

# NEW WORLD

JANUARY

1 9 5 5

20¢

## *Review*

## THE ROAD TO PEACE FOR AMERICA

*Negotiations with the USSR  
—not the rearming of Germany*

**OTHER ARTICLES:** *How People's Hungary is  
Cutting Red Tape • The True Situation Regarding  
Religion in Rumania*

# NEW WORLD *Review*

JANUARY

1955

New Year Message to Our

Readers

3

The Road to Peace for

America

*Jessica Smith*

4

Religion in Rumania

*Stanley Evans*

25

Hungary Cuts Red Tape

*Lawrence Kirwan*

29

JESSICA SMITH, *Editor*

FREDERICK V. FIELD, *Far Eastern Editor*

ANDREW VOYNOW, *Managing Editor*

DONALD SCHOOLMAN, *Business Manager*

ESLANDA ROBESON

*Editorial Consultant on Negro and*

*Colonial Questions*

Vol. 23, No. 1, January, 1955. Re-entered as second class matter June 27, 1951, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Subscription \$2.00 per year, \$1.00 for 6 months (Canadian, \$2.50; foreign \$3.00 a year. Draw money orders or checks payable in New York). Published monthly by the S.R.T. Publications, Inc., 23 West 26th Street, New York 10, N. Y. Indexed in Bulletin of the Public Affairs Information Service, Phone: MUrray Hill 3-3855.  
PRINTED IN U.S.A.  209

## YOU WILL WANT...

... additional copies of The Road to Peace for America, which we are publishing in this issue, for your friends and acquaintances.

We are reissuing this important article as an inexpensive reprint, under the title, What Rearming Germany Means, so that it can be distributed as widely as possible.

Order your copies at once. Only 10c each (if ordering only one copy enclose an additional 5c for postage and handling) or 13 for \$1.

### NEW WORLD REVIEW

23 W. 26th St., New York 10

Send at once \_\_\_\_\_ copies of What Rearming Germany Means at the rate of 10c each or 13 for \$1. I enclose \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ Zone \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_

## ***New Year Message to Our Readers***

**O**UR New Year's resolutions can all be rolled into one—to continue and strengthen our work for peaceful co-existence through the continued publication of this magazine.

We know from our readers' comments that the type of material we publish is indispensable to an understanding of the nations with whom we must live in peace if we are to live at all. Therefore we feel confident of your support in our resolve.

We have embarked on a practical program to make possible the carrying out of this resolution, for however great our determination, we cannot achieve it by mere wishful thinking.

Our first step has been a careful review of every item in our budget in order to reduce further our operating expenses. This means new reductions in staff, in working space, in printing expenses, in photographs.

During the past year we have had to reduce many issues below our former sixty-four pages, sometimes, as in this issue, cutting down to thirty-two pages. Our aim is an average of 48 pages. With less it is difficult to give adequate coverage to the developments in the Soviet Union, People's China, the Eastern European Democracies and other countries, as well as the many issues in the field of foreign relations which are of life and death concern to the American people.

In this issue, for example, we have concentrated on the question of rearming Western Germany. This, we feel, is the most immediate pressing question before the American people. We have devoted almost a whole issue to this question, and will have reprints ready in pamphlet form. This has meant the postponement of much other vital material which will have to await future issues.

But those future issues depend on you! On our part, we have done everything possible in reducing our budget. We must count on you to continue to give as generously as you have in the past. It is particularly urgent that we have funds with which to start the New Year.

Please help us carry out our New Year's resolution by sending us as much as you can spare today.

-----

**NEW WORLD REVIEW • 23 West 26th Street • New York 10, N. Y.**

I am enclosing \$..... to help you carry out your New Year's resolution.

Name .....

Address .....

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

# The Road to Peace for America

## **Negotiations with the USSR— not the rearming of Germany**

by JESSICA SMITH

**T**WO WORLD WARS, launched by aggressive German militarism, have involved two generations of American youth and meant the killing and maiming of almost a million and a half Americans.

In the first World War, 126,000 Americans died, 238,800 were wounded, taken prisoner or missing. In that war, 4,355,000 Americans were mobilized into the armed forces, torn away from their peaceful pursuits and their families, to kill and die on the bloody battlefields of Europe. In all the warring nations, nearly 30,000,000 people were killed or wounded.

In the second World War, 407,828 Americans died, 670,846 were wounded, 16,112,566 were mobilized for the business of killing and dying on land, air and sea in Europe and the Far East. It is estimated that military and civilian casualties, including the dead and the wounded, reached a staggering total of close to 60,000,000 in all countries involved.

A third world war, fought with atomic and hydrogen weapons, would mean the death and maiming of tens of millions of Americans, and countless million of others. Our own land would no longer be spared, our civilian population, our children and our old people, would no longer be

safe. Cities, industries, homes and farms would be wiped out. The agony would touch every family in the land. For such a war the entire population would have to be mobilized. This picture would be duplicated all around the world. All life on earth would be threatened by the fiendish weapons of today.

*Can there be any single task of more compelling urgency than for each of us to do everything in our power to insure that this shall never happen?*

The American people do not want a new world war, nor any part in any more wars, as they have made clear in a thousand ways. That is why we must all be alert to the mortal danger of the program for rearming Germany which is at the heart of the Paris Pacts.

The masses of the people in Europe understand and oppose this danger. The French National Assembly voted with the greatest reluctance for the ratification of these pacts, under intense pressure from the U.S. and British governments. The vote did not express the will of the French people, or even of a majority of the deputies. Now it is up to the American people to muster all their forces to prevent ratification by the U.S. Senate, and German rearmament.

## BACKGROUND TO THE PRESENT DANGER

THE PARIS PACTS for the rearming of Germany under NATO represent a new and dangerous stage in the drive to align the regions of the world into opposing armed blocs of nations of different social systems, instead of trying to find a way for these systems to live together in peace.

They are the direct result of the abrogation by the Western Powers of the Potsdam Agreement which provided for the setting up of a unified Germany on peaceful, democratic foundations, a Germany which would never again be able to threaten the peace of the world. Instead, Germany was divided into two rump sections living under different systems. In the West, the capitalist German Federal Republic was set up in May, 1949, at Bonn, and four months later the German Democratic Republic was set up in the East, dedicated to developing along socialist lines.

The integration of the German Federal Republic into the Western system began at once. Monopolists and Nazis came back into positions of power, and plans for remilitarization were launched.

Meantime, the North Atlantic Treaty was signed in Washington in April, 1949, under the aegis of the United States. Called a "defensive alliance," it was universally recognized as a military alliance directed against the USSR. U.S. Senators who opposed its ratification pointed out the grave constitutional issues raised by the automatic commitment for the United States to go to war without the consent of Congress. On the basis of the Treaty, NATO, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, was set up as the military organization

for its implementation, with a U.S. general in Supreme Command.

From the beginning, the initiators of NATO counted on Germany, as the dominant industrial and military power in Europe, to provide the main forces for its implementation, and U.S. policies in Western Germany have been wholly directed toward preparing it for this role.

At the time of the signing of the North Atlantic Pact, memories of Hitler's gas chambers, the extermination of 6,000,000 Jews, and the horrors inflicted by Nazi occupation forces were still too fresh in the minds of the people of Europe to make it advisable to bring in Hitler's successors at once as full partners in an alliance propagandized as purely defensive.

Therefore, the EDC (European Defense Community) setting up a six-nation army including those of France, Italy, Belgium, Holland, Luxembourg and of West Germany, was devised, with the idea of making German rearmament acceptable to the people of France and of Europe through the pretext that it would be controlled under a supra-national authority.

The armies of the six nations were to be integrated under EDC, with a common budget, common armament production, common mobilization plans. Thus the nations participating were, in fact, to yield a large degree of their sovereignty to this common authority, which, in turn, was to operate under NATO. This was the reason England refused to provide troops for the EDC, though backing the plan.

The EDC, in fact, gave superiority to the German army. It provided for

a minimum of twelve active German divisions to be commanded by German generals who gained their battle experience under Hitler, who would join the unified staff of EDC.

How little this limitation meant was revealed by Karl Franz Schmidt-Wittmack, a West German Bundestag deputy, and a member of Chancellor Adenauer's Christian Democratic Party. On August 26, 1954, after receiving asylum in the German Democratic Republic, he told an international press conference:

In June and July of this year [1954] a secret special conference was held in Bad Godesberg and Bonn between the representatives of the United States and the Federal Republic; at this conference a mobilization plan for the raising of a German contingent of 24 divisions was decided upon, not 12 divisions as originally foreseen. At the same time a reserve of a further 24 divisions was considered. General Gruenther, Commander in Chief of the NATO forces, represented the United States at these negotiations, and General Heusinger and General Cruwell represented the German side.

