

JUNE, 1957

30¢ 35

New World

REVIEW

PROBLEMS OF CULTURE

ILYA EHRENBURG

China and the U. N.

Eslanda Robeson

The Bomb, Peace and You

Jessica Smith

Democracy in New China

Murray Young

NEW WORLD REVIEW

JUNE 1957

The Bomb, Peace and You
Jessica Smith 3

China and the U.N.
Eslanda Robeson 15

"Bright New China"
Murray Young 20

A Necessary Clarification
Ilya Ehrenburg 26

BOOK REVIEWS

The Challenge of Soviet Education
 —George S. Counts 40

A History of Russian Music
 —Richard A. Leonard 41

The Critique of Capitalist Democracy
 —Stanley W. Moore 42

NEW RECORDINGS

Reviewed by Sidney Finkelstein 42

JESSICA SMITH, *Editor*
 FREDERICK V. FIELD, *Far Eastern Editor*
 MURRAY YOUNG, *Managing Editor*

ESLANDA ROBESON
Editorial Consultant on Negro and Colonial Questions and UN Correspondent

Vol. 25, No. 6. June, 1957. Re-entered as second class matter June 27, 1951 at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Subscription \$2.50 per year. \$1.25 for 6 months (Canadian, \$3.00 foreign \$3.50 a year. Draw money orders or checks payable in New York). Published monthly by the S.R.T. Publications, Inc., 34 West 15th Street, New York 11, N. Y. Indexed in Bulletin of the Public Affairs Information Service. Phone: CHelsea 3-0666.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.



WE MUST REACH THAT GOAL

\$6,000 received
 \$4,000 still needed

Receipts for our summer survival fund, reported at \$4,701.15 in our last issue, have now reached \$6,078.65. It is absolutely essential that we raise the additional \$3,921 before full summer is upon us.

We are deeply grateful to all of you who have helped. But with the greatest urgency we must ask all the rest of our readers to help complete the fund.

So far only 507 readers have contributed—some large sums, and some small. In the over-all picture, the dollar contributions mean as much as the bigger ones—if only there are enough of them!

We have based our summer plans on completing this fund. We had no choice. Naturally there will be more needs later—since costs of publishing are a never-ending thing. But there will not be a "later" unless this special survival fund is completed now.

We believe from the letters you write us that you consider the magazine worth while, and that you want us to continue publishing. This will only be possible if the burden is further shared, and those of you who have not yet contributed will send something, large or small, in lump sums or monthly installments.

Please fill out and mail today

NEW WORLD REVIEW

7th Floor,
 34 West 15th Street, N. Y. 11. N. Y.

I enclose..... for the NWR survival fund.

I pledge..... monthly for the fund.

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY..... ZONE... STATE....

The Bomb, Peace and You

by JESSICA SMITH

World Outcry to End the Tests—U.S.-U.S.S.R. Relations—Who is Recalcitrant?—The Crucial Disarmament Talks

THE END OF FURTHER EXPERIMENTS WITH ATOM BOMBS WOULD BE LIKE THE EARLY SUNRAYS OF HOPE WHICH SUFFERING HUMANITY IS LONGING FOR.

THUS spoke the great humanist and beloved world figure, Albert Schweitzer, in his "Declaration of Conscience," issued April 24 under the auspices of the Nobel Prize Committee, in Oslo.

He called upon the people of all nations to form a public opinion strong enough to compel the ending of nuclear weapons tests.

Dr. Schweitzer's appeal, emotional in its deep concern for the safety of mankind, is a sober statement of actual hazards encountered and still to be faced by present and future generations, based on a careful study of scientific material.

He marshals facts of the harmful effects known to science of radiation, the nature of the radioactive elements slowly filtering down to earth from A- and H bomb explosions, especially Strontium 90, the dangers from radioactive rain, contaminating water and food supplies, the hazard to future generations demonstrated by the exceptionally high occurrence of still births and deformed children in Hiroshima and Nagasaki in the

years following the dropping of the bombs.

The text of the appeal, designed to be broadcast throughout the world, was not heard over American radio stations, and few American publications carried it.

It is gratifying, however, that an American helped to inspire this action. Norman Cousins, editor of the *Saturday Review of Literature*, published an account in the May 18 issue, which also carries the appeal in full, of discussions in which he urged Dr. Schweitzer to make public these views he had expressed in private conversation.

The tests go on. Great Britain exploded its H-bomb on May 15. The United States is currently carrying on a series of over 15 tests in Nevada. The Soviet Union has declared it is compelled to continue its own testing as long as the other atomic powers refuse the persistent Soviet proposals to end the tests.

But the mounting worldwide protests, to which the Schweitzer appeal has given new stimulus, indicate a massive body of public opinion, which the statesmen of the world must heed.

This opinion is growing in our country, too. A number of organizations are circulating petitions for an end to the tests. The Quakers have

issued a petition to President Eisenhower based on the highpoints of Schweitzer's statement.

We urge every one of our readers either to join in one of the petition campaigns, or to write individually, at once, to President Eisenhower appealing for an end of the tests.

World Demands to End Tests

The worldwide protests reviewed in our last issue have been continuing. The entire Japanese public supports its Government's official position opposing the tests. The biggest demonstrations yet took place when the British explosion occurred. An international conference for the prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons will be held in Tokyo August 3.

The Japanese Council of Action for the Prohibition of Atomic and Hydrogen Weapons wants to send a delegation to the United States, Great Britain and the USSR. They have already received an invitation from the Soviet Peace Committee.

In Great Britain, protests against the Christmas Island tests and demands for the ending of all tests have become the most burning issue among all sections of the people.

In West Germany ending of tests has become the main issue in the election campaign. The statement of the West German scientists that they would not participate in making nuclear weapons has won wide support from trade unions, religious circles, the powerful Social Democratic opposition and others. As a reluctant concession, Adenauer's Christian Democratic Party put through a resolution in the lower

house of parliament calling on the nuclear powers to suspend the tests. This was presented as an alternative to the Social Democratic motion to ban atomic equipment for West German armed forces and to refuse permission to the Western Allies to stockpile such weapons in Germany.

A dispatch to the *New York Times*, May 19, reported that throughout Scandinavia "just about everyone wants to see an end to nuclear weapons tests." In Norway's cities people are queuing up by the hundreds to sign a public round robin saying "We think Albert Schweitzer is right." Swedish papers support the campaign.

In Italy the Pope's letter supporting Japan's appeal against the tests has been published widely, and followed up by the Vatican newspaper, *L'Osservatore Romano*, which denies the anti-test movement is supported mainly by Communists.

In India, Premier Nehru on May 17 renewed his appeal "to save the world from extinction." Chakravarti Rajagopalachari, early colleague of Gandhi and former Governor General, proposes India leave the Commonwealth unless England bans tests. From New Delhi (*New York Times*, May 10) came the report that the banning of the tests "has become such a lively issue in this country that hardly a day passes without some reference to it by political leaders, scientists and the press." The *Hindu* of Madras commented: "The Western powers don't seem to realize that every time they hold a nuclear test they are creating ill-will in the East."

In all the Socialist countries government and people stand unitedly for agreement to end the tests.

The Soviet Union has repeatedly called for the ending of tests.

On May 10, the Supreme Soviet of the USSR issued an appeal to the U.S. Congress and the British Parliament to help bring about an agreement for the immediate ending of nuclear weapons tests. It proposed an interparliamentary committee among the three powers for this purpose.

This action followed a comprehensive statement by Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko outlining the position of the Soviet Government on disarmament and cessation of tests as the first step toward prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons. The Supreme Soviet passed a resolution approving this policy.

Americans Against Tests

In this country, flying in the face of the majority of the scientists of the world, a dangerous propaganda is being conducted to lull the justified fears of the people.

Secretary Dulles, answering a Japanese note urging that the Nevada tests be called off, said that they would be conducted "under extreme safety measures," that they were necessary to deter aggression, and blamed the USSR for obstructing progress towards control and ending tests.

Dr. Willard Libby of the Atomic Energy Commission has released several statements minimizing the dangers. In an interview in *U.S. News and World Report*, May 17 he declared "We have not conducted tests in any way hazardous to health" and pooh-poohed the worries of scientists. Dr. Frank H. Shelton, technical director of the Armed Forces

Special Weapons Projects, said tests could continue 40 or 50 years without endangering the world's population.

The *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* has published a great deal of important scientific opinion on radiation hazards from nuclear weapons testing or use. It was all the more shocking to find an apologia for atomic warfare in the May, 1957 issue, by Edward Teller, of the University of California Radiation Laboratory, Berkeley. Asserting that the only difference between nuclear and conventional weapons is that the latter are outmoded, Dr. Teller calls for a nuclear-submarine navy by 1960, and "small battle groups" that could operate independently and effectively with atomic weapons anywhere in the world. For our defense, deep shelters in all heavily populated areas with mining equipment in case entrances are destroyed, well stocked with food surpluses, buried trucks to re-start transport, power units stored underground to restart industry. . . . "With such a system of shelters," he affirmed, "there is no need to anticipate, even under the most serious attack, that the casualties in a future war will be much greater than the casualties we have experienced in past wars." Not a word about how we are all going to live in the radioactive chaos into which we will emerge. Anyway, he says, with horrifying callousness:

We will have to continue to live, at least for some time, in a dangerous world. But after all, life has been on this planet for 500 million years, and each individual has so far died, or faces inevitable death sooner or later. For the past few thousand years we have been living with the knowledge that each of

us must die and that any one among us may be hurt—and fatally hurt—at any time.

We can only say thank God there are Dr. Schweitzers in the world and thousands of scientists like Linus Pauling, Phillip Morrison and others we have quoted, who love humanity, whose hearts and minds are dedicated to the great task of making life ever safer and more beautiful for people everywhere, instead of helping to turn the world into a savage wasteland.

Warning signals are increasing of the danger to our children in the milk they drink. Dr. Arnold B. Kurlander, assistant for planning to the Surgeon General of the United States, told a National Conference of the Association of Food and Drug officials at Louisville (*New York Herald Tribune*, May 8) that "new traces of potentially dangerous radio-activity have been found in milk" since the testing of nuclear weapons began. The Food and Drug Administration has announced a program for continuous monitoring of radioactivity in common food products. The U.S. Public Health Service is starting to test radioactivity in milk in five key areas.

A new book has just appeared, "Radiation: What it is and How it Affects You" (Viking) by Ralph E. Lapp, physicist formerly associated with the Argonne National Laboratory in Chicago, and Mrs. Jack Schubert, authority on radiation poisoning. The authors announce their purpose "to sound a warning against the radiation peril," and call for a worldwide cessation of tests pending sound calculations of the extent of the dangers.

The *Reporter* magazine for May 16 carries a report "Fallout from Nevada" on previous tests. Disputing the AEC claim that no harm has been caused by these former tests, it tells the story of 7-year Martin Bardoli who lived nearby and died last year of leukemia, Minnie Sharp of Nyala, Nevada who lost all her hair, of thousands of people in nearby areas exposed to fall-out, of the death of thousands of sheep grazing near the test site. Max Ascoli, in an editorial, calls all nuclear weapons tests, no matter how small the weapons "acts of hostility against mankind," and asks an end "to this insane, unending race."

Newspapers like the *Washington Post*, the *Detroit News*, the *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, individual columnists in many conservative papers, as well as all progressive and liberal publications in the United States, have published material on radiation dangers, alerting the people to the need to halt testing.

Dr. Charles Price, retiring President of the Federation of Atomic Scientists, and head of the Chemistry Department of the University of Pennsylvania, took issue with the official U.S. position minimizing test dangers. He said: "Most scientists agree that the tests are harmful. There is plenty of data to suggest that the hydrogen bomb we exploded in 1954 harmed at least 10,000 people. Actually, between 10,000 to 1,000,000 is the closest we can get on the basis of our present knowledge, to the number that are harmed by the radioactive fall-out of a bomb of that magnitude."

Senator Wayne Morse (D-Ore.) on May 16, called upon the government "to give a new impetus to dis-

armament by halting its nuclear weapons tests right now and challenging Russia to do the same," in a broadcast over twenty Pacific Northwest radio stations.

On May 5, Adlai Stevenson again renewed his call for the halting of tests, and Eleanor Roosevelt wrote in the *New York Post*, May 19 "I always have felt strongly that we should stop nuclear tests altogether."

A Gallup Poll announced on May 18 an estimated 63 per cent of the American people now believing that the United States should stop testing nuclear weapons if Russia does, three times as many as were opposed to tests in 1954.

The Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy has called hearings on dangers of atomic radiation beginning May 27. It is to be hoped that these will lift the veil of official secrecy on this matter, alert the whole people to the peril, and arouse them to action.

