

✓ SOCIAL SCIENCES ✓
MAY, 1955
20¢

PUBLIC LIBRARY

APR 30

DETROIT

New World

REVIEW



*Children in the kindergarten of the Teachers Union
in Hangchow. Other photos of China on pages 24, 25*

**Ehrenburg's Speech to Writers • Dr. Du Bois
Reviews Peace Movement • In a Polish Cot-
ton Mill • Eslanda Robeson on Trusteeship**

NEW WORLD *Review*

MAY

1955

Will America Meet the
Challenge?

Jessica Smith 3

Anna Louise Strong 7

The World Peace Movement
Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois 9

Soviet Writers Congress 15

Tasks of the Soviet Writer
Ilya Ehrenburg 16

Peking's Theaters
Elsie Fairfax-Cholmeley 23

China Greets the Spring,
photos 24

Trust in Trusteeship?
Eslanda Robeson 28

In a Polish Cotton Mill
Eula Mendes Figueiredo 31

Linking the Soviet Seas
Nikolai Mikhailov 36

The Yalta Papers 41

Soviet Disarmament
Proposals 44

Book Reviews 46

Cover photo and those on pages 24 and 25
are by Eastfoto.

JESSICA SMITH, *Editor*
FREDERICK V. FIELD, *Far Eastern Editor*
ANDREW VOYNOW, *Managing Editor*

ESLANDA ROBESON
*Editorial Consultant on Negro and
Colonial Questions*

Vol. 23, No. 4, May, 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

How About Your Friends?

These days it's in the very nature of
things to have to issue our constant
appeals for help from our readers.

We are not overlooking the fact that
you have been extremely generous. In
fact, it is your help that has enabled
us to continue publishing, to continue
our work for better understanding of
those areas of the world that are either
black-out or distorted in our general
press.

We are ever grateful for your sup-
port.

But frankness demands that we let
you know that our needs are still very
great.

So, we must call on you again to help
us just as much as you possibly can.
But we would like to make a suggestion:

Why not approach your friends? Let
them share the burden. Ask them to
contribute, to subscribe. We need both
funds and subscribers—and your friends
can be a rich source for both these needs.

Help us directly, as much as you can,
and talk to your friends today. Enlist
their help.

NEW WORLD REVIEW
23 West 26th St., New York 10

I am enclosing \$..... to help you
to continue to publish your magazine.

Name

Address

City

Zone..... State.....

Will America Meet the Challenge?

by JESSICA SMITH

Good news as we go to press is the USSR-Austrian agreement on a State Treaty for Austria opening the way for four-power negotiations on this and other issues.

THE IMPORTANT ARTICLE by Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois, which we are publishing in this issue, on the growth and strength of the mighty world peace movement embracing hundreds of millions of people of varying political views and affiliations in eighty-five countries, should serve as a challenge to Americans concerned with peace. The strength of the peace sentiment in this country is made manifest at every new threat of war, and has served as a mighty deterrent on many occasions. But its great weakness is its lack of organization.

With the increased dangers of atomic war arising from the further steps toward German rearmament, and the wild war cries of those who would plunge our country into war with China, the time has come for the American people to give urgent consideration to uniting and making more effective their efforts for peace. In this inspiration and strength can be drawn from the united efforts described by Dr. Du Bois of the people of the world who have so far been able to stay the hands of those who would use atomic weapons, and are now embarked on a new world-wide effort to ban atomic and hydrogen weapons. If the united strength of the American people is joined with this great world movement for peace, a new world war can surely be averted.

The effect of the will of the peoples for peace on governments everywhere must be noted. America's own allies do not support the idea of a war with China, and ratified the Paris pacts for the rearming of Germany with the greatest reluctance. A great new force for peace has arisen in Asia under the leadership of Premier Nehru of India, with strong support from Indonesia, Burma and other Asian countries. The Asian-African conference in Bandung can be counted on to give strong expression to the will for peace of the more than half of the world's people there represented.

A new impetus has been given the forces of peace everywhere by the Easter message of Pope Pius XII warning against the horrors of nuclear warfare and appealing for new efforts toward progressive disarmament and international understanding. In this connection special note should be made on the latest proposals of the Soviet Government at the London disarmament talks for the banning of nuclear weapons and tight methods of international control and inspection (See page 44).

The Fire-eaters Call for War

The reported efforts of Admiral Carney, chief of Naval Operations, to precipitate war with China, as indicated by his remarks at a news-

papermen's dinner that the Chinese were ready to launch an attack on Quemoy and Matsu islands by April 15, have stirred up a nationwide storm expressed in a flood of letters to Washington, newspaper editorials and statements by public figures. Such attempts to plunge us into war were seconded by other Pentagon officials, by Senator Knowland (R-Cal.) Senator Bridges (R-N.H.), Senator McCarthy and others of the war-now crowd. Inspired stories about the dinner said the President was being urged by his military advisers "to destroy Red China's industrial potential and thus end its expansionist tendencies" (meaning its desire to possess its own territory). The military leaders have made clear that this attempt would involve the use of nuclear weapons.

The furor raised over this threatening incident led President Eisenhower to declare at his March 31 press conference that he had no information to support the view that an attack on the off-shore islands is imminent and that such talk does not serve the cause of peace. But neither the President nor Secretary Dulles have taken any effective steps to quiet the fears of the American people, and they still leave open the question of whether Americans will be called on to die for the defense of these islands belonging to China, and the world plunged into war.

Senator Estes Kefauver (D-Tenn.) declared on March 31:

That the United States should be plunged into war over Matsu and Quemoy ought to be unthinkable. Yet there are those in high places in the present Administration itself who are plotting and planning to bring such a war about, whatever the risks involved . . . forces so powerful and apparently so eager for a war with China that they are becoming almost impossible to resist.

The *New York Times* of March 27 warned against the opposition the United States would encounter from all its allies and all the Asian peoples in attempting to hold Quemoy and Matsu, and declared editorially:

It is time that the fire-eaters in Washington, whether in the Pentagon or elsewhere, went into silence. We need calmness and wisdom. This newspaper hopes and believes that President Eisenhower, hating war as we know he does, and realizing, as he said he did, that one cannot see where a war will take us, will exercise his leadership, during this coming critical week to save this country and the world from irretrievable disaster.

On April 1, Senator Wayne Morse (D-Ore.) and Senator Herbert Lehman (D-N.Y.) introduced a resolution against any U.S. military operations over Matsu and Quemoy and calling for the evacuation of Nationalist forces from these islands. So far so good. This move should be supported. But what we must be on guard against is that even if there should be no war over Quemoy and Matsu U.S. military intervention to hold Formosa and the Pescadores on behalf of Chiang Kai-shek would be just as dangerous and unwarranted. (See article "Formosa," Mar. NWR.)

On April 10 Adlai Stevenson at last voiced his "grave misgiving" about a third world war in defense of Quemoy and Matsu islands, although at the same time defending America's "right" to be on Formosa.

New Wehrmacht Looms Closer

While the danger in the Formosa Strait has brought an immediate reaction from the American people, there has unfortunately been less awareness of the dangers of the rearming of Western Germany. (See January and March NWR.)

On March 18, the Bundesrat, West German Upper House, completed ratification of the Paris Pacts. But the campaign against rearmament continues unabated throughout Western Germany, where the leading bodies of the powerful Social Democratic Party, the whole trade union movement, the youth, the women, church and other groups are in action to reverse the decision and bring about four power negotiations for German unification before rearmament actually goes into effect.

On March 28, the French Council of the Republic (Senate) reluctantly completed ratification. The *New York Times* correspondent wrote from Paris:

France doubtless will receive much praise in Washington for her belated acquiescence in German rearmament. *But it would be putting the picture in false focus if it were assumed that France was in agreement with Washington.* (Emphasis added)

In France, too, the campaign against implementation of the pacts continues and spreads. All Europe knows that these actions were taken at the behest of Washington and against the will of the peoples.

On April 1, the Senate ratified the Paris pacts for rearming West Germany, with only Senators William Langer (R-N.D.) and George W. Malone (R-Nev.) casting negative votes.

This was preceded by hurried hearings held by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, where Secretary Dulles' contention that the rearming of Western Germany and its admission into NATO would advance the cause of peace, was sharply challenged by a number of witnesses.

Witnesses opposing ratification of the pacts included James Imbrie, of Princeton, New Jersey, on behalf of the Progressive Party; Thomas Dom-

browsky editor of *Glas Ludowy*, Polish language paper of Detroit; Stanley Nowak, former member of the Michigan State Senate; Mrs. Yetta Metz of New York, representing the Emma Lazarus Federation of Jewish Women's Clubs; Paul Green, a Purple Heart veteran, representing the American Veterans for Peace, and Morris Golden, Executive Secretary of the American Labor Party.