At that time, it should be noted,

the EDC Pact, though signed in 1952, had been ratified only by Holland, the German Federal Republic, Belgium and Luxembourg, in all cases over vigorous popular opposition. But the strength of the opposition in both France and Italy, without whom it could not go into effect, prevented its even being brought to a vote in the parliaments of either of these countries up to the point where the action of the French Assembly on August 30, 1954, decisively killed all prospects of its ratification.

The United States Government refused to accept this clear mandate of the people of Europe. It refused to heed the demands rising in governmental circles as well as among the people of Western Europe for a new try at reaching agreement with the USSR. It rejected the repeated Soviet proposals for new negotiations on the question of Germany and European security, and it compelled its reluctant allies to go along with it in finding another method of rearming Germany. This was achieved in the London agreements of October 3, 1954, and embodied in the Paris Pacts of October 23.

### **WHAT THE PARIS PACTS MEAN**

THE PARIS AGREEMENTS on the rearming of Germany were submitted by President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles for ratification by the United States Senate, on the basis that they achieve "the great primary objectives of security, peace and freedom in Europe."

Let the American people, who have a life and death stake in the issues involved, decide whether these agreements can accomplish this purpose for either Europe or our own country.

The Paris agreements provide that Western Germany is to be rearmed as a sovereign state with its own national army and integrated into the Western system.

This is to be done through the inclusion of West Germany, along with Italy, as a partner in the Brussels Treaty (now known as Western European Union to escape the use of the too meaningful initials BRUTO). The Brussels Treaty, signed in 1948, provided for economic and military cooperation of Brit-

ain, France, Belgium, Holland and Luxembourg, and, ironically, was originally directed against any revival of German aggression. Having been made an integral part of Western European Union, the German Federal Republic, under the Paris agreements, is to be a full-fledged partner in NATO. The new German army, along with those of the other Western European Union nations, will be integrated with the NATO force under the Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, now U.S. General Alfred M. Gruenther. Under the new arrangement, Britain has agreed to station four divisions on the Continent.

*The Paris Pacts provide that West Germany shall have a fully mechanized 12-division army, with an air force, a navy and its own General Staff. This means total active armed forces of 500,000 men.*

Hitler began with the Weimar Republic army of 100,000.

The organization of the 12-division army is to be in the hands of the same generals who have already planned a 24-division army, and a reserve of 24 more.

Commenting on the agreements in the *New York Times* of October 24, M. S. Handler wrote from Germany:

The sense of the Paris agreements was to create a sovereign West German state based on a national army integrated with other European forces at such a high level as to leave no doubt as to which military establishment would ultimately become the most important in the Western Alliance.

The basic twelve divisions, mechanized and motorized, would have a fire power and mobility far greater than anything known in the last war.

This is the army, preparations for

which are already well under way, that will go into uniform on ratification of the Paris Pacts. This is the army for which American arms and supplies to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars are already stockpiled in Germany. This is the army which American taxpayers will be called upon to supply billions of dollars to build into a new monstrous instrument of aggression that may some day be turned against our own country, as happened in World War II. It is well to remember that the same John Foster Dulles who is today the chief architect of the new plan for rearming Germany, also played a role through the Schroeder and I. G. Farben interests, in the building up of the German monopolies which financed Hitler, and that then, as now, he insisted there was no danger to the West from this course. In March, 1939, he declared, "Only hysteria entertains the idea that Germany, Italy or Japan contemplates an attack against us."

We had better fully understand the nature of the forces the new West German military machine represents. The real rulers of West Germany today are the same monopolists and militarists who backed Hitler—the Krupps, Thyssens, Flicks, Schroeders, I. G. Farben executives and the rest are in the saddle. The last pretense of "decartelization," which was never in fact carried out, will be destroyed by a new law ready for enactment on ratification of the Paris agreements, which sanctions any cartel the ruling powers desire, through special exemptions, and when in "the public interest."

Powerful American interests have bought into the German trusts. But is it not likely that when Germany again becomes the dominant military power on the Continent the



Germans will want full control? The *Wall Street Journal* of October 5, 1954, pointed out, "Many are asking how can we be certain these former enemies will really be on our side and not turn their weapons against us?" Right now West Germany depends on American support. But the unreconstructed Nazis and militarists nourish revenge not only against the Soviet Union but against the whole coalition which defeated them in the war, of which the United States was a part.

As to the extent to which the Nazis are back in power, remember the words of Dr. Otto John, the J. Edgar Hoover of West Germany. Dr. John went over to East Germany last summer when he became convinced that Adenauer's policy of integration of a partitioned, rearmed Germany with the West could only result in Germany being the battleground of a new war threatening its national existence. He told a press conference on August 11, referring to the situation in West Germany:

Everywhere in government, in economy, in industry, in the universities, wherever one looks, the Nazis are back again; with them the spirit which led the German people into total catastrophe has come to life once more.

Adenauer's own cabinet, his foreign office and top government ministries, are largely staffed by Nazis.

Remilitarization has long been under way. Theodor Blank's "office", which is to become the new War Ministry, has long been functioning in that capacity. It employs former members of Hitler's General Staff and SS and Waffen SS Commanders who are being readied to take over command of the new armed forces.

The only trained officers available to fill the 20,000 posts the new army will need are those who fought with Hitler against the Allied nations.

Throughout West Germany a network of 528 militaristic and veterans organizations, with many thousands of local groups, are keeping alive aggressive and chauvinistic traditions under the wing of the Adenauer government. Many thousands are already in arms as "Labor Service" groups. There are numerous Nazi groups revived under new names, while a new Gestapo has come into being to terrorize the German people. Quantities of literature glorifying Hitler and his methods pour from the presses.

Over against this is a mighty and growing movement of the people of West Germany who never again want to return to the evil days of Hitler, who are concerned with peaceful unification of their country, and with negotiations with the Soviet Union. A West German government engaged in rearming would try to crush such opposition. It must be kept in mind that if the Paris agreements are ratified and German militarization is given the green light, *this would open the way to unleashing again a program of Hitler repression against the people, and the further revival of Nazism, with all its attributes of anti-Semitism and unbridled police terrorism.*

There have been numerous reports in the press of the extent to which anti-Semitism has already reared its head in West Germany.

Recently the German Party (member of Adenauer's national coalition) held in West Berlin what was characterized in a dispatch to the *New York Post* of November 26, as "a Nazi type rally of an openly anti-Semitic nature." Spectators who refused to sing the supposedly banned



first verse of "Deutschland Uber Alles" were beaten and called "Jewish swine."

On November 26, the Joint Council of the Societies for Christian-Jewish Cooperation, the leading German organization for combatting anti-Semitism, charged that nationalism and anti-Semitism were once

again on the march in Western Germany.

It is the same Nazi elements who were responsible for the mass extermination of millions of Jews and other peoples that we are now asked to embrace as allies, and to count on for the defense of "security, peace and freedom in Europe."

## CONTROLS OVER GERMAN REARMAMENT LACKING

WHILE THE PARIS PACTS are being propagandized as containing real safeguards against fresh German aggression, and controls over the level of German troops and rearmament, no such safeguards in fact exist.

The stationing of four British divisions in Europe can hardly be considered a real safeguard in the light of the experience of World War II.

No adequate controls nor any kind of adequate inspection to guard against West Germany exceeding the agreed upon levels of troops or armaments production were agreed upon at London and Paris. There is only a loose arrangement for "reports" to be submitted through the Western European Union powers to NATO, and the powers concerned are invited to assist in the inspection of levels of armed forces and armaments "as necessary." Presently agreed upon levels may be increased by later decision.

The mere word of Chancellor Adenauer that Germany will not make atomic, bacteriological or chemical weapons, will not exceed its quota in armaments and troops, and will confine its military machine to defensive purposes only, was accepted by the negotiating powers in lieu of any real controls.

Yet the December decision of the

NATO council to base its military planning on atomic weapons, means that West Germany would be supplied with such weapons, whether or not it manufactures them.

There is a curious contrast in the United States position on inspection as applied to the Soviet Union and to Germany. In the United Nations debates on arms reduction and control of nuclear weapons, it was demanded that inspection be extended to button factories in the Soviet Union in order to determine whether they might be making munitions. But the mere word of Chancellor Adenauer is enough.

On the eve of the London Conference, trying to quiet French fears of German rearmament, General Gruenther told a group of French manufacturers that inspection of German armaments would be impracticable, adding: "If you're going to have a police state with every baby carriage inspected to see if it's making guided missiles, it's going to be very difficult to make it work."