The New Soviet Peace Moves

From Washington two trends are reported in relation to the new Soviet disarmament proposals presented in London April 30 by Soviet Representative Valerian Zorin. One of "cautious optimism" about the possibilities of reaching at least some minimum agreement when the UN Disarmament Sub-Committee resumes its deliberations on May 27, the other remaining "highly dubious" about Soviet intentions.

Mr. Harold Stassen, Presidential Disarmament Assistant, and US representative in London, has reported on his latest visit home that East and West are closer than ever on a "first step, small cut." President

Eisenhower indicated that he shared this view in his May 15 press conference in which he said he thought the Soviet Union "was growing more serious" about disarmament. Secretary Dulles has given no indication of any desire to reach agreement. On May 20, Admiral Arthur W. Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, expressed opposition to any sort of agreement because "We cannot trust the Russians in this or anything."

But in all seriousness, we must ask what has our own country done to build confidence in its own peaceful intentions?

Our statesmen have so far turned a deaf ear to the repeated proposals of the Soviet Union, India, Japan and other countries, and the overwhelming desire of the world's peoples, for an agreement to call a halt to nuclear tests.

Despite protestations of government leaders of their desires for peace and presentation of all their war plans as designed for "deterrence" only, it is difficult to point to one constructive act in the direction of peace.

Our huge war budget is based on a growing stockpile of nuclear weapons indicating an assumption that nuclear war is inevitable. Actual policies are based on an ever-increasing network of military bases in foreign countries, many of them now to be equipped with nuclear weapons, including the revived Wehrmacht of Western Germany, the forces of the discredited dictator Chiang Kai-shek on Formosa, and even, as recently reported, those of the aged despot Syngman Rhee of South Korea.

Support of use of tactical weapons

in "small wars" as carrying no threat of world war, by Chief of Staff Nathan Twining and others, can only further alarm. It is the logic of war that each side must use ever more powerful weapons, and there is no real dividing line between small and big nuclear weapons.

The Eisenhower Doctrine has revealed its real purposes to any who were blind enough not to see them originally, in its support for King Hussein of Jordan by the calculated show of force when the U.S. Sixth Fleet was swiftly ordered to Mediterranean waters and the grant of \$10,000,000 dollars to help Hussein stay in power. While Hussein won this support by charging that the crisis in Jordan was created by "international communism," the whole world knows that it was in fact only a part of the anti-feudal, anti-imperialist revolution that the oil monopolists and those who represent their interests so greatly fear. Even the *Wall Street Journal* editorialized (April 30) ". . . whatever else this crisis in Jordan has been, and however much the Communists have shrewdly exploited it, its roots lie in the internal political stresses of the country, not International Communism." And the British *New Statesmen and Nation* wrote on May 4, that Hussein ". . . is now in danger of becoming an American puppet, in charge of something like a police-state whose shaky budget is directly dependent on Washington."

After his American-aided victory against internal opposition, Hussein banned more than fifty trade unions and civil service associations, dissolved the nationalist parties, announced the trials of more than 200 political leaders, cracked down on

the press, surrounded the refugee camps with armored units. Thus the interests of the "free-world" are upheld!

Meanwhile, the recent series of Soviet peace efforts are called a "trap," in some Washington circles, in *New York Times* editorials and elsewhere, and labelled mere propaganda. But the blunt fact remains that the Soviet peace proposals coincide with the aspirations of the overwhelming majority of the people of the world. We believe that the American people need to examine these proposals with the greatest care, and judge whether they offer a basis for greater security for ourselves and our children than a mounting atomic arms race and continued pollution of the atmosphere by tests of nuclear weapons.

First of all, it should be pointed out that there is nothing exactly new in what is termed the current Soviet "peace offensive." It has been going on for a long time. What may be called new in it is only a new urgency compelled by the growing danger to mankind of the atomic weapons race and policies which promote it.

In recent months Premier Bulganin has written a series of notes to the NATO powers warning against the dangers to themselves and to humanity of permitting atomic and missile bases on their territory. All of these notes have in addition to their sharp warnings contained friendly, constructive proposals for mutual security. Notes to the United States, Great Britain and France on the Middle East proposed the renunciation of all outside interference in Middle Eastern affairs, help for the underdeveloped economies of

the countries of the area, and agreement not to increase dangers and tensions by providing arms.

Notes recently made public in Britain and the Soviet Union show that the USSR sought to bring about a peaceful solution of the Suez crisis in special notes to Britain and France last September and October, before their invasion of Egypt.

In a note to Premier Macmillan of Great Britain on April 23, Premier Bulganin proposed renewal of the friendly relations disrupted by the Suez crisis. He urged at least a temporary ban on nuclear weapons testing, renewed the long-standing Soviet proposal for an all-European security treaty to begin with a non-aggression pact between the NATO and Warsaw Pact powers, and proposed that former Prime Minister Eden's proposal of demilitarized zones in Europe be discussed.

In a note to French Premier Mollet of April 20, described in the press as found "very friendly in tenor" by French officials, Mr. Bulganin made similar proposals, stressing their mutual grave concern in averting any renewal of German aggression. While criticizing France for permitting atomic bases on its territory and for its policy in Algeria, the note stressed the importance of improved relations between the two countries. Mr. Bulganin said that if Soviet proposals for liquidation of all foreign troops on the territory of other lands could not be achieved, a beginning should be made by their limitation. He proposed bilateral discussions between the two countries on questions of European security and disarmament, and greatly expanded trade and cultural relations.

The USSR has also shown its good faith in speedily ratifying the International Atomic Energy Treaty for the implementation of Eisenhower's Atoms for Peace program, while U.S. ratification is being blocked by Senate opposition.

Khrushchev on US-USSR Ties

The desire of the Soviet Union for improvement in US-USSR relations has been consistently expressed, notably in the series of personal letters from Premier Bulganin to President Eisenhower.

The latest declaration of this desire was expressed forcibly by Nikita Khrushchev in an interview on May 10 with Turner Catledge, managing editor of the *New York Times*.

In the interview, as reported in the *Times*, Mr. Khrushchev expressed the opinion that a new heads of government conference would be useful, if the discussion was carefully prepared in advance, in helping to bring an end to international tensions and solving the question of European security. The latter, he thought, should lead to the liquidation of military blocs. He felt that if the German question were left out of big power negotiations and put to the Germans themselves, there was no question on which agreement might not be reached. He reiterated the readiness of the Soviet Government to reach agreement on questions of disarmament and ending nuclear tests.

But Mr. Khrushchev emphasized especially his conviction that relations between the United States and the Soviet Union, as the two most powerful nations, industrially and militarily, were at the heart of the

whole international problem. He declared:

Ideological problems will always exist between us. But that should not prevent us from having good neighborly relations. That is one course. The other course is to continue stockpiling weapons—atomic weapons, rockets, including intercontinental missiles. As a result of this there is always a chance that by some mistake or accident war would start. That would be a great misfortune for our two countries and for the whole world. Therefore we have a great desire for talks with the United States.

Throughout the interview, Mr. Khrushchev laid great stress on the extreme war danger inherent in the present situation. Asked by Mr. Catledge whether he thought the U.S. contemplated war, he said he felt that was an indisputable fact, although he made clear this did not refer to the American people:

A country which does not plan war would not continue to develop its armed forces and to stockpile weapons and would seek agreement with the other side. There is no doubt that the American people do not want war.

There are selfish people carrying on a policy of balancing on the brink of war. Even an experienced acrobat makes a slip and falls now and then. When that happens we are sorry but an acrobat is only one person. But if a political leader slips and falls he might bring death for millions of people. Those who stand for peace and do not want war are the working people of America. . . .

The Disarmament Negotiations

The new Soviet disarmament proposals, outlined in the following pages, are reported as having received a favorable reception all over Europe, despite the negative attitude in some Washington circles.

The United States' own proposals

have been presented to the American people as offering the only secure basis for agreement. It must be pointed out, however, that under the American program, the crucial question of ending nuclear weapons tests would only follow a long series of other complicated problems on which it has already proved difficult if not impossible to reach agreement. The U.S. position that there must be inspection to control even an agreement to end tests, does not hold water in the light of the universally accepted opinion that all tests can be detected.

The U.S. position that tests must be continued for reasons of American security is equally untenable in the light of the numerous statements by military figures that we already have enough nuclear weapons to blast the Soviet Union from the face of the earth, and the generally accepted fact that our stockpiles are already considerably larger than those of the USSR.

The U.S. proposal for the registration of nuclear tests in the future, and limited international observation of them, does not solve the problem. It could in effect be an obstacle to future ending of tests and prohibition of nuclear weapons as it would in a sense be a legalization of such weapons.

The U.S. proposal for the withdrawal in the future of fissionable materials from weapons production and their use for peaceful purposes only can also not be considered a solution, since it does not affect the monstrous destructive powers already in existence.

Having failed to achieve a basis of agreement in its fuller program, the new proposals of the Soviet

Union are for a partial program, in which they have made considerable concessions to the Western viewpoint. The most notable concession is with regard to President Eisenhower's mutual air inspection proposal. Here, as in a number of previous cases, it is notable that in the measure that the Soviet Union comes closer to American terms, our government begins to withdraw them. Originally, President Eisenhower proposed total inspection of the USSR and the United States. When the Soviet Union proposed a zone on both sides of the East-West dividing line in Europe, and even to extend it into some Soviet territory, this was rejected as too small an area. Now, reportedly in answer to a proposal made by Harold Stassen himself, the USSR has enlarged its proposals to include Siberia, and the Western United States and Alaska. Whereupon, Mr. Dulles says the United States is seek-

ing a more limited "sparsely populated" area—as for example, Alaska and North Canada in return for Siberia, although he knows very well that there are great new industrial combines and population centers arising all over Siberia, and that the Soviet Union could hardly be expected to accept such a onesided exchange.

New hope arises in the news as we go to press of President Eisenhower's May 22 statement emphasizing the need to work "on this business of disarmament," and his seeming rebuke of General Radford's negative statement in saying "our first concern" must be that we ourselves are not "recalcitrant" in this matter, which "just has to be done in the interest of the United States." This is new evidence of the importance of a flood of messages to the President in support of immediate steps towards disarmament and ending of nuclear weapons tests.

New Soviet Disarmament Proposals

"Either there is to be peaceful co-existence and cooperation among the states, or a new war of extermination with the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons, threatening mankind with incalculable disasters. That is why the Soviet Government considers it most urgent that concrete measures in the field of disarmament be carried out without delay."

Valerian Zorin, Soviet representative, made this statement at the April 30 session of the meeting of the UN Disarmament Commissions Subcommittee in London, where

representatives of the United States, Great Britain, Canada, France and the Soviet Union have been meeting since March 18 in a new attempt to work out an international disarmament agreement.

It was made in connection with a new set of proposals offered by the Soviet Union to break the deadlock that had existed up to that point, offering a partial program instead of the fuller one previously presented, and making major concessions with regard to the Western program of aerial inspection.

Mr. Zorin placed special emphasis on the question of reaching immedi-

ate agreement on the cessation or temporary suspension of nuclear weapons tests as a step that could be separated from other disarmament measures.

At the outset, Mr. Zorin reviewed the March 18 proposals of the Soviet Government designed "to work out an international agreement on disarmament which would insure the total prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons and their withdrawal from national armaments and a substantial reduction in the armed forces and armaments of the states, with the establishment of proper control over these measures."

He declared that it has been the unswerving position of the Soviet Union that a comprehensive program of disarmament is the only answer to the people's need for peace, the only firm foundation for international cooperation. Yet, lacking support on the part of the West for such a program, the Soviet Union was prepared to consider more restricted measures in an effort to break the deadlock.

Nine Point Program Presented

In introducing the new Soviet proposals, Mr. Zorin declared that the USSR proposed first of all the ending or temporary suspending of tests of atomic and hydrogen weapons. This question, he said, could be taken up separately from other disarmament questions, and should be settled independently and without delay.

He said this could be done at once because no complicated organizational measures were involved and the present level of scientific knowledge made all tests detectable with-

out elaborate inspection measures.

The memorandum on Soviet proposals contained the following main points:

1. Reduction of Armed Forces

A two-stage reduction of the armed forces of the big powers. As a first step, reduction of the armed forces of the United States, the USSR and China to the level of 2,500,000 men, and of Britain and France to 750,000 men; this is to be followed by reductions of the armed forces of first three countries named to the level of 1,000,000 to 1,500,000 and the latter two to 650,000.