The week before, on March 21, the ALP had held a peace rally attended by 2,500 at New York's Manhattan Center. Among the speakers were Frederick L. Schuman, Professor of Political Science at Williams College, who pointed out that the rearming of Western Germany would in no way serve any rational American purpose. Among his major points was that the widespread belief, which is the premise of American official policy, that the rearming of Western Germany will strengthen the relative military power of the Western coalition vis-a-vis the Soviet bloc or give it a superiority of power over the latter, is wholly without foundation, since the USSR and its allies will feel obliged by virtue of tragic past experience to match each German division with two additional Soviet divisions. Therefore, he said, the balance of military power on the European continent will in no way be altered by the folly of rearming Germany. He also expressed the opinion that the changes of personnel and policies in the Soviet Union announced early in February are in direct response to the projected rearmament of Western Germany. He continued:

The effect, then, of German rearmament will be to intensify the arms race, to divert the human and material resources of the Soviet bloc and of the Atlantic Coalition into quite useless armaments which will in no way modify the established

military deadlock or stalemate between the two halves of a divided world.

For Big Power Negotiations

In the midst of the war alarms in Washington, Senator Walter F. George (D.-Ga.), Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, called for great power negotiations. After some confusion as to whether this proposal did or did not have the support of the President, Mr. Eisenhower indicated that he favored the idea. An immediate response came from the Soviet Union in a statement by Premier Bulganin:

The Soviet Government, as before, takes a positive attitude toward the idea of a conference of the great powers expressed by the President of the United States if there is envisaged a conference that would contribute to the lessening of tension in international relations.

In this connection, it may be pointed out first of all that the Soviet Government already has proposed to hold in the nearest future a conference of the four powers at which it would be possible to settle the question of the Austrian state treaty.

From Washington came inspired stories to the effect that ratification of the Paris treaties had cleared the way for negotiations, as though only now had the Soviet Union, which has consistently been pressing for them, accepted the idea. The Soviet Union has made clear that ratification of the Paris agreements would put great obstacles in the way of negotiations on German unification. However, until the pacts are implemented, possibility of German reunification remains open, and there are many other unsettled issues to be covered.

The Administration gives little evidence of seriously pursuing the idea of big power negotiations, and Mr. Dulles seems to take a very dim

view indeed of their happening in the near future. So far there is just talk about talks. The plan which has so often made negotiations difficult before, is preliminary talks among the Western powers in an effort to reconcile their differences and present a united front. Then talks among minor officials of the big powers—then among foreign ministers—with top level discussions far away, and apparently only on the basis that the USSR agrees in advance to everything the United States wants.

President Eisenhower made clear he did not share Churchill's ideas that there might be an early top-level conference. And Sir Winston shuffled off the British stage still facing toward the past, instead of turning toward the future as he might have done had he not supinely let the U.S. Administration veto his efforts during the past two years to bring about negotiations with the USSR.

Organize for Peace!

Too little is the voice of trade union leaders heard on these great issues. But the will of labor's rank and file found expression at the recent CIO United Auto Workers' Convention, when Walter Reuther devoted a large part of his opening speech to the idea that the union's plan for a guaranteed annual wage is only possible in a world at peace.

Another highly important peace expression was the April 2 letter of fourteen Protestant Church leaders addressed to President Eisenhower. They declared that the policy urged by his military advisers of consenting to an all-out war and the use of atomic bombs against China "Would expose the United States Government and the American people before the whole world as wanton aggressors." The letter concluded:

We beg you, Mr. President, to con-

tinue your action for peace, stop the drift toward war, insist on peaceful settlement of differences between nations. The problem of today is not the prestige of Chiang Kai-shek, but the survival of civilization.

Among the signers were the Right Rev. Norman B. Nash, Protestant Episcopal Bishop of Massachusetts, Bishop John Wesley Lord of the Boston Area of the Methodist Church, The Rev. Dr. John A. Mackay, President Princeton Theological Seminary, The Right Rev. Charles K. Gilbert, Protestant Episcopal Bishop of New York (ret.), The Rev. Guy Emery Shipley, editor *The Churchman*, The Rev. John Bradbury, editor *The Watchman Examiner*, The Rev.

J. Tremayne Copplestone, editor *Zion's Herald*, Clarence Pickett, honorary secretary American Friends' Service Committee.

There is much more the American people can do for peace, in stepping up their demands on Congress and the Administration that there shall be no war with China, and in urging that arrangements for a big-power conference be made quickly, before German rearmament becomes a reality. And, above all, new efforts must be made for the uniting and organizing of existing peace settlement into a mighty force that can help to bring about the banning of nuclear weapons and the end of all wars, forever.

Anna Louise Strong

THE wisest and most helpful comment on the action of the Soviet Government in clearing Anna Louise Strong of the espionage charges made against her in 1949 as the basis for her arrest and deportation from Moscow, has been made by Miss Strong herself.

In a letter published in the *National Guardian*, March 28, Miss Strong, referring to those who "wonder what to do about me now," wrote:

... It seems to me that if we can just give the right word at the right time in the right tone, there is a chance to come through to a wider unity than there ever was before. A unity that avoids both dogmatism and cynicism, that accepts both that "Moscow can make grievous mistakes" and that "Moscow seeks justice and corrects mistakes when found."

This is something we can all take to heart.

It was not surprising that the arrest of Anna Louise Strong, who had for so many years made such a signal contribution to American understanding of the Soviet Union, should have dealt a blow to the faith of many people in the Soviet Union. Nor was it surprising that many others, while finding it impossible to believe that Miss Strong could have consciously participated in espionage, found it equally difficult to believe that such an action could have been taken without what at least appeared to be justifiable grounds.

In her newsletter *Today*, for March 24, Miss Strong corrected reports carried in the American press to the effect that the Soviet announcement had said she had been "framed" by Beria. She quoted the statement that had appeared in *Pravda* as follows:

In February 1949, the American journalist A. L. Strong, being in the

USSR, was arrested by the organs of State Security of the USSR on suspicion of espionage and sabotage and deported beyond the frontiers of the USSR. As a result of checking by the Procurator's office of the USSR, it is established that the former chiefs of the Ministry of State Security, (Beria, Abakumov) made the charge without grounds. In connection with this the charge is now removed.

What is important now is the fact that, as in the case of the doctors falsely arrested under the Beria administration, cases of injustice are being carefully reviewed and full acknowledgment of mistakes is being made. The release of Noel Field in Hungary and Herman Field in Poland, with the announcement that they had been imprisoned on false charges, are similar examples.

It is not possible to restore to the Fields their years of imprisonment, nor to Anna Louise Strong her years of agony and frustration. But frank acknowledgment of error by the governments concerned should be a salutary restorative to those who wavered in their faith, as well as to the dogmatists among us who have felt that socialist governments could do no wrong.

In her first statement to the *National Guardian* Miss Strong gave her answer to those who asked her whether she was satisfied with the explanation, or whether she thought there was some deeper reason for the whole affair: "Of course there was, for I learned in college philosophy that the total cause for anything that happens is the sum total of the whole world as it was before."

That sum total was the cold war situation which has led our government to make use of every means,

overt and covert, to organize hostility to the Soviet Union from without, and seek out those elements that could be used as tools to undermine it from within. This in turn has inevitably caused a suspicious attitude toward American diplomats and correspondents who, separated from the real Russia and living in the abnormal atmosphere of the Moscow foreign colony, too often act the part of agents of a hostile power. Yet there is no doubt of the friendly feelings of the Russian people to the American people as such, testified to by those who take the trouble to go out among them, nor to the earnestness of the desire of the Soviet leaders for the normal relations with our country necessary to maintain peace.

The lesson for us all is to work harder to end the cold war and restore normal and friendly relations with the USSR. Miss Strong ended her letter to the *Guardian*:

We must all face the fact that we shall be working all our lives in a movement that contains not only people under suspicion, but a lot of undercover agents of the FBI. We must work out techniques for acting even under this difficulty without rejecting any help that is offered in our fight for peace.

All honor to the Soviet government for its frank admission of this and other grievous mistakes. All honor to Anna Louise Strong that she has survived this ordeal without bitterness, and has continued her work for peace and international understanding in the face of obstacles that would have seemed insuperable to others. We rejoice that these obstacles have been removed, and that she may once again give her full, great talents to the fight for peace.

The World Peace Movement

by DR. W. E. B. DU BOIS

THE moral decadence of the United States since 1945 is shown not only by increasing injustice in the courts and deliberate distortion of the truth, but especially by the collapse of all organized effort for peace. At the beginning of this century the peace movement was regarded as triumphant. We had but a small standing army; we not only drafted no youth into military service but regarded compulsory military service as proof of moral decadence in Europe. Our philanthropists were endowing movements for world peace: Carnegie gave twelve million in 1910, and the World Peace Foundation the same year got thirteen millions. Both still live and both are practically dead so far as advocacy of peace is concerned.

The peace movement of our century arose from nineteenth century effort; from the great London international peace congress of 1843, whose ringing pronouncements

against military education and sale of munitions would put most of its advocates in jail today. Elihu Burritt and his Brussels Congress followed in 1848; and the great Paris meeting in 1849 at the call of Richard Cobden and Victor Hugo. Other efforts followed for a half century but ran into wars and rumors of wars and economic imperialism which preached European peace and waged continuous colonial wars, until finally peace collapsed in the failure of the Hague conferences, and rising socialism was strangled by expanding colonial empire and capitalist domination of the world.

Then came the Great Disaster in the fight for world dominion which transformed civilization. World wars, separated by boom and depression, overwhelmed us, killing and maiming the youth of two generations, destroying property on an incredible scale; but more than that, destroying the world's faith in itself. So that today the world is preparing for 50 years of murder and destruction and in the United States of America it is practically impossible to hold a mass meeting for peace or to say a word for peace without adding three words for war, preparation for war and studied hatred of half of mankind for the other. The

DR. W. E. B. DU BOIS, renowned Negro scholar and author, is Vice-Chairman of the Council on African Affairs. He was awarded the 1952 Peace Prize of the World Council for Peace. The most recent of his many books is "In Battle for Peace."

Christian Church, far from upholding the Prince of Peace, is today with few exceptions, one of the strongest advocates of war.

But this war voice of America is no longer the voice of the world. How strongly, steadily and persuasively the great voice for world peace has risen in Europe and Asia and been blotted out from the general knowledge in America is bitter tribute to the propaganda begun by Goebels and Hitler and copied by Acheson and the Dulles brothers. We can rejoice that a new Peace Movement actually began in the United States 100 years after the first Paris Peace Congress. Harlow Shapley of Harvard University, an unselfish Yankee of the finest tradition, called on and secured the support of 500 leaders of American and world opinion, science, literature and art for a peace meeting in New York in March, 1949.

There ensued an exhibition of public lying, slander and hypocrisy; of intimidation and cowardice; of insult and barbarism unequalled in America even in the height of the pro-slavery controversy. Church and University began to run to cover; artists and writers recanted, and the civilization of America started to repudiate Peace, Courtesy and Common Sense, and we relapsed into hysteria over Communism and Socialism and to studied hatred of a thousand million human beings whom we stigmatized as plotters, criminals and slave drivers. We began to expand for war the largest budget ever conceived by man.

Before we realized how complete was our surrender to Fascism there was called in Paris, one hundred years after the great Peace Congress of 1949, a World Congress of the Partisans of Peace. Delegates from

72 nations representing 600,000,000 people met in the Salle Pleyel. I wrote:

I have attended the greatest meeting of men ever assembled in modern times to advance the progress of all men. The Races Congress of 1911 in London was comparable but quickly forgotten. The first meeting of the League of Nations Assembly in that little Geneva church raised hopes of universal significance. The UNO at San Francisco, after a Second World War, lifted the hearts of men, until the long drawn-out horse-trading on trusteeships revealed the determination to hold in serfdom the majority of mankind.

The Paris outpouring for Peace was extraordinary not simply because it brought together 2000 delegates from 72 lands; not only because of the single-hearted earnestness and deep determination which kept them fastened to their seats for five full days.

In Paris the colored world was present; not simply on sufferance; not with the appalling Anglo-Saxon condescension; but as members of a world movement in full right and with full participation.

To all this should be added the colored contingent at the Prague Congress, those delegates refused visas to enter France. Foremost among these were the 40 delegates from China and eight from Korea.

The Manifesto of the World Congress faced definitely the colonial and color questions: "We are against colonialism, which continually breeds armed conflicts and threatens to play a decisive part in unleashing a new World War. We condemn . . . the fostering of race hatred and enmity among peoples."

A world peace organization was formed and supporting congresses held in Moscow and Mexico. At a meeting of the World Partisans of

Peace in Stockholm on March 15, 1950, attended by 150 delegates from 18 of the leading nations of the world, including the United States and the Soviet Union, this statement was unanimously adopted:

We demand the absolute banning of the atomic weapon, an arm of terror and of mass extermination of populations.

We demand the establishment of strict international control to ensure the implementation of this ban.

We consider that the first government henceforth to use the atomic weapon against any country whatsoever will be committing a crime against humanity and should be treated as a war criminal.

We call on all people of good will throughout the world to sign this appeal.

The half billion persons who signed this Appeal and the billion who would have signed if given the chance, were moved not by the thought of defending the Soviet Union so much as by the desire to prevent modern culture from relapsing into primitive barbarism. The reputation of Dean Acheson, United States Secretary of State, will never recover from his deliberate attempt to misrepresent the origin, intent and word of this great appeal. The effort to imprison five officials of the Peace Information Center culminated his campaign. It cost \$30,000 and a national and worldwide campaign of protest to keep me and my four fellow victims from jail and fine. Even at that I was handcuffed, fingerprinted and publicly humiliated.

A second World Peace Congress was called to meet in Sheffield, England in 1950. The warmongers wheeled into line. The British Labor Government, egged on by the American

State Department, sabotaged the meeting by insulting requirements and peremptory rejection of many delegates until Warsaw, war-torn as it still was, welcomed the meeting of delegates in a hall hastily arranged and decorated by volunteers working night and day. The Warsaw Congress met November 16 to 22, 1950. It said:

When you read this message which has been adopted in the name of the peoples of 80 countries at the Second World Peace Congress held in Warsaw, remember that the fight for peace is your vital concern. Know that hundreds of millions of peace partisans, who have joined together, are extending their hand to you. They are calling on you to take part in the most noble struggle ever waged by humanity with firm faith in its future.

One does not wait for peace to come—one fights to win it. Let us join our effort and demand the cessation of the war which is ravaging Korea today and is threatening the whole world with conflagration tomorrow.

Let us be set against attempts to kindle anew the hotbeds of war in Germany and Japan.

There were 1655 delegates who approved the resolutions and elected an international presidium of 208 members to carry on the work.

In February, 1951, the first session of a second World Peace Congress met in Berlin and urged "all national committees greatly to increase the circulation and popularization of the Address to the United Nations Organization. The Address must reach every corner of the earth; it must be made known to every man and every woman. The Council calls upon every peace-lover to show the greatest initiative in this task both nationally and internationally."

In November, 1951, a Third World Peace Congress meeting took place in Vienna, with 57 nations represented, addressing itself especially to the sixth United Nations General Assembly about to convene in Paris. The Peace Congress said:

The worsening of the international situation in recent months disturbs and worries the men and women of all countries. Everyone hopes for negotiation and agreement between the five great powers responsible, in accordance with the terms of the UN charter, and by their own strength, for the peace of the world. The campaign of the World Council of Peace for a pact between the big five is, therefore, looked upon by world opinion as justified by the course of events and the present ineffectiveness of other methods.

Early in January, 1952, an American International Peace Conference was scheduled for Brazil. This was postponed to March, but I and other American advocates of Peace were refused passports by the State Department. Eventually under great difficulties, the Conference was held in Montevideo, Uruguay.

In July, 1952, a special session of the Peace Council took place in Berlin. The next session of the World Peace Congress took place at Vienna. There were 26 American delegates present. The Congress was held in the British sector of Vienna in December, 1952. It embraced people and groups not previously associated with the organized world peace movement. For eight days the vast hall of Vienna's Concert House was filled with the colorful assembly of nearly 2,000 delegates from 85 lands. From Asia, for instance, came 21 delegates — including Japan, China, India, Vietnam, Korea. From North and

South America came 23 delegations — 293 members in all. From Africa and Oceania came 10 delegations with 96 members.

The Appeal of the Congress expressed the unanimous desire of all people for the immediate discontinuation of hostilities in Korea, Indo-China and Malaya; for the conclusion of a peace pact among the Five Great Powers; for the ending of any interference by one State in the affairs of another; for the peaceful settlement of the problems of Germany and Japan; for the immediate suppression of all weapons of mass destruction; for progressive disarmament; for international trade and cultural exchange; and for the seating in the UN of the Chinese Government.

In October, 1952, a peace conference of the Asian and Pacific regions was held at Peking with delegates from 37 countries in Asia, Australia and countries on the Pacific coast of the Americas, representatives of the World Peace Council, the World Federation of Trade Unions and its Asian-Australasian Liaison Bureau, the Women's International Democratic Federation, the World Federation of Democratic Youth, the International Union of Students, the International Association of Democratic Lawyers, as well as visitors from the United Kingdom, France, Brazil, Algeria and champions of peace who had been specially invited to attend this Conference.

In June, 1953, the World Council of Women met in Copenhagen. With 611 elected delegates, 1,187 invited guests and 65 observers, the Congress represented hundreds of millions of women in 70 countries, women of different races and nationalities, occupation and social status, political views and religious convictions.

tions. It took a strong stand for peace.

In July, 1953, more than 1,500 delegates from 106 countries were present at the Third World Youth Congress in the Floreasca Sports Hall, Bucharest. They said:

Let us unite so that we can devote our youthful energies to the noble cause of peace. Let us take part in the peoples' movement for negotiations, mutual understanding and peace.

Meeting at Budapest in June, 1953 the World Council of Peace called upon the peoples to redouble their efforts to help forward negotiations for international settlement:

The armistice in Korea, leading to a Korean peace, must be signed forthwith on the basis of the agreements already arrived at. Each new delay adds to the bereavements, the destruction, the suffering.

The Fourth Peace Congress was held in Budapest on February 26 and 27, 1954 and was attended by more than 2,000 delegates and guests, including representatives from China, Turkey, Rumania, Germany, Austria, Poland, Iran, the USSR, and the World Council of Peace.

In Vienna, March, 1955, the Bureau of the World Peace Council sent out a call for another peace meeting in Finland in May, 1955:

The open threat of an atomic war from now on hangs over every country, every home, every man, woman and child.

Instead of atomic energy being made to serve mankind, terrible weapons are being piled up. Instead of disarmament, fresh military blocs are being put together. Instead of negotiation and agreement, there are threats and hate-propaganda.

The abolition of nuclear weapons, general disarmament, the security of all, respect for the sovereignty and rights of every nation, these must be pursued by the peoples with the energy needed where life itself is at stake.

It is in this spirit and with these aims that the World Council of Peace invites supporters of peace from every country to come together in Helsinki on May 22, 1955 in a World Assembly, there to discuss freely questions of the action urgent to preserve peace.

Following the Helsinki Peace Assembly, there will be convened in June, on the initiative of the Women's International Democratic Federation, a great World Congress of Mothers to protect their children from war and to promote disarmament and friendship among the peoples.

Thus from 1949 until today, all over the world except in the United States there has spread a movement for peace on earth. Today a tremendous peace movement is sweeping Japan with twenty-three million signatures against nuclear warfare. The current campaign for the destruction of all atomic weapons is spreading everywhere except in the United States. In Brazil a national committee is at work; in India 100 members of the Congress party have joined in a statement and the All-India Trade Congress have thrown their influence back of the effort. The Swiss Peace Movement is active. China began her campaign in March and 70 per cent of the population of the Yiangtse-kiang valley have already signed; the Chinese Academy of Sciences and the Federation of Scientific Societies have helped. Korea, Vietnam, Syria, Hong Kong and Macao are working. Sweden, Finland and Norway are signing.

In Italy workers, university students, many Catholic societies and municipal councils are signing petitions. In Austria, on the anniversary of Hitler's annexation, 2,000 people met to ask the people to sign the "Appeal against preparation for atomic war." In Argentina and Mexico, in Paraguay and Canada, even in West Germany; everywhere except in the United States where few have even heard of the great movement.

Here, since 1950 all news of peace movements have been suppressed or distorted. No American citizen has been allowed a passport to attend a peace congress. In public opinion "Peace" is synonymous with "Communism" and to "Communism" is attributed ever vile and evil object. Our jails are filling with alleged "Communists" and concentration camps are already prepared for persons to be accused of "Communism" at any future time.

Since Communism is regarded as a "cause" of Peace there has been no great meeting for peace in the country for a year or more. The American Peace Crusade has

practically ceased public activity. The President, cabinet members and most leaders in science, art and literature are either silent on peace or use the word to fulminate for a vaster army, atomic and hydrogen bombs, "defending" Formosa and advocating or not opposing universal military service. Our decadence into war psychology and a program of human hate is nearly complete. No American citizen will get permission even to attend Helsinki save as a paid liar.

This is our "free democracy of the West!"

Despite this there is undoubtedly an overwhelming majority of American public opinion for Peace, as shown by pressure on Congress and other unexpected manifestations.

A shrewd general hitherto wild for war has recently sensed a change in America. His devastating attack on war and for coexistence was promptly suppressed by the warmongers and even the peacemakers dare not believe their ears. Douglas MacArthur may have been nearer the truth than either think.

POPE'S WARNING AGAINST NUCLEAR WARFARE

POPE PIUS XII issued the gravest warning yet heard against nuclear warfare in his Easter message. He called on those with influence in world affairs to "arrange treaties which will insure peace, start a progressive disarmament and thus spare humanity the dangers of a new war."

Urging scientists to put nuclear energy to the service and not the destruction of men, he prayed that God would "prevent such great and noble effort from being turned into an infernal violence which would destroy everything." Warning of the dangers which the science of genetics foresees as possible for future generations as a result of radioactivity, the Pope said in his message:

"The horrors of monstrous offspring, and, worse still, the hidden shocks caused to parental genes, would then give indication of the revolt of nature against such violence."

THE SOVIET WRITERS CONGRESS

THE Second All-Union Congress of Soviet Writers which convened in Moscow in mid-December was a major event in the USSR and, indeed, held the attention of the entire cultural world. Attended by some 700 writer delegates from all over the Soviet Union as well as guests from dozens of other countries, it opened in the great Kremlin Palace, and continued for nine days, subsequent sessions being held in the Hall of Columns of the House of Unions. There had been a lapse of twenty years since the First Congress, which was held under the aegis of Maxim Gorky, and vast changes had occurred in the interval, both within the Soviet Union and throughout the world. These changes were reflected in the reports and speeches of the delegates, which covered so many themes that it is impossible even to list them in a brief account.

Poet Alexander Surkov, in the main report on the state of Soviet literature and its tasks, spoke for three hours on the developments in Soviet literature since the First Congress. From the beginning, the reports and discussions were forthright, vigorous, critical, and revealed differences of opinion that the West usually considers non-existent in the Soviet Union. The area covered included every phase of literary activity. The co-reports included papers on Soviet fiction, by Konstantine Simonov, well-known in this country for his plays and his novel about Stalingrad, *Days and Nights*; Soviet drama, by the playwright Alexander Korneichuk; Soviet film drama, by S. Gerasimov; Soviet literature for children and young people, by Boris Polevoy; fundamental problems of Soviet literary criticism, by B. Ryurikov; translation of the literature of the peoples of the USSR, by P. Antokolsky, M. Auezov and M. Rylsky. There was a report by Nikolai Tikhonov on present-day progressive literature of the world.

These were the reports. There were also countless speeches as well, which discussed the reports and sought to hammer out a clear understanding of the responsibilities and aims of the Soviet writer.

Simonov's report on fiction, a 12,000-word treatise, while pulling no punches, was careful to show that, despite the weaknesses still apparent, Soviet literature was making an important contribution to the world's literary fund.

Criticism was directed at the tendency of some writers to "embellish" life, smooth it out, rosy it up, delineate characters in only black or white. And this had its origin in the "no-conflict" theory, whereby novels, plays and films depended upon the "struggle" between good and better, instead of seeking the true and basic conflicts of life. And this, in turn, sprang from the over-cautious policy of writers and critics to "play it safe," to avoid recognizing any negative aspect in Soviet life by charging that it would be "untypical."

Swinging away from this rosy-hued depiction of Soviet life, some writers were accused of stressing the gloom and shadows. Simonov termed this kind of writing "objectivism"—the detachment of the writer from life and his acceptance of the motto "to understand all is to forgive all." Among these writings Simonov included Ehrenburg's short novel *The Thaw*. While he noted that it contained many positive aspects, Simonov declared that this novel "produces most contradictory feelings and, in the long run, dissatisfaction." This he declared is a deviation from socialist realism which earlier in his report he defined as follows:

"In the literature of socialist realism, as in any other literature, the people in it argue, make mistakes, even commit crimes. While not closing its eyes to this, the literature of socialist realism passes unambiguous judgment upon it,

a just judgment from the point of view of the great interests of the people.

"The aesthetics of socialist realism does not demand softening the picture of life where life is stern and even merciless. It does demand that the goal should always be seen beyond the deed; beyond sacrifices, the cause for which they have been made; beyond temporary defeat, the prospect of final victory."

It is impossible, of course, to summarize the total exchanges that took place at the Congress. We are, therefore publishing the full text of the speech of Ilya Ehrenburg, whose writings are well known in this country, as an example of some of the problems discussed and the forthrightness with which the Congress approached its important and varied problems.

A. V.

Tasks of the Soviet Writer

Speech at the Congress

by ILYA EHRENBURG

I HAVE OFTEN heard readers argue heatedly over our books, not only in Moscow college student circles but in remote steppe settlements. Far beyond the borders of our country I have met people who have been inspired and influenced by a Soviet book. Our literature owes its birth and its significance to the people who are building the future on the foundations of justice and humanity.

Why has Western bourgeois literature become so arid today? Perhaps there is a lack of talent, or the writers are lazy? No, there are many gifted and productive authors, but the society in which they live does not inspire them. Some of the aspects of life have been ably described by the great writers of the past. Other aspects present such a picture of spiritual desolation that the authors timorously crawl into a hole which resembles, not an ivory tower, but a dark bomb shelter. J. B. Priestley

can hardly be suspected of heresy, and for this very reason I permit myself to cite his statement on the new English literature: "Even when these novels portray episodes in the life of society, it appears strange and distorted. This literature basically portrays not simply personal life but personal life that is deeply introverted and limited by the bedroom and the bar. . . . About thirty years ago there appeared a strange novel by Romer Wilson which created much interest. It was called *The Death of Society*. When reading the novels of the new writers one has the impression that this is already taking place."*

And we can add: Yes, the disintegration of bourgeois society is already taking place. And here lies the key to the sterility of those Western writers who have not broken away from the spiritually immove-

* This quotation is re-translated from the Russian.

ished world. Here is the clue to the world significance acquired by Soviet literature.

If we had gathered here to celebrate the twentieth anniversary of the First Congress of Soviet Writers I could conclude my statement right here. However, we have convened not only to total up the results. We should examine that which we have not yet accomplished, and think not of the books of the past but of the ones yet to be written.

We know that the tasks confronting the young Soviet literature were exceedingly difficult. Our predecessors portrayed a society which had already been formed and settled, while we spent decades on the scaffolds of construction, not only of cities but of people as well. Our way of life, our thoughts and our feelings underwent rapid change. We changed along with the people. Now we face not merely the excavation, but a completed and lived-in apartment house. New times demand a new creative upsurge.

Soviet writers have given their readers many good books. Why, then, do the readers become angry at times when they read some of the novels depicting Soviet reality? It seems to me that the reason is that in some of the books they find neither themselves nor their contemporaries.

One article, which in my opinion aroused too much attention in the press, set out to prove that the weakness of certain books lay in their authors' lack of sincerity. In the past certain reactionary critics affirmed that Nekrassov was not completely sincere, while no one at the time doubted the sincerity of Katkov. However, it was Nekrassov, and not Katkov, who told the truth about his epoch. We know certain

contemporary writers who quite sincerely write untruths, some because they do not sufficiently understand their contemporaries, others because in the complexity of the world they are accustomed to seeing only two colors, black and white. Such writers embellish their heroes externally and impoverish them spiritually. They do not spare guilt in depicting a communal apartment. In their book a factory shop appears like a spotless laboratory; factory clubs, like noblemen's manors. But this tinsel, artificial world is inhabited by bloodless people, waxen goody-goody boys who are utterly unlike the Soviet people with their complex, deep, inner life.

A developing society which is becoming ever stronger has nothing to fear from a truthful portrayal. Truth is a threat only to the doomed.

There is no divergence in our literature between truthfulness and Party spirit. We know that great art has always been tendentious, that is, impassioned. A writer is not a mere observer of life, but its creator. By describing a man's spiritual world, he changes it. However, we should not simplify what it means to influence the reader: Do this, and don't do that. If you emulate the behavior of the positive hero, everyone will admire you. But if you follow the path of the negative character, you will inevitably be exposed. The Union of Soviet Writers has a commission on children's literature which has given our children a great many good books. So, at times, while reading a new novel where, from the first page the author assails the reader with a dull sermon, the thought occurs, isn't it time to set up in the Writer's Union a commission on literature for adults?

In the first ten or fifteen years

after the October Revolution there were many people who did not want to or could not understand the principles of socialist society. There were also open enemies and people marking-time, waiting to see how it would come out. There were sceptics and those who were indifferent. The fight was on for the very recognition of the new system. At that time society was divided not only into the advanced and the backward, but also into those who were for us and those who were against us. Much has changed since then. Generations have grown for whom our society is their very own, the only conceivable one. Heroism, creative aspirations and love for people, in their fight to displace egoism, indifference and stagnation, can now be found in the consciousness and hearts of many people. And it is precisely there that the new is struggling with the shadows of the past, that good fights evil. Certainly it is possible to set up two opposing poles and in a romantic work describe a hero as one symbolizing everything good and counterpose him to a complete villain. Such a book, if written in a truthful and impassioned manner, will undoubtedly appeal to the reader, especially to the young ones. But, it seems to me, that along with such a book there should be others depicting not the poles but the whole tremendous world, books which reflect the feelings and thoughts of the millions of Soviet people.

Soviet readers are tired of the dozens of books in which, from the first page, it is clear that the villain is awaiting his exposure and the heroic worker is painted with the brush of a mediocre ikon painter. Such books educate no one. A person with shortcomings never recognizes himself in the villain. And good peo-

ple, but with many human frailties, will look upon the positive hero as a creature from another world.

Writers who divide the characters in a novel into mandatory categories of positive and negative are themselves the negative phenomena in our literature, they still carry many remnants of the past.

Certainly by now everyone acknowledges that it is not possible to paint a picture with only white lead and soot. But should a writer depict a good person with certain shortcomings, immediately there pops up an indignant literary critic protesting "a slander on the Soviet people." Should another author show that a bureaucrat or a hack or a loafer are not villains, that they, too, have something that is human, the very same critic, or his friend, will protest "why so lenient toward negative characters?" Literary critics of this ilk are trying by every manner of means to uphold the simplified approach to characters, they are afraid lest literature should outstrip them.

But what has actually happened? The readers have outstripped many writers. Let us recall the days of the First Congress of Soviet Writers. At that time we saw tens of millions of new readers. These readers had taken a novel into their hands for the first time in their lives. They were experiencing a great deal for the first time. From the time of the Revolution to 1930 culture developed in breadth; it was necessary to communicate it to the people. At that time some of the writers could complain about a certain one-dimensional spiritual quality in the reader. Now the Soviet reader looks down upon them. He sees that the characters in the novel are too one-dimensional, too primi-

tive and spiritually poor as compared with himself or his friends.

The Soviet approach to the problem of individuality is diametrically opposed to the American. There they cultivate individualism, but suppress individuality. There a man is deformed by profession, by narrow specialization. We try to obtain a harmonious development of individuality. However, at times, our education outstrips emotional maturity. All of us have met people who are good workers, who can reason correctly but who in human terms fail to find the correct approach to wife, mother, children or friends. It is possible to say that we writers are partially responsible for this. At times we have paid more attention to the work bench than to the man working at it. We are called "engineers of the human soul." This imposes many obligations on us. Yet, at times you read a story or a novel wherein everything is in its place, the parts of the machines, the production conference, as though an engineer had written it. But where are the souls of the people?

Let us recall the days of the First Congress of Soviet Writers. At that time the socialist reconstruction of the village was still a matter under discussion. With tremendous effort the people were building those first giants of heavy industry which helped them to defend the homeland from invasion and which now, twenty years later, enable them to make life easier and more beautiful through an abundance of the things we need. In 1934, they still spoke abroad about "the Russian experiment"; and Hitler who had just come to power was devising plans, with the kind cooperation of his future enemies, to conquer Russia. Now the times have changed. There isn't

another state in the world possessing greater authority than ours. Our Congress is taking place at a time portentous for the future of Europe and the entire world: the peoples know that the outstretched hand of the mighty and peace-loving Soviet Union can save mankind from unprecedented disaster. We do not stand alone. Great China is with us. The People's Democracies are with us. All of progressive mankind is with us. In the last twenty years culture has become deeply rooted in our country, and now we are proud, not only of the number of our readers, but of their profound and passionate appreciation of creative literature. Previously this kind of reading was enjoyed by hundreds, perhaps thousands, of the elite. Now creative literature has actually become the domain of all the people, and all the people are watching the progress of our Congress. This imposes upon us a great responsibility. We must do everything possible to make our literature worthy of our great people.

I have already stated what, in my opinion, the writers should do with the characters in their works. Now I want to say what I think the writers should not do to the writers. One should neither extol nor slander the writers nor consider them a select caste. One should not whip them like schoolboys.

Why have there been some mediocre or even questionable books which have been protected from criticism? Why does the tone of some critical articles persist in resembling an indictment?

Criticism is the opposition of different opinions. The reader of today and tomorrow is the final judge. The opinion of readers often differs from that of critics. I have often encount-

ered this while attending readers' conferences.

I completely agree with Comrade Simonov when he regrets that frequently only certain of readers' letters are published while others are withheld. That's a fact. Many readers have sent me copies of their letters to the *Literaturnaya Gazeta* in which they objected to Comrade Simonov's article. These letters were not published, while many others expressing their agreement with the opinion of the Secretary of the Writers Union were published. I am gladdened to find out that Comrade Simonov condemns such practice.

I welcome an uncompromising struggle against alien ideology. But I think the critics must be extremely careful when judging the merits of a work permeated with Soviet ideology. We know how often even major writers were mistaken in their judgments. Goncharov called Turgenev a plagiarist. And Turgenev affirmed that Nekrassov's name was destined for oblivion. Hugo considered Stendhal a dull and illiterate graphomaniac. And Stendhal thought Hugo a rhymier of questionable quality.

But why this excursion into the far past? Let us recall the creative path of Mayakovsky which was under attack by so many of those who later praised him.

I might be accused of trying to break down an open door. Now everyone recognizes that critical evaluations cannot be final and unchallengeable. But this is theory. I hope that in the near future it will also be true in practice.

I would prefer not to touch upon the criticism of my last short novel which was contained in the report and the co-report, but this might be wrongly interpreted. I do not entertain any delusions. I know that in

The Thaw, as in my other books, there is much that is far from perfect and much that is incomplete. However, I reproach myself for entirely different matters than were chosen for criticism. If I am able to write a new book I'll attempt to make it a step forward from my last one, but not a step to the side. Galina Nikolayeva did not like Vera Panova's novel. There is nothing amazing in that, and it is quite possible to find a writer who didn't like Nikolayeva's novel. But both Nikolayeva and Panova are Soviet writers devoted to their country. Yet, some critics recently have applied the term objectivism in relation to Panova and to myself. Such accusations are hardly admissible. A great battle is under way for the future of our people and for the whole of mankind. The book is the heart of a writer, and it is impossible to separate the author from his work. Can we, while acknowledging the value of a writer's work, counterpose to it one book and declare that this single book negates everything that he has defended through his entire life? Can people in the ranks of battle, fighting for a common cause, be numbered among the indifferent observers of life?

Without participation in the construction of Soviet society, without passion and enthusiasm, the writer is doomed to inner sterility. Foreign ill-wishers reproach us for fanaticism or absence of creative individuality. They do not want to, or cannot understand that for us the policy of the Communist Party is the road to the flourishing of human values, to the triumph of humanism. And if we are fanatic in our devotion to the cause of our people then this in no way contradicts the precepts of our great predecessors—

Pushkin, Tolstoy, Chekhov, Gorky—to defend mankind.

We all agree on this, we only differ on our literary evaluations and on our approach to writing. Our selection of different heroes depends on the writer's character, his life's experience and literary style. Where is the literary code that establishes the rules for writing? Where are the scales, the test tubes which permit one to measure unerringly that this hero is typical while that one is not? Such points could and should be discussed. But the discussion of a book is not a trial, and the judgment of the Secretary of the Writers Union must not be taken as a sentence, with all the attendant consequences.

Arbitrary sentences are especially dangerous when beginning writers are concerned. The beginning writers are our tomorrow, our hope. We must do everything possible to help them surpass us, and for that we need to part with certain habits that unfortunately still persist. Only with a bitter smile can we imagine what would happen to Mayakovsky if in 1954 he had brought his first poems to Vorovsky Street.

Now, of course, Mayakovsky is invoked on every occasion. His name is invoked when it is necessary to condemn an objectionable author. Sermons by judges without moral authority and subjective evaluations which are carefully followed by magazine editors and book publishers are often interlarded with references to the traditions of Mayakovsky. For friends and contemporaries of Mayakovsky it is painful to hear this for they have not forgotten the difficulties of his creative life. Why in discussing the trends in our literature have I devoted so much time to the conditions in which we work? Because the fate of literature is indi-

visible from the fate of the writer. A writer once said "We shall help our friends ruthlessly." I think one should be ruthless with enemies, and not with friends. I want to summon all writers to a greater understanding of each other, to a greater comradesly solidarity. One of the leaders of the Union of Soviet Writers, speaking of the significance of "average" writers, has stated that without milk there would be no cream. By extending this somewhat unfortunate comparison, we may say that without cows there would be no milk. One should keep this in mind.

Never has literature occupied such an important and responsible place as in our country. The Soviet state and the Party have provided us with wonderful conditions. We are not at the mercy of commercial publishers and there are no McCarthys over us.

We Soviet writers must come to an agreement among ourselves on how we can work best. We must remember that the growth of our society during the past twenty years has progressed faster and more brilliantly than the growth of our literature. This is natural. The house is never built beginning with the roof. When a society matures, forms and comes into its own there appears a literature which completely expresses its morality, its aspirations and its passions. A writer is a person who possesses the gift of inner fire, clear vision and acute perception. This enables him to express the thoughts and feelings of his people. Our Soviet society is now at such a high level that we have a right to foresee an unprecedented flourishing of our literature.

Friends, the enemies of humanism, the enemies of progress, the enemies of the peoples are trying to stop the

PRIME MINISTER NEHRU'S PLEA FOR PEACE

IN A SPEECH before the Indian Parliament on March 31, Prime Minister Nehru condemned the Western "madhouse" policy of building up military alliances everywhere, and called for big power talks to avert world catastrophe.

Regarding SEATO, he said that it threatened the successes achieved at the Geneva Conference, that "the Manila Treaty and the Bangkok Conference have upset any idea of peace that previously existed" in Southeast Asia, and that such policies were "promoting discord and conflict" in Asia.

On *Military Pacts*: "It seems very extraordinary to lay great stress on all kinds of military alliances and pacts in Southeast Asia, in Western Asia and elsewhere in the name of security and peace."

On the *Asian-African Conference* at Bandung, he said its great significance was in marking a change from the previous situation in which "decisions are made affecting Asia in which Asia has little say."

On the *Formosa Situation*, he said India's approach flowed from its recognition of the Peking Government, that Quemoy and Matsu islands were part of the mainland and "will go to the mainland of China by logic and by reason unless

you have great wars and nobody knows the consequences of those wars."

On the *Middle East*, the Prime Minister attacked military alliances such as the Turkey-Iraq pact, resulting in "the breaking up of the Arab League which has brought the Arab countries together for cooperative effort" and splitting the Middle East into hostile camps.

On *Dominion of South Africa*—"This racialism will become more dangerous than any other of the world's problems today."

On *Europe*, he said he could not reconcile the West's action in rearming the Bonn Government on one side and disarmament talks on the other, deplored insistence on building up positions of strength, and suggested high power negotiations "at the earliest possible time."

On *Atom and Hydrogen Bombs*, he said violence could not be diminished by 'forces of violence; the time had come for their control by moral or spiritual standards.

On *Coexistence* he said India's five principles—already agreed on with China and other nations—and including the principles of non-aggression and non-interference provided a firm basis for agreement.

march of time. They threaten to drown our future in blood. With all our strength we will defend peace. But if the maniacs will dare to encroach upon the hope of all mankind, they will encounter a people that is strong not only in its army

and advanced industry, but a people with a great heart and a great literature.

—Translated from
Literaturnaya Gazeta,
December 20, 1954

PEKING'S THEATERS

by ELSIE FAIRFAX-CHOLMELEY

I HAVE lived in New York off and on for fifteen years, but with the exception of the Rockefeller City Music Hall, which was still quite a novelty when I first came, I never remember going to a newly-built theater (I am not speaking of movie houses). On the contrary, I remember theaters closed for long periods.

My experience in Peking has been very different. During the three years I have been here, five indoor and two outdoor theaters have been built, with a total seating capacity of 10,700. The total indoor theater-seating capacity, I found on inquiry, is now some 37,800. Full houses are the rule, not the exception. In 1953 alone 5,600,000 people saw plays on the stage! This averages two visits to the theater for every man, woman and child in the city.

Largest of the newly built playhouses, with 1,700 seats, is the Peace Theater in the Tienchiao district in the southern part of the city, noted of old for its folk carnivals. Here, in the midst of former slums, the visit-

ing Stanislavsky Musical Theater of Moscow gave a superb two-month-long series of opera and ballet performances to packed houses last fall. The Peace Theater has a large orchestra pit, modern stage machinery and private dressing rooms with showers for each actor. It is thoroughly up-to-date in design, and the best in the city, with good acoustics and a perfect view from every seat.

At the time of writing, the Youth Theater, one of the first to be opened after liberation, is once more in scaffolding. It will soon reopen, greatly enlarged and modernized. It is situated on Tung An Chieh, Peking's main east-west thoroughfare. Here I saw Kuo Mo-jo's drama of China's patriot poet, Chu Yuan, and an opera on the Long March of the Chinese Red Army, as well as musicians and dancers from India and Indonesia and a Korean choral and dance ensemble. American representatives at the Asian and Pacific Peace Conference in 1952 will remember the breath-taking performance the Chinese national acrobatic troupe put on here for delegations of many countries. Also held here at various times were China's commemorations of the great world cultural figures, Leonardo da Vinci, Victor Hugo, Henry Field-

(Continued on page 26)

ELSIE FAIRFAX-CHOLMELEY during the Sino-Japanese war was a correspondent of the London "Daily Telegraph." She spent some time in the U.S. and now lives and works in Peking.



A common scene throughout the countryside. Members of an agricultural cooperative receiving goods bought especially for the Spring Festival.

This is a time to spruce up. Brothers hang pictures on the walls and sisters see that they look their prettiest.



CHINA GRE THE PRI

The Spring Festival, or
oldest and most fest
holidays in China begin
new lunar year and lasts
15 days. This is a time
visiting and then going
course, it means new clo
and the decorating o

A GREET'S E SPRING

Festival, one of the
most traditional
China begins with the
year and lasts for some
time of parties,
the r-going, and, of
eans new clothes, gifts,
decorating of homes.



Of course she wants to look her best. Mou Hsiufen is making herself up to take part in the spring celebrations of her agricultural cooperative.

The big flower fair in Canton is traditional during the Spring Festival. Street of flowers extends several miles.



(Continued from page 23)
ing, Aristophanes, Gogol, Chekhov, Jose Marti and others.

In a residential area in the north of the city, the attractive Experimental Theater has been built. Seating over 1,000, it was originally intended for dramatic students only, but because this district has no other theater, it is now used for public performances as well. The current production there is a six-act play on the Long March (different from the opera and an undoubted advance in the treatment of this tremendous theme). It was written by a former participant in that epic campaign, and is being performed by present-day soldiers of the People's Army.

The armed forces, by the way, have constructed a theater of their own. It is the home base of the People's Liberation Army Cultural Song and Dance Ensemble which has just been touring various countries of Europe. Beautifully situated on Hou Hai, the most northern of Peking's big lakes, it has witnessed performances by the Bulgarian and other visiting army cultural groups.

The two new open-air theaters have 7,000 seats between them. One is in the center of the city in Sun Yat-sen Park where performances of the immensely popular Peking opera are given every Saturday night throughout the summer. The other is outside the city wall, in an amphitheater attached to the palatial buildings put up for the Soviet Industrial Exhibition.

In the western outskirts is Peking's first municipal theater for the workers and miners of the suburbs. It serves the Shihching-shan steel mill and power station, and the Mentoukou collieries. Companies that perform in the large theaters in the center of the city come here on tour, so

workers and their families have a chance to see first-class performances without making the long, tiring trip into town.

Now a word about management. Of the 36 theaters in Peking, one-third are owned by the national and municipal governments and the rest are private. Generally speaking, the nationally-owned theaters get the newly written scripts, chosen by the various cultural organizations. The Peking Theater, an old building which has been completely remodeled, specializes in such plays and some memorable performances have been given here—the latest being Tsao Yu's *Bright Sky*, which deals with a noted scientist and how he came to work whole-heartedly with the People's Government. It has also put on very popular revivals of plays of democratic protest first produced under the Kuomintang.

The municipally-owned theaters specialize in various styles of traditional Chinese drama which are very popular. Private theaters choose their own plays, new or old.

Though there is no censorship, obscene, obscurantist and reactionary plays have virtually disappeared. Why? Because since liberation, the 2,800 professional actors and actresses in Peking have organized themselves. Looked down on in former days, they now enjoy a place of honor in society (some are delegates to the local and national People's Congresses). No company can be found nowadays to perform scripts which actors consider derogatory to their calling or to the dignity of Chinese dramatic art. The public, too, no longer responds to inferior plays, which are quite likely to lose money for their producers.

A good play, on the other hand, is a guaranteed sell-out. In fact, the

main problem the theater world faces is to get more good scripts. A responsible member of the Cultural Division of the Peking Municipal Government said recently that the extent of the plan for building new theaters depends on their availability. So the problem is the opposite of that in the West. Instead of the playwright thinking, "Can I get my play on the stage?" he can safely assume, "If there are good plays, theaters will be provided."

Likewise the problem for the public is not, "Can I afford to go to the theater once more this month?" but "How can I get a ticket before the run ends?" Prices are very cheap, ranging from the equivalent of ten cents to one dollar in U.S. currency. Persons working in factories or offices generally get them through their trade unions which buy whole blocks of seats. To buy a ticket individually involves standing in a queue, and no more than two can generally be obtained in this way. Tickets can be got only at the box-office and scalping is illegal.

All theaters finance themselves by their own receipts. No theater is subsidized, but the government gives loans for modernization. With such aid, many of the old private houses, formerly badly ventilated and drab, have become pleasant, modern places of entertainment. Old theaters which had no footlights have now acquired them.

What about the most popular

plays? Top box office appeal in Peking in the last couple of years belongs to a light comedy about marriage called *Between Husband and Wife*, which had a total audience of 180,000 people. *Dragon Beard Ditch* by Lau Shaw, which tells of the cleaning up of one of the worst workers' living areas in Peking, was seen by 99,000 people. Translated plays which have drawn large audiences include: *No Other Way to Live*, about life in the German Democratic Republic; the Soviet play, *Dawn Over Moscow*; Chekhov's *Uncle Van-ya*; and the Czech play, *Julius Fucik*. A play about the Rosenbergs by a Polish dramatist has been translated for production.

Why does the government concern itself with building theaters? Because it is its duty under the Constitution, which guarantees the right to cultural recreation for all Chinese citizens. So, apart from new theaters already provided, a Peking People's Theater, with a seating capacity of 2,000, is being built by the municipal administration. To be opened by May 1 this year, it will be equipped with a revolving stage on which 400 people can perform, modern stage machinery, dressing rooms for more than 200 players, a ballroom and landscaped grounds. There is also to be a National Theater, still larger and suitable for the presentation of the most elaborate operas and ballets, which will be completed by the end of the Five-Year Plan in 1957.

OPERA FOR INNER MONGOLIAN HERDSMEN

HERDSMEN in far off Inner Mongolia are now able to listen to domestic and international news and opera and other musical programs. The People's Government of China has established 47 radio stations to broadcast programs so that the herdsmen can be in touch with world events and with the cultural life of their country.

Trust in Trusteeship?

by ESLANDA ROBESON

THERE are eleven Trust Territories with 20 million inhabitants now being administered by the United Nations under the trusteeship system, through six member states who are called the administering authorities.

The difference between ruling a territory outside the United Nations, and administering it under the trusteeship system, is the recognized moral responsibility under the latter to make the primary consideration the *interests of the people of the territory* and not the interests of the administrator, when and if these interests should clash.

Chapter XI of the UN Charter states:

... Members of the United Nations which have, or assume, responsibilities for the administration of territories whose people have not yet attained a full measure of self-government, recognize that the interests of the inhabitants of these territories are paramount, and accept as a sacred trust the obligation to promote the well-being of the inhabitants. ...

a) to ensure, with due respect for the cultures of the peoples concerned, their political, economic, social and educational advancement, their just treatment, and their protection against abuses;

b) to develop self government, to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples, and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions. ...

The eleven Trust Territories of the United Nations lie deep in the colonial world. Their administering authorities are all colonial powers, with long histories and experience in colonialism. None of these administering powers has so far voluntarily set free any colony under their control. Those former colonies which are now free, owe their freedom to long-range, persistent, organized resistance by their people against colonialism, or to the emergencies or circumstances created by the two recent world wars.

It is not surprising, therefore, that in the more than eight years of the trusteeship system, no colonial power in the United Nations has let go a single Trust Territory under its administration. No United Nations colonial power has so far brought the people of any Trust Territory to self-government of independence.

The only Trust Territories which have achieved independence under United Nations supervision are Libya

and Palestine. The only Trust Territory for which a target date (1960) for independence has been set is Somaliland. None of these territories was under the trusteeship system. Both Libya and Somaliland were administered by Italy, a non-member of the United Nations, and the nation with the shortest history and least experience in colonialism.

The colonial administering powers in the Trusteeship Council not only have not brought the people in their Trust Territories to self-government; they refuse steadfastly and openly to even set a target date—however remote — for the achievement of their independence.

The target date, the time table principle, was one of the most controversial issues of the 15th session of the Trusteeship Council (January 25 to March 28). The representatives of the member nations discussed this matter particularly in relation to the Trust Territories of Tanganyika under British administration, and Ruanda-Urundi under Belgian administration. The delegates of Britain, Belgium, France, Australia, New Zealand and the United States, the members of the Trusteeship Council which are administering authorities, all rejected the target date suggestion. The representatives of all the non-administering-members of the Council—El Salvador, Haiti, India, Syria, the Soviet Union and China (Formosa) — expressed the view that since the objective clearly laid down for the trusteeship system by the Charter is the attainment of self-government or independence, it would be encouraging to the peoples of the Trust Territories to set a definite target date.

But, "no, No, NO!" said the colonial powers. And the "No" triumphed.

It is such decisions which have provoked people to call the Trusteeship Council a "colonial club." The Council consists of 12 members, 6 administering and 6 non-administering powers. Because the administering powers usually vote solidly, they can block a major decision even if the opposition is equally organized, because a tie vote cannot carry a decision. Frequently important resolutions are adopted by the Council when the non-administering powers so word their proposals that the colonial powers hesitate, or are ashamed to go on record as opposing certain reasonable measures; they then abstain in the voting, and the motion is carried.

There is much food for thought in the stream of petitions which come to the Trusteeship Council every year from the inhabitants of the Trust Territories. Since January 11th of this year, the Standing Committee on Petitions, through which the petitions are channelled, has dealt with 236, and has referred 110 to the next session. Some of these petitions disclose the brow-beating tactics pursued by the administrations in trying to suppress the steadily growing movements for independence.

The protests and complaints are too frequent and come from too many organized parties to be discounted, and they are sometimes confirmed in the reports of the United Nations Visiting Missions which regularly tour the Trust Territories.

It is my very strong conviction that, even with the best intentions, a colonial power can not or will not prepare a people under its domination for freedom, unless it is regularly checked and prodded and challenged.

In assessing the challenge which

the trust peoples now place before the United Nations, it must be pointed out that the majority of the member states of the United Nations and their people support their aspirations for self-government and independence. The behavior of the colonial powers—their timidity in advancing independence on the one hand, and their arrogance in trying to suppress it on the other—is recognized as both a moral and legal violation of the Charter. It is not the United Nations, nor even the trusteeship system which is on trial;

it is the colonial powers who stand before the bar of world opinion.

The colonial powers must be helped to face the inevitable: that the hundreds of millions of non-self-governing peoples in the world *are going to achieve independence in the foreseeable future*, with or without the help of the United Nations and the Trusteeship Council. Many of us believe that they can and will be helped by the United Nations, and hope the Trusteeship Council will justify this faith, so that the peoples of the world may put their trust in trusteeship.

KENNAN ON US POLICIES TOWARD USSR

SHARP QUESTIONS regarding U.S. policies in relation to the Soviet Union were raised, in a letter published in the *New York Times* of March 6, by George F. Kennan, U.S. Ambassador to the USSR in 1952, now a member of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton.

Mr. Kennan first comments on the matter of refusing further residence in this country to the Metropolitan Boris of the Russian Orthodox Church as the cause of the retaliatory measure taken by the Soviet Union in requesting the departure of the Reverend Georges Bissonette, an American Roman Catholic priest stationed in Moscow. He asks whether this action was a responsible decision, or whether

... this was one more instance of governmental confusion—and particularly of governmental policy being needlessly distorted by persons responsible only for internal security considerations and not conscious of the other aspects of national interests.

Mr. Kennan also takes sharp issue with the action of the postal authorities in preventing delivery of Soviet publications such as the Moscow *Pravda* and *Izvestia* (the policy applies to a wide list of periodicals). Of this, too, he asked, whether it had been a responsible decision, or one taken without thought of wider issues involved.

Emphasizing the importance of Soviet newspapers as a source for authoritative knowledge of the Soviet Union, Mr. Kennan writes:

In conclusion I can only raise again the question I have raised on previous occasions: Are there really people in our Government who believe that our own political philosophy is so unconvincing, our attachment to it so weak, our youth so bewildered and gullible—and the outlook of our adversaries, on the other hand, so forceful, so logical and so persuasive—that we must shield our people physically from every confrontation with Communist thought?

In a Polish Cotton Mill

by EULA MENDES-FIGUEIREDO

PRE-WAR PIOTRKOW was known as a town of pensioners and unemployed, but none the less it was not spared by the fascist invaders. Most of its workers and poor farmers were sent to concentration and death camps. The one textile mill was stripped of all its machinery. Today, however, Piotrkow is a thriving town with a population of 45,000. The changes there are changes taking place all over new Poland.

Poland, ten years ago was in ruins. The Nazi occupation and war left its people in poor health, its industry practically destroyed, and its farms in poor condition. Piotrkow, like other Polish towns and cities, had, and still has, many difficulties and hardships to overcome. It is therefore remarkable to see the progress that has been made, and what can be expected in the near future. A recent visit brought out these things very sharply, and I contrasted the conditions of textile workers here

with those in New England cotton mills, with whom I worked and lived for many years.

After a night's rest in a central hotel, a bus from the mill picked us up and in about 10 minutes we were at the Marceli Nowotko Cotton Textile Combine (or Piotrkow mills for short). It consists of two spinning mills, two warehouses, an electric power station, a machine repair shop, a fire department, dining room and recreational hall, administration and other buildings. Nearby is the health center and the housing project with its various buildings. A few miles away is a farm that belongs to the workers.

The two mills are quite different in construction. The "old" mill, built in the early 1900's is a five-story building, and as I have said, the fascists had taken away all the machinery. With tremendous help from the Soviet Union, the Polish people completely renovated the building, turning it into a modern cotton spinning mill, with dust-suction, air-conditioning and humidity control systems installed throughout. Machinery was imported from England.

In addition a completely new spinning mill was built, based on Soviet plans and with the help of Soviet engineers and technicians. This is

EULA MENDES-FIGUEIREDO is an experienced textile worker who for many years worked in the New Bedford mills in New England. She was a charter member of the ILGWU, and later worked as an organizer for the CIO. She is now living in Poland.

one of the many mills and factories built during the present Six-Year Plan, and began production of fine cotton yarn in January, 1952. The one-story building is constructed so as to allow as much natural light as possible. The dust-collecting, air-conditioning and humidity control systems are built-in. Machinery for this mill was imported from the Soviet Union.

The two Piotrkow mills produce 8 per cent of Poland's cotton yarn. Plans are now under way for the construction of a weaving mill here in 1956, which will eliminate the cost of transporting yarn to be woven elsewhere.

In both mills I was impressed by the lack of cotton dust flying around. I was amazed that even in the picking and card rooms there was hardly any dust. And in all departments there was comfortable temperature, plenty of good light, clean floors.

The majority of the 2,400 workers are women. Most come from Piotrkow or surrounding farm villages and had never worked in factories before. Many were trained in Lodz, the Polish textile center, and came to Piotrkow as skilled workers and instructors.

The workers in the various departments told us of their working and living conditions, their wages and plans for the future.

There is no speed-up or excessive work-load here. For example: the spinners on coarse yarn run from 2 to 6 sides, and on finer yarn up to 8 and sometimes 10 sides, depending on the yarn, the job, and the skill of the worker. The workers don't look a bit harassed or under tension. I noticed seats at the various machines and saw many workers sitting. Most workers have helpers who are training to become skilled workers. There

are also of course the regular doffers and cleaners. There are special training courses for new workers lasting from 16 weeks to 5 months. They are paid while learning.

Wages vary according to the skill, job and production levels agreed upon by the union. All workers, regardless of sex or age, get equal pay for equal work. Workers on the night shift get 10 per cent extra, and of course all get paid vacations, holidays and sick-leave. Workers also get paid when machines are stopped for changing, fixing or waiting for work. Poland has to import her raw cotton, and sometimes there is a shortage; 80 per cent of the cotton for the Piotrkow mills comes from the Soviet Union and 20 per cent from Egypt.

Knowing that in American textile mills each new machine or technique means lay-offs, speed-up and heavier work loads, I asked how Piotrkow workers felt about new machines and improved methods of work and what happens to replaced workers. What a difference! Here the workers actually welcome and want new machines and new methods. Here the machines serve the workers by making work easier, and the greater production helps meet the needs of the country. There is no fear of unemployment in People's Poland as the right to work is guaranteed by the Constitution and backed up by the development of the country. New mills, built throughout the country, need skilled workers.

The trade union in the mills interested me very much because in America I had worked in the labor movement for many years to help organize textile and other workers. In the U.S. we were in a constant struggle with the mill owners who wanted to squeeze every ounce of energy

from the workers into huge profits for themselves. In People's Poland there are no private owners, therefore the union does not have the problem of constantly fighting bosses or mill owners. The textile mills here, like all industry, belong to the people. Profits are used for further improvement in working conditions, for expansion of the mills, for housing, for health and safety protection, for education, sport and cultural activities—in short, for the benefit of the people.

The union, through representatives elected by the workers, checks on working conditions, wