to the Conference and to the Appeal with which it concluded. It is also due to the growing strength

of public opinion both in West Germany and in the world in general, and to the anxiety of the West German Government, perturbed by the continued lack of acceptance of its aggressive policies described above, to conciliate world opinion.

At the same time, it must be recognized that the victory is clearly only a partial one, and that there is no guarantee that even prosecutions not subject to limitation will go forward with more speed or success than hitherto. To begin with, the Bill expressly confines the removal of the statutory limitation to murder and genocide. It is claimed that this will hit the main criminals while leaving minor ones free. But it is likely to have the reverse effect, in that the so-called "desk-murderers," who sat in their ministries and laid down the policy of wholesale murder, may well be left free on the ground that only those who actually carried out the murders are guilty of murder in the eyes of the law, and that the plotters in the ministries were guilty only of incitement or conspiracy. And there are of course many war crimes and crimes against humanity which are not primarily murder or genocide.

The next defect is that the West German Government is standing by its refusal to sign the UN Convention. And perhaps the worst defect is that the whole procedure of dealing with war crimes and crimes against humanity, and in particular, that the decision as to which cases should be regarded as covered by limitation, and which should still be open to prosecution, is left in the hands of the apparatus which has so inadequately dealt with the whole problem hitherto. Thus all the methods of sabotage described above are still available, and there is nothing to suggest that they will not be used as before.

**W**E HAVE indeed gained one important victory, and have made it clear that the West German Government is sensitive to public opinion; but we still have a great deal more to achieve. We must compel the West German Government to sign and observe the UN Convention, and to carry forward the work of investigation, prosecution, and punishment with greater sincerity and urgency. We must awaken public opinion in every country, and bring pressure to bear on all governments that seek to help the West Germans "drag their feet." It is of the greatest importance to international morality, to the future behavior of the FRG Government, and to the cause of peace in the world, that the really guilty men should be effectively punished, and the lesson thus brought home to all who commit or plan to commit further war crimes and crimes against humanity, whether in Europe, Asia, or elsewhere, that mankind will not tolerate such conduct.

MARGRIT PITTMAN

## The Two Germanys Celebrate Their Twentieth Anniversaries

**T**HOUGH the language of Luther, Goethe, Marx and Engels (and Hitler) is spoken on both sides of the border, the two German states are as dissimilar as highly industrialized capitalist and socialist states can be.

This difference is highlighted this year by different attitudes toward their 20th anniversary. In the socialist German Democratic Republic (population 17 million) confident and hectic preparations for a giant 20th anniversary observation on October 7 have been going on for some time. "It seems as if we were celebrating this anniversary for a year already," an acquaintance told me during a recent visit. There is civic pride, expressed by many people in casual conversation and confidence in the future and in their ability to attain goals that mean continuous improvements in living standards.

The goals are industrial, cultural, educational, social, set to mark the new level of accomplishment the country has attained in the past few years. During my recent visit, I read in newspapers, on bulletin boards and huge outdoor slogans about the goals set for the 20th anniversary. Berlin has a huge building program, a certain part of which is to be completed by The Day. Several people remarked to me with misgivings that the new, huge hotel at Alexanderplatz would not be ready until 1970, as if it were quite a serious matter to have it still shrouded in scaffolding on the anniversary.

Lea Grundig, the country's most famous graphic artist and chairman of the Association of Graphic Artists said that she had prepared special illustrations for an anniversary edition of the Communist Manifesto. Helene Weigel, director of the Berliner Ensemble and

---

MARGRIT PITTMAN came to the United States in the 1930s as a refugee from Hitler. She has since been active in anti-fascist circles, and has written widely on German problems. She is the co-author (with her husband) of *Peaceful Coexistence; Its Theory and Practice in the Soviet Union* (International, 1964), and is currently on the staff of the *Daily World*.

Bertolt Brecht's widow, was putting together a special anniversary repertory of plays of struggle. A taxi driver summed it up in the untranslatable Berlin dialect that specializes in understatement. "It will be quite an ado," he said, "the place will be jumping with so many foreign guests, we'll have to sleep in telephone booths, but we don't mind showing that things are looking up."

West of the border, in the Federal Republic of Germany (population 60 million), the anniversary is being ignored. May 23, the day the country's constitution was adopted in 1949, went virtually unnoticed and no plans have been made for any of the other dates that could be used for ceremonies. "Criticism rather than celebration marked the 20th birthday of West Germany today," United Press International correspondent Roy Gutman reported from Bonn. "There were no public ceremonies, no parades, no speechmaking by leaders to recall the event. Instead, public grumbling over deficiencies in the Constitution and the way West Germany is run because of this were on the rise."

During a visit to Frankfurt in March, I was told of another, more important reason why there would be no anniversary celebrations in the Federal Republic. "To do this would be to admit the existence of another German state," an anti-fascist journalist told me. The fact is that 20 years have gone by since postwar Germany was split for cold-war purposes, and cold-war goals have not been achieved.

The peace of Europe is threatened by the policy that prompted the division of postwar Germany. It is the policy of "containment of communism."

The German Federal Republic clings to the policy on which it was founded 20 years ago and is still tenaciously backed by the United States, though the realities of Europe have changed.

The Bonn Government still maintains its revanchist "sole representation claim." For US diplomatic purposes the GDR does not exist and for political purposes it should be wiped out. Though US and West German interests are antagonistic in the quest for power, they are identical in regard to the GDR.

The "sole representation claim," backbone of the policy of each successive West German Government from Adenauer to Kiesinger, is the basic notion for a reversal of post World War II relationships of forces in Europe. It is the motivation for the succession of Berlin crises and has brought the world to the brink of war several times.

It refuses to recognize the existence of the German Democratic Republic and the frontiers set down by four-power agreements after World War II. In the Federal Republic this policy is demonstrated

continuously. Election of the president of the Bonn parliament in West Berlin last spring is an example. West Berlin is not part of the Federal Republic, but has been selected by the cold warriors as a "free world outpost inside socialist territory," 110 miles inside the GDR to be precise.

Official maps of the Federal Republic express this policy too. They show the 1937 German frontiers, encompassing not only West Germany and the GDR, but also territories belonging to the Polish People's Republic and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic east of the Oder-Neisse frontier.

The Bonn-Washington policy regarding the frontiers in Europe has been successful in some respects and unsuccessful in others. Like so many US "containment of communism" policies, it succeeded in preventing normal and peaceful conditions of coexistence of the two social systems. On the other hand, it has been unsuccessful in halting development of the GDR as an important member of the socialist community.

Despite elaborate subversive efforts, the Bonn-Washington conspiracy has been unable to halt development of the first socialist German state, though it has slowed it. On the other hand, it has been successful in keeping Europe on the brink of war.

Subversion came in an impressive arsenal. It included extensive disruption, economic and political. The economic measures included a well-organized brain drain, not confined to intellectuals but equally aimed at skilled labor. Then there was the economic drain through the open frontier in Berlin, implemented by a fraudulent currency exchange (four East marks for one West mark). It enabled the West to rob the East of consumer goods. It is estimated that the economic loss during the years before the wall was built equalled the effort of a five-year plan.

These problems were essentially ended when the Berlin Wall was built.

Then there was the disruption of the GDR economy by violating trade agreements and transport arrangements. Frequently FRG firms would sign contracts, but deliveries were held up by government chicanery. In Rostock, the GDR's only deep sea port, built in the early 1960's, a longshore union official tells of the year when all shipments of oranges, bananas, tangerines and nuts had been held up at the Hamburg (FRG) just before the Christmas holidays. "You couldn't get a piece of fruit anywhere in the republic," he said. "They arrived after the holidays, after their lack had created a lot of grumbling. Now we have our own port and get things on time."

The territory of the GDR was formerly the poorest, economically most backward third of Germany with the least important natural resources, the poorest climatic and soil conditions. It comprises that part of the old Reich that Otto von Bismarck, the reactionary Prussian politician of the last century, once described this way: "Should the world come to an end," Bismarck is quoted as saying, "I would like to be in Mecklenburg, because there events are always two years behind the times."

Despite this handicap, the country has tripled its industrial production between 1950 and 1967 and is now among the ten top industrial countries in the world. Its exports between 1960 and 1967 increased 64.5 per cent, while imports for the same period rose 57.8 per cent. But less than a fourth of the foreign trade turnover is with industrial capitalist countries. The largest share of trade is with other socialist countries.

Thanks partly to Bonn's diplomatic blackmail, only about five per cent of the trade is with developing countries. Covertly, Bonn is threatening these countries with economic reprisals if they expand trade with the GDR. Overtly, Bonn has a policy that says that any country it has diplomatic relations with thereby recognizes the "sole representation claim," and recognition of the GDR would be considered an unfriendly act against the Bonn regime.

Result of this policy is that the GDR trades with about 70 countries, but until a few months ago has had full diplomatic relations only with the 13 socialist states.

Due to this FRG blackmail a number of non-socialist countries have maintained consulates in Berlin, others trade representations, but none would accord the country full recognition. Only in recent months has a breakthrough been made. Iraq was the first non-socialist country to recognize the GDR, followed by Cambodia, Sudan and Syria. Others are expected to follow suit in the near future.

At present, Finland is the only capitalist country that has a trade representation in the GDR, though the country has trade with over 20 capitalist countries including the United States and Canada. Largest capitalist trade partner is, despite government resistance, the Federal Republic.

The most important aspect of this incredible situation is not its effect on the GDR but on world peace. It has been said that if there is a third world war it will start in Europe and the obvious place is either the 900-mile frontier between the two German states or the Berlin enclave.

There can be no stable peace in Europe as long as the United

States and the Federal Republic pursue their present policy. There is no sign that either government intends to seek a change.

Such a change can only be brought about by popular pressure. The opposition to the Bonn-Washington policy is rising. A year ago, prominent personalities from 15 West European countries met in Helsinki to urge recognition of the GDR. Participants were of varying political views and walks of life and their step was motivated by their concern for peace in Europe.

In the last few months public opposition to the government's policy has also grown rapidly in the Federal Republic. This spring's provocative Bundestag election in West Berlin produced, for the first time, widespread opposition in that country and in West Berlin. At present more and more newspapers, clergymen, trade unions, cultural leaders demand normalization of relations with the GDR so that the war danger can be removed.

The demand is usually coupled with that for Bonn's signing of the nuclear non-proliferation pact, demands for an atom-free zone in central Europe and for disarmament.

The GDR has put forth such proposals many times and has most recently been partner to the Warsaw Pact powers' proposal for dissolution of military blocs in Europe.

In the United States, caught in the nightmare of the Vietnam war, not much attention has been paid to the problem of the two German states, even by opponents of the government's foreign policy. But there have been some voices of protest.

The National Council of Churches has spoken out in favor of "acceptance of the existence of the German Democratic Republic."

The American Society for the Study of the GDR is now trying to collect signatures to appeal to the President and Congress asking for normalization of relations with the GDR.

"There can be no durable peace in Europe without a *modus vivendi* between the two German states," that petition says. "The undersigned believe that such a *modus vivendi*, rather than unilateral support of the West German Federal Republic, should be the object of United States policy."

June 1, 1969

---

"THE RUSSIANS must . . . be brought to the point where they are faced with the problem of deciding either to maintain the present *status quo*, with all the unforeseeable risks that it contains as far as the tension in Europe is concerned and in its effects on the Sino-Soviet problem, or to accept a solution in which the German problem is no longer a bone of contention."

Franz-Joseph Strauss, FRG Finance Minister, in *Grand Design*, pp. 45-46.

---

MIKHAIL SHOLOKHOV

## They Fought for Their Country

NEW WORLD REVIEW is proud to present what we believe are the first translated excerpts to appear in this country of Mikhail Sholokhov's long-awaited novel of World War III, *They Fought for Their Country*. Our translation, furnished us by courtesy of the Novosti Press Agency, is from excerpts of the work published in Pravda March 12, 13, 14, and 15, 1969, which we have further shortened for reasons of space. Sholokhov, of course, is well known in this country through translations of his *And Quiet Flows the Don*, and the subsequent volumes. He was awarded the Nobel prize for literature in 1965, and has been a deputy to the USSR Supreme Soviet since 1946.

THE MONTH of May was almost over, but everything had come to a standstill in the Streltsov family. Something irreparable had happened between Olga and Nikolay. It was as though an invisible break had shattered their relations. And now these relations gradually began to assume painful, oppressive forms that would have been unimaginable to either of them even six months before. Day by day the affection that had bound them so closely for eleven years dwindled away. The warm intimacy of their evening talks was a thing of the past and neither of them any longer had the desire to share with the other the worries and anxieties, the small annoyances or pleasures of their working day. Quarrels flared up between them more frequently than ever before, sometimes about the most trivial matters, and blazed fiercely, like dry brushwood in the wind, and the brief moments of reconciliation brought neither relief nor peace. The short lull was like a truce between two belligerents and did nothing to ease the tension or the concealed mutual revulsion that had sprung from some deeply hidden sources.

What had at first been a barely perceptible chill in their relations was taking an ever stronger hold and becoming alarmingly routine. It had invaded their life, become an inseparable part of it and nothing could be done about it. Nikolay sometimes had the purely physical sensation of living for a long time in an unheated room and yearning constantly to be in the sun for a while, to be able to warm himself by it.

Looking at himself from the outside, as it were, he noticed that both at work and at home he had become senselessly distraught and irrit-

able. More and more often in his dealings with people he was overcome by a feeling of impatience and a completely unwarranted readiness to take offense. He had certainly not been like this before. Moreover, he noticed similar changes in Olga's character. All this led to sudden outbursts of bickering, which inexorably developed into real quarrels.

Painfully, with a wretched sense of inevitability, Nikolay felt Olga drifting further and further away from him every day. He no longer had the strength to stop her, to call her back, tenderly. This knowledge of his own helplessness, of the impossibility of changing anything, the nagging suspense about the break that was bound to come, made living together under the same roof unbearably depressing and hateful.

Since the beginning of Spring Olga had used the approaching examinations as a pretext for spending all her time after dinner either at school or with her fellow teachers. She paid hardly any attention to their child, leaving him entirely in his grandmother's care. Nikolay himself had no need to seek excuses for being home as rarely as possible. Spring plowing, the sorting of seeds, the sowing of spring wheat, and after that the row crops, the care of the fallow land, keeping the weeds down—all this completely absorbed his time. He left home in the morning with mixed feelings of relief and bitterness, returning only at night, after Olga had finished correcting her pupils' work, and was asleep. This did not leave much time for quarrelling. But by avoiding each other, fearing to be alone together, they were only putting off the decisive moment and thereby only intensified their own suffering and the discord in the family.

It was clear that Olga and Nikolay were equally afraid of making the break; although both knew it could not be avoided, neither wanted to take the initiative.

Oddly enough, Nikolay's mother-in-law had been on his side from the beginning of the family conflict. On several occasions when for some reason Nikolay came home at an unusual hour, he had heard stormy words between Olga and Serafima Petrovna as he approached. But as soon as he turned the doorknob the house grew silent. His mother-in-law would stalk past him with lips compressed, majestic and unapproachable in her maternal indignation, while Olga, her eyes red from weeping, would hurry out of the house as quickly as possible and return only at dusk, when her puffy, tear-marred face would not be so noticeable.

And then there was little Kolya. With the shrewdness of an adult, the child had noticed at once the growing rift between his father and mother. Since he could not understand the cause, he had turned to his

grandmother, and now kept to her little room next to the kitchen, where he did his homework and even slept, having resolutely moved his bed out of his own room on the pretext that he was afraid of being alone at night. More than once Nikolay had caught his shy, questioning glances during breakfast or dinner, but there seemed to be no way of answering them.

Olga was meeting Ovrazhny not only at school. Nikolay had surmised this, but could not under any circumstances bring himself to spy on his wife. Even when she remained late at school or out visiting her friends, he would not leave his own courtyard but sit in the darkness on the porch steps, smoking and waiting. Then he would hear Olga's quick steps approaching the gate. He could have recognized them among the steps of a thousand other women, for he knew that light tread by heart. And always, at the familiar sound of those tapping heels, he would experience a faint sense of suffocation, as though his heart had suddenly slowed its beat. Olga would walk past him in silence, leaving the fresh scent of her clothes and the warm evening dust behind her, he would pull in his long thin legs and get up and follow her into the kitchen. There they would have supper in silence, except for a few meaningless comments, and then go to their separate beds. In the morning the same thing began all over again.

All through the spring, Nikolay had met Ovrazhny only once, in the street, by chance. He had been on his horse, Voronok, riding out to the fields and Ovrazhny had been coming towards him on his way into the village. There were puddles in the street and the wind was chasing fine ripples across them. The water in the puddles shone unbearably bright in the sunlight, the warm air was saturated with the fresh smell of melting snow and the damp black earth.

The horse splashed through the puddle, throwing out sprays of water which sparkled iridescently in the sun. Oily black gobs of mud splattered out from the horse's hooves. Cocks were crowing raucously, somewhere in a nearby courtyard a hen clucked spiritlessly and the first lark, trying out its strength, poured out its tremulous song as it plunged down out of the hazy blue in swift, slanting flight toward a moist patch of meadowland. Such blissful tranquillity reigned over Dry Gully that Nikolay forgot about everything as he sat swaying in his saddle in rhythm with the horse's gait, holding the reins loosely, unthinkingly rejoicing with his whole being in the cool breeze, in the sun, appearing and disappearing behind transparent wisps of cloud, and in the lark's first timid attempts at song.

And then, catching sight of Ovrazhny not far away, picking his way along carefully by the fence, slipping in the mud, he suddenly

felt a cruel choking sensation in his throat. The world became strangely mute, devoid of all sound. Nikolay could see only the oncoming figure of Ovrzhny. In one glance he took him in from head to foot, the handsome, ruddy-brown face with its dark stripe of moustache, the jet-black lock of hair that had fallen out under the crumpled brim of his gray felt hat, the red and black triangular design on the embroidered Ukrainian shirt, the gray-striped jacket draped carelessly over those broad, well-shaped shoulders, the legs in their old black trousers and the short, mud-splattered rubber boots sliding apart in the mud. The image of Yuri Ovrzhny as he looked at that moment had imprinted itself on Nikolay's memory for his whole life, like an arrested motion shot from a color film. Nikolay gazed intently, avidly, at the man who had ruined his life and become his mortal enemy. Ovrzhny's teeth flashed in a cheerful grin as they passed one another.

"Good morning, Nikolay Smionovich! What a bog, eh? And this delightful spot is known as Dry Gully!"

Nikolay tried to return the greeting, but only a sort of low gurgle came from his throat. He swallowed desperately but still could say nothing. When he raised his right hand to his cap, the whip hanging from his wrist felt as heavy as a dumb-bell.

After he had gone about ten paces, Nikolay swiveled around with his left hand on the saddle pommel and looked back. Ovrzhny was leaning against the fence and watching him, an uncertain smile playing on his sharply etched lips.

Nikolay walked his horse as far as the next turning and once again became aware of Voronok's contented snorting and the lark's never-ending paean to spring. The world regained its sounds and scents, its living breath. At the corner Nikolay put his horse into a swinging canter and beyond the village broke into a gallop which he checked only after he had gone over a mile out into the steppe. Both horse and rider breathed heavily as they stopped.

"Ach, I might have killed him. Only a few minutes ago. I would have dismounted, gone right up to him, stretched out my hand, and then instead of shaking his, I would have grabbed him by the throat. And in just one second he would have been lying in the mud beneath me. Who would have saved him? Who would have torn him away from my grip? There was no one on the road. Before anyone could know. . . . I am strong, much stronger than he is. I would have pressed down hard with both hands and it would have been all over, finished! And what then?"

His memory served him too well, reminding him of the time twelve years ago, while he was still at the Institute, when he nearly strangled

a fellow student who had insulted him at a party given by one of the girls in their class. He had loosened his grip only when he himself was unconscious, and someone had hit him hard on the head with a heavy stool. . . . And once again Ovrzhny's handsome face, with its wavering, uncertain smile, rose before his eyes.

Feeling a little sick, Nikolay pulled off his cap. His hands were damp with sweat. Since that occasion he had carefully avoided meeting Ovrzhny. There was no need to tempt fate, to play with the life of another, and his own.

**T**HE STATE of uncertainty in the family seemed to have taken root. And it was not until the first of June that this miserable existence was shaken by an unexpected telegram from Kislovodsk, from Nikolay's older brother. Nikolay received it one morning in the office of the Machine and Tractor Station where he worked. "Arriving second by train twenty two car seven meet me at station love Alexander."

Unable to conceal his joyous smile, Nikolay entered the director's office a little more hurriedly than usual, and quietly placed the telegram on his desk.

"I'm expecting a guest, Ivan Stepanovich!"

The director looked up in surprise at Nikolay from under his steel rimmed spectacles.

"Not your brother?"

"You guessed it!"

"But wasn't he going to be on leave until the middle of June?"