Mr. Zorin pointed out that the United States proposes to limit reductions to the first-stage figures only. He argued in support of the Soviet position, that the USSR in the past 18 months had already reduced its armed forces by 1,840,000 men, while the Western forces had remained practically unchanged. He declared that the U.S. proposal, in the absence of any comprehensive disarmament agreement, could not help but give an advantage to one side. The fact that the Soviet Union has a territory much larger than the United States and much lengthier frontiers, had to be considered; and especially the fact "that the security of the Soviet Union is threatened by the North Atlantic bloc in the West, by the Baghdad Pact grouping in the south and by both the Baghdad grouping and the SEATO military block in Asia and the Far East."

At the same time, he pointed out, it is recognized by the United States itself, that its smaller territory and frontiers are in no way threatened,

thousands of miles of ocean separating it from other countries in east and west, and with neighbors on north and south from whom no danger is anticipated. He continued:

These considerations show that if the reduction of armed forces to the level of 2,500,000 men not only ensures the security of the United States, but also enables it to maintain large forces beyond its frontiers, on foreign territories, the reduction of the Soviet armed forces to the same level would be detrimental to the security of the USSR whose frontiers are not protected by natural obstacles such as the United States frontiers are, and which, moreover for a considerable length are common with member countries of the aforementioned military groupings.

The matter would look differently, if the United States, the USSR and China were to agree on a reduction of their armed forces at the second stage to the levels of 1,000,000 to 1,500,000 men and of the armed forces of Britain and France to the levels of 650,000 men; such a substantial reduction in the armed forces of these powers, along with the prohibition of the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons, would signify that we were moving toward effective disarmament, towards peace.

2. Reduction of Armaments and Military Budgets

A reduction in conventional armaments and military budgets by 15 per cent during the first period, instead of 10 per cent as proposed by the United States for countries reducing their armed forces. This would substantially reduce the burden of military expenditures placed on the people of all countries. Further reductions could be considered later.

3. International Control

A control body should be established within the framework of the

Security Council for checking on the implementation of first stage measures in points 1 and 2.

Control posts during the first stage reduction to be established on the basis of reciprocity at large ports, railway junctions and large motor highways to guard against any dangerous concentration of armed forces and armaments; during first stage these should be only in western frontier regions of the USSR, on territories of France and Britain and on the territories of other member-countries of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty, as well as in the eastern part of the United States, and, by agreement, on territories of other states within the zone of aerial photography. Control posts at airfields to be established during second stage of the reduction and related to measures for prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons.

4. Renunciation of Use of All Types of Nuclear Weapons; Ending Tests

Simultaneously with above three measures, and to enter into force at the beginning of the first stage of arms reduction, assumption by the states concerned before the peoples of the world, of:

A solemn obligation to renounce the use for military purposes of atomic and hydrogen weapons of all types, including air bombs, rockets of any range of action carrying atomic and hydrogen warheads, atomic artillery, etc.

At the same time, states parties to the above should assume an obligation to exert all their efforts to reach agreement on "complete prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons,

with their elimination from national armaments, the ending of their production and destruction of stockpiles of these weapons." The memorandum continued:

Bearing in mind the particular urgency of discontinuing tests of atomic and hydrogen weapons, it would be advisable at present to single out this issue from the general problem of atomic and hydrogen weapons, as a measure of top priority, and to solve it without delay.

5. Abolition of Foreign Military Bases.

In view of menace to peace of existence of foreign military bases on foreign territories and particularly in view of plans for equipping them with atomic weapons, that the question of their abolition be considered, and agreement reached, in the first instance, as to which of these bases can be abolished within one or two years.

6. Reduction of Armed Forces in Germany

USSR reiterates its belief that its proposal of November 17, 1956, for reduction by one-third of armed forces of the United States, the USSR, Britain and France on the territory of Germany would contribute toward easing international tensions.

7. Reduction of NATO and Warsaw Pact Forces

Restatement of Soviet proposal for agreement on reduction of U.S., British and French armed forces on territories of NATO countries and Soviet forces on territories of War-

saw Treaty countries; size of reductions to be determined by negotiations.

8. Mutual Aerial Inspection

Soviet proposal of November 17 last for aerial photography 800 kilometers east and west of demarcation line between NATO and Warsaw Pact countries recalled. U.S. counter proposal described as moving demarcation line "arbitrarily to the east," covering only a small part of NATO countries' territory, and substantial part of Warsaw Treaty members. USSR agrees to apply aerial reconnaissance within sector of Europe proposed by the United States, with modifications toward equalization of NATO and Warsaw Pact territories.

In view of U.S. proposal to cover Far East by aerial inspection, new Soviet proposal offers to expand previous plan to include 7,219,000 square kilometers in the Far Eastern sections of the USSR, 7,063,000 square kilometers in the Western Sections of the United States; control posts at railway junctions, motor highways and ports could be established in aerial photography areas of Europe and Soviet Far East from moment of agreement on partial measures entering into force.

9. Ending War Propaganda

Noting continuance of propaganda for war, and especially for use of atomic and hydrogen weapons against certain states, despite 1947 resolution of UN General Assembly against such propaganda, appropriate measures should be taken to put an end to propaganda for war.

China and the U. N.

by **ESLANDA ROBESON**

THE PEOPLE'S Republic of China—the country with the greatest area and the largest population in the world—has for seven years been denied representation in the United Nations, the world organization which aims to achieve peace, cooperation, and progress for all the peoples of the world.

When considering problems of the Far East and world problems such as disarmament, atomic energy, education, the status of women and the welfare of children, UN members are denied the benefit of the wisdom and experience of the representatives of one quarter of the world's population. Instead, the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek's group are foisted upon them.

Everyone knows that the Chiang Kai-shek group cannot assume obligations for the government and the people of China in the UN or anywhere else.

It is a matter of history that at the beginning of the Chinese civil war, Chiang Kai-shek had an army of five million men, while the Communist army numbered a mere 500,000. At the end of the war the situation was reversed; the Communist army had grown to five million and had won the support of the Chinese people. Chiang and his remaining 500,000 fled from the mainland and established themselves on Taiwan (For-

mosa), an island off China's coast.

The Communist army consolidated its victory. The People's Republic of China, with a Central People's Government, was established in October 1949. This Government exercises effective authority over China and enjoys the enthusiastic support of the vast majority of its people. It has carried out important political, social and economic reforms, and has radically improved the condition of the Chinese people. It has embarked upon a vast program of educational, cultural, and industrial development, and has already raised the standard of living.

The Central People's Government of China has not only made tremendous progress in domestic affairs; it has also made notable contributions to understanding, friendship and cooperation in the Far East. The statesmen of New China and India prepared a Declaration known as *The Five Principles* for peaceful coexistence which have become the basis for relations between the two countries, and were later subscribed to at Bandung.

The countries of Asia and Africa were deeply impressed by the restraint, dignity and wisdom displayed by Mr. Chou En-lai and his delegation at Bandung. The statesmen of New China made a constructive contribution to the relax-

ing of world tension at the Geneva Conference. And it must be remembered that when the United States wanted to discuss problems of urgent interest to itself and China, it was to Peking, and not to Formosa, that it addressed itself.

Yet, at the UN, the delegates from Formosa, who do not even represent the Formosans but only Chiang Kai-shek's rejected group, continue to sit in China's seat. Technical maneuvers and political pressures have been used by the United States from year to year to perpetuate this abnormal situation.

Mr. Vaclav David of Czechoslovakia told the General Assembly on November 15, 1955:

It is no secret that the United States, at great expense, has for many years been financing the so-called Chiang Kai-shek Government. It is no secret that, in defiance of common sense and legality, the United States presents this Chiang Kai-shek group as a Government only in order to be able to maintain its military bases on the territory of Taiwan, thereby threatening the peace and security of the Far East. . . . The exclusion of the rightful representatives of one of the five Great Powers from international cooperation only results in the complication of the work of the United Nations.

During the eleventh session of the UN General Assembly (Nov. 1, 1956 - Mar. 8, 1957) another valiant effort was made to seat the representatives of the legal, functioning government of China.

For seven years, ever since November 18, 1949, when the representatives of the People's Republic of China first applied for the UN seat which belongs to China, the question of the proper representation of China has been raised at every session of the Assembly, and the dele-

gates from Formosa have been challenged and protested by India and the Socialist countries.

Because of its pro-Western, pro-United States composition this year, there was no hope that the Credentials Committee would recommend the seating of China. The Committee was composed of 8 members: Argentina, Brazil, Burma, Iraq, Netherlands, New Zealand, Spain, the United States and the USSR. Only two—Burma and the USSR—could be counted upon to recommend the seating of New China. All the other members of the Committee voted against even any discussion.

Mr. Krishna Menon of India made a proposal in the General (Steering) Committee on November 14 to include the question of China's representation in the Agenda of the General Assembly. Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge, U.S. representative, promptly countered with a resolution not to include this item on the agenda during the current session. The discussion highlighted the definitely pro-Western position of 12 of the 16 General Committee members.

Mr. Menon said it was not enough merely to question academically the legitimacy of China's present representation. The time had come, he said, to settle the question once and for all in accordance with the spirit of the Charter. Mr. Lodge said that since member states were deeply divided over the question, it was undesirable to intensify and aggravate that division at this time of grave international crisis.

Mr. V. V. Kuznetsov (Soviet Union) said that the absence of the real representatives of the world's largest country was extremely detrimental to the prestige of the United

Nations, especially in Asia, and prevented the organization from playing a really effective part in the world.

Mr. Koca Popovic (Yugoslavia) said refusal to discuss the issue perpetuates and deepens the present division of the world into two blocs. "Surely," said Dr. T. Sudjarwo (Indonesia) "this organization cannot be too timid even to consider this important international problem."

Mr. P. M. Crosthwaite (Britain) and Dr. Victor Belaunde (Peru) supported Mr. Lodge. Mr. Vincent Broustra (France) and Mr. Enrique de Marchena (Dominican Republic) said that discussion of the item in present circumstances would run counter to UN interests.

Mr. Menon replied that since almost no one disputed the fact that the Central People's Government was the real government of China, and since it represented one quarter of the world population, its direct active participation in the UN would help to reduce international tensions and to solve world problems, and was therefore necessary and desirable especially at this time. Mr. Hermod Lannung (Denmark) supported Mr. Menon.

Although Mr. Menon's resolution had been presented first, Mr. Lodge succeeded as usual in winning priority for his own, which was adopted by a vote of 8 to 5 with 1 abstention. The 5 who voted against him were Denmark, Egypt, Czechoslovakia, India and the Soviet Union.

However, it was an empty victory for Mr. Lodge. Although he won the vote in the General Committee, Mr. Menon nevertheless won his point, because on the following day when the General Committee's Re-

port was presented to the Assembly, a full-dress discussion of the representation of China began and continued through three plenary sessions, challenging rejection of the Item.

In the General Assembly, the United States and its Latin American, Western and other supporters could find no new points against the seating of the legal representatives of China, only repeating that "the time is not ripe," and that discussion of the issue would further divide the Assembly.

Mr. Dmitri Shepilov of the Soviet Union was moved to comment that the rights of the New China in the UN "are so irrefutable that the enemies of the People's Republic of China do not find any serious argument to question them."

Mr. Menon answered Mr. Lodge:

The representative of the United States told us that this would divide the General Assembly. . . . What in fact he means is that if this was considered, it would be against his point of view, and therefore the division would attain a different color. It is divided now because there are many of us who want this matter considered, and therefore it is not as though we are creating the division. Why should the division be looked at from the point of view of one side? . . . The best way to deal with division is to discuss it.

The argument against consideration of this item is that it is not timely. When has one heard of an imperial country ever thinking that progress was timely? . . . The one grave concern that everybody must have is the general state of tension in the world, which can at any time erupt in any part of the world into war, which would lead to world war. . . . China itself is a very powerful country with a considerable army and a considerable industry . . . it would be fallacious not to bring them into discussions. Therefore, instead of being un-

timely, it is our humble view that this is the time, more timely than any other, to consider this question dispassionately.

Mr. U. P. Kin of Burma and Mr. R. S. S. Gunewardene of Ceylon also presented strong arguments of the difficulties of solving the urgent problems confronting Asia and the world without the real China.

Mr. David (Czechoslovakia) pointed out that 30 countries have already established diplomatic relations, and 62 countries have commercial relations with the People's Republic of China. Dr. Farid Zeineddine (Syria) said he could not explain how some countries, while recognizing the Chinese People's Republic, continue to refuse it its seat in the UN. "In our view," he said, "the act of recognition inevitably entails the duty to try and give China's seat in the councils of the UN to the proper Chinese Government."

