

SOCIAL SCIENCES

# **NEW WORLD REVIEW**

SEPTEMBER, 1951

SECTION II

## **THE PATH TO PEACE**

***Significant Documents  
of Our Critical Times***

## CONTENTS

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| THE PATH TO PEACE            | 3 |
| PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S LETTER    | 6 |
| THE CONGRESSIONAL RESOLUTION | 6 |
| PRESIDENT SHVERNIK'S REPLY   | 7 |
| SUPREME SOVIET RESOLUTION    | 9 |

*The following articles are from the USSR News*

|                                                                                                                                      |    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| FOR PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE                                                                                                            | 13 |
| OUR AIMS                                                                                                                             | 13 |
| KEY TO INTERNATIONAL SECURITY                                                                                                        | 14 |
| DEVELOPMENTS IN KOREA                                                                                                                | 15 |
| WHY I BELIEVE IN SOVIET AMERICAN FRIENDSHIP<br><i>by Alexander A. Troyanovsky, Former Soviet Ambassador<br/>to the United States</i> | 16 |
| PAST AND PRESENT<br><i>by Academician E. Tarle</i>                                                                                   | 18 |
| VOICES OF AMERICA<br><i>by Composer Dmitri Shostakovich</i>                                                                          | 20 |
| FELLOWSHIP OF SCIENCE<br><i>by Academician Grigori Landsberg</i>                                                                     | 20 |
| "NEWS" INVITES THE "TIMES"                                                                                                           | 22 |

|                                |    |
|--------------------------------|----|
| THE MORRISON - PRAVDA EXCHANGE | 22 |
| ARTICLE BY MORRISON            | 22 |
| PRAVDA'S REPLY                 | 25 |
| MALIK AND THE BRITISH QUAKERS  | 29 |

## THE PATH TO PEACE

**WE BELIEVE** that the series of documents and exchanges here presented are of vital import to all Americans, who will decide for themselves the relative merits of the viewpoints set forth. These documents deal with the most crucial issue of our time, the restoration of friendly relations between the United States and the Soviet Union, which is the key to security and life for all the peoples of the world. They show that the path of peace is open for those who are ready to take it. This must be made known to the American people who should now with all their strength make known to our government their determination to take this path.

It has been said that recent expressions of the Soviet desire for peace represent a change in Soviet policy from one of hostility toward the Western countries to one of friendly relations. It has also been said by official American spokesmen that these friendly expressions are only a "propaganda trap" designed only to halt the arming of the West while the USSR and the People's Democracies of Europe and Asia presumably continue to prepare for war.

The friendly overtures of the Soviet Government to the countries of the West represent no new policy. The policy of peaceful co-existence between capitalist and socialist countries has been the consistent policy of the Soviet Union ever since its inception.

The specific proposals for arms reduction, prohibition of atomic weapons and a Five-Power Pact of Peace have been repeatedly proposed by the Soviet Union within the United Nations. Soviet representatives have made clear that arms reduction applies to the USSR as well as to other nations, and that atomic energy control includes inspection of installations within the USSR.

Recent peace statements and actions on the part of the Soviet Union thus represent nothing new, but rather a renewed determination to leave no stone unturned in the search for peaceful solutions.

These latest exchanges were in fact initiated by Jacob A. Malik in his broadcast over the United Nations "Price of Peace" series on June 25, 1951, in which he declared:

The Soviet Union has invariably upheld and continues to uphold the cause

of peace and pursues a policy of co-operation with all countries which desire such cooperation. The Soviet Union threatens no one, and it does not and cannot plan any conquests. The peaceful policy of the Soviet Union proceeds from the basic principles underlying the Soviet social system and from the interests of the Soviet people. The efforts of the Soviet people are directed towards goals of peaceful construction. . . .

In its policy the Soviet Government proceeds from the fact of the peaceful co-existence of the two systems—socialism and capitalism—and it firmly adheres to the line of loyal peaceful relations with all those States which manifest a desire for economic cooperation provided the principles of reciprocity and fulfillment of the obligations assumed are observed.

Reemphasizing the consistency of the Soviet Union's attempts to apply this policy in its relations with the United States, Mr. Malik significantly quoted a statement made by Joseph Stalin to an American journalist as long ago as 1932, when Stalin declared:

As regards the USSR it is hardly necessary to prove that the peoples of the USSR as well as the Government of the USSR want no armed conflict between the two countries ever to take place under any circumstances.

After referring to the repeated efforts during the past year on the part of the Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic and other countries to end the war in Korea, Mr. Malik concluded his broadcast with these words that opened the way for the cease-fire negotiations at Kaesong:

The Soviet Union will carry on the struggle to strengthen peace and prevent another world war. The peoples of the Soviet Union believe that it is possible to uphold the cause of peace.

The Soviet peoples believe too that the armed conflict in Korea—the most acute issue of the present time—could also be settled. Readiness of the parties to take the path of peaceful settlement of the Korean question is necessary for this. The Soviet peoples believe that as a first step the belligerents should begin negotiations for a cease-fire and an armistice with a mutual withdrawal of troops from the 38th Parallel.

Is it possible to take such a step? I believe that it is, provided there is a sincere desire to put an end to the sanguinary clashes in Korea. I believe this is not too high a price for assuring peace in Korea.

It was only after the machinery for peace had been set in motion as a result of this broadcast, and a series of other pronouncements and moves for peace had been made by Soviet leaders, that President Truman decided on July 7th to transmit to the Soviet Union the text of the Congressional Resolution which had been adopted on May 4th, over a month before. This resolution was passed by the Senate and concurred in by the House of Representatives, although the votes of only 43 of its 435 members could be mustered on its behalf.

Discussion of this resolution in United States official circles, in Congress and the press, was accompanied by bitter denunciations of the Soviet regime, accusations that the USSR alone bears responsibility for present world tensions, and appeals to the Soviet people to rise and overthrow their leaders. According to its sponsor, Senator Brien McMahon (D-Conn.) it was designed to appeal directly to the Soviet people over the heads of their leaders.

Explaining his motives in introducing the resolution in a speech before the viciously anti-Soviet "Friends of Fighters for Russian

Freedom," Senator McMahon made the inflammatory statement that the establishment of friendly relations between the peoples of the two countries is "the weapon Stalin fears most," and declared:

It is Stalin's Communist imperialism and not the Russian people which is the barrier to world peace.

Such an atmosphere, and the implication in the resolution itself that only the USSR bears the responsibility for the barriers separating the two peoples, were in sharp contradiction to the peace sentiments expressed therein. Even greater was the disparity between these sentiments and the hostile actions simultaneously being pursued by the American Government against the Soviet Union, recounted in detail in the resolution of the Supreme Soviet published later.

Against this background the McMahon resolution had a hollow ring. And the Soviet leaders could hardly have forgotten the number of occasions in recent years when direct offers of Stalin to meet with Truman and to conclude a pact of peace with our country were summarily rejected. Nevertheless, while not unnaturally questioning the purpose of the United States, the Soviet Government welcomed the resolution and the message from Truman as opening a possible door to peace.

It is hardly befitting the dignity of our nation that the first official reactions to the Soviet response to its own overtures should be to reject it out of hand. This attitude irks

even *The Wall Street Journal* which on July 8 commented:

It is regrettable that the U.S. is once again put in the position of rejecting even an ostensible bid for peace. . . . We believe the State Department could and should get out of the habit of automatically denouncing nearly everything the Soviet suggests. For one thing, it runs the risk of sometime missing a bet for easing if not ending the cold war.

The State Department was charging that the exchange was being kept from the Soviet people even as the full texts were rolling off the presses of all leading Moscow newspapers, to be followed by the regional press, and being broadcast at repeated intervals over the radio over the length and breadth of the Soviet land, so that there is probably hardly a person in the USSR not thoroughly familiar with them.

Two New York papers, the *New York Times* and the *Daily Worker*, published the exchange in full. But papers throughout the country carried only meager reports, and radio stations gave only excerpts.

That is why we have felt it necessary to publish these texts in full and other recent statements by Soviet leaders. The American people no less than the Soviet people have the right and duty to know the contents of these documents and to decide for themselves on the sincerity of the Soviet overtures for peace as well as that of their own government. They have the right to demand of our government that these peace proposals be studied seriously and that it enter upon the path to peace.

EDITORS OF NEW WORLD REVIEW

# President Truman's Letter

(To President Shvernik)

I have the honor of transmitting to you a resolution adopted by the Congress of the United States with a request that its contents be made known by your Government to the people of the Soviet Union.

This resolution expresses the friendship and good-will of the American people for all the peoples of the earth and it also re-emphasizes the profound desire of the American Government to do everything in its power to bring about a just and lasting peace.

