

file -
HHH speech
carboms.

International Peasant Union

THE SEVENTH CONGRESS

September 2 and 3, 1961

Washington, D. C.

HIGHLIGHTS:

SOVIET ATOMIC TESTS CONDEMNED

"We must never give up the principle of self-determination."

**SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
PAGE 6**

"We will never tire of repeating that for our nations enslaved by communism we also demand freedom."

**STANISLAW MIKOLAJCZYK,
President of the IPU**

Contents page 2



**MONTHLY BULLETIN
SEPT.-OCTOBER 1961
11th YEAR**

INTERNATIONAL PEASANT UNION

President:

STANISLAW MIKOLAJCZYK

Secretary-General and Editor:

DR. GEORGE M. DIMITROV

MEMBER PARTIES OF THE I.P.U.

Albanian Democratic Agrarian Party • Bulgarian National Agrarian Union • Croatian Peasant Party • Czechoslovak Republican Agrarian Party • United Farmers and Small-holders Party of Estonia • Hungarian Peasant Association • New Farmers and Small-holders Party of Latvia • Populist Peasant Union of Lithuania • Polish Peasant Party • Romanian National Peasant Party • Democratic Party of Slovakia • Yugoslav-Serbian Agrarian Union • Slovenian Peasant Union.

OFFICE

724 Ninth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Telephone: STerling 3-6664

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

285 Central Park West, New York 24, N. Y.

Telephone SUsquehanna 7-1377-8

REGIONAL OFFICES

69 Edith Grove, London S.W. 10
18 bis, Rue Brunel, Paris 17

Via Padova 90/4, Rome
Moltkestrasse 23, Bonn

THE BULLETIN OF THE INTERNATIONAL PEASANT UNION

EDITORIAL OFFICE

285 Central Park West
New York 24, N. Y.
Tel. SUsquehanna 7-1377-8

HENRIKAS BLAZAS,
Managing Editor

This material is filed with the Department of Justice where the required statement under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of the International Peasant Union, 724 9th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., as an agent of the Central Eastern European peasant parties is available for public inspection. Registration does not indicate approval or disapproval of this material by the United States Government.

Contents:

<i>The Opening and First Plenary Session: THE CAPTIVE PEOPLE ARE IN THE FOREFRONT OF THE STRUGGLE AGAINST COMMUNISM</i>	3
Stanislaw Mikolajczyk	
ADDRESSES AND MESSAGES	4
WE MUST NEVER GIVE UP THE PRINCIPLE OF SELF-DETERMINATION	6
Senator Hubert H. Humphrey	
<i>Second Plenary Session: THE WORLD STANDS IN THE SHADOW OF COMMUNIST THREATS</i>	10
Stanislaw Mikolajczyk	
THE COMMUNISTS ARE OUT TO WIN OVER THE PEASANT COUNTRIES OF THE GLOBE	14
Dr. George M. Dimitrov	
<i>Third and Closing Plenary Session: INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS</i>	17
RESOLUTION	17
INTERNAL AGRARIAN AFFAIRS	18
CULTURAL AFFAIRS	20
WOMEN	21
AGRARIAN YOUTH	22
<i>Countries of Eastern and Central Europe Behind the Iron Curtain</i>	
FOOD SHORTAGES FOR AT LEAST ANOTHER FIVE YEARS	23
Vasil Andoni	
BULGARIAN ECONOMY IS A REPLICA IN MINIATURE OF THE SOVIET	25
Slavi Neikov	
TO TRANSFORM A HUMAN BEING INTO A MACHINE IS A CRIME	27
Dr. Vladko Macek	
THE DESTRUCTION OF THE FREE PEASANTS CONTINUES	27
Dr. Juraj Krnjevic	
RED AGRARIAN INTERNATIONAL REVIVED IN PRAGUE	28
THE MUCH ADVERTISED ECONOMIC PROGRESS IS NOTHING BUT A TISSUE OF SOVIET LIES	30
HALF OF LATVIA'S ARABLE LAND LIES FALLOW	32
Alexander Ozolins	
THE RURAL POPULATION IS EXPOSED TO UNTOLD MISERY	34
Juozas Audenas	
THE MOST OPPRESSED COUNTRY IN THE SOVIET ORBIT	35
Cornel Bianu	
COLLECTIVIZATION AND REGIMEN- TATION HAVE RUINED AGRICULTURE	37
BILLIONS OF AID DOLLARS HAVE GONE DOWN THE COMMUNIST DRAIN	38
Dr. Milan Gavrilovic	

Material contained in our Bulletin may be reproduced without charge or obligation. The International Peasant Union would appreciate clippings if this material is reprinted.



The Central Committee of the International Peasant Union at the opening of the Seventh Congress. From left to right: Mr. Halil Maci, Mr. Alexander Ozolins, Mr. Ferenc Nagy, Dr. George M. Dimitrov, Mr. Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, the President, Dr. Vladko Macek, Mrs. Alena Devenis, Dr. Augustin Popa and Dr. Josef Lettrich.

THE OPENING AND FIRST PLENARY SESSION OF THE SEVENTH CONGRESS

The Berlin crisis, Soviet resumption of atomic tests, Khrushchev's threats to attack the Free World, oppression of the captive nations of Eastern and Central Europe, defense of freedom and democracy against Communist tyranny everywhere—such was the background of the deliberations when over two hundred and fifty delegates met at the Seventh Congress of the International Peasant Union on September 2 and 3, 1961, at the Sheraton Park Hotel in Washington, D.C.

Mr. STANISLAW MIKOLAJCZYK, the President of the International Peasant Union opened the Congress with a short address and Reverend HUGH BROGAN delivered the invocation.

After the Congress heard addresses delivered personally by distinguished guests, and messages received from officials, prominent individuals, and various organizations in many parts of the World, the floor was given to the prominent Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, who was the main speaker at the Seventh Congress.

THE CAPTIVE PEOPLE OF CENTRAL EASTERN-EUROPE ARE IN THE FOREFRONT OF THE STRUGGLE AGAINST COMMUNISM

By STANISLAW MIKOLAJCZYK, IPU President, Opening Speech to the Seventh Congress of the International Peasant Union

Honorable Guests, Delegates to the Seventh Congress of the International Peasant Union, Ladies and Gentlemen:

It is my duty and honor to open the Seventh Congress of the International Peasant Union.

We are gathered here, in these days of great international tension and in the midst of a most dangerous world situation, to discuss not only our organizational problems but first and foremost the fate of millions of our brothers and sisters conquered and subjugated

by the Red Armies, ruled by cruel Communist dictatorship, and exploited for the benefit of Communist world aggression and Soviet imperialism and colonialism. I refer to our brothers and sisters in Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Albania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria.

Their fate and future are closely connected with world events. Therefore, the motto of our last Congress is once again the motto of today's Congress: "THE PEACE AND SECURITY OF THE FREE

WORLD ARE INDIVISIBLE FROM FREEDOM AND INDEPENDENCE FOR THE COMMUNIST-SUBJUGATED PEOPLES."

More than ever, during these difficult days, the eyes of our people are directed to Washington.

The subjugated and exploited peoples of Central and Eastern Europe, who are in the forefront of the struggle against communism, have been resisting and ceaselessly fighting communism by the widespread use of passive resistance. They fervently hope that, despite Khrushchev's rocket-rattling and blackmailing following the famous speech by President Kennedy which included a demand for their freedom, Washington will produce the initiative and the determined policy which will finally bring about the fulfillment of their wishes for freedom for themselves and independence for their nations.

The hopes and desires of these nations, some of them with a history of more than a thousand years of national existence, are strengthened when they see how many new nations in various parts of the globe are gaining their independence.

They also hope that the just determination to defend the freedom of the people of Berlin will be extended

to the whole of Central and Eastern Europe, for this could also result in national freedom and independence for the peoples of the various republics of the Soviet Union itself.

At this time, I would like to ask you to rise, for a few moments, in tribute to the memory of those who have left us forever, those who fell in the struggle for the freedom of our nations during the Nazi and Soviet invasions of our countries, which precipitated the outbreak of the Second World War on September 1, 1939, just twenty-two years ago; those who died while being deported to the Soviet Union and in Soviet labor camps and prisons, and those who died in Communist concentration camps and dungeons.

I would also like to request a few moments of silence to honor the memory of the late Johannes Sikkar, former Prime Minister of Estonia, our dear friend, who, as a member of our Central Committee, was with us during the last Congress and later died in exile in Sweden. Let us also honor the memory of the late Bohuslav Vosnjak, the Slovenian Agrarian leader and member of the Central Committee of the International Peasant Union, who died in June 1959.

Thank you.

ADDRESSES AND MESSAGES TO THE SEVENTH CONGRESS

DELIVERED PERSONALLY:

Dr. S. A. BACKIS, on behalf of Lithuanian Legation in Washington, D.C.; Mr. HORACE E. HENDERSON, on behalf of Free Europe Committee and its President; Mr. V. SIDZIKAUSKAS, Chairman of the Assembly of Captive European Nations; Mr. S. OSTUTCKY, and Dr. J. SLAVIK, on behalf of the Council of Free Czechoslovakia; Dr. A. HEIDRICH, on behalf of the Political Committee of the Council of Free Czechoslovakia; Dr. V. Meyer, on behalf of the Socialist Union of Eastern-Central Europe in exile; General Dr. I. MODELSKI, on behalf of the Polish National Democratic Committee; Mr. N. ANTONOV, on behalf of the Bulgarian National Committee; Dr. A. KOPRENSKA, on behalf of the National Democratic Committee for a Free Albania.

The shortage of space prevents us from publishing the addresses and even excerpts from them.

MESSAGES OF U.S. GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS:

Hon. T. WANAMAKER, Department of State, on behalf of Secretary DEAN RUSK, Under-Secretary CHESTER BOWLES, and Under-Secretary GEORGE W. BALL.

Honor. EDWARD R. MURROW, Director U.S. Information Agency.

FOREIGN REPRESENTATIONS TO THE UNITED STATES:

Honor. J. KAIIV, Acting Consul General of Estonia.

U.S. SENATORS:

Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER of Kentucky; Senator JACOB K. JAVITS of New York; Senator PHILIP A. HART of Michigan; Senator KENNETH B. KEATING of New York; Senator FRANK J.

LAUSCHE of Ohio; Senator WILLIAM PROXMIER of Wisconsin; Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL of Mass.; Senator BENJAMIN A. SMITH of Mass. and Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS of Delaware.

U.S. CONGRESSMEN:

Repr. VICTOR L. ANFUSO of New York; Repr. FRANK J. BECKER of New York; Repr. GLENN CUNNINGHAM of Nebraska; Repr. EMILIO O. DADDARIO of Conn.; Repr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS of New Jersey; Repr. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI of Illinois; Repr. CHARLES C. DIGGS of Michigan; Repr. JOHN D. DINGELL of Michigan; Repr. JOHN LESINSKI of Michigan; Repr. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB of Calif.; Repr. ANCHER NELSON of Minnesota; Repr. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI of Illinois; Repr. JOHN J. ROONEY of New York; Repr. DON I. SHORT of N. Dakota; Repr. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI of Wisconsin; Repr. T. J. DULSKI of New York; Repr. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI of Illinois, Repr. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL of Maryland and Repr. LOUIS C. RABAUT of Michigan.

U.S. ORGANIZATIONS AND PERSONALITIES:

Hon. JOHN RICHARDSON, JR., President of Free Europe Committee; Hon. BERNARD YARROW, Senior Vice-President of Free Europe Committee; Mr. LAVERNE BALDWIN, Free Europe Committee.

MESSAGES FROM ABROAD:

Mr. JEREMIAS U. MONTEMAYOR, President of Free Farmers, Philippines; Mr. D'EMIL ROCHE, President of Economic and Social Council of France; Mrs. SUZANNE LABIN, President of the International Conference of Political Warfare, France; Mr.

Honorable John F. Kennedy,
President of the United States of America,

The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Mr. President:

The Seventh Congress of the International Peasant Union held on September 2 and 3 in Washington, D.C., speaking for the majority of the peasants of the captive Central and Eastern European nations, has authorized us to send to you and through you to the great American nation our warmest greetings and to express their great satisfaction with your dignified, courageous, and wise stand on the so-called Berlin crisis created by the Soviet dictatorship.

We all believe that you consider the Berlin issue an issue of the fight not only for the legitimate rights of the victorious democratic powers to stay in Berlin but also for the freedom and independence and the right of self-determination of all captive Eastern and Central European nations through free and unfettered elections under international control. We believe you will stand firm on your position and be ready to resist the Communist aggressive plans until our victory over the Communist imperialistic and colonial domination and exploitation of the captive nations and over the treacherous plans of Communist aggression to impose itself on all freedom-loving humanity, which Khrushchev intends to bury.

The hope of all the freedom-loving captive, but not defeated, nations is in the mighty and invincible American nation under your wise, courageous, and dynamic leadership. Our captive nations are strongly inspired by your readiness to help and to make sacrifices in the fight for freedom and human dignity, as you stated solemnly in your inauguration address. The spirit of resistance in our nations is greater than ever before, and they have unshakable faith in you and are ready to follow your leadership with all necessary sacrifices in the name of your historical and God-blessed mission.

STANISLAW MIKOLAJCZYK, President
Dr. GEORGE M. DIMITROV, Secretary-General

EUGENE L. METZ, Free Europe Organizations and Publications, France; Mr. ROGER KAEPPELIN, President of the Federation of Association of Aid to Refugees of E. C. Europe, France; Professor SALVADOR DE MADARIAGA, President, Liberal Intern., G. Britain; Mr. MAXIME BLOCK-MASCART, French Committee for a Free Europe, France; Professor Dr. STEFAN GLASER, Belgium; Dr. EUGEN GERSTENMAIER, Speaker of the West German Bundestag, Germany; Mr. JOSEF JOSTEN, Editor F.C.I. News Agency, England.

MESSAGES FROM EXILES ABROAD:

Professor STANISLAW KOT, Chairman of the Supreme Council of the Polish Peasant Party, England; Mr. A. J. GYDZIK, President, Association of Polish Students in Exile, England; Dr. MILOS TUPANIANIN, Representative of Yugoslav-Serbian Agrarian Union, England; Mr. F. J. WILK, Chairman of the Polish Peasant Party in Great Britain; Mr. L. ELIAS, Acting Chairman of the Czechoslovak Republican Party in Great Britain; Mr. ABAS ERMENJI, President, Albanian Democratic National Committee, France; Mr. M. KWIATKOWSKI, Editor of the Polish Daily *Narodowiec*, France; Mr. J. BOROWCZAK, Secretary-General of the Polish Agrarian Youth (WICI) France; Mr. T. CHCIUK-CELT, Radio Free Europe, Polish Desk, Germany; Dr. V. SVBODA, Political Representative of the IPU in Germany; Messers SOLTYS and HABER, on behalf of Polish Peasant Party in Germany; Mr. S. SZYM-

CZEWSKI, Polish Peasant Party, Germany; Mr. VASIL ANDONI, Secretary-General of the Albanian Democratic Agrarian Party, Balli Kombeter, Italy; Messers AKSEL MARK and ENNO PENNO, Chairman and Secretary-General of the United Farmers' and Smallholders' Party of Estonia, Sweden; Mr. AUGUST REI, President of Estonian National Council, Sweden; Messers P. MISZCZAK and K. BIZNIA, Polish Peasant Party, Switzerland; Mr. J. ZWOLINSKI, Polish Peasant Party, Denmark; Messers A. PERCZAK and E. PAPCIAK, Polish Peasant Party, Holland.

EXILE ORGANIZATIONS AND PERSONALITIES IN THE U.S. AND CANADA

Monsign. BELA VARGA, President of the Hungarian National Committee, New York; Dr. A. TRIMAKAS, President of the Supreme Committee for Liberation of Lithuania, New York; Dr. S. T. TUNG, Representing the Republic of Free China, California; Mr. R. BOSSY, Chairman of the Liberal Democratic Union, New York; Mr. A. KUTT, Chairman of the Committee for a Free Estonia, New York; Mr. A. LELL, President of the Estonian-American Citizens Association, New York; Mr. S. P. TURKIEWICZ, President, Polish Roman Catholic Union, Chicago, Ill.; Mr. B. BILOGAN, Editor of the Polish Monthly *Orka*, Chicago, Ill.; Mr. R. TURDIV, New Jersey; R. BANKA, Toronto, Canada; Mr. J. E. MARKUS, Toronto, Canada; Mr. I. KRZNARIC, Toronto, Canada.



WE MUST NEVER GIVE UP THE PRINCIPLE OF SELF-DETERMINATION

Address by SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
the main speaker of the Seventh Congress of the
International Peasant Union.

Mr. President, my good friends of the International Peasant Union:

I am going to visit with you and talk about a few things that are on my mind and, if possible, to state what I believe is, and what ought to be, the policy of the United States of America. I don't say that in false pride or, as we would say, to pat ourselves on the back as Americans. I say it because it is a fact.

There are two great centers of political power in the world today. One of them is in Moscow and one of them is in Washington, D.C. We in this part of the world must understand this, and also understand that with leadership comes the responsibility to lead, and with the responsibility comes the necessity of sacrifice.

THE RESUMPTION OF NUCLEAR TESTS BY THE SOVIET UNION REPRESENTS A REVERSION TO POWER POLITICS

And so today I shall speak of what I hope will be the continuing policy of our country and what I hope may well be some of the changes, or should I say, the adjustments of policies of our country. This is an appropriate time to talk about it, too. I can only say this: that the International Peasant Union must have prophetic vision to have called your meeting for today, the second, and tomorrow, the third day of September. The fact that it is just thirty-six hours after the resumption of nuclear weapons testing by the Soviet Union indicates to me that you have more than ordinary vision, because the setting for your gathering is surely appropriate. This resumption of nuclear tests by the Soviet Union is symbolic of what we are talking about and what you are talking about. What does it mean? Well, first of all, it means that the Soviet Union, in complete disregard of the resolution adopted unanimously in the United Nations condemning these nuclear tests, violated this agreement. That's number one.

Number two—its represents again the breaking of an agreement, of an understanding, between the Soviet Union, the United States and Great Britain and the other countries of the world, relating to the suspension of nuclear tests. But more significantly, it represents the application in power-politics of the use of terror, of fear, of massive destructive power in Soviet foreign policy.

IN THE FACE OF SOVIET THREATS DISARMAMENT IS IMPOSSIBLE

I have been one of those, and I say it without any apology, that has sought for years to slow down the arms race. Because I am convinced that over a long

period of time an uncontrolled arms race will lead to total catastrophe for humanity. But I do not believe in slowing down the arms race at the expense of one side: namely our side.

I have never believed in unilateral disarmament. I have never believed in our side's disarming either by design, out of policy, or because we wanted to pinch pennies a little bit.

Now let me make it quite clear. The people of the United States are not militaristically minded, and you know it. Our longing and our hope and our prayer has been for peace. It is very difficult to get the people of this nation to want to even support a major, powerful military establishment, it runs contrary to our religious, political, and ethical convictions. We don't believe in it essentially and what we have done, we had to do almost against our will. We have done it, and we have armed. We have spent billions for armament, billions for research, billions for what we call our defense, because there is a powerful, evil force that works in this world, that knows no limits to its appetite or its ambition. That force is the force of Communist totalitarianism, and it is because of that force that we have been compelled, as you know, to take counter-measures.

I have been one of those that sought for years for a slowing-down of the arms race. I am an advocate of disarmament with effective controls, of what I call reasonable, sensible, effective disarmament for all sides, not just one side.

So I have tried for three years now, and longer than that in fact, to seek an agreement to stop the testing of nuclear weapons. Why? Well, first of all, if there is continued testing of nuclear weapons, it won't be long before many other countries will have them. And if that happens, it won't be long before many of them will have the means of delivery; namely the rockets and the missiles. And when they get the means of delivery, plus the thermo-nuclear warheads, you will never know from whence the attack may come. The possibility of surprise attack is magnified and intensified every day, and maybe just because I love life in the fullness of its meaning as God Almighty intended it to be, and because I want other people to enjoy the pleasures of life and the pursuit of happiness, I, as one public official, have sought to halt this arms race before it destroys us.

THE TRUTH TURNED UPSIDE DOWN BY SOVIET PROPAGANDA

And yet, for some peculiar reason, we Americans have had a difficult time getting the people of the

world to understand that here in America is the true spirit of peace. The Soviet Union has announced through its propaganda system that it is the protector of the peace, that it wants peace. With its dove of peace, with its propaganda, it has convinced hundreds of millions of people in the world that it is the agent of peace and that we are the agents of war and destruction. It's as if the world were upside down.

You know, they've re-defined words, they've changed the meanings of words. They talk about a democratic peoples' republic—which is not democratic, which isn't a republic and which has no relationship to the people at all. And we have let them get away with it, and one of the reasons, I think, we have let them get away with this is because we have not had the propaganda setup that is required to dramatize what we mean by democracy and the people and by the republic and by peace.