In the end, Mr. Lodge's resolution was adopted in the Assembly by a vote of 47 to 24 with 8 abstentions; Mr. Menon's rejected by a vote of 45 to 25, with 9 abstentions. The vote on the Menon resolution was however, encouraging. Those in favor were: The Bandung group—Afghanistan, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Nepal, Sudan, Syria and Yemen; the Socialist group—Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, Ukraine, Soviet Union and Yugoslavia; the Scandinavian group—Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden. The abstentions were: Israel, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Libya, Mexico, Portugal, Saudi Arabia and Tunisia.

Mr. Lodge again technically won

his fight to exclude discussion of China's representation. But again it was an empty victory, because the issue had already been discussed, and was discussed again when the question of enlarging the Security Council came up.

The present membership of the 11-member Security Council is as follows: The 5 permanent seats are occupied by Britain, France, United States, USSR, with Formosa in China's seat; the 6 non-permanent seats are occupied by Cuba and Colombia for Latin America, Sweden for Western Europe, Iraq for the Middle East, Australia for the Commonwealth, and the Philippines for *Eastern Europe*. (This means that 9 or 10 of the total 11 are pro-Western).

On December 14 the Latin-American bloc (minus Mexico and plus Spain) sponsored a resolution to add two more non-permanent seats to the Security Council, because of the addition of the 20 new members to the Assembly. Their suggestion for the new membership was: Latin America 2, Western and Southern Europe 2, Asia and Africa 2, Eastern Europe 1, and British Commonwealth 1. This would mean that the 170 million people of Latin America, or the 166 million people of Western and Southern Europe, would have equal representation with the one and a half billion people of Asia and Africa.

This proposal was obviously so unfair and disrespectful to the people of Asia and Africa that it was promptly and strongly rejected by the Asian, African and Socialist delegates. "It creates," said Mr. Menon, "the feeling that the UN is still a Western Alliance. We cannot sell to

our people the idea that it takes 20 nations to make one European nation, which was the theory in days gone by." "I am surprised," said Mr. Gunewardene (Ceylon) "that anyone of any intelligence should have the hardihood to suggest that two-thirds of the world should be represented by 2 seats. Time was when one European was good enough for hundreds of Asians. That theory, however, has been exploded."

Mr. Julius Katz-Suchy (Poland) pointed out that before enlargement could be considered, the present misrepresentation in the Security Council would have to be corrected. No one could contend that the Philippines was in Eastern Europe, although she occupies the seat assigned to that region. No one could contend that Formosa represents the 600 million people and the mainland of China, although she occupies the seat assigned to them.

Mr. Kuznetsov (USSR) declared that no increase could be made in the Security Council, and that in fact no other change could be made in the Charter so long as Formosa occupies the seat assigned to China. Change or amendment to the Charter requires approval and confirmation by two-thirds of the membership—including all five of the Great Powers. One of the Great Powers, China, is missing. No one could contend that Formosa is a Great Power.

The real issue before us, said Mr. Zeineddine (Syria) is not an increase in the Security Council, but representation that reflects the present realities in the world situation, and the changes since the Charter was signed at San Francisco. At present Western Europe is too heavily

represented in the Council, he added.

The Latin American bloc finally gave up its proposal, and the question of enlarging the Security Council was given over to a special committee for study and report to the next Assembly. From the extended discussion on the issue during the 11th session it became clear that the question of realistic geographic and numerical democratic representation in the major UN organs must be resolved without delay, as well as the question of the proper representation of China.

"States, not Governments, are Members of the United Nations," Mr. Shepilov reminded the Assembly. "It was not Chiang Kai-shek who was given in San Francisco a permanent seat in the Security Council; it was the noble people of China who, together with the peoples of other Great Powers, made their tremendous contribution to the cause of victory over fascism."

"So far as the presence of China itself is concerned," said Mr. Menon, "I think that the best authority on this matter is the present Secretary of State [John Foster Dulles]. He said, in 1950:

'I have now come to believe that the United Nations will best serve the cause of peace if its Assembly is representative of what the world actually is, and not merely representative of the parts we like. . . . Therefore, we ought to be willing that all nations should be members, without attempting to appraise expressly those that are good and those that are bad.'

The future of this potentially magnificent world organization may well depend upon its ability to face this issue forthrightly at its next session.

“Bright New China”

by MURRAY YOUNG

THE CHINESE People's Political Consultative Conference is one of the most interesting and creative developments of China's road to socialism. Unfortunately, little is known about this significant body or its relations to the central government because of restrictions placed by our government on all travel in China since its liberation in 1949.

The National Committee of the C.P.P.C.C. meets annually. This year it met from March 6 to 20 and some indication of its deliberations as well as a brief description of its origin and composition should, we believe, be of interest to our readers.

The C.P.P.C.C. grew out of the conditions existing in China in 1949—the great final year of liberation. Called together in September of that year, on the eve of the establishment of the new government, because the situation throughout the country did not allow for universal elections, the C.P.P.C.C. exercised the functions later assumed by the National People's Congress. It elected the Central People's Government Council as the organ of state power, issued the common program, and formed the government's first National Committee as a united front and consultative body.

With the election of the National People's Congress in 1954 through universal suffrage, the work of the Consultative Conference was, of course, taken over by that elected body. However it was decided that

such a broad grouping of people had still a major role to play in the political life of the country—that its existence corresponded to the actual relation of classes and special groups in China. Therefore in December 1954 its second National Committee was called. It has continued to meet each year.

No longer an organ of the state, the C.P.P.C.C. is, as from its inception, a voluntary association of political parties, national groups, and mass organizations that reflect the actual groupings who make up the total Chinese population. The National Committee is made up of 729 members representing all of China's nine political parties, people of no party, national groups, organizations of workers, peasants, women, youth, writers, artists, scientists, doctors, journalists, capitalists, religious bodies, the overseas Chinese, and special invited guests. During the term of their office the delegates are freed from all other work, paid full wages, and their traveling expenses are borne by the government.

Apart from its National Committee, the C.P.P.C.C. has provincial and city committees through the country whose function is to gather public opinion as widely as possible and to supervise the work of local government bodies.

The annual meeting of its National Committee reports on opinions gathered by the local committee, discusses achievements and

failures of government policies on a local scale, or affecting special groups. Equally important is the discussion of government policies and orders before they are formally presented to the National People's Congress. Between annual meetings its work is carried on by a Standing Committee.

Of the 729 delegates on the National Committee, less than one-third are members of the Communist Party. This percentage compares interestingly with the fact that 45 per cent of the 1,226 deputies to the National People's Congress, the official government body, are also non-Party people and hold about one-third of the positions as government ministers and chairmen of committees under state control. Mao Tse-tung is Honorary Chairman of the C.P.P.C.C. and Premier Chou En-lai functioning Chairman.

The political groupings in the conference, apart from the Communist Party, comprise the following eight parties:

The Chinese Peasants and Workers Party.

Founded in 1927 after the defeat of the first great revolution, this party has 12 seats in the Conference. Its Chairman is also Minister of Communications in the National Government.

The Chinese Democratic League.

Founded in 1941, this party has always had close ties with the intelligentsia. It has 25 seats in the Conference and its Chairman is also Vice-Chairman of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress.

The Chiu San Society.

Founded in 1944, the society evolved from forums and gatherings

of a section of university professors. It has 12 seats in the Conference and its Chairman is also Minister of Forestry in the National Government.

The China Democratic National Construction Association.

Founded in 1945, it is largely composed of industrialists, businessmen and intellectuals connected with these circles. With 25 seats in the Conference, its Chairman is Vice-Chairman of the Standing Committee of the National Government and five of its members are Vice-Ministers in the government.

The China Association for Promoting Democracy.

Founded in 1946, it is chiefly made up of people in cultural and educational circles. With 12 seats in the Conference, its Chairman is a member of the standing committee of the Government.

The China Chih Kung Tang.

Organized originally by Chinese groups in America, it has contacts with many overseas Chinese. It has 6 seats in the Conference.

The Taiwan Democratic Self-Government League.

Founded in 1947, the League has 6 seats in the Conference. Its Chairman is a deputy to the National People's Congress.

The Revolutionary Committee of the Kuomintang.

Established in 1948 by former members of the Kuomintang, it retains contact with former Kuomintang officials and upper and middle class people. With 25 seats in the Conference, a number of its members are Ministers in the National Government and Vice-Chairman of the Defense Council.

It is clear from these brief descrip-

tions that these parties are mainly made up of middle-class people and the intellectuals who rise from this class. Much smaller, of course, than the Communist Party which represents the peasants and workers, these parties nevertheless occupy important places in Chinese life and have very wide influence in many directions.

In a semi-colonial, semi-feudal country like China before liberation, resistance to the oppression of imperialism and feudalism affected all classes with the exception of the landlords and the very small body of the largest capitalists—a very minor portion of the population. These parties rose during the years of revolutionary struggle for reform within the country and freedom from imperialist control. Their contribution to the final liberation of China was of great importance and their voluntary participation in the first calling of the C.P.P.C.C. in 1949 signified the vital role they had played. Their continued existence as parties and their increasing contribution through the C.P.P.C.C. to Chinese political life as a consultative and supervisory group, indicates the realistic and original approach of the Communist Party and its acceptance of the differences that objectively exist in Chinese society. Last year the Communist Party reaffirmed its policy of “long-term co-existence and mutual supervision” of the democratic parties under its leadership and pointed out that it expected China would have a multi-party system even after the building of socialism within the country had been completed. This prospect for the future served as a great stimulant to the growth of the democratic

parties and their membership today is 6 times the size it was in 1949.

Recently an editorial in the official Party paper, *People's Daily*, had this to say on “long-term co-existence”:

Those who doubt the necessity of the other democratic parties co-existing with our Party over a long period either are totally ignorant of the former's status, and role, and the changes in China's history, or harbor narrow-minded sectarian feelings toward them. . . . We need the supervision of other democratic parties and non-party democrats. This is because they represent the views and demands of one sector of society and moreover they have certain political experience and professional skill, hence they are often able to put forward views and criticisms that go right to the point. . . . In order to achieve genuine “long-term co-existence and mutual supervision” we should all the more fully respect the independence, freedom and equality of other parties. We should not interfere in any affairs of the separate democratic parties. . . . Of course, one should not oppose the respect for the independent and equal position of other democratic parties to the leading role of our Party in the political life of the whole of China.

The Conference this year was opened by a report from Premier Chou En-lai on developments in foreign relations during the course of the past year. Describing in detail his visits in the crucial months at the year's end to eleven European and Asian countries, he affirmed his unbounded confidence in the fundamental health of socialism even in the face of all the crises it had gone through in 1956. For so new a form of society mistakes were inevitable, he declared, but the guarantee of socialism's ultimate victory was the frankness with which its mistakes were faced and the decisiveness with which corrections had been insti-

tuted. Moreover, he went on to say, the unhappy tensions that had grown up among the socialist countries were not the inevitable, incurable tensions that exist between imperialist states, but were, like the internal mistakes, expressions of the relative newness of socialism as a form of organization of society, and were now happily on the way to correction.

Pointing out that recent developments had proved the validity of the coming together of the Asian and African nations at Bandung, he movingly spoke of how the Asian people, so long brutally separated by imperialism, were growing again into a unity of purpose that would prove in the end triumphant for them. Bitterly assailing U.S. policy in the Middle East as merely the old imperialism under new, hypocritical names, Chou En-lai ended with the assertion that the will of the Chinese people, like that of all the people of the world, was for peace.

A few examples selected from the two-weeks meeting may serve to give some indication of how varied and rich the proceedings were. All the speeches make clear that this was a truly representative body, seriously concerned with the problems of a developing socialist society, open in both praise and criticism, unafraid to make suggestion, to point out shortcomings, eager to make public the interests of all possible groups among the Chinese people. Thus archeologists cry out against the thoughtless demolition of ancient monuments in the course of hasty building programs; scientists complain that they are still too much involved in administrative affairs and do not have enough time for re-

search; a trade union official asks for the setting up of workers' representative conferences for the better running of individual factories; a spokesman for the industrialists calls for closer ties between the planners and those carrying out the plans, more reasonable quotas, more economical use of manpower; a non-Communist complains that there is still too much rigidity on the part of Party members in their relations with non-Party people; a group of writers assert that worry over the reappearance of romances, bad or empty writing, or the reintroduction on the stage of the traditional ghosts, shows a lack of confidence in the discernment of the people.

One of the most vigorously discussed proposals at the Conference was that concerning birth-control and planned families. Grace Liu, an American who lives in China, has sent us an interesting article on this proposal which will be printed in our next issue.