Still smiling, Nikolay spread out his hands:

"Looks as though he couldn't stand the sanitarium regime, and ran away before his time was up. That kind of place isn't so pleasant when you're new at it. As far as I remember, this is his first time at a resort. He also preferred a freer sort of holiday, with hunting and fishing."

The director read the telegram again, slipped his spectacles into the breast pocket of his old canvas jacket, and said approvingly:

"Well, good for him! Your brother's right, Nikolay. He'll have a better vacation with us here and it will do his heart good to have some peace and quiet. To my way of thinking the wormwood-scented air of our steppe can cure a man's heart or anything else he has wrong with him. I read somewhere that even Count Tolstoy used to cure himself with fresh air and koumiss [fermented mare's milk]. Well, I don't know about the koumiss. I drank it once with the Kalmyks, during the civil war, and I came to the conclusion that it's no use at all to a Russian. Just a tickling in your nose and a rumbling in your stomach, and it doesn't do a bit of good."

"Once, for curiosity's sake, I also drank fresh milk right from the mare. Ever tried that, Nikolay? You haven't? Well, don't. Just a bluish, watery liquid, a little sweet, lots of froth, but as for any goodness or nourishment I didn't notice any."

He fell silent for a moment and, then, to add weight to his words, went on:

"Of course you can't live on air alone, even ours. But here, besides air, we've got not just sour mare's milk, but natural cow's milk, unskimmed, with a five per cent fat content, and eggs, still warm from the nest and not turning bad, and on top of that there's bacon, quarter of an inch thick, and the dumplings in sour cream and young lamb and other things—why, there's not a heart that could resist all this and not gradually become normal again. And if you add to that a good bowl of borsch and a little glass of something before dinner, that brother of yours will live with us till he's a hundred, without even a hiccup before he dies. Yes, he's made the right decision in coming to us—absolutely right!"

There was so much childishly naive, simple-hearted conviction in the words of this steppe dweller, himself bursting with health, that Nikolay, laughing openly, agreed:

"I think so too, Ivan Stepanovich. What about transport?"

"Of course — no problem. Just take the truck in the morning and go to meet him."

"Sure you won't need it?"

"I can use the wagon if necessary. You take the truck. Your brother's a general, and he's suffered a lot too. It's not right to meet him just any old way. Tell the driver to be ready to start out early. And see that he drives carefully over our bumpy roads. Your brother's a sick man."

"Thanks a lot, Ivan Stepanovich!"

"No need to thank me. I'm glad too about your good fortune, Nikolay!"

"Thanks again, anyway. This really is a great joy for me. We haven't seen each other for nine years, you know."

The director got up from his desk.

"I'm off to the workshop. What are your plans?"

"I'll have to warn the family, and get everything ready. Can I have the day off?"

"Goes without saying. Do you need any help?"

"I'll manage myself, thanks. We have everything we need."

The director hesitated for a moment at his desk, then came close up to Nikolay and asked him, for some reason in a whisper:

"How long was he inside, Nikolay?"

"Nearly four and a half years."

Ivan Stepanovich scowled. Then he strode firmly to the door, locked it, and dropped himself so heavily into an ancient chair of pre-revolutionary vintage that, instead of creaking, it gave a plaintive moan. After a brief pause, he asked: "What do you think? Why was your brother released?"

Streltsov shrugged silently. The question had caught him unawares.

"Still, what's your opinion about it?"

"I suppose they realized in the end that he had been unjustly convicted, and so they let him out."

"That's what you really think?"

"And what else is there to think, Ivan Stepanovich?"

"Well, with my simple mind, I see it this way. Comrade Stalin's eyes are beginning to open a little."

"Now, look here! Does he rule the country with his eyes shut?"

"It seems that way. Not all the time, but since '37."

"Ivan Stepanovich! Have some fear of God! What can you and I see from our MTS? Is it for us to judge such things? You actually believe that Stalin has been blind for five years and now suddenly has seen the light?"

"Such things do happen."

"I don't believe in miracles."

"Neither do I. But somehow we've got to explain this case of your brother's. Comrade Stalin saw through Yezhov, didn't he? And so perhaps he's beginning to catch on to Beria?"

"Come along, I'll go with you as far as the workshop. I don't like your way of talking. First you whisper, then you start shouting. Let's finish this conversation on the way."

"So I wouldn't make a good conspirator?"

"The hell you would. You're too excitable."

The director sighed and holding onto the small of his back, heaved himself out of the chair. He walked to the door, limping slightly, and muttering indignantly.

"Science tells us that lumbago comes from getting chilled. That's a lot of rot. Doctors they call themselves. Take me. As soon as I get excited, this triple damned lumbago gets me in the small of the back, just at the base of the spine. I can't stand up or lie down. I've got my own views about medicine, so they needn't bother me with their ideas. This carcass of mine has been out of order ever since the civil war."

They walked in silence down the empty corridor and went out

through the back door into the MTS yard. A fitful wind was blowing across the big yard with its weathered fence and dry matted grass crushed flat by the caterpillar tractor treads. Now the wind would blow softly from the West, then it would swing around and blow in from the South, with more force and persistence, for some reason. It had been cool since morning. A single cloud, white as foam, was making its lonely way across the pale blue sky. From the wide-open doors of the workshop came the hum of a lathe. The forge rang with the melodious answering clangs of hammers, supported by the asthmatic sighs of the bellows. Close by in the dense growth of wild flax on the other side of the fence, a quail steadily drummed out its note, keeping time with the hammers. Ivan Stepanovich stopped beside the well in the middle of the yard, and both sat down on the low well frame.

"I think," said Ivan Stepanovich, "that your brother will keep away from people at first, but he'll get over that, and will adjust himself."

"Alexander is a sociable fellow. Anyway he used to be," Nikolay remarked thoughtfully.

"That's the point — 'used to be'! But what's he like now? Well, we shall see. The whole point is whether he was the only one they let out. I'm sure he must know about that. That's why, Nikolay, your brother's homecoming is a great boon for me, too. Others who've been suffering for nothing may come after him, and gain their freedom too, eh? What do you think about that, Nikolay?"

"I'd like to know for sure, not just guess about it."

"Yes, that's it, we must *know*. It can't be that he's the only one freed."

"Why not? It's quite possible Stepanich, just let's wait until Alexander gets here. You and I know nothing about it and there's no point in guessing."

Ivan Stepanovich clapped his strong stubby hands together like a woman.

"Oh, isn't there! Let me tell you that while I'm waiting for your brother to appear my head will burst with thinking! Right this very minute my nerves are beginning to go to pieces and my lumbago is shooting up my back. I don't know whether I'll be able to get up from where I'm sitting. I may have to crawl to the workshop. So, just as soon as your brother's had a rest, you find out everything about it from him. He's been in Moscow and must know what the people at the top are thinking. Approach him on tiptoes, treat him gently, and you'll find out everything, get it all out of him."

Nikolay said imploringly: "But not right away. Let him get his

breath back. You must understand, Stepanovich, that it will be painful for him to talk about all this. We've got to be tactful, considerate."

"Oh, just listen to him! 'Tactful, considerate, it will be painful for him.' And isn't it painful for me and the others not to know the truth? Can't you see that, Nikolay?"

"Clear as daylight!"

"Oh no it isn't. Not to you! Only this spring you reproached me in front of everyone at a meeting. Ivan Stepanovich, you said, is something of a coward. He's afraid of wasting gasoline, he's afraid of the higher-ups, afraid of this, afraid of that. Maybe you're right. I have grown a little scared of things in the past few years, but back in 1918 I wasn't afraid to take on a fight with the Whites when I had only one clip of cartridges left! I wasn't afraid of anything in those years so dear to our hearts! But now I *am* afraid of wasting gasoline, afraid to cuss out that lazy fitter Vanka, as he deserves, and I do tremble before the higher-ups. I've lost my nerve. But it's those Odessa riff-raff that made a joke of our words: 'What did we fight for?' I know what I fought for! And when I meet your brother, I won't be talking to him about nature or about our agricultural plans. I don't need any of your damned tact. I need to know what's going on in Moscow, what those at the top are thinking, what makes them tick. Surely we won't be getting into a war with the fascists without putting our own house in order first? But you be on the lookout when you're with your brother, and tell me all about it afterwards. You will see everything more clearly, of course, from a family standpoint."

**N**IKOLAY STRELTISOV arrived at the station an hour before train time. It was about nine in the morning. There had just been a light shower and a special smell rose from the tracks. There was not only the usual odor of fire-box smoke, axle grease and damp coal clinkers. There was also the familiar, earthy scent of rain-flattened dust and moist grass, and from the huge stacks of fresh planks piled beside the red warehouse there came suddenly such a dizzying whiff of pine resin and steaming timber, that for a moment it seemed to Nikolay that he was walking through a grove of pines in the heat of noonday, and the hiss of the nearby shunting engine sounded like the murmur of the tall century-old pine trees. Nikolay stopped for a moment, and even closed his eyes, joyously breathing in the scent and smiling gently at his far-off childhood and its insistent memories.

After all he had been born in the forest zone, and lived there till the age of eight, in distant Vologda Province. But it seemed that not even a quarter of a century, all the long years of his life spent in the

vast open steppes of Southern Russia, could wipe out his love of the fragrant forest, the bracing, beloved scent of the pines.

"What a strange creature is man," thought Nikolay, as he climbed onto the platform and looked back at the pale-gold stacks of timber on the other side of the tracks. The sun had come out from behind a cloud, and was shining on them, and the rough weather-stained planks on top were steaming slightly as they gave off their pungent, penetrating smell of resin, the comfortable smell of houses-to-be and of settled home life.

The evening before, Nikolay had knocked on the door of his wife's bedroom and entered. She had been combing her hair before going to bed, and was standing with her back to the door. In one glance he had taken in her neck, a little thinner now, and the deep shadows of the touching little hollows beneath her small ears. Vainly struggling with an unbidden feeling of sadness, he had said very quietly:

"I want to ask one thing of you, Olga. Alexander is coming for a visit, so will you do all you can to keep him from noticing what is going on between us?"

She had swung around to face him. There had been a troubled smile on her lips. Looking up at Nikolay with a frightened glance, she had whispered:

"I'll try, Kolya. But what about you, will you be able to keep a grip on yourself?"

Nikolay had nodded and gone out, closing the door softly behind him.

And now he was pacing the deserted platform, smoking and recalling the conversation with his wife, her forced, pitiful smile, and gritting his teeth as he felt his heart breaking with regret for the Olga he had known, with sheer human anguish.

A goods train hauled by an FD locomotive rumbled heavily through the station. The oily heat left by the engine's powerful body hung for a long while over the platform. Then the express appeared.

Nikolay hurried from the end of the platform. A man of medium height, with broad, straight shoulders, was standing by wagon number seven. He had raised his dark blue hat high over his head. His thin pale face was wreathed in smiles and a pair of vividly blue, slightly protruding, moist eyes, like bits of the first November ice, gleamed from under whitish blond brows.

Nikolay went striding toward him, but it was no use trying to check himself and, like a little boy, he broke into a run, arms outstretched.

The arrival of Nikolay's older brother wrought a sharp change in the life of the Streltsov family. Olga became noticeably more lively

and cheerful. She now scarcely left the house and once again began to take an interest in the household, helping Serafima Petrovna with the cooking and other chores.

Even little Kolya recovered his temporarily lost childhood. He spent all his time with Uncle Alexander, trudging alongside of him doggedly on his walks through Dry Gully, and refusing to go to bed until he had heard another of his soldier uncle's civil war tales. Alexander knew just how to tell the stories for a child's ears. Kolya would listen with his eyes fixed rapturously on the narrator and then lie in bed wide-eyed, with a contented, dreamy smile on his lips. On the second night he crept into bed with Serafima Petrovna and whispered excitedly into her ear:

"Granny! Uncle Alexander said today that Commander Zhloba was pockmarked. Can the commander of an army really have pockmarks on his face?"

Serafima Petrovna, who was by nature a jolly person, always ready to smile at anything comical, began to shake with unrestrainable laughter.

"But why shouldn't he, Kolya dear! Anyone can be pockmarked. There's no law against it."

"I thought only robbers were pockmarked," Kolya said in a disappointed tone, and wandered back to his own bed, pondering over this new discovery in life.

A minute later he said indignantly: "There's no need to laugh. And please don't jiggle like that under the blanket. You're making the bed shake and I can't go to sleep. You're a nonsensical woman!"

"Oh, heavens! Where did you get that word?" Serafima Petrovna asked, choking back her laughter.

"Uncle Alexander and I were going to the workshop yesterday and there was a woman swearing and shouting rude words at her neighbor. Uncle Alexander said to me: 'Don't listen to her, Kolya, she's a nonsensical woman!' And that's what you are."

"But I'm not swearing, Kolya!"

"No, but you laugh in the middle of the night, when no one else does, and you don't let me sleep. You're nonsensical, Granny!"

He went on in a sleepy voice, the words coming out more and more slowly:

"All pock-marked people are robbers. I know that for sure. Take Uncle Vassily, the carpenter. You know him, he's pockmarked too. I asked him when he was mending the fence at school, 'Uncle Vassily, when you were young, were you a robber?' And he said: 'You bet I was, especially where women were concerned!' So. I asked him what

he meant by that, and he said, 'I used to rob the nunneries.' And then he wouldn't say any more, just stroked his moustache and looked at me with smiling eyes, then he put some nails in his mouth and wouldn't talk to me any more because he was nailing some boards. He could knock a nail right in with two bangs! Even if he was a robber, he's a good guy. He's always smiling and he never uses swear words. One day when I was watching him, he banged his thumb very hard with a hammer, and all he said was: 'Ach, God love your mother!' Granny, that's not a rude way of talking, is it? Granny, are you listening, or are you asleep?"

Instead of replying, Serafima Petrovna buried her face in her pillow and by the time she had finished laughing, the little boy was already asleep, sighing softly.

The drive to the district center, where Uncle Alexander went to register with the District Party Committee, was an event of enormous importance to Kolya. They had a snack together in the local restaurant, and while his uncle and the driver drank only one glass of vodka each, young Kolya had a whole bottle of lemon soda, a drink that had never been heard of in Dry Gully.

They returned from the trip bosom friends. The boy's affection had been won easily by his warmhearted uncle. And when Kolya, using the familiar form of address, said over supper: "I think I'll move from Granny's room to yours, Uncle Alexander. After all, you're a man. It will be more convenient for you and me to sleep in the same room," Olga cried out reprovingly: "Kolya! How dare you use the familiar form in talking to your uncle! Say you're sorry at once." But Uncle Alexander at once came to his small friend's defense: "There's nothing wrong, Olga, we're on familiar terms by mutual consent. We find it more natural since we're together so much."

There was no doubt about it, this old soldier, so sociable and unpretentious, had found the key to all their hearts. He won over Olga with his courtesy and considerateness, his unaffected compliments and ill-concealed delight in her beauty. She was well aware of his secret admiration and was quite gratified by it. She even flirted with him, just a little, within the bounds of family relationships.

Serafima Petrovna, disarmed by his simple manners and his officer's readiness to be of service, was utterly astonished when he found a torn shoe of hers under the hatrack in the hall, and mended it as neatly as a skilled shoemaker would have done. Little Kolya had gotten hold of an awl and some thread from the cobbler who lived next door, and they had done the job together in the seclusion of the stable.

Nikolay could only smile to himself at the fantastic speed with

which Alexander was establishing himself as a member of the family.

"Where did you learn your cobbling?" he asked, examining his mother-in-law's shoe.

"In the camp," Alexander replied shortly. "It wasn't one of the subjects they taught at the Frunze Military Academy, but I learned a lot in my four years at the other academy. I can cobble, I'm an expert at making clay stoves, I can do a bit of carpentry. It's an ill wind that blows no good, Kolya! But that knowledge was hard to come by in the conditions out there. . . ."

Serafima Petrovna entered the room just then, and the conversation broke off.

**E**ARLY Saturday morning Alexander Mikhailovich and little Kolya went down to the river with their fishing rods. Two hours later they returned in triumph, asked Serafima for a large bowl and silently, with the dignity of true anglers, shook out of their basket a pile of quivering, live gudgeon.

"My dear Serafima Petrovna!" Alexander began. "Here we have exactly sixty-three of these little wrigglers. If they could be cleaned, fried in the best clarified butter, right through, till they're crisp, and then have a dozen eggs poured over them, you couldn't imagine a better breakfast! It's the dream of every self-respecting fisherman!"

When breakfast was over and little Kolya had slipped away from the table, Alexander Mikhailovich eyed Serafima Petrovna humorously, drummed on the table with his fingers for a moment, and then gave her a mischievous smile.

"What are you laughing at, Alexander Mikhailovich?" she asked, blushing involuntarily.

"I'm not laughing. I'm just smiling happily and perhaps a little foolishly as I look at you. And I've been thinking what a heartbreaker you must have been when you were young! You're a very comely woman now, but what about twenty years ago? The men must have swarmed around you in droves!"

"Oh, I'll bet you were quite a heartbreaker then yourself, Alexander Mikhailovich!"

"No, dear lady, there never was time for anything like that. The war took all our energy!"

"Not all, I imagine."

"Yes, every bit of it! I joined the tsarist army at twenty, had four years of the world war, then came the civil war, then fighting all kinds of bands and bandits, and then I got married. When did I have time for philandering? Now with you, it was a different matter. You

became a widow when you were still young."

"At twenty-one."

"Twenty-one and a free Cossack woman!"

"Free, indeed! I was left with two young children on my hands. What kind of freedom do you call that? It was more like slavery."

"When did you lose your husband?"

"1918."

"My God, why didn't I meet you in those fabulous years? I went through your home town, Mariupol, with my regiment that very year."

"Fate decreed otherwise." Serafima feigned a sigh. Then she gave a youthful laugh. "And if we had met, what would have come of it?"

Alexander raised his white blond eyebrows in affected surprise.

"What would have come of it? I would have conquered you!"

"You really think so?"

"As sure as God is holy! I'd have flung my sheepskin over you, said 'you're mine!' and that would have been that!"

"What a nerve you've got! I used to be pretty sprightly in those days, you know. I could have slipped out easily from under that sheepskin of yours!"

"Pardon me, Serafima Petrovna, but I would have thrown it over you in such a way that there would have been no slipping out of it. I used to be a firebrand! It's only now I've become just a charred ember. Just picture for a moment the twenty-four-year-old regimental commander. Boots with those small officers' spurs that jingle, red riding breeches, leather jacket, a sabre with a silver sword knot on the left side, on the right a Mauser in a wooden holster, his Cossack hat at a jaunty angle, and his eyes blue fire! Terrific, eh? Irresistible! And no mercy at all for the fair sex! You would go down the street like a young devil with your cavalry swagger and the girls you met would drop their eyes for fear of getting them scorched. And behind you was just one long tender sigh. And some of these girls—you know what?"

"How should I know what?" Serafima was sitting with her chin in her hands, regarding her companion with eyes glistening with tears, her still full red lips quivering in a barely restrained smile.

"Of course you do! They were practically swooning, that's what. And in certain especially grave cases, it was a real state of shock, no less! We were no jokers in those days, my dear Serafima Petrovna! Even now I sometimes meet a woman my own age or younger, with regret still in her eyes, and I find myself thinking, 'there goes another victim of the civil war and her own folly. In her youth she looked too longingly, much too longingly, at one of those young heroes such as

I was then, and that was it. A broken heart forever! You women folk don't get away with it so lightly, not at all so lightly. So how could you have escaped if you'd run into me in those days?"

"Well, I'm no believer in religion, but I think St. Varvara, the protector of us frail women, must have saved me. We didn't meet, did we? That's how I escaped!"

"And why did this Varvara have to interfere in our affairs? Who asked her? Eh, deliver me from these women, even the ones that are saints! So it was her fault I missed everything!"

Alexander Mikhailovich clasped his balding head in both hands and rocked to and fro, exclaiming in mock despair:

"All is lost, and Varvara's to blame! She's no saint, she's a typical destroyer of other people's happiness, and a jealous one besides. My God, what petty feelings women have, even the saints!"

"Dear Alexander Mikhailovich, please stop! I can't bear any more!" Serafima Petrovna, choking with mirth, begged in a tearful voice.

Olga smiled quietly as she listened to the old folks' banter, while Nikolay out in the corridor spoke into the telephone receiver in a low voice:

"No, he's not saying anything about it. . . . Not yet, Ivan Stepanovich. . . . Yes, I think so too. Just wait a bit. . . . I'll let you know at once. All right, so long!"

The women withdrew to get on with the housework, but the two brothers remained at the table, drinking glass after glass of a strong brew of tea in the old-fashioned way, with lumps of sugar in their mouths, sweating profusely, and talking.

A warm wind was blowing in through the wide-open window, making the tulle curtains flutter and billow. It filled the room with the mingled scents gathered in the night of the petunias, lungwort and violets that grew under the window, and the sharp pungency of the sun-warmed wormwood from the steppe beyond. A bee buzzed monotonously somewhere beneath the ceiling. Now and then the shutters moaned faintly.

Before rising from the table, Alexander Mikhailovich let his misted eyes rest on Nikolay in a long, silent look, and then said quietly:

"I marvel, Kolya, when I look at you. You're so like mother! The same smile, the same mannerism of jerking your shoulders and tossing your head when you're contradicted, the same eyebrows, the same eyes. But your eyes have changed somehow. Your black eyes, mother's eyes—they're sadder than they used to be. You must be growing up!"

"It's about time. I've passed the thirty mark without noticing it. I didn't notice it at all, Sasha! The years just slipped by like a dream."

Nikolay turned away to the window and—perhaps because of the gentle, affectionate tone in which his older brother had spoken, perhaps because of the heart-rending memory of his mother—he suddenly felt the same unbearable self-pity he had once known in childhood. Whether it was because his youth had indeed passed away beyond the distant steppeland horizon, or whether it was because his family life had so irreparably collapsed, the short, searing pain was so intense that Nikolay felt hot tears in his eyes, and, ashamed of his childish sensitivity, he answered briskly, but without turning his head from the window:

“Enough of sad things! This isn’t the kind of morning to talk about them. Only, you know, the day before you arrived was the ninth anniversary of mother’s death. . . . Oh, well, let’s drop it!”

Alexander noticed his emotion and also set about changing the subject.

“You’re right, Kolya, I chose the wrong time to start that kind of talk. But these memories will come back, no matter what mood you’re in. They can hit you any time, like a toothache. Why didn’t you mention the anniversary when I arrived? But never mind, that’s enough! Listen, Kolya, how about going for a real fishing trip today? Those gudgeon have whetted my appetite. You said there was a deep pool in the river somewhere about ten kilometers from here. What about spending the night there? We could catch a couple of dozen perch and make a great chowder of them. How does that strike you Kolya?”

“It strikes me we’ll be ready by twelve, then I’ll harness Voronka, and off we’ll go!”

**B**Y TWO in the afternoon, they had reached the river. Nikolay unharnessed and hobbled Voronok, and put all their tackle into a bag. They forced their way through old, dense willow thickets and descended a gentle bluff into a narrow spit of sand.

Before them stretched a mirror-like sweep of quiet water that seemed to lie cupped in a huge cockle-shell, embedded in the earth. The opposite bank formed a steep cliff, and the cliff was overgrown up to the very top with an old mixed forest that had never been cut or cleared. Ancient oaks, not very tall but gnarled and of massive girth, elms and willows, mingled with crab apples, poplars and aspens, and this whole riotous mass of foliage and dense undergrowth stretched like a battlemented wall both upstream and down, and further back, where it joined the rolling steppe, the high crowns of the poplars and aspen trees rose, catching the upper winds, their tall pale green trunks looking like marble columns.

Opposite the bluff the wooded bank was divided by a wide clearing, in the middle of which towered an ancient elm with such a huge spreading crown that it provided ample shade for a flock of some three hundred sheep. Sweltering in the sultry afternoon, the animals were all nosing into the circle, occasionally stamping their hind legs and uttering muffled snorts. The reek of the flock came to them even across the water.

Not far from the elm, in the blazing sun, stood a graybearded shepherd, leaning motionlessly with both hands on his staff. The old man had a faded red cloth wrapped round his head and was dressed in dirty canvas trousers and a long belted shirt that reached to his knees.

There was something ancient, almost biblical in this picturesque scene: the patriarchal elm, the old shepherd with his flock, the virgin forest untouched by the hand of man, and the deep stillness, occasionally broken by the song of an oriole or the cooing of a turtle dove. It all seemed to have stepped out of a canvas by some old master, and been endowed with life, sound and unique color.

Alexander Mikhailovich’s eyes were shining as he glanced at Nikolay and whispered: “Kolya! This is like a fairy tale! I never expected to see anything like this.”

He sat down on the sand, quickly pulled off his shoes and socks and wiggled his toes delightedly. Then, after a little hesitation, he took off his trousers. His flabby, bluish-white calves were covered with dark, uneven patches. Noticing Nikolay’s glance, he frowned.

“You think they’re shrapnel scars? No, there’s nothing heroic about them. I collected these lovely objects felling timber. Got my legs frozen. You know what kind of footwear we had in the camps. My legs started festering and I nearly conked out. Not from the sores but from undernourishment. It’s long been known that ‘he who does not work, neither shall he eat.’ Well, what it meant out there was that you got your ration, which was little enough already, further reduced. But how can you work when you can’t stand on your feet? The other comrades gave me their food. Yes, that’s where you learn the real strength of comradeship, when you’re in trouble. And how do you think I cured the sores? Rubbed tobacco ash into them. There wasn’t any better medicine out there. So I came through all right, except that I’m spotted like a leopard up to the knees, but higher up I’m certainly no beast of prey; in fact, quite the opposite—pure vegetarian. Only temporarily, I hope.”

Alexander Mikhailovich leaned back on his elbow and looked up at Nikolay with a smile. And that simple, boyish smile was so out of keeping with his rough humor that Nikolay could only shake his head.

"Nothing gets you down, does it, Alexander! I could never be like that. . . ."

"It's the way we're brought up and our Russian nature. And anyway, I'm an old soldier. Grin and bear it! But as a matter of fact, Kolya-Nikolay, you could be just the same. Necessity would force you. It's not joy, but necessity, they say, that makes a carp dance on a hot frying pan. Well, let's not waste too much time. Come on, or we won't catch enough to make our chowder. A fishing spot like this and no soup afterwards? That's out of the question. Come on. Five little perch would do. I haven't had a decent fisherman's chowder for ten years, brother!"

"If you want chowder, you'll have to catch the fish yourself. I'll have plenty of work without that. I've got to get a pailful of mussels."

ON THE OTHER side of the river, Nikolay dug a hollow in the sand with his oar, pulled the nose of the boat up so that the stern settled deep and said, wishing his brother good luck in the traditional manner, putting it the other way round:

"Not a beetle nor a fish scale for you! Put this tarpaulin over the stern so that you don't make too much noise with the rods when you put them down. Let them soak in the water for five minutes first and they'll give you plenty of bend. I'll come round a bit later and see how you're getting on."

Twice, when he cast, the line tied itself into curious knots in Alexander Mikhailovich's hands. Muttering curses, he took a long time untangling them, and at last, on the third cast, the line ran out smoothly, the cigar-shaped sinker plunked softly into the water, the flexible tip of the birch rod dipped and rose again. The sinker was on the bottom.

At sunset they ate a big supper of fish and delicious fisherman's chowder. With the boiled perch Alexander drank a glass of vodka, but firmly refused a second.

"Don't press me, brother. I used to be able to drink plenty without getting drunk, but not now. And anyhow, I'm in good enough spirits without vodka. I'd rather talk. I've got to tell you my Odyssey, haven't I? Pour me a cup of tea, and make it strong."

Moist air drifted up from the river. It was noticeably cooler. The sunset was burning out in the west, beyond the willows on the opposite bank. Blue darkness was advancing from the east. Only in the zenith a small lone cloud, lighted from beneath by the sun, glowed with such tender opal radiance that for some reason Nikolay found it poignantly sad to look at it.

A nightingale started singing uncertainly in the bushes. Alexander Mikhailovich sat by the dying fire, poking the ashes with a stick to get a light for his cigarette. For a moment he listened to the nightingale's hesitant notes.

"He's young, hasn't found his voice yet, hasn't had enough practice," he said, and paused to pull hard at the damp cigarette. "It's the same with you young people, some of you at any rate. Before you've had any experience in life you start passing judgments on all and sundry, even on things you haven't understood, haven't got to the bottom of, and the result is you just copy other people. You just pipe away like this young nightingale, but you don't produce any real song. I had a talk not long ago with one of these young pipers. What was it like in your day, he says, during the revolution? Everything was simple and primitive then. 'The land to the peasants, the factories to the workers.' But in life, in the class struggle, everything is much more complicated, he says. Well, life is complicated, that's true enough. But what he called 'primitive'—the 'land to the peasants, factories to the workers'—had come only after a whole century of struggle by revolutionaries, and ten or twenty years of intense work by our Party, work that demanded sacrifices. And what sacrifices!"

(Another installment of "They Fought for Their Country" will appear in our next issue.)

### PRAVDA CELEBRATES WALT WHITMAN

THE POETRY OF WALT WHITMAN, imbued with trust in man, optimism, and gentle love of nature, is a source of joy to us to this day.

Many countries of the world are marking the 150th anniversary of the birth of Walt Whitman, the great American poet. . . . The US press has written many times, and not without surprise, about the keen interest shown in Whitman's poetry and other writings in socialist countries, especially in the Soviet Union. There is no gainsaying that the author of *Leaves of Grass* is very near and dear to us with his inimitable, heartfelt verse, his realism, his love of the working man, his yearning for the progressive ideals of his times . . .

The poet was a passionate champion of the revolutionary war of the American people against the slaveowners of the South, and he frequently expressed his ardent sympathies with the revolutionary movement of the 19th century in the European countries. His poetry is imbued with a spirit of internationalism. The poem entitled "Greetings to Peace" proclaims for instance, the greatness and equality of people of all nationalities, living in every part of the globe. And in his famous "Letter to the Russians" Whitman said in part: "The purpose beneath the rest in my book is hearty comradeship."

Prof. M. Mendelson, in *Pravda*, May 30, 1969

**END THE VIETNAM WAR***(Continued from page 11)*

The hearings have shown up the immense profits and the immense waste embodied in the Pentagon's \$80 billion a year budget. Proxmire submitted a list showing how weapons ordered by the Pentagon end up costing the people three or four times the original estimates due to "unforeseen costs," with the Aerospace industry, the main beneficiary, having virtual veto power in the granting of contracts.

The hearings have brought out that the supposed "threat" from the Soviet weapons deployment, which ABM and other US weapons developments are supposed to counter, has been mainly a response to prior US actions.

According to a report from Washington by Tom Foley (*Daily World*, June 24) Dr. Thomas Wolfe of the Rand Corporation testified that in 1963-65 there had been a steady reduction in Soviet military spending until US policies forced them to reexamine their "markedly inferior strategic posture." This decision, according to Dr. Wolfe, was based on Soviet analysis of US escalation of "the war in Vietnam and the apparent Soviet belief that US military power was being increasingly committed to the suppression of national liberation movements in the third world." Dr. Wolfe further testified that the military policy of the Brezhnev-Kosygin regime rests on the assumption that "general nuclear war must be avoided," and agreed that the "historical pattern" was that Soviet defense measures were largely a response to what we do.

New strength was given public opposition to ABM, as well as to the Vietnam war, by big rallies in New York and Los Angeles sponsored by the Coalition on National Priorities and Military Policy. This group is a confederation of 26 religious, scientific and peace groups headed by former Democratic Senator Joseph C. Clark.

We repeat our call for a mass movement to compel the Nixon Administration to end the war now and withdraw all American troops.

Each week of delay means more hundreds of needless American and Vietnamese deaths. Each week of delay means more thousands of victims of the war at home as well. And each week of delay means more victims of the savage repressions of the Nixon Administration against the black people moving irresistibly toward freedom, against the militant youth who want life instead of death on a far-away battlefield, and a voice in what kind of life it will be, and new repressions against all who resist war, against all advocates of social change and a decent human society.

*June 26***HOWARD PARSONS****U.S. Philosophers  
and Marxism**

ON MAY 6, 1963, at the meetings of the Western Division of the American Philosophical Association in Chicago, Professor Lloyd D. Easton delivered a paper, "'Alienation' and History in the Early Marx." The discussion that ensued was spirited, and some of us asked how we might continue the discussion on Marxism on a regular basis. Accordingly, at the next year's meeting of the APA in St. Louis, May 4-6, a symposium was sponsored by the Western Conference on the Teaching of Philosophy on the subject, "On the Teaching of Marxism and Soviet Philosophy." Following that, a number of philosophers met informally to discuss the formation of a permanent group within the American Philosophical Association to deal with the philosophical issues in Marxism. We were all agreed that we needed such a group, though we could not agree on its name or scope; some wanted a society that would deal with issues in social philosophy, while others thought a society concentrating on problems in Marxism was desirable. A committee was appointed and charged with the task of coming up with definite proposals at the next year's meeting of the APA. It consisted of Professors Nolan P. Jacobson, Cecil Miller, Arthur Munk, Howard L. Parsons (chairman), and John Somerville.

On May 3-5, 1962 the Western Division of the APA convened at Detroit. Our committee had arranged a symposium, "Ethics and Dialectical Materialism," jointly sponsored by two other groups affiliated with APA, the Personalist Group and the Society for Creative Ethics. The symposium was received with lively interest.

Immediately after the symposium, at a business meeting, the philosophers of the group adopted a constitution and the name, Society for the Philosophical Study of Dialectical Materialism. The constitution stated that "membership shall be open to members and associate members of the American Philosophical Association irrespective of their

---

HOWARD L. PARSONS is Chairman of the Department of Philosophy at the University of Bridgeport. He is a board member of the American Institute for Marxist Studies, the World Fellowship of Faith and the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, and vice chairman of the Society described in this article.

philosophical positions." It also specified that "the purpose of this Society shall be to afford to professional philosophers opportunity to hear and discuss scholarly papers concerned with problems and issues related to the philosophy of dialectical materialism." Officers were elected and the first dues were collected.

What were the major causes leading to the formation of our Society? First, all of us were scholars of Marxism and heretofore had no formalized way of meeting one another and discussing problems of mutual interest. Second, the APA as such provided no sure means for doing this, and in fact for some time some members of it had been wary of discussion of very controversial issues like Marxism. One member of our group had tried in the past to arrange programs on Marxism within the APA meetings, proposing participation of Marxist philosophers from other countries—but without success. The cold-war atmosphere among APA leaders militated against such programs. Third, the formation of an independent society affiliated with the APA had ample precedent, for a number of such societies had been conducting their own programs for many years in conjunction with the annual meetings of the APA.

It may seem strange that, though the Soviet Union was founded in 1917, no philosopher from a socialist country (to my knowledge) was invited to the United States by an established body before 1960. (In that year the first Yugoslav philosopher to receive a grant from the Ford Foundation came to this country to study.) But this fact can be explained. The USSR was not officially recognized by the US government until 1933. Then came the rise of Hitler and Nazism, World War II, and the cold war on communism. By 1962, however, things and ideas were beginning to change rapidly. Our 1962 symposium included a paper by a Yugoslav philosopher, Professor Mihailo Markovic of the University of Belgrade, who was also a Ford grantee.

In 1963 our Society secured for its symposium the participation of two prominent Soviet philosophers, M. B. Mitin, editor-in-chief of *Voprosy Filosofii* (Questions of Philosophy), the leading theoretical journal in philosophy in the Soviet Union, and M. E. Omelianovskii, a member of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. To our knowledge, these were the first Soviet philosophers ever to appear in the United States as guests of a philosophical group. Limitations of space here do not permit me to set forth in detail the failures and difficulties which we experienced in attempting to consummate visits of Soviet philosophers to the United States. Not only did the anti-communist attitudes of the cold war operate; but the State Department was hobbled by a law which bars the visit of any communist — scientist,

artist, philosopher, etc. — except by special waiver. The recent case of the barring of the famous novelist, Carlos Fuentes, illustrates the folly of this law. For the purposes of developing cultural exchange, we earnestly hope that the Congress will let it lapse this year.

Nearly every year since its founding, our Society has conducted two symposia in conjunction with the annual meetings of the Western and Eastern Divisions of the American Philosophical Association. These symposia have been well attended, attracting sometimes more than 200 philosophers. In December of 1964 Professors P. V. Kopnin and V. V. Mshvenieradze of the Soviet Union and Dr. S. Novakovic of Yugoslavia participated in a symposium, as did Professor Ivan Babic of Yugoslavia in 1965. In 1966 Professor Adam Schaff, Director of the Institute of Sociology and Philosophy of the Polish Academy of Sciences, accepted an invitation to present a paper before our Society, but illness prevented his doing so, and his paper was read in his absence. In the same year Chaim Perelman, Professor at the University of Brussels and Secretary of the International Federation of Societies of Philosophy, participated in the Society's program on Marxism and Existentialism. After the Vietnam war was escalated by President Johnson early in 1965, the Soviet philosophers informed us that they would not participate in symposia as long as the Vietnam war continued as it was. On May 1, 1969, however, Academician P. N. Fedoseyev, Vice-President of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, and Dr. L. N. Mitrokhin of the Institute of Philosophy in Moscow participated in our symposium, "Marxism and the Concept of a Just War." The latter, like Kopnin and Mshvenieradze before him, also lectured at a number of universities in the country — an activity that we feel is valuable for our students and teachers of philosophy and for the visitors. An important part of philosophy is dialogue on important questions, and in fostering dialogue between philosophers of different nations our Society has tried in a small way to foster cultural exchange and mutual understanding across national and ideological barriers.

The Society has also sponsored two international meetings. On September 13, 1963, in the setting of the XIII International Congress of Philosophy in Mexico City, the Society brought together American and Soviet philosophers in the first philosophical conference of its kind. For two and one-half hours, American philosophers put questions to their Soviet colleagues, who answered. Most of the American participants, of course, were not Marxists, but were eager for this kind of discussion.

On September 16, 1968, the Society, which is a member of the

International Federation of Societies of Philosophy, sponsored a symposium officially listed in the program of the XIV International Congress of Philosophy at Vienna. The symposium, "The Nature of Man and the Problem of Peace," included statements from Marxists from several countries, Christians, an Indian philosopher, and many others. It lasted four hours and was one of the more successful symposia of the Congress.

In all of the symposia of the Society it has been our effort to include representatives of diverse perspectives on the issues in dialectical materialism and to stimulate discussion through the presentation of opposing viewpoints. Topics discussed have included the nature of man, humanism, alienation, logic, philosophy of science, metaphysics, religion, and developments in China. Our Society includes many who would not consider themselves Marxists but who with their fellow members share the conviction that the study and discussion of issues in dialectical materialism are of great relevance for our philosophical life and for understanding between governments, peoples, and philosophers.

Although the Society has no governmental or formalized arrangements for exchange with scholars of dialectical materialism in other countries, some of our members have visited other countries and have lectured and engaged in discussions with our counterparts there. Thus we believe that in an unofficial but significant way we have promoted cultural exchange among philosophers. Of course we would like to see this exchange greatly widened.

The meetings of the Society are normally held in conjunction with the meetings of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association, December 27-29, and in conjunction with the meetings of the Western Division, the first Thursday, Friday, and Saturday of May. The current national officers are: President, John Somerville, California Western University; Vice-President, Howard L. Parsons, University of Bridgeport; Secretary-Treasurer, Donald Clark Hodges, Florida State University. The current Eastern Division officers are: Chairman, Dale Riepe, State University of New York at Buffalo, and Secretary, David H. De Grood, University of Bridgeport. The current Western Division officers are: Chairman, Cecil Miller, Kansas State University; Secretary, George H. Hampsch, John Carroll University.

---

"THE QUESTION whether objective truth is an attribute of human thought is not a theoretical but a *practical* question. Man must prove the truth, i.e. the reality and power, the 'this-sidedness' of his thinking in practice."

Karl Marx, *Theses on Feuerbach*, 1845

---

DANIEL MASON

## Marxism and Guerilla Warfare

**I**N recent years guerilla warfare has become the subject of intensive study by the top military circles in the imperialist countries of the West and by the leaders of national liberation movements in Latin America, Africa and Asia.

It is understandable why the top military circles in the West have become so concerned with guerilla warfare. After all, the use of this military tactic by the national liberation forces was a major factor in the defeat of the imperialist forces in China, Cuba, Vietnam and Algeria. It is equally understandable why the leaders of the struggle for national liberation in Africa, Asia and Latin America would want to study the experiences of those countries in which guerilla warfare led to victory.

In a number of colonial and semi-colonial countries, elements of the national liberation movements have turned to guerilla warfare, with varying degrees of success and failure. The determining factor has been the level of understanding of the relationship of social and economic forces and of the objective situation.

In the United States, Britain and the countries of Western Europe, however, the debate over the use of guerilla warfare has been limited in the main to the Left intellectuals and students in the colleges and universities. For some of these, guerilla warfare—under the present conditions of life in their own countries—appears to be the only way to overthrow the present system and achieve power. They have transformed guerilla warfare into a theory and practice of revolution.

One of the clearest expositions of their position is contained in an article entitled "Two Tactics," by James Wilcox, in the *New Left Review* (January-February 1969), published in London. In that article, Wilcox dismisses out of hand what he calls the "European" theory and practice of revolution and opts for what he believes are the lessons of "the revolutionary practices" of the Chinese, Vietnamese, Algerian and Cuban revolutions. He writes:

"Guerilla strategy is the generalized form of this revolutionary

practice. It contrasts on four levels with many of the traditional anti-capitalist strategies of the European Left. It is premised on a different 1) sociology of power; 2) conception of revolutionary practice; 3) theory of consciousness; 4) estimate of the role of mass activity."