I see it in Congress again and again. Many times I hear my fellow colleagues say, "Well, they ought to understand around the world that we are democratic, people ought to know that we believe in constitutional government. And people around the world ought surely to know that we believe in peace."

My good friends, I have come to the conclusion that people don't know. And I wish that our political propaganda were half as effective as our commercial advertisers.

WE SHALL TRY TO DO SOMETHING ABOUT IT

It is a shame that this great United States of America, with its wealth, its talent and its skill, its ability to project and to send out a message, was not able to have the people of the world really understand what it stands for, what it works for and what it sacrifices for throughout the world. It is incredible to me. And I know why we are not doing it: because we are not trying.

We can do anything we want to do, but the question is, do we want to do it? Now I talked yesterday afternoon to a gentleman who came back from Latin America. He was at that conference in Uruguay. This man told me what the Communists and the Castroites are up to. Eighty per cent of the advertising carried in many Latin American newspapers today, according to him, is placed there by Communist money to keep them alive. Let me make this clear. This great rich America and the Free World are doing little or nothing to keep alive the democratic free press in many parts of the world. We are letting it be taken over by Communist goals and even Castro goals.

HOW TO WIN THE BATTLE FOR MEN'S MINDS

We talk about how Cuba is going broke. It may not have food for its people, it may not be able to keep up some of the essential services for its people, but the Communists and totalitarians always have money for their ambitions and their purposes in the political arena, for they are taking over one newspaper after another. In the Middle East, in Africa, in Asia, in Latin America, they are taking over radio stations, and how do they do it? They don't come in and say, "Will you let me buy your station?" They don't do that. They do it simply. Through loans, through gifts, through placement of ads and through a hundred and one other little subtle techniques.

I say that the Congress of the United States has not done right by our propaganda program—and by propaganda I mean simply telling the truth. And we have not equipped our government nor has our government asked to be equipped. We have the means to do the job that is necessary in this battle for men's minds.

KHRUSHCHEV OUT TO FORMULATE A BLUEPRINT FOR OUR RETREAT

I said to Mr. Khrushchev when I talked to him, "Wait till my crowd gets in, Mr. Khrushchev. We will run you right out of Gorky Park." And that is what I want to do. You see, what Mr. Khrushchev wants is to make everybody believe that the only alternative is war. That is what he is trying to do. He tried to get everybody in Belgrade, everybody in Western Europe, everybody in Asia, everybody in Africa, everybody in Latin America and everybody here to think that there is only one way: Either capitulate, give up, retreat, or he will give you the advantage of retreating slowly.

Now, Mr. Khrushchev, let me tell you something. We have news for you. There are not just two alternatives. First of all, we are not going to retreat. That is number one. Even the threats of war do not compel the American people to stand paralyzed in fear. No, not at all. Secondly, there is another alternative, and it is that alternative that is based upon the unity of free people to compete in every area of human endeavor—to double, triple, our efforts on the economic front, on the propaganda front—to really go to work. And I will tell you something. If we really tried, they wouldn't have a chance. Because what we are doing now is playing the game according to Communist rules.

They know how to play the game of terror, of fear, of brutality, of inhumanity. They have lived by terror, they came to power by it, and they hold power this way. They are not afraid to kill; they are not afraid to take society and civilization to the edge of disaster. They will even push it over. So when we play the game of fear and terror with the Soviets, we are playing according to their rules.

Whenever you are in a contest—whether it's football or baseball or politics or whatever it is—and you play the game according to the other man's design, he has the jump on you.

WHILE WE KEPT OUR WORD THE SOVIETS BROKE THEIRS

Well, let us come back to what I said before. I had been very active and tried to promote the cessation of nuclear weapons testing, and I pleaded with our government, and successfully, to go the whole way to prove to the whole world that we were prepared to make great sacrifices for the cause of peace, to take great risks because we know we can't detect every test.

Our President sent our negotiators back to Geneva time after time. We presented to the Soviet Union a draft treaty that went far beyond what many Americans thought desirable, and our President insisted that we go the whole way to restrain this nuclear arms race before other nations got into it—before we went crazy, insane.

The Soviet Union has refused with dogged determination, almost with arrogance, to cooperate, and the negotiations became a forest. Nevertheless, I was one

of those, I want you to know it, that advised and counseled our President. Whenever I have the chance, I say: "Mr. President, never let us be first."

Even though we have taken many risks in the course that we pursue, thank goodness that our President had the moral courage, the stamina and the fortitude to keep the faith. We gave our word; we kept our word.

The Kremlin gave its word and it broke its word and the whole world knows it today. With callous disregard for the rights of humanity, without any regard whatsoever, my friends, as to the matter and the welfare of mankind, the Soviet Union has opened up again a new stage in the arms race. It seeks to promote its nuclear technology, which is almost an admission of its weakness, and I am not one to think these Soviets are ten feet high. Not a bit. Some of them are just as clumsy as some of the people I have known, even here. I don't happen to think they are supermen.

CONSOLIDATION OF SOVIET CONQUEST IN EUROPE AND FURTHER SOVIET EXPANSION

This grave decision to resume nuclear tests takes on a new meaning in the context in which it was taken. It is part of the so-called Berlin crisis. Mr. Khrushchev has made up his mind that he is going to what he calls "stabilize" his conquest in Eastern Europe. That is what he is after. He couldn't care less about Berlin. What he cares about is to make sure that the captive peoples are captured for once and for all. He wants to make sure that the boundaries that he has are going to be boundaries that will be his, and once that is stabilized, there will be more new frontiers for him—new places to look.

In other words, there are many hunting grounds for the despot today. Tyranny would like to consolidate its position in Europe so that it can explore the wonders of Africa, of Latin America and even of Asia. This is what is going on. Mr. Khrushchev wants to make sure that his front door is fully hinged and locked. That is why the wall was put up between East Berlin and West Berlin. He wants to make sure that there will be no duration of agitation with what he calls the Western States. He wants us to say that the boundaries that are there now will be there for years to come; and once we have said that, he will say, "Well boys", and he will call a meeting in the Kremlin. "Let us go to Africa, that's a nice juicy place. Let us go there. It is rich, it is the treasure house of the world."

THE FREE WORLD DOES NOT INTEND TO SURRENDER

Now, where does the nuclear test program fit in? The putting up of the wall between East and West Berlin doesn't cause the Western nations to say, "Well, let's give it up." The threats that the Soviets have been making in Japan, in Greece, in Turkey, in Denmark, all over the world—and they are making plenty of threats—have not terrified the world. Oh yes, they have caused great concern, but even in London, where the spirit of negotiation prevails, the government has not capsized, nor have the people of Great Britain said, "Let us give up." And in France, with all of its troubles, Mr. De Gaulle and his people have not said, "Let us give up." Nor have they in the Federal

Republic. Nor in Italy, or in any place else, and I will tell you why.

Not only because these peoples have refused to bow down before the tyrant, but also because this country, the leader, refuses to be intimidated. And as long as the United States of America refuses on the one hand to be driven by blackmail, intimidation, and threats of force, and on the other hand, preserves a reasonable attitude and willingness to try to find ways and means of settling disputes, the free nations of the world will not panic nor will they give up.

THE HUNDRED-MEGATON NIGHTMARE

Mr. Khrushchev said, "Well, there is only one thing to do, I will start talking about big weapons." A hundred-megaton weapon, says Mr. Khrushchev. He says he can make one.

Well, my dear friends, this government of the United States of America has known that we could make a hundred-megaton weapon, or a two-hundred-megaton weapon, for the last five years. What kind of nonsense is this? A group of scientists some three years ago discovered that not only could we make one, but we could have the capacity to deliver it. But why?

Was man put on this earth with the spark of God Almighty in his very soul to see if he could destroy all of human kind in an ordeal of insanity and madness? Is that what our purpose is? We have already created weapons that are beyond human calculation in terms of destructive power. They are in our stockpiles. How much further does one have to go? So our government made up its mind that it would not even talk about it. It put it to rest. We said, "There will be no hundred-megaton weapon." But let me make it crystal clear, so that no one will misunderstand me. This government has had the capacity, and could within a short period of time produce a weapon far more fantastic in its destructive power than anything Mr. Khrushchev's propagandists have talked about. But we are not going to. And the reason we are not going to is because we do believe that there is something more important than just material things in life. We were not put on this earth to destroy it. We were put on this earth to love it, to build, to create, to protect. So let us take this hundred-megaton nightmare and put it to sleep.

Let us tell Mr. Khrushchev, "You are not frightening the United States. You are not frightening our allies; you are not frightening anybody except the Russian people."

THE UNITED STATES IS TOO STRONG TO BE FRIGHTENED

Now let me give you another word of assurance. This is the strongest country on the face of the earth. This is fact number one. We are not bragging about it, but I think it is about time people understood it.

Number two is that our nuclear weapons stockpile is far superior to that of any other nation or combination of nations on the face of the earth, if we need to use them. And our advance in technology, in the technology of nuclear science, is beyond that of all the greatest scientists of the Soviet Union.

We don't need to test in the atmosphere to prove

that we have good weapons. I want to make this statement for the record: we have a stockpile of weapons that are adequate for our defense and for the defense of the Free World if needed; we have a stockpile of weapons that can destroy any enemy, or any combination of nations if they should attack us; and we have a stockpile of weapons that is bigger in size, variety, quality, design, and quantity than any stockpile of weapons that the world has ever known. But we are not bragging about it. We seek not to use those weapons, we seek even to discard those weapons. We are prepared to do so. But we are not prepared to do so at the point of a gun. So, Mr. Khrushchev, you have shocked the world, you have shocked your friends, you have shocked those who have never been your friends, you have disturbed your allies, and you have upset the neutrals all over the world. There is tenseness, discouragement, shock and unbelievable pain because of the action of the Communist government in Russia.

What has he gained? The hope that he could use terror, blackmail, the force of confusion. Well, my good friends, there will be negotiations, of course, but let us make it crystal clear that the issue today in Europe is not Berlin. Even though we have rights in West Berlin, and not just in West Berlin, and we intend to keep those rights. We don't intend to have anybody force those rights away from us. That is manifestly clear. We don't want to force anybody else's rights away from them. We are not aggressive. We seek an honorable solution.

THE BERLIN PROBLEM IS THE PROBLEM OF ALL CENTRAL EUROPE

I have said, and I repeat, that for Americans to negotiate about Berlin is to negotiate about something that is not negotiable by itself. The problem that relates to Berlin is bigger than Berlin. That is the problem of all Central Europe.

When I came back from a trip in that section of the world just a few weeks ago, one of the first things I said to our government officials was that we must talk of self-determination, we must never yield on this principle of self-determination. This is literally the very moral site of our whole political philosophy, and we have agreements on self-determination. We should recite, until the repetition becomes almost sickening, the agreements that were arrived at between ourselves and our allies in World War II, including the Soviet Union, on self-determination. And when we talk of colonialism, let us talk of all forms of colonialism. We don't want any of it. The colonialism that, if you please, has absorbed the free people of Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia—free peoples of Eastern Europe—and you are represented here, country after country, I don't want to name them all, lest I forget one.

Colonialism and imperialism. We are not an imperial power. What imperialism do we demonstrate, what are we seeking? I want to say to the Soviet that if there would be free elections, self-determination for the captive nations, we would be prepared as a nation to provide freedom of elections every place in the world where we have anything to say; and we are prepared to engage in disarmament to the point where we will literally beat our swords into plowshares and war shall be no more.

We are prepared for this and we are prepared to

take the initiative and I think we must always be prepared to take this initiative. But I think we ought to recognize that this will take a lot of doing. Now I want to close on these notes. The first thing we need to understand is that there are no easy answers or quick solutions to these problems. War is not the solution. You people know that. War as we know it today is the solution to nothing; it may dissolve the world, but it will not solve the problems of the world.

WE WILL NEVER ACCEPT THE CAPTIVITY OF OTHER PEOPLES

But this does not mean that there are no answers. There are. The answers are found in the dedication to principles and the dedication to objectives that we've held for years. I mentioned one a moment ago. We must never give up the principle of self-determination. I don't care if we are holding meetings like this twenty-five years from now. We must make it clear that we will never accept—morally, ethically, or politically—the captivity of other people, the new colonialism. We will never accept tyranny. Tyranny that is imposed from without or tyranny that comes from within. Let's make that clear.

And while we wage a relentless struggle against those who dominate and control people, we must also wage a relentless struggle to get to the hearts of the people. To see, for example, that the aid that this country so generously gives gets to people and not just to governments; to see the people that we keep contact with.

Oh, how I want our government, for example, to have what I would call family-to-family cultural exchange. People like you in this room to go see their loved ones, to bring from your lips, from your hearts, the message of freedom and hope that is much more effective than a radio broadcast—much more effective than even a pamphlet. I want students, thousands of them, to come from all parts of the world to taste, feel and sense the exhilarating experience of freedom—academic freedom, religious freedom, political freedom.

These are the things that we must do and we must do more than that. We must constantly show that we are not afraid. We must have a dedication and conviction, a zeal for what we have and what we believe in.

So let us dedicate ourselves to doing what is right. You're doing what's right. I know that so many people must say: "Well, what do you think that International Peasant Union is doing? What is that crowd doing?" I can hear some folks saying that the Union hasn't got a chance. Well, I want to say it's a great privilege for me to stand alongside people who were courageous enough to literally stand up before the guns, the firing squads for freedom. I want to say that I find it a great source of inspiration and encouragement that men will give years and years of their lives to a cause that is a noble one, the cause of human freedom.

Don't give up, because if you give up then other people are going to give up. When you are down, we also are going to be down.

So I want to wish you the best in your conference and, as I leave you, to say, "Don't forget for a minute that the peasant is the target of the Communists, everywhere in the world today." And may I also say that one of the most encouraging signs of our times is the resistance of the peasants throughout the world.

SECOND PLENARY SESSION

The Chairman of the Seventh Congress, Dr. VLADKO MACEK, was elected, as were the Vice-Chairmen, Mrs. ALENA DEVENIS and Mr. HALIL MACI, and the Secretaries: Messrs. TSENKO BAREV, LUAN GASHI, ZBIGNIEW T. JURCZYNSKI, GYULA SZENTADORJANY and JON STERE.

The Congress elected members of the following Commissions: International Affairs, Internal Agrarian Affairs, Cultural and Educational, Women's, Agrarian Youth and the Admission and Organizational Commission.

Mr. STANISLAW MIKOLAJCZYK, the President, and Dr. GEORGE M. DIMITROV, the Secretary-General, delivered their reports to the Congress.



THE WORLD STANDS IN THE SHADOW OF COMMUNIST THREATS

An Evaluation of the Political Situation

By STANISLAW MIKOLAJCZYK, President
Of the International Peasant Union

THE AGGRESSIVE ACTIONS OUTLINED IN THE RECENT COMMUNIST MANIFESTO

We remember very well the recent Communist Manifesto, signed in Moscow by eighty-one Communist parties in December, 1960, a document which was in essence a declaration of war against the anti-Communist world. A thorough analysis of this declaration and of more recent speeches by Mr. Khrushchev makes clear the ultimate aims which the Communists are trying to achieve. However, the most important thing about this Communist Manifesto is that it does not exclude a Third World War.

THE THIRD WORLD WAR, Mr. Khrushchev has declared, will come if the free nations resist the Communist drive for expansion and world domination. This domination, insisted Khrushchev, will come in accordance with the laws of historic development. Yet he knows that the Free World will not capitulate voluntarily and give way to Communist world domination. To avoid a direct military clash with the Free World, therefore, both the Communist Party Manifesto and KHRUSHCHEV HIMSELF GAVE THEIR BLESSINGS TO THE IDEA OF REVOLUTIONARY WARS IN UNDERDEVELOPED COUNTRIES. Aid to such wars, including military equipment and supplies, was promised and in some cases has already been delivered by the Soviets in many parts of the world.

THE ISSUE OF DISARMAMENT in the Communist Party Manifesto does not involve military disarmament at all. In the language of the Communist declaration, disarmament means any active fight against imperialism, a fight to narrow its world-wide potentials; and we know, by this time, that for the

Soviets every non-Communist country in the world is imperialistic, reactionary, and undemocratic.

Even the Khrushchev POLICY OF PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE was at last clearly defined in the above-mentioned Communist Manifesto. Peaceful coexistence is intended to protect the activity of the Communist parties and other so-called "progressive" (meaning pro-Communist) organizations in the capitalist countries, to help them fight there against "aggressive world blocs and foreign military bases" and to contribute to the success of national liberation movements. And Khrushchev has declared that peaceful coexistence is nothing more than "an intensification of the struggle of the working class and of all Communist parties for the triumph of Socialist (Communist) ideas."

We should not forget, also, that the Moscow Communist Manifesto was directed mainly against the United States. Khrushchev constantly refers to the United States not only as the greatest of all imperialistic exploiters but also as the chief bulwark of world reaction and the international gendarme who has become the enemy of the people of the whole world.

THE WESTERN WORLD REFUSES TO BELIEVE WHAT WAS SO CLEARLY STATED BY THE COMMUNISTS THEMSELVES

It seems to me of some importance to point out that the leading American newspapers do not publish, comment upon or present to American public opinion material pointing out what is so clearly stated in the Communist Party Manifesto. And this is happening now, when the world stands in the shadow of Communist threats.

When Hitler made public his intentions as to what he intended to do, nobody was willing to believe him. When Stalin made his declarations of intentions, a



Delegates and guests of the Seventh Congress of the International Peasant Union, at its Plenary Session.

great many people did not want to believe him either. Today, Khrushchev and the world Communist conspiracy are making very clear statements as to what they are driving at, but wishful thinking prevails in the Free World against the common sense demanded by the instincts of self-defense and self-preservation.

MANY PEOPLE IN THE WEST REJECT OUR RESEARCH AND DOCUMENTATION ON SOVIET AFFAIRS

Although the state of Soviet agriculture may be referred to in our resolutions, I would like to comment upon the failure of the Communist system. We were right from the very beginning, when we described the Soviet agricultural system as one that is destructive of both men and production. However, many people in the West had no confidence in our research, documentation and presentation. They regarded all our analyses as merely the talk of exiles. Once again, therefore, I should like to express the fervent hope that the press of the Free World, and particularly the American press, will write more about the agricultural crisis in Soviet Russia and will inform public opinion about the importance of this issue.

THE STATE OF SOVIET AGRICULTURE REVEALS A SHARPENING OF TERROR AGAINST THE PEASANTS

Khrushchev promised that Soviet agriculture would out-produce that of the United States. This didn't happen, and Khrushchev, declaring the Communist Party functionaries responsible, had them purged. Without going into too many details, we see that delivery quotas were falsified, that production figures for meat, milk and other produce (running into millions of tons) referred to completely non-existent products. And now we learn—and these are not my words, but Khrushchev's words—that two million, five hundred thousand sheep died of hunger and frost; that out of a hundred thousand tractors delivered to Kazakhstan, seventy-five thousand were used for spare parts to repair old tractors; that fifty-five percent of the harvest in the Ukraine had been stolen, as Khrushchev said, from the fields. We also learn that Khrushchev has been dashing through Russia, from one Soviet republic to another, dismissing and purging Communist functionaries, who have been made scapegoats of the inefficient system of Soviet agriculture.

What has Khrushchev proposed as a means to end this state of affairs in Soviet agriculture? Firstly, he intends to liquidate the private garden plots of kolkhoz members. But what does such a move entail? Until now, nearly fifty percent of the USSR's output of meat and dairy products has come from the privately owned cows and garden plots of kolkhoz members. Do you think for one moment that when the privately owned cows are taken away and the private lots of the kolkhoz members are liquidated, the result will be an adequate supply of milk or meat in the Soviet Union? The propaganda justifying the liquidation of the private garden plots of kolkhoz members will no longer convince anyone. Khrushchev says that kolkhoz members will have a better life; they should produce something to make their lives more joyful—like roses or other flowers—and they ought not to worry about raising their own cows, sheep or pigs. And I am quite certain that although the big Sovkhoz, operating within the Communist system of agriculture, may—to a certain extent—have proven adequate for the production of grain, they have failed completely in the fields of animal breeding, meat products, and dairy produce. Essentially, Khrushchev's proposal to deprive the kolkhoz member of his privately owned cow, sheep or pig and his private garden plot is an attempt to solve the agricultural crisis by means of a new regime of terror. Unfortunately for him, no terror has ever managed to increase the production of meat and dairy products or to eliminate the shortcomings of Soviet agriculture.

Secondly, Khrushchev proposes to close those comparatively free markets where kolkhoz members sell their privately produced butter, milk, poultry and vegetables to the people of the Soviet towns. He has also created a special ministry to plan the marketing of agricultural produce. But none of this explains why agricultural production in the Soviet Union is falling steadily and why so many rank and file Party functionaries must be dismissed and purged. Can newly appointed functionaries improve Soviet agricultural production when the system itself remains unchanged?