One delegate reporting on agricultural cooperatives pointed out that some fairly well-to-do peasants were complaining that their income in the cooperatives had not risen as much as those of the poor peasants and in some instances were less than the returns they had realized when working their land independently. The speaker explained that these peasants had joined cooperatives during the height of the drive for organization, before they really understood what was involved. Some of the cooperatives had plunged into heavy investments too early and found themselves short of cash. Also, he said, there were complaints of the unfair distribution of the dividends, of lack of democracy in the

management, and far too much bureaucracy.

On the other hand a speaker from a formerly poverty-stricken province reported that the peasants in the cooperatives there already had two years of food supply stored, that they were buying bicycles and building new houses. At the same time he cautioned on the necessity for developing greater democracy in the management of the cooperatives and further instruction in the management of livestock.

Speaking on the administration of justice, one representative pressed for more education about the operation of Chinese law and asked that a complete code of criminal law quickly be worked out. He reported on instances in local courts where defendants' rights had not been properly respected. He had also found illegal treatment of criminals in labor reform settlements and failure to release inmates immediately on the expiration of their terms. Praising the People's Courts for their quick correction of mishandled cases, he stressed that the whole system of appeal should be widely popularized so that the people would know their rights.

The leader of the Protestant group in the Conference praised the achievement of the government in protecting religious freedom but sharply criticized the many failures to carry out government policy on a local scale. Because of the relations of Chinese protestantism with imperialism, he said, many Christians were still under influences from the old days, but he deplored the fact that the treatment of religion in various publications was crude, non-objective and denied the possibility

of religious believers being progressive. At the same time he declared that there had been a real rejuvenation of religion in China and called on outsiders "to come and see for themselves."

A representative of the Chinese Catholics, while echoing some of the criticism of the Protestant spokesman, especially about conditions in remote regions, said that the improvement in the people's living standards and the whole raising of the level of social morality had deeply inspired the patriotism of the 3 million Chinese Catholics.

On the urgent matter of education there were proposals that senior school students teach primary school graduates, that private schools run by individuals or organizations should be encouraged, that educated housewives, intellectuals and high school graduates should be encouraged to hold private classes in the primary grades.

On the college level, objections raised about too heavy programs carried by the students and excessive hours of study, were answered by speakers from the universities who pointed out that steps had already been taken to reduce the numbers of classes and study hours for the individual student with the view that this would, among other advantages, lead to greater initiative on the part of the teachers and more independent thinking on the part of the students.

A representative from the acting profession proposed that all theatrical entertainment now be self-supporting, stressing that this would lead to a greater initiative, independence and variety in both content and production.

A number of speeches were made by important ex-Kuomintang officials who now occupy leading positions in the present People's government. Chiang Kai-shek's former propaganda chief called on his friends in Taiwan and abroad in cultural and press circles to visit China and leave again "if they wish to." Many of his old friends, he said, had made valuable contributions during the Japanese war and the people of China had not forgotten. In other speeches by ex-Kuomintang officials invitations were extended to their former colleagues now serving with Chiang Kai-shek; changes in China were described and the important work to be done by them for their own people if they would return to the mainland.

The Vice-Chairman of the China Democratic National Construction Association, the political party of the capitalists, held up for criticism the attitude of some of its members towards workers and state-representatives in the state-private joint enterprises. Recognizing the fault was in part on the side of the state representatives, he felt, nevertheless that there was too much self-satisfaction among the capitalists with their old knowledge, and a reluctance to accept the fact that the relations between the two sides in the joint enterprises was one between two classes.

In closing the Conference, Premier

Chou En-lai promised that every speech and proposal made by the delegates would be carefully studied by the department concerned. Forty-four per cent of the delegates had either made speeches or handed in written proposals, he proudly stated, twice as many as at the previous conference.

He concluded by pointing out that this conference was an example of putting into practice the policy of letting "all flowers blossom, all schools of thought contend."

The Protestant leader in finishing his report on the situation of his group, had said that the failures of carrying out government policies in regard to religion which he had pointed out would be seized by people outside of China to slander the country but that nothing would be gained by this slander: "We love our bright new China, and its leaders, the Communist Party and Chairman Mao."

And it is this "bright new China" with its extraordinary creativeness, that our government by its travel restrictions tries to cut off from us. But the voices of 600,000,000 people heard through the debates, criticism, proposals of this conference, must eventually make so profound a change in the future development of democracy and socialism, not only in China but throughout the world, that even Mr. Dulles' restrictions must collapse before them.

TRANSLATION INTO CHINESE

Translation to be published in China this year: Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*; Spinoza's *Ethics*; Keynes' *The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money*; the poems of Charles Baudelaire.

ILYA EHRENBURG

Writes on Cultural Problems

Translation by Amy Schechter

Ilya Ehrenburg's article was first published in two issues of *Literaturnaya Gazeta* for February 9 and 12, 1957, under the title "A Necessary Clarification."

This is the first part of a discussion of East-West cultural relations by one of the most distinguished Soviet writers. Ehrenburg introduces his subject in the first section, placing it within the context of the tensions of the past year as seen against the whole history of Soviet-Western relations. In the second section to be published in our next issue, Ehrenburg reviews the struggle against dogmatism in all fields of Soviet art, the maturing of a socialist audience that is beginning to demand creative work on the highest level, and continues his discussion with the intellectuals of the West on the question of realism in its relation to the whole development of world culture.

In the course of the article Ehrenburg deals with many controversial issues which both Soviet and non-Soviet writers and artists are discussing today. The urgency of his argument makes evident Ehrenburg's deep concern with the importance of keeping the channels of cultural communication clear throughout the world.

We feel privileged to present in *New World Review* the full text of Ehrenburg's article, hitherto available in English only in a condensed version.

THIS is not the first time the defenders of bourgeois society have gone through a spell of anti-Soviet and anti-communist fever. I remember the posters I saw on the walls of cities in Western Europe thirty years ago: a man gripping a knife in his teeth threatening culture. That was the way the students of Pavlov, the readers of Gorky, the friends of Mayakovsky, were depicted by the fathers and elder brothers of those who are denouncing us today.

This is not the first time the apologists for a decrepit society have tried to convince—at least themselves if no one else—that their dreams are reality. Exaggerating our difficulties,

they clamor about "the crisis of communism," even "the end of communism." The special feature of their speeches is their complete lack of historical perspective. Gigantic social advances are treated in terms of Europe's usual ministerial maneuverings. They completely fail to see that communism is born not out of Utopian fantasies or conspiratorial plotting, but out of industrial development, sharpening class contradictions and social progress. They cannot, or will not see that it is American monopoly, the robber raids on the Suez Canal, and the factory owners themselves who are inevitably bringing communism.

Human beings growing old, become farsighted; an aging class becomes nearsighted. When we say we are correcting the mistakes we made in former years, our Western ill-wishers begin shouting about "the bankruptcy of communism," although surely common sense should at least make them a little cautious. They know very well that despite specific mistakes, our country has grown and gained in strength—and that means not only that the power of the state has grown, but also the spiritual force of the individual Soviet human being. And they also know that only a people strong in spirit and united is capable of speaking out openly about their mistakes, some of which they have corrected, others of which they are in the process of correcting today. Never have the chiefs of capitalist states had the courage to tell the people about mistakes they themselves have committed, because their mistakes are impossible to correct, linked as they are to the very nature of the capitalist state. The fact that capitalism still exists—this is the essential error. Sooner or later it will be corrected, not by the apologists for the bourgeois order but by the people.

In these recurring bouts of anti-Soviet and anti-communist fever, the surprising thing is not the vehemence of the politicians nor the hysteria of the newspapers, but the confusion among some of the cultural figures of the West who can hardly be numbered among the devotees of capitalism.

Here I am not thinking of those Western intellectuals who during the past ten years have attempted to maintain a neutral position between the capitalist and socialist worlds.

There may be good grounds for certain states to hold to a position of neutrality at a time when the world is divided into military blocs. But there is not, and never was such a thing as neutrality of mind, of heart, of conscience. At one period the French poet Pierre Emmanuel tried to maintain a position of spiritual neutrality. Now, in the face of the current anti-Soviet campaign he comes out not alone against communism but against neutralism as well. He is filled with indignation against those Frenchmen who are sickened by the American "way of life," the logic apparently being that Western intellectuals who yesterday attacked communism in the name of neutrality of the spirit, now attack neutrality of the spirit in the name of a stronger capitalist order.

In saying that I find the confusion existing in certain circles of Western intellectuals amazing, I have in mind those cultural figures who have repeatedly denied their belief in the idea of "neutrality of the spirit;" insisting that a "third force"—between the capitalist and socialist worlds—can have no reality.

Least of all am I inclined to reproach those cultural figures of the West who, in a fit of irrationality, are ready to turn their backs on former friends and on everything they lived by. With them I want to talk about the things that are of paramount importance, about man's fate and the fate of culture. I feel that their spiritual turmoil springs not from recent happenings, grave as these were. As early as the summer of last year, reading Western periodicals and talking with some representative Western intellectuals, I felt the pervasive doubt,

the growing restlessness among them.

Observing that we condemn specific mistakes we made in the past, some writers, scientists, and artists began to cast doubt on everything Soviet society and Soviet culture had achieved. In this complex time we live in, not easy to understand, the essential thing seems to be to view developments in broad perspective. Soviet culture is not ephemeral, it is a tremendous historical fact, you cannot throw it into the discard in a fit of resentment or anger. You may write a pamphlet to unburden your soul; but a pamphlet which turns its fire against a great idea, against the creative impulse of a nation, becomes nothing but a spiteful lampoon.

It seems worth noting that certain of the literati of the West, who now doubt all the unquestioned achievements of Soviet culture, are the same who five years ago went into transports over everything Soviet, including feeble novels and foolish films. They make one think of disappointed adolescents falling out of love.

Soviet culture has enriched the world with outstanding works of art; but when I used to read rapturous articles about some jerry-built novel, about some oversized canvas by a third-rate painter, or about the film "The Fall of Berlin," I often wondered how anyone who loved and understood art could admire that sort of thing. And now you find just such inconstant enthusiasts holding forth on the inferior quality of Soviet literature and Soviet culture.

Socialism is not a religion; it is founded on reason and conscience, on science and on the longing for justice inborn in men. A love for Soviet society, for Soviet culture, can

have nothing in common with the papal dogma of infallibility or the absolutes of canon law. Those in the cultural field in Western countries who admired us extravagantly yesterday, and now meet our statements that we are correcting many of our former mistakes with derision, only display their own spiritual immaturity. An idea is not a coquettish girl content with her admirer of the moment; an idea demands constant and conscious devotion.

We are not going to give up criticizing our shortcomings, our mistakes, for fear that this might prove unsettling to certain writers or scientists of the West, or even cause them to switch allegiances. It is not "blind" love we want—but a love instinct with wisdom, the sort of love our culture and our people deserve.

Among cultural figures in other lands who are now living through a period of turmoil are some whose steadfastness and sincerity I do not for a moment question. They are deeply disturbed by the anti-Soviet and the anti-communist campaign carried on by the enemies of progress; and—what is still more important—they are distressed to find some of the thoughts they are secretly thinking scarcely distinguishable from the bitter tirades printed in "Figaro" or "Il Messagero." They want to think in broad terms, but inevitably their thoughts keep harking back to one or another isolated detail.

Discussing the situation with writers in France, Italy and other countries of the West, I felt the existence of a deep-seated trauma. They seemed to be drawn compulsively toward some trashy book or noxious film which appeared in the Soviet Union perhaps ten years ago. At the

time they had found the book or film offensive, but the unfortunate piece of work angered them for an hour or so, and then they forgot it. Now, however, they keep harking back to those earlier impressions, and, becoming outraged all over again, attempt to draw general conclusions from their remembered anger.

Like people everywhere, they are subject to the influences of their environment. Fresh from reading the newspapers, it is hard for them to think in long-range terms, forgetting that you have to stand back from a building a little way to see it as a whole and in its proper proportions. Somehow they are unable, having freed themselves of these transient moods, to breathe in the fresh air of history.

In 1956 we criticized the trashy volumes and films of 1950; we did this in order to produce better ones. Many Western intellectuals, thinking over our criticism and remembering the books or films they had in the past disliked, now are trying to understand how it had been possible for prettied-up novels and showy, empty films to have appeared in our country. In seeking for the causes, intellectuals who are devoted to the cause of socialism sometimes unconsciously repeat the arguments of their enemies—the enemies of socialism.