As Chief Executive of the United States, I give this resolution my sincere approval. I add it to a message of my own to the Soviet people in the earnest hope that these expressions may help form a better understanding of the aims and purposes of the United States.

The unhappy results of the last few years demonstrate that formal diplomatic negotiations among nations will be largely barren while barriers exist to the friendly exchange of ideas and information among peoples. The best hope for a peaceful world lies in the yearning for peace and brotherhood which lies deep in the heart of every human

being. But peoples who are denied the normal means of communication will not be able to attain that mutual understanding which must form the basis for trust and friendship. We shall never be able to remove suspicion and fear as potential causes of war until communication is permitted to flow, free and open, across international boundaries.

The peoples of both our countries know from personal experience the horror and misery of war. They abhor the thought of future conflict which they know would be waged by means of the most hideous weapons in the history of mankind. As leaders of their respective Governments, it is our sacred duty to pursue every honorable means which will bring to fruition their common longing for peace. Peace is safest in the hands of the people and we can best achieve the goal by doing all we can to place it there.

I believe that if we can acquaint the Soviet people with the peace aims of the American people and Government, there will be no war.

I feel sure that you will wish to have carried to the Soviet people the text of this resolution adopted by the American Congress.

## The Congressional Resolution

**A Declaration of Friendship from the American People to all the Peoples of the World, including the Peoples of the Soviet Union**

WHEREAS the goal of the American people is now, and ever has been a just and lasting peace; and

WHEREAS the deepest wish of our Nation is to join with all other nations in preserving the dignity of man, and in observing those moral principles which alone lend meaning to his existence; and

WHEREAS in proof of this, the United States has offered to share all that is

good in atomic energy, asking in return only safeguards against the evil in the atom; and

WHEREAS this Nation has likewise given of its substance and resources to help those peoples ravaged by war and poverty; and

WHEREAS terrible danger to all free peoples compels the United States to undertake a vast program of armaments expenditures; and

WHEREAS we rearm only with reluctance and would prefer to devote our energies to peaceful pursuits: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Members of this Congress reaffirm the historic and abiding friendship of the American people for all other peoples, including the peoples of the Soviet Union, by declaring—*

That the American people deeply

regret the artificial barriers which separate them from the peoples of the USSR, and which keep the Soviet peoples from learning of America's desire to live in friendship with all other peoples, and to work with them in advancing the ideal of human brotherhood; and

That the American people desire neither war with the Soviet Union nor the terrible consequences of such a war; and

That although they are firmly determined to defend their freedom and security, the American people welcome all honorable efforts to compose the differences standing between them and the Soviet Government; be it further

*Resolved, That the Congress request the President of the United States to call upon the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to acquaint the peoples of the Soviet Union with the contents of this resolution.*

## President Shvernik's Reply

*While the Soviet authorities were studying the Congressional resolution and President Truman's letter, accusations were rife in official circles and in the American press that the Soviet Government was ignoring the President's communication and the Congressional resolution and keeping their contents from the Soviet people.*

*On August 6, however, the Soviet Embassy in Washington delivered to the State Department a reply from Soviet President Shvernik and a resolution adopted by the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, the texts of which follow:*

His Excellency,  
Harry S. Truman,  
President of the United States  
of America.

Your Excellency:

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of July 7, 1951, and of the enclosed resolution of the Congress of the United States of America and to transmit to you a resolution of the

Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

This resolution expresses the feelings of sincere friendship of the peoples of the Soviet Union toward the peoples of the whole world—it speaks of the fact that the Soviet people is unified in its attempts to establish a stable peace and to eliminate the threat of a new war.

The Soviet people has no basis for

doubting that the American people also do not want war.

However, the Soviet people know well that there exist in some states forces which are striving to unleash a new world war, in which the circles in question see the source of their own enrichment. The peoples of the Soviet Union believe that there will be no war if the peoples take into their own hands preservation of peace and defend it to the end, unmasking the attempts of those forces which are trying to draw the people into another war.

I share your opinion that a desire for peace and brotherhood exists in the hearts of a majority of people. Therefore, governments which not with words but with deeds are striving to support peace must encourage by every means the peaceful strivings of their people.

The Soviet Government assists in every way the unification of the efforts of the Soviet people fighting for peace with the efforts of the peoples of other countries. It hospitably receives communications [the envoys] of peace from any country and by every means contributes to [facilitates] the intercourse of the Soviet people with the peoples of other countries, placing no barriers in the path.

There is no doubt that friendship between peoples which is mentioned in your communication pre-supposes the development of political, economic and cultural relations and connections between peoples on a basis of equal rights. There is also no doubt that a most important step on this road must be the elimination of any discrimination with regard to the Soviet Union on the part of the American authorities.

The duty of all peace-loving peoples consists in steadfastly carrying

on a policy of war prevention and preservation of peace, of not permitting arms races, of attaining limitation [the official Soviet text uses the word *reduction* here and elsewhere] of armaments and the prohibition of atomic weapons with the establishment of inspection over the implementation of such a prohibition, and of cooperating in the conclusion of a five-power pact for the strengthening of peace.

The conclusion of such a pact would have an exceptionally important significance in the improvement of Soviet-American relations and the strengthening of peace among peoples. Such a pact would raise the confidence of all peoples in the preservation of peace and, moreover, would permit the possibility of limiting armaments, of lightening the burden of military expenditures, which lie with all their heaviness on the people's shoulders. [The full weight of which falls upon the shoulders of the people.]

In implementing the indicated measures the American people will always find full cooperation on the part of the Soviet people, who unalterably defend the cause of peace.

I hope that the text of the resolution of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will be brought to the attention of the American people.

I take this occasion to request you to transmit to the American people my greetings and good wishes from the people of the Soviet Union.  
Moscow, August 6, 1951.

NIKOLAI SHVERNIK,

*President of the Presidium  
of the Supreme Soviet of the  
Union of Soviet Socialist Re-  
publics.*

# The Supreme Soviet Resolution

## A Resolution of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

Being informed of [after studying] the joint resolution adopted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the USA, which was transmitted together with a letter from Mr. Truman, President of the USA, on July 7 of this year, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, combining the work of both Houses—the Council of the Union and the Council of the Nationalities of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, considers it necessary to make the following statement:

### [1]

Expressing the will of the peoples of the Soviet Union for peace, the Soviet Government always conducts a policy directed toward strengthening peace and establishing friendly relations between states. The principle of this policy was laid down in the peace decree adopted by the Second Congress of Soviets on Nov. 11, 1917, as soon as the Soviet State was formed. Since that time the foreign policy of the Soviet Union has remained unchanged, being directed toward the strengthening of peace and friendly relations among peoples.

After the second World War, when, as the result of the joint efforts of the Allies, the forces of the aggressors were smashed, the aggressive states were disarmed, an international organization was established for the maintenance of peace and the prevention of the outbreak of any new aggression, conditions were created for the establishment of a lasting peace. As is known, in the matter of strengthening international security the Soviet Government assumed the initiative, coming forth with a proposal for general reduction in armaments, including as its primary mission the prohibition of the production and

utilization of atomic energy for war purposes.

Subsequently, in defending the cause of peace and expressing the inflexible determination of peoples to prevent the threat of a new war, the Soviet Government has twice introduced a proposal that the United States, Great Britain, China, France and the Soviet Union unite their efforts for the purpose of supporting international peace and security and conclude a peace pact among themselves. The initiative of the Soviet Government met with fervent support and approval on the part of the peace-loving peoples of the entire world. The Soviet people cannot understand what peace-loving motives the Government of the United States of America can have in hitherto rejecting the proposal of the Soviet Government for the conclusion of a peace pact between the five powers.

After the outbreak of the military conflict in Korea and the open armed intervention of the United States of America in Korea, the Soviet Union made repeated proposals for a peaceful settlement of the Korean conflict. Recently the Soviet Union again advanced a proposal to put an end to the bloodshed in Korea which has even led to negotiations for an armistice and a cessation of military activities in Korea.

The peace policy of the Soviet Union is based on the full and unconditional support of the peoples of the Soviet Union, in which there are no classes and groups which are interested in unleashing a war. The Soviet Union has no aggressive plans and does not threaten any country or any peoples. The armed forces of the Soviet Union are not waging war anywhere and are not taking part in any military actions. The peoples of the Soviet Union are completely absorbed in executing the tasks of peaceful construction. The Soviet State is developing the construction of magnificent hydro-electric stations and irrigation systems and is creating con-

ditions for the steady future improvement of the standard of living of the population of the country.

[2]

In the resolution of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the USA it is stated that the American people deeply regret the presence of "artificial barriers" that separate them from the peoples of the Soviet Union.

The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR must state that the foreign policy of the Soviet Union does not place any obstacles in the way of friendship of the Soviet people with the American people or with other peoples, and does not create any obstacles to the establishment of business, trade and friendly relations between them.