This question of lack of safeguards over the extent of German rearmament was emphasized by Hanson Baldwin, military commentator of the *New York Times*. In an article on October 26, in which he wrote that the military assets of the new agreements on rearming Germany

must be weighed against major liabilities, he listed among the latter:

Loose controls over German rearmament: The controls provided by the new treaties are more of an irritant than an insurance; they cannot prevent the emergence of West Germany as the first military power in Western Europe, and they probably will not prevent the reemergence of a type of German general staff, with subsequent dangers of chauvinism.

In the light of the long history of violations of solemn pledges voluntarily given by German governments of the past, what faith can we place in the undertakings of Hitler's successors to limit their armaments, and never to have recourse to the unification of Germany by force?

It was the German Chancellor Bethmann-Hollweg who made the words "a scrap of paper" an international by-word for treaty violations, when he tore up the guarantee of Belgium's neutrality in 1914. How can we forget the successive violations by Germany of the disarmament clauses of the Versailles Treaty and other international agreements? The Nuremberg trials brought out 26 breaches of solemn international covenants by the Nazis.

Referring to the bland assurances given by the authors of the London and Paris agreements, that they will

be able to keep Ruhr armament output within agreed upon limits, J. Alvarez del Vayo wrote in *The Nation*, October 23:

To anyone over forty years old . . . such optimism is incredible. The story of Germany's secret rearmament in violation of the Versailles Treaty, of the complete collapse of the Allied effort to halt the rebirth of German militarism, is a story not from history books, but of our own generation. The very statesmen who today speak so glibly and confidently of "guarantees" and "controls" were only yesterday fulminating against the inadequacy of either to halt the growing German military menace. It is as if the whole period between the two world wars has been expunged from time. There can only be one explanation for this astounding amnesia: the current anti-Communist obsession, the hatred of Russia and the fear of Communist China, has proved stronger than memory or reason.

And let us not forget that it was under this same phony banner of anti-Communism, which threatens all democratic forces, that Hitler won the support of those in the West who expected him to confine his aggression to the Soviet Union, only to find themselves the first victims. The world cannot survive a second lesson of this kind.

## SEED-BED OF NEW WAR

UNDER THE PARIS agreements, the Western occupying powers, the United States, Great Britain and France, have each issued declarations presumably granting sovereignty to the Federal Republic of Germany.

However, each of these countries reserves the right to maintain its

troops and military bases on the territory of West Germany at their present strength, with the provision that it be increased with the agreement of the Federal Republic.

The Paris agreements, while paying lip service to the aim of the future peaceful unification of Germany,

recognize the Federal Republic of Germany as "the only German Government freely and legitimately constituted and therefore entitled to speak for Germany as the representative of the German people in international affairs."

This completely nullifies the statement on peaceful unification. It could only serve to perpetuate the division of Germany. It completely ignores the German Democratic Republic which exists on the basis of elections that have taken place in Eastern Germany, and has been recognized as a sovereign government by the Soviet Union and other governments. It nullifies statements made by the Western Powers regarding the necessity of "free, all-German elections," and in line with the position taken by these powers at the Berlin Conference, determines in advance that such elections should be held only under the auspices of the Bonn Government, under conditions extending its control to the whole of Germany. It takes all meaning from the Three-Power declaration of agreement on "a peace treaty for the whole of Germany, freely negotiated between Germany and

her former enemies," since it would prevent the coming into being of any unified Germany with which such an agreement could be made.

No guarantees for creating the conditions that could lead to the peaceful unification of Germany are to be found anywhere in the agreements. All that they depend on is the word of 78-year-old Chancellor Adenauer that his government "undertakes never to have recourse to force to achieve the reunification of Germany or the modification of the present boundaries of the German Federal Republic."

Forgotten are Adenauer's previous threats to re-take by force the Eastern territories which have now become a part of Poland under the provisions of the Potsdam Agreement.

These irridentist designs are in fact encouraged by the Three-Power declaration which now provides that these Eastern boundaries are subject to review in a final peace treaty.

Thus, in their every aspect, the Paris agreements support the rebirth of an aggressive German military power and create new dangers of war in Europe and the world.

## **OPPOSITION TO REARMING GERMANY**

ALL AROUND THE WORLD opposition to the rearming of Germany is being expressed by spokesmen of governments and peoples. The World Peace Council, representing hundreds of millions of people of many political affiliations in 85 lands, has warned repeatedly of the threat of this course to world peace. India's representative, V. K. Krishna Menon, in a speech before the UN Assembly on October 6, spoke of the fears of the Asian peoples that they

would be drawn into a new war if German militarism were reestablished. Declaring that "A German peace is necessary for world peace, and a German peace means the reunification of Germany," he advocated direct talks between the two governments in Germany to bring about this unity.

The overwhelming opposition of the people of Western Europe to the rearming of Western Germany was made clear in the defeat of EDC

after the two-year effort to impose it. While the false claims that the new agreements include effective safeguards to keep German rearmament within bounds have temporarily created some confusion, this opposition remains, and will grow in strength as the full meaning of the Paris agreements is recognized. That is the reason for the frantic haste to complete the ratification before the opposition could mobilize to defeat these pacts as it did EDC.

The defeat of EDC clearly opened the way for the new negotiations with the Soviet Union demanded by the people of Europe, which both the British and French governments would doubtless have been ready to accept had not the United States prevented it.

Deep differences among the Western allies came to the fore, as the United States Government took the position first, that there could be no substitute for EDC, and then that a substitute must be found which would accomplish the same purpose. Secretary Dulles imposed this program by making it absolutely clear to England and France that if they did not go along with a joint plan rearming Germany, the United States Government would make its own direct arrangements with the Adenauer Government. This, and the financial dependence of Britain and France on the United States, kept them in line.

The deep-seated fears of German aggression among the French people, three times invaded by Germany within a century, have been expressed in many ways.

Not only the Communist Party, the largest in France, but important sections of other parties have been consistently opposed to German rearmament. The C.G.T. (Trade Union

Federation), opposes the new agreements, as well as veterans organizations and many other groups. The General Assembly of the three million member French Union of Veterans' Organizations passed a resolution the day the London agreements were announced, confirming "its unwavering opposition to any revival of German militarism."

General Aumeran expressed the attitude of millions of the French people when he told the French General Assembly on October 7, 1954: "The country, which thought it had delivered itself from the nightmare of German rearmament by the vote rejecting EDC . . . cannot believe that its rejoicing was in vain."

Any hopes that might have been raised as a result of his position at Geneva, that French Premier Mendes-France would pursue an independent foreign policy, were blasted when Secretary Dulles by-passed him for direct talks with Adenauer before the London conference. He was then faced with the choice between an isolation of his country that would have resulted in his own downfall, and going along with the United States plans. He has thus defended the new pacts as inevitable because Germany would be rearmed anyway and so it had better be within the Western Alliance than outside it.

The power of the parliamentary opposition to EDC in France rested on the conjunction of the deep-seated popular hostility to any rearming of the German militarists with the objections of those nationalist circles who want to retain some degree of independence for France, to the supra-national features of EDC which would have ended French sovereignty.

The new arrangements were made more palatable to French nationalist

elements by the elimination of these supra-national features, by the promise of England to station four divisions on the Continent, and finally, by the agreement reached by Mendes-France with Adenauer on French control of the rich industrial resources of the Saar. With the support of these elements, and the abject capitulation of the Socialists to the plan for rearming Germany, Mendes-France was able to win a preliminary majority in support of the Paris agreements.

The shakiness of this majority was revealed on December 24 when the French National Assembly voted against the rearming of Germany under the Western European Union. By making ratification a question of a vote of confidence, Mendes-France was able to get this decision reversed under blunt warnings from the United States and Britain that Germany would be rearmed anyway, and that failure to ratify the Paris Pacts would mean the isolation of France in the Western alliance. Press reports that the U.S. Government was prepared to exert economic pressure to force ratification were no doubt substantiated in the numerous Washington-Paris calls over the Christmas week end.

The *New York Times* reported on December 26 on the concern in Washington lest the French deputies, visiting their constituencies for Christmas, "might find much popular support" for their votes against German rearmament! And its correspondent in France wrote:

A question asked here is: How far is a French deputy justified in heeding advice and admonitions from Washington and London when they seem to be opposed to the sentiments

of the people those deputies represent?

Enough deputies decided to place the voices from abroad ahead of the voices of the French people to change the results. Far from reflecting the will of the French people, the subsequent votes for ratification did not even represent a majority of the French Assembly, many of whose members abstained from voting. Final approval, however, was made dependent on exchange of all instruments of ratification at the same time. Thus if the West German Parliament should fail to ratify the Saar agreement all the other protocols would be held up. The French Senate must also act before ratification is final.