One gathers from Wilcox and others like him that the time is ripe for guerilla warfare now in the advanced capitalist countries and that this must be undertaken immediately as the starting point for getting the masses into motion.

They seem to have arrived at this conclusion, not by a sober appraisal of the objective situation in their own countries, but rather by a subjective reaction to that situation. They would appear to be infected with a perverse form of elitism. The working class has become a corrupted appendage of the ruling class. No other section of the population is ready to make the changes needed in society. Only they—the students and the intellectuals—are ready and willing. And they will impose their will upon society. As Wilcox writes:

" . . . guerilla theory does not envisage popular consciousness as a homogeneous entity to be patiently raised by the Sisyphian labors of the workers' movement. . . . The great guerilla commanders have all known that the rural masses simultaneously respect and loathe their oppressors. . . . The guerilla force cures this schizophrenic affliction of the popular consciousness by arming the revolutionary Hyde against the timid Jekyll. . . . The new militants of the coming revolution in the advanced West are not frightened of shocking, indeed thoroughly provoking, the existing reactionary and cowardly aspects of popular consciousness, because they have confidence in the masses . . . "

Apparently, these students and intellectuals have mistaken the part for the whole. The truth of the matter is that guerilla warfare is a military tactic employed for both defensive and offensive purposes by different classes and peoples under varying conditions and times. As William J. Pomeroy points out, in his introduction to *Guerilla Warfare and Marxism*:\*

"History, it needs to be mentioned at the outset, shows that guerilla warfare in itself is not necessarily a revolutionary form of struggle. It has occurred in all periods of history as the classic way for less well-armed people to fight the organized power of a strong opponent, has often served as an adjunct of regular warfare in the purely military sense, and has at times been employed by reactionary and

\* *Guerilla Warfare and Marxism*, edited with an introduction by William J. Pomeroy. International Publishers, 1968. 336 pp., \$5.95.

counterrevolutionary forces as well as by revolutionary movements. Banditry has often had a guerilla character."

Pomeroy's book should prove a salutary corrective to fuzzy thinking about guerilla warfare. Pomeroy has brought together in *Guerilla Warfare and Marxism* the writings of 100 years by authors espousing Marxism-Leninism on the employment of guerilla warfare in revolutionary struggle. In addition to Marx, Engels and Lenin, there are pieces by Soviet historians Minz and Fyodorov on guerillas and partisan bands in the Civil War and in World War II; contributions from the Irish liberation struggle and the Spanish Civil War, from Yugoslavia, Greece, and France; the writings of Mao Tse-tung and Lin Piao on Chinese experience and theories; Ho Chi Minh and Vo Nguyen Giap on the Vietnamese liberation wars; material from the Philippines, Indonesia, Algeria, South Africa, Venezuela, Columbia, Guatemala, the Dominican Republic; the views of Kwame Nkrumah, Luis Corvalan, Che Guevara, Fidel Castro, Regis Debray, and others; and an analysis by Henry Winston of the struggle for Afro-American freedom in the United States.

It is clear from this collection that Marxist-Leninists have studied the question of guerilla warfare as a tactic in revolutionary struggle ever since Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels conceived scientific socialism. As Pomeroy writes, in his introduction:

"For well over a century, the role of armed struggle in revolutionary change has been a constant subject of discussion among Marxists. Obviously, the problem is complex, having arisen always in the context of specific revolutionary situations, in which particular features of time, place and circumstance have been involved. Nevertheless, certain principles of analysis and approach have been well established in Marxist-Leninist thinking, as tested against actual experience. It would therefore be helpful to know what Marx, Engels and Lenin actually wrote about the employment of armed struggle by revolutionary movements. In addition, an examination is needed into how the revolutionary movements that subscribe to the principles of Marxism-Leninism have sought to apply them in revolutionary situations since World War I and in the contemporary world. This volume endeavors to provide such an insight."

Pomeroy is eminently qualified to carry out the task he has assigned himself. He was a participant in the Huk guerilla movement in the Philippines after World War II. He has demonstrated his own authority on the subject of guerilla warfare in his book entitled *Guerilla and Counter-Guerilla Warfare*. He is an exemplary Marxist-Leninist scholar.

The essence of Marxist thinking on guerilla warfare is contained in two quotations cited by Pomeroy in his introduction. The first, by Engels, declares:

"If it is our duty to *support every real* movement of the people, it is not less our duty to protect the scarcely formed core of our proletarian Party, not to sacrifice it uselessly and not to allow the proletariat to be decimated in fruitless *local* risings. But if, on the contrary, the movement is a really *national* one, our people will not keep themselves hidden and will need no password."

The other, by Marx, asserts:

"The minority substitutes dogmatism for the standpoint of criticism and idealism for materialism. It treats *pure will* as the motive power of revolution instead of the actual conditions. While we say to the workers: 'You have got to go through fifteen, twenty, fifty years of civil wars and national wars not merely in order to change your conditions but in order to change yourselves and become qualified for political power,' you on the contrary tell them, 'We must achieve power immediately, otherwise we may as well lie down and go to sleep. . . . Just as the democrats turned the word 'people' into a sacred thing, so you have done with the word 'proletariat.' Like the democrats you substitute revolutionary phrases for revolutionary development."

**P**OMEROY'S book gathers together the thinking and experiences of Marxists on guerilla warfare under varying conditions, in various parts of the world and at different times. It therefore requires a guide. This is provided by Pomeroy's brilliant introduction, which analyzes the varied writings and places them properly in the context of Marxism-Leninism, and by Lenin's article, "Guerilla Warfare," which extends and refines Marx's analysis for the 20th Century.

Lenin assails those who dismiss out of hand guerilla warfare as a tactic of revolutionary struggle. He asserts that in weighing the use of guerilla warfare two basic principles of Marxism must be kept in mind. He asserts that Marxism does not bind the revolutionary movement "to any particular form of struggle," but demands a recognition of the conditions of the moment and an examination of the forms of struggle that flow from this.

". . . Marxism demands an absolutely historical examination of the question of the forms of struggle. To treat this question apart from the concrete historical situation betrays a failure to understand the rudiments of dialectical materialism. At different stages of economic evolution, depending on differences in political, national-cultural,

living and other conditions, different forms of struggle come to the fore and become the principal forms of struggle; and, in connection with this, the secondary, auxiliary forms of struggle undergo change in their turn . . ."

Lenin then emphasizes that one "can never regard guerilla warfare as the only, or even as the chief, method of struggle; it means that this method must be subordinated to other methods, that this method must be commensurate with the chief methods of warfare, and must be ennobled by the enlightening and organizing influence of socialism. And, without this *latter* condition, *all*, positively all, methods of struggle in bourgeois society bring the proletariat into close association with the various non-proletarian strata above and below it and, if left to the spontaneous course of events, become frayed, corrupted and prostituted . . ."

With this essay by Lenin and Pomeroy's introduction as guides, *Guerilla Warfare and Marxism* is a significant book for all those interested in understanding the tactics used, contemplated or debated by those forces now involved in struggles for national liberation and changes in society all over the world.

---

#### SOVIET SCIENTISTS' APPEAL: BAN CBW

WE APPEAL TO SCIENTISTS of all countries, to all who prize peace and progress. A new terrible threat hangs over humanity! Development of mass destruction CBW agents has gone unchecked in recent years in the secret arsenals of many countries.

Chemical agents have already been employed in the long-suffering land of Vietnam to destroy vegetation or agricultural crops and to put manpower out of action. Up to this day the United States and some other countries have not joined the Geneva Convention. Nazi Germany's patents and specifications for producing chemical gases are being reproduced and multiplied today in the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany and other countries.

We appeal to all honest scientists to lay bare the work carried on in strict secrecy on developing and stockpiling chemical and bacteriological weapons, to explain widely how disastrous they can be if used, and to seek a UN ban on the development, manufacture, stockpiling and transfer of all kinds of CBW agents, to be joined by all countries. These inhuman mass destruction weapons must be outlawed everywhere!

We do not doubt that our appeal will find response in the hearts of millions of people on the earth. Reason must defeat madness. The future belongs to science affirming life and contributing to human happiness, rather than science preparing death and destruction.

*Excerpts from May 15 appeal by leading members of USSR Academy of Sciences.*

---

JESSICA SMITH

## Siberian Science City

**M**Y HUSBAND and I had the good fortune to visit Akademgorodok, the Science City outside of Novosibirsk in Western Siberia, in July 1967, and brief though our stay was, I count it among the most exciting of all my experiences in my many years of visiting the Soviet Union.

We flew some 3,300 kilometers eastward and southward from Moscow to Novosibirsk, over the lovely winding Volga, over the Urals into Asia, over the great Ob River bisecting West Siberia North to South, observing below us great patches of Siberian taiga alternating with vast ripening grain fields, for this part of Siberia is an important agricultural as well as industrial area.

A drive of fifteen miles beyond the booming city of Novosibirsk brought us to the most charming hotel we had encountered in the Soviet Union, its glass-enclosed lobby drawing in the forest outside as part of the decor. Early next morning, with our interpreter, Anna Maslova, we set off for our appointment which we learned to our joy was to be with Mikhail Lavrentiev himself, the head of the whole place.

### *Mikhail Lavrentiev*

**L**AVRENTIEV greeted us in his office at the Presidium of the Siberian Academy of Scientists, of which he is chairman. This remarkable man is at the same time head of the Institute of Hydrodynamics, Vice President of the All-Union Academy of Sciences and the originator, administrator and heart and soul of the whole of Akademgorodok. He is a member of the Executive Committee of the International Mathematical Union and an honorary member of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences.

With the simplicity, directness and human warmth that mark truly great people, Lavrentiev set us at our ease at once. He is a very tall man, with a large spare frame on which his gray tweed suit hung loosely and easily. His face is unusually long, with a generous forehead, high cheek bones, a jutting jaw and long chin, cleft and firmly sculptured, the deep concentric grooves around the mouth denoting warmth and humor.

## SIBERIA

Lavrentiev's eyes were crinkled at the corners from frequent smiles and they kept flashing behind his glasses as though with an extra electric charge as spoke of his work, his Science City, his Siberia, his beloved country.

He led us to a great map of the USSR covering the wall opposite his desk and swept his pointer over the great Siberian territory beyond the Urals, stretching all the way to the Pacific. Inside that area, the whole United States could be fitted, with room to spare for another country half its size.

"In the old days," Lavrentiev told us, "hardly any of this huge territory was cultivated. It was a sleeping giant. Mostly exiles, as you know, peopled Siberia before the revolution. Irkutsk, its oldest city, is over 300 years old. Founded originally as a military outpost, the exiles turned it into something of a cultural center. Novosibirsk was just a village of a few thousand at the turn of the century, a camp for construction workers of the Trans-Siberian railroad."

He had first seen Siberia in 1925 on a trip to the Altai Mountains, with a group of fellow-graduates of Moscow University: "We rode through Siberia on horseback—a wild, unexplored, harsh land! I fell in love with it. I liked the strong, quiet Siberian people—I always dreamed of coming back—today I call myself a Siberian."

He told us that the Academy of Sciences had always taken a special interest in the development of Siberia, and had been instrumental in the early years in organizing Kuzbas, the Kuznetsk iron and coal basin, a second Donbas. It had set up Siberian branches in Vladivostok and Irkutsk, and developed the science center connected with the University at Tomsk.

"Then," he continued, "when the Nazis invaded our industrially developed Ukraine and other Western sections we had to get as much of our machinery and equipment as possible out of their hands, and many industrial enterprises were evacuated out here. While that laid the basis of further industrialization, the war, of course, hindered the development of Siberia. It took the best manpower away, and all production had to be for war purposes. In the postwar period, from 1945 to 1950, the development of Siberia was also held up because all our forces had to go into reconstruction."

Meantime, Lavrentiev and other scientists were thinking of the enormous latent resources of Siberia, its giant rivers with two-thirds of the Soviet Union's hydropower potential, its massive mineral resources, its vast forests, 80 per cent of the whole country's timber reserves.

"In 1956," said Lavrentiev, "when the government decided to begin

all-out development of Siberia, it became clear that in order to guarantee the most rational use of Siberia's riches, it was necessary to establish a great scientific center here. With the discovery of nuclear energy and missile development, tremendous technical problems arose that could be solved only by combined efforts in many fields. Thus, ten years ago, in 1957, it was decided to create an enlarged Siberian branch of the Academy of Sciences which would embrace all scientific development in both West and East Siberia, Yakutia and the Far East.

"We wanted an attractive site, where scientists could do their work under the best possible conditions, despite the Siberian cold. We did not want to be inside an industrial city, yet it was important to have one near at hand. We needed railroad connections and plenty of electric power. Already a big hydroelectric dam was being built up the Ob River from Novosibirsk, and a great reservoir was forming—now the Ob Sea, 125 miles long. It was in a low rolling country of pine and birch forests, with agricultural areas near by. This was our spot! We selected about fifteen square kilometers for our site, and here, ten and a half years ago, Akademgorodok was founded, with three main tasks: First, to establish a science center linked with industry, which would insure speedy application of scientific discoveries and advanced techniques in the national economy. Second, to train skilled scientific cadres for industry. And third, to train teachers of science for higher educational establishments."

For this, he continued, the services of prominent scientists in all the basic disciplines were enlisted, as well as a large number of young people carefully chosen for their scientific abilities and practical skills. He made the point that whereas in other countries it was usual for science to develop around the universities, here the principle was that the university was subservient to the Academy of Sciences.

### *Science City After Ten Years*

**T**HE GOVERNMENT provided 200 million rubles to start with, subsidized the building of a series of scientific institutes, of which there were now 20 covering all the main branches of science, with laboratories containing the most modern scientific equipment, the university, four secondary schools and a special physics-mathematics school for gifted youngsters.

"We can say, after ten and a half years, all of these plans have been in the main fulfilled," he stated.

At the Akademgorodok institutes and university there are now

over 50 members of the USSR Academy of Sciences (full Academicians and corresponding members), 125 Doctors of Science and 1,000 Candidates of Science (equivalent to our Ph.D.) and some 2,000 scientific workers in addition at the various institutes. The scientists double as teachers at the university. The town now has about 40,000 inhabitants, of whom 10,000 work at the institutes, 5,000 in construction, and the rest directly or indirectly connected with the town's working life. The average age of the scientific workers is thirty. All live together in a closely knit community, with well built living quarters, club houses, ample sport and cultural institutions, stores and other service facilities. Movies, music, theater and art also are available. Along with optimum working conditions, there is a rich, exciting and gay social life open to all without exception, a wide variety of winter sports and seashore and boating facilities in the summer. The young people go in for jazz combos, dance the twist and the frug, write and recite poetry, and have endless philosophical discussions.

The choice of a site had been fully justified by the discovery in recent years, in the lowlands of West Siberia, of vast natural gas and oil reserves on a scale outstripping everything previously dreamed of.

We asked whether there had been a problem of attracting scientists to Siberia.

"Of course there was a problem at first," he answered. "Earlier in the development of Siberia it often occurred that when institutes and colleges were transferred out here, within a year all their scientists and specialists went back to Moscow! Historically the bulk of our institutes and scientific research centers have all been in Leningrad or Moscow, or nearby. The ambition to live in the capital is natural.

"There is a story about who will be the first people chosen for a trip to the moon. The answer is 'Muscovites.' Why? Because they will only have to be given one-way tickets—they'll be sure to find the way back to Moscow themselves!

"The main problem originally was with the wives. Many of them did not come out at first with their husbands. But one of our professors helped us solve this problem. His wife had remained in Moscow for a year and a half. Then suddenly he received a wire that she was coming out to join him. He wired back asking her to wait for him as he was coming to Moscow. When he got there, he explained that he had fallen in love with a fellow scientist in Akademgorodok and wanted a divorce. You can imagine what a rush of wives

out here there was after that! We don't have the problem of reluctant wives any more."

Lavrentiev then sketched in for us the work of some of the other scientific centers which function under Akademgorodok's supervision.

Another Akademgorodok is already established in Irkutsk and another is planned for Krasnoyarsk, on the Yenesei, where a hydroelectric station even bigger than the one at Bratsk is nearing completion. And still another is envisaged at Shushenskoye, near the Mongolian border, where Lenin spent several years in exile before the Revolution. In Ulan Ude there is already a comprehensive research institute, also in Chita. Vladivostok is also becoming an important scientific center. Extensive scientific bases are in operation in Kamchatka, Magadan, Sakhalin, the Kurile Islands and the Yakut Autonomous Republic.

Lavrentiev then took up the question of training new cadres of scientists in the shortest possible time to meet the needs of Siberia's surging growth.

### *Special Physics-Math Schools*

“A COUPLE of years after the University started its work here we found that the students entering the University and the institutes were not well enough trained. We knew that there were many young people in our country with a special bent for mathematics or physics who could lose these gifts if they did not have the chance to develop them during their most creative years, when they were still quite young.

“So here and in Moscow we have set up special schools for children gifted in math and physics, where of course they go through the general program as well.

“We have organized an Olympics system to select the students. Every year we publish in the press ten to fifteen questions in chemistry, math and physics, to be solved in a two-month period. Anyone from 14 to 18 may take part. Usually we receive about 10,000 replies.

“A day is set for the second stage. Those who have sent in good answers to the first list of questions are called to 20 different centers in major cities. Each contestant goes to the nearest one for examinations, both oral and written, with still more difficult questions to solve, under the supervision of our scientists. Those who pass this second stage well, about 700, are invited here to Akademgorodok for a month. The time is spent part in vacation, part in lectures, seminars, visiting the institutes and learning about the life and work here. The 250 who do best in the finals are accepted for the intensive

preparatory course at the physics-math school, which covers the eighth, ninth and tenth grades.

“We do not reject those who have failed to pass. Real ability cannot be hidden and if mistakes are made and we find real ability but perhaps not enough training, we accept them anyway. After they graduate, they are enrolled in the university, sometimes going directly into the second year.

“Beginning with the third year, university students work in the institutes, under the guidance of our best scientists, and in addition to attending regular lectures may carry on independent work.

“The youth who come here are not just ordinary youth. They are young people enamored of science, in love with it! To carry on independent scientific work in the laboratories is no burden to them. There are no rewards for them beyond the greatest one of all—the sheer joy of creative work.

“In the beginning we found there was a preponderance of youngsters from the cities. Now we are making a point of drawing in more from the rural areas.”

The work of this school has been recorded in a number of ways. A delightful film\* shows the youngsters at work and play, mostly boys, but some girls among them. Photos of the young instructors are shown, some seeming hardly older than their students. Yevgeny Bichenkov, the principal, is only thirty. *Life* magazine included pictures of the school in its Fiftieth Anniversary issue (November 10, 1967). A particularly beguiling photograph showed the kids at their lunch hour, making jokes with complicated formulas chalked on the sidewalk.

Since my visit I have run across discussions in educational and other Soviet journals raising questions about these special math-physics schools. Some fear that singling out young people for special training at such an early age might tend to create an elite group. Others say that withdrawing those who are especially bright in math and physics from the general schools is unfair to the other pupils and deprives them of stimuli which would sharpen their own development in these fields.

Proponents of the system argue that in these two sciences the best work is done in these very early years, that special aptitudes in math and physics can be lost if not cultivated, thus depriving the individual of this opportunity for creative development and depriving society of incalculable benefits.

\* Available through the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10010.

Others argue that the proportion of those withdrawn is too small to make a difference, that plenty of bright ones remain, that any loss is compensated by greater emphasis on an earlier beginning of scientific studies in all schools and the greater knowledge of science all children have today than ever before through the influence of TV and the technological wonders with which they are all surrounded in this modern world.

It is also pointed out that special schools have long existed for gifted children in ballet, music and art and are part of the regular Soviet educational system. That these have proved their usefulness both to society and the individual is attested by the high artistic standards of the Soviet dancers and musicians who have visited our country.

### *Applying Science to Industry*

LAVRENTIEV described to us a new project, already under way, which grew out of Akademgorodok's connection with some 300 plants and factories in different parts of Siberia. Often when the scientists tried to apply new discoveries directly to industry they encountered difficulties. Not only were factories using old equipment and techniques, but their engineers and scientists were often inclined to resist change and cling to familiar methods. To solve the problem, a new unit was now being established, devoted to small experimental factories where prototypes of new types of machinery, adapted to new techniques, would be built and tested and people trained to use them. The new project was separated from Akademgorodok but within easy access. The scientists of Akademgorodok would be advisers. Designs would be worked out in Akademgorodok's institutes. Students of the University and technical school would be involved in the work. In general, Lavrentiev said, the new economic reform, and the greater initiative now falling upon factory managers, are opening the way to quicker use of scientific discoveries in industry. When the machines were perfected and tested they could go into production in regular factories. New cadres of scientists and industries would be trained to introduce the new machines and methods into industries.

The biggest problem in reaching the high level of mechanization needed for Siberia, Lavrentiev explained, is to develop materials suitable for operation under low temperature conditions often reaching 50 below zero, in the vast permafrost regions, and for use in the heavily water-bogged areas. In the beginning machinery had been brought here suitable only for the central, southern and west-

ern part of the country. Breakdowns were five to ten times more frequent than in milder climates.

"In these severe frosts," he said, "steel grows brittle and easily breaks up, rubber crumbles like bread, plastics crack and lubrication hardens. Even in more southern areas of Siberia like Cheremkhovo there are frequent breakdowns of their great excavators. So the No. 1 problem in the conquest of the north is frost-resistant equipment and materials. Northern standards must be worked out for every type of machinery. We are planning an exhibit of such machinery in a year or so. If the climate here is hard on machinery, how much harder it is on the human beings who use it!"

Along with the extraordinary range of Lavrentiev's scientific knowledge, his awareness of the human beings involved in the work was always in evidence. His most passionate concern was that the best possible conditions be provided for scientists and scientific workers, not only to enable them to do their best work, but so that they would find their highest fulfillment as individuals and live in an environment which would meet their needs as human beings in their family, social and cultural life outside of their working hours.

Science to him was not an end of itself. He said several times that he had no use for the conception of "pure" science, and at every point the work of Science City was geared to meet the needs of the socialist economy so that it in turn could better meet the needs of the people.

Science could not stop there. New industries brought new problems of air and water pollution, which scientists must be prepared to fight. Unfortunately, he said, there continues a lag here. The clearing of the great Siberian forests to make way for new enterprises and communities for their builders, the cutting of trees for industrial use, gave rise to new problems of conservation both in terms of lumber riches and in preservation of animal life which must also be part of the scientists' concern.

For all the new projects to open up more of the vast expanses of Siberia, the greatest need, he said, was people. Siberia and the Far East cover two-thirds of the USSR, but have only about ten per cent of its population. The lure of pioneering was a powerful factor in attracting them, but the severity of the climate was a repelling force. While the overall population of Siberia was increasing, both through influx from the West and natural growth, in some of its harshest sections climatically the westward return had begun to exceed the influx. Special groups were at work on the problem of providing good living arrangements under these rigorous conditions.

Many steps had already been taken. All workers migrating to Siberia and the Far East could automatically expect wages from 20 to 40 per cent higher than the rate in areas of milder climate. Free transportation for themselves and their families, free moving of furniture and household goods, extra paid vacation-time, free travel to other parts of the USSR—these and other privileges were provided for all new settlers.

But many other factors had to be considered to make permanent residence more acceptable—housing, heating, food, clothing, tools, working equipment, machinery, all had to be adapted to special conditions. Intensive research was being done, including such questions as how to compensate in the raw new frontier settlements, springing into life, for the richness of past history, culture and tradition that are an inseparable part of the environment in the cities and communities of the long-settled parts of the USSR.

#### *With Lavrentiev as Our Guide*

**WE** HAVE kept Lavrentiev such a long time we are feeling guilty, but as we rise to take our leave Lavrentiev says it is not yet time to say goodbye, he wants to show us the general layout of Academgorodok himself.

Getting behind the wheel of his seven-passenger ZIM he drove through the area where the University, and the Institutes are situated in close proximity, pointing out the main buildings, as well as the shopping center and clubs and theaters, the dormitories for students and apartment houses for construction and service workers and scientists near by.

We remarked on the modern, airy, imaginative architecture and the attractive and well-planned layout of the town. Lavrentiev told us they had made a point of enlisting the best available architects to carry out the plans of creating the most convenient and attractive living and working conditions possible. "But the general layout we decided on ourselves!" he added.

Having observed how deeply involved Lavrentiev was in every aspect of the work, both creatively and administratively, I asked him at one point how it was possible for one man to accomplish so much. "Of course, it's very simple—no single person *could* do all this!" he answered. "We have a wonderful collective here, a team of gifted people, who work together well and are all warm friends as well as co-workers. That's how we get things done. All my co-workers are very energetic—we share the work, all of it. All of our top scientists here are concerned with administration work as well as science."

It was a sparkling morning, with the high blue Siberian sky above us and the sunlight glistening on birch tree leaves still wet from last night's rain. Lavrentiev spoke lovingly of the natural beauty of the place, as we entered a road through thicker woods.

"The architects wanted to build out here and destroy all this beauty," he said. "But we don't want to spoil nature. We insisted on keeping the forest with us." There had really been nothing there when they came. The earlier farms had been abandoned. They had cleared only enough land for building, made roads where there had been only ruts and holes before. He made a detour to drive us down to the seashore, which had been cleared as their main recreation place. The wide Ob Sea stretched before us. Sailboats and motor launches rode at anchor. Bathers dotted the beach.

From there he took us to a colony of individual cottages in the woods. These were for the leading scientists, college professors and others who had settled there permanently. Land was provided for others who wished to build their own homes, but many of the young people who came there preferred apartments.

We entered the driveway of a large house with spacious grounds, sloping lawns, flower beds, noble old trees, a lovely vista, half cultivated, half wild, blending in with the forest all around. This was Lavrentiev's home. Mrs. Lavrentiev came out and greeted us in perfect New York English. She was a Barnard graduate! Her family had emigrated to the United States in 1914. Her mother, a biologist, had been on the faculty of Columbia. The family had returned to Russia in 1928. Recalling her girlhood in the United States, she led us into a spacious living room, tasteful and comfortable, its large windows framing the view. Mrs. Lavrentiev had designed it herself, and especially the large stone fireplace, from her memory of houses in Connecticut. Her neighbors liked it so much that now all the other houses in the community had similar fireplaces in addition to their regular Russian stoves which they needed for warmth in the Siberian winters.

Mrs. Lavrentiev led us to a large dining table at the end of the room, with about a dozen chairs around it. She explained that this didn't mean they had such a large family—both their son and their daughter and their families had houses of their own nearby—but that hardly a day passed without visitors arriving from the community itself, from other parts of the Soviet Union, or abroad, and she always had to be ready for them. Fortunately, she did not have to cook for so many people, since they could get semi or fully prepared meals at a central community kitchen nearby.

She apologized that this very day a group of scientists were expected for a conference, and she could only offer us vodka. So we drank to the Lavrentievs, to us, to Akademgorodok, to American-Soviet friendship, and a special toast by Lavrentiev to a peaceful future when the scientists of the world would find the means of creating enough abundance and beauty to satisfy the needs of all men everywhere, and would never again have to use their great creative gifts on means of mass destruction of human beings. And that was quite enough toasts for the middle of the day.

After this pleasant interlude, Lavrentiev drove us to the next appointment he had arranged for us, pointing out other institutes to us on the way, including the Institute of Hydrodynamics which he heads. He is an authority on complex variables in mathematics. But it was from others we heard that Lavrentiev had received two Stalin prizes (now Lenin prizes) and the Order of Lenin for his scientific work.

The Hydrodynamics Institute has numerous achievements to its credit. Its scientists have developed a blast welding method that can be used to weld together any pair of metals to create hybrid materials needed for the latest fields of technology. An "impulse water thrower" was developed in this laboratory named the "hydraulic gun." It develops a pressure of 100,000 lbs. to the square inch and can shatter the hardest rock. In cooperation with the mining industry new hydro-extraction machinery is being developed which will greatly increase labor productivity in mining. The Hydrodynamics Institute has also undertaken to solve the problem of using computers to predict floods.

It is working on new methods of breaking ice by explosion, of great importance for the Arctic Sea Route, and on the use of explosions to move great quantities of earth as must be done in many of the new industrial developments in Siberia.

Lavrentiev emphasized the transcendent importance of the work of their computing center headed by Guri I. Marchuk, which was nearby. The center serves all the other institutes in Akademgorodok as well as industries all over Siberia, charging a fee to help cover the institute's budget. It has a staff of 400, and 40 candidates of science (equivalent to Ph.D. level). Some of the institutes, of course, had their own computers as well.

One of the useful services of the computer center is analyzing weather reports from some 2,000 stations in an effort to provide three-day forecasts for the region stretching from Moscow to Tokyo. The method used here has been adopted by the Central Weather Bureau

in Moscow. The center also studies hurricanes, tornadoes and other meteorological phenomena. Lavrentiev confided that they were also working on the problem of changing Siberia's harsh climate—but were not yet ready to make predictions about the prospects.

The center, at the time of our visit, had four computing machines, one of them a BESM-6, the largest Soviet digital machine, which is said to compare with the best on the American market.

The setup of Akademgorodok has made it possible for mathematicians and economists to work together, using the computer center, to determine the most efficient utilization of the productive forces of Siberia and the Far East, such as the optimal distribution of agriculture and the location of new industries, to study factors inhibiting development in some regions, and to work out the best version for the development of power systems such as the unified power grids of the Siberian and European areas of the USSR.

Passing the Institute of Nuclear Physics we noticed that its windows faced on a large "ATOMS FOR PEACE" sign on the building opposite.

Another building had a large sign in English over the entrance—FREE RADICALS CONFERENCE. We were astonished that a group of this character should be meeting in a Soviet city. Lavrentiev didn't understand our puzzlement until Anna explained what the word meant in English. He laughed uproariously as he told us that an international conference had just been held in this institute, but that it had to do with chemistry, not politics.

Lavrentiev deposited us at the Institute of Geology and Geophysics and turned us over to the pretty young woman geologist in charge of the museum.

An enormous relief map showed the location of all the known resources of Siberia—immense resources, of course, still remain to be discovered. Circling the map with a pointer, the curator said "here we have everything in the geological table. It is easier to tell you what we have not than what we have—in fact that would practically mean remaining silent!" She pushed buttons showing in "what is probably the world's richest treasure house" all the natural and mineral resources and the centers where they were being developed. In well-arranged showcases we saw specimens of every known variety of ferrous and non-ferrous minerals, precious and semi-precious gems, glittering arrays of gold and diamonds. We learned of the active work of this institute, employing 800 people, in supervising numerous teams of geologists in the field and opening up ever new resources in this fabulous land.

*The Institute of Cytology and Genetics*

LAVRENTIEV had proposed that we also visit the Institute of Cytology and Genetics, where we were given the warmest kind of a reception. Its director, Dmitri Belayev, a corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences and head of the biology department of Novosibirsk University, was at the moment preparing to visit the United States on the invitation of the American Genetics Society. His assistant Maltsev did the honors, along with a group of young scientific workers. One of the women scientific workers spoke English fluently, with a very British accent, and was delighted at the chance to do the interpreting, insisting that it was better for her to do it than Anna because she knew all the scientific terms. Her torrential flow of words was practically incomprehensible, but her enthusiasm for her work, and the enthusiasm of the whole group, was infectious. New members of the staff kept appearing and as always I was amazed at the generosity of these busy people in being so ready to give their time to talk with Americans.

The deputy director started at once to talk about Trofim Lysenko, and the harm he had done to the development of genetics in the Soviet Union. They had never supported his ideas in this Institute, but their very remoteness had made it possible for them to continue legitimate work in genetics when it had been stifled elsewhere through Lysenko's influence.

Pointing to a large portrait of Mendel on the wall, the deputy director said: "We honor him as the father of genetics! Now, fortunately, he is again formally, officially recognized as such."

We asked whether Lysenko had in fact made any practical contributions in agriculture, as had been claimed. They said that he could be credited with practical achievements in some fields, although his work really had no relation to genetics. His theories about the inheritance of acquired characteristics simply did not hold water. There had been a great deal of noise at one time about the "yarovization" of wheat (treatment for early sprouting) and about producing new varieties of wheat. But his methods were too costly, not realistic and had not been used in practice. We found this group of scientists extremely bitter about the harm done by the former official support of his false theories. But at the same time they wholly approved the policy of giving him every facility to continue work in practical fields as he was now doing, in a laboratory near Moscow.

Lysenko's influence had not only held up any publication of reliable textbooks and materials on genetics in the Soviet Union for a good

many years, but had also meant cutting off all books and magazines from other countries on the subject. Now the Institute was receiving books and magazines from all over the world on genetics and related subjects and they had close relations with scientists of other countries. Many works were being translated from English and other languages and reliable textbooks of their own were again available. Their standard textbook on genetics for university use was one by Soviet Academician Lobashev, written in '64, now in its second edition. A number of the scientific staff of this institute had recently written up-to-date, modern textbooks on biology. The institute has 430 on its staff, 130 of them scientific workers.

The group was especially excited about drugs developed at the institute in connection with their studies of the genetic structure of the virus. They put before us the two neatly packaged drugs that they said had already been recognized in world medical literature, and which were already in use in the Soviet Union. One of them, Ribonuclease, had been approved by the Ministry of Health for the treatment of virus infections of the eye, was being produced in large quantities in Leningrad and had been used with very good results. There were still some differences of opinion about its effectiveness, however, and tests were being continued.

The other drug, Desoxyribonuclease, was used in the treatment of multiple sclerosis. They cautioned me that if I planned to write about this I must be sure to say that it was effective only in the early stages of the disease. They had been distressed because word of a "wonder drug" for the cure of multiple sclerosis had gotten abroad, and they had been receiving heartbreaking appeals for the drug from people already in the advanced stages of the disease, or members of their families, and in such cases the drug could not be effective.

The Institute's scientists do a great deal of experimental genetic work in connection with breeding improved strains of domestic animals and crops. They have their own experimental fields and laboratories and also work with experimental state and collective farms.

The institute was at present engaged in intensive work on the genetics of fur animals. They were working on problems of fertility, getting more offspring per mother by extending the amount of light per day, and also studying the influence of domestication on fertility. (They have found that increasing the daylight with artificial environmental lighting decreases the number of still births 20 per cent.) They were also engaged in increasing the variety of colors available in furs through combinations of the genes. Their methods were already being widely applied in state farms.

A young woman scientist showed us an extraordinary range of color achieved in mink skins—black, beige, a whole range of pastels, all the way to pure white. We saw a series of gorgeous blue, black and silver fox skins, and a platinum mutant. They were producing lighter and lighter sable skins, from the original rich brown, and had now reached a light beige. Siberia, of course, has a monopoly in sable and producing more for the world market is an important contribution to the national economy. "Most of our work goes for the benefit of your American movie actresses," she told us. She said that the USSR, with 27 varieties, is the next highest mink producer in the world, following the United States.

**W**HAT I have written here is, of course, only a laymen's superficial account of what is surely one of the most heartening and exciting developments in today's tormented world.

But it made us feel keenly the great and noble role of Soviet scientists in opening doors to the future. Next to the workers, creators of all material values, they bear the greatest share of the responsibility for bringing about the abundance necessary for the satisfaction of all man's needs in the communist society they are building, pointing the way to the creation of abundance over all the earth.

Does this mean that the Soviet Union has lost its revolutionary fervor, that its leaders, its scientists, its workers are concerned only with increasing material advantages and comforts? I think not. They are concerned with opening the way for the true liberation of all mankind which is the aim of all truly revolutionary movements. We find this concern in the words of Professor Nikolay M. Semenov, a leading Soviet physical chemist and winner of the Nobel Prize for chemistry in 1956. He is also chairman of the society called "Knowledge" whose work of bringing scientific information to the people is all-pervasive throughout the USSR. In an article in the magazine *Nauka I Chelovechestvo* (Science and Humanity), #11, 1963, he wrote:

To liberate mankind from heavy physical labor as well as from labor which is repetitious, monotonous, demanding no thought; to provide everybody with food, clothing and housing; in other words to make all people truly free and to bring within their reach, according to their abilities, the joys of creativeness, the delight of cultural and spiritual treasures—is this not the basic humanist idea dear to all honest people?

Contemporary science and technology are continually opening up new possibilities to satisfy the material needs of people, up to the level of their reasonable requirements. If the social system in which power belongs to the true creators of wealth—the workers—prevailed in the whole world, mankind would already have been able to live in prosperity and make use of all the benefits of civilization.

The Soviet scientists' role goes far beyond the creation of material abundance through their scientific work and its speedy application to productive problems. If rigid and dogmatic attitudes develop at times, in some aspects of Soviet life, it seems to me that this cannot again happen in science, as it did during the Lysenko period, and that as scientific knowledge becomes more and more a part of life, dogma must everywhere recede.

Let me end by quoting the Novosti correspondent who arranged our trip, Gregory Meisak, another remarkable Siberian patriot, who deserves a whole story to himself. In a booklet, *Land of Great Prospects*, he wrote:

"Tsarist Siberia was a land of penal servitude fifty years ago. Within half a century, a moment in terms of history, the Soviet people have managed to turn this gigantic land into a mighty industrial base of the Soviet Union, into a land of flourishing culture and unheard of accomplishments.

"Anyone who wants peace among nations will be moved by the great feat performed by the Soviet people in this formerly desolate land. Everything we are doing here proves that the Soviet people stand for peace. For the time being, it is snowy and frosty, but the Siberians are confident that in time warm winds will blow over Siberia, that it will blossom like the rose! Siberia, to whom nature has been so generous, will become a wonderful land of plenty, happiness and joy. Surely, it will be so, for nothing is stronger than peaceful labor."

---

#### TRETYAKOV, SIBERIAN VIOLINIST, IN NYC

ANOTHER SIDE of the life of Siberia (although Science City has its musicians too) was demonstrated last February in New York's Carnegie Hall by the local debut of Krasnoyarsk-born Victor Tretyakov, 22-year-old violinist, and first prize winner in the 1966 Moscow Tchaikovsky Competition.

Harriet Johnson wrote of him in the *New York Post* (February 2) that he "demonstrated a sharp intelligence, linked to a fiery temperament" and is "an extraordinary artist, so young in years, so mature in music." He gave a "smooth, sensitive performance" of a Mozart sonata, and two Paganini pieces were "bewitched by cool wizardry." She went on:

"The only obvious hint that Tretyakov hailed from Siberia was the slant of his hair which, well trimmed but poetically long, reached down formally from rear neck to collar as if he had planned it that way for added warmth. . . . Like any personality with wide horizons, he stimulates the listener's imagination. Like the Northern Lights, his playing had their rays of reason and mystery; their seeming prophetic vision.

"Mikhail G. Erokhin at the piano provided a well-balanced and imaginative collaboration. He was, indeed, a worthy colleague."

---

KHUDZHUMA SHUKUROVA

## Women in Soviet Uzbekistan

I BELIEVE no women in the world have ever known a more difficult and humiliating lot than that suffered by the women of Central Asia in prerevolutionary Russia. The fate of women in Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Kirghizia, Tadzhikistan and Kazakhstan in those days was many times more cruel and humiliating than that of their Russian sisters.

The Bey,\* the father, husband and brothers, were masters of their women's destiny, of their very lives. Total illiteracy, the complete absence of civil rights—or any kind of rights for that matter—was their fate. Even sunlight was forbidden to these women. The black *parandzha*—a heavy horsehair veil which covered them from head to foot—cut them off entirely from the world around them.

The socialist regime for the first time led Uzbek women out of bondage and restored to them their human dignity. It released their creative energies so that they were able to participate fully in the building of socialism in Uzbekistan and to share the joys of the gigantic achievements of our Republic.

Before the Revolution Uzbekistan had no industries at all. At present it has more than a hundred thriving industries of different kinds. Under the old regime there was not a single institution of higher learning and only two per cent of the population knew how to read and write. Today our people are completely literate. Every fourth person is studying. We have thousands of regular schools, hundreds of technical schools, several institutions of higher learning and our own Uzbek Academy of Sciences. All of these remarkable achievements here on our ancient Uzbek soil were the fruit of the great October Socialist Revolution. We women are proud to have a hand in the creation of this new life.

Women today are innovators in industrial production and in agriculture. The Uzbek woman is scientist, doctor and teacher, author and artist, composer and architect. It has become the usual thing for women to be engaged in governmental and other public

\* Local Government official.

work. Indeed, the very top post in our Republic Government, that of the Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of Uzbekistan, is held by a woman, Yadgar Nasriddovna, who also served recently as a member of the Soviet delegation to the United Nations. Eighteen women occupy the posts of Ministers, Deputy Ministers and heads of leading Republic bodies.

Twenty-two women of Uzbekistan are now Deputies to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR; 141 are Deputies to the Supreme Soviet of the Uzbek Republic; over 35,000 have been elected to local Soviets in Uzbekistan, and over 2,000 are chairmen, vice-chairmen, secretaries and members of executive committees of the Soviets.

About 7,000 Uzbek women are now working in various scientific research institutes, 837 are candidates (preparing their dissertations) for a Doctor of Science degree, and 28 already hold this degree. There are 76,000 girl students in the Republic's institutions of secondary and higher education.

To this we must add that for their remarkable achievements in the field of labor more than 28,000 Uzbek women have been honored with various orders and medals, of whom 75 have received the especially high designation of Hero of Socialist Labor.

Among specialists with a higher education engaged in the national industries of Uzbekistan, 41 per cent are women. Women occupy the leading positions in such industries as textile and silk. There are more than 26,000 women engineers and technicians in Uzbekistan and 116 women are directors of industrial establishments.

Many women may now be found as heads of collective and state farms, as chiefs of brigades and leaders in other agricultural groups and organizations. The names of such outstanding collective farm workers as Tursuna Akhunova, Saodat Gulakhmedova, both decorated as Heroes of Soviet Labor, are well known beyond the boundaries of our Republic. Akhunova received a Lenin prize for her part in designing a new cotton-picking machine. She is a deputy to the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Uzbek women have won distinction not only as excellent workers. Many of our women are gifted artists, especially in the varied folk arts of our republic. Visitors from abroad have been impressed by the remarkable skill and grace of the artists of the state ensemble *Bakhor*, headed by the talented dancer Mukaram Turkunbayeva. Our leading Uzbek dancer Galina Izmailova and our famous singer Saodat Kabulova have both performed abroad and been acclaimed in the foreign press.

**THE PROVERB**

by Yusuf Shamansurov

*I hear a proverb—on two lips it gleams  
And lightens all the face of speech—  
I then behold a sage, as if in dreams,  
Whose wisdom only years could teach.*

*Forever grateful shall I be  
For that swift moment when, in flight,  
From words of his to verses penned by me  
Sweet pollen falls, enchanted, bright.*

Soviet Literature, No. 12, 1967

YUSUF SHAMANSUROV is a young Uzbek poet. His first collection of verses was published in 1957.

Could our Uzbek women have dreamed of anything like this in the years before the Revolution? The struggle of the Uzbek women for their freedom, the struggle to rid themselves of the shackles of their old life, was hard and bitter in the first years after the Revolution. Many women were murdered by fathers and husbands as a result of their fight to rid themselves of the hated *parandzha*. It was an act of high courage for the thousands of women who, in the twenties, tore off their veils and made bonfires of them.

In the early years of the Soviet regime Clara Zetkin, the great German Communist leader, in an address to the women of Soviet Central Asia, wrote:

"We feel, with you, how intense is your struggle, how enormous the sacrifices you have to make. Nevertheless, we are confident that your will for freedom, your battle to provide the conditions in your country for all your people to be free and cultured representatives of the human race, is strong and unvanquishable, and will prevail over all the enmity directed against you . . .

"Red October awakened in the hearts of the women of the East an ardent desire for freedom and equality. This desire is like a flame that burns ever higher and cannot be extinguished. Its sparks will fly far beyond the borders of the Soviet Union, and arouse the shackled, oppressed and gradually awakening women of the East."

Many years have passed since those days, years of gigantic changes and reforms, and the prophetic words of Clara Zetkin have become a reality. Today a new race of women live and work in Uzbekistan. They are wise, proud, courageous, strong—active builders of socialism. And all this is taking place in the very same land where for centuries the strictest laws of segregation of women were

## UZBEK WOMEN

enforced, where a woman not only did not dare appear with her face bared in the presence of strange men—and all were deemed strange to her outside of her family—but was not even permitted to speak in their presence!

Today, in our Soviet Socialist Republic of Uzbekistan, where half a century ago women were illiterate, downtrodden and enslaved, Lenin's dream of having women actively participate in running the government, has come true.

## A NOTE ABOUT THE AUTHOR

**K**HUDZHUMA Samatovna Shukurova, author of the foregoing article, is herself a shining example of the new woman of Uzbekistan of whom she writes. I met her first on a visit to Tashkent with my husband in 1961, and have kept in touch with her ever since. Small and ardent, she brims with enthusiasm about the surging growth of her republic, and above all of the outstanding role of women in all phases of the life of her people. As chairman of the Uzbek Society for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries, our host organization, she filled our short visit with exciting and enlightening visits to factories, schools, theaters, farms and homes (about which I wrote in NWR at the time).

One of Shukurova's deepest concerns was to show us by living examples how this formerly backward land of Central Asia, inhabited by people of darker skins than their Russian neighbors, had risen, with the help of labor and special financing provided by the central government of the USSR, to a place of full and absolute equality in the Soviet family of nations. Of this we were fully convinced by everything we saw, as well as of the full equality of all the hundred different nationalities that lived within the borders of Uzbekistan, representing in microcosm\* the multinational USSR, with the Uzbek people naturally predominating.

I saw another example of the strong ties of friendship and mutual aid binding together all the peoples of the Soviet Union on a second visit to Tashkent in the summer of 1967 (I did not see Shukurova on that trip, she was away on vacation). This was after the disastrous earthquake of the spring of 1966. Within the year since then the older parts of the city which had been largely destroyed had been almost completely rebuilt by groups of workers of all

\* Well, perhaps not so "micro"—Uzbekistan covers almost half a million square kilometers, and has about 11,000,000 inhabitants.

nationalities from all parts of the Soviet Union. As a result of their labor and the fraternal help sent from other areas, new modern apartment buildings had risen everywhere in place of the ancient clay homes that had been demolished.

Willing to talk endlessly about the achievements of the Uzbek Republic and of her Uzbek sisters, Shukurova always talked least of all about herself, and only later after much urging sent me a brief written biography.

Khudzhuma Shukurova was born in 1927 in Samarkand. She graduated from high school with a gold medal in 1945, and in 1950 from Tashkent State University, the first higher educational institution in Uzbekistan, established in 1920 by a special decree of Lenin. She specialized in history, in which she completed a graduate course at Moscow University in 1954, and then returned to teach history at Tashkent University for several years.

In addition to her full-time work as head of the Friendship Society, Shukurova is active in the Committee of Soviet Women and various public organizations, and is the author of a book on the history of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan, as well as numerous articles on historical and current subjects. She is the mother of three sons.

In the winter of 1968 Shukurova and two other representatives of the Committee of Soviet Women toured this country as guests of the Women Strike for Peace, visiting a number of other cities as well as New York. I was happy to see her again while she was here. Her eagerness for facts about life in the United States was overwhelming. On her return to her own country she wrote a most perceptive article in the Tashkent paper, *Pravda Vostok* (Truth of the East) about her experiences here, of which she sent me a clipping.

Understanding well the dark sides of the life of our country, the contradictions, she emphasized that what impressed her above all was that "the voice of right-thinking Americans protesting against the hateful and shameful war in Vietnam is sounding ever more loudly." She wrote in detail about what she had learned of the peace activities and demonstrations being carried on by the WSP and other peace groups at that time, and also of the peace activities of the youth.

She ended her article with the words:

"We are proud of our American sisters and friends, who in the face of persecution and slander, stand firmly in the ranks of those who represent the conscience of their country."

J. S.

## Current Documents

### WORLD CONFERENCE OF COMMUNIST PARTIES

Excerpts from the principal document adopted in Moscow, June 27, by the World Conference of Communist Parties, as distributed by TASS, official Soviet News Agency, published in *New York Times*, June 19.

**M**ANKIND has entered the last third of our century in a situation marked by a sharpening of the historic struggle between the forces of progress and reaction, between socialism and imperialism. This clash is worldwide and embraces all the basic spheres of social life: economy, politics, ideology and culture.

At present there are real possibilities for resolving key problems of our time in the interests of peace, democracy, and socialism, to deal imperialism new blows.

However, while the world system of imperialism has not grown stronger, it remains a serious and dangerous foe. The United States of America, the chief imperialist power, has grown more aggressive.

The war in Vietnam is the most convincing proof of the contradiction between imperialism's aggressive plans and its ability to put these plans into effect.

In Vietnam, United States imperialism, the most powerful of the imperialist partners, is suffering defeat, and this is of historic significance.

The armed intervention in Vietnam holds a special place in the military and political designs of United States imperialism.

The aggressor planned to destroy an outpost of socialism in Asia, block the way for the peoples of Southeast Asia to freedom and progress, strike a blow at the national liberation movement, and test the strength of the proletarian solidarity of the socialist countries of the whole world.

The criminal intervention in Vietnam has resulted in considerable moral and political isolation of the United States.

It has turned ever broader masses of people, new social strata and political forces against imperialism and speeded up the involvement of millions of young people in many countries in the anti-imperialist struggle.

It has aggravated existing contradictions between the imperialist powers and created new ones.

The successes of the heroic Vietnamese people are convincing proof that in our day it is becoming increasingly possible for peoples resolutely using all means to defend their independence, sovereignty and freedom and enjoying broad international support, to defeat imperialist aggression.

In the Middle East a grave international crisis has been precipitated by Israeli aggression against the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan.

Through this, imperialism, that of the United States above all, tried to crush the Arab countries, undermine the Arab liberation movement, and preserve or regain its position in the Middle East. This it has failed to do.

United States imperialism has not abandoned its plans to strangle revolutionary Cuba. It continues to threaten the independence of the Republic of Cuba and in

flagrant contravention of international law tries to blockade it economically and carries on provocative and subversive activity against it.

In Europe, the North Atlantic bloc, the chief instrument of imperialist aggression and adventurism, continues to be active.

The axis of this bloc is the alliance between Washington and Bonn. Contrary to the will of the peoples of Europe, the ruling circles of the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany and Britain are doing their utmost to prolong the existence of this bloc, strengthen its organization and maintain the military presence of the United States in Europe.

West German militarism, the main source of the war danger in the heart of Europe, was revived and grew strong mainly with NATO assistance.

The imperialist ruling circles of the Federal Republic of Germany, where neo-Nazism and militarism are gaining strength, persist in their revanchist program of revising the results of the World War II and of changing the frontiers of a number of European countries.

This policy, aimed primarily against the German Democratic Republic, the first socialist workers' and peasants' state in German history, threatens the security of all European peoples and the peace of the world.

The Mediterranean countries occupy an important place in the plans of imperialism, which has important military bases in Spain, continues to support the Franco regime, thereby helping it to survive in opposition to the struggle of the fighting Spanish people.

The repeated exacerbation of the situation in Cyprus and the fascist coup in Greece are the handiwork of the imperialists, who support the colonels' junta.

Imperialism has become more active in a number of African countries. It tries to halt the growth of the liberation struggle and preserve and strengthen its positions in that continent.

The British and French imperialists, and the imperialists of the United States, West Germany and Japan are making extensive use of neo-colonialist methods of economic, political and ideological infiltration and subjugation.

The armed intervention in the Congo (Kinshasa), the reactionary coups in Ghana and some other countries, imperialist moves designed to dismember Nigeria, the political and military support given to reactionary and anti-national cliques, to the fascist and racist regimes in the Republic of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia, the fomenting of inter-state conflicts and inter-tribal strife, economic pressure and monopoly expansion — all serve to further imperialist plans.

The Portuguese colonialists, backed by NATO, try to keep their possessions by force of arms.

United States imperialism continues to step up its economic penetration, as well as its political, ideological and cultural intervention in the Latin American countries. In alliance with the local reactionary forces it has been pursuing a policy designed to prevent the peoples from following the example of Cuba. It suppresses any step leading to economic and genuine political independence.

However, the policy of United States imperialism is encountering great difficulties. It fails to stabilize reactionary regimes or secure the agreement of all the governments to the setting up of the "inter-American peace forces." The Alliance for Progress program has failed.

Other imperialist powers, particularly West Germany and Japan, likewise seek to entrench themselves in that continent.

The West German imperialist war machine is reaching out for nuclear weapons and intensifying its drive for domination over Western Europe.

It opposes all steps leading to disarmament and the easing of international tension, and pursues a policy of neo-colonialism and expansion in relation to the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Despite the weakening of British imperialism, Britain remains one of the major imperialistic powers and strives to maintain its positions in Africa, Asia, the Caribbean and the Middle East by neo-colonialist methods and sometimes by direct military intervention.

On the principal issues of world politics Britain acts as one of the most active partners of the United States. It is a leading aggressive force in NATO and seeks a closer alliance with West Germany.

Japanese imperialism is gaining in strength, intensifying its expansion, first of all in Asia. Militarism is again rearing its head in Japan. Linked by many ties with United States imperialism, the ruling circles of Japan have virtually turned the country into a United States arsenal in the war against the Vietnamese people, and take part in conspiracies against the Korean people.

French imperialism tries to maintain and consolidate its positions in world economy and politics. It persistently continues to build up a nuclear strike force and refuses to join in measures that would promote disarmament.

It retains its colonial domination over the peoples of Guadeloupe, Martinique, Reunion, and some countries of Africa and Oceania, and refuses to recognize their right to self-determination and to govern their own affairs.

It uses the influence it still has in its former colonies and, employing new methods of colonialist policy, is particularly active in Africa.

Italian monopoly capital is likewise stepping up its expansion.

The defense of socialism is an internationalist duty of Communists.

The development and strengthening of each socialist country is a vital condition of the progress of the world socialist system as a whole. Successful development of the national economy, improvement of social relations and the all-round progress of each socialist country conform both to the interests of each people separately and the common cause of socialism.

One of the most important tasks before the Communist and workers' parties of the socialist countries is to develop all-embracing cooperation between their countries and insure fresh successes in the decisive areas of the economic competition between the two systems, in the advance of science and technology.

As the struggle between the two world systems grows sharper, this competition demands that on the basis of the socialist countries' fundamental interests and aims and of the Marxist-Leninist principles underlying their policy, the socialist system should place greater reliance on the international socialist division of labor and voluntary cooperation between them, which rules out any infringement of national interests, and insures the advance of each country and consolidates the might of the world socialist system as a whole.

Relying on its steadily growing economic and defense potential, the world socialist system fetters imperialism, reduces its possibilities of exporting counter-revolution, and in fulfillment of its internationalist duty, furnishes increasing aid to the peoples fighting for freedom and independence, and promotes peace and international security.

So long as the aggressive NATO bloc exists, the Warsaw Treaty organization has an important role to play in safeguarding the security of the socialist countries against armed attack by the imperialist powers and in insuring peace.

The successes of socialism, its impact on the course of world events and the effectiveness of its struggle against imperialist aggression, largely depend on the

cohesion of the socialist countries. Unity of action of the socialist countries is an important factor in bringing together all anti-imperialist forces.

The establishment of international relations of a new type and the development of the fraternal alliance of the socialist countries is a complex historical process. Following the victory of the socialist revolution in many countries, the building of socialism on the basis of general laws is proceeding in various forms, which take into account concrete historical conditions and national distinctions.

Successful development of this process implies strict adherence to the principles of proletarian internationalism, mutual assistance and support, equality, sovereignty and non-interference in each other's internal affairs.

Socialism is not afflicted with the contradictions inherent in capitalism. When divergencies between socialist countries do arise owing to differences in the level of economic development, in social structure or international position or because of national distinctions, they can and must be successfully settled on the basis of proletarian fraternal cooperation, they need not disrupt the united front of socialist countries against imperialism.

Communists are aware of the difficulties in the development of the world socialist system, but this system is based on the identity of the socio-economic structure of its member countries and on the identity of their fundamental interests and objectives. This identity is an earnest that the existing difficulties will be overcome and that the unity of the socialist system will be further strengthened on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

The cohesion of the Communist and workers parties is the most important factor in rallying together all anti-imperialist forces.

The participants in the meeting reaffirm their common views that relations between the fraternal parties are based on the principles of proletarian internationalism, solidarity, and mutual support, respect for independence and equality, and non-interference in each other's internal affairs.

Strict adherence to these principles and strengthening the unity of the Communist movement require close cooperation. Bilateral consultations, regional meetings and international conferences are natural forms of such cooperation and are conducted on the basis of the principles accepted in the Communist movement.

These principles and these forms give the Communist and workers' parties every possibility to unite their efforts in the struggle for their common aims, under conditions of the growing diversity of the world revolutionary process.

All parties have equal rights. At this time, when there is no leading center of the international Communist movement, voluntary coordination of the actions of parties to effectively carry out the tasks before them acquires increased importance.

United action by Communist and workers' parties will promote cohesion of the Communist movement on Marxist-Leninist principles. Joint action aimed at solving vital practical problems of the revolutionary and general democratic movements of our time promote a necessary exchange of experience between the various contingents of the Communist movement.

They help to enrich and creatively develop Marxist-Leninist theory, to strengthen internationalist revolutionary positions or urgent political problems.

The participants in the meeting proclaim their parties' firm resolve to do their utmost for the working people and for social progress, with the view to advancing toward complete victory over international capital.

They regard joint action against imperialism and for general democratic demands as a component and a stage of the struggle for socialist revolution and abolition of the system of exploitation of man by man.

The participants in the meeting are convinced that the effectiveness of each Communist party's policy depends on its successes in its own country, on the successes of other fraternal parties and on the extent of their cooperation.

Each Communist party is responsible for its activity to its own working class and people and, at the same time, to the international working class. Each Communist party's national and international responsibilities are indivisible.

Marxists-Leninists are both patriots and internationalists; they reject both national narrowmindedness and the negation or underestimation of national interests, and the striving for hegemony.

At the same time, the Communist parties, the parties of the working class and all working people, are the standard bearers of genuine national interests, unlike the reactionary classes, which betray these interests.

The winning of power by the working class and its allies is the greatest contribution that a Communist party fighting under capitalist conditions can make to the cause of socialism and proletarian internationalism.

The Communist and workers' parties, regardless of some difference of opinion, reaffirm their determination to present a united front in the struggle against imperialism.

Some of the divergences that have arisen may be eliminated through an exchange of opinion or disappear as the development of events clarifies the essence of the outstanding issues. Other divergences may last a long time.

The meeting is confident that the outstanding issues can and must be resolved correctly by strengthening all forms of cooperation among the Communist parties, by extending interparty ties, by mutual exchange of experience, comradely discussion and consultation and unity of action in the international arena.

It is the internationalist duty of each party to do everything it can to help improve relations and promote trust between all parties and to undertake further efforts to strengthen the unity of the international Communist movement.

*Following the conclusion of the conference, it was announced that 61 of the 75 parties attending had signed the entire document without reservations. The five parties which did not participate in the signing were those of Cuba and Sweden (since they had attended as observers only); Britain and Norway (which desired to consult with their Central Committees before signing); the Dominican party. The Italian, Australian, San Marino and Reunion parties signed only the section dealing with the struggle against imperialism. Five parties signed the entire document but voiced reservations on certain points, to be included in the Conference record: the Romanian, Swiss, Spanish, Sudanese and Moroccan parties.*

### NLF 10-POINT PEACE PROPOSAL

*The following is an unofficial translation of the 10-point peace proposal of the National Liberation Front, submitted at the Paris talks on May 8 by Tran Buu Kiem, head of the NLF delegation:*

**P**ROCEEDING from a desire to reach a political solution with a view to ending the United States imperialists' war of aggression in South Vietnam and helping restore peace in Vietnam,

On the basis of the guarantee of the fundamental national rights of the Vietnamese people,

Proceeding from the fundamental principles of the 1954 Geneva agreements on Vietnam and the actual situation in Vietnam,

On the basis of the political program and the five-point position of the South Vietnam National Liberation Front, which agrees with the four-point stand of the government of the Democratic Republic of North Vietnam,

The South Vietnam National Liberation Front sets forth the principles and main content of an overall solution to the South Vietnam problem to help restore peace in Vietnam as follows:

[1]

To respect the Vietnamese people's fundamental national rights, i.e., independence, sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity, as recognized by the 1954 Geneva agreements on Vietnam.

[2]

The United States Government must withdraw from South Vietnam all United States troops, military personnel, arms and war material of the other foreign countries of the United States camp without posing any condition whatsoever; liquidate all United States military bases in South Vietnam; renounce all encroachments on the sovereignty, territory and security of South Vietnam and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam.

[3]

The Vietnamese people's right to fight for the defense of their fatherland is the sacred, inalienable right to self-defense of all peoples. The question of the Vietnamese armed forces in South Vietnam shall be resolved by the Vietnamese parties among themselves.

[4]

The people of South Vietnam shall settle themselves their own affairs without foreign interference. They shall decide themselves the political regime of South Vietnam through free and democratic general elections; a constituent assembly will be set up, a constitution worked out and a coalition government of South Vietnam installed, reflecting national concord and the broad union of all social strata.

[5]

During the period intervening between the restoration of peace and holding of general elections, neither party shall impose its political regime on the people of South Vietnam.

The political forces representing the various social strata and political tendencies in South Vietnam that stand for peace, independence and neutrality — including those persons who, for political reasons, have to live abroad — will enter into talks to set up a provisional coalition government based on the principle of equality, democracy and mutual respect with a view to achieving a peaceful, independent, democratic and neutral South Vietnam.

The provisional coalition government is to have the following tasks:

A. To implement the agreement to be concluded on the withdrawal of the troops of the United States and the other foreign countries of the American camp.

B. To achieve national concord, and broad union of all social strata, political forces, nationalities, religious communities and all persons, no matter what their political beliefs and their past may be, provided they stand for peace, independence and neutrality.

C. To achieve broad democratic freedoms — freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, freedom of belief, freedom to form political parties and organizations, freedom to demonstrate, etc.; to set free those persons jailed

on political grounds; to prohibit all acts of terror, reprisal and discrimination against people having collaborated with either side, and who are now in the country or abroad, as provided for by the 1954 Geneva agreements on Vietnam.

D. To heal the war wounds, restore and develop the economy, to restore the normal life of the people and to improve the living conditions of the laboring people.

E. To hold free and democratic general elections in the whole of South Vietnam with a view to achieving the South Vietnam people's right to self-determination, in accordance with the content of point 4 mentioned above.

[6]

South Vietnam will carry out a foreign policy of peace and neutrality:

To carry out a policy of good neighborly relations with the Kingdom of Cambodia on the basis of respect for her independence, sovereignty, neutrality and territorial integrity with her present borders; to carry out a policy of good neighborly relations with the Kingdom of Laos on the basis of respect for the 1962 Geneva agreements on Laos.

To establish diplomatic, economic and cultural relations with all countries, irrespective of political and social regime, including the United States, in accordance with the five principles of peaceful coexistence: mutual respect for independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity, nonaggression, noninterference in internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit, peaceful coexistence, to accept economic and technical aid with no political conditions attached from any country.

[7]

The reunification of Vietnam will be achieved step by step, by peaceful means, through discussions and agreement between the two zones, without foreign interference.

Pending the peaceful reunification of Vietnam, the two zones shall re-establish normal relations in all fields on the basis of mutual respect.

The military demarcation line between the two zones at the 17th parallel, as provided for by the 1954 Geneva agreements, is only of a provisional character and does not constitute in any way a political or territorial boundary. The two zones shall reach agreement on the status of the demilitarized zone, and work out modalities for movements across the provisional military demarcation line.

[8]

As provided for in the 1954 Geneva agreements on Vietnam, the two zones, North and South Vietnam, shall undertake to refrain from joining any military alliance with foreign countries, not allow any foreign country to maintain military bases, troops and military personnel on their respective soil, and not recognize the protection of any country or military alliance or bloc.

[9]

To resolve the aftermath of the war:

A. The parties will negotiate the release of soldiers captured in war.

B. The United States government must bear full responsibility for the losses and devastations it has caused to the Vietnamese people in both zones.

[10]

The parties shall reach agreement on an international supervision about the withdrawal from South Vietnam of the troops, military personnel, arms and war material of the United States and the other foreign countries of the American camp.

The principles and content of the overall solution expounded above form an integrated whole. On the basis of these principles and content, the parties shall

reach understanding to the effect of concluding agreements on the above-mentioned questions with a view to ending the war in South Vietnam, and contributing to restore peace in Vietnam. (New York Times, May 9, 1969.)

## SOUTH VIETNAM ACTION PROGRAM

*This text of the "Action Program" of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam, and the list of members of the Provisional Revolutionary Government which follows, were broadcast by the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam and monitored by "United States listening stations."*

In face of the imperative requirements of the new situation and tasks, responding to the deep aspirations of the broad social strata, the historic All-South Vietnam Congress of People's Representatives, meeting on June 6, 7 and 8, 1969, set up the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam.

The Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam solemnly pledges to assume its heavy responsibilities before their countrymen and the world, all its members solemnly declare to do their utmost to fulfill the heavy and glorious mission entrusted to them by the congress.

The Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam pledges to mobilize the South Vietnam armed forces and people in order to push forward the struggle against US aggression, for national salvation, to total victory and to successfully accomplish the lofty tasks laid down by the Congress of People's Representatives.

For the sake of the supreme interests of the fatherland and people:

In this sacred hour of history, in order to carry out the tasks entrusted to it by the congress, the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam proclaims hereafter its 12-point program of action:

[1]

To lead the armed forces and the entire people to unite as one man, step up military and political struggle, defeat the US imperialists' aggressive war and their attempts to "Vietnamize" it, and demand that the United States enter into serious talks with the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam at the Paris conference on Vietnam on the basis of the 10-point overall solution put forward by the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation, compel the US Government to withdraw the US camp totally and without conditions from South Vietnam with a view to bringing the war to an early end, restoring peace and carrying into effect the fundamental national rights of the Vietnamese people— independence, sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity—as recognized by the Geneva Agreements of 1954 on Vietnam.

[2]

To abolish the disguised colonial regime established by the United States imperialists in South Vietnam, to overthrow the entire structure of the puppet administration, to abolish the constitution and all antinational and antidemocratic laws enacted by the puppet administration, to annul the sentences passed by that administration, that are detrimental to the life, property, dignity and other interests of the citizens, to build a really democratic and free republican regime, to organize general elections according to the principle of equality, real freedom and democracy, without foreign interference.

[3]

In a very broad spirit of national concord for the sake of the supreme interests of the country and nation, the Provisional Revolutionary Government is prepared to enter into consultations with the political forces representing the various social strata and political tendencies in South Vietnam that stand for peace, independence and neutrality, including those persons who, for political reasons, have to live abroad, with a view to setting up a provisional coalition government on the principle of equality, democracy and mutual respect. The provisional coalition government will organize general elections in order to elect a constituent assembly, work out a democratic constitution fully reflecting the interests and aspirations of the entire people, and set up a coalition government reflecting national concord and a broad union of all social strata.

[4]

To strengthen the resistance potential of the people in all fields, to consolidate and develop the revolutionary power at all levels, to build and consolidate the revolutionary armed forces, to unify the patriotic armed forces, to consolidate and widen the liberated zone.

[5]

To achieve broad democratic freedoms, to set free all persons jailed by the United States imperialists and the puppet administration on account of their patriotic activities, to prohibit all acts of repression, reprisal and discrimination against people having collaborated with either side, and who are now in the country or abroad, to achieve equality between men and women in all fields, to carry out a policy of unity and equality among the various nationalities. The national minorities have the right to use their own languages or their usages and customs.

To respect freedom of belief and to achieve equality among the various religions, to protect the interests of Vietnamese nationals abroad, to protect the legitimate interests of foreign nations in South Vietnam.

[6]

To pay the greatest attention to the interests of all strata of urban populations, first of all the right to a decent life and democracy.

To improve the living conditions of the workers and laboring people, to amend the labor legislation and fix minimum wages, to fight against corporal punishment, wage-stoppages, and sackings of workers and laboring people. The workers enjoy the right to take part in the management of enterprises, and freedom to join trade unions.

To fight against the press-ganging of youths and students into the puppet army, and guarantee to youths and students opportunities for education. Personalities, intellectuals, professors, writers, artists, journalists must enjoy freedom of opinion and freedom of the press.

Industrialists and traders must enjoy freedom of enterprise, and be in a position to fight against any oppressive competition by foreign monopoly-capital. The various strata of urban populations must be able to take part in political activities, in all actions for peace, independence, sovereignty and a better life, to oppose all terroristic and repressive acts of the US puppets.

[7]

To boost up production in order to supply the front and increase the people's potential, to create conditions for the building of an independent and self-supporting economy, to care for the living conditions of the laboring people and pay proper attention to the interests of the other social strata.

To carry out a land policy consistent with the specific conditions of South Vietnam, to improve the living conditions of peasants, to restore and develop agricultural and industrial production, to encourage industrialists and traders to contribute to the development of industry, small industry, and handicrafts, to protect the right of ownership of means of production and other property of the citizens in accordance with the laws of the state.

[8]

To fight against the enslaving and depraved culture and education of American brand, which are doing harm to our people's fine cultural traditions, to build a national and democratic culture and education, to develop science and technique, to raise the cultural standard of the people, to liquidate illiteracy, to organize education to open new general education schools.

To develop health work and promote prophylactic hygiene.

[9]

To encourage, welcome and properly reward those officers and men of the puppet army and police and those functionaries of the puppet administration who cross over to the side of the people after accomplishing meritorious deeds, to grant special encouragement and rewards to those puppet army and police units that cross over to the side of the Provisional Revolutionary Government.

To show leniency and refrain from any discrimination against those guilty persons who repent and truly rejoin the ranks of the people. Those who will have accomplished meritorious deeds shall be treated according to their merits.

[10]

To actively resolve the problems left behind by the US war of aggression and the puppet regime, to heal the war wounds and stabilize the normal life of the people, to extend best care and wholehearted help to war invalids and the families of the fighters who have died for the fatherland, to find jobs for the people to actively resolve the problem of unemployment. Those compatriots forcibly resettled by the enemy in concentration camps and strategic hamlets who desire to stay shall be granted recognition of the right of ownership on their land, and given help to continue living in the place. Those who desire to return to their former villages shall also be given help for this purpose.

To grant relief to the compatriots in misfortune, to care for orphans, old people and invalids. Invalid puppet army men and puppet policemen and those families of puppet army men and puppet policemen killed in battle who are finding themselves in a distressful situation shall also benefit by proper attention.

To help those persons who have been driven by the United States imperialists and their agents into depravity, to remake their life.

[11]

To re-establish normal relations between South and North Vietnam, to guarantee freedom of movement, of correspondence, or residence, to maintain economic and cultural relations according to the principle of mutual benefit and mutual help between the two zones. The two zones reach agreement on the status of the demilitarized zone, and work out modalities for the movements across the provisional military demarcation line.

The reunification of the country will be achieved step by step, by peaceful means, through discussions and agreement between the two zones, without constraint from either side.

[12]

To win the sympathy, support and aid of all countries and progressive

people in the world, including the American people, for the South Vietnamese people's struggle against US aggression, for national salvation.

To actively support the national independence movement of the Asian, American and Latin American peoples struggling against imperialism, colonialism and neocolonialism.

To achieve active coordination with the American people's struggle against the US imperialists' war of aggression in Vietnam, to actively support the just struggle of the Afro-Americans for their fundamental national rights.

To carry out a foreign policy of peace and neutrality.

To maintain friendly relations and to carry out a good-neighbor policy with the Kingdom of Cambodia on the basis of respect for her independence, sovereignty and neutrality, to recognize and pledge respect for the territorial integrity of the Kingdom of Cambodia in her present borders. To carry out a good-neighbor policy with the Kingdom of Laos on the basis of respect for the 1942 Geneva agreements on Laos.

To establish diplomatic, economic and cultural relations with all countries, irrespective of political and social regime, including the United States, in accordance with the five principles of peaceful coexistence: mutual respect for independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity; nonaggression, noninterference in internal affairs; equality and mutual benefit; peaceful coexistence, to accept aid, with no political conditions attached, from any country, in terms of capital, technique and specialists.

To refrain from joining any military alliance with foreign countries, not to allow any foreign country to maintain military bases, troops and military personnel on the South Vietnamese territory, not to recognize the protection of any country or military alliance.

The Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam earnestly calls on the entire armed forces and people to unite closely as one man behind it, to strive their best to carry out the program of action expounded above, to lead the generalized offensives and uprisings to still brighter victories, to defeat all schemes and perfidious maneuvers of the United States imperialists and their agents and to bring about new developments in our people's sacred resistance.

The Provisional Revolutionary Government pays a warm tribute to the admirable spirit of sacrifice and gallantry of our whole armed forces and people who always remain worthy of a heroic nation in the struggle against United States aggression, for the independence and freedom of the country.

The Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam expresses its deep gratitude to the Government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and to our dear northern compatriots who have done their utmost to fulfill their duty as the big rear area to the big front.

The Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam expresses its deep gratitude for the great sympathy and support extended by the socialist countries, all peace loving countries and progressive peoples in the world, including the American people, to the struggle of the South Vietnamese people against United States aggression, for national salvation.

Let our armed forces and people heroically continue their victorious march, level all obstacles, fight perseveringly and enhance their vigilance, determined to defeat the US imperialists' war of aggression, to overthrow the puppet administration, to compel the US Government to withdraw totally and without conditions the US troops and those of foreign countries belonging to the US

camp, and let the South Vietnamese people effectively exercise their right of self-determination, with a view to gloriously completing the national liberation and creating basic conditions to build an independent, democratic, peaceful, neutral, prosperous South Vietnam progressing toward the peaceful reunification of the fatherland.

Southern compatriots, march forward valiantly! Splendid victories are awaiting us! The South Vietnamese people will win!

*South Vietnam, June 10, 1969.*

*The Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam.*

*The president, Huynh Tan Phat.*

### MEMBERS OF THE PROVISIONAL REVOLUTIONARY GOVERNMENT

*Chairman*—Huynh Tan Phat, architect.  
*Deputy Chairman and Minister of Interior*—Dr. Phung Van Cung.

*Deputy Chairman and Minister of Education and Youth*—Prof. Nguyen Van Kiet.

*Deputy Chairman*—Nguyen Do.  
*Minister to the Chairman's Office*—Tran Buu Kiem.

*Minister of Defense*—Tran Nam Trung.  
*Minister of Foreign Affairs* — Mrs. Nguyen Thi Binh.

*Minister of the Interior*—Dr. Phung Van Cung.

*Minister of Economy and Finance*—Cao Van Bon, engineer.

*Minister of Information and Culture*—Luu Huu Phuoc, composer.

*Minister of Education and Youth* — Prof. Nguyen Van Kiet.

*Minister of Health, Social Action and Disabled Veterans* — Dr. Duong Quynh Hoa.

*Minister of Justice*—Truong Nhu Tang.  
*Deputy Minister to the Chairman's Office*—Ung Ngoc Ky.

*Deputy Ministers of Defense*—Dong Van Cong and Nguyen Chan.

*Deputy Ministers of Foreign Affairs*—Le Quang Chan and Hoang Bich Son.

*Deputy Minister of Economy and Finance*—Nguyen Van Trieu.

*Deputy Ministers of Information and Culture*—Hoang Trong Qui (pen name Thanh Nghi) and Lu Phuong, writer.

*Deputy Ministers of Education and Youth*—Prof. Le Van Tri and Ho Huu Nhut.

*Deputy Ministers for Health, Social Action, and Disabled Veterans*—Dr. Ho Van Hue and Mrs. Bui Thi Nga.

*Deputy Minister of Justice*—Prof. Le Van Tha.

*Deputy Minister of Interior*—Nguyen Ngoc Thuong.

*President of the Advisory Council*—Nguyen Huu Tho.

*Vice President of the Advisory Council*—Trinh Dinh Thao.

(*New York Times*, June 12, 1969.)

### AN APOLOGY TO GEORGE WHEELER

THROUGH an unfortunate office error, the name of George Wheeler did not appear under the review he wrote of *Aims and Methods of Socialist Planning*, by Mikhail Bor, which appeared in NWR's First Quarter 1969 issue. Names of authors do not always appear in the proofs; in this case, another member of the staff assumed that the author was David Laibman, who had been handling most of our reviews on economic subjects, and was away at the time. The mistake was not noticed in time for correction in the 2nd Quarter issue. We very much regret this error and will see that the correction is entered in the index for 1969.

## BOOKS in review

### BLISS WAS IT IN THAT DAWN

*Years of Hope*, by Konstantin Paustovsky. Translated by Manya Harari and Andrew Thompson. Pantheon, 1968. 223 pp., \$4.95.

THE FIRST part of Konstantin Paustovsky's autobiography, *The Story of a Life*, was published here in a splendid translation in 1964. The present book carries his story through the difficult years 1920-1922. Paustovsky by this time is in his late twenties and an experienced journalist. Odessa, Sevastopol, Yalta, devastated by revolution, counter-revolution and invasion, provide the discouraging famine- and disease-ridden background.

But Paustovsky and his fiery and impatient half-bohemian, half-revolutionary fellow-journalists on the newspaper *Seaman* were indifferent to the lack of adequate food, clothing, shelter, as well as to the constant danger of disease and the bullets of White Russian snipers: their youthful eyes, their fevered imaginations were transfixed by the future.

"We knew perfectly well that the revolutionary changes must take time, but we felt like skipping the hard, strenuous years and talking about the final outcome of the revolution — victory and happiness.

"Sometimes we sat up at the club till dawn, and the golden light in the eastern sky seemed to us youngsters, in our lyrical mood, the glow of approaching happiness, a reflection of the golden age so near at hand."

Thus the hardships and privations of the early years in the new, revolu-

tionary country return in Paustovsky's memory luminous with the light forecast from the golden age which the confident young men, exuberant with youth and illusions, were preparing to greet.

*Bliss was it in that dawn to be alive.  
But to be young was very heaven!*

Blocked as an international shipping center by the war of intervention, Odessa nevertheless retained much of its cosmopolitan air in the foreign look of its buildings and the sounds of the many languages spoken in its streets. In the spring and summer, fragrant with the scents of its luxurious flowers and trees and warmed by the sun-drenched winds from the southernly sea, the hungry city seemed even in those years almost festive; but the winters were bleak, and bitter winds assailed the paralyzed streets, squares and the empty waterfront.

Odessa swarmed with an extraordinary lot of "characters." Paustovsky, with his familiar and endearing appreciation of the peculiarities that make people worth endless solicitude, generously offers us a rare selection of them, both among the millennium-expecting young journalists and the militant sailors who read and distributed the *Seaman*.

Of all the "characters" he presents us, the most memorable obviously to Paustovsky is Isaac Babel, whose short-stories of Jewish life in Odessa and sketches of life in the Soviet army in the collection *Red Cavalry* are among the glories of Russian writing. Paustov-

sky records with the deepest reverence Babel's talk about the high calling of the writer, the necessity for absolute devotion in mastering the craft of using the Russian language so that the writer will be able to express the most complex ideas and emotions truthfully and with the fewest possible words. That Paustovsky has profoundly absorbed Babel's passion for truth and precision in writing, the reader is made aware on every page of this masterfully written book. (This, mind you, is a translation. What the writing must be like in Russian!)

In January of 1922 Paustovsky went on a tour of the Black Sea ports for the *Seaman*. After a brief stay, during which he almost starved, in historic Sevastopol poised on its cliffs "majestic as a Russian Acropolis," he sailed on over dangerous, mine-filled waters to Yalta where fighting was still in progress.

Against the advice of the port authorities Paustovsky went into the war-wrecked city, drawn by some mysterious power. Stumbling through the dark and hazardous streets he came at last to the house in which the dying Chekhov had spent his last years. He only learned where his strangely compelled journey had brought him through the sniper-ridden streets of the city, when a fusillade of bullets forced him to crouch in the gateway of Chekhov's house. In the pitch dark a cautiously struck match applied to the brass name-plate told him where he was. As a young boy sixteen years before he had come here on a pilgrimage two years after Chekhov's death. What, Paustovsky wondered — and still wonders, he writes — had drawn him again to this remote suburb of a dark and dangerous city?

Suddenly overcome by grief for all the sorrow he had known in those sixteen years and for the desolation of the period through which he was living, Paustovsky, crouching in the dark-

ness, pressed his face against the gate and wept bitterly. More than anything else in the world he wished the gate would creak and Chekhov would come out and ask him what was wrong.

Looking up, he saw that in the night fresh snow had fallen on the mountains that surround one side of Yalta and that the snow was shining with a steady and magical light in the darkness:

"Suddenly I felt the nearness and certainty of happiness. Why, I don't know. Perhaps because of that pure snow-whiteness which looked like the distant radiance of a beautiful country, or because of my sense of sonship — long unexpressed and driven to the back of my mind — towards Russia, towards Chekhov. He had loved his country in many ways, and he had loved her as the shy bride about whom he wrote his last story. He firmly believed that she was going unwaveringly towards justice, beauty and happiness.

"I, too, believed in that happiness—that it would come to my country, to starved and frozen Crimea, and also to me. I felt this as a swift and joyful impulse, like a passionate look of love. It warmed my heart and dried my tears of loneliness and fatigue."

Readers of Paustovsky's *The Story of a Life* will hardly need to be admonished to read this, its enchanting sequel; those not yet acquainted with this remarkable writer in the great Russian tradition should do so at once, beginning with either book. Human, gentle, profoundly consoling, these recollections, musings, meditations about a life lived in our troubled century will warm your heart, as the memory of Chekhov warmed Paustovsky's and helped restore his belief in the ultimate triumph of justice, beauty and happiness in his beloved country.

MURRAY YOUNG

•  
*Shortwave Radio Fans:* If you want to tune in on Radio Moscow this summer, please write to NWR for a free copy of their current schedule.

## APPRAISING SOVIET EDUCATION

*Soviet Education; Achievements and Goals*, by Elizabeth Moos. National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, 1967. 128 pp., \$1.25.

*This review appeared originally in the Soviet educational journal Narodnoe Obrazovanie, #11, 1968.*

THE author of this short book, Elizabeth Moos, is a former teacher, and founder of a school near New York. Since 1948, she has devoted herself to the study of the Soviet educational system, published six books on problems of Soviet education, delivered lectures and carried on other educational work for the N.C.A.S.F.

Mrs. Moos gathered the material for this new book, timed for the 50th anniversary of Soviet Power, during her frequent trips to the USSR and also from her reading of general social-political and pedagogical literature.

Thorough preparatory work and careful selection of material enabled the author, in a comparatively small booklet, to give a detailed and convincing picture of the success of the Soviet people in the field of education, from the first year of the Revolution through its first half-century. The author tells of the tremendous efforts of the Soviet people to transform backward and illiterate Russia in a short time into a completely literate country, moving into the vanguard of world culture and science.

The author does not impose her own feelings upon the American reader. She depends on presenting first-hand observations from which the reader may draw his own conclusions. Thus, for example, the author writes that even 30 years ago 85 per cent of the population could already read and write and seven year schooling was obligatory in cities and industrial centers. Today illiteracy has been com-

pletely wiped out. Many countries in the world, even today, the author continues, face serious illiteracy problems. According to UNESCO statistics, there are 700 million illiterates in the world.

Describing the broad network of nurseries and kindergartens, which cared for five million Soviet children of pre-school age in 1967, the author writes that in the USA no more than 10 per cent of such children may attend pre-school institutions and therefore many working mothers experience great hardships.

Mrs. Moos describes in detail the content of the curriculum and the level of knowledge acquired by the Soviet pupil, which she finds higher than that in comparable American schools. She illustrates her description of Soviet elementary and middle schools with material from many Republics.

Especially interesting are her impressions about how the Soviet school prepares youth to participate in practical activities, how compulsory general education is combined with opportunities for the development of the interests and abilities of every single pupil.

The author shows that the practice of education in Soviet schools has, at its base, a clearly thought-out pedagogical theory. The main principle of this theory is the creation of realistic conditions, providing all possibilities for the social development of the personality. In this the author sees one of the main differences between Soviet pedagogy and the bourgeois conception of education and upbringing, which justifies sorting out children into different types of schools, in fact limiting educational opportunities for the rising generation.

Telling about life in various Soviet educational institutions, Mrs. Moos notes that everywhere there is an atmosphere of kindness, humaneness,

consideration and at the same time a demanding relationship between adults and children and youth. In this atmosphere, the author notes, friendly collectives are formed and the required mutual help becomes an important condition for life and work.

Even in colonies for juvenile delinquents, writes the author, this humane spirit rules. She emphasizes that work with juvenile delinquents is considered reeducation in the Soviet Union and not punishment. Therefore the colonies belong in the area of education.

The number of juvenile delinquents in the Soviet Union, writes the author,

is considerably less than in the USA and cases of sadism, violence and brutality so widespread in America are seldom found in the USSR.

Mrs. Moos concludes her book with the words of the Academician P. Alexandrov that Soviet society is consistently going toward the goal of making it possible for every individual to fully realize his potentialities and abilities, that only in this way will society as a whole be able to develop along the progressive road, and every individual live a full, harmonious and happy life.

R. SALIMOVA

### A SHOSTAKOVICH FILM-OPERA

*Katerina Ismailova*, screen play and libretto by Dmitri Shostakovich, after the novel *Lady Macbeth of Mtsenk*, by Nikolay Leskov. Directed by Mikhail Shapiro. A Lenfilm production, released by Artkino Pictures. Star Galina Vishnevskaya, A. Ino-temtsev, N. Boyarsky.

**A**LTHOUGH Dmitri Shostakovich in the years following the anti-fascist war has taken up a variety of variety of musical forms with great distinction, including symphony, choral work, concerto, art song, piano music and string quartet, he has written no opera since *Katerina Ismailova* (or *Lady Macbeth of Mtsensk*) of 1932. This work has now been made in the Soviet Union into a magnificent color motion picture, featuring Galina Vishnevskaya both singing and acting the central role. It is now being shown in New York.

The film, directed by Mikhail Shapiro, is a tragic drama of small town life in nineteenth century Russia, so authentic and absorbing that the audience forgets the apparent artificiality of people singing instead of speaking. The opera was originally planned by

Shostakovich as the first of a series that would take up the question of the freedom of women, in various stages of society, but he never carried this project through. Here the story is of a high-spirited woman who, through a "wealthy" marriage to a characterless husband, dominated by his tyrannical father, finds herself imprisoned in a life of bleakness and boredom. Her way of breaking out of the trap is self-destructive. Seduced by a handsome, ambitious young employee, she comes to love him, and when they are on the point of being discovered, they commit murder. At the end, while they are in a convict group tramping to Siberia, she is betrayed by her own lover.

The narration through the camera, with the shifting scenes, fine acting and well-paced action, is altogether masterly, and at times makes a most imaginative and effective use of twin images, side by side. It is genuinely fine motion picture art, as contrasted to "artiness." The motion picture is an example of the high level of cultural life enjoyed by the Soviet people. It should not, however, be taken as a substitute for the stage opera. Although it follows the story scrupulously, and

adds a fluidity and spaciousness that only a camera can provide, the price it has paid for its tightness of action is that of dropping a considerable amount of the music, notably much of the satiric and mocking element that played so large a part in the original composition. Music lovers however can enjoy the film — if its limited engagement

is extended — and also study the complete musical score in a Soviet-made recording, available here as a Melodiya Angel three-record album. The opera, which was produced by the New York City Center Opera two seasons ago, is scheduled again by this organization in the coming season.

SIDNEY FINKELSTEIN

### THE MIGHT OF THE MILITARY

*The Power of the Pentagon*. Special issue of *The Progressive* magazine, June 1969. 58 pp., \$1.00.

**T**HE unprecedented public debate on the aggressive, predatory role of US imperialism abroad and the stranglehold of the military on every aspect of our internal life, was in large part triggered by the "Congressional Conference on the Military Budget and National Priorities," held on Capitol Hill March 28 and 29.

The conference was sponsored by members of the Senate and House. It was chaired by Arthur L. Larson, director of the World Rule of Law Research Center at Duke University, former USIA director, and former special assistant to President Eisenhower. Participants included leading Democrats and Republicans, distinguished scholars and scientists, among them officials and advisers of the last three administrations.

*The Progressive* magazine has devoted its June issue to an edited transcript of the proceedings, hitherto unpublished, with the cooperation of the initiators of the Conference: Senators George S. McGovern (D-N.D.) and Gaylord A. Nelson (D-Wis.) and Representatives George E. Brown Jr. (D-Cal.), Philip Burton (D-Cal.), John Conyers Jr. (D-Mich.), Don Edwards (D-Cal.), and others.

In a special introduction, these initiators stress the conference's warn-

ing of the menace of the enormous "national security bureaucracy" that runs the country. This bureaucracy they describe as "an enormous, self-perpetuating institutional organism" composed of the Armed Services, the Central Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency, the Atomic Energy Commission, and other bodies . . . closely linked to the aerospace and armaments industry, segments of the labor movement, and a new middle class of scientists, engineers, businessmen and universities with defense research contracts."

The authors urgently repeat the conference's call for the end of the Vietnam war, postponement of ABM deployment, a moratorium on testing of MIRV (multiple individually targetable re-entry vehicle) and immediate commencement of strategic arms talks with the Soviet Union "which has been pressing for such talks," while we have been putting them off while completing testing. They warn that the time for such talks may soon pass the point of no return, since once MIRV or similar missiles are deployed the impossibility of detecting the number of warheads within each missile, without the on-site inspection neither nation would wish, would make limitation of strategic weapons far more difficult to achieve.

Many important facts were brought out by the experts in the transcript of the conference discussions on the

waste and inadequacy of Pentagon programs even in their own terms. While most of the discussants spoke in terms of reform and control rather than of any fundamental change, their criticisms and revelations are of the greatest value in stimulating the widest possible public debate.

The editors' epilogue stresses the historic significance of the conference in signaling and symbolizing "a momentous change that is taking place in America — a widespread revulsion against war, the instruments of war, the constant threat of war, all of which cast such a hideous pall over our nation and the world."

J.S.

### LENIN ON BOOKS

*Lenin, Krupskaja and Libraries*, edited by S. Simsova. Translated from the Russian by G. Peacock and Lucy Prescott. Archon Books and Clive Bingley, 1968. 73 pp., \$4.00.

**I**N JULY 1913 there came into Lenin's hands a report of the New York Public Library for 1911. This was the year when the new building with its smiling lions was opened on Fifth Avenue. Writing for a party publication, he described with a kind of awe the fact that a call slip was handed in at 9:08 a.m., and the book was delivered to the reader at 9:15 a.m.

What further excited his envy and admiration was the highly efficient way the library system went about bringing its services to the citizens of the city, carefully placing the branches so that the vast areas of the metropolis would all have available to them not only books but the meeting rooms and exhibit galleries the branches afforded. Here, one hears him saying to himself, is how we shall use our libraries in a socialist Russia!

Almost immediately after the victory

of the Revolution, Lenin found time to write out a series of recommendations about the reorganization of the St. Petersburg public library that begins:

"Study is essential for intelligent, thoughtful and successful participation in the revolution.

"Library affairs in St. Petersburg, by virtue of the damage done to public education by tsarism over many years, have been reduced to a sorry state.

"It is essential to carry out immediately and unconditionally the following fundamental reorganization, based on principles long in existence in the free countries of the west, particularly Switzerland and the United States of North America . . ."

Almost to the end of his life, in speeches, articles and recommendations, Lenin ceaselessly made clear his passionate concern with education and the reading of books by the people of the Soviet Union. A selection of examples are given in this collection as well as interesting articles and reminiscences by Krupskaja, herself equally dedicated to public education and the spread of library facilities. One of the most interesting of the selections is the full text of Lenin's article written in 1905 on political control of literature: "Party Organization and Party Literature."

In his introduction Edward Dudley —surely a librarian!—quotes an inquiry sent by Lenin in 1920 to the Rumiantsev (now the Lenin) Library in Moscow:

"If, according to regulations, reference books cannot be borrowed, could I not be allowed to borrow for reference purposes some books for one evening, say a night, after the library is closed?"

Mr. Dudley writes: "Such tender respect for library regulations must surely be rare in a head of state. But then heads of state with such personal and political interest in developing libraries are also rare."

### RUSSIAN CULTURE PAST AND PRESENT

*A Cultural History of Russia*, by Joel Carmichael. Weybright and Talley, 1968. Illustrated. 272 pp., \$12.50.

**R**USSIAN history for most Westerners is a dim and misty perspective reaching indefinitely back in time. Religiously influenced by Byzantium rather than Rome, without a Renaissance or a Reformation, speaking a difficult language with an exotic alphabet, inhabiting a land mass that seems as undefined as the historic stages through which its people have evolved, how shall we ever come to know the Russian?

Is it possible to read all the books now flooding from the press about every aspect of the country, its historical eras, its past and present organizational forms, its architecture, painting, music, novels, agriculture, etc.? Between those books which tell us far more than we are prepared to take in on a given aspect of Russian life or history, and those which tell us far too little and that with far more preaching and moralizing than we are prepared to accept, what is the curious reader to do?

Well, one answer is a book such as the present cultural history by Joel Carmichael, handsomely illustrated with perfectly chosen historic prints and modern photographs. With com-

mendable clarity and concentration Mr. Carmichael leads the reader through the first five centuries of Russian history—the whole of the country's recorded history is little more than a millennium—and the subsequent five centuries that bring us to our own time.

Demonstrating the continuity of Russian cultural development from the Kievan age to the Soviet period, Mr. Carmichael's wonderfully chosen illustrations give solidity and a kind of spatial dimension to the patterns he establishes with his concise words.

The first illustration in the book is a photograph of a fourth century metal relief of a deer found in a grave near Kostromkoj; the last is a reproduction of a superb pen and ink drawing of a nude man by the contemporary artist Ernest Neizvestny. From icons to cathedrals and remote country churches, from the characteristic Russian-styled classic palaces and great public buildings of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries to the brilliant cubism of the early Chagall painting, there is a recognizable vigor of line, and unmistakable richness of feeling that gives to Russian creative forms an astonishing unity.

The photographs of a subway station built in the 30s and of a subway entrance built in the present decade show all too clearly that no more than ourselves have the Russians really found a satisfactory modern style.

It is a great pity that so useful a book should be so expensive.

### ASSORTED RUSSOVIETALIA

*The Russian Conquest of Bashkiria 1552-1740*, by Alton S. Donnelly. Yale University Press, 1968. 24 pp., \$6.50.

An account of the expansion of the Russian Empire into south and south-east Siberia after the capture of Kazan in the 16th century. It took the better

part of two hundred years to subjugate the defensive and fierce steppe nomads. Not until after 1740 were the Russians able to begin exploiting the rich mineral, timber and agricultural resources of Bashkiria.

Information about Russian expansion in Central Asia and the facts about the

colonial administration set up there are not generally known in the West. Mr. Donnelly's book provides useful information.

*Psychiatry in the Communist World*, edited by Ari Kiev. Science House, 1968. 276 pp., \$10.00.

Dr. Kiev, a professor of psychiatry at Cornell University Medical College in New York, compiled these accounts of psychiatric work in the socialist countries. Written by practicing psychiatrists in the USSR, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the GDR, Hungary, Poland and Yugoslavia, they present the work in this field being done in each country, pointing up the shortcomings and the achievements.

A reading of the essays makes clear the similarities and the differences of psychiatric practice among the socialist countries as well as defining their general difference with practice here.

Neither China nor Albania replied to Dr. Kiev's request for essays but he was able to print an essay on Chinese practice by Professor Bermann of Cordoba University, Argentina, who has visited China several times.

*Social Welfare in the Soviet Union*, by Bernice Q. Madison. Stanford University Press, 1968. 288 pp., \$8.50.

Professor Madison's study is comprehensive in its scope, representing as it does ten years of research and direct observation. Welfare in Russia prior to the Revolution is described and a history of the Soviet welfare system is presented in some detail.

The present welfare policy is demonstrated by analyses of case histories. Work therapy programs, family and child care services and services for the physically handicapped and the aged are carefully described. The author makes an extended comparison between Soviet and US welfare methods and achievements.

In her conclusion Prof. Madison presents an analysis of what she thinks Soviet experience in welfare has to teach the underdeveloped countries who want to provide some measure of social services during the difficult period of modernization.

*The School and State in the USSR*, by Herbert C. Rudman. Macmillan, 1967, 286 pp., \$6.95.

Prof. Rudman has made three trips to the USSR, in 1958, 1962, and 1963-1964, to study Soviet educational administration, the last visit as Head of the US Research team sent by the State Department.

The whole administrative structure of Soviet education is analyzed in careful detail with numerous graphs and charts in Prof. Rudman's study. Part I is concerned with the role of State Agencies in education administration; Part II describes the roles of the trade unions and the RSFSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences in the administrative process.

*The Komarov Botanical Institute. 250 Years of Russian Research*, by Stanwyn G. Shetler. Smithsonian Institution Press, 1967. 240 pp., \$5.95.

Peter I founded a Pharmaceutical Garden in St. Petersburg in 1714; the Komarov Botanical Institute in Leningrad is its present-day successor. Mr. Shetler has written an account of the Institute as well as a history of two-and-a-half centuries of Russian research in the field of botany.

Today the Institute is one of the oldest and most important centers of botanical science in the world. American botanists should welcome this very thorough description of its work.

*The Doukhobors*, by George Woodcock and Ivan Avakumovic. Oxford University Press, 1968. 382 pp., \$7.50.

The Russian religious sect known as the Doukhobors break, from time

to time, sensationally into the press from their unique habit of signifying governmental opposition by setting fire to their villages and parading naked through the village streets.

The two authors of this study of the sect are professional historians. They trace the Doukhobors from their obscure beginnings among the Russian peasants of the eighteenth-century Ukraine down to the present time. They are for the most part found in British Columbia today.

Pacifist, equalitarians with a curious godlike leadership, they have been studied closely—much of it by direct observation—over a good many years by the authors, historians who teach at the University of British Columbia. The full details of their leaving Russia in 1890, their wanderings, their final settlement in Canada with the help of Tolstoy, are all told in detail.

The photographs illustrating the books are of the Canadian villages in which they live; they look very much like present-day villages in the Ukraine.

*The Third Department: The Establishment and Practices of the Political Police in the Russia of Nicholas I*, by P. S. Squire. Cambridge University Press, 1968. 272 pp., \$11.50.

The accession of Nicholas I to the Russian throne in 1826, shortly after the Decembrist uprising the preceding year, brought drastic changes in politi-

cal surveillance and methods of political investigation. The Third Department, as the newly set up secret political police was generally called, is examined in detail by Dr. Squire. He describes its organizational structure and its methods of operation and analyzes the changes it brought in the social, cultural and political life of the 19th century.

*Nikolai Gogol, Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends*. Translated with an introduction by Jesse Zeldin. Vanderbilt University Press, 1969. 271 pp., \$5.95.

For the first time Gogol's controversial book, *Selected Passages*, first published in 1847, four years before his death, has been put into English.

Gogol's contemporaries who had looked upon him as a satirist were profoundly shocked by this book, in which he appeared to reject the whole satirical import of his *Dead Souls* and his play *The Inspector General*. In the letters printed in *Selected Passages* he revealed himself to be both a political opportunist and a religious fanatic.

Gogol is not the easiest of the great Russian 19th century writers for the non-Russian to approach; however, the full text of this significant book will be of considerable help in coming to an understanding of a most complex creative personality.

NEW WORLD REVIEW—156 Fifth Ave., Suite 308. N.Y., N.Y. 10010

I enclose \$3.50 for 1-year sub (4 issues)

I enclose \$..... for.....copies of SPECIAL YOUTH ISSUE  
(Special republication price 75c; 5 or more copies, 60c each)

Name.....

Street.....

City.....Sta.....Zip Code.....

Canadian and foreign \$4.50 for sub — \$1.25 for FIRST FIFTY YEARS

# Soviet Films

Now in Release:

## An All-Eisenstein Program

- Ten Days That Shook the World  
(New sound version, with musical score by Shostakovich)
- Bezhin Meadow  
(Musical score by Prokofieff)
- Katerina Ismailova

Coming:

- I am Twenty

Released by:

## ARTKINO PICTURES, INC.

723 Seventh Ave., N.Y., N.Y. 10019

Telephone: Circle 5-6570

## A LIFE OF ADVENTURE FOR PEACE

by **JEROME DAVIS**

Foreword by Bishop James A. Pike

This is the autobiography of a man who has dedicated his life to world peace. He is one of the few living Americans who was in Russia at the time of the Revolution and who met Lenin.

Paperbound, price \$2.45

Order Through NWR

Suite 308, 156 5th Avenue

New York, N. Y. 10010



## NOW Is The Time To Learn About The Prospects For East-West Trade

The American Review of East-West Trade is the first journal published in the United States directed to the business reader specializing in East-West commerce.

This new monthly is designed to supply the business community with every phase of information essential to penetrate and remain in this highly complex market.

**FEATURES:** authoritative comments and analysis by leading Western, Soviet and Eastern European trade specialists; **ALSO HIGHLIGHTS:** comprehensive up-to-date news coverage; how to deal with state trading corporations; sources of credit (government and private); new products (quality and price characteristics); cooperative arrangements in licensing of new technology and know-how; U.S. policy, rules and regulations; Comecon developments; trade fair and exhibit information; full translations of important legal documents and regulations; and many other pertinent data.

THE  
**New**  
TRADE JOURNAL  
FOR  
BUSINESS READERS  
SPECIALIZING IN  
EAST-WEST TRADE

Annual subscription: \$50.00

SYMPOSIUM PRESS, INC.

108 Grand Street White Plains, N.Y.

10601

Advertising information available upon request.

## KEEP UP WITH WORLD EVENTS

Subscribe to

## WORLD MARXIST REVIEW

Theoretical and Information  
Journal of the Communist and  
Workers' Parties

News, analysis and commentary  
on the struggles for national  
liberation, peace and socialism

One-year subscription \$3.50  
(Sample copy 35c)

Send check or money order to:

New Outlook Publishers

Dept. N

32 Union Square East  
New York, N. Y. 10003

## NEW WORLD REVIEW

for 1968

Bound Volumes

\$10.00 each

Index

50¢ per copy

Order from:

NEW WORLD REVIEW

156 Fifth Avenue

New York, N. Y. 10010

Nothing is censored, cut, emphasized or de-emphasized in

## Reprints From The Soviet Press

A magazine of record • every two weeks • indexed

Current documents, reports, communiqués, articles and speeches, translated word for word from Soviet newspapers and magazines. Covers economics, politics, foreign affairs, agriculture, industry, labor, science, law — and more.

In Recent Issues:

- Main Documents of June International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties:  
Keynote Speech by L. I. Brezhnev  
Final Majority Statement and Call for Unity
- USSR Government Statement of June 13, 1969, to Chinese Government on Border Issue
- Students of the West and Anti-Monopoly Struggle
- State Power and Self-Government Under Socialism

A cumulative source of significant material, authentic, complete, in a form convenient for permanent filing

One Year \$25 • Two Years \$48 • Three Years \$70

COMPASS PUBLICATIONS, Inc.

BOX 69, COOPER STATION • NEW YORK, N. Y. 10003

# SOCIOLOGY IN THE USSR

EDITED BY STEPHEN P. DUNN

This encyclopedic volume provides a detailed and comprehensive description of the current state of sociological study in the Soviet Union. All aspects of the discipline are covered. The collection presents comparative studies of recent data produced by Soviet research, including extensive statistical material.

The book largely fills the void in Western knowledge of Soviet sociology, which is a rapidly expanding field of study in the USSR.

\$12.50



INTERNATIONAL ARTS & SCIENCES PRESS Inc.  
901 NORTH BROADWAY WHITE PLAINS, NEW YORK 10603