THE PERMANENT CRISIS OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION CONTINUES

Two years ago, Khrushchev himself officially announced that the Soviet Union would surpass the United States in agricultural production by 1961.

Now that this goal has not been achieved, the new Communist Party program promises that production of grains, meat, butter and other agricultural foodstuffs will be raised only during the next twenty years. I have been told that the people of the Soviet Union, when discussing this situation, say: "It was bad enough when we had Five-Year Plans and we had to guess what our lives would be like after five years. But now it's even worse, because the promises have been postponed for twenty years!" Clearly, Soviet agriculture has been a failure, and there must be some reorganization of the Soviet agricultural system. Far from surpassing the United States in the production of food, the Communist countries have been forced to buy foodstuffs in the United States to feed their people, who are suffering from shortages of food.

This state of hunger (and sometimes even starvation) is particularly evident in Red China's communes. Unable to improve agricultural production under the Communist system, the Chinese Communist newspapers today are writing that they must seek out again the wise men in the villages, those old villagers who know how to raise farm output. Thus, another Communist country has admitted that it has failed to improve agricultural output. When millions of Chinese were suffering from hunger and starvation, the Communist regime was forced to buy as much food as possible in the capitalist countries, food which they were unable to produce in their own countries under the Communist farming system.

THE NEW COMMUNIST PARTY PROGRAM CAN PROVIDE NO SOLUTION

On top of all this, came the announcement of the new Communist program for the forthcoming session of the Communist Party of Soviet Russia. I will not analyze this program in detail. It is very difficult even to read, and when reading it one doesn't know whether to laugh or to cry. For this new Communist program presents a completely false and utopian picture. This program disregards the fact that the failure in agriculture will have an adverse effect not only upon farming but upon industry as well.

Even if the Communists succeed in improving the standard of living of their people, the new program still preserves the dictatorship of the Communist Party and the Communist state. I think there are very few people who really believe in the falsehoods and the promises of the Communist utopia written into the new program, which will be presented to the forthcoming Congress of the Communist Party next October in Moscow. In the meantime, we observe Moscow's tactics of blackmail and diversion and her economic and political aggression in Berlin, Laos, South America and other areas.

THE COLD WAR IS NOTHING BUT AN IDEOLOGICAL WAR

I would like to remind you that the IPU has emphatically and repeatedly declared, at all its previous Congresses that the Cold War is nothing but an ideological war. It is a state of war created not by the United States, as President Truman rightly stated in one of his articles, but by the Soviet Union with her acts of aggression and her deliberate and repeated breaches of international commitments and

agreements. For us, the ideological war has always been a struggle of the greatest importance.

On the one side, there is human freedom, national independence and social justice; on the other, there are lies, dictatorship, slavery, hate, etc. We warned the Western leaders and the public opinion of the Western world not to underestimate the ideological fight with communism but our warning was in vain.

Khrushchev himself gave us the proof that we were right when, after he had attended the session of the United Nations in 1960 and had then visited Red China, he declared that there will be a period of co-existence between East and West and that this co-existence would help the Communists to wage an ideological war in every foreign country among the people. And what does this mean? It means that the West, which dislikes the so-called "cold war" so much, is actually facing a Communist ideological offensive. Senator Humphrey, who spoke before me today, rightly emphasized the importance of the American radio network's participation in this ideological struggle.

THE PUBLIC OPINION OF THE WEST SHOULD BE MORE INFORMED

Year after year, I myself have done research and asked the offices of the International Peasant Union to find out how much has been written about Africa or other underdeveloped countries in the American press. How well has public opinion here been informed about the underdeveloped countries, about their needs, the causes of their backwardness, their desire for progress, etc? Such information was very scarce until just before the session of the United Nations in 1960 when the African nations were accepted as new members of the U.N. In general, the newspapers of the United States did not inform the public very well about the problems of those nations.

The Communist press, on the other hand, has printed extensive information about Africa and other underdeveloped continents and their people, their customs, their progress and their needs.

And now gentlemen, and I am addressing particularly the American leaders, how do you expect to lead the world—and you must lead it—if your public opinion is not informed about what is happening?

Some will say, "Why provoke Khrushchev?" Thus, when the Captive Nations Week was declared, Moscow immediately reacted most vigorously. But Mr. Khrushchev does not hesitate to provoke the Western world on Laos, Berlin or any other issue. And who knows? Perhaps the day will soon come when his provocations will go so far that the Free World will be forced to fight in its own defense.

WE DESIRE PEACE BUT WE ARE ALSO FOR FREEDOM

Who desires war less than we do, and who genuinely wants peace more than we do? We know only too well that if a new war comes our countries will suffer again and they could be destroyed by a nuclear attack. Mr. Khrushchev, however, does not hesitate to threaten mankind and to declare openly that he will use atomic power and wipe out one nation after another. In a blackmailing manner, he threatens that he will finish any country that is either on the side of NATO or that acts against any Communist state. We in the

International Peasant Union declare emphatically, and this will be reflected in our resolutions, that we are for the freedom of the people in Berlin and we are for the freedom of the underdeveloped countries; but we will not forget the Communist enslavement of Eastern and Central Europe. You cannot separate these problems, even if Khrushchev grows angry at the mere mention of Eastern and Central Europe. If you overlook the freedom of the peoples of Eastern and Central Europe, it may still happen that you will get from Khrushchev not the peace you so desire but an atomic bomb.

We are not advocating war, but I must say that there is no free people who would like to or who would agree to give up freedom in order to be enslaved. Rather, they will die. We will never tire of repeating that for our nations enslaved by communism we also demand freedom.

MOSCOW IS INFURIATED BY OUR UNMASKING OF SOVIET LIES

Let me remind you of the atmosphere that prevailed during the last Congress of the IPU in 1960, an atmosphere in which almost everybody believed that an agreement could be reached with Khrushchev. What happened afterwards is very well known to all of you. The International Peasant Union was even given some credit for these developments by Moscow, when, in May 1960, the Moscow radio singled out the International Peasant Union as one of those chiefly responsible for the failure of the Paris Summit Conference. I must say, I wish the IPU really had that much influence. Actually, the main reason why Moscow denounced the IPU at that time was the Kremlin's anger at our repeated denunciations of Soviet lies. They were enraged by our revelation of the truth about communism and by our demands for individual freedom, independence for the captive nations, social justice for the peasants and workers and for all the peoples of the captive countries of Eastern and Central Europe and of the Soviet Union itself. The Communists know that their system is doomed if these ideas are not removed from the hearts of their people.

We have always demanded and will never tire of demanding free elections in the captive countries, under international control.

FREEDOM AND PROGRESS MUST BE ASSURED TO ALL NATIONS

In my opening speech to the IPU Congress this morning, I mentioned that our nations have behind them a thousand years of national history, independence and statehood. Now, however, many are trying to forget these nations and to focus their attentions only upon those nations who are still under colonial rule in Africa or Asia. At a time when the colonial era has almost neared its end, a new kind of colonialism, Soviet colonialism, characterized by a degree of vicious exploitation hitherto unknown to history, still exists and flourishes in the Soviet Empire and in the captive countries of Eastern and Central Europe.

Can anyone today really believe that he can escape political responsibility by concentrating upon the promotion of freedom and progress only in the underdeveloped and newly independent countries of Asia and Africa while deliberately turning his back upon

the peoples of Eastern and Central Europe with their thousand-year-old history of struggle for independence?

We do not believe that such an approach can solve any problems, and therefore we continue to demand liberation for our captive nations, while extending our best wishes to the people of the young nations who have recently gained their independence.

The International Peasant Union has published a special memorandum to the peoples of Africa in which we wished them well and expressed our delight that they have finally attained freedom. But we also warned them that freedom involves responsibility in the exercise of self-government. Freedom cannot be bought! Why, after getting rid of one type of colonialism, should they take another variety—namely, Soviet colonialism? Furthermore, after reminding them of the experiences of our subjugated peoples under the Communist dictatorship and the new colonialism of Soviet Russia, we begged them not to side with communism and not to believe the misleading lies of Communist propaganda. We advised them to ally themselves always with the forces of freedom and democracy, with the Free World.

THE WEST CANNOT LET ITSELF BE OUTSMARTED BY KHRUSHCHEV

We cannot erase from our memories the remark made by Stalin before an international gathering, when someone raised the question of the Vatican. Stalin's reply was: "How many military divisions has the Pope?" For Stalin there were no other problems, no problems concerning religion or freedom. For Stalin the only thing that mattered was force and military divisions!

And there actually are people who think they can disregard such facts about the Communist leaders and think they can buy something from Khrushchev! They must understand that Khrushchev will respect neither weakness, righteousness nor legality, and that he will retreat only if met with firm resistance. The West must be prepared not to let itself be outsmarted by Khrushchev and finally defeated.

In the past I have advocated very friendly and peaceful solutions, and I still do today. But now I am afraid that wishful thinking and imagination may create a situation in which the hopes for peace will be overshadowed by the danger of war, and a war which can be lost.

Our faith is strong, and it is a faith based on principles. These principles always have been, and are still, rooted in the freedom of the individual, national independence, economic progress based on the initiative of free men and social justice. We have heard recently that those nations will be helped today who are ready to fight for their independence. Why, then, does this not apply to our nations, which in their fight for freedom and independence have lost more than their share of blood, as in the case of Hungary?

And so, in concluding my political report, permit me to leave you with this thought:

From this moment on, not a single day should be allowed to pass without the demands for solutions in Laos and Berlin being coupled with demands for the freedom and independence of the peoples of Central and Eastern Europe.



THE COMMUNISTS ARE OUT TO WIN OVER THE PEASANT COUNTRIES OF THE GLOBE

By Dr. GEORGE M. DIMITROV
Report of the Secretary-General

In enumerating a few of the most important activities of the IPU it is very much in place to emphasize, first of all, that the IPU was the first international organization in exile to publish a memorandum on the situation in the captive countries as early as July 4, 1947, and to warn the Free World of the danger of Communist imperialism to its existence and to freedom and peace everywhere.

THE ACTIVITIES OF THE INTERNATIONAL PEASANT UNION

The IPU was the first organization in exile which, in 1947, presented a memorandum to the United Nations demanding restoration of basic human rights and self-determination to the countries of Eastern and Central Europe.

In October, 1950, the IPU published its first manifesto to the peasants of Asia, warning them of Soviet plans to sovietize them.

In June, 1951, a special pamphlet was prepared by the IPU about Communist activities in India and their plan to occupy this country as a main base for Communist expansion in Asia.

As a result of this action, the IPU still maintains very close contacts with the peasant leaders of Asia. An agreement was reached on close cooperation between the IPU and Asian movements against international Communist plans and activities. Our manifesto and our brochures were translated into many foreign languages by local peasant organizations. All this work was done through the generous contributions of these peasant organizations, which had only the most modest of means at their disposal, while at the same time we were refused any help from the Free World to translate our brochures into all Asiatic languages and distribute them among those hundreds of millions of poor but freedom-loving people. Our activity was met by the rulers of the Free World with very little encouragement.

We have organized Forums and Round Table Conferences (in New York, Rome, Brussels, and other places) which were attended by experts from Europe and America, who came to discuss the Communist agricultural problem as a whole, and the incurable economic crisis which the Soviet Union and satellite governments were undergoing. Our purpose was to call the attention of the Free World to the weakness of the Communist system so that it might learn to utilize this weakness against the militaristic, aggressive plans of international communism. Instead of complicating the situation of the enemy, the Free World began to give economic aid to the Communist

regimes. This aid helped them, but they soon began to use it against the Free World and in this way to assist Khrushchev in burying the Free World, as he had declared he would some time before.

When we watched the great efforts made by Khrushchev to find a way out of the agricultural crisis by using many different kinds of tricky methods and false promises to the peasants, we predicted that Khrushchev would fail to deceive even the Soviet peasants. To all our warnings and recommendations, too little, if any, attention was paid by the governments of the Free World.

The President, Vice-President, Secretary-General, and other members of the IPU ruling bodies and the staff have participated in many conferences at which all these problems were discussed:

A three day Seminar was organized in Lexington, Kentucky, with the participation of representatives of about fifty-four American universities and college professors.

In Santiago de Chile, the Conference of "Catholic Rural Life" was held in 1957, and in Palermo, Italy, the Congress of European Agriculture was held in 1958. We defended our views very strongly in the European Movement Conferences, especially at the 1952 Conference held in London. Many Europeans participated in those Conferences, and some of them are now heads of governments. At these Conferences many resolutions were adopted which reflected our point of view.

The IPU, in cooperation with the Socialist Union and the Christian Democratic Union, issued a memorandum on the international situation and the problems of our captive nations, which was sent to the Foreign Ministers' Conference in Geneva, in May, 1960.

In March, 1961, the IPU sent a memorandum to the free democratic governments and the United Nations on the situation of our captive nations and the tension created by international communism.

In April, 1961, the IPU prepared a manifesto to the Peasants of Africa and another to the Peasants of South America. The purpose of these manifestoes was to warn those nations of the treacherous plans of the Communists and of their real plans to enslave them. We know that the Communists are presenting themselves as champions of the struggle against the old colonialism, but in the meantime they are practising a new tyrannical and inhuman colonialism. We could not carry out our plans to the end, because we did not have the necessary means to translate and distribute our manifestoes among the African and South American peasants.

We still face many great difficulties. We badly need to have publications in several other languages to tell the peasants and all honest people throughout the world what has happened and what is happening in our countries under the tyrannical Communist system and under Soviet imperialistic and colonial domination as well. Unfortunately, we have no means available for such activities. With regret we must say that the Free World seems to prefer to give aid to some Communist dictators, thus helping to carry out Khrushchev's designs for burying free humanity.

Those who are close to the IPU know that we have tried and still are trying to honestly fulfill our duties with regard to our task of striving for the liberation of our captive nations and also as regards the safeguarding of the Free World. But what can we do, without adequate aid and without the necessary technical facilities, to meet the gigantic, international Communist conspiratorial machine?

Yes, there are many difficulties, but despite them all, we are determined to continue our fight and do our best. Some will understand us, others will deride us, still others may slander us. But I would like to stress that nothing will stop us, nothing will kill our spirit of resistance to the Communist anti-social system and our strong belief in the final victory of democratic conceptions. We are the representatives of our peasant nations who so far have given to the Free World, as well as to the enemy, enough evidence that they are determined to fight tyranny and foreign domination to the victorious end, regardless of the sacrifices involved. And we will follow in their footsteps.

THE STRUGGLE FOR THE PEASANT'S MIND

The peasants of Eastern and Central Europe are resisting and with their resistance they are slowly destroying the anti-peasant and anti-human Communist feudalistic system and its red serfdom, just as they have destroyed their tyrants in the past.

This is clearly reflected in the evidence contained in a recently published book, *A House Without a Roof*, written by Maurice Hindus. Mr. Hindus, who is an American of Russian descent, visited the Soviet Union several times and had an opportunity to speak to the Russian people in their native language. In the foreword to his book, Mr. Hindus gives us a genuine insight into the real character of the Russian Revolution of 1917 and the role of the peasants in it. He writes: "The revolution that never was either international or proletarian but national and peasant exploded . . . particularly out of the mujik's century-old battle for land. . ." Further, he writes: ". . . the struggle between the Communist and non-Communist countries, notably between America and the Kremlin dictatorship, is not over the capitalist industrialized nations in Europe or elsewhere, but over the underdeveloped or peasant countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. . . Kremlin leaders are concentrating their attention now as never before on peasants in backward areas of our globe. *We are indeed living in an age of not a proletarian but a peasant revolution*" (Preface, page 13.).

It is clear now why Lenin was afraid of the peasants and why, in an effort to fool them, he ordered dis-

tribution of the land to the Russian peasants in his Decree No. 1. He knew how strong was their longing to own the land they till, yet when Communist dictatorial power was established, the land was taken away from them and was collectivized by his successors. He called them, "hopeless sobstveniki"—hopeless landowners.

Like Lenin, Stalin was afraid of the peasants also. He confessed to Mr. Churchill that the fight with the millions of peasants resisting collectivization was more disastrous than the revolution itself. He was forced to make concessions; he gave them family garden plots with a cow, a few head of sheep, etc. Stalin did so in order to save both the peasants and the industrial workers from starving. Finally, in 1936, Stalin was forced to approve a new Constitution which provided for private garden plots for the peasants.

In 1950, Stalin and Khrushchev tried to kill the individualistic feelings of the peasants. They tried to build up Agrogorods (huge rural towns), forcing the peasants to live in communal buildings and to give up their family way of life so that the children of the peasants could more easily be educated in the spirit of communism. The outcry of the peasants forced the dictators to drop the project, because depriving the peasants of their farmsteads would have brought starvation not only to them but to the industrial workers as well. These events are related by Mr. Hindus in his book. In 1959, at the Twenty-First Congress of the Communist Party, the project of the Agrogorods was discussed again as the only way to crush the individualism of the peasants. The system of "disengagement" of the peasants from their own cows, gardens, and sheep was tried for the same purpose. But it failed again.

After the revolution, from 1917 to 1923, the number of private individual farms increased from twenty to twenty-five million.

In the wake of peasant resistance against collectivization, Lenin was forced to say: "Either we choke them, or they choke us. . ."

COLLECTIVE FARMING IS AGAINST THE PEASANTS AND DOES NOT WORK

The statistics given by Mr. Hindus are rather revealing when compared with data on U.S. agricultural production. He states that in 1960 the Soviet Union produced twenty million tons of grain less than in 1958. In Oxford, Indiana, the seven-hundred acre farm of a Mr. White is worked by two laborers and himself; the eight-hundred acre farm of a Mr. Rabers in Elkhart County is worked by his son, his son-in-law, and one laborer; the Krimskaya Collective Farm, in the Kuban area of the Soviet Union, contains 25,000 acres and is worked by 3,691 laborers.

In 1959, four million acres of grain remained unharvested in Kazakhstan because 32,000 tractors, 21,000 combines, and 11,000 reapers were left un-repaired and stood useless.

In 1951, 850,000 head of cattle died of starvation, and there were 1,043,000 pigs, 4,845,000 sheep, and 4,000,000 milk cows less than in 1916. These figures were given to Mr. Hindus by a Soviet agronomist.

After forty-five years of Communist rule, says Mr. Hindus: "Of all the unanswered questions about Soviet

farming, the surviving individualism of the peasants is the most worrisome to the Kremlin."

Let us hear the confessions of Khrushchev himself about the situation of Communist agriculture in the Soviet Union, which reflects to a great degree the situation in all the Communist captive nations.

Khrushchev has failed in his attempts to solve the problem through kolkhozes and sovkhozes, through Agrogorods and increased collectivization of the land. He was forced to call conferences with agricultural leaders and specialists from the fifteen Soviet republics to discuss the critical situation in agriculture and to look for a solution.

On June 14 to 17, 1960, he called a huge conference and tried to get more active participation from the local Party and kolkhoz leaders by giving them more responsibilities. He failed again. Production did not increase. He went all over the country and vigorously attacked the local Party leaders for the failure of his organically impossible and openly anti-peasant system. He had many of them dismissed, and he was furious at the Ukrainian Party leaders, because in the Ukraine, which has always been the granary of all Russia, agricultural production had fallen off seriously.

On January 17, 1961, Khrushchev called another meeting to discuss the insoluble agrarian problem. The meeting was attended by delegates from fifteen Soviet republics, and in their presence Khrushchev, the great Leninist, as he calls himself, denounced Lenin's conception of communism. Lenin, as is well known, claimed that, "Communism is Soviet power plus electrification." Khrushchev, however, declared at this meeting that communism is not only heavy industry and electrification, but also the absolute necessity to "build a well-developed peasant economy in order to build communism."

At the same meeting, Khrushchev made public some data on the critical situation of Communist collective agriculture. He stated: "In the Russian Federal Republic more than five million sheep were allowed to die in 1960. In Kazakhstan, 3,306,000 sheep died; in Kirgizia 609,000, etc."

Khrushchev criticized his own agricultural mechanization: "During 1949, in the Ukraine, there were only 14,000 tractors . . . in 1960, there were 115,000 tractors. . . Yet in 1948 the Ukraine delivered to the State 613 million puds (a pud is equal to about thirty-three pounds) of grain . . . and during 1960 only 358 million puds. Machines and experienced workers are far more numerous there, but the kolkhozes and the sovkhozes are delivering to the State just about half of the grain. . ."

" . . . My belief in the necessity of the anti-Communist fight and in the importance of the Central European countries represented by you has not changed at all. I am continuing to lead our Committee in the same direction."

*Mr. MAXIME BLOCK-MASCART,
President of the French Committee
for a Free Europe, to the Seventh
Congress of the IPU*

Another scandal revealed by Khrushchev at the meeting we have just referred to was the frequent use of false reports concerning agricultural production. Some collectives brought food from others in order to meet the state delivery quotas. Some even stole from the produce of the farmsteads (family plots) for the same purpose: to fulfill the compulsory quotas. Some kolkhoz managers built houses for themselves with the produce they stole. Does one need any better proof of how rotten and corrupt is the agricultural system of the Communists?

As is well known, Khrushchev declared that the Soviet Union would catch up with the U.S. in agricultural production of milk, meat, and butter per capita, and would even surpass her. He declared, however, that the production of meat should be at least forty-two centners per hundred hectares of arable land in order to achieve this goal. This was said with the full knowledge that meat production during 1959 was only seventeen centners per hundred hectares of arable land.

The other Communist countries are struggling with the same crisis. Mao Tse Tung has confessed that forty percent of the reports on agricultural production were false. If the Soviet Union, with nearly half a century of Communist dictatorship using all possible tricks, was unable to solve the agrarian crisis, one can imagine what chances the satellite governments have to solve the organic diseases of this utopian and anti-social system.

The Soviet Union is able to mobilize slaves to build pyramids, to mobilize scientists to perform technical research and to design sputniks and missiles. All this may impress the naive, and serve the purpose of spreading Communist propaganda among millions of ignorant people. This also may supply ammunition to Communist sympathizers and fellow-travelers all around the world. However, the Soviet Union is not able to solve the peasant problem, which is the most important problem of all. Only those who understand the peasant's devotion to the piece of land which he tills with his family and which is the bastion of his freedom, his independence, his rights, his well-being and his strength only they will understand why peasant resistance against Communism will never cease and why the Communist system regards the peasants as its enemy number one.

The peasants have destroyed feudalism, serfdom and many despotic empires down through the centuries. They will also crush Communist feudalism and colonialism with even more vigor and heroism.

THIRD AND CLOSING PLENARY SESSION

The member parties of the International Peasant Union presented reports on their activities as well as on the political, economic, social and cultural situation in their respective countries. Those who presented the reports were: Mr. HALIL MACI, Albanian Democratic Agrarian Party; Mr. DIMITAR GOLUBOV, Bulgarian National Agrarian Union; Dr. VLADKO MACEK, Croatian Peasant Party; Mr. OSKAR LOVI, United Farmers and Smallholders Party of Estonia; Mr. JUOZAS AUDENAS, Lithuanian Populist Peasant Party; Dr. MILAN GAVRILOVIC, Yugoslav-Serbian Agrarian Union; Mr. TADEUSZ PAUL, Polish Peasant Party; Mr. CORNEL BIANU, Romanian National Peasant Party and Mr. FEDOR HODZA, Democratic Party of Slovakia. Extensive excerpts from the reports of member parties are published at the end of this issue.

The reports and resolutions of the Commissions were presented by Mr. FERENC NAGY, International Affairs Commission; Mr. ADAM GNIAZDOWSKI, Educational and Cultural Affairs Commission; Miss DAIVA AUDENAS, Women's Commission; Mr. LUAN GASHI, Agrarian Youth Commission; Dr. JOSEF LETTRICH, Organizational and Admission Commission.

To the Executive Committee of the IPU were elected: Mr. STANISLAW MIKOLAJCZYK, as President; and as Vice-Presidents, Dr. VLADKO MACEK, Dr. MILAN GAVRILOVIC, Dr. JOSEF CERNY, Mr. FERENC NAGY, Dr. AUGUSTIN POPA, Mrs. ALENA DEVENIS and Dr. FEDOR HODZA.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS RESOLUTION

I

The Seventh IPU Congress states with regret that the international situation has, since the Sixth Congress, become more dangerous and complex than ever before. In the face of the present dangers to world peace, the IPU reaffirms its conviction, expressed in the past in numerous resolutions and memoranda, that the basic and original causes of a potential conflict between the East and the West remain the same. The most important among them is the forceful and artificial division of Europe, perpetrated and maintained by the subjugation and colonization of the nations of Central-Eastern Europe. This Communist conquest, tacitly condoned by the Free World, has resulted not only in a great increase in the economic potential of the Soviet Union (while providing the Communist countries with a position of important strategic advantage), it also encourages the USSR to attempt new conquests all over the world.

The armament race, the recent warlike acts in Southeast Asia, the economic and ideological penetration of Africa, Asia and Latin America, the growing uneasiness of the uncommitted nations seeking refuge in neutralism, the growth of pacifist movements and the tendencies toward unilateral disarmament in some European countries and last, but not least, the present Berlin crisis, are all direct consequences of a divided Europe. The other side of the coin is the arrogant

confidence of the Communist leaders in the superiority of their system and the ensuing worldwide offensive against freedom, independence and the political and social order of the free nations.

The IPU Congress notes with satisfaction that in responsible Western quarters there is a better understanding of the important role of the peasantry in the Communist countries, where peasant resistance is diminishing the military potential of the Communist camp. It is now being recognized that the present desperate state of agriculture in the Soviet Union and in the other Communist ruled countries is possibly the single greatest deterrent to World War III and that the shortage of food now makes any military adventure too hazardous to be undertaken lightly.

The IPU Congress, fully aware of the dangers of the present times and desirous to further a just and peaceful solution, reiterates its earlier resolutions and its belief that the Western Powers should take and maintain the initiative in proposing an overall plan for the solution of the problem of Europe, the ultimate goal of which should be unification, mutual security and the restoration of the right of self-determination to the Central and Eastern European nations, and that the present Berlin crisis cannot be solved outside a general European settlement of which Berlin would be only one part.

In view of the fact that the Soviet Union—as the leading power of the Communist world—is striving

unceasingly for world domination and has, in order to achieve this goal, taken on the role of champion in the fight against colonialism, the IPU Congress feels that the leading powers of the Free World should have their own program against colonialism, in which the liquidation of the European colonies of the Soviet Union would be the main demand.

The Congress proposes that since the Soviet Union has officially intervened in order to place the question of colonialism on the agenda of the U.N. General Assembly, the Western Powers should likewise place the question of the right of self-determination for the Central and Eastern European Nations on the agenda of the coming Session of the U.N. General Assembly in addition to the Hungarian question.

The Seventh IPU Congress is aware that the future of mankind depends to a great extent upon the stand taken by the agrarian nations of Asia, Africa and Latin America, and it is ready and wishes to continue and to intensify the activities of the IPU, especially in the emerging agrarian countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, and to make them aware of the dangers communism represents for the peasantry.

The IPU Congress is convinced that the outlined activities are even more important now in view of the new draft program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, in which the condition of the peasantry living under communism is depicted in a dangerously misleading light, as a desirable, free and progressive way of life best suited for the peasantry in the emerging nations; and it believes that those who have themselves fought for the progress of their own peasantry, for its political rights, for its cultural advancement and for land reform, and who have themselves seen how communism has robbed the peasants of their lands and degraded them into serfs, are best suited to be entrusted with this task.

The IPU Congress is convinced that it is possible to end international tension, to limit armament and to lay the foundations for a lasting peace only through

INTERNAL AGRARIAN AFFAIRS RESOLUTION

The agrarian problems of today have been raised and discussed by Pope John XXIII, in his Encyclical *Mater et Magistra*; by Khrushchev, in his new Communist Party draft-program; by the Inter-American Economic and Social Conference at Punta del Este, and in many countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America—Iran, Iraq, Pakistan, India and Indonesia, just to mention a few.

In any country where there exist, on the one hand, too many poor and landless peasants or people who do not have enough land to make ends meet, while, on the other hand, only a very few own most of the land and control the wealth of the country—land reform and other economic and social changes become burning issues of the day.

The democratic powers of the Free World are now pooling their resources to aid the underdeveloped and backward areas of the globe in overcoming their economic and social problems and to lead them towards increased opportunities, greater prosperity and more social justice and freedom.

a firm, decisive and effective Western policy, and it expresses the hope that the West will adopt and pursue such an active and positive policy for the unity of Europe and for the sake of freedom and democracy throughout the world.

II

The International Peasant Union, gathered at its Seventh Congress, condemns the Soviet Union for the latest violation of international pledges and for the resumption of atomic tests.

The Congress of the IPU demands that this case be brought immediately before the United Nations with the proposal that the Soviet Union be condemned, because this new violation of the pledges of the atomic powers not only reveals the warmongering policy of the Soviet Union but also threatens with annihilation the whole of mankind.

More than ever, the Congress insists on the implementation of previous proposals made at the International Peasant Union's Congresses and in its memoranda and requests that the Soviet Union be condemned before the United Nations:

for the forcible violation of freedom and independence of the nations of Central-Eastern Europe;

for the violation of all human rights of the peoples living in these countries;

for the abolition of religious freedom, of independent political parties and other economic, cultural and social organizations;

for the mass deportation of natives of those countries to the Soviet Union;

for the act of genocide perpetrated against these nations;

for the demoralization of youth and for the use of the youth of these countries as cannon fodder for the Soviet war machine;

for the colonial exploitation of these nations for the benefit of Communist world aggression.

The Communist world conspiracy, however, is utilizing its propaganda apparatus to undermine the aid programs of the Free World and to delude the naive and ignorant with the illusion that only the Communist way of doing things can provide more food and solve the burning economic and social problems facing the underdeveloped countries, among them the agrarian problem.

We in the International Peasant Union know from our own experience that this Communist propaganda is a lie, because neither in the Soviet Union, nor in Red China, nor in any captive country of Eastern and Central Europe has the Communist system been able to produce better standards of living or more freedom for the rural population; i.e., the peasants.

To reveal the truth about communism and to expose its lies, the Seventh Congress of the International Peasant Union has adopted the following resolution:

Whereas, the Communist agricultural system during the last two years has failed even more miserably than before to achieve its planned goals because of the

forcible collectivization of the land and the means of production and because of the regimentation of labor; and whereas Khrushchev himself declared publicly at the Party Plenary Meeting on January 17, 1961, that in general "the already achieved agricultural output (of the Soviet Union) particularly of meat production, and also the quantity of deliveries to the state, are not adequate to satisfy the ever growing demands for meat, milk, butter and some other edibles"; after which he went on to cite examples of mismanagement in farming, disclosing that in the Russian Soviet Republic more than five million sheep died and in the Kazakhstan Republic more than three million sheep perished because of the ignorance of the Communist bureaucrats and technocrats in the kolkhozes and sovkhozes; and whereas Khrushchev also admitted that, while the Soviet Union needs to produce at least forty-two centners of meat per hundred hectares of arable land in order to "catch up with the United States' meat production per capita", in 1959 the production of meat still was only seventeen centners per hundred hectares;

Whereas, the mechanization of Communist agriculture is producing negative results in agricultural output and in the peasant economy; and whereas Khrushchev has confessed publicly at the same Plenary Meeting on January 17, 1961, that in 1949 the Ukrainian Soviet Republic, although it had only 14,000 tractors, delivered 613 million puds of grain, while in 1960, when it had 115,000 tractors, only 358 million puds of grain were delivered; and whereas on another occasion the Soviet dictator admitted that there were instances when, out of 372 corn-reaping combines, only fifteen were used and when not a single one of the available sugar-beet harvesters was used all year around;

Whereas, both Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung, as well as some other Communist dictators in captive countries, have publicly confessed that the reports about fulfillment of the Five-Year Plans and deliveries of produce to the state were falsified (in the Chinese case, up to forty percent of the total), and Khrushchev called the managers of the kolkhozes bureaucrats, technocrats, liars, crooks and "thieves who steal the people's production and building materials and build houses for themselves"; and whereas Khrushchev and his henchmen in the captive countries (Todor Jivkov in Bulgaria, for example) complained that some managers of collectives buy from other collective farms and some even take the private property of the peasant families in the kolkhozes and the produce raised by them in their small gardens, in order to fill the obligatory state quota deliveries;

Whereas, women and children perform the heaviest jobs on the collective farms, because the male population and the heads of peasant families were deprived of their own land and were no longer in a position to earn enough to support their families in the villages, with the result that they went to look for jobs in the towns and factories, even though they could not take their families with them or provide enough to keep them alive; and whereas many women and children are forced to work because their husbands or fathers were

deported, put in prison or even executed for not submitting docilely to the Communist regime;

Whereas, Khrushchev himself has admitted failure of Communist agricultural policy to find effective modern means to raise agricultural output (and in doing so, he named Soviet agricultural research and scientific institutes which failed to produce very much more than ordinary collective farms); and whereas many people who went to work in the virgin lands are "sitting on their trunks and waiting to be brought back to the towns" from which they were "voluntarily" delivered to Siberia;

Whereas, all the agricultural (and industrial) output of the captive nations of Eastern and Central Europe is being integrated into the Soviet Union's economy through the so-called COMECON which is directed from the Kremlin; and whereas the economies of the captive nations are being sucked dry to serve the aggressive militaristic and imperialistic purposes of the Soviet Union, leaving the peasants and the workers of the captive countries under Soviet colonial exploitation in misery and slavery; and whereas the most common methods practiced by Soviet colonial exploitation in the captive countries are applied with the help of COMECON, which arranges to have all goods—agricultural and industrial—which are taken from the captive countries to the Soviet Union, paid for at ridiculously low prices, while all goods delivered from the Soviet Union to the captive countries are sold at extremely high prices, much higher than the prevailing prices for such goods in the free markets of the world;

Whereas in the Baltic States, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania all peasant property is forcibly nationalized without any compensation given to the owner, and whereas this property is annexed into the Soviet Union, this is a timely example of the great new colonialism and its exploitation of subjugated countries;

Whereas, so-called Communist revisionists (such as Yugoslavia's Tito) or "nationalists" (such as Poland's Gomulka) are trying to deceive the Free World by pretending to have "differences" with Moscow and its agricultural system in order to get billions of dollars in material aid from the nations of the Free World, especially from the United States, at the same time that they are, in fact, promoting the same system of communism and driving towards a full and arbitrary monopoly of agricultural production, marketing and prices, thus depriving their peasants, step by step, of their political, economic and social rights and their human dignity;

Whereas, peasant resistance in the Communist dominated countries against the exploitative collective farm system and against the oppressive Communist system itself must be maintained in order to keep alive the hopes of the people for liberation and in order to stop the war-producing capacities of the Communist international aggression headed by the Soviet Union;

Whereas, agrarian and rural social problems have become crucial issues in the fateful struggle between

Communist tyranny and free and civilized humanity everywhere in the world, including the underdeveloped areas;

The Seventh Congress of the International Peasant Union resolves:

1. To bow before the innumerable graves of all those peasants and other laboring people who died in defense of liberty and human dignity, fighting forced collectivization, the Communist system of tyranny and Soviet imperialistic and colonial domination and exploitation;

2. To declare full solidarity with all those who are still resisting Communist political and economic concepts and Communist cultural slavery;

3. To protest against the greatest disgrace of the twentieth century—the enslavement of the peasants and their families into kolkhozes where they are exploited under a system of serfdom similar to that of the Dark Ages; to protest the so-called “voluntary” deportation of the youth from the Baltic States to Kazakhstan, where they are put to forced labor under inhuman conditions; to ask the United Nations to take action against slave labor conditions in kolkhozes and in the virgin lands of Kazakhstan and Siberia because these conditions are a violation of elementary human rights;

4. To assure the captive peoples, in a brotherly fashion, that their free representatives from Eastern and Central Europe, united in the International Peasant Union, are meeting all difficulties with high morale and undaunted courage in their determination to contribute to and to hasten the victory of freedom and democracy in their homelands and the defeat of communism and all other tyranny everywhere in the world; and to achieve this goal, the International Peasant Union in exile is in close cooperation with all other democratic forces of the Free World, sharing the same danger and fighting the same enemy;

5. To appeal to the United Nations to place on their

CULTURAL AFFAIRS RESOLUTION

At the end of World War II, the United Nations pledged themselves to achieve the promotion of universal respect for the observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms as the basis of freedom, justice, and peace in the world. According to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion. Everyone should have freedom of opinion and expression, which includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any medium. Everyone has the right to education, which should be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It should promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations. Everyone has the right freely to participate in cultural life, to

agenda the liberation of the captive nations of Eastern and Central Europe, to raise the question of their right to self-determination, and to provide the necessary international help to guarantee that the captive peoples of Eastern and Central Europe once again can regain genuine independence and exercise all civil rights in freedom and democracy, including the right of the peasants to till their own land, the land which they have possessed for centuries;

6. To appeal to the United Nations, as well as to all nations of the Free World to initiate land reforms in all areas of the globe where poverty, social injustice and ignorance have taken root and where democratic rights and the need to promote progress for all, including the peasants, are ignored; to advocate agrarian reforms, with all democratic rights respected, so that the peasants can become masters of the land they and their families till and so they can enjoy the benefits of their own productive labor;

7. To appeal most ardently to the nations and governments of the Free World not to give material aid to Communist Governments, for such aid inevitably means support for the dictatorial rule of the Communist oppressors. Instead, political, material and moral aid should be given to the captive peoples and their democratic representatives in order to strengthen the determination of the captive peoples to continue resistance and to nurture their ambitions to defeat the Communist tyranny and to keep up their hopes that one day they will expel the Soviet imperialists and colonial exploiters from their countries now under Soviet subjugation;

8. To appeal to the political leaders and governments of the Free World, and especially to the European Movement and its affiliated groups, to integrate the captive nations of Eastern and Central Europe into their plans for economic cooperation, in order to give the captive nations the opportunity to take their place among the United-European states, after their liberation.

enjoy the arts and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits.

All captive European nations, Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania and Yugoslavia, except the Baltic States—Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania—as members of the United Nations are bound by these solemn pledges. And yet, their forcibly imposed Communist totalitarian regimes have systematically violated human rights and fundamental freedoms not only in political and social spheres of interest but also where spiritual and cultural matters are concerned.

The Seventh Congress of the International Peasant Union notes with the greatest indignation that since 1959 the following developments have taken place behind the Iron Curtain:

In the Baltic States, as well as in all other captive countries, the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion has been completely suppressed. There is no more freedom of opinion and expression, no freedom of information and no academic freedom in the captive European area. The Marx-Leninist doctrine has been introduced as the official creed. Schools and churches (without respect to their traditional positions and rights), cultural institutions and all media of mass communications have been degraded to the undignified role of mere tools in the Sovietization and Communization of cultural life.

A reorganization of the school system according to the Soviet pattern has been carried out. Its main feature is the so-called polytechnization, a combination of education with manual training. The churches have been put under State control and compelled, at least partially, to serve the Communist regimes. If they resisted, their leaders were persecuted. Freedom of worship and religious expression was hampered, and religion is regarded as a superstition, hostile to the Marx-Leninist world outlook and to scientific progress. Participation in religious services is officially discouraged, and aggressive atheistic propaganda is constantly being circulated.

A planned effort has been under way to uproot all spiritual values, domestic and foreign, which are considered to be obstacles to the success of Communist cultural indoctrination. Thus, not only the ideals,

WOMEN RESOLUTION

Whereas, the Communist dictatorship issues clamorous propaganda in South America, Africa, Asia and all over the world about the equality of women and their emancipation, when under the Communist regime there is only equality in slave labor, misery, hunger and terror;

Whereas, the Communist dictatorship is forcing women and children to participate in the hardest physical labor in collective farms for a required number of working days, especially in the absence of their arrested, imprisoned or deported sons, husbands, and brothers;

Whereas, women in the Communist police state are forced to perform immoral and unnatural duties in state administration—duties highly incompatible with woman's role as mother, wife, and sister;

Whereas, the Communist regime is separating children from their parents, educating and indoctrinating them against their parents, against their families and against their fatherlands, in order to destroy traditional family relations and to counteract the family's education of the children in the spirit of patriotic duties and humanitarian ideals, principles, and sentiments, thereby causing the destruction of the moral standards of future generations of women in the oppressed nations;

Whereas, the peasant women have shown enormous courage and readiness for self-sacrifice in defending freedom, social justice, and national independence

spiritual endeavors and cultural heritage of the captive nations, but also their traditional cultural ties with the West, their history and literature, their theatre, music, arts, press, radio and television have fallen victims of the Communist inquisition and its lying propaganda. All national cultures are now required to be oriented toward Moscow. The Communist Party also, as the highest cultural authority, issues official guides to authors on how to write, to artists on how to create works of art and to commentators on how to speak. The Communist Party is the sole guardian of the ideological purity of all aspects of public life. Non-conformists are removed (as bourgeois nationalists) from their jobs, and all cultural workers have become tools of the regime. Even students of non-proletarian origin are excluded from higher learning. Under such conditions, there can be no free education, no free culture and no free participation in cultural life.