All our successes as well as all our failures are attributable to the fact that we are building a new house and not contenting ourselves with patching up the old one, that we are writing instead of copying. To rearrange the furniture or paste up new wallpaper is not such a complicated job. It is easy to advance along a

path laid down by somebody else a long time ago. History, however, demanded something else of us: we were the first to break a new trail. For centuries, for thousands of years the state was ruled by castes, estates, classes, which represented only a very small privileged section of society. In 1917 for the first time in the history of mankind, the toilers assumed command over their own destiny. If in addition we bear in mind that for forty years an almost unbroken succession of wars—sometimes real ones, sometimes of the “cold” variety—have been carried on against the Soviet Union; that weapons of all sorts have been leveled against it—blockade and embargo, slander and provocation—then it begins to become clear just how difficult the conditions have been under which our people had to build a state and create a culture. Everyone knows how difficult it is to drive a car with a motor that is not yet broken in, especially along a road that is not a smooth one, but a road freshly hewn through the forest.

For centuries, for thousands of years, culture was the sole property of the educated elite of the nation. From the first years of the Revolution we set ourselves the lofty and difficult task of making culture not only the property of the whole people, but the creation of the whole people.

If we now turn our attention to the West, viewing it without either irritation or arrogance, we see that all the best things there are connected either with the new forces which are attempting to lead their people along new paths, or with the momentum of the great past. When I speak of new forces I am thinking

of the ranks of the progressive people who see all about them spiritual stagnation, hypocrisy and fear. When I speak of the momentum of the past I am thinking of advanced technical development; of skills acquired, and of the richness of cultural tradition. It is more difficult to make a new discovery than a new invention, but more difficult to make a new invention than merely to perfect the models already in existence.

For man forty years is a long time—almost a lifetime. For history forty years is only the briefest segment of time.

It is true that in France much has changed in forty years: autos crowd the streets and highways, great plants have risen, every branch of science is advancing. But much remains quite unchanged. Today, as forty years ago, the press discusses which ministerial combination the Radical Socialists will vote for; whether the shares of Credit Lyons and the Bank of Indo-China will fall or rise; the men of letters write novels about smoking opium being better than everyday life, and about elephants being nobler than men.

It is also true of course that there are many excellent writers and artists in France today; but few who are looking ahead—there is no breakthrough into the future. What I have said about France can also be said about other western lands. No one speaking about capitalist society today says it *already* has accomplished some certain thing, but rather that it *still* is holding its own.

When the defenders of capitalism speak about the “bankruptcy” of socialist ideology, this is understandable: they want to hang on a while

longer, they dream of a respite. But when doubts grip people to whom capitalism is hateful, this is evidence of one thing only: the “thinking reed”—to use Pascal’s fine metaphor—bends with the wind too easily.

It is possible to give a stranger a wrong address, and he may lose a day; it is possible to tear up rails and hurl a train over the embankment, causing the death of hundreds of people, but it is not possible to turn back history. The calendar shows that after 1957 comes 1958, not 1916.

Forty years have changed the face of our land and of the entire world as well. The vital force of the Soviet Union lent vigor to the working people of far distant lands, progressive circles everywhere gained strength from it. China became a great socialist power. The peoples of Africa and Asia—and above all, the remarkable Indian people, fought for and won national liberation and set out along a new road. The aspect of Eastern Europe was transformed.

Many things changed in Western Europe as well. If the interventionists had succeeded in their plan to strangle the new-born Soviet Republic in the years of 1918 through 1920, there would exist no powerful workers’ party in France today or in Italy; the British Laborites and the Scandinavian Social Democrats would not have been able to push through even modest measures raising the living standards of the working-class. In the course of World War II fascist Germany brought one land after another beneath its yoke; and if fascism was shattered on the Volga this was not because the houses of Stalingrad proved to be an impregnable Maginot line, but

because the ideas backing the Soviet fighting men proved more powerful.

The drawing power of socialist ideology is so obvious that the zealous defenders of capitalism were forced to resort to camouflage: even the fascists blasphemously mouthed the words of socialism, about the role of the workers.

Westerners working in the field of culture, in their hour of hesitation and doubt should look upon the world as a whole, on the battle between the past and the future. They and the Soviet intellectuals as well, are most deeply stirred by the problem of the spiritual wealth which has come down to us from earlier centuries, which we seek to enrich with new values, and thus pass on to coming generations. For the writer, for the scholar, for the artist, the fate of culture is not a question involving his specialty alone, but a problem bound up with the perception of the life of man as a conscious and noble path.

It is precisely because this is so that I want to speak now to my Western friends about the significance of Soviet culture, about the great and genuinely new things it has already created and about those which it still has to create—about our joys and the difficult problems we still have to solve.

Being a writer, I shall deal chiefly with literary problems, although literature as such is not the subject of this article. If I were a physicist, or a sculptor, or a musician, speaking of these same things I would use different examples. The western writers are now indicating that they want a discussion. In friendly conversations each interlocutor may touch upon any theme he wishes.

However acute the present urgent political problems may be, it seems to me that, with a view to evaluating them correctly, it may be useful to bring into the discussion themes of a broader character as well. Influenced by recent events, some of the western writers are at this time plagued by doubt. In our discussions I believe not only the events that gave birth to their doubts should be taken up, but also the things which they are questioning.

In these months of bitter polemics, passionate accusations and hasty generalizations, it seems to me appropriate to express my own views on the direction in which Soviet culture is developing.

PART II

I have received a letter from a village schoolteacher, she writes:

We follow literature carefully, we argue about it a great deal, and I ask you to help me to get an understanding of a number of questions. Recently I attended a conference in Tula, where I heard a report on literature. The speaker stated that a lot is now being said about the struggle against bourgeois ideology, and that certain conclusions must be drawn from this. When I reported about this to our staff, R. threw up her hands and said: "That means they're no longer going to print novels like *The Quiet American!*"

We get *Inostrannaya Literatura* (Foreign Literature), and we all liked the novel by Greene, and there were also other good novels in it by Remarque, Hemingway and others. I argued with R. As far as I can see, this is an absurd inference of hers. And our principal believes that all of this has to do with Soviet literature, that it is necessary to struggle against bourgeois ideology infiltrating it. This simply does not make sense to me! I follow the periodicals, I read a great deal, but I never once found any bourgeois ideology.

But there are other things I dislike in Soviet literature—how few good books there are, with any depth to them. I realize it is foolish to blame anyone for this, that to write well is a very difficult thing; and I speak about this only as about a dream—my own and all of ours. From us to the district center it is 40 kilometers, books are everything to us. Sometimes there is nothing to read, then I recite poetry to myself from memory, and at once my heart becomes lighter. . . .

The schoolteacher's questions are closely related to my theme, and I shall try to answer them. This article is not only for my western readers. For a Soviet writer, it is even more important these days to talk about things with his Soviet readers.

The enemies of socialism are attempting to hurl humanity back into the evil cold war years. In defiance of the interests of their own people, they seek to break those cultural bonds which have become broader and stronger in the course of these past few years. They have been successful in convincing, or rather, in forcing conformity on certain individuals active in the cultural life of the west; and I have learned with sorrow that some of them who only recently were defending the idea of cultural cooperation between East and West, have now gone over to the position occupied by the monopolists of things spiritual and the cultural isolationists.

Is there any need to keep on demonstrating again and again that there are no ideological differences which can serve as a barrier against cultural cooperation? No one has ever suggested that peaceful coexistence and peaceful cooperation between states with different systems must involve giving up the ideological struggle. It is possible to hold

differing philosophical concepts, differing viewpoints in regard to the course that the cultural development of humanity will take, without, because of this, destroying cities, refusing to carry on negotiations, without sending in diversionists, or heaping vulgar invectives on one's ideological opponent.

There is no doubt that there were men of diverse political beliefs among the physicists who two years ago met to discuss the peaceful use of atomic energy; but the fact that they were able to work together opens up new perspectives both for the growth of science and for the well-being of all the nations. The tours of the Moscow Ballet and the Peking Opera broadened the horizons of many Britons and Frenchmen, enriching their spiritual world, and this was not prevented by the deep-going differences existing between the people of these two worlds. Like the teacher who wrote to me, I rejoice at the fact that some of the good novels by western authors have appeared here in translation, and I am certain that we shall continue translating important works by foreign authors, even if they differ with us on a number of basic questions.

Exhibitions of paintings from India, France, England, Belgium and other lands have been held in Moscow; visiting these exhibitions, some liked the paintings, others not. But, looking at a landscape which stirred his soul, the viewer did not ask whether the artist was an idealist or a materialist.

The teacher writes: "Much time is now being devoted to the discussion of the struggle against bourgeois ideology." In my opinion, the strug-

gle against bourgeois ideology needs to be discussed both when the international situation becomes more acute and when tension is lessened. This struggle is made necessary not by the changing international situation, but by the very nature of socialist society, which arose from the fact that the people no longer wished to accept the injustice, amorality and senselessness of the decaying bourgeois system.

The ideological struggle cannot prevent us from aspiring to cultural bonds with all the countries on earth. It is not correct to place ideological discussions and diplomatic conversations on the same plane. Our approach to American science, to English literature, to French painting cannot depend on the mood Mr. Dulles woke up in, or on the sort of speech Mr. Selwyn Lloyd made, or the sort of ministers there are in France, or what those ministers may be contemplating at a given moment. In common with the rest of my countrymen, I consider agreement on universal disarmament to be an absolute necessity; but I do not think that it will be necessary for people to give up the exalted and precious weapon of their own consciousness.

I like many contemporary American writers — for example Hemingway, Caldwell, Faulkner, Steinbeck, Fast, Saroyan. I am glad that many of their works have been translated into Russian, and that Soviet readers like them. But is it possible for anyone to deduce from this that we have renounced, are renouncing, or will at any future time renounce the struggle against the racist ideas which are widespread in the United States, or against the

anti-human theories of Vogt or the scholars and writers of that country who sanction the wolfish moral viewpoint of what they call "free enterprise?"

I have great admiration for the paintings of Picasso, Matisse, Roualt, Marquet, Leger, Braque and many other French artists. But the blind, mechanical aping of some of the works of Picasso and Braque has contributed to a still wider spread in western countries of a kind of abstract painting that I feel to be anti-human and which I shall not stop opposing.

I think highly of a number of contemporary French writers, and am doing everything I can to make it possible for Soviet readers to get to know their works; but yet I feel much in French literature to be unacceptable and anti-human, specifically the works of those authors who make a study of all types of perversion, all forms of human isolation.

The ideological struggle should be a serious analysis of our opponents' positions, not just a collection of disparaging epithets, it should not be conducted on the level of caricature or slashing journalistic commentary. For us this struggle is not a defensive action, but a moral offensive; it is a necessity for the growth and deepening of socialist ideology.

I think that at times our publishing houses, editorial committees and critics tend to approach serious ideological problems from the angle of the latest dispatches from abroad appearing in the press. Last summer I read a French play called "Alarm in the Night"; at that time it struck me as third rate farce, and today this is what it still appears to me to

p37 > rated it as an outstanding work of art at that time but now seem to regard this same play as a sort of delayed-action mine, demonstrates a fairly irresponsible attitude towards the serious problem of combatting bourgeois ideology.

It is not often that the apologists for capitalism can find philosophers, writers or artists who will come out in defense of the world of money, profit and the violation of justice. Much more frequently the ruling circles of bourgeois society resort to "ersatz" culture to do the job, to the cheap novel, play or film, to the "comics," which instead of contributing to the development of people's minds, play an active role in blunting them. Perhaps the outstanding example of this organized process of debasing the mind would be the "abridged" editions of novels, in which "Anna Karenina" or the "Red and the Black" are presented as obscene literature, or a Dostoyevsky novel appears in the form of a comic.

Every year thousands of films are made up of disconnected shots and banal songs; and not a single person in the audience can say what the picture is all about after they leave the theater. The fight against this sort of thing, the task of defending the people against it, especially children and adolescents, is the duty of every intelligent society. We must of course fight against vulgarity and sham penetrating into our literature (or more accurately, into our life). We must of course do a thorough and skilful job of showing up the mostly rather crude attempts of western writers to make use of philosophy or of literature for the justifying of capitalism with its catechism

of "sacred property rights" and "free competition," with its cult of individualism and contempt for the individual.

However I want to underline again the truth that the chiefs of state of the west actually place little faith in the firing power of their ideas. Just because of this they stubbornly reject disarmament. They put much greater reliance on their bombs than on their philosophers or in their writers. They obviously incline more to sabre rattling than to peaceful discussion or to peaceful competition.