During the French Assembly debate, Mendes-France insisted that ratification would improve the prospect for negotiations with the USSR on Germany, despite the repeated Soviet warnings that ratification would make such negotiations useless. Many of the deputies, however, urged that the Soviet warnings be taken seriously. A number of leading de Gaullist deputies, as well as former Premiers Daladier, Herriot and others, continued to demand new negotiations with the Soviet Union before proceeding with German rearmament. Barrett McGurn wrote in the *New York Herald-Tribune*, December 23, "The dread of German rearmament dominated every speech." Harold Callender wrote in the *New York Times* the same day:

The speeches on the floor and the talk in the corridors indicated that there was no enthusiasm in any quarter for the Paris agreements, and that those who would vote for them would do so either to keep the Men-



des-France government in office or to avoid a breach in the Atlantic Alliance. . . . There was almost universal hope of successful negotiations with the Soviet Union and the debate would have led the listener to believe that *the Assembly considered the potential enemy the Germans rather than the Russians.* (Emphasis added.)

In England, the strong popular opposition has expressed itself in many forms during recent months, among religious, trade union, cooperative, Labor Party and peace groups.

The vast majority of British trade union members are opposed to German rearmament, as expressed by their resolutions at trade union conferences. The endorsement of German rearmament at the Brighton Trade Union Conference squeaked through by the narrowest of margins, only because of the block system of voting which enabled conservative trade union leaders to ignore the opposition of millions of their members. In some cases, the votes of the members were actually reversed by their leadership.

Britain's Labor Party approved Clement Attlee's call for German rearmament by the tiny margin of 248,000 out of 6,292,000 votes cast at the annual Labor Party Conference at Scarborough, and only because the right wing Labor Party leaders had to present it in a form so watered down it did not seem to mean rearmament. Left wing leader Aneurin Bevan's resolution, calling for an absolute ban on German rearmament received almost three million votes. The Labor Party had to take this sentiment of its members into account and abstained, with a few exceptions, when the British House of Commons voted to support

German rearmament under the new plan, which was approved 264 to 4. The fact that 357 Members of Parliament, 57 per cent of its total membership of 625, abstained from voting indicates what a small proportion of the British people the vote represented.

Drew Middleton wrote in the *New York Times*, November 11, 1954:

There's a strong trend in West Europe and Britain toward the negotiation of a general settlement of Continental problems with the Soviet Union. . . . In Britain there is a solid basis of support for an early meeting with the Soviet Union in both the Conservative and Labor Parties.

Despite all his talk about the necessity for "a real good try at peaceful coexistence," the Churchill who sought to strangle the Soviet Union at its birth by organizing the armed intervention of fourteen nations, and the Churchill who called for an Anglo-American military alliance against the Soviet Union at Fulton, Missouri in 1946, has won out over the Churchill who for a time seemed to wish to go down in history as the great peacemaker.

Sir Winston, indeed, is now urging "caution" in the matter of talks with the USSR, and boasted in a speech on November 23 that when the Germans were surrendering in the last days of the war, he directed Field Marshal Montgomery to stack their arms so that they could be given back if the help of German soldiers proved necessary to stop the Russian advance! This statement has caused wide alarm in England. Deploing this "ill-timed remark," the conservative *London Times* wrote on November 25:

It will not help to convince the



Russians that the Western Powers are straightforward in their declarations of peace today, nor, by suggesting that we were ready to use Nazi-indoctrinated troops in 1945, will it help the cause of West German rearmament now.

The mighty opposition of the Italian people to German rearmament was reflected in the fact that the Scelba Government never dared to bring EDC to a vote in the Italian

Parliament. On December 23, however, the Scelba Government pushed through ratification of the Paris Pacts in the Italian Chamber of Deputies. In doing so it beat down opposition not only from the Left, but from deputies of Scelba's own Christian Democratic Party who sought to delay German rearmament pending new efforts for East-West negotiations. The Italian Senate must act before ratification is final.

### **MOUNTING OPPOSITION IN WEST GERMANY**

THE SURGING OPPOSITION to the Paris Pacts manifesting itself throughout Western Germany indicates the obstacles ratification will face there. Many new elements have joined in the opposition to Chancellor Adenauer's policies.

This strong and growing opposition of the masses of the people in West Germany to remilitarization and a return to the methods of Hitler, joined to that which animates the people of Eastern Germany, is the strongest guarantee that a solid and healthy foundation exists for a unified, peaceful and democratic Germany. It places those in the West who support the Paris Pacts in the position of forcing rearmament on West Germany against the will of its people.

When Adenauer returned to West Germany from the London Conference it was to face the coolest possible reception for the spoils of victory he brought home. The opposition to his policies is composed of many elements. It goes far beyond Communist and Left-wing circles. It includes the parties in his own coalition, and the powerful trade union movement. It includes the Social Democrats, the second largest party

after Adenauer's Christian Democrats, which received 8,000,000 votes in the 1953 elections and has been showing increasing electoral strength. It includes the Free Democratic Party, second largest in the government coalition, and also the Refugee Party, which is part of the coalition, as well as important elements within Adenauer's Christian Democrats. Opposition of the Free Democratic Party headed by Thomas Dehler threatens the continuance of the coalition. The Free Democrats represent industrialist and upper middle class groups who do not want to destroy the last bridge to Eastern Europe and its profitable markets. All of these groups have been pressing for new talks with the Soviet Union on the question of unification.

Erich Ollenhauer, Social Democratic Chairman, told the Bundestag (lower house) on October 6 that the London agreements represented a "useless" approach to a solution of Europe's problems, assailed Adenauer's policy of strong ties with the West and German rearming as dangerous, and called for a new Big Four Conference before ratification of the agreements, to consider proposals along the lines of those of-

ferred by the Soviet Union. He said the Soviet offer to negotiate on the question of an all-European security pact could not be ignored.

Describing the angry debate in the Bundestag, M. S. Handler wrote in the *New York Times* of October 8:

The debate dramatized the complete cleavage between the government coalition and the opposition on Germany's future. It was clearer than ever that the Western Powers in signing up with West Germany would continue to encounter the determined opposition of a powerful political party representing a great segment of the population that had been gaining strength in recent provincial elections. The future of the London agreements depends on the survival of the government coalition after Adenauer has passed from the political scene. Most of the foreign observers in West Germany are agreed that the future of the coalition is the great unknown in German politics.

Along with the opposition to Adenauer on the basis of the trend for German unification and negotiations with the Soviet Union, his agreement to French demands that the Saar remain detached from Germany and attached economically to France has been under sharp fire by the Social Democrats, the Free Democrats and others who have demanded the reopening of negotiations on this question. On December 12, the Social Democratic Party's executive committee announced a decision to wage an all-out fight against the Paris agreements and the Saar accord. Their position in this fight is strengthened by their retention of power in the Hesse coalition government, and their accession to power in Bavaria, which will transform the

Adenauer majority in the West German Bundesrat (upper house) into a minority and can affect the fate of ratification of the Paris Pacts.

On October 10, the German Trade Union Federation, most powerful mass organization in Western Germany, representing 6,000,000 workers, voted 391 to 4 to oppose West German rearmament until "all possibilities for negotiations [with the Soviet Union] on the reunification of Germany have been exhausted." Their resolution warned:

As for the internal development of the Federal Republic, the remilitarization and creation of a German army as provided by the London agreements, brings about the danger of an authoritarian military state which might put an end to the efforts of the German workers' movement to create a political, social and economic democracy.

Following the Federation's action, trade union youth groups, with a membership of 700,000, voted unanimously against rearmament of any kind. Throughout Western Germany, the youth are demonstrating against the plans to make cannon fodder of them, as of their fathers and grandfathers before them.

Gaston Coblenz, writing from Bonn in the *New York Herald Tribune* of October 10, described the feelings of the youth of Western Germany at the prospects of the new conscription law that would be one of the first results of the Paris Pacts:

Among them is sheer horror of modern atomic and hydrogen bomb warfare. The sight of American atomic cannon being wheeled around West Germany provides little comfort for the youth of this country. They tend to see Germany as the

principal battleground in another world war. At the same time, the youth, as well as many adults, are starting to think more thoroughly about the problem of reuniting their nation. They believe it is a hopeless task to try to do it by force. They reckon that if unification is to come, it can only be by talking with the Russians, and not by fighting them.

Wide religious circles in West Germany are demanding negotiations with the USSR on peaceful unification, along with the large and growing peace movement which includes millions of members. Among the most outstanding opponents of rearmament are the widely respected Pastor Martin Niemoller, and Dr. Gustav Heineman, President of the Evangelical Synod and former minister in Adenauer's cabinet.

Three former Chancellors of pre-Hitler Germany, Joseph Wirth, Heinrich Bruening and Franz von Papen have warned that a divided Germany is bound to become the battleground of a new war, and urged talks with the Soviet Union. Women's organizations in West Germany, as elsewhere in Europe, have expressed strong opposition to German rearmament.

In all these circles, the offers of the Soviet Union and of the German Democratic Republic for new efforts toward unification have met with the strongest possible response.

Meantime, the German people are finding other ways to express their desire for re-unification. Gaston Coblenz reported in the *New York Herald Tribune* of October 11 that there was little left of the "iron curtain" between the two halves of Germany and that at times during the last few months as many as 10,000 persons a day have travelled in both directions. This includes private visits to fami-

lies and friends, visits for commercial purposes by doctors, artists and professional people. It includes 10,000 West Germans who attended the Evangelical Church rally in the East German City of Leipzig last July, 15,500 West German businessmen who went to the Leipzig Fair in September in search of trade plums, and 20,000 East Germans who attended the Roman Catholic Congress in Fulda, West Germany, the same month.

It is clear that the German people in both East and West will never reconcile themselves to a permanent division into two states, one allied to the West and the other to the East. Rearmament, by blocking possibilities of reunification, can only create new tensions imperiling the peace of Germany, Europe and the world.

This growing opposition was sharply reflected in the Bundestag debate on ratification of the Paris Pacts which opened on December 15. Adenauer was able to get only a simple majority of votes instead of his usual two-thirds on the question of passing the pacts on to committees for further processing. His position was weakened considerably when he conceded that there was a sharp divergence of opinion between the West German and French Governments on the meaning of the Saar accord. The real test on ratification will come only on the second and third hearings on the agreements sometime late in February. Meantime, as M. S. Handler wrote in the *New York Times* on December 19, "... the pro-reunification, anti-militarist line-up, as posed to the rearmament line-up, is winning new adherents daily" in West Germany.

Significant in this connection was the opinion issued on December 20

by Adenauer's legal adviser, Prof. Wilhelm Grewe, that the Paris agreements would become invalid and inapplicable after Germany's reunification. One aim of the publication of this decision was undoubtedly to answer the Social Democrats' contention that ratification would result

in the permanent partition of Germany since it would close the door to negotiations with the Soviet Union. But it can also be considered as a warning by the Bonn imperialists to the West that they intend to retain some freedom of action in future foreign policy.

## **THE USSR PROPOSES A PEACEFUL ALTERNATIVE**

THE UNITED STATES has based its insistence on the rearming of Germany on the necessity for the defense of Western Europe against the alleged threat of aggression from the Soviet Union.

No one in Europe believes that such a threat exists. Throughout the two-year struggle in Western Europe against EDC, it was apparent that the real fear was of a renewed threat of German aggression as a result of rearmament, and the fear that a new world war would be precipitated as a result of U.S. foreign policy. It is widely recognized that United States policy is aimed not against any actual threat of aggression, but against all people's liberation movements and social change.

Indeed, it is clear that the United States government itself knows there is no threat of Soviet aggression, as many of its spokesmen have admitted. Even the rabidly anti-Soviet General Mark Clark, former Far Eastern Commander, who signed the Korean armistice last year, declared on November 19, 1954, "I don't think you could drag the Soviet Union into a shooting war. . . ." Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense, has declared: "I don't think the Russians are going to start a war and move in on us first because they have A-bombs any more than they did just because they've got big land armies on the other side of the line in Eu-

rope" (*U.S. News and World Report*, November 13, 1953).

The Soviet Union has called for four-power negotiations on a united and peaceful Germany and for a unifying, all-European collective security treaty as an alternative to the present agreements perpetuating the division of Europe into two armed camps.

The Soviet proposal for an all-European collective security treaty was first raised at the Berlin Conference, and has been repeated several times since. On July 24, it proposed a conference of European countries and the United States on this question. The USSR has made clear that it has no inflexible position with regard to the details of its own proposal and is quite ready to consider alternate plans. Similar plans have been proposed by former French Premier Edouard Herriot, and others.

The Soviet project envisages a system that would ensure peace in Europe by the combined efforts of all European countries, irrespective of their social systems, and with the participation of the United States. It would provide collective action in case of any attack or threat of attack against any of the signatories. While the aim would be to include a reunified Germany within this collective security system, both the German Federal Republic and the German

Democratic Republic would be invited to join pending unification. All the member states together would agree on the arms limitations for Germany that would confine any rearmament to defense purposes alone, and all together would agree on guarantees against the rise of aggressive militarism. The Soviet proposal is based on the principle of mutually beneficial cooperation in the economic sphere.

On October 23, the USSR sent a note to the United States, Great Britain and France, recalling its previous proposals for an all-European conference on a system of collective security for Europe, and a preliminary four-power conference to consider this question as well as the German question.

The note pointed out that while no agreement had been reached at the Berlin Conference last winter on the holding of all-German elections, the rejection of EDC opened possibilities for bringing the positions of the four powers on German reunification and all-German elections closer together, and declared it was ready to re-examine this question.

The note concluded with a proposal for a conference of the Foreign Ministers of the United States, Great Britain, France and the Soviet Union in November, to consider the following questions:

1. The restoration of the unity of Germany on peaceful and democratic foundations and the carrying out of all-German free elections.
2. The withdrawal of occupation troops of the four powers from the territory of East and West Germany.
3. The convening of an all-European conference for the examination of the question of creating a system of collective security in Europe.

With regard to the question of a peace treaty for Austria, which the Western Powers insist must be settled prior to any renewal of conferences on Germany, the Soviet Union renewed a previous proposal that this should be examined by the ambassadors of the four powers in Vienna, and asked whether the other three powers would agree to this.

Despite the fact that its proposals for a new conference on Germany were ignored, the Soviet Union on November 13 sent a note to the governments of all the European countries, with copies to the United States and the Chinese People's Republic, proposing an all-European conference on November 29 in Moscow or Paris, with United States participation, to consider an all-inclusive system of collective security in Europe. Poland and Czechoslovakia supported the proposal.

The Soviet Government proposed that all European states as well as the United States, should meet to consider this proposal, as well as any proposals put forward by any other states, and that the Chinese People's Republic should attend as an observer. It declared that the postponing of such a conference would not be desirable, since the question of ratifying the Paris agreements on rearming Germany would begin in December. It said ratification would complicate the situation and undermine the possibility of settling the German question and other, unsolved European problems. When the Western countries failed to respond to this proposal, raising among others the objection that the date set for the conference did not allow sufficient time for preparation of such a conference, Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov suggested that the conference might be postponed.



He made this offer in an interview with the Moscow *Pravda*, released on November 20, in which he declared that ratification of the Paris agreements on the remilitarization of Germany and its incorporation into such military groups as the Western European Union and NATO would "block the road toward reunification" of Germany, and would create a new situation in Europe "which will only aggravate the threat of a new war." He said that "In such circumstances the peace-loving European states will have to give thought to new measures to guarantee their security."

When the United States, Great Britain and France and other Western European nations turned down the offer to convene the conference at a later date, the USSR proceeded with its plans. A conference on European security opened in Moscow on November 29, attended by top government officials of the USSR, Poland, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Albania and the German Democratic Republic, with a representative of the People's Republic of China present as an observer.

On December 2, the participating countries issued a joint declaration on the results of their deliberations. Warning against the dangers to peace that would result from implementation of the Paris agreements, they urged rejection of the plans for remilitarization of West Germany and held the door open for new efforts to reach agreement on holding free, all-German elections as a prelude to German unification and on an all-European collective security system to end the recurrent devastating wars in Europe. The declaration stated that ratification of the Paris Pacts "would blast the possibility for the

settlement of pending European problems, the German problem in the first place," and would force the states represented at the Moscow conference to examine the situation again in order to take counter-measures. It continued:

The states participating in this conference declare their resolve to carry through, in the event of ratification of the Paris agreements, joint undertakings with respect to the organization of armed forces and their command, as well as other measures necessary for strengthening their defense capacity, in order to protect the peaceful labor of their peoples, to guarantee the inviolability of their borders and territories and to insure defense against possible aggression.

On December 16, the Soviet Union followed up previous warnings to France with an official notification to the effect that ratification by France of the Paris agreements would mean the nullification of the Franco-Soviet Treaty of Alliance and Mutual Assistance of 1944. It declared that French action in concluding these agreements fundamentally contradicts the obligations assumed by France under this treaty "to preclude new aggression on the part of German militarism and another war in Europe" and the mutual undertakings "not to conclude alliances or to enter coalitions armed against one or other of them." The USSR based this charge on the fact that the Paris agreements mean the resurrection of German militarism and thereby create a threat of fresh German aggression and would make France and Germany partners in a military alliance directed against the USSR. On December 20, a similar formal notification was given to England that final ratification of the



Paris agreements would void the 1949 Soviet-British treaty of friend-

ship and mutual assistance against German aggression.

## WORDS OF PEACE vs. DEEDS OF WAR

TODAY THE WHOLE WORLD is talking of the necessity for peaceful coexistence as the only alternative to no-existence.

The American people overwhelmingly expressed their desire for peace in their demands for an end to the wars in Korea and Indo-China. Our government, in fact, sought to block the truce in Korea, and refused to be a party to the Indo-China settlement. But the peace sentiments of the people of America and the world compelled agreement on an armistice in Korea, and prevented the sending of American planes and troops to Indo-China, as our government was prepared to do.

The peace sentiments of the American people were an important factor in the November, 1954 elections. The Republican Administration took advantage of this and in the last weeks of the campaign took credit for peace settlements effected in spite of, and not because of Administration policies. Only the demagoguery of Administration spokesmen in posing as peacemakers, and the failure of their opponents to take a vigorous peace line, prevented a far greater Republican defeat.

The Administration continues its peace talk. President Eisenhower, on November 16, in an address to educators, called for a better understanding between the peoples of the United States and the Soviet Union, and declared that only thus can man's dream of lasting peace be realized.

The strength of the peace sentiment among the people, the reluc-

tance of America's own allies to be drawn into military adventures, have compelled the Administration to repudiate the mad ravings of the McCarthyite war-now crowd. There are, indeed, sharp differences in the Administration with those who have been calling for a break in diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union, such as Senators Knowland and Jenner, and those who have been calling for the bombing of the mainland of China, like General Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Carney, Chief of Naval Operations, and Admiral Twining, Airforce Chief of Staff.

But whatever the differences regarding the timing and locale of a new war, and whatever lip service is paid by the Administration to the idea of eventual negotiations with the Soviet Union leading to peaceful coexistence, the fact remains that the basic cold war policies which could only lead to a new world conflict have undergone no change, and have in fact been intensified.

Words about peaceful coexistence are not enough. The American people must demand that they be implemented by deeds which will make peaceful coexistence possible. Divisive military pacts, mounting armaments and H-bomb stockpiles, military bases all around the world, cannot aid the cause of peace.

The end of the shooting wars in Korea and Indo-China showed that negotiations with the Soviet Union and People's China can be successful, and opened the way for further

negotiations on other international issues. The defeat of the EDC plan for rearming Germany, which expressed the will of the peoples of Europe, opened the way for new negotiations to find a peaceful solution for European problems, and especially the problem of Germany. But the repeated proposals of the Soviet Union for such negotiations have been turned down by the Administration as futile until after the rearming of Germany is an accomplished fact.

The new possibilities opened up in the United Nations for international agreement on the question of arms reduction and banning of atomic and hydrogen weapons, due to the sweeping concessions made by the Soviet Union in the recent General Assembly session, aroused new hopes for a settlement on this all-important issue.

But while United States spokesmen have insisted that our country wants disarmament, a ban on nuclear weapons and world peace, the Administration has simultaneously pushed ahead with its new plan for rearming Germany, which is utterly incompatible with these aims and, if realized, will completely blast any hopes for arms reduction.

The Administration presents its plans for the rearming of Germany

under NATO as an extension of the regional pact idea contained in the United Nations Charter, and in line with the Charter's principles.

The preamble to the UN Charter says:

"The peoples of the United Nations are determined to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors, and to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security. . . ."

Pacts that unify the regions of the world would support these principles. Pacts that extend divisions on both a regional and a world-wide scale, such as the Paris agreements and the Manila Pact, run counter to the Charter.

The rearming of Germany within the Western European system will inevitably bring about counter-measures on the part of the nations of Eastern Europe. This means setting in motion an arms race of unprecedented magnitude and peril, with all that this means in imposing crushing military budgets on the peoples. The postponement of East-West negotiations until such a race is already under way may well prevent their taking place at all.

The time for East-West negotiations is now, before, not after the Nazi march again.

## ACT NOW FOR PEACE

WE CANNOT IGNORE the consequences of the Paris agreements, if ratified, as something that may happen far in the future, that does not concern us now.

The very process of rearming Germany even in its early stages holds a grave threat to us all.

We have seen how the process of

remilitarization is already bringing about the revival of Nazism in Germany.

The cold war, which the rearming of Germany will intensify, has already given a new lease on life to reactionary and fascist forces here and everywhere, *because only with their help can it be carried on.*

It is in this atmosphere that such dangerous groups thrive as the "For America" group organized in Chicago, whose name should be instead "For McCarthy," and the group organized in New York under the leadership of fascist-minded generals and admirals in an effort to create a mass McCarthyite movement.

The increasing militarization of our own country which the Paris agreements and the continued cold war and building up positions of strength involve, the further development of our war economy, can only mean further repressive and fascist measures against the labor movement and the whole American people.

The billions of dollars that will be poured into the rearming of Western Germany will be taken out of the people's pockets, will mean higher living costs, less houses, less schools. Already we see the effect in plans for an increased military budget and to put over Universal Military Training in a disguised form.

The alternative, negotiations that could lead to a peaceful, unified Germany within a peaceful Europe, would be a long step toward that peaceful coexistence that is the only guarantee for our own country's future well-being and democratic development.

Peaceful coexistence would mean first of all trade with the Soviet Union and China and the People's Democracies, which would make an important contribution to solving our economic problems. The filling of the vast orders that would ensue from this trade would mean millions of jobs for America's unemployed workers.

The wide expressions among trade union, religious and many other groups in America in favor of a course of peaceful coexistence is a

measure of the opposition of the American people to the rearming of Germany, which contradicts the very idea of peaceful coexistence.

Many American progressive and peace forces have spoken out against German rearmament—the Progressive Party, the American Labor Party, the American Peace Crusade, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, the Quakers and numerous church peace groups. Jewish organizations such as the American Jewish Congress, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, and others have warned of the consequences to Jews of a remilitarized Germany where anti-Semitism is on the rise.

Senator Ralph E. Flanders (Rep.-Vermont) recommended in a speech on September 20 that East and West Germany be reunited as a neutral nation with "neutrality guaranteed by both the Soviet Government and the Western Powers." He warned: "The more one thinks about it, the more dubious becomes the massive rearmament approach to German reunification except at the price of initiating or at least engaging in World War III."

Commenting on the London agreements on his return from a trip to Europe on October 5, banker James Warburg declared that the Western Powers are still on the wrong track with regard to Germany—"The track that leads to war rather than peace."

Dr. Emanuel Newmann, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Zionist Organization of America, said in a speech before the National Administrative Council of that body on November 28: "The newest manifestations of anti-Semitism and Neo-Nazism in Germany threaten to disqualify the Bonn Republic as an ally of this country, consecrated to the

## MALENKOV'S NEW YEAR MESSAGE TO AMERICANS

On January 1, the American press published Premier Malenkov's answers to questions by an American correspondent. The Soviet Premier sent his cordial greetings and best wishes to the American people and expressed hope for strengthened friendship between the peoples of the USA and the USSR. He declared that maintenance of peace between the two countries demands:

"First of all that both sides should sincerely want peace and strive for it, that they should base their relations on the possibility and necessity of peaceful coexistence with each other and on the consideration of mutual legitimate interests. As to the Soviet Union, guided by the above principles, it is ready and will be ready to do everything in its power to secure stable and lasting peaceful relations between the USSR and the USA, to settle the existing differences, assuming that the same readiness will also be shown by the United States of America."

cause of democracy and human freedom."

The immediate task of the American people is to block the ratification by the United States Senate of the Paris agreements. Ratification would inevitably mean worsening of relations with the Soviet Union and place enormous if not insuperable obstacles in the way of East-West negotiations. The continued division of Germany would create the danger of a second Korea, with American troops fighting on the side of reaction in a useless war. The rearming of Western Germany would take the world a long step along the road that leads to the measureless disaster of a new world war, an H-bomb war, bringing death and agony to millions and millions of people.

Letters, wires and resolutions should pour into the United States Senate when it convenes in January demanding that the Paris Pacts for rearming Germany should not be ratified. All democratic and peace-

loving groups in this country, churches and trade unions, fraternal, civic and community groups, organizations of youth, women, Negro, Jewish, nationality groups—all who care about saving our country from the monstrous twin threats of war and fascism, must make their voices heard. Delegations should visit Senators. Individuals must act in whatever way open through letters to the press, letters and wires to your own Senators and to the members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee which will consider the pact before it is voted on.

Should the Paris Pacts be ratified despite these protests, the fight must go on to reverse this fateful decision.

The stake of the American people in making sure that the Nazis will not march again, and that our government abandon the cold war and take the course of peaceful coexistence, is no less than the lives of ourselves and our children, the future of America and the world.

# Religion in Rumania

by REV. STANLEY EVANS

WHEN the new Constitution of the Rumanian Republic was under discussion a couple of years ago, a meeting was held in the fascinating Transylvania city of Stalin, which used to be called Brasov and before that was known as Cronstadt, a city in which at different times German and Hungarian and Rumanian have predominated and which is today a city of racial and religious equality which epitomizes in itself both the history and the social destiny of Transylvania.

The meeting was a gathering of leaders and representatives of the various religious bodies of the city and it met at the house of an Orthodox archpriest to discuss the draft of the Constitution. It began by the reading of the text of the draft Constitution. Then the host, Archpriest John Cemsă spoke. The document just read had mirrored, he said, the great achievements of the Rumanian people. "Our task," he insisted, "is to join with the people in the construction of a new and joyful existence in our native land."

---

REV. STANLEY EVANS, former editor of the "New Central European Observer," has written extensively on East Europe.

---

Others spoke too. The orthodox priest Julius Isa recalled that in the old days the churches were "used as tools by the exploiting class" and were used to accentuate race hatred.

He was followed by a Roman Catholic priest, Francis Birtok, who said that the freedom of all religions was now established in Rumania and priests could express their thoughts openly. There was a good deal more of this sort and finally the meeting decided that its members would aid their local communities to study and understand the new Constitution.

Go back now to the words of the archpriest, "Our task is to join with the people in the construction of a new and joyful existence in our native land."

Read and re-read these words—for they are the key to the understanding of the religious situation in Rumania today. Behind them lies the fact that the Orthodox Church, overwhelmingly the largest of the Rumanian religious bodies, has taken a decision, and been followed in it by all the other religious bodies, to throw in its lot with the new People's Republic.

This decision has nothing to do with political expediency. For many of the clergy who sprang themselves

from the peasantry it meant fulfilling their natural desire to side with their own people. For leaders such as Justinian, the present Patriarch of Rumania, who had risked a great deal before the war as a parish priest to side with the people against the police and against the fascists, it meant the fulfilment of all they had longed for and all they had worked for. And what they had longed for and worked for, let there be no mistake about this, in common with the clergy and Christian believers all over the world, was the triumph of the social principles of the Christian gospel. "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth." "Blessed are the peacemakers."

These were the things they saw coming true before their eyes and because they were honest and sincere they welcomed them.

But it is because they welcomed these things and supported them that they are so widely misrepresented in other countries. Clergy who are prepared to support H-bombing and who are equalled by none in social sycophancy cannot forgive the Rumanian Church that it exchanged a monarch for a people's state. At least they would not forgive it if they thought it had happened, but in reality such a staggering idea seems to them completely impossible. They cannot, they dare not, admit that it has happened.

The pity of it is that this blindness has meant that in the Western world one of the most significant events in modern Christian history has passed unnoticed. In 1948, a law was passed in Rumania nationalizing all large landed estates except those belonging to the church. As soon as the law was passed, Justinian called the Bishops together. There was a long conference. Then they called on

the government and stated that they were not prepared to be the only large landowners in Rumania, and they handed over to the government the title deeds of their land.

This is the only example in history of a church voluntarily giving over its possessions and it stands in clear contrast to the innumerable example of churches being corrupted by their possessions. It should have been trumpeted from one end of Europe to another! It was ignored.

The Rumanian Orthodox Church is orthodox in doctrine, in ceremonial, in discipline and in custom. But it is modern in the use of its historic treasures and it is not surprising to find that a church which gives away its estates has registered its monasteries and nunneries as cooperative associations and so ensured that people who adopt the monastic way of life are not stealing from the general community by depriving it of their productive capacity. The monasteries and nunneries, too, produce for the common pool.

The simple fact is that church life in Rumania today is stimulating, instructive and challenging and this applies not only to the Orthodox. The Catholics have had their struggles but most of them have emerged from them convinced of what they now have to do.

A letter from a Catholic priest of the chief Hungarian region of Transylvania (now the Hungarian Autonomous Region) received way back in 1950, put it like this:

On the occasion of the Targu-Mures Conference, the Roman Catholic clergy and the Catholic believers in the Rumanian People's Republic have, through their authorized representatives, endorsed the Appeal for the Banning of the Atomic Bomb, and pledge their support for the Five



Power Pact of Peace. We condemn any attitude which might attempt to utilize the church for warmongering purposes, or to place religious sentiment in the service of aims alien to our people and our beloved fatherland, the Rumanian People's Republic.

The action carried on by the Catholic Action Committee met with a strong response among the ranks of the Catholic clergy and believers. No place of honor is due to a man who, although longing for peace, does not take an active part in its defense. To an attitude of this kind apply the words of our Lord Jesus Christ: "By their fruits, ye shall know them." This is why we peace-loving priests, following the commandment of the Redeemer to propagate peace and to keep peace alongside the mass of believing people, have joined the struggle for peace wholeheartedly.

The Catholic clergy has become integrated into the way of living of our People's Republic while, of course, as the law permits, preserving their own freedom of organization and expansion in accordance with the dogmas and traditions of the Catholic Church. The honest Catholic clergy and believers are aware that by taking part in the struggle for peace, they are also safeguarding the honor and integrity of their church. Their whole work is dominated by the Christian concept: "Scatter the people, O Lord, that delight in war," and they preach the lofty commandment of the gospel: "Peace on earth, good will to men," and they are convinced that the Lord of Peace is with them in this work. They take pride in belonging to the organization for the promotion of world peace and are sparing nothing for the defense of the great cause of peace.

The truth is that if we were to start cataloging the resolutions and statements for peace that have come from the Rumanian churches, we would be embarking upon a lengthy

and serious task. When, for example, in May, 1952, all the Soviet churches met in a peace conference in Zagorsk, the Rumanian Orthodox Church warmly responded to its appeal to churches and religious communities of all kinds to support the world struggle for peace, and they were not alone in the greetings they sent to this congress. Messages went too from the Roman Catholics, from the Reformed (Calvinist) Church, from the Armenian Church, the Lutheran-Evangelical Church, and from the Old Believers. The Rumanian Orthodox Church sent the Metropolitan Sebastian to this congress as a fraternal delegate. His speech sums up the Rumanian record:

Today, when, as a result of the aid received from the Soviet Union, our people have cast off the yoke of their own and foreign enslavers, when our people have taken their destinies into their own hands, and when they are working for their country's prosperity with an enthusiasm never known in former days, they love their liberty and are steadfastly determined to defend it.

Our Church from the very outset aligned herself with the peace movement, and then joined its ranks as an active force.

As far back as the year 1948, here in Moscow, the Rumanian Orthodox Church joined the other fraternal churches in addressing a peace appeal to Christians the world over.

Through the medium of countless letters, manifestoes and instructions, the Holy Synod of the Rumanian Orthodox Church has urged churchmen and believers to join the peace movement, to participate in the activities of peace committees and thereby constantly strengthen the peace front.

In order the better to convince her churchmen of the need to play an active part in the peace movement, and to lay a still greater obligation on them to do so, the Rumanian Ortho-

dox Church has organized special courses for the priesthood, and also periodic district conferences. She has caused to be printed and has distributed documentary materials, scientific papers, articles, letters, and other literature required to strengthen activities on behalf of peace. . . .

. . . She considers that this course requires the joint endeavors and common efforts of all honest people throughout the universe, for she is convinced that only the joint struggle of all the peoples of the earth in support of peace can render it secure.

Guided by this conviction, our Church has offered her full support to the peace movement in the Rumanian People's Republic.

The Rumanian Orthodox Church is aware that in doing so she is following the path to which her missionary nature commits her.

For verily, what can be of greater good to the Church's mission than peace; what can be of greater harm than war?

This same note was sounded when all the church bodies in Rumania met and issued a manifesto on peace to their own members. In the course of it they dealt with a popular question:

How can I, just one single person, defend peace and with my own feeble powers prevent a new war?

The answer is simple. You are not alone. Hundreds of millions of simple, honest, hard-working people have risen, as you can, to form a strong barrier against war. Hundreds of millions have decided to defend the peaceful lives of their children, the tranquility of their homes, their labor and the fruits thereof, against the annihilating fire of war. You, my dear faithful one and witness to God are, in your word and faith, to which none can set a limit, one of those. When you and all those who **love** peace are as ardent and unflinching in your determination to **defend** peace, then the

hundreds of millions of peace-loving people will become an invincible power.

We must also understand that all over the world the lovers of peace can fight for its defense in various ways.

In our country, dear brethren, all of you can prove yourselves worthy of the Creator whom you all honor and worship, by fighting for peace without pause.

. . . Inasmuch as we work for a happy life for our toiling people, we are fighting for peace.

Inasmuch as we work for the future of our children, we are fighting for peace.