The Seventh Congress of the International Peasant Union strongly protests against such barbarian degradation of national culture by the Soviet and Communist regimes behind the Iron Curtain, and it draws the attention of the United Nations, and its member nations from the Free World, to these intolerable conditions, asking them to declare all the Communist representatives in the United Nations responsible for flagrant violations of the United Nations Charter and its Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

during the riots in Poznan, during the Hungarian Revolution and in all actions against oppression in the face of Soviet military and imperialist aggression,

The Women's Section of the IPU resolves as follows:

1. Because of the danger to their lives and to the lives of their children, to refrain from sending greetings to the peasant women under Communist oppression who are determined to oppose the red dictatorship with all necessary sacrifices and to accelerate the final victory of freedom through free democratic education of the present and coming generations.

2. To appeal to all free peasant women in exile to unite their efforts and to take active part in the activities of the IPU aiming at the liberation of the Communist-subjugated nations.

3. To entreat the free women of the world to help their enslaved sisters behind the Iron Curtain to regain their human dignity.

4. To appeal to the leaders of the Free World to fulfill their pledges to the small nations about their God-given inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Under the banner of the IPU, the free peasant women in exile can set an example as courageous fighters for freedom and devoted, faithful builders of a new and free democratic society with strong moral and educational foundations, living in lasting peace and spiritual and material prosperity.

AGRARIAN YOUTH RESOLUTION

The Youth Commission of the Seventh Congress of the IPU met in plenary session at 9:30 a.m. on September 3, 1961, in the Cotillion Foyer of the Sheraton Park Hotel in Washington, D.C.

First item on the Agenda was the Election of the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Secretary.

The following were elected unanimously: Mr. Jani Shopov, Bulgaria, Chairman; Mr. Jon Stere, Rumania, Vice-Chairman; Mr. Luan Gashi, Albania, Secretary.

A draft resolution was presented, which, after being read and discussed, was adopted:

Whereas, the Communist regimes continue their repressive measures against the youth of Central and Eastern Europe, and persist in depriving it of its basic rights and freedoms, and the material and spiritual conditions which are necessary for its moral and physical integrity;

Whereas, the Communist establishment uses all means to tear the young men and women away from their families and to place them in a position of complete dependence on the Party;

Whereas, all political, cultural, and sports organizations of the youth are under Party control and from an early age, Communist propaganda attempts to sow in children's minds hatred for their parents and to regiment their feelings, thoughts, and attitudes in accordance with the Communist model;

Whereas educational legislation has succeeded in impoverishing spiritually all educational enterprise, and school children are forced to donate their labor to factories and kolkhozes; atheist propaganda has reached a new high of intensity, and the purpose of all these efforts is to destroy the moral and spiritual foundations of contemporary society based on the individual; the widespread display of hooliganism is a symptom of the profound crisis in which the youth of Central and Eastern Europe finds itself, and it is a product of the social conditions of the Soviet-Communist system and the most eloquent demonstration of its complete ideological and political degradation;

Whereas, the Communist ideology has failed to arouse enthusiasm, and its efforts to attract the youth with scholarships and other privileges have also failed; the youth is steadily rejecting them and rebelling against them, and this is why the Communist

regimes have continued to place young people under arrest, convicting them and sending them to concentration camps, and dismissing large numbers of students from secondary schools and universities;

Whereas, thousands of young people are still condemned to forced labor in Siberia and discontent is so intense that it is apparent even in the Communist youth organizations and evident in their publications;

Whereas, the peasant youth in Central and Eastern Europe remains faithful to the ideals of the peasant movement and side by side with the youth in the schools and the factories, it fights the Communist dictatorship and its spiritual and economic exploitation,

Therefore be it resolved that:

"The Seventh Congress of the International Peasant Union expresses its admiration for the young people in our captive countries, who, as they did during the Poznan rebellion and the Hungarian Revolution, have demonstrated their willingness to defend the spiritual and political independence of their countries and to destroy the established oppressive regimes, regardless of sacrifices. It appeals to them to stand firm on their sacred convictions that freedom belongs to those who truly and persistently struggle for it.

The Seventh Congress of the IPU is convinced that the youth will continue to stand for freedom, social justice, and freedom of education.

The Seventh Congress of the IPU appeals to the democratic nations to support the struggle of the youth of Central and Eastern Europe for its right to live and work in liberty and enjoy the benefits of free science.

The Seventh Congress of the IPU appeals to the United Nations to implement its Charter and guarantee the youth of Central and Eastern Europe its right to live in free, independent, and democratic countries. Only in this manner will it enjoy the rights and freedoms of speech, thought, the press, and education.

The Seventh Congress of the IPU appeals to the leaders of the free nations to do everything in their power to raise, at every international conference, the question of the captive nations and to demand the restoration of their sovereignty."

"We know that there is one and only one way to peace; and that is through freedom. The recognition of a slave state as a free state would only add power to the enemy . . . while ruining the moral authority of the free world. The free world must give up any delusions it may have about peace being possible otherwise than by the liberation of all the people of Europe."

*Professor SALVADOR DE MADARIAGA,
President of the Liberal International,
to the Seventh Congress of the IPU.*

COUNTRIES OF EASTERN AND CENTRAL EUROPE BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

IPU Member Party Reports To the Seventh Congress

FOOD SHORTAGES FOR AT LEAST ANOTHER FIVE YEARS

*By VASIL ANDONI
Secretary-General of the Albanian Agrarian
Democratic Party BALLI KOMBETAR*

THE DETERIORATING ECONOMY

The years 1959 and 1960 (especially the latter) have witnessed a rapid and serious deterioration of the country's economy, a tendency which has continued to gather momentum to the present day.

As the last year of the Second Five Year Plan, 1960 was to have been the year of great expectations for the Tirana regime. The overhauling of the entire framework of Albania's state planning, which was undertaken and carried out by thousands of Soviet experts, who came to Albania after the signing in Moscow, on April 17, 1957, of a comprehensive agreement between Moscow and Tirana, was to have come to fruition during 1960. As was pointed out at that time, the main objective of this agreement was to turn the country's economy from a liability into an asset for the Soviet bloc.

In April, 1957, the Soviet Union, on the one hand, agreed to cancel a debt of some 420,000,000 roubles, and on the other, undertook to run the country's economy in all its varied phases for the next fifteen years with the help of Soviet experts.

After several months of reconnaissance and planning, the Tirana Government announced early in 1958 that the end of 1960, the last year of the Second Five Year Plan, would witness two main achievements: the solution of the chronic food problem by internal means only and the boosting of oil production to an annual average of 20,000,000 tons. It was then argued by the Tirana propaganda machine that by solving the food problem, agriculture would not only be able to feed the people, but also to aid the growing industry, and with an increasing oil production the industrialization campaign would reach a highly productive phase.

Meanwhile, however, the Soviet experts have stepped up the collectivization campaign to the point where some 85 percent of all arable land has now been fully collectivized, leaving only a few unimportant and rather inaccessible areas yet to come under this system. On the other hand, they have continued with the process of gearing and reshaping the country's economy to the requirements of the Soviet bloc, rather than developing it with full regard for the country's internal conditions, requirements and potentialities.

The inevitable consequence was that the existing dislocations which had until then kept the Albanian economy at a singularly unfruitful level, far from being removed, increased in variety and intensity through 1959 and 1961. From official declarations and statistics it soon became obvious that even the intensified and unhampered efforts of Soviet experts had failed to solve Albania's intractable problem of economic solvency. And so it was that in 1960, the year of great expectations, the year which was to have witnessed the solution of the food problem by internal means only and the boosting of oil production, the last year of the Second Five Year Plan came to a dismal and hopeless end, and was ushered out by far-reaching and comprehensive failures critically effecting all sectors of the country's economy.

The extent to which the economic situation has so inexorably deteriorated was eventually revealed during the twice-postponed Fourth-Party Congress, convened in Tirana on February 13, 1961. In their official reports on past "achievements" and future promises, both Enver Hoxha and Mehmet Shehu publicly admitted that the Second Five-Year Plan had failed to reach its main objectives both in agriculture and industry. They spoke in very glowing terms about so-called successes in the collectivization campaign, but, when it came to giving concrete production figures, they avoided the question by stating that, due to adverse weather conditions in 1959 and 1960, agriculture had not been able to produce enough food for the people. They avoided also the complex question of industrial production, with its allied problems of raw materials, domestic and foreign prices, the balance sheet of import-export trade and the place assigned to Albania within the Comecon framework.

When it came to the chronic food problem, they stated that this would be solved during the coming five years, by the change from extensive to intensive agriculture, which, in turn, would be made possible by the construction, in Northern Albania, of a chemical plant to produce the necessary fertilizers. In short, the Albanian people have been told that food shortages would continue for at least another five years and that even then there would be no guarantee whatsoever

of any serious improvement in the food supply. The truth of the matter is revealed by official reports, published during the Party Congress, in which it was revealed that more than three quarters of the Third Five-Year Plan is based not on resources already discovered or even prospected, but on resources, in the form of iron, nickel, oil, chrome, and copper, which have not even been discovered yet and which, for all they know, may not even exist at all in the country's underground wealth. . .

BETWEEN MOSCOW AND PEKING

Parallel to this disintegration in the country's economy and organically linked with it, 1959 and 1960 have witnessed certain deteriorating changes and developments of comparable intensity and importance in the political situation as well. Of these, the most shattering and the most dramatic has been the prolonged and worsening strain in Moscow-Tirana relations, a strain whose roots lie inextricably deep in Khrushchev's attitude toward Tito's Yugoslavia.

From previous experience it is obvious that any rapprochement between Moscow and Belgrade would have serious and far-reaching repercussions among the Communist leadership in Tirana. In order to forestall any such development, which would spell their doom, the latter have reacted, and are still reacting, very strongly against such a policy, hiding themselves as usual behind the transparent mask of a pseudo-patriotism, and adopting a purely chauvinistic and opportunistic attitude towards the Albanian minority of one million who live in the Yugoslav provinces of Kosova and Metshija. However, in their struggle to assert their rights as a minority, against Tito's regime which oppresses them, the Albanians in Yugoslavia have the political maturity to distinguish between Tirana, the capital of their mother-country, and Tirana, the mouthpiece of Communist propaganda, and they have not succumbed to the temptations from across the borders. Their struggle is fortified by the great faith they have put in the principle of self-determination contained in the United Nations' Charter.

The Tirana regime is the only one left among the East European satellites which has not yet followed Khrushchev's line and which has remained Stalinist to the core. Looked at from Moscow, this Soviet window on the warm Mediterranean waters has now become a political as well as an economic liability, and for reasons of prestige alone it must be kept under control. Consequently, the Soviet Union resorted, during 1959 and 1960, to pressures of different kinds (heavy economic pressure being not the least among them) to bring the Hoxha-Shehu clique to their knees.

From official statements the inference is clear that Moscow has withdrawn the credit of three hundred million roubles promised in 1959 for the Third Five Year Plan. Many Soviet experts seem to have left the country and returned to Russia, and Soviet heavy equipment is not being sent to Albania at the prices and in the amounts agreed upon. More important than all these, however, is the fact that Moscow has appreciably decreased its exports of grain and foodstuffs to Albania to relieve the country's very serious food shortages.

On the political and military levels, the Tirana regime has been further ostracized and isolated from the Soviet fold of East European satellites. The Soviet ambassador had for months been absent from Tirana during 1960, while the Tirana regime was being repeatedly threatened with expulsion from both the Cominform and the Warsaw Pact. A few months ago, eight Soviet submarines and a tender withdrew from their base at Valona and sailed back to the Soviet Union without submerging, having stopped some eight hours at Gibraltar for all to observe them.

Meanwhile, Hoxha, who during this period has reverted to the personality cult, has reacted by systematically boycotting all Communist and international gatherings in which Khrushchev has participated with all his East European underlings. He did not go to the Bucharest conference of Communist leaders in June, 1960, although he sent Shehu to the United Nations General Assembly the following September, and Balluku, the Defense Minister, to the Warsaw Pact meeting in Moscow a few months later. He did, however, participate in the international conference of eighty-one Communist parties, held in Moscow in November 1960, where he crossed swords with Khrushchev on more than one occasion. His main speech, which was eventually "leaked" to the West, reveals in unmistakable terms how deep and serious this rift has become and how far Khrushchev has gone in bringing pressure to bear on the Tirana leadership to toe his line towards the West in general and Yugoslavia in particular. Khrushchev has gone so far as to create a pro-Soviet group within the Albanian Communist Party through his Ambassador, Ivanov, in Tirana, in order to bring about either a change from within by elections, or, failing that, a coup d'etat by the army. Hoxha's speech reveals also how critical the food situation had become in August and September of 1960. But Khrushchev had refused to answer the call for help.

It's relations with Moscow having come to such a sorry pass, and all its attempts to find for itself some secure place within the Communist bloc having been thwarted, the Tirana regime eventually turned to far-off Peking for aid and guidance. The Tirana leaders have at last found in Peking both a friendly ear for their grievances, one conditioned by the Peking-Moscow rivalry for hegemony within the Communist camp, and a fertile ground in which to sow their ideological views vis-a-vis coexistence, the inevitability of war and revisionism, particularly Yugoslav revisionism. But in view of the current economic crisis that Communist China herself is going through, it is highly doubtful whether Peking will be able to fulfill any part of the economic agreements signed with Tirana at the beginning of this year. The terms of these agreements would seem to indicate that Chinese help, to the tune of 112,500,000 heavy roubles, is intended to replace not only Soviet aid in its entirety, but also a good part of the assistance Albania has contracted to receive from the East European satellites for her Third Five Year Plan. Peking has undertaken to construct twenty-five industrial projects with Chinese experts, who have already started replacing their Soviet counterparts. Meanwhile, China has, in spite of her very acute food shortage bordering on

widespread famine, diverted over 90,000 tons of wheat to Albania from the amount she has so far bought from Australia.

On the domestic front, Hoxha's reaction against Khrushchev's pressure and intrigues took the form of extensive purges against Communists of doubtful allegiance, which culminated in the trial last May of ten Party members, accused of having plotted to overthrow the Tirana regime by force, allegedly with the

help and connivance of Yugoslavia, Greece and the American Sixth Fleet. After the usual "confessions" they were all found guilty and sentenced. Of these, four were sentenced to death, including the ex-commander of the fleet Vice-Admiral Temo Sejko, and executed at the end of May. This, together with the arrest of some four hundred Party members who had studied in the Soviet Union, was Hoxha's answer to Khrushchev's methods.

BULGARIAN ECONOMY IS A REPLICA IN MINIATURE OF THE SOVIET

By SLAVI NEIKOV,
Chairman of the Bulgarian National
Union in Exile

THE COMMUNIST ECONOMY

With their Third Five-Year Plan, which was hastily wound up at the end of 1960, the Communist rulers gained full control over Bulgaria's economic life. The so-called socialist way of ownership, production, exchange and distribution has encompassed all branches of the economy: agriculture, industry, credit, transport, etc. Within this new-fangled economic framework, the Communist regime has carried out a grass-root revamping of the administrative apparatus. During the time between the Sixth and Seventh IPU Congress, Bulgaria's economic and political sovietization has been completed.

The Red rulers are proud of having succeeded in transforming the country into a full-blooded Soviet colony. Party Secretary, Todor Jivkov, declared at the Central Committee's plenary meeting on April 12-14 of this year, that "the plenary discussion of the Soviet Communist Party's Central Committee is, for us Bulgarian Communists, also a great lesson and a valuable experience, because their fundamental problems are identical with those of the unfolding of our socialist rural economy". In a word, the Bulgarian economy is but a replica of the Soviet economy.

WHAT THE SETUP OF COLLECTIVE FARMING LOOKS LIKE

According to official sources, the collectivization of agriculture has been concluded. All arable land is in the kolkhozes' hands, i.e., it is owned solely by the state. The collectives have been merged into bigger units, and there are now 934 of these huge collective farms.

Private ownership of farming land is limited to five decares, on which the peasant must find place for his courtyard, garden plot, house and installations for a cow, a hog, a few sheep and half a score of chickens for private needs.

The Bulgarian collectives are tailored to resemble the Soviet model, where the bureaucratic apparatus is under the direct control and supervision of the Party organization. The labor force is divided into "brigades", each one made up of three hundred to five hundred ploughmen. The brigade foreman is called "brigadier", and he is assisted by five to six deputy-brigadiers who are paid on a monthly basis and do not actively participate in production. Each brigade contains a certain number of "outfits" made up of thirty to fifty peasants, and the foreman of each outfit is

also an employee receiving a monthly salary. The outfit in turn is made up of a certain amount of "groups" numbering five to ten persons and headed by an older farmer. The latter is paid on the basis of his workdays and receives, in addition, an increment. On the average, from ten to fifteen peasants are supervised by one bureaucrat.

MECHANIZATION HAS COLLAPSED

Through the so-called MTS [Machine-Tractor Stations] the bulk of the agricultural implements is owned by the state. The dismantling of the MTS, which took place a couple of years ago in emulation of a similar step in the USSR, and their conversion into repair shops was a fizzle. The collectives do not have the wherewithal for either buying the implements from the MTS or getting machinery from the state. As a consequence, the MTS are still in existence in Bulgaria, although some of the large amalgamated kolkhozes own farm machinery.

The Communists have been bragging about having equipped the collectivized rural economy with tractors, combines and other agricultural machinery and, in so doing, lifting the countryside to a higher level of productivity. The record, however, shows that they have fared even worse in this area. There are said to be 40,000 fifteen horsepower tractors, 8,000 combines, 10,000 trucks and 837 repair centers.

Without dwelling upon the accuracy of these figures, we would like to point out that according to official sources these agricultural implements had been in use as follows: in 1956, 44.4 per cent of the tractors were used, and between 1959 and 1961 no more than 9.0 per cent of the tractors.

Out of the available 372 corn-combines, only 15 units were in the field in 1960, and none of the 206 beet-root combines were used.

Moreover, out of the 837 repair centers only 453 were used, and then not at the optimum level of efficiency.

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION IS LOW

Productivity in collectivized agriculture is dwindling steadily each year, and Party Secretary, Todor Jivkov, recently admitted that "the collectives' output is not commensurate with the population's needs and industry's requirements of raw materials". The chief eco-

conomic planner, Stanko Todorov, has acknowledged that "the Five-Year-Plan for the rural economy has not been implemented for a great many products", among them grapes, cotton, tobacco, grains, poultry, eggs, pork, wool, vegetables, etc.

In his report, Party Secretary Jivkov pointed out that the number of cattle began decreasing substantially from the day the government decreed collectivization of all arable land, i.e., from 1948 onwards. Jivkov conceded that the number of livestock had fallen below that of 1939.

The Communists' failure in the rural sector is highlighted by the following statistics: in 1960, the total agricultural output of Bulgaria was estimated to be worth 18,403,000,000 levas, of which only 13,288,000,000 are attributed to the collectives and State Farms. This means that no less than one-third of the total farm output came from the private sector, which consists entirely of five decare garden plots plus a few farm animals for private needs. These figures bear witness to the rock-bottom productivity and poor management of the collectives and State Farms.

The existence of this appalling discrepancy between the means available and the results achieved is further corroborated by the volume of investments earmarked for the rural sector in the Plan for 1961. Out of 7,816 million levas of capital investments, only 737 million [or 9.5 per cent] are set aside for agriculture and forestry, and 65.4 per cent are reserved for industry. While an output of 50,694 million levas is anticipated for the industrial sector, an output of 26,863 million levas is expected from the rural economy.

The level of efficiency in State Farms and collectives is very low, the management is wasteful, and the produce is usually shoddy. Around 142.38 levas are spent on each decare of wheat and a kilogram of wheat produced by the sovkhozes costs 0.73 leva. The yield per decare is low: 174 kilograms of wheat and 185 kilograms of corn.

The yearly deficit in collectivized agriculture is huge. Thus, for example, one hundred million levas went down the drain because of a bad alfalfa crop; another three hundred million were forfeited as a result of inadequate irrigation facilities. While the 1960 plan foresaw a sixty million leva revenue from the State Farms, the latter ended the year twenty million leva in the red.

In the field of animal husbandry, the mortality rate is excessively high: 37.1 per cent for chickens and 12 per cent for hogs.

Unwarranted delays in bringing in the crops of cotton, tobacco, fruits and vegetables, resulted in an aggregate loss of over one billion levas.

It goes without saying that the bill for the Communists' agricultural mismanagement is paid by the farmers, for the compulsory deliveries of rural produce are collected by the state regardless of the population's requirements or any special conditions that may arise.

The legislation dealing with compulsory deliveries to the state has not been substantially revised. The collectives are bound to "sell" their produce to the state at fixed prices. According to official data, around ninety-four per cent of the state's purchases come from the kolkhozes and sovkhozes.

PRIVATELY OWNED FARM ANIMALS STILL ARE AN IMPORTANT ECONOMIC FACTOR

Animal husbandry is, so to speak, the soft underbelly of the Communist rural economy. The various categories of livestock are apportioned between state owned farms and private farmers as follows:

Of 294,000 cows, 65.4 per cent are state owned, while 34.6 per cent are privately owned. There are 5,898,000 sheep, 72.2 per cent of them state owned and 27.8 per cent privately owned. The total number of hogs is 1,391,000 of which 66.9 per cent are state owned and 33.1 per cent belong to private farmers. In poultry farming, 53.1 per cent of all the poultry are state owned, while 46.9 per cent are privately owned.

These figures used seem to indicate that the collectivized sector is in trouble. The productivity of state-owned cows is below 1,400 litres on the average per year, and hens owned by the collective farms average ninety-one eggs per year.

Although deprived of any help from the state and lacking any subsidiary means of investment, the private sector still holds a key position in the Communist farm system in the teeth of a thousand and one chicaneries conjured up by the authorities. The Communists seem to have tacitly acquiesced to that state of affairs as inevitable.

LIVING STANDARDS

Work in the collectives is paid for on the basis of a complex system of computations. The collectivized farmers' workday is no longer paid for both in kind and in money, as in the past, but in cash only. The recent Communist "reform" in this realm has somewhat stepped-up the farmers' proletarianization by simultaneously increasing the countryside's dependence upon the regime.

Living standards in Bulgaria, and particularly in the countryside, edge towards the mere subsistence level. The yearly per capita income is below that of some African or Asian countries. The collectivized farmer does not get more than seven levas for a workday, while the monthly wage of an industrial worker or a civil servant is around five hundred levas. Foodstuffs and consumer goods, such as shoes or clothing, have to be bought from the state stores at exorbitant prices. Thus, for example, a kilogram of bread costs from 1.50 to 3.40 levas; a kilo of butter, 24 levas; a kilo of cheese, 10 to 12 levas; a pair of shoes 240 levas; and a suit from 800 to 1,200 levas.

EVEN KHRUSHCHEV ADMITS THAT "YOU CANNOT EAT STEEL"

The facts we have cited indicate that the Bulgarian farmers' problem is not an economic but a political one. There is little doubt that it is a serious one and forms the main barrier to the consolidation of Communist power, on the one hand, and the expansion of Soviet imperialism, on the other. It is not an accident that Khrushchev, notwithstanding Soviet prowess in space and rocketry, declared at the January 1961 plenary meeting of the Party's Central Committee: "Comrades, you cannot eat steel." This is, of course, a truism which speaks volumes. We all need bread. The efficient production of bread is predicated upon freedom, human dignity for those who plough the soil, and the latter's right to own the land they till and the tools they use.



TO TRANSFORM A HUMAN BEING INTO A MACHINE IS AN UNPARDONABLE SIN AND A CRIME

By VLADKO MACEK,
President of the Croatian Peasant Party,
Chairman of the Seventh
Congress of the IPU

When Karl Marx wrote *Das Kapital*, he was unable to assign any place to the peasants in his projected social system. To this day, other Marxian writers have turned out to be equally unsuccessful in determining the role of the peasant under communism. For this very reason, the Communists in endeavoring to realize their Marxist ideas, treat the peasants as their chief enemies. Although they have used force, and are still using it, to enroll the free peasants in their kolkhozes, they have fallen short of their aims. It is a historical fact that the Bolsheviks killed and exiled to the forced labor camps in Siberia more than twenty million Russian peasants. In spite of everything, even after forty years of ruthless dictatorship the Communists did not succeed in completely destroying the free peasantry.

With the destruction of the free peasantry in mind, they came upon the idea that the well-being of every nation depends on industrialization and particularly the well-being of the so-called "economically underdeveloped countries". Obviously, the Communists still insist on this misleading idea, but we do not understand why some Western statesmen, representing the anti-Communist world, also accept this Communist idea wholeheartedly. We find it difficult to understand why they believe in the rapid industrialization of the peasant countries and offer substantial aid to such projects, not only where the conditions require them but also where they are completely misplaced.

There is no doubt that the machine is one of man's most wonderful inventions, but only as long as it serves man. Its value changes entirely if man must serve the machine, and especially if man—a rational being—must become merely a part of the machine.

Some eighty years ago, the famous English author and critic, John Ruskin, wrote: In our society work is fractionalized and not equally distributed. On the contrary, man's spirit is fractionalized and broken into many small pieces. In the factory, he produces only a part of something. With the little common sense left to him, he is unable to produce a single pin or a nail, and he has to exhaust himself to produce no more than a pin point or a nail head. Of course, it is useful to produce many pins every day, but when we examine the way they are produced, we should realize how damaging it is. These machine products are cleaned and polished with the sand of the human soul.

Men can be put in chains and tortured, and still remain, in a spiritual sense, free. True slavery begins with the destruction of the immortal human soul and the transformation of people into mere parts of a machine. It is this transformation that is the cause of permanent dissatisfaction among industrial workers. They are dissatisfied not because of the lack of clothing or food but because they can find no satisfaction or pleasure in their work. This, in essence, is Ruskin's view of modern industrial society.

At times, land becomes overcrowded and exhausted and peasants are forced by natural circumstances to leave the work for which God created them. This is always considered a misfortune. But when the State and the political system are used to force the peasants to become industrial workers, as the Communists are doing (sometimes, unfortunately, with the help of the Western Democracies, which help the Yugoslav Communist dictator, Tito, to transform the free peasant into regimented serfs), then it is an unpardonable sin and a crime.

THE DESTRUCTION OF THE FREE PEASANTS CONTINUES

By Dr. JURAJ KRNEVIC,
Secretary-General of the Croatian Peasant Party

The life of the Croat peasant under the present Communist regime is one of permanent martyrdom. It is true that the forcibly created kolkhozes have been disbanded and do not exist anymore, and that formal requisitioning has been stopped, but the leaders of red Yugoslavia have never really given up the idea of breaking the peasant as a free human being and turning him into a blind tool of their policy. The

main instrument in that endeavor is at the present time the exorbitant taxation which forces every peasant family to send at least one of its members to the town to look for some employment and bring home some money each week. In poorer mountainous regions, there already exist a number of completely deserted villages. In their efforts to carry out their program of the "socialist transformation of the

village", the Communist government of Yugoslavia recently used the device of a redistribution of agricultural lands to destroy the free peasants. The best plots of lands are reserved for the kolkhozes, and as most peasants are unable to pay the exorbitant costs of all services they receive, part of their lands is taken away to cover expenses and it is added to that of the kolkhozes.

Foreign aid, especially from America, though it is extended with a view towards improving agriculture, never reaches the peasants in Croatia. It is used exclusively on state-owned and government-run estates or on the kolkhozes, created out of the holdings formerly owned by German peasants expelled after the war to Austria and Germany, or even for entirely senseless and unnecessary industrialization projects. The Croat peasant lives exclusively by his super-human exertions and unaided by anyone, lives and hopes for the better. Cannot at least some moral encouragement be given to him by the West? That is the question which has been put to us in many letters reaching us from Croatia.

The activity of the Croat Peasant Party abroad is not confined to any country or to any continent and is conducted with a view to supporting the unequal struggle of the people in the homeland. Final deci-

sions as to the future of our people will be taken by the people in the home country, and our most essential duty is to support them and to keep alive their faith that justice must finally prevail.

Among the outstanding activities of the Croat Peasant Party between the last and the coming Congress of the IPU were the Third Congress of the Croat Peasant Party, which took place in Brussels, Belgium, in August 1960, and the Third Congress of the Free Croat Workers' Federation, which was held in July this year in Brussels, under the slogan: "A union of workers and peasants for a free and democratic Croatia!" The Free Croat Workers' Federation is a professional workers' union which was, before the last war, by far the strongest workers' union of Croatia. Ever since its foundation in 1921, it has given its close political cooperation to the Croat Peasant Party. Both congresses were fully successful in their aims. Their decisions regarding close cooperation between peasants and workers in a free Croatia, the uncompromising struggle against the present dictatorial and exploitative Communist rule, and the struggle for a free, democratic and independent Croatia within a United Europe composed of free peoples, received wide publicity in the homeland and among the Croats living abroad.

RED AGRARIAN INTERNATIONAL REVIVED IN PRAGUE

By the Czechoslovak Republican Agrarian Party

The following lines aim to attract attention to special international activity of Czechoslovak Communists among the peasantry of the Free World.

fight against communism remains often misunderstood in the West and in the United States as well. The social evolution of the United States took place in a favorable political climate. No political movement among the farmers or considerations of the farmers' special role as a class were needed to assure the democratic progress of the country. Americans, therefore, lacking this experience, neglect the peasants in their aid to underdeveloped countries.

Those favorable conditions which built the United States as a free society do not exist in the underdeveloped countries at present. Communist subversion there demands the creation of a strong and prosperous class of working people. The main pillar of the working class, traditionally, is a prosperous and politically influential peasant class is a *sine qua non* for a healthy democratic evolution in the underdeveloped countries.

We are emphasizing this since a number of voices have been heard advising that the Latin American situation could be saved only by unlimited support of non-Communist leftists among workers, intelligentsia, and students. The advocates of such a policy forget that in South America seventy-five per cent of the people are still peasants and the majority of them

live in great poverty. If no care is taken to raise their cultural, social and economic standards, they may, someday, participate in a Communist inspired revolution led by leftist elements. We witnessed this phenomenon in Russia forty-five years ago, in China after the Second World War, and more recently in Guatemala and Cuba.

We have, however, seen in our Eastern and Central European countries that an independent, prosperous and well organized peasantry offers the strongest resistance to communism.

FAILURE OF THE PREWAR RED AGRARIAN INTERNATIONAL

In 1923 the Soviets made a fruitless attempt to organize a Red Agrarian International and arranged to hold its first Congress in Moscow.

The one-week congress was called the *First International Peasant Conference* and was advertised as being held in the magnificent throne room of the Kremlin Palace. Speeches to the "international peasants" were given by Kalinin, Zinoviev and Clara Zetkin. Communist theses on the peasant were discussed and the Hungarian-born Soviet economist Varga attacked the peasant system in capitalist societies, while Lebedev spoke on the merits of agricultural cooperatives in Russia. Manifestos and appeals were published. Special appeals to the *Working Peasants of the Colonies*, to *Peasant Women*, and *Working Women of all Countries* were produced, and the International Peasant Council was organized.

From the very beginning of its existence, the Bolshevik regime in its aggressive international activities has tried to get sympathy from and control of workers, peasants and what the Communists call the working intelligentsia. It was successful in different countries in varying degrees with workers and working intelligentsia, but it failed everywhere with the peasants. At the First International Peasant Conference in Moscow they did not get a single agrarian leader of stature to attend the meeting. (A book on the Conference was published by the Peasant (Communist) Library in Paris; an English translation was published by the International Peasant Union in 1957.)

The Soviet attempt to organize the *Red Agrarian International* failed and the Communists never became influential among the independent peasantry before the Second World War. The proletarianization of the peasants through the collectivization of Soviet agriculture and the cruelty which accompanied the process in Russia, where millions of peasants perished, alienated the peasant masses from the Soviet form of "cooperatives."

Although the Soviets failed before the war to organize the peasantry on an international scale for Communist political aims, the situation has decisively changed since then, to the advantage of the Communist world:

a) Communist rule penetrated, through aggression, into sixteen states in Europe, Asia and even America (Cuba), and it is trying to establish a foothold in Africa.

b) Communism has many militant and politically confused sympathizers in the new underdeveloped

states of Asia and Africa. It also has sympathizers among the peasantry of Latin America. The miserable, illiterate masses in all these countries are infected by Communist propaganda and influenced by Communist political maneuvers.

c) The Soviets not only continue to subsidize Communist parties all over the world, but are now strong enough to pursue their political aims through economic help to underdeveloped countries.

In September of last year the Communists organized a large international meeting in Havana on "agrarian problems of the national liberation movements." This year, a second *International Agricultural Conference* was held in Prague. Both consumers' and producers' cooperatives were represented at this conference which was dominated by delegations from the underdeveloped countries.

WHY PRAGUE WAS CHOSEN FOR THIS YEAR'S MEETING

Czechoslovakia, a small country, is often chosen by the Soviets when indirect action is being planned. The Czech Communists are very loyal to the Soviets, and Czechoslovakia, in the minds of many people in the Free World, is still somehow living on its good prewar reputation. Czechoslovak agriculture before the war was one of the best developed in Europe; and even taking into consideration its mismanagement by the Communists, it still has one of the most developed agricultural economies behind the Iron Curtain. Prague, with its festivals, is very pleasant, the Karlovy Vary and Mariánské Lázně helping to create an air of hospitality. No better place for holding an agricultural congress could be found behind the Iron Curtain, especially when political gains are being considered.

We can expect this: The Soviets may organize a large-scale drive to gain some hold over the peasantry in Asia, Africa and South America through cooperatives. The cooperatives, as a means to improve their economic and social standards, have a great appeal to small farmers. The Soviets feel that their time has come. Before the war their attempts ended in failure; firstly because they did not possess enough strength and experience to carry their plans through and secondly, because they had no foothold in Asia and Africa, which were controlled by the Western Powers. They are now facing countries which have been liberated and where the peasantry still represents almost eighty per cent of the population. With the new states now subject to political and social unrest, the Communists have a freer hand to carry through their plans.

Aid to cooperatives is an innocent-looking, humanitarian, social and economic endeavor. Land reform, as a plan for de-proletarianization of the peasant masses, might bring many social, economic and political difficulties if not properly conducted and helped by the West. When large estates are broken up and parcelled out, new farm buildings must be provided, new roads built, the soil must be improved, and cattle and machines must be bought. There must be a reorganization of the system for buying all the things that new

farms need for marketing agricultural products, and the problem of receiving credits must be solved.

To make millions of poor people immediately happy is practically impossible. The Soviets will have a wide choice of places to step into where they can make their investment pay off best. In helping to organize cooperatives, in giving economic help to underdeveloped countries through cooperatives and providing agricultural implements and machines, they might harvest excellent results in the form of political control over the underdeveloped countries.

Control over the cooperative movement and through it control over large segments of the population living on small farms, is not difficult to attain. It requires having the Communists' local men in control of the central cooperative organization in each state. Economic aid would reach this target. The Communists are quite clever in organizing a small, efficient minority which takes over the organization of the masses. Economic aid to the central cooperative organization will make Communist control of local organizations easy. This aid will be given to those communities where Communist control of the organization has been prepared. Such control is possible in localities where the gift of a simple steel plow or a cow changes the whole life of a peasant for the better. The leaders of the cooperatives do not need to be farmers; and in underdeveloped countries where peasants are mostly illiterate, they never will be.

Through local Communists to take control over the cooperatives, through the cooperatives to control the peasantry, and with the help of a Communist-organized

THE MUCH ADVERTISED ECONOMIC PROGRESS IS NOTHING BUT A TISSUE OF SOVIET LIES AND FORGERIES

peasantry, led by city Communists, to gain control of the country: this may be the new Soviet plan.

Communists are masters of betrayal, and we can expect that behind the innocent democratic slogans about the social advancement of the peasantry they will lure many politically inexperienced and well-intentioned people in the underdeveloped countries to cooperate in their design. They may employ the same tactics of infiltration, in cooperating with democratic elements, which they used in Eastern and Central Europe after the last war and which they are now trying to apply in Laos. They plan, organize, cooperate democratically, and wait patiently until they feel that they are in control of the situation, and that the time has come to strike. During this period of infiltration, they try their best to gain the confidence and sympathy of the people.

Reports have reached us from the Prague meeting of the International Agricultural Conference of this interesting political game of the Soviets. After the Conference, the majority of the delegates from the underdeveloped countries remained in Czechoslovakia for training in the Communist style of agricultural cooperative. European peasant Communists are in Czechoslovakia for training in collectives. *The Soviet drive to win control over the peasantry through back-door tactics has begun.*

Material help and education of the peasants in underdeveloped countries should be made an item of top priority by the Western Powers and should be furthered by all possible means and in a variety of ways.

Reports by the United Farmers' and Smallholders' Party of Estonia

SOVIET STRUGGLE TO CATCH UP WITH FREE ESTONIA OF TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AGO

The past two and a half years were the first years of the Soviet Seven-Year Plan for occupied Estonia. In the agricultural sector, this period has been characterized by frantic efforts to raise the level of Soviet agricultural production and to improve the meager diet of the Soviet common man. "Surpass the United States in the production of milk, butter and meat" is the slogan dangled like a carrot before the Soviet toiler.

These same efforts are reflected in occupied Estonia. If one reads the local newspapers and other publications, one gains the impression that the main concern has been to catch up with Free Estonia, to restore the level of agricultural production that Independent Estonia had reached just before the Second World War. A certain amount of progress apparently has been made, enough so that Nikita Khrushchev himself has expressed satisfaction with results in Estonia, while severe reprimands have been the portion of

many Party bosses throughout the Soviet Union. Yet, the flattering objective has not yet been achieved; generally, the present agricultural output seems to be about one fifth below the level attained by Free Estonia. Soviet claims that this level has been achieved in some areas have, upon closer examination, proven to be lies.

GENERAL CONDITIONS

Until recently Estonia, like Latvia and Lithuania, was almost hermetically sealed off from the Western World. The country was one of the restricted regions in the Soviet Union where no Western visitors, tourists or journalists were permitted to travel. In 1959, these restrictions were partially lifted and the capital city of Tallinn was opened to tourist traffic. However, individual trips are still nearly impossible, and visits are limited mostly to guided tours. Soviet authorities have not given permission to tourists to visit the graves of their relatives if these happen to be outside of Tallinn.

Western journalists who have visited Tallinn recently and who knew Tallinn before have observed that, despite the years of Soviet occupation, the city has still preserved much of its Western atmosphere and the typical Soviet drabness is not so prevalent as in the Soviet Union proper.

GENOCIDE AND RUSSIFICATION PROGRESSING SLOWLY

The years of occupation have brought great changes in the composition of the population, insofar as occupations and national composition are concerned. According to the 1959 Census the urban population increased from thirty-four per cent in 1939 to fifty-six per cent in 1959. Estonia and Latvia seem to be the most highly urbanized republics of the Soviet Union. This shift is due partly to massive deportations of peasants during the forced collectivization of Estonian farms. Partly, it is due to the large number who have left agriculture, the most miserably treated segment of the Soviet economy, and partly to the continuous influx of Russians into urban areas and into the more highly paid occupations.

The proportion of Russian nationals is now approaching one fourth of the total population in Estonia. The 1959 Census showed that 20.1 per cent of the population were Russians, 2.2 Byelorussians and Ukrainians and 1.4 per cent Russianized Finns in Estonia. The majority of this 23.7 per cent of foreign population must have entered the country after the Soviet occupation. It is not possible to determine the exact extent of this influx since parts of Estonian territory with considerable Russian population were annexed, after the occupation, by the Russian Federal Republic. In the present territory of Estonia, the Russian and other Slavic elements have probably increased about three to four times.

There is no information about recent mass deportations, although political persecution continues and so do arrests for political reasons. Another method of deporting Estonian youth out of the country is the "voluntary" migration to the virgin land areas in Soviet Kazakhstan and other places in Asia.

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION STILL LAGS BEHIND THAT OF FREE ESTONIA

The projected increases in agricultural production during the 1958-65 seven-year period average about seventy to ninety per cent more than the output of 1957. Specific increases planned are: meat and pork, seventy per cent; milk, ninety per cent, and vegetable crops fifty per cent. Also, the Seven-Year Plan provides for the building of 20,000 dwellings for collective farm workers. Production goals for 1965, however, are only slightly over the level of production reached by Independent Estonia in 1939.

To put all this into proper perspective, one must recall that, despite some stagnation of agricultural production during the years of the great depression before the Second World War, agricultural production in Estonia was growing at the rate of four to five per cent a year. In other words, over a twenty-six year period, from 1939 to 1965, agricultural production in Independent Estonia would have grown approximately three hundred per cent.

Let us bring just one illustration. In 1934, Estonia initiated a large scale campaign to reclaim and cultivate her extensive natural, unimproved grassland areas. This was begun with such success that in the year 1939 alone approximately 25,000 hectares of natural grassland were drained and improved by reseeded and fertilization. At this rate, the increase in the improved grassland acreage over a twenty-six year period (1939-1965) would have been 650,000 hectares. One hectare of improved grassland added, at a conservative estimate, from two to two and a half tons of milk a year, or a total of 1.3 to 1.63 million tons annually by the year 1965. Just before the Soviet occupation, in 1939, Estonia produced 1.05 million tons of milk each year. On this basis, the 1965 production level would have reached 2.4 to 2.7 million tons if Estonia were still independent.

The Soviet production goal is 1.3 million tons of milk by 1965, i.e. just about half of the probable output of Independent Estonia.