However, this cannot be said of the foreign policy that is being conducted by the organs of authority of the United States of America. This is proven not only by such facts as the systematic refusal on the part of the American authorities to issue visas for entry into the United States of America to agents of [workers in] Soviet culture and their expulsion in spite of permits for entering the United States of America previously received through legal channels, but also a number of other measures of the Government of the United States of America of a discriminatory character with respect to the Soviet Union. For example, this is confirmed by the following facts:

(a) In December, 1949, the American Immigration authorities on the Virgin Islands, without any justification, issued an order by which the crews of two Soviet fishing vessels, the Trepang and the Perlamutr, which had called at St. Thomas for minor repairs and taking on water, were forbidden to come ashore.

(b) In July, 1950, in the port of Baltimore the Soviet steamship Krasnodar was subjected to an indiscriminate search by the American authorities, and in violation of generally accepted international custom police agents remained on board the steamship after

the search until the very moment when it put to sea.

(c) On March 18, 1948, the American authorities arbitrarily seized the Soviet vessel Rossiya which had arrived in New York and which is State property of the Soviet Union, on the grounds of searching for two particular passengers of this vessel.

(d) In March, 1949, the Immigration authorities in New York proposed to the Soviet representatives who were present at the Congress of Cultural and Scientific Workers of the USA in Defense of Peace, to leave the United States within a week under the threat of application of administrative measures against them in case they did not comply with this order.

(e) In October, 1950, at the Brumm Airport two Soviet diplomatic couriers were detained in spite of the fact that they had American diplomatic visas on their passports.

(f) In March 1951, the Department of Commerce issued an order to annul the licensing for exporting scientific and technical literature to the Soviet Union.

(g) Recently in front of the building of the Mission of the USSR at the United Nations in New York there have been gathering, with the connivance of the police, gangs of hooligans who interfere with the normal work of the Mission and threaten the personal security of its members. On the second of August the First Secretary of the Mission, A. S. Polyanski, who possesses diplomatic immunity, was, on his exit from the Mission, subjected before the eyes of the police to an attack by hooligans who hit him on the head with sticks.

(h) On the 23rd of June of this year, only a few days before the President of the United States of America sent the resolution of the Congress of the USA to the President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, N. M. Shvernik, the Government of the United States of America denounced the trade agreement concluded between the USSR and the USA in 1937.

(i) On June 2 of this year a law was passed by the Congress which demanded

that countries receiving so-called economic and financial aid from the USA practically eliminate trade with the Soviet Union and with the countries of the Peoples' Democracy under threat of termination of this aid.

(j) The prohibited lists published on June 7 of this year in connection with this law include almost all goods entering into international trade.

(k) On August 2, even after the approach of the Congress of the USA to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, the House of Representatives of the Congress passed a new law, which, under the pretext of prohibiting shipments of strategic materials, provides for measures directed toward the termination of trade with the Soviet Union and with countries friendly to the Soviet Union.

The discriminatory measures in the trade field indicated above have led to the result that the exchange of goods between the USSR and the USA over the past five years, beginning with 1946, has dropped more than six times and has reached an almost non-existent level.

Thus all these facts bear witness that on the part of the organs of power of the United States of America there is carried on a policy of discrimination toward the USSR and artificial barriers are being set up which interfere with the free intercourse of the Soviet and American peoples and which are pushing our countries apart from each other.

There arises a legitimate question how to reconcile the statements contained in the resolution of the Congress of the USA regarding the necessity for the elimination of barriers in relations between the peoples of the two countries with the above-mentioned acts of the American authorities.

The Soviet people have no doubt that the American people, like all other peoples, do not want war. However, as history shows, questions of peace and war are not always decided by the people. The statements of many responsible representatives of the Government of the United States of America, and also of members of the Congress of the USA, contain direct appeals for the unleash-

ing of aggressive war against the peoples of the USSR, for the use of weapons of mass destruction against the peaceful population. Such statements, which contradict not only the interests of peace but also the elementary requirements of human morality, must call forth condemnation on the part of the Congress of the United States.

### [3]

The Government of the United States of America came forth as the initiator of the establishment of the North Atlantic military alliance directed, it is clear, against the USSR. It has established a wide network of military bases on foreign territory near the frontiers of the USSR and, in infringement of obligations taken upon itself, is putting into effect the remilitarization of Western Germany and is re-establishing Japanese militarism. At the same time there is being implemented in the United States of America a gigantic armaments program.

The Government of the United States has unalterably refused [invariably rejected] all proposals of the Soviet Government aimed at strengthening peace and international security. Thus, up to this time there has not been achieved an agreement for the conclusion of a peace pact between the five powers, for the prohibition of atomic weapons and for the establishment of inspection over the implementation of this prohibition, and also for the limitation of armaments and armed forces. In the resolution of the Congress the thought is set forth that now the path is open for the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. At the same time there is no doubt that only after the prohibition of atomic weapons can atomic energy actually be used for peaceful purposes, for the welfare of peoples.

The Soviet people are daily convinced that the policy and actions of the Government of the United States of America diverge from its verbal declarations regarding the preservation of peace, and equally from the peace-loving desires of the American people, and that

there are being established conditions for the further worsening of relations with the Soviet Union, although no danger has threatened and does not threaten the United States from the Soviet Union.

[4]

It goes without saying that one can only welcome the approach of the Congress of the US to the Soviet people and its appeal for the strengthening of friendly relations between the US and the Soviet Union. However, an approach by words with an appeal for cooperation in the improvement of relations between the USSR and the USA and in the strengthening of international peace can give positive results only in the event that there is no divergency between it and the deeds of the Government of the USA, the policy and actions of the Government of the United States of America.

However, inasmuch as the Congress of the USA states that it is seeking a path toward the improvement of relations with the Soviet Union, it can have no doubts that such attempts by the Congress will find a response in the peace-loving efforts of the Soviet people and the peaceful policy of the Soviet Union.

The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet

considers that one of the serious steps on this road could be the elimination of the discrimination toward the Soviet Union in all fields of international relationships which hinder normal relations between our countries.

A still more important step in the matter of improving relations between our countries and strengthening peace between peoples could be the conclusion of a peace pact between the five powers, to which could also adhere other states which are striving to strengthen peace.

The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has no doubt that all peoples striving for the preservation of peace would greet with great satisfaction the conclusion of such a pact.

The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet expresses the hope that the Congress of the United States of America will bring the present resolution to the attention of the American people.

*(The texts of the Shvernik message and the Supreme Soviet Resolution were taken from the preliminary State Department translation as published in the New York press. The official English texts issued by the Soviet Government have only become available as we go to press. Where there is a substantial difference in translation, we have indicated in brackets the phrase appearing in the official Soviet version.)*

## FOR PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE

*On July 15, 1951, there appeared in Moscow the first issue of the English language magazine News devoted to the advancement of peaceful co-existence between the peoples of the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies on the one hand, and the peoples of the Western countries on the other.*

*The magazine is published by the newspaper Trud (Labor), organ of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions of the USSR. Its chief editor is the distinguished Shakespearian scholar, Mikhail Morozov.*

*The contents of the main articles in News have been made widely known to the Soviet people through reprints in Pravda, Izvestia and other leading Soviet newspapers. They have been broadcast over the Soviet radio and begmed to the peoples of the world in English and many other languages. Excerpts from the first issue follow:*

### Our Aims

*(From an editorial in the "News")*

In undertaking the publication of a fortnightly magazine in English, we are moved by the earnest desire to promote, to the best of our ability, closer understanding between the peoples of the Soviet Union and the Anglo-Saxon world. We are firmly persuaded that there is no cogent reason why nations should not co-operate in peace and concord no matter what the political structures or social systems of their countries may be. This was borne out in the last world war, when many different nations together with the Soviet Union fought shoulder to shoulder to defeat their common enemy—fascism, the enemy of the liberty and independence of all nations, the foe of civilized society. . . .

In our days it is of paramount importance for the strengthening of

peace to have the public of the West properly informed and given a sober and balanced picture of international events and developments. Our magazine will survey and discuss the major developments in international life, devoting particular attention to the affairs of the Anglo-Saxon countries. NEWS will do so chiefly and primarily with a view to promoting the cause of peace and democracy. It will endeavor to present as full and accurate a picture as possible of the leading events and trends in the political, economic and cultural affairs of the world. NEWS will seek to promote peace among nations, and counteract the vicious war propaganda disseminated by numerous periodicals and radios in the West.

Our magazine will invite the col-

laboration of scientists, artists and men and women prominent in public affairs. . . .

We do not believe that war is inevitable. We are firmly convinced

that peaceful international cooperation is possible, and indeed, essential for the tranquility and security of the peoples of the world.