It is not to my liking to discuss those of our past mistakes which we have corrected. I consider it more important to discuss those mistakes of ours which still demand correction, and which still at times impede our cultural growth. Yet one of these past mistakes must be mentioned. Seven or eight years ago we used to talk a great deal about the struggle against "kowtowing." This anti-kowtowing campaign was conducted all down the line in every possible way. Food Ministry workers hastily re-christened the pastries they put out; literary specialists came up with hot denials that either Indian fable or Greek epic could have penetrated our shores in ancient times, that Shakespeare, Molière or La Fontaine could have wielded any influence on any Russian writer. Dramatists wrote plays dealing with Soviet scientists—or composers or architects—who were slavish in their devotion to Weisman, or to jazz, or to the skyscraper, respectively. A great amount of fervor was injected into the campaign, but no one could give a coherent answer to the query against whom

and against what the war was actually being waged.

Russian officers who went to France in 1814 returned with ideas deriving not from the Bourbons but from the French Revolution; the spirit of the Convention inspired the Decembrists. I myself knew French flyers who fought the Nazis on the Soviet front, and then returned to France carrying with them socialist ideas. . . . Capitalism was not successful in its seduction either in 1945 or 1949. Towards the end of the war against Germany I had many talks with our soldiers and officers.

One would say the Germans built good houses, another that the Czechs did better printing than we did; but there was not one of them who sounded enthusiastic about the ideas of the bourgeoisie. What then was the manner in which this "kowtowing" found expression; in our drivers' admiring talk about American machines, or the vogue for imported sweaters among modish Muscovites?

All this meant recognition of the high level of western technical achievement, but not at all of western ideology. No one thought of even bowing to Ford, the politician, or Ford, the thinker, let alone getting down on their knees to him.

Just as no family is without its freaks, we have with us our "stylyagi," our dressed up dolls and dizzy dandies. But there is not one serious Soviet girl who is envious of the spiritual world of these dolls in their modish get-up.

We do however bow low before a Shakespeare, a Rembrandt, a Stendahl—and however low we bow before them, this in no way lowers us.

(It is, incidentally, worth noting, that it was precisely during those years when we were doing battle against "kowtowing" that we were running some really revolting films from Western lands—such as "Tarzan" and others that had no possible claim to artistry, and exerted a harmful influence on children and adolescents.)

I am convinced that cultural exchange between East and West is not at all to the liking of Western politicians, in spite of the speeches they make about the need for it on various gala occasions. They were deeply disturbed when we began translating numerous western writers, when western musicians, actors and artists began to visit our country more frequently and ours to visit theirs.

In the past two or three years a large number of translations of western authors have been published in the Soviet Union, exhibitions of the work of foreign painters have been held, tours by companies of foreign actors organized. Our readers and our audiences displayed a lively interest in these examples of the culture of the West, but I saw nothing in any way resembling "kowtowing."

Naturally Soviet readers like the works of Hemingway, Greene, Remarque, Vailland, Caldwell, Carlo Levi. There is no question about their being good. Yet, more excitement has been generated among Soviet readers—and this is altogether understandable—by some of the books our young Soviet authors have been writing, weak enough from the standpoint of art, but digging into problems of our own Soviet life.

Naturally, our audiences were en-

thusiastic about the excellent work of the "National French Theater." But people of the older generation, watching their performances, remembered the productions staged by Meyerhold, Vakhtangov, Tairov, which in their time influenced the development of the art of the French theater.

I heard many impassioned arguments here at the Picasso exhibition. At exhibitions of the artist's work held in Paris, London, Rome, people also argued hotly. Some of our own painters have an immense admiration for the genius of Picasso. They have spoken with profound respect of the complex path pursued by the artist; and yet there was scarcely one of them who was moved to go back to his studio and turn out a "Picasso" canvas. Picasso should, of course, be studied, like every great artist, but not imitated; his works are too deeply branded not alone with the special marks of his genius, but also with the brand of the tragic world he lives in.

The problem is not that occasionally some bad film from the West, or some inane play or off-color vaudeville turn put on by a foreign touring company, may find fans among us. The unaccustomed is always good for an hour's relaxation. It would be better, of course, if there were a more serious approach to vaudeville in this country; what we need is to combat our own home-grown variety of vulgarity, not to import this item from abroad. But nevertheless, I shall never believe that a farce of the type of "Alarm in the Night" can really effect the spiritual world of our Soviet audiences.

Soviet people are not going to be

corrupted by bourgeois ideology, for the reason that they possess a higher ideology of their own. This is true, also, because there is not a single authentic writer or poet in the West who assumes the role of defender of the capitalist world in his writing. Whatever the attitude of Caldwell, Mauriac or Moravia may be in relation to communism, since they are real writers they do not eulogize the capitalist world, but on the contrary expose its fearful sores. For a long time I have not seen a single novel important as a work of art, or a good film which failed to reflect the No Exit tragedy of bourgeois society. In these novels there are no slogans, no moral conclusions, but each and every one of them bear witness to the urgent need for a change to different and humane relationships, to a better form of society.

PART III

Western detractors of Soviet culture like to gloat over every badly written Soviet novel, but dislike any discussion of the great contribution with which Soviet scientists, writers and artists have enriched world culture. A year ago George Duhamel declared that Russia, up to 1917, gave the world great scientists, writers and composers, but that after that year, when it "turned away from the West," the luster of Russian culture became tarnished. It is quite true that Soviet literature has as yet no Leo Tolstoy; and also true that agreeable as some of Duhamel's stories may be, he is no Balzac or Stendahl. And France has not turned away from "The West"—on the contrary, she keeps her eyes turned westward quite consistently. And yet no

writer equalling the great authors of the past in depth and scope has emerged during the last 40-year period, either in France or in the rest of Western Europe.

Two phenomena which perhaps may have some surface similarity, are in essence, quite distinct and attributable to different causes. A magazine of France's left Catholics, "Esprit," in criticizing the culture of socialist society, ill-advisedly speaks of "sclerosis." But it happens that the sclerosis of old age is a typical trait of bourgeois society, and as such responsible for the impoverishment of western culture. The ailments of socialist society are connected with its growth, they are the ailments of adolescence.

Some years ago I wrote that it is much more difficult for an artist to portray a growing, changing society than a society already formed and at a standstill. In some cases failure overtakes some Soviet novelist because he lacks a comprehensive and profound knowledge of his characters. The causes for the decline of western literature are of another nature: too often in the west we witness the pursuit of the exotic, the cult of the exceptional or even of the pathological. It seems at times, that one or another author, bored with depicting what has already been described by his predecessors, and hot on the trail of the new, forgets the true duty of the writer: to reveal man, defend man, help man to rise to his full stature.

In speaking thus I am far from claiming that Soviet writers or Soviet artists have contributed all that they might have contributed. I have made known my ideas about the problems we face, written at

length about the things holding back the further development of our culture. But at this moment I am continuing my answer to Duhamel, and together with him, many of our hostile critics in the West who try to deny our undeniable achievements.

I hesitate to speak of the successes of Soviet science; this is rather a task for someone who is better informed on the subject. But I will say that I have had the opportunity of talking with leading Western scientists, many of them definitely not sympathetic to communism; and that all of them showed that they held the work of Soviet physicists and mathematicians in high esteem. The men who make the Nobel awards are not guilty of undue love for the Soviet Union; and if a Soviet chemist wins the Nobel prize it is not because he is Soviet, but in spite of it.

Is it possible, in all honesty, to speak about contemporary music and not name Prokofiev and Shostakovich? Is it possible to deny the immense influence which Eisenstein, Pudovkin and Dovzhenko have exerted on the development of the most advanced cinema art of the West?

I have read scores of articles by western writers and journalists bent on proving that Soviet literature simply does not exist. They come back to the statement too often, repeat it too desperately, for me to believe they are sincere. It is not the non-existence of Soviet literature which agitates them but its incontestable existence. They say: "Of all the translations of Russian novels coming out there isn't a single one you can read through to the end." be. The fact that some of our critics

But not only do they themselves read these novels through, but they are bitterly aware that millions and millions of western readers are reading Soviet novels.

One of the Italian literati writes: "In the Soviet Union they stopped publication of the works of outstanding writers, like Babel, Bagritsky and Ilf and Petrov a long time ago."

A third-rate French critic observes condescendingly: "If there ever was a Soviet literature it existed only up to 1934."

An American journalist declares: "Soviet novels are superficial and untrue; they have only one aim—to embellish their Soviet heroes. . . ."

I should like to answer these assertions.

Yes, for almost 20 years we stopped printing Babel in our country; we reprinted the poetry of Bagritsky and the satires of Ilf and Petrov only rarely and grudgingly. If the Italian man of letters who writes about this had looked through our magazines and our newspapers he would have seen that we spoke about this wrong before he did; it is one of those mistakes which cannot be repeated following the Twentieth Congress of the Party.

Absurdly and unscrupulously, such mistakes have been represented as emanating from the essential character of Soviet society, whereas they in fact involve the violation of those principles on which Soviet society is built. However distinctive and divergent the creative individuality of Babel, Bagritsky and Ilf and Petrov, they were all profoundly Soviet writers, and drew their inspiration from the Soviet people. The fate of Babel was tragic: he was slandered and de-

stroyed by base people. Soon his collected works will be issued, and reading them, everyone will realize the close bonds of this writer with the Soviet concept of the world, and the dishonesty of counterposing him to other Soviet writers as alien.

It is not true that Soviet literature was strong up to 1934 and since then has been in eclipse. It is impossible to divide up the work of writers into brief segments of time. Leading Soviet writers gave us excellent books up to 1934 and after it: it is sufficient to name A. Tolstoy, Sholokhov, Prishvin, Fadayevev, Babel, Fedin, Tynianov, Leonov, Paustovsky and Katayev. I feel that neither in French, English, nor American literature, has the Second World War been presented with such depth and humanity as in Soviet literature. This is understandable—together with their people the Soviet writers fought, suffered, had faith; many died soldiers' deaths. The books of Panova, Nekrassov, Grossman, Kazakevich, Bek have been translated into scores of languages, and I have often heard the most heartfelt and warm praise for these books from foreign readers.

It is far from true that all Soviet writers "embellished their heroes." Yet, there were of course bad works, whose defects lay in the fact that their mediocre authors, in attempting to "embellish" their heroes, in fact only debased and impoverished the spiritual world of Soviet man.

In France the translation of the diary of the girl from Kashin—Ina Konstantinova, who died in battle—was a great success. This diary was given me by her parents, no one added a word to it. It gives a true picture of a young Soviet girl's radi-

ant spirit, first as a school girl, then as a partisan, not because any professional writer has added to it, but because the girl Ina Konstantinova represented all that was finest in the Soviet people.

"How the Steel was Tempered" by Ostrovsky is an inspiring human document, a rare expression of purity, of generous spirit, and of humanity. This book cannot be separated from the world of which it was born; it has been read, is being read and will be read for a long time to come by the youth of the whole world, because men trapped in a deep mine need a breath of fresh air, and the hopes of the youth of other lands find close bonds with what I would call the selflessness of our people.

In the development of any young society poetry outstrips prose; Soviet poetry—from Mayakovsky to Martynov, from Yessenin to Tvardovsky, from Pasternak to Zablotsky, from Bagritsky to Smelyakov, from Kupala to Tychina, from Titsiana Tabidze to Samed Vurgun, from Isaakyan to Markish—is richer than any other poetry of the last forty years.

We have no need to be ashamed before the detractors in the West. Their attempts to sweep aside Soviet literature, and all Soviet culture, are stupid more than anything else. Those circles of Western intellectuals who are now going through a period of inner turmoil, know very well what we have contributed to world culture. It may be that they say now: "We want much more." We too want much more. We are far from being drunk with success.

The Soviet teacher who wrote to me had good reasons for writing that we in our country do not have enough good books. She has the right to argue along these lines; she, but not the critic of "Figaro Litteraire."

We can look back with pride, but we wish to look ahead: to sit at one's desk working is harder than listening to anniversary greetings, but more rewarding. Now, when so many unjust accusations are being hurled at us, it is necessary for us, maintaining our composure, not to stand still, but to move ahead. We must consider with the utmost seriousness what is the cause of those difficulties which at times hinder our growth. *(To be continued)*

SOVIET WRITERS URGE CULTURAL EXCHANGE

ON APRIL 15 a statement was issued by Sergei Mikhalkov, Chairman of the Foreign Commission of the Soviet Writers' Union, welcoming their Government's statement at the recent session of the Supreme Soviet on behalf of increased cultural cooperation with other countries. Expressing the hope that there could be a greater exchange of visits between Soviet and other writers, Mikhalkov said:

"Developments in world literature are a constant source of interest to Soviet writers. The best works of foreign writers are studied in USSR colleges. . . . We feel that each nation's literature helps to enrich the literature of all mankind and thus promotes progressive art which serves the cause of peace, freedom and independence."