At present, if one takes the Soviet statistics at face value (although Khrushchev himself has pointed out that this cannot be done!), milk production in Estonia is claimed to have been 813,000 tons in 1959 and 829,000 tons in 1960. This is roughly four-fifths of the pre-war output of Independent Estonia. And adjustment of figures to allow for the loss of about five per cent of Estonia's territory would not change the overall picture.

It is noteworthy that the Soviets now claim that the level of milk production of Independent Estonia has been surpassed. The repetition of this claim indicates the importance the Soviets place on this fact. To substantiate their claim, the Soviets have chosen as a basis for comparison the production of milk during the year 1940—782,000 tons. This last figure may be correct, although it may also have been subjected to Soviet statistical manipulation. The fact is that 1940 does not in any way represent the situation in Free Estonia. The Red Army moved into military bases in Estonia in October 1939, and in June 1940, there followed the final occupation of Estonia and the imprisonment of her legal government.

The first steps in the Sovietization of the Estonian economy were accompanied by the usual developments: disorganization and a sharp decline in production in all segments of the economy. The agricultural sector was especially hard hit by this situation after all land was nationalized and the redistribution of land was decreed by the occupation authorities. Thousands of good dairy herds were dispersed and many cows were slaughtered. Imports of concentrated cattle feeds ceased, and it is quite likely that milk production fell nearly twenty-five per cent during this first year of "peaceful Bolshevik ravage."

The selection of this year as a basis for comparison with the achievements of Independent Estonia may have been badly needed, for domestic purposes, to save the face of the occupation forces. For any impartial observer, this lie typifies once more the petty, thievish methods that are widely applied in Soviet statistics to indicate progress that actually is non-existent.

The Quixotic fight of the Soviets with the windmills of the past is pathetic. They cannot, of course, allow themselves to admit the flagrant and dismal failure of their collectivized system of agriculture. Rather than do this, they prefer to resort to lies, forgeries and tricky devices of all kinds.

EVEN THE GROWTH OF INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION IS NOT SPECTACULAR

In industrial production some progress seems to have been made, although the rate of growth is not very spectacular when compared with the rate of industrial growth in Free Estonia. On the other hand, industries producing consumer goods for local consumption do not seem to have reached the level of Free Estonia, except, perhaps, in textiles. Whatever progress has been attained is mainly in heavy industries serving the Soviet war potential and other heavy investment requirements of the USSR. Notable advances have also been made in industries exploiting Estonian raw materials, in the interests of the Soviets.

But even in this more successful area the Soviets have resorted to characteristic trickeries. As their statistical yearbooks indicate, the index figures of industrial growth are based on that part of 1940, when Estonia was formally annexed by the Soviets, i.e. from August sixth to the end of the year. This period represents at most forty or forty-five per cent of the total annual production. Nevertheless, the Soviet manipulators of statistics cheerfully use the figures

HALF OF LATVIA'S ARABLE LAND LIES FALLOW

By ALEXANDER OZOLINS,
On Behalf of the New Farmers' and Smallholders'
Party of Latvia.

Latvia, once a flourishing and independent country, has now become, after sixteen years of Soviet occupation a splendid example of general pauperization and ruthless exploitation. Economically, the Russian Soviet system has been fully enforced, which means exploitation, low wages and total regimentation. Industry has been geared, for the most part, to military production to serve the USSR's imperialistic strategic plans. The output of non-military items, industrial and agricultural, is lagging. Managers of collective and State Farms continue to provide the government with deceptive figures, in order to conceal the lag in the quotas of agricultural production assigned to them.

THE RESULTS ACHIEVED BY COLLECTIVE FARMING

The results achieved through collective farming can best be determined through the facts and figures released by the Russian Communist occupiers themselves. The acreage under crops was 1.9 million hectares in 1960, or approximately fifty per cent less than in 1939, when Latvia was an independent state. The sovkhozes and kolkhozes did not fulfill the plan for improving the neglected farm areas, and the yield of winter crops was lower than in 1959.

In the field of animal husbandry, there has been a

for 1940 to indicate increases in production roughly two and a half times higher than they actually were!

THE STANDARD OF LIVING

The final measure of economic progress in the West is the standard of living of the population. The Soviets have published information concerning living standards only for their most favored class—industrial workers. Some studies seem to claim that the present day standard of living has exceeded that of Independent Estonia. Discounting the usual exaggerations, it seems that the present living standards of industrial workers may be approaching those of Free Estonia.

However, all other segments of the population—farmers, teachers, professional workers, etc.—and these are the large majority—now have a much lower standard of living than they had in Free Estonia. One has only to look at the miserable housing situation and the very limited choice of food in the markets, and the Soviet boast about the well-being of their population crumbles like a house of cards.

To brighten up the shabby Soviet reality in occupied Estonia, it is urgently necessary for the Party to invent myths. One of the most hopeful of these myths in Estonia seems to be the claim that the level of a quarter of a century ago has been reached on the road toward communism. Should the level ever be reached where Free Estonia would have been today, then it will probably seem that communism has finally been achieved.

steady increase in the amount of livestock owned by kolkhozes and sovkhozes, with the exception of sheep. In the so-called private sector, there was a decrease in the number of cattle and sheep, although the number of pigs owned privately had grown since 1953. Nevertheless, the private sector, managed by owners of small plots of land [approximately four per cent of all the land being tilled], still accounts for a considerable percentage of animals in comparison with the numbers owned by the state; and this is one of the best examples of the uneconomical and absurd system of Communist agriculture.

PRIVATE AND STATE OWNED LIVESTOCK

	1953	Total	State owned	Priv. owned
Cattle [Incl. cows]	808	411	331	
Cows	466	215	251	
Pigs	600	239	361	
Sheep	520	200	320	
	1960	Total	State owned	Priv. owned
Cattle [Incl. cows]	937	324	613	
Cows	552	256	296	
Pigs	1,048	401	647	
Sheep	470	346	124	

If certain livestock animals have decreased in number during the year 1960, the losses are due solely to the pressures applied by the Communist Party to force the peasants to sell the privately owned cattle to the state farms. Even more interesting is the picture revealed by the figures indicating production of meat, milk and eggs.

PRODUCTION OF MEAT, MILK AND EGGS

	1953	Total	State owned	Priv. owned
Meat [incl. pork and bacon] in thousd. tons	83	36	47	
Pork	41	14	27	
Milk [thousd. tons]	980	400	580	
	1960	Total	State owned	Priv. owned
Eggs [millions]	176	50	126	
Meat [incl. pork and bacon] in thousd. tons	151	74	77	
Pork	84	39	45	
Milk [thousd. tons]	1,470	725	745	
Eggs [millions]	305	86	219	

It is evident that the so-called privately owned garden plots are fulfilling more than fifty per cent of the plan for agricultural production, despite the fact that they occupy only about four per cent of the land tilled. And this applies to all phases of farm production, despite the pressure exercised by the Party and the government. It is a prime example of the results achieved by the collectivized system of agriculture.

It is also interesting to note the quantities of Latvian agricultural products which Latvian farmers are forced to deliver to the All-Union Fund, in other words to the representatives of Soviet Russian colonialism:

REQUIRED DELIVERIES FROM LATVIA TO THE USSR—1953 and 1960

	Total	State owned	Priv. owned
<i>Item of produce: 1953</i>			
Meat on the hoof			
[in thousd. tons]	35	20	6
Milk [in thousd. tons]	410	292	118
Eggs [in millions]	25	15	10
	Total	State owned	Priv. owned
<i>Item of produce: 1960</i>			
Meat on the hoof			
[in thousd. tons]	130	98	32
Milk [in thousd. tons]	862	641	231
Eggs [in millions]	67	54	13

Thus, of the total agricultural output only 21,000 tons of meat, 608,000 tons of milk and 238 million eggs are left for the population of the Latvian SSR. The rest is sent away to satisfy the needs of the Soviet Union proper. This is the most striking example of colonial exploitation, and it is, therefore, no wonder that the private sector sells to the state only about one third of its produce while the rest is sold on the local markets or consumed by the producers themselves. This may also be described as a kind of resistance against the Russian Communist regime displayed by the once free farmers of Latvia, now adversaries of the collectivized system.

THE OPPRESSOR CANNOT EXPECT LOYALTY FROM THE OPPRESSED

Through untold hardship, suffering and humiliation the Latvian people have borne their tragic fate with patience and fortitude. Years of oppression, deportation, persecutions and attempted indoctrination have not extinguished the spirit of democracy and hope for human freedom and social justice. That these are not just empty words was revealed recently by a certain Mr. Gribkov, a Russian Communist whom the Kremlin has placed in actual charge of the Latvian Communist Party.

On June 6, at a Central Committee convention, Mr. Gribkov began his speech with a criticism of Latvia's lagging agriculture in which he chided the rural cells of the Party, the Komsomol, the trade unions, and Party agitators for their apparent inability to combat "the remnants of bourgeois-nationalism and capitalism." He reminded his listeners that these "remnants", which include even some Communists, will never give up their schemes to "corrupt" the Soviet people, old and young alike. It is, therefore, the duty of the Party and the Komsomol, he said, to be constantly alert in unmasking their felonies at home and abroad. He thus revealed how great is the Kremlin's concern about the questionable loyalty of the Latvian working people toward their Soviet Russian masters and their discomfort over the anti-Soviet activities of the Latvian emigres living in free western countries.

In the fight for our rights and our freedom, the captive nations hope that the Western democracies will stand by the principles of the Atlantic Charter which they signed in 1941 at Placentia Bay, on the coast of Newfoundland. They agreed that "no territorial changes should be made except with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned; that all people should choose their own form of government; that all states great or small, victor or vanquished, should have access, on equal terms, to raw materials; that peace should be assured to all men everywhere and that all should enjoy "freedom from want"; and that all nations of the world "for realistic as well as spiritual reasons must come to the abandonment of the use of force."

We may read this declaration today with a great sense of sorrow. Many millions of men died to make it come true, and yet it did not entirely come true. The Atlantic Charter was made good in the blood of the freedom loving peoples, and yet it was not entirely made good. It was betrayed by one of the governments that subsequently agreed to it, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The present world crisis demands for all of us full awareness of the danger to all the spiritual values of mankind, which are now at stake, and the true causes of this danger. It is about time that the Free World finally began to reappraise their policy, now based on fear and wishful thinking, and adopt with dignity the policy of resistance.

We appeal to the conscience of the Free World not to forget: All peoples are entitled to the enjoyment of freedom and independence, for these principles are universal and apply to all people everywhere, including the people behind the Iron Curtain.

THE RURAL POPULATION IS EXPOSED TO UNTOLD MISERY

by JUOZAS AUDENAS, On behalf of the
Lithuanian Peasant Union

The reorganization of agriculture and the charges against officials involved in farm management affected not only the Russian Federal Republic but all the other constituent Soviet Republics as well, including occupied Lithuania.

In Lithuania, which was occupied for the second time by the Soviet Union in 1944, collective farming was imposed in 1947, and since then agricultural production in Lithuania has fallen steadily from year to year. Before the Second World War, when Lithuania was independent, her agricultural output was so abundant that there was a constant problem as to where to find markets to export the agricultural surpluses. Today, after years of Soviet occupation and the imposition of collective farming, agricultural output in Lithuania is barely sufficient to properly feed the population.

The problem of feeding the Lithuanian population is complicated even more by the fact that Moscow is constantly demanding from Lithuania deliveries of grain, meat and dairy products to the Soviet Union. Thus, during some winter and spring seasons the Lithuanian population is forced to go hunting for food throughout the empty state stores in the cities and towns, while in the villages, where all units of collectivized agriculture are kept under strict government and Party control, the rural population is exposed to the grim reality of semi-starvation.

THE TRUE FACE OF THE LITHUANIAN COUNTRYSIDE TODAY

As recently as this summer, many Americans of Lithuanian descent had the opportunity to make tourist trips to their homeland. There they were permitted to walk the streets of the capital, Vilnius, and sometimes those of the second largest city, Kaunas; but they were forbidden to visit the small towns and particularly to take a closer look at the kolkhozes (the collective farms).

It is no secret that some of these visitors to occupied Lithuania were pro-Communist, but even those openly admitted among close friends that the Lithuanian landscape does not look very good. Everyone who had visited independent Lithuania before the Second World War remembered the well-cultivated fields, stretching without interruption throughout the countryside, the large herds of cattle in the pastures, and the well-kept farmhouses and other farm buildings on the private family homesteads of the free peasants of Lithuania. Now, however, the Lithuanian landscape presents a very depressing view: The land often lies fallow over long stretches and the wilderness is beginning to take over. Sometimes, in the midst of this wilderness the eye catches sight of a single cow or horse grazing in places separated by large distances. Farm buildings are falling apart, and even the farmhouses look shabby—broken windows, leaking roofs and a general state of disrepair. The once free peasants shuffle about in despair and resignation, with

expressions of deep sadness on their faces. They are poor, badly dressed and always hungry.

In the midst of all this devastation, there are a few oases provided by the stretches of land cultivated by State Farms and kolkhozes. Here, at least, one can see fair sized crops growing, and on the wide kolkhoz pastures one can see comparatively small herds of cattle, sheep or pigs. These are the new estates of Communist agriculture where horses still outnumber tractors and man himself is transformed into an obedient tool of the regime and reduced to a new kind of serfdom—personal, material and spiritual.

We spoke to many witnesses, we saw their worried faces and the many pictures taken in occupied Lithuania and brought back to the West.

LITHUANIAN AGRICULTURE IN 1960

A. Production of grain crops

The production of grain crops in 1960 was smaller than that of 1959 and almost half the size of the average annual yield before the Soviet occupation and the forced collectivization of Lithuanian agriculture. In 1939, for example, independent Lithuania produced 1,824,510 metric tons of grain, but under Soviet occupation the production of grains fell, in 1959, to 977,000 metric tons,¹ and in 1960 it dropped to 859,000 metric tons.² The yield of grain crops in independent Lithuania reached a yearly average of 1,579,295 metric tons during the years 1935 to 1939, but under Soviet rule the production of grain crops from 1954 to 1958 fell to a yearly average of 684,000 metric tons.³

The Lithuanian Communist Party, eager to please its bosses in the Kremlin, pledged itself as early as 1959 to fulfill the agricultural portion of the Seven Year Plan (1959 to 1965) in five years. However, after the yield of grain crops fell so markedly below the production level of 1959, the Communist pledges and propaganda slogans looked completely ridiculous. Today, no one mentions any longer the Party's great desire to rapidly increase agricultural output or to speed the fulfillment of the Seven-Year Plan. Official Communist sources have made public some statistical data concerning the fulfillment of the Seven-Year Plan in Lithuania during the year 1960. However, detailed figures for the production of grain crops, potatoes and certain other farm products are missing. There was only a brief reference in passing, to a decrease in the yields of grains and potatoes.

A modicum of success was attained during 1960 in the yield of milk per cow; the output of milk per cow rose from 2,118 kilograms in 1959 to 2,224 kilograms in 1960. Perhaps this is best explained by the abundance of rain in 1960 which made it easier to raise green fodder.

¹ & ³ *Norodnoye Khozyaistvo S.S.S.R.*, 1959, Page 357, Moscow.

² *Komjaunimo Tiesa*, No. 113, 1961, Vilnius.

B. Livestock Breeding

Vestnik Statistiki, No. 5, 1961, published in Moscow, disclosed that in Lithuania during the year 1960, there was an increase in almost all categories of farm animals over the total livestock counted for the year 1959. A breakdown of this general increase reveals that most of it took place in the State Farms and kolkhozes. The number of privately owned cows decreased in 1960.

This development is, of course, a direct result of the farm policy of the regime which has, for the past three years, been confiscating all calves that were born to the privately owned cows and turning them over to the State Farms and the kolkhozes. Kolkhoz members have already been forbidden to keep their calves or to raise them. Newly born calves are forcibly taken away from the peasants and given to the "socialist sector" of agriculture. Thus in 1960 about 240,000 calves were taken from private households and from January 1, 1961 to May 20, 1961 about 203,000 calves were confiscated and given to the State Farms and kolkhozes.⁴

The above-mentioned increases in Lithuanian livestock during the year 1960 may be broken down as follows: The number of cattle increased by 5.6 per cent, of milk cows by 3.8 per cent and of pigs by 20 per cent. Only the number of sheep decreased by 4.6 per cent.

It may be of some interest to compare the figures of privately owned farm animals and farm animals owned by the "socialist sector": The "socialist sector" increased its cattle holdings by 18.5 per cent and of milk cows by 13.5 per cent, while the numbers of privately owned cattle fell by 13.5 per cent and of milk cows by 2 per cent. In the "socialist sector" of agriculture the number of pigs rose by 25 per cent, while the number of privately owned pigs increased only 14.2 per cent.

Nevertheless, the tables shown below, based upon official statistics, reveal that private households in Lithuania still own more than fifty per cent of all the farm animals in the country. The total population of livestock in 1961 is still below the total livestock population of independent Lithuania in 1939; this is especially true with reference to cows and sheep.

Number of Farm Animals in Lithuania As of January First, Each Year

	1939	1960	1961
Cattle	1,312,000	1,158,000	1,223,000
Cows	862,000	710,000	737,000
Pigs	1,377,000	1,435,000	1,719,000
Sheep	1,256,000	391,000	371,000

⁴ *Valstieciu Laikrastis*, No. 62, 1961, Vilnius.

THE MOST OPPRESSED COUNTRY IN THE SOVIET ORBIT

by CORNEL BIANU, On behalf of the
Rumanian National Peasant Party

MOSCOW'S DOMINATION IS WITHOUT LIMIT

The situation in Rumania shows hardly any signs of improvement or relaxation since our last Congress in 1959. The real face of the country and of its people's

Number of Farm Animals in Lithuania
on January 1, 1961

	Total in State Farms and Kolkhozes	Total Privately Owned
Cattle	658,000	565,000
Cows	316,000	421,000
Pigs	913,000	788,000
Sheep	124,000	247,000

From the second table it is quite obvious that private households in Lithuania even now possess more than fifty per cent of the country's cows and sheep and still represent the most significant factor in dairy and wool production.

LITHUANIA'S AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION AND SOVIET COLONIAL EXPLOITATION

The Soviet Union, acting as a colonial power, decides the size of the tribute which occupied Lithuania must pay, in agricultural produce to its conqueror and exploiter.

On January 18, 1961, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union met in Moscow and decided that Lithuania must produce and deliver to the Soviet Union the following quantities of farm products during the year 1961:

	To be Produced (in Metric Tons)	To be Delivered to the USSR— (in Metric Tons)
Grain	1,640,000	130,000
Meat (live weight)	265,000	245,000
Milk	2,400,000	1,250,000
Potatoes	3,460,000	123,000
Sugar Beets	883,000	680,000
Flax	27,000	20,000
Eggs	550 (million)	70 (million)

This table proves that the Soviet Union is "generous" enough to leave some grain and potatoes for the native population of Lithuania while it takes away their meat, dairy products, sugar and industrial crops. Incidentally, it is well to remember that grain and potatoes are also needed to feed cows and pigs and to produce meat and dairy products, which are the main objectives of the Kremlin masters. Perhaps the Kremlin's requirements will not be met, and perhaps the Soviet colonial masters will have to be satisfied with somewhat less than they had expected. Moscow's stooges in Lithuania are already lamenting that this year's output of meat and milk products is lagging far behind the planned schedules. The truth, however, remains unchanged: Without its ruthless exploitation of the captive peoples, the Soviet Union would not be able to play such an important role in world affairs politically or economically.

life is, however, better hidden behind certain aspects camouflaged for propaganda purposes. Statistics and newly erected mass-dwellings are brought into the limelight in order to satisfy the curiosity of foreigners, but any visit to the country is curbed, and contact with the

population is purposefully reduced and rationed. Even the circulation of the natives is confined, and their access to regions where the tension is high or where riots have occurred, is forbidden. Deportations and slave-labor camps are blooming and the newly established "comrade's courts" are even more feared than the state judiciary. The new Party-organ, the so-called "street-cell" has been introduced all over the country, and has added to the increasing number of agencies, offices and organs controlling the population. With the standard of living on a miserable near-starvation level, with the most cruel and pitiless administration and working conditions, no wonder that G. Coblentz of the Herald Tribune, in the issues of May 5, 9, 10, 11 and 12, 1961, has described Rumania as the most oppressed and depressed country of the Soviet empire.

At the Party Congress in June 1960, Gheorgui Dej, the Party Secretary-General, stressed the Party's faithfulness to the principles handed down by Lenin and the orders issued by Moscow. There can be little doubt about this apparent loyalty, the more so as Dej himself announced to the Central Committee of the Party that "all anarchical, selfish tendencies due to foreign influence, together with the anti-Party activities have been rejected by the homogenous and united Central Committee". None of the original founders of the Party, except Gheorgiu Dej, is left in the Central Committee.

THE FIVE-YEAR PLAN WAS A COMPLETE FAILURE

One of the main events of the years since 1959 was the failure of the 1956-1960 Five-Year Plan. In order to conceal its glaring deficiencies, the new Six-Year Plan (1960-1965) has been made to cover the last year of the previous plan, the account of the last year being mixed up with the newly started Plan. This trick, however, is too crude and the procedure too flagrant not to catch the eye at once. Despite the official figures of achievements, the deficiencies—both industrial and agricultural—spoil the shining rosy picture of the report made by Dej to the Congress, dismissing the shortcomings simply as "due to the bureaucratic attitudes of the Party agencies". The stratagem worked momentarily, and Khrushchev, who flattered the Congress with his presence, himself described the achievements and the new Plan as "wonderful", and as a "symphony of the socialist orchestra".

The spell was, however, broken the very next day by Prime Minister Stoica himself. There was not one state, or Party institution and agency, beginning with the ministries, which did not come under his sharply worded criticism. Production, distribution and consumption of goods were found to be outdated, of poor quality and expensive. "Negligence, carelessness, and waste abounded in the management. . ." "Enforcement of order and discipline in all fields of activity" was an urgent necessity. . . Thus, the Communist regime discovers, at its own expense, at every stage and survey, that it is unable to cope with the problems of advanced technology. Placing the responsibility on the local agencies has proven to be no excuse and has not made

for improvements in the system's shortcomings and bottlenecks.

There are no figures available on the total waste and losses suffered as a result of high cost of production and distribution. It must, however, be made clear that these high costs are not due to the cost of labor, as they are in the Western countries. Actually, according to the last official figures of the Statistical Annual of 1960, the share of all salaries in the costs of goods in 1959, shows a decline from 17.6 per cent in 1957, to 17.2 per cent in 1959, while the costs of materials have meanwhile increased from 61.0 per cent to 62.5 per cent. In the West, the tendency is reversed, and this tends to point up the deterioration of the Rumanian workers' situation.

In agriculture, the deficiencies of the recently ended Five-Year Plan are even more eloquent. It was planned that cereal production should reach 15 million tons yearly by 1960 (*Scinteia*, December 28, 1955). The 1960 harvest allegedly amounted to 9,800,000 tons of cereals, making the total deficit of cereal production for 1956-1960 over 15 million tons.

After production of cereal grains, the main stress is laid by the regime on animal husbandry. Here, again, however, the results are not gratifying. They are far below the planned figures, and even mark a substantial regression. The Statistical Annual of 1960 shows 4,450,000 head of cattle as compared with 4,800,000 in 1956; 1,110,000 horses compared with 1,150,000; 4,300,000 pigs compared with 4,950,000. Only the number of sheep has shown a slight increase from 11,120,000 to 12,100,000 heads since 1956, while the number of goats has dwindled from 598,000 to 415,000.

The position is no better in those provinces incorporated into the USSR. The New York Times of October 11, 1960, quoting *Pravda*, reported that "the State-Farms of Moldavia (Bessarabia and Bucovina) are not fulfilling their socialist commitments regarding animal and milk production."

The progress made in both mechanization and socialization of land has not turned out to be a panacea for the outstanding failures. The process of land socialization, with the main emphasis on the forced transformation of the loose agricultural associations into collective farms, has made deep inroads into the sector of individual peasant holdings. All the forces of darkness were let loose in the turmoil directed against the outcast peasantry, struggling with all its wits and its shrewdness and at last resorting to force to oppose the collectivization of their farms. However, the remnants of the "chiaburi" (rich peasant) were quickly liquidated. The regions of the cereal-belt were earmarked for total and direct collectivization, while the farmer associations were to be, by all means, transformed into collectives, with individual property rights to remain undisturbed during the first stage of collectivization.

The official statistical figures, marking a yearly increase of 22 per cent in the collectivized areas, now totalling some 82 per cent—according to the New York Times of March 27th, 1961—reflect the havoc and the torment of the losing battle fought desperately by the peasantry, men, women and children alike.

THE CURRENT PLAN

Built on the failures of the previous Plan, the new Six-Year Plan, boasting high flown economic achievements for industry and maintaining for agriculture the goals set, but not obtained, in the last Plan, justifies all our doubts. It is too early to assess the first year's achievements, but we are bound to declare that in agriculture, the first year's production has not lived up to expectations. The harvest, instead of showing the planned increase, fell some 8 per cent below that of 1959.

THE PEASANTRY

Forming 69.1 per cent of the population, the backbone of the country still is, as it has been in the past, the peasantry. Hardworking, valiant, and God-fearing, it has kept the nation safe against powerful external enemies and against the internal remnants of feudalism. The struggle was long and bitter, but it brought freedom, land and political independence. Some 90 per cent of the arable land came into the possession of the peasants after the First World War, and their political party gained power under the leadership of Juliu Maniu and Mihalache in 1928, winning eighty per cent of the ballots cast and forming the first Peasant Party government in the country.

Under Soviet occupation, in the elections of 1946, as well as in the ensuing life and death struggle with communism the Peasant Party was, with the help of the occupying power, crushed, and its leadership, headed by Juliu Maniu and Mihalache, liquidated slowly and secretly. But the Peasant Party is still haunting the Communist regime. The peasants, with their spirit of national and individual responsibility alive and militant, are considered to be the arch-enemies of the regime. Former members of their party

COLLECTIVIZATION AND REGIMENTATION HAVE RUINED AGRICULTURE

By the Democratic Party of Slovakia

THE RULES OF INDUSTRY CANNOT BE APPLIED TO AGRICULTURE

The class hatred spread by the Party and state organs has been directed mainly at those peasants who had successfully resisted all Communist attempts to make them give up their own small farms and join the collective farms. All kinds of tricks, terror and persecution were used in order to rob them of their property, and to force them into kolkhozes. When they failed, the peasants would be subjected to criminal indictment and to confiscation of their property. Only these extreme measures made it possible to herd 994,000 peasants into 10,816 Unified Agricultural Cooperatives in Czechoslovakia, so that by January 1, 1961, 87.4 per cent of all the soil tilled in Czechoslovakia was collectivized.

However, the kolkhozes in Czechoslovakia are far from living up to Communist expectations. On the contrary, they represent an ideological, political and economic failure. They confirm the fact that Marx, Engels and Lenin had no true grasp of the prob-

are again and again rounded up, imprisoned and sent to slave labor camps, to the rice fields or the reed swamps, the worst of all the forced labor sites, at the mouth of the Danube. The resistance of the peasants has, however, still not been broken. Nor have they been brought closer to the socialist conception of life. Their struggle for freedom, dignity and their traditional way of life has now been shifted to the collective farms, only temporarily.

Actually, the political meaning of the resistance and the struggle of the peasantry was never realized by the Western press, nor conveyed to its public opinion as a real, open, daily plebiscite rejecting the regime. Instead, the resistance has been presented as a purely economic problem—measured in collectivized hectares and solved by communism in terms of advanced science, in accordance with the deceiving and damaging propaganda of the local Communists and Moscow.

Actually, very practical economic reasons should have prevented the peasants' total proletarianization. In practice, every means was good enough to bring them to heel—no matter what the consequences.

And yet, the spirit of the population and of its largest sector—the peasantry—is not broken. On the contrary, they were able to create—at the last so-called general elections—such tension that the regime had to withdraw some of its candidates and to admit it publicly in the case of two withdrawals of candidates for parliament and over twenty-seven withdrawals of regional and local delegates, according to the official newspaper (*Scinteia*, March 5, 1961). This unforeseen incident, unique in Communist "elections", not only in the P.R.P., but behind the entire Iron Curtain, is more eloquent a confirmation of the people's spirit than any interpretation could be.

lem of agriculture and that it is a fundamental mistake to apply automatically the rules of industrial mass production to agriculture. No wonder, therefore, that the Communist economy in Czechoslovakia has so many grave problems which cannot be denied even by the spokesmen of the Communist regime. First of all, the Communist kolkhozes are far behind the level of agricultural production reached by free Czechoslovakia and even further behind their own economic plan. They intend to improve the level of industrial production by 1970. Meanwhile, however, the lack of sufficient production of foodstuffs compels the Communist government to import agricultural produce from abroad in a much larger quantity than before and to pay with its own industrial products. The fall in production is evident not only as far as grain is concerned. It is even worse with regard to dairy and meat products. There are constant complaints by Party and state organs about negligence, shortages or sabotage relating to production of grain and particularly of fodders, corn, sugar beets, and

potatoes. According to official sources, there is now a shortage of 60,000 cows, and the average milk production is very poor—about 1,788 liters per cow annually.

AGROGORODS STILL IN SIGHT

The Communist regime is attempting to improve the situation of the collective farms by various reforms, but because the system itself is rotten, they are of no value. One of these attempted reforms is the amalgamation of many kolkhozes. About one third of the original collective farms were abolished and combined with others. Before this, the average acreage of a collective farm was 350 hectares, while now it is 450 hectares. Before any expected beneficial result of this step could be seen, the unification process had to be stopped because of confusion and the danger that it would further threaten farm production. There is no doubt that the unified kolkhozes represent the nucleus of the Communist dream of agricultural cities, so-called "agrorods."

The Communist kolkhozes also face another problem; namely, the problem of the garden plots left to the members of cooperatives for their private use. The kolkhoznik is accustomed to paying much more attention to these plots than to the cooperatives, and so, they produce and are able to sell much more than the kolkhozes do. The members of the cooperatives still have 370,000 cows under private ownership.

THE LOT OF THE PEASANT

Another serious problem facing the cooperatives is an increasing lack of initiative and, therefore, of labor. Between 1955 and 1960, over 482,000 workers left the agricultural cooperatives for industry. Only 4.4 per cent of the workers are 15-20 years of age, while over 45 per cent are over 50 years of age. Women represent the majority of the labor force on the farms. The youth does not see any secure future in agriculture, and so it flees the kolkhozes. This systematic depopulation of the villages creates a great headache for the regime, particularly, in so far as the planned development of the collectivization of agriculture, and the improvement of the food supply and the stimulation of economic growth are concerned.

BILLIONS OF AID DOLLARS HAVE GONE DOWN THE COMMUNIST DRAIN

THE FORCES IN CONFLICT

Events are developing fast, faster than they ever have until now. We cannot say that the end is in sight, but we can say that we are approaching it faster than before. We refer to the end of the great struggle generally called the struggle between East and West, between the free countries, headed by the United States, and the Communist bloc, headed by the Soviet Union. This conflict is, in fact, much larger and deeper than many people suspect.

The stake is freedom, freedom to be preserved for

Nevertheless, the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia has achieved its primary goal: namely, to destroy the peasantry as a class and to dismantle its private enterprise. This destruction has been followed by the destruction of other strata of the formerly strong and prosperous middle class, the artisans, businessmen and all "has-been people". In order to demolish their economic and social position, the government ordered an extensive control of the nationalized, communal and cooperative enterprises aiming at the elimination of all politically and economically undesirable elements from their jobs.

A LIFE OF PLENTY PROMISED AFTER SOME TWENTY YEARS

Czechoslovakia, as a whole, is an industrialized country, and the majority of her people are employed in industry. Yet, the pauperization of the country is an accomplished fact because living standards, except for the Communist ruling class, have fallen. There is increasing economic experimentation and chaos—shortages of food, high prices, lack of labor force in some economic fields, a critical housing shortage, constant tension and dissatisfaction. The only remedy against these ills is the promise of a future Communist paradise, not this year or next, but in 1965, 1970 or even in 1980 when everybody will have everything in abundance.

THE SITUATION IN SLOVAKIA

The Communist double standard toward Slovakia is apparent from its different political and economic attitude. Whilst Slovakia has gradually been robbed of her autonomous political rights, as demanded by her Slovak national organs, and degraded to the level of an administrative province, economically it is strongly supported by the establishment of new industries. This two-faced policy is calculated to subjugate the Slovak people and to help exploit Slovakia's natural wealth for Soviet benefit. Slovakia's closeness to the USSR is especially helpful for this purpose. However, the Slovak people have preserved their traditional anti-Soviet and anti-Communist feelings, manifested so strongly and so many times in the past. No wonder that Slovakia represents a stronghold of anti-Communist resistance in Czechoslovakia.

*By DR. MILAN GAVRILOVIC,
On behalf of the Yugoslav-Serbian
Agrarian Union*

those who still enjoy it, and freedom to be won for those who have lost it to the Communists, freedom of those silent peoples who can think freely, but cannot speak freely. So on this side, on the side of freedom, we have the United States, Great Britain, France, West Germany, Italy, and other free countries, and in addition to this, we have on this side the profound feeling of all subjugated peoples. These silent peoples are natural allies of the free West, and, in the first place, of the U.S.A. This extremely important fact is often overlooked.

WHERE DO THE NEUTRALS STAND

Between these two forces locked in a fateful conflict there stand the so-called neutral nations.

At this very moment, while we are meeting here in Washington, in Belgrade, the capital of my country, another meeting is being held. That meeting is the International Conference of Uncommitted Countries. It is a meeting of the so-called neutrals, representing twenty-four countries who, they say, do not belong to any bloc, neither the Soviet bloc, nor the Western bloc. They say their only aim is to achieve peace and to preserve it. From whom? From those who are bent upon destroying it?

It seems to me that the fact that officially they do not belong to any bloc is not important. However, what is very important is whose side they are, in fact, helping to win. This is what matters, nothing else.

The only European country participating in this Conference is Yugoslavia. All the other countries are from Africa, Asia, and Latin America, including Cuba. Asia, Africa, and Latin America are all heavily infiltrated with Communists, and some of these countries are in overt collaboration with the Soviet Union. In others, the Soviet Union dominates what is called the "street", that is to say, the street mob, dominated by the Communists and recognized by the Soviet Union as the "sovereign people". Some of these countries live in constant fear of the Soviet Union and Red China. They fear not only the subversive movements within their frontiers, directed from Moscow or Peking, they also fear that if they resist they may be attacked by the Soviets or Red China, whether by so-called voluntary armies, as in Korea, or openly, without this mask, as in Hungary. They fear that they may be abandoned by the West. What then, can you expect from these countries?

TITO'S VERY SURVIVAL IS BOUND UP WITH THAT OF MOSCOW

Tito, the chief organizer of this Conference of Neutrals cannot, in this great struggle between Moscow and Washington, make any move which would help Washington to win or cause Moscow to fall. He is well aware that if Moscow falls, all Communist regimes will fall, including his own. The records show that Tito has constantly and persistently voted in the U.N. with the Soviet Union, knowing very well that Soviet foreign policy is also his own foreign policy.

For two months Tito toured the new countries of Africa and Asia thundering against "colonialists" and "imperialists" in exactly the same way that Khrushchev had.

In Ghana, for instance, according to his own Party organ, *Borba*, he said: "Opposite attitudes between progressive and reactionary forces . . . lead to ever greater tension." Is it difficult to guess whom he is referring to as "reactionary forces"? And he added: "There are certain warmongers, especially in the West, who want to solve international problems by force. . ."

Can we expect him to change his mind now in Belgrade? Or can we expect him to pursue an "identical or similar" foreign policy?

Khrushchev is trying to destroy the present organization of the United Nations. He is trying to replace

the office of Secretary-General by a "troika" representing the Soviet bloc, the neutrals, and the Western bloc. This would mean a majority of two to one for Khrushchev. Otherwise, he would not have proposed it. It would also mean that if the West were to use its veto power in this "troika", the veto so generously used by the Soviets, the West would be blamed for any hypothetical failure. Khrushchev made the same proposal for the Commission on Disarmament.

Tito supports him, and in a speech reported by *Borba* on June 6, 1961, Tito stated: "We want to prevent what has happened in the past, the fact that the United Nations are the instrument of this or that policy, the instrument of some determined power or group of powers. . ." It is not difficult to understand which powers Tito was alluding to. In the question of the United Nations Organization, its Secretary, and its reorganization, Tito has joined hands with Khrushchev.

THE NEUTRALS ARE MOBILIZED TO HELP KHRUSHCHEV

One cannot easily dismiss the Belgrade Conference. It must prepare the groundwork for Khrushchev's proposal to reorganize the United Nations, to help Khrushchev in some way or other to solve the Berlin crisis on his terms.

At this moment the Free World is shocked by Khrushchev's threat to resume atomic testing with his Giant Bomb of one hundred million tons of explosive, but it is also rejoicing in the fact that Khrushchev has at last shown his hand. Perhaps the Free World is hoping that the neutrals will change their minds.

I am afraid that those among the neutrals who fear the Soviet Union will be frightened still more, and those who side with the Soviet Union through their ideology will find in Khrushchev's latest action further support for their ideological ties.

WHY HAS THE WEST SPENT OVER EIGHT BILLIONS IN FOREIGN AID

All this raises yet another question—the question of the foreign policy of the Free World, and of the United States.

The United States has given 8.2 billion dollars in foreign aid to twenty-one of those twenty-four nations now attending the conference of neutrals in Belgrade. This aid was given without any political strings attached to it. It was given simply to help these peoples to stand firmly on their own feet as a condition for maintaining their independence. But what about those invisible strings that Moscow manages to attach to the foreign policy of these countries without spending all those billions of dollars?

Do you know how much aid Tito has received? The total sum received by Tito is 4,150,328,000 dollars, of which the United States has contributed more than 2,200,000,000 dollars.

One may ask to what end the West has spent such an enormous sum of money. In order to obtain the present situation? The West could have got the same international results without spending these 8.2 billion dollars.

The argument offered at this moment in support of this aid fall into three general categories:

Firstly, it is true that Tito is a Communist and his

regime is a Communist regime, but he is not in the Moscow camp of satellites. (However, if foreign policy is a question of life or death, a question of survival for the United States—and both Kennedy and Nixon defined it as such in their electoral campaigns—the fact that in that foreign policy Tito has always sided with Moscow negates any significance in his not being in the Moscow camp of satellites.)

Secondly, other Communist countries may imitate Tito and break with Moscow. (However, none has done so.)

Thirdly, this aid will enable Yugoslavia, and eventually other Communist countries, to stand on their feet economically as a prerequisite for their full independence. This principle is valid for all free countries with a free economic system. (But a Marxist collective economy is the most costly and wasteful economy that could ever exist and Yugoslavia is a good example of it.)

One could easily imagine what a freely-elected government in a free Yugoslavia could have done with the sum of \$4,200,000,000. Yugoslavia could have lived for about three to four years at least without its government taking from the people a single cent in taxes of any kind. Furthermore, Yugoslavia, once an exporting agrarian country of free peasant producers, has recently been asking the United States again for enormous quantities of wheat and corn. They give as their reason for the imminent food disaster, bad weather and floods. As if in prewar Yugoslavia there had never been any bad weather or floods!

So it is only right to ask: Where did these billions go? They were swallowed up by the Marxist economy, just as the efforts and slave labor of 18,500,000 Yugoslavs were.

THE PEASANTS ARE AGAINST TITO'S REGIME

Collectivization of land in this country of small landowners and free peasants has utterly failed. Since 1953, about ninety per cent of the arable land has

been in the hands of individual peasants, and only ten per cent has been owned by cooperatives and State Farms. In spite of this, agricultural production is low. This is so because of the Marxist system, because of the Communist rule, because of the burdens imposed on individual owners, because of the discrepancy between high production costs and excessively low prices paid for agricultural products, because of the basic peasant distrust of the regime in every respect. So the peasant does not produce as the Communist government expects him to produce. Faced with the massive stubborn resistance of the peasants, Tito is now trying to appease them—with words. What is the attitude of the Serbian peasants? I again quote from *Borba*, reporting Tito's speeches:

"What is the reason the peasants are so unwilling to cooperate? The reasons are mainly economic. The earning capacity of individual producers is not given sufficient stimulus."

Speaking in Bor, Tito said: "If our peasant has been distrustful of what we have been telling him about the advantages of collective work on the land, now he can see with his own eyes how much it is in his interest to stop torturing that small plot of land, and to put it into a collective farm, so that it could be tilled by the most modern means and become highly productive. This is what pains me. I would like to see our peasants go ahead as fast as our working men in the factories who are trying to raise the productivity of their labor." (*Borba*, June 8, 1961). But it is precisely because of what he can see with his own eyes that the peasant has remained distrustful. So we have yet another admission from Tito, namely that the peasant has been distrustful of communism from the very start, and that this distrust shows no sign of diminishing.

If these peasants—as Tito himself testifies—are not cooperating and do not trust the Communists or communism, how could Tito rely on them to defend the same Communists or communism in the event of an international conflict?

Hungarian and Polish reports will be published in the next issue.



INTERNATIONAL PEASANT UNION
285 Central Park West, New York 24, N. Y.

RETURN POSTAGE GUARANTEED

BULK RATE
U. S. POSTAGE
PAID
NEW YORK, N. Y.
Permit No. 7882

IN U.S.A.

Hon. H. H. Humphrey
U. S. Senate
Washington, D. C.



Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org