THE EDITORS

## Key to International Security

(From an editorial in the "News")

It is probably true to say that no problem at this juncture is agitating the minds of men more than that of international cooperation and above all cooperation between the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies on the one hand, and the Anglo-Saxon countries on the other.

Indeed, one can hardly overestimate the importance of peaceful settlement of differences between the Great Powers. Above all, of course, cooperation between them would mean durable peace. Neither can one overestimate the beneficial effect a change from the policy of war preparation and frenzied armament for a policy of peaceful cooperation would have on stabilizing the internal situation in a number of Western countries. And is it not obvious what advantages the development of trade and other economic relations with the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies would bring the Anglo-Saxon countries and the other countries of the West. . . .

The more one analyzes the factors which are at present hindering peaceful relations between the Powers, the clearer it becomes how hollow are the arguments of those who consider that cooperation is altogether impossible, that the world has been "split" hopelessly and irrevocably.

Their basic argument is that the

Soviet Union's designs are aggressive. It is our belief that this argument has been thought up exclusively in justification of certain uncalled-for military preparations. Neither now nor in the past has the Soviet Union nurtured designs against anyone's territory. It has no aggressive military treaties with any country. It is not engaged in hostilities anywhere. . . .

It is no wonder, in view of this, that the foes of cooperation, when they accuse the Soviet Union of aggressiveness, have to give an extended meaning to the word "aggression" and to interpret it as signifying a threat to the social system of other states. They argue that if military force is not applied against the Soviet Union, undesirable changes of regime may take place in a number of countries.

Unbiased minds will undoubtedly perceive the hollowness of this line of reasoning. Never has the Soviet Union attempted to "change regimes" and existing social or government systems anywhere. Non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries is one of the basic principles of Soviet foreign policy. The Soviet Union maintains, and is prepared to maintain, the broadest business relations with countries no matter what their regime. . . .

And, indeed, who seriously be-

believes that the Soviet Union, and still less the People's Democracies, are planning to interfere in the internal affairs of the United States or Great Britain, or of any other country for that matter? Who believes that Poland or Bulgaria is contemplating aggression against Britain, or that the citizens of Moscow are making ready to occupy New York?

There are no serious grounds for a clash between the national inte-

rests of the Soviet Union and those of Britain or the United States. Still less are there grounds for any clash between these countries and the People's Democracies. It is certain that the latter wholeheartedly desire to see trade and all other relations prospering between them and Britain and America, and it is assuredly not any design on their part to alter or influence the internal regimes in Britain or America that is preventing this.

## **Developments in Korea**

*(From an editorial in the "News")*

The public reaction to the cease-fire negotiations in Korea is highly noteworthy. Perhaps no other proposal in recent times has met with such keen and solid support among the broadest sections of the population in literally every country, as the proposal to start negotiations for a cease-fire and armistice in Korea.

When Y. A. Malik, the Soviet representative in the Security Council, said that the Soviet people believed that the armed conflict could be settled, he seemed to be uttering aloud what hundreds of millions of people all over the world were thinking and passionately desiring. It was at once apparent that the bloodshed in Korea could be stopped immediately, and that all that was necessary was the "readiness of the parties to enter

on the path of a peaceful settlement." . . .

All lovers of peace desire to see the success of the cease-fire negotiations. It will be a big step towards the establishment of peace in the Far East and the elimination of the threat of another world war. Democratic opinion expects that with the termination of the American armed intervention in Korea the firm foundation for a full and complete settlement of the Korean issue itself must be laid. This is a matter to be agreed upon. . . .

This is the sacred truth. Everybody wants peace—peace in Korea, and peace throughout the world. They want the powers to settle their disputes peacefully, by negotiation, without resorting to bloodshed.

## **Soviet-American Friendship**

**ALEXANDER A. TROYANOVSKY**

***Former Soviet Ambassador to the United States***

(Article from "News")

The Soviet Union and the United States have a common boundary. It passes through the Bering Strait, between Chukotka and Alaska, or rather between the Big Diomed Island and the Little Diomed Island. The Big Diomed belongs to the Soviet Union, and only a few miles away lies the Little Diomed, a United States possession.

The fact that the two great countries have a common boundary is often forgotten, and the general belief is that they are separated by boundless expanses of ocean. Still more often is it forgotten nowadays that the two nations have common interests, the belief being unfortunately encouraged that the Soviet Union and the United States are divided by an ocean of insuperable differences and irreconcilable antagonisms.

Is this so?

Relations between nations are not the product of a single day. They are the result of a long historical process to which many factors contribute — economic, political, geographical, etc. Well, neither the history of Russo-American relations nor the history of Soviet-American relations—in a word, neither the past nor the present provides any warrant for the assertion that the two countries are divided by irreconcilable antagonisms, that their political and

national interests are fatally at variance.

The common boundary of the two countries has never witnessed a frontier incident. History furnishes no instance of Russo-American rivalry on land or on sea. As to the two World Wars it has been the lot of mankind to experience, in both cases the two nations fought on the same side of the front.

It is not the existence, but rather the absence of profound conflicts of interest that distinguishes the relations between the two great countries, with their far-flung territories and vast natural resources that render them self-contained and economically independent of the rest of the world.

More, we know from history that the two peoples have always been drawn to each other, have always been mutually interested in one another. This was true in the past and it is true now. Russia's progressive men followed with deep interest and sympathy the struggle of the American people for independence. Radishchev earned Catherine's wrath because of his admiration for the American Revolution and his profound respect for America's great scientist and statesman, Benjamin Franklin. It is well known, too, how highly Pestel, Ryleyev, Kakhovsky and other Russian Decembrists prized the American Revolution.

They eagerly studied the American Constitution, which in its day was a progressive development.

Naturally enough, these sympathies were not shared by Russia's rulers. Catherine II refused to recognize the young American Republic. But, on the other hand, Catherine refused to support England's hostile policy towards the United States.

This disparity between the sympathies of people and rulers in the past was not confined to the Russian side. Normal diplomatic relations between the United States and the Soviet Republic, it will be remembered, were not established until President Roosevelt came into office. America's rulers refused for sixteen years to recognize the Socialist Republic, although we know that progressive-minded people in America rejoiced with the Russian people over the downfall of the tsarist regime and the victory of the October Revolution. More, the American people condemned United States participation in the intervention against the young Soviet State. It is appropriate to recall the message sent by the People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs to the U.S. Secretary of State in 1919, which pointed out that "the perplexity as to the reasons for the presence of American troops in Russia was shared by American officers and soldiers themselves, and we had occasion to hear some of them directly express their perplexity."

Russians have always admired American efficiency, the ebullient creative energy of the American people, and their democratic spirit. Americans have always had a deep respect for Russia's cultural attainments, and appreciate and esteem our distinguished writers and artists.

The national interests of the two countries have never once conflicted throughout the long history of their relations, and often enough have harmonized. This has been true in the distant past, in the recent past and it is true today. Let us recall the first World War. The Russian army, by launching its offensive in East Prussia, saved Paris and disrupted the German offensive. The Germans' plan of war was upset, because without the Russian offensive there would not have been the Marne. The Russians, in the first World War, deflected 127 German, Austro-Hungarian and other divisions from the Western front, and one result of this was that the United States was able to make proper preparations for entering the war against Kaiser Germany.

The second World War is still fresh in the memory of both the Soviet and the American peoples. In that war their ties of friendship were still closer knit. Yet we know that in those years, when the Soviet people were engaged in a truly titanic struggle against Hitler's hordes, there were men in the United States who built their hopes and plans on the expectation that the Soviet Union would be weakened and exhausted, and said so aloud. This was not only an offense to the Russians; it was also an offense to the American people, who were following with deep sympathy and concern the Soviet people's struggle against their common enemy, fascism, and for the salvation of civilization and progress.

Difference of political system and government can be no bar to the development of friendly cooperation to the advantage of both countries. This was borne out during the war. Cooperation is imperiously demanded by the political and economic inte-

rests of the two countries. The Soviet Union is engaged in a gigantic program of peaceful construction, and peaceful construction always makes for broader economic ties with the rest of the world.

As to the American people, I have had the opportunity to observe them closely, and I know that they entertain friendly feelings for our people. I cannot believe that they countenance the idea of armed aggression against the Soviet Union so widely propagated in the United States at the present time. I share the view expressed by President Roosevelt in

a message he sent to M. I. Kalinin on July 10, 1941, shortly after Hitler Germany attacked the Soviet Union: "The American people is disgusted at armed aggression. It is bound to the Russian people by firm ties of historic friendship."

I am, and always have been, a firm believer in Soviet-American friendship, because I am convinced that it is in the interest of both nations, and in the interest of peace and security. Elimination of Soviet-American tension would certainly be an earnest of enduring world peace.

## Past and Present

ACADEMICIAN E. TARLE

(From an article in "News")

My mind can conceive no rational excuse for the highly strained relations that have arisen between the two great Anglo-Saxon powers and the Soviet Union. I am positively unable to find either in the past or in the present any justification for that, at bottom artificially fostered, animosity which is poisoning the international atmosphere today. This is equally true of Anglo-Soviet and American-Soviet relations; but it is only the former I intend to discuss in this article.

It is worth noting that in all the long centuries of Britain's history only once was she at war with Russia. That was at the time of the Crimean campaign. And even that war, in the opinion of a long line of Britain's most authoritative historians, was entirely unnecessary. There are, of course, dark pages in the record of Anglo-Soviet relations, such as the intervention against the young Soviet Republic—Churchill's notorious "campaign of fourteen nations." But this was a venture instigated by a handful of multi-millionaires; it was not dictated by

Britain's national interests, and the British people were certainly not party to it.

The fact remains that there is no European Great Power with whom Russia has fought less often than with Britain and none with whom Britain has fought less often than with Russia. Far more frequently have the two powers entered into close military and diplomatic agreements and assisted each other against a common enemy, or negotiated with a direct view to concluding an alliance needed by both.

[Professor Tarle then reviews the history of Anglo-Russian and Anglo-Soviet relations from the eighteenth century to the present day, including the alliance of 1942 which resulted in the victory over Nazi Germany. He shows how even during the period when Tsarist Russia was pursuing provocative policies toward England, diplomatic accommodations were found possible. He asks why peaceful relations are not equally possible today when "absolutely no danger exists of an attack on Britain's frontiers by the Soviet Union," and continues:]

But now, after the war and the victory over Germany, we find Britain resuming her hostile policy towards the Soviet Union with redoubled vigor. To us, Soviet intellectuals and scientists, and especially to Soviet economists and historians, this line of action seems even more devoid of political sense now than it did in the period between the two wars.

Indeed, one has only to ask the very simple question—is there the slightest reason for anyone, except the armament firms, to desire an armed conflict between the Soviet Union and the Anglo-Saxon powers?—and the answer comes immediately and irrefutably.

Consider first the economic aspect. Russia and the East-European and Asian People's Democracies constitute a vast, inexhaustible and unequalled market for goods and a source of supply of raw materials. Free and normal trade with this market on mutually advantageous terms would be an immense asset for British industry and commerce in their present hard plight. The Soviet market alone, for all the development of our own industry, is able to absorb a vast quantity of British goods. This is very well known by Britain's trans-Atlantic competitors. It was their press that every time Britain attempted, in the years since the defeat of Germany, to extend economic relations with the Soviet Union, immediately raised an outcry and accused Britain of being lured by material advantages to desert the struggle for the "salvation of Western civilization." . . .

It would require much racking of brains, and a most fertile imagination besides, to discover any spot on the globe where the interests of the Soviet Union and Britain clash to such an extent as to make it impossible, given the desire, to put an end to the mutual "fears" and misunderstandings. In the celebrated "iron curtain" there is so little "iron," that even now, when so much has been done to envenom Anglo-Soviet relations with the virus of mis-

trust, Britons are conducting trade with us to the advantage of both parties. This trade could probably have been not twice, but ten times as great, if the absurd fables about a "Russian menace" and the Communists wanting to "conquer the world" did not prevent people from calmly, frankly and honestly seeing things as they really are.

We consider the assertion that war is inevitable, that a bloody conflict is unavoidable, a criminal lie that is poisoning the lives and the minds of men. What is true is that there are men who with deliberate and malignant intent are stirring up diplomatic conflicts and making fortunes from fostering the idea of a future war that will cut the Gordian knot of supposedly irreconcilable interests. In the eyes of the foes of an Anglo-Soviet rapprochement, the "irreconcilability" of interests lies in the very existence of the Soviet Union. We must say that they ignore the facts of reality and stubbornly close their eyes to the obvious, which is that if there was ever in modern history a "saturated state," that state is the Soviet Union as it exists today. A "saturated state" was Bismarck's term for a country all of whose requirements were already satisfied within the foreseeable future without resort to arms. . . .

The last thing we are thinking of is an attack upon Britain, or America, or any of our neighbors. We are engaged in a gigantic work of peaceful construction. We need the new miraculous discoveries of science and technology for the waging of a successful offensive, not against other powers but against nature.

Close economic intercourse advantageous to both parties, firm determination and complete readiness to settle all misunderstanding by peaceful negotiation, and broad and close cultural cooperation—these are what, in our opinion, should constitute the basis of the relations between the two Anglo-Saxon countries and the Soviet Union.

## Voices of America

COMPOSER DMITRI SHOSTAKOVICH

(From an article in "News")

[Shostakovich begins by quoting a letter published in the *Boston Globe* in which Mr. and Mrs. Harry Winchester, of South Ryegate, Vermont, express their anxiety over the fate awaiting their three sons of military age. He goes on to say:]

Someone may ask why a Russian composer should interest himself in what Americans think. In reply, let me say that man was born to listen to the voice of the piano and the violin, the harp and the flute, and to enjoy the marvelous symphony of life and creative work, and not to be deafened by bomb bursts and blinded by atomic lightning. Man was born to live life to the full, delighting in it as a bird delights in flying, and this regardless of whether he was born the son of an American working woman or of a Russian peasant woman, whether he was born in New York or in Moscow, whether his language is English or Russian. Man was born to be happy. That is what I have been taught to think by Leo Tolstoy and Mark Twain, by Chekhov and Whitman, Chaikovsky and Mozart, humanists who sang to the sun, to joy, to human genius. . . . That is why I was so deeply touched by the Winchesters' letter. And that is why I, a Russian composer, feel duty bound to

express the thoughts aroused on reading of the danger threatening the sons of this American family from South Ryegate. . . .

I know not a single true artist at present who feels that he can remain aloof from the struggle for life and for peace on earth, and whose heart does not contract at the thought of another war. I do not know a single such person, because true art, which is always dedicated to mankind, must of necessity serve the cause of peace, and oppose war, with its annihilation of human beings and whole nations.

Our times have confronted us with a question not to be evaded: peace or war? It is the most burning question of our day. It is a question which Americans find particularly pressing and fraught with menace, for the shadow of war has already crept across the threshold of the American home, taking its first toll of tens of thousands of young American lives. . . .

Before me lies a sheet of paper on which I should like to compose music telling how an ordinary American father and mother suffered, how they fought and won the battle for life and peace. Perhaps some day it will be given me to write such a cantata to life, triumphant over war and death.

## The Fellowship of Science

ACADEMICIAN GRIGORI LANDSBERG

(From an article in "News")

[Professor Landsberg reviews the decisions adopted by the British Association of Scientific Workers at its recent annual meeting. He notes particularly the statement of the Association's vice president, Dr. D. MacLean, that:

"In the present state of tension in the world, it is of vital importance to

maintain our connection with scientists in the USSR and Eastern Europe."

Commenting on this statement, Professor Landsberg declares:]

The decisions of the British scientists are a reflection of the sincere desire of men of science to dedicate their knowl-

edge to the furtherance of human progress.

It is a desire which we, Soviet scientists, fully sympathize with and share. Soviet science has played a notable part in postwar reconstruction, it has contributed no small share to the rapid progress of our socialist industry and agriculture. And today our scientists are working on gigantic problems, involving the refashioning of nature, the remaking of the climate of whole regions, the harnessing of mighty rivers and the revivification of lifeless deserts. The multiplication of the productive forces of our country, the opening up and utilization of its natural resources, the continuous improvement of the material conditions of our people, lengthening the span of human life, such are the problems that are engaging the minds of our scientists.

And problems like these are assuredly exercising the minds of many scientists in other countries too. . . .

The position of Soviet scientists is clear and definite. We have always stood for the banning of the atomic bomb and of all other weapons of mass destruction. Our physicists, chemists and workers in other branches of science, whose achievements are known to the whole scientific world, have on repeated occasions proclaimed emphatically in favor of a reduction of armaments, of research for radical means of healing the diseases of men and improving their health, and of working for the utilization of atomic energy exclusively for peaceful purposes.

It was not in order that this great achievement of scientific thought should be used for the destruction of peaceable beings that the scientists of the world devoted decades of intense effort to its

discovery. I have not the least doubt that the overwhelming majority of scientists share this view, and that if intercourse between them were free it would become evident that all researchers sincerely desire to work in the calm assurance that the fruit of their labor will be used for the benefit of humanity, and not for its destruction.

Dr. MacLean is therefore profoundly right when he says that connection between the scientists of the USSR and the People's Democracies and the scientists of Britain and other countries is a vital necessity.

As I see it, this connection should be very comprehensive. It should be a close fellowship of the scientists of all countries as much in their creative work, as in the effort to prevent another war, with the menace implicit in it of the destruction of the centers of modern civilization, of our cities, our universities, our laboratories, libraries and museums, and of ourselves and our near ones. . . .

It is a truism that science is not the monopoly of any one nation. Science, more than any other form of creation, is by its very nature a collective pursuit. Close intercourse among scientists is vital for scientific progress; all advances in science have been the product of the collective effort of scientists of many different countries. . . .

The amazing progress in the theory of the atom and its nucleus, culminating in the discovery of the use of nuclear energy, has been the work of our generation. Yet, is it possible to name any one scientist to whom the chief merit for the solution of this problem can be attributed? Rutherford and Dirac of Britain, Niels Bohr of Denmark, Planck and Heisenberg of Germany, Schrödinger of Austria, Joliet-Curie of France, the Italian Fermi, the Americans Lawrence and Millikan, the Soviet investigators Skobeltsyn and Tamm and many, many others have all made their contribution to this paramount discovery. Not one of them can be stricken from the list, and not one of them can be considered the man who made success certain. And the closer

---

**ACADEMICIAN GRIGORI LANDSBERG** is a well-known Soviet physicist, the author of some one hundred works on spectroscopy and other branches of modern physics. He has represented the Soviet scientists at international scientific congresses, notably at the "Victory Congress" in Paris in 1945.

the fellowship among scientists, the more swiftly science passes on from the solution of one problem to that of another. . . .

It is the bounden duty of the scientists of the world to do all in their power to help promote this fellowship of effort, so that it may be fully commensurate with the increasing complex-

ity and magnitude of the problems science is called upon to tackle. And, quite evidently, we must at the same time see to it that the voice of the scientists of the world makes itself heard in warning to those who are bent on making scientific progress an instrument for the ruin and destruction of nations.

### **"News" Invites the "Times"**

*In the second issue of News, which appeared on July 2, the editors referred to an editorial in the New York Times which had commented in an irritated tone on articles appearing in the News, and charged that the Soviet press spreads "hate America" propaganda. The News then proposed an exchange between the two journals, declaring:*

The *New York Times* proposes as a real means of improving relations "to permit free interchange of persons and ideas." We should not like to think that this is merely an empty phrase. Why not start with our magazine? We would willingly give space in our columns for the expression of ideas designed to promote friendly relations between our country and America. Why should not Soviet and American journalists discuss in our magazine the mutual advantage of friendly relations

between our two countries, and try to find ways and means of bringing public influence to bear on those who are preventing such relations?

After all, it is the function of the press to promote international friendship and understanding. The *New York Times* apparently thinks so too. At any rate, it is to be gathered from its editorial on the first issue of our magazine that it is opposed to "hate propaganda." Well, we are for backing the word with the deed.

## **The Morrison-Pravda Exchange**

*Answering a challenge from British Foreign Minister Herbert Morrison to publish a statement by him in full, the Moscow Pravda of Aug. 1, 1951, published an article received from Mr. Morrison and a reply thereto. The exchange also appeared in other leading Soviet newspapers. The text below is reprinted from the New York Times of Aug. 1, 1951.*

### **Article by Morrison**

In a speech last month I asked for this opportunity to have a message of mine reproduced in the Soviet press. I did so because I felt that, while our papers were always ready to publish declarations by your leaders, British

Government spokesmen were not properly reported in your newspapers.

Knowledge of the truth is essential to understanding between peoples. But truth can only be arrived at if there is freedom to hear different points of view: Only then can people sift them and determine for themselves what

they consider to be the truth. In Britain we impose no restrictions on access to all available news and views so the people can make up their own minds for themselves. Their views are neither made for them nor dictated to them.

People can only draw independent conclusions properly for themselves if they have full knowledge of what is happening in the world around them. From our acquaintance with your press and radio it seems to us that it is different in your country. Many facts and views are withheld from you and there is no freedom of speech and free access to knowledge of how the rest of the world lives and thinks which is essential to understanding of each other. This ignorance creates fear and suspicion of the motive of other peoples. I regret therefore that full knowledge of what is happening in my country is not available to you.

If you were able to meet more British people or free to travel to Britain this ignorance could be broken down. I know that in the Soviet Union you meet very few British people, and, even when you do, you do not feel free to speak freely to them or with other foreigners and to exchange your ideas or hopes or fears. This is not our fault. Hundreds of thousands of our people go abroad for their annual holidays each year, and I am sure many would be glad to spend their holidays if they could in the Soviet Union. Your Government, for reasons I cannot understand, refuses to let you travel freely. You could learn more about us, too, if our newspapers and periodicals had free circulation in your country, which they have not, or if you could listen freely to our radio.

Even that your Government makes difficult because, although we transmit broadcasts to the Soviet Union in Russian daily at 6:15 a.m., 5:15 p.m. and 12:15 a.m. Moscow time, they are artificially and intentionally jammed by your Government. I wonder why. What has your Government to fear? I wish it would follow our practice—broadcasts in English from the Soviet Union can be freely listened to and not only the British Communist daily paper but

*Pravda* itself can be bought. Our view is that in a free and enlightened democracy everyone is able to judge for himself the truth of what he hears or reads.

In Britain we set great store by such manifestations of personal freedom. Among them is the freedom from arbitrary arrest. If the police take some one into custody he must within a maximum of forty-eight hours be charged with an offense in open session in a court of law which is entirely independent of the Government, and he is always assumed innocent until proved guilty. British citizens are not removed from their homes, they are not deported, they are not sent to labor camps. If there is a knock at the door in the early morning there is no fear that it is the police. It will probably only be the milkman or the postman. I wonder whether all of you can honestly say that you have this same sense of personal security which every British citizen enjoys. We prefer the situation whereby the Government no less than the private citizen is bound by law and the state has no unfettered power of arbitrary action.

Among the other freedoms which the British enjoy are those of assembly. Persons of the most varied opinions can freely associate together and organize themselves into political or other societies whether in support of or opposed to the government of the day. This freedom, combined with others including freedom of speech and of the press, insures political freedom, which enables free choice of governments by the people themselves. In Britain, therefore the different political parties, including Labor, Conservative, Liberal and Communist are free to express their different programs, to nominate their candidates, and put their views to the people, whether critical of the Government or not. Any evening in Hyde Park, the largest park in central London, spokesmen representing a variety of views can be seen speaking to crowds of Londoners and, if they wish to, freely criticizing the Government. Among them,

most evenings, can be found Communist speakers.

No group has a monopoly of power in Britain. Immediately before the war the Conservative party was in power, but in 1945, exercising their free choice of government through elections held by secret ballot and with candidates of two or more parties to choose from in the constituencies, the people of Britain elected a Labor and Socialist Government. Since then that Government, with no challenge of violence, has peacefully pursued its policy and the Opposition its right to criticize and oppose.

None the less, much to our regret, it has been found necessary to divert much of our national energy to rearmament for defensive purposes. I would like to make it clear to you why we consider this necessary. You are told we are warmongers, that, in alliance with the other countries of Western Europe and the United States of America, we are arming to the teeth to attack the Soviet Union, that we are engaging in an arms race, that we are preparing for a new war. That is not true. None of it is true.

The British people, who shared with the Russian people the sufferings of the Hitlerite war, do not want a third world war. We are a peaceful people who want to feel secure, but we are ready to make sacrifices to defend our democratic way of life and preserve the freedoms we enjoy. Our alliances are defensive alliances. With you we have the Anglo-Soviet treaty of alliance concluded in 1942. The North Atlantic Treaty is another defensive alliance. They are not directed against anyone except aggressors.

Why is it then that we have considered it necessary to build up our strength and to devote so much of our national resources to rearmament when we would rather devote them to improving the standard of living of all of us?

To be frank with you, it is because of the policy which has been pursued by the Soviet Government since the end of the war. At the end of the war, we had hoped that the wartime cooperation between the great powers would continue

and become strengthened in peace. We expected and strove for cooperation with you in the United Nations. But alas our hopes were disappointed. They were changed to doubts by your Government's refusal to cooperate in Germany and in the economic rehabilitation of Europe. These doubts were confirmed as we watched the imposition of Communist regimes in Eastern Europe and the establishment of the Cominform. For if, as your leaders tell us, Communist and non-Communist states can live together in the world, why is it necessary for your Government to pursue a policy and to found organizations whose only purpose seems to be to stir up trouble and international hatred?

We saw that, while we had demobilized and disarmed, your Government had retained vast armed forces and military establishments in being. Gradually we came to realize that the lack of balance in military power between the Soviet Union and the Western powers was endangering our very existence, and that the lack of balance must be redressed. We did not want to turn over our resources to a new defense program, we wanted to carry on with our economic recovery. But we concluded that we must be strong enough to make clear that aggression, from whatever quarter it might come, could not succeed against us if we were to fulfill our purpose of avoiding war. For that is our main purpose—to avoid war, to preserve peace. It is the purpose of all our foreign policy and of all our diplomacy.

Peoples everywhere are today afraid of war. We should like to see the causes of this fear removed and all grounds for suspicion and distrust between nations eliminated. On behalf of the British Government I can assure you there is no reason to have any fear of our policy toward the people of the Soviet Union.

I hope what I have written so frankly will help to bring about a better understanding between our peoples and that, now *Pravda* has opened its columns to me, I shall have further opportunities

of putting the British point of view before the Russian people and of answering any observations which *Pravda* may wish to make.

I send you the friendly greetings of my fellow-countrymen and our sincere wish for the genuine cooperation of your country in advancing the peace and progress of the world.

## **Pravda Reply**

In his statement Mr. Morrison raises two groups of questions: Questions of domestic and foreign policy.

### **Domestic Policy**

Mr. Morrison asserts that in the Soviet Union there is no freedom of speech, no freedom of the press, no personal freedom.

Mr. Morrison is deeply mistaken. In no country is there such freedom of speech, freedom of the press or personal freedom, freedom of organizations for workers, farmers, intellectuals, as in the Soviet Union. Nowhere are there so many workers' and farmers' clubs, so many workers' and farmers' newspapers, as in the Soviet Union. Nowhere has the organization of the working class reached the stage that it has in the Soviet Union. It is an open secret that the entire working class, literally all the workers of the USSR, are organized in trade unions, just as all the farmers are organized in cooperatives.

Does Mr. Morrison know of this? Evidently he does not. Moreover, apparently he does not even want to know of this—he prefers to draw his data from complaints coming from representatives of the Russian capitalists and landlords, who were driven out of the USSR by the will of the Soviet people.

In the USSR freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of organizations does not exist for enemies of the people, for the landlords and capitalists overthrown by the Revolution. Nor does it exist for incorrigible thieves, for subversive agents, terrorists and assassins sent in by foreign secret ser-

vices, for the criminals who shot at Lenin, who killed Volodarsky, Uritsky, Kirov, poisoned Maxim Gorky and Kuibishev. All these criminals, from the landlords and capitalists down to the terrorists, thieves, assassins and subversive agents, are out to restore capitalism in the USSR, to restore the exploitation of man by man and to drench the country in the blood of the workers and farmers. The prisons and labor camps exist for these gentlemen, and for them only.

Surely it is not for these gentlemen that Mr. Morrison seeks freedom of speech, freedom of the press and personal freedom? Surely Mr. Morrison does not think that the peoples of the USSR would consent to grant these gentlemen freedom of speech, freedom of the press, personal freedom and, hence freedom to exploit the working people.

Mr. Morrison makes no mention of other freedoms which are of much greater significance than freedom of speech, freedom of the press, etc. Specifically he does not say anything about freedom from exploitation for the people, about freedom from economic crises, from unemployment, from poverty. Perhaps Mr. Morrison is unaware that all these freedoms have existed for a long time in the Soviet Union? And these very freedoms are the basis of all the other freedoms. Does not Mr. Morrison bashfully keep silent about these basic freedoms because, unfortunately, they do not exist in Britain and British workers still suffer from exploitation by the capitalists, in spite of the fact that the Labor party has now been in office in Britain for six years?

Mr. Morrison asserts that the Labor Government is a Socialist Government and that the radio broadcasts organized under the supervision of such a Government should not meet with any hindrances by the Soviets.

Unfortunately we cannot agree with Mr. Morrison. At first, when Labor had just come to power, one could have thought that the Labor Government would take the path of socialism. Sub-

sequently, however, it turned out that the Labor Government differed little from any bourgeois government anxious to preserve the capitalist system and insure impressive profits for the capitalists.

The profits of the capitalists in Britain are indeed growing from year to year, while the wages of the workers remain frozen, the Labor Government protecting this regime of exploitation directed against the workers with every possible means to the extent of persecuting and arresting workers. Surely such a Government cannot be called a Socialist Government.

One might have thought that with the coming of Labor to power capitalist exploitation would be abolished, that steps would be taken to insure the systematic reduction of the prices of mass consumer goods, that the conditions of the working people would be radically improved. Instead of this, we observe in Britain the growth of capitalist profits and the freezing of workers' wages, a rise in the prices of mass consumer goods and so on. No, we cannot call such a policy a Socialist policy.

As for the British broadcasts to the Soviet Union [BBC broadcasts], they are known to be aimed primarily at encouraging the enemies of the Soviet people in their efforts to restore capitalist exploitation. Naturally, the Soviets cannot support such anti-popular propaganda which, moreover, constitutes interference in the internal affairs of the USSR.

Mr. Morrison asserts that Soviet power in the USSR is monopolized power, since it represents the rule of one party, the Communist party. Arguing along this line, one can come to the conclusion that the Labor Government is likewise a monopolized Government, since it represents the rule of one party, the Labor party.

This, however, is not the point. The point is that the Communists in the USSR, in the first place, do not act in isolation, but in a bloc with non-party people and, in the second place, that in the course of the USSR's historical development the Communist party

proved the only anti-capitalist, people's party.

In the course of the past fifty years the peoples of the Soviet Union have tested in action all the principal parties that existed in Russia: The party of the landlords [the Black Hundreds], the party of the capitalists [Cadets], the party of the Mensheviks [Right-Wing Socialists], the party of the Social Revolutionaries [the Defenders of the Kulaks], and the party of the Communists. In the course of the revolutionary developments in the USSR the peoples of our country swept aside all the bourgeois parties and made their choice in favor of the Communist Party, considering this party to be the only anti-landlord and anti-capitalist party. This is a historical fact. Naturally, the peoples of the USSR are giving their wholehearted support to the Communist Party which has been tested in battle.

What can Mr. Morrison put forward against this historical fact? Does Mr. Morrison think that for the sake of a dubitable rigmarole with an opposition, the wheel of history should be turned back and these long-deceased parties brought back to life?

### Foreign Policy

Mr. Morrison asserts that the Labor Government is for strengthening peace, that it does not in any way threaten the Soviet Union, that the North Atlantic pact is not an aggressive pact, but a defensive one, and that if Britain has taken the road of an arms drive, this is because she has been compelled to do so, inasmuch as the Soviet Union did not demobilize its Army sufficiently after the second World War.

There is not a grain of truth in all these assertions of Mr. Morrison's.

If the Labor Government is really for the preservation of peace, why does it reject a five-power peace pact, why does it oppose a reduction of the armaments of all the great powers, why does it oppose the prohibition of the atomic weapon, why does it persecute those who champion the cause of pre-

servation of peace, why does it not ban war propaganda in Britain?

Mr. Morrison wants his words to be taken for granted. But Soviet people cannot take anyone's words for granted, they demand deeds and not declarations.

Equally unsound are Mr. Morrison's assertions that the USSR did not demobilize its army sufficiently after the second World War. The Soviet Government has already stated officially that it demobilized thirty-two age groups, that its army is at present approximately the size it was in peace time before the second World War and that the British and American armies on the contrary are double the size they were before the second World War. Nevertheless, unsubstantiated assertions are continually advanced against these irrefutable facts.

Perhaps Mr. Morrison would like the USSR not to have an army sufficient for defense? An army is in general a great burden for the national budget, and the Soviet people would willingly go to the length of doing away with a regular army were it not for the danger from without. But the experience of 1918-1920, when the British, the Americans and the French (together with the Japanese) attacked the Soviet Union, attempted to sever the Ukraine, the Caucasus, Central Asia, the Far East and the Archangel region from the USSR and tormented our country for three years—this experience teaches us that the USSR must have a certain minimum regular army necessary to defend its independence from imperialist invaders. There is no instance in history of the Russians attacking the territory of Britain, but history has witnessed a whole series of instances of the British attacking the territory of the Russians and seizing it.

Mr. Morrison asserts that the Russians declined to cooperate with the British in the German question, in the question of European recovery. This is quite untrue. Mr. Morrison can hardly believe this statement himself. In reality, it is known that it was not

the Russians, but the British and Americans who refused to cooperate, since they knew that the Russians would not agree to restoring fascism in Germany, converting Western Germany into a base for aggression.

As for cooperating in the matter of European economic recovery, far from rejecting such a cooperation, the USSR, on the contrary, was the one to propose it on a basis of equality and observance of the sovereignty of the European countries without any dictation from abroad, without any dictation from the United States of America, without the enslavement of the countries of Europe by the United States of America.

Equally groundless are Mr. Morrison's assertions that the Communists came to power in the people's democratic countries by violence, that the Cominform engages in the propaganda of violence. Only those who have set themselves the aim of slandering the Communists can permit themselves to make such allegations.

Actually, as is known, the Communists came to power in the people's democratic countries as a result of general elections. Of course, the peoples of those countries threw out the exploiters and all kinds of agents of foreign secret services. But again, such has been the will of the people—the voice of the people is the voice of God.

As for the Cominform, only people who have lost all sense of proportion can assert that it engages in the propaganda of violence. Cominform literature has been published and is being published. It is known to everyone. It completely refutes the slanderous fabrications about the Communists.

In general it must be said that the method of violence and acts of violence is not the method of the Communists. Quite the reverse. History proves that it is the enemies of communism and all kinds of agents of foreign secret services that practice the method of violence and acts of violence.

One need not go far afield for examples. Quite recently, the Premier of Iran, the Premier of Lebanon and the

King of Jordan were assassinated within a short space of time. All these assassinations were perpetrated with the aim of forcibly altering the regime in these countries. Who assassinated them? Was it, perhaps, the Communists, the supporters of the Cominform? Surely it is ridiculous even to ask such a question. Perhaps, Mr. Morrison, being better informed, could help us to clear up this matter.

Mr. Morrison asserts the North Atlantic pact is a defense pact, that it has no aggressive aims, that, on the contrary, it is directed against aggression.

If this is true, why did the initiators of the pact not invite the Soviet Union to take part in it? Why did they fence themselves off from the Soviet Union? Why did they conclude it behind the USSR's back and in secrecy from it? Has the USSR not proved that it can and is willing to combat aggression, such as Hitlerite or Japanese aggression? Surely the USSR did not fight against aggression any worse than, say, Norway, which is a party to the pact. How then are we to explain this surprising incongruity, to say the least?

If the North Atlantic pact is a defense pact, why did the British and Americans not agree to the Soviet Government's proposal to have the nature of this pact discussed in the Foreign Ministers' Council? As is known, the Soviet Government offered to have all the pacts it has concluded with other countries discussed in the Foreign Ministers' Council. Why are the British and Americans afraid to tell the truth

about this pact and why did they refuse to have the North Atlantic pact discussed? Was it not because the North Atlantic pact contains provisions about aggression against the USSR, and the sponsors of the pact are compelled to conceal this from the public? Was it not for that reason that the Labor Government consented to Britain's conversion into a military air base of the United States of America for attacking the Soviet Union?

That is why the Soviet people regard the North Atlantic pact as an aggressive pact directed against the USSR.

This is borne out most strikingly by the aggressive actions of the Anglo-American ruling circles in Korea. For over a year now the Anglo-American forces have been tormenting the freedom-loving and peaceful people of Korea, destroying Korean villages and towns, murdering women, children and old folks. Can those sanguinary actions of the Anglo-American forces be called defense? Who will claim that the British troops in Korea are defending Britain from the Korean people? Would it not be more honest to call these actions military aggression?

Let Mr. Morrison point to a single Soviet soldier who has discharged his gun at any peaceful people. There is no such soldier! Then let Mr. Morrison explain properly why British soldiers are killing peaceful citizens in Korea? Or, why, for that matter, British soldiers are dying on foreign soil far from their native country?

That is why the Soviet people regard present-day Anglo-American politicians as instigators of a new world war.

## Malik and the British Quakers

On July 27, the text of an important declaration made by Mr. Jacob Malik to a visiting delegation of leading British Quakers was made public in Moscow. Since the text has not yet become available in this country, the following is drawn from a report published in the *New York Times* of July 28 from its Moscow correspondent, Harrison E. Salisbury.

The discussions of the British Quakers in Moscow, according to Mr. Salisbury, were regarded as of great importance since they followed careful discussion of their mission with British Foreign Secretary Morrison, who had authorized them to assure Soviet officials of the basic desire of Britain for peaceful and friendly relations with the Soviet Union.

Mr. Salisbury reported that Mr. Malik's statement was in the nature of a response to a seven-point program for peace submitted in advance by the Quaker delegation to the Soviet Ministry for Foreign Affairs. In a three and a half hour interview, Mr. Malik answered all seven questions in great detail, Mr. Salisbury said:

One fact that gave Mr. Malik's statement importance was that he prefaced his remarks by declaring that he was outlining the program that was followed by the Soviet Union and its Government in their struggle for peace and friendly relations between the Soviet Union and other countries, including the countries of the West. He also described his statement as presenting the position of the Soviet Government concerning the struggle for peace and the preservation of international security.

One of the points submitted by the Quakers was an inquiry regarding the following:

A willingness on the part of the Soviet Government to give pledges of non-intervention in action or in spirit and directly or indirectly in internal affairs of non-Communist countries on the understanding that corresponding pledges disavowing any counter-revolutionary purpose in Communist countries is given by countries of the West.

In response to this, Mr. Malik stated the general policy of the Soviet Government against interference in the internal affairs of other countries. He then added, as a restatement of what Soviet policy has been and remains, the following quotation from the famous interview given by Stalin to Roy S. Howard, the American newspaper publisher, in March, 1936:

To attempt to export revolution is nonsense. Without the desire within a country, there will be no revolution. The Russian people desired revolution and brought it about. Now we are engaged in building a society without classes. But to assert that we are allegedly desirous of making revolution in other countries, interfering in their lives, is to express what does not exist in reality and what we have never expressed.

Mr. Salisbury noted that the forceful reiteration of this statement at the present juncture in relations between the Soviet Union and the Western world was regarded as significant by foreign observers in Moscow. Among other important points made by Mr. Malik, according to

Mr. Salisbury's account, were the following:

First, the Soviet Union stands ready today "to enter into negotiations of a most business-like character and with the view to agreement" with any powers on major international issues now in conflict.

Second, the Soviet Union continues fully and actively to support the United Nations, which, it hopes, may yet become a "reliable organ for the maintenance of peace and should carry out its Charter obligation to free the coming generation from the scourge of war."

Third, the Soviet Union is prepared and willing to participate under the United Nations auspices in that part of the program of a general character of the twenty-year peace plan advocated by Secretary General Trygve Lie, which has as its aim the promotion of domestic resources and the national industry and agriculture of backward nations through provision of technical assistance.

Fourth, the Soviet Union desires the "development of international trade on a basis of equality and sovereignty of all countries, and non-interference in the domestic affairs of states."

Fifth, the Soviet Union continues to support the plan for admission to the United Nations of all states that have applied for admission.

Sixth, the Soviet Union desires expanding cultural contacts between Soviet and foreign citizens and organizations through exchanges of correspondence and visits.

Mr. Salisbury summed up Mr. Malik's presentation of the basic components of Soviet policy in the following five points:

First, cooperation of the Great Powers along lines suggested in the Soviet proposal for a five-power peace.

Second, the immediate reduction of arms and "unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon and establishment of international control over the prohibition of this weapon."

Third, strict and absolute observance of the Potsdam decisions on Germany.

Fourth, peaceful settlement of the German and Japanese questions.

Fifth, development of peaceful and economic relations among all countries.

The members of the British Quaker delegation were: Bernard Metcalf, chairman of the East-West Committee and chief engineer of the National Coal Board; Gerald Bailey, secretary of the Committee; Mrs. Kathleen Lonsdale, F.R.S., professor of crystallography at the University of London; Paul Cadbury of the Cadbury chocolate firm and former mayor of Birmingham; Mrs. Margaret Backhouse, until recently head of the British Quaker movement; Miss Eleanor Creak, director of a children's hospital in London; and Frank Edmead of the *Manchester Guardian*.

In a statement made on behalf of the delegation at a press conference before leaving the Soviet Union, Mr. Bailey said:

"... What we have seen of Soviet life and activity has shown us a people of skill and resource and vigor, looking forward with great confidence to their future tasks and deeply anxious to have necessary peaceful conditions with which to carry them out. ...

"We leave the Soviet Union in a mood of deeply felt respect and affection for the Soviet people, and of heartfelt gratitude for all the kindness and friendship shown to us. ... We leave renewed in our determination to work for the spread of the spirit of love and friendship among all peoples which is the essence of peace."

NEW WORLD REVIEW publishes these documents as a service to its readers. We urge all friends of peace to get additional copies in order to insure the widest distribution among the tens of thousands of Americans who did not find these significant documents in their daily newspapers. We are, incidentally, counting on the sale of individual copies and bundle orders to help defray the initial printing costs.

Place your orders today!

|                      |                 |
|----------------------|-----------------|
| <i>Single copies</i> | <i>15¢ each</i> |
| <i>10 copies</i>     | <i>10¢ each</i> |
| <i>100 or more</i>   | <i>5¢ each</i>  |

NEW WORLD REVIEW  
114 East 32nd Street,  
New York 16, N. Y.

*Send me ..... copies of The Path to Peace. I enclose \$.....*

*Name .....*

*Address .....*

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