Book Reviews

SOVIET EDUCATION

a review by

ELIZABETH MOOS

THE CHALLENGE OF SOVIET EDUCATION, by George S. Counts. McGraw-Hill, New York, 1957. 330 p.p. \$6.00.

THE purpose of Dr. Counts' latest work is to "provide a comprehensive picture of the Soviet educational system" and especially to describe its use as "a mighty weapon in the cause of communism."

In the process of "proving" that education is indoctrinating the Soviet people with belief in socialism (*not* capitalism), with patriotism, and with devotion to the building of communism, Dr. Counts has compiled 307 pages of quotation and comment. There are some clearly written, fairly objective pages, but these are rare. The person who has enough endurance to read through the wordy and tendentious volume will find statistics on education past and present and some discussion of curriculum and methods—though brief and superficial. The picture of the schools is, however, far from comprehensive. For example, there is not a word about the special schools for the arts, not a word about sports, children's theaters, libraries, etc.

Source material has been selected to prove a point, not to present a complete and truthful picture. With one or two notable exceptions—in historical works—only established anti-Soviet writers are quoted. Much space is given to "Re-education." One might expect this chapter to deal with the remarkable theories of Anton Semyonovich Makarenko whose work with juvenile delinquents has profoundly influenced all Soviet teaching, particularly in the field of rehabilitation. We are merely presented with a re-hash of the story of "slave-labor camps."

About two-thirds of the book deals with the past, with Russia and the early days of the revolution. The material is repeti-

tious and frequently confusing. Special emphasis is given to the negative aspects and the reader cannot tell whether the evils described still continue or not. We are told of the repudiation of parents during the first days of the revolution; we are not told of the role parents now play, nor of the importance of parent-school relations in the USSR. We read of the "militarization" of the schools in 1942 (that the USSR was being invaded is not mentioned) but nowhere are we told of any change in the contemporary school picture. This, it seems to me, verges on dishonesty.

Not satisfied with voluminous quotations from firmly anti-Soviet sources, Dr. Counts interjects comment of his own, undocumented. Illustrations abound but I shall quote but a few. We are told in the chapter on the education of the army that "when Hitler marched into the USSR . . . two or three million soldiers defected from the Red Army." With no apparent relation to the subject, we read that "it is true that the mass of the people have not prospered under the Soviet regime" . . . that "the standard of living has not risen appreciably since 1928" . . . that "the difference in compensation . . . is as great in the Soviet Union as in the USA."

Although there are no figures available on the number of policemen in the Soviet Union nor on the number of persons in penal institutions, Dr. Counts does not hesitate to write that the ratio of policemen to teachers and of persons in penal institutions to students is higher than in any non-Communist country. This is in a section devoted to the thesis that—"One of the most characteristic features of the Soviet regime is the fact of widespread and continuing popular hostility and resistance." Such unsupported comments serve no other purpose than to arouse hostility to the Soviet Union.

The story of Soviet educational development is inspiring, exciting. Dr. Counts has managed to make it a dull matter. The real challenge to the American education system in the Soviet educational achievement Dr. Counts does not consider: ending illiteracy in our country, both north and south; providing ten years of schooling for every boy and girl no matter what his color or race; assuring free college education for all who wish it; training more and better

equipped teachers, researchers and scientists.

One cannot recommend the reading of this book for information—past or present. Other better written and more scholarly works are to be found. It is interesting, in a painful way, to read this book and try to follow the confusions and contradictions of a man who is so blinded by his hatred of communism that he cannot write objectively, yet is too much of an educator not to be affected by studying the immense task being done. So Dr. Counts' final section is oddly at variance with the body of his book. Finding the Soviet victory over illiteracy "impressive" and their science program "phenomenal," he warns against hoping for disintegration of the Soviet state through education. Granting that this is possible, but not probable, he goes on to say that:

"The Soviet Union has survived the greatest ordeals—although the average person has not prospered—they take pride in their 'grandiose' achievements. . . . The rigors of the Stalin regime and the entire program of education may have achieved their basic purpose of carrying the Soviet people into a new epoch and a new human image."

To Dr. Counts this seems a threat. For many of us it seems more like a promise.

RUSSIAN MUSIC

A HISTORY OF RUSSIAN MUSIC, by Richard Anthony Leonard. *The Macmillan Co., New York, 1957. 382 p.p. \$6.00.*

ON the credit side of this book is the fact that the author writes about a great number of 19th century musical works with warm appreciation, and it is always pleasant to read a writer who likes his subject. On the debit side is its high and mighty attitude towards the country, an attitude not unfamiliar in books about Russia, past or present. The one justification apparently for the existence of anything Russian, whether social, political or cultural, is the extent to which it meets the author's august approval. We of the "West" are the supreme arbiters not only of taste but of morality as well. This is evident even in the generalizations that

spot the book. "The Russians have always been an isolated people." We might ask, isolated from whom? "One other factor aggravated the cultural backwardness of Russia in the Middle Ages—the extreme dogmatism of the Orthodox Eastern Church." I do not recall that the Western Church in the Middle Ages was a model of liberalism, nor was it the Eastern Church that invented the Inquisition. "To the Russians the West has always been a giant magnet which alternately attracts and repels them."

One could of course add that to the "West," the "East" has also been a "giant magnet," a magnet made up of iron ore, spices, oil, tea, rubber and other profitable raw materials.

The author's smug and self-righteous attitude becomes most harmful to the book, as a worthwhile history, in the ninety pages devoted to Soviet music. If Mr. Leonard had simply offered these pages as his impressions of Soviet music, there would be no quarrel.

Mr. Leonard is arrogant, however, in claiming that this section is a history, when it is obvious that he has not heard or studied the great bulk of compositions by the composers he discusses. Nor has he apparently made any effort to get the feeling of Soviet musical life as a whole, with its music schools, its musical studies, its concert life and perceptive audiences, to which recent American visiting musicians have glowingly testified. He writes of the period of 1917-21 as one of "bloodshed, famine and terror." He offers no inkling that most of the bloodshed was due to the efforts of the highly moral "West" to overthrow the Soviet Union. He finds in Russian music since the revolution a "falling off in quality, vitality and originality." This may or may not be. But the author gives no hint of the fact that the composers rising during this period in the West have offered no abundance of greatness, and also seem to be afflicted by a few problems.

There is no desire on the part of this reviewer to suggest that Soviet music cannot profit by criticism from abroad. It would be more useful, however, if Mr. Leonard would show a consciousness of some notes in Western eyes.

SIDNEY FINKELSTEIN

MARXISM AND THE STATE

THE CRITIQUE OF CAPITALIST DEMOCRACY, by Stanley W. Moore. *Paine-Whitman. New York. 1957, 180 pp. \$4.50.*

THIS BOOK is well worth the attention of readers seriously interested in understanding the Marxist attitude to capitalist democracy. A carefully organized presentation of the writings of Marx, Engels and Lenin on the theory of the state gathered from at least twenty of their books, this is in no sense a popularization.

Professor Moore states that his book "presents no evidence for or against their theory. It presents no alternative theory. It can help only those who take seriously their responsibility to find out what these thinkers actually say, before deciding in the light of evidence to what extent their statements are true."

In the midst of the spate of books now pouring from the press which attempt to "explain" all aspects of Marxist theory according to their authors' preconception, Professor Moore's book in its objective presentation of the ideas of its chief theorists by means of quotation, careful paraphrase and skillful organization is a most useful contribution.

A hundred years of "explanations" and "interpretations" of Marxism has left wide confusion—a confusion in which the current "interpreters" flourish unchallenged. Professor Moore by leading us back to the actual writings of Marx, Engels and Lenin, helps provide that clarity which alone makes possible an understanding of one of the basic problems of our time.

M. Y.

NEW RECORDINGS

A TALENTED but little publicized ensemble from Czechoslovakia, the Smetana Quartet, has been keeping alive the brotherly principle of cultural interchange, with a Spring American tour. These four musicians, all of them in their thirties, perform without notes, and with a passionate absorption in the style and spirit of the music they are playing which makes every performance an exciting one. At the con-

cert I caught in New York they opened with a polished, elegant performance of Mozart's Sixteenth Quartet. Then they electrified the audience with a performance of the First Quartet by their countryman, Laos Janacek (1854-1928) a somber, dramatic and difficult work, which sounded as if every note came from the players' hearts. Last was the Quartet Op. 105 by Antonin Dvorak, which showed that however much we may think we know Dvorak, a group from his homeland can still tell us some new things about him. Let us hope this group comes back next season. Meanwhile Angel Records offers a disk which exhibits the beauty and refined playing of this group in two Mozart Quartets, No. 15 in D minor and No. 16 in E flat (Angel 45000).

From the Monitor Company come three records devoted to the big Soviet Union virtuosos. Sviatoslav Richter, whose style and temperament remind us of giants of a past era like De Pachmann or Friedmann, plays with orchestra two piano concertos, Rachmaninoff's No. 1 and Saint-Saens' No. 5. The second work leaves me a little bored, but the playing is exemplary (Monitor MC 2004). Emil Gilels and Yakov Zak give a beautiful account of Mozart's Concerto for Two Pianos, K. 365. The other side of the disk offers Saint-Saens' witty "Carnival of the Animals," in which the same two pianists have a good time, but the high point is Daniel Shafran's performance on the 'cello of "The Swan." (Monitor MC 2006). A third disk offers a chamber recital. David and Igor Oistrakh (father and son) play a little-known Bach Sonata for Two Violins, in C major; David Oistrakh gives a warm reading of Mozart's very great Sonata in B flat, K. 454, with Vladimir Yampolsky at the piano; Gilels, Rastropovich and Kogan collaborate in Beethoven's early and pleasant Trio in E flat, No. 9 (Monitor MC 2006).

SIDNEY FINKELSTEIN

CORRECTION

Sixth World Youth Festival
MOSCOW—JULY 28 - AUGUST 11
ALL-INCLUSIVE COST IS \$695.97

Write to:

YOUTH FESTIVAL COMMITTEE
Main P.O. Box 5793—Chicago, Illinois

THE PADLOCKED SCHOOL

There is a padlock on the door of the California Labor School in San Francisco.

After an eleven-year struggle for freedom to teach the truth as we see it, agents of the U.S. Government padlocked our doors.

WILL YOU DEFEND YOUR OWN RIGHT TO THINK AND LEARN BY HELPING US OPEN OUR SCHOOL DOOR?

For information on how you can help:

"THE CASE OF THE PADLOCKED SCHOOL"

In brief—25¢; Full statement—\$1.00

Write to:

HOLLAND ROBERTS, Director
Box 392, San Francisco, California

NEW SOVIET FILMS

THE IMMORTAL GARRISON

BORIS GODUNOV

THE GADFLY

THE MEXICAN

PRIVATE IVAN

Watch for:

THE FORTY-FIRST

Artkino Pictures, Inc.

723 SEVENTH AVE., NEW YORK 19

Telephone: Circle 5-6570

Reprints

HUNGARY IN TRAVAIL

By JESSICA SMITH

10c each—6 for 50c—12 for \$1.00

22 pages

LAND REFORM IN NEW CHINA

By D. N. PRITT

10c each—6 for 50c—12 for \$1.00

22 pp.

BOUND VOLUMES

Of 1954-5 New World Review
Indexed

\$4.00 each

Indexes alone, 35c each

ORDER ALL THE ABOVE THROUGH

New World Review

7th Floor

34 West 15th Street, New York 11

For Subscriptions

NEW WORLD REVIEW

34 West 15th St., 7th fl., New York 10

I enclose \$2.50 (Canadian \$3.00, foreign \$4.00) for a

new subscription

renewal

Name

Address

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

The first book of its kind!

Contains the documented story of how, as the *Washington Post* said, "Corliss Lamont deliberately defied the McCarthy Subcommittee . . . in order to bring about a court test of the subcommittee's authority." From the account of the subpoena to Lamont's final vindication in the U.S. Court of Appeals, a readable book and a valuable aid in assessing the strange career of Senator Joseph McCarthy.

THE LAMONT CASE

History of a Congressional Investigation

Edited with commentary by

PHILIP WITTENBERG

Introduction by

HORACE M. KALLEN

who writes:

"So far as I know, there is not another such book whose subject is the defense of his rights by a citizen on his own, against the Goliath-power of the agents of government and whose method is the reproduction of documents as disclosure of the nature of the forces engaged. A unique book, it seems to me the first of the kind; its publication will illuminate the struggle for our civil liberties and for the conservation of our society as a free society."

\$5.00 at your booksellers or from

HORIZON PRESS

Dept. NW, 220 West 42 Street, New York 36, N. Y.