Inasmuch as we work for plenty in our homes, we are fighting for peace. . . .

It is a tragic thing that a Christian Church which speaks like this should be misrepresented as the Rumanian Church is in a recent official report of the Church of England. The moral of the situation is to be seen in the story of a certain Rumanian Orthodox Bishop of the United States who will forgive its telling. By chance the present writer was at the airport at Bucharest when he arrived from the States for his consecration as a Bishop, and there to meet him was a considerable gathering of bearded Orthodox clergy who greeted him with much surprise when he descended from his plane without a beard. No doubt, they observed, the customs of the homeland were forgotten in America. He assured them that that was not the case and that he had simply shaved off his beard to come here. And why? He had heard stories of religious persecution in Rumania and thought it more discreet to come without a beard! They consecrated him, but he was the only beardless priest in the Cathedral.

# Hungary Cuts Red Tape

by LAWRENCE KIRWAN

**A** DRASTIC slashing of bureaucracy is going on in Hungary today as part of an all-out drive for rationalization in the country's economic life.

The aim is to eliminate a double-edged problem. Industry and the State economic apparatus was unhealthily overweighted with non-producers such as inspection and supervision departments, while factories and farms were crying out for hundreds of thousands of new hands.

A solution of problem one would help solve problem two. The big job-switch is now on.

This, and much else that goes with it, springs from the new government policy declared a little over a year ago. Then, it will be remembered, Hungary's leaders decided that the building of socialism must be accompanied by present benefits as well as sacrifices for things to come.

It was and still is acknowledged that over-industrialization was a mistake. Nowhere in all the People's Democracies, Premier Imre Nagy revealed in an article in the leading newspaper *Szabad Nep* as recently as October 20, 1954, had there been

such big-scale, over-hurried industrialization as took place in Hungary in the after war years up to 1953.

The industrial power achieved up to that point, together with the gathering strength of the other socialist countries, made it possible to reduce the emphasis on long-term projects and to put more money into producing goods for immediate use.

The decision was not taken without some heartache. For example, work on Budapest's new underground railway, of which everyone was very proud, has been suspended and the materials and manpower diverted to house-building. The railway, entailing tremendous capital outlay, could not have brought any benefits for some years, whereas people were waiting for homes.

This drawing in, as it were, of the economic horizon has already had quite considerable effects on the standard of living.

Heavy investments in farming under the three-year program, and material encouragement to the peasants to grow more and dispose of their surpluses on the free market, have put more food into the shops. Consumer industry has sharply stepped up its output.

Wages in 1953-54 have gone up 15.8 per cent while prices have fallen 3.3 per cent.

---

LAWRENCE KIRWAN is a British journalist who recently returned from a visit to Hungary.

---

people bought 72 per cent more confectionery, 36 per cent more butter and 32 per cent more eggs than in the second quarter of last year. Purchases of others goods show similar big increases.

But bigger output brings big problems. With a population of only ten millions it is not easy to find workers to man expanding industry and farming.

"At least 100,000 hands are needed for agriculture," Matyas Rakosi, first secretary, told a Working People's Party meeting at the end of September. "In the building industry many thousands are needed. In the mines we can give work to thousands. The textile and food industries could employ many thousands more."

"With such a labor shortage we must rationalize. We must cut down unnecessarily swollen state, economic, cultural and other apparatus."

How acute was this problem of swollen administrative apparatus was shown at another meeting by Mihaly Farkas, member of the Party's political bureau, when he disclosed that in industry as a whole there were 35.9 non-productive workers to every 100 productive workers—and the tendency was to worsen.

How has such a state of affairs come about? It is one of the problems which can arise in the rapid building of an entirely new social system in a country which was until recently backward, industrially underdeveloped and dominated by more powerful capitalist neighbors.

When a socialist state was created in Hungary, building of the economic apparatus had to be begun from the bottom, with inexperienced people. The newspaper *Szabad Nep* explained it this way:

"The apparatus was not ready-

by experiment. The new leaders coming from the people at first had not the necessary experience, expert knowledge, schooling for this type of work.

"Much experimentation took place, and this gave birth to more and more supervisory groups and departments and heavy increases in the number of administrative workers—those who drafted the work schedules, made the programs, and divided out the work.

"Additionally, the exaggerated pace of industrialization and over-rapid development of heavy industry brought in organizations, institutions and offices which burdened the state with excessive expenditure."

People in charge of the direction of economic life came to look down on the capacities of leaders of lower organs and wanted to solve everything "from above." This "bureaucratic lack of confidence," the paper said, "led to a narrowing of the sphere of rights of industrial managers, almost complete lack of economic independence of local councils," and resulted in building up of unnecessary supervisory organizations and inspectors.

This mushrooming of administrators, all of whom were of course very busy, not only put too many fingers in too many pies, but also made industry expensive and complicated.

Thus Hungary's labor problem had a double form—a general shortage of manpower to help industry to grow, and an excessive growth of supervision, which not only put the brakes on but swallowed up too many precious workers.

Illustrating the changing face of Hungary in recent years is the fact that in the four years 1949-52, 200,000 people left the land to become

factory workers. That loss has still not entirely been made up by machine help to expanding farms.

Side by side with its recent orders for rationalization, the government decreed greater independence for managers of state industry and farms. The decree clearly defines the factory manager's powers and makes him answerable only to the leader or chief engineer of the directing organ or trust of which his factory is part, and through them to the minister or deputy minister concerned.

This emphasis on personal responsibility is all part of the war on bureaucracy, the elimination of "passing the buck."

As István Kovács, first secretary of the Budapest Party, put it: "Without regard to person or function, we must judge or criticize and call to account those who with faulty or mistaken conception or incorrect measures, hinder the fast execution of the policy of the new period."

Another move which cuts out bureaucracy is the new law on local councils. This emphasizes that power is in the hands of elected bodies, who are subordinate only to higher elected bodies—such as district councils to county councils—and that permanent officials are answerable to the elected councillors.

Incidentally, the council law also abolishes bloc-list voting and puts in its place voting for individual candidates. This is to ensure proper observance of the Constitution which makes councillors responsible to their electors and liable to recall if not giving satisfaction. With a bloc system it was not easy to ensure individual responsibility.

The present big switch-over of jobs has not been without its human problems and the country's leaders and rank and file have been quite

frank about them in discussions in the public press.

There was some criticism of the lack of advance discussion before the rationalization drive began. People like to understand the reasons, no matter how correct a decision may be.

Then papers, notably the independent *Magyar Nemzet*, came out with an appeal for personnel managers to take displaced workers into their confidence, and not only to give them understanding of the need for transfer but to help them settle on the new job.

The fortnight's notice of transfer given at first was found a bit sharp for people, and many were not sure how they stood about long-service, pension and social insurance rights earned in their old jobs.

So the government came out with a decree assuring continuance of such rights and increasing the pay on leaving to four weeks instead of two. And the Trades Union Council weighed in with a grant to heads of families who did not find a job at once.

Probably one of the most significant features of what is going on in Hungary today is this emphasis on more sympathetic human relations. It goes hand in hand with the energetic steps being taken to attract all sections of the population to take part in political life through the newly-formed Patriotic People's Front, which held its inaugural congress on October 23-24.

This body, representative of every possible organization from the Catholic Church to the Red Cross, from scientific societies to trade unions and farm cooperatives, is going to exert a powerful influence on the building of the Hungary of the future.

## IMPORTED LINENS

### Men's Irish Linen Handkerchiefs

17x17

dozen \$5.00

### Dish Towels

16x30 White with colored border

(green, blue or red) dozen \$6.00

### Polish Tablecloths

Peasant-craft, multi-colored on ecru background

52x52 \$4.95

52x70 5.95

63x87 White on white damask with eight napkins \$10.50

order through

**NEW WORLD REVIEW**

## NEW SOVIET FILMS

*All in Spectacular Sovcolor*

ALEKO

TRUE FRIENDS

THE ANNA CROSS

STARS OF THE RUSSIAN  
BALLET

SKANDERBEG

**Coming**

A New Czechoslovakian  
Film in Color

THE EMPEROR AND  
THE GOLEM

**Artkino Pictures, Inc.**

723 SEVENTH AVE., NEW YORK 19

Telephone: Circle 5-6570

*Rich in poetry, music selections,  
and meditations . . .*

## A HUMANIST FUNERAL SERVICE

by Corliss Lamont

*"Liturgy that is also  
literature . . ."*

For those who cannot accept supernatural or sectarian ceremonies, this funeral service by Corliss Lamont offers a simple and beautiful ritual at time of death. It is a manual of consolation for mourners . . . an aesthetic experience for anyone who has ever meditated on death.

One dollar postpaid

**HORIZON PRESS**

220 W. 42nd St., New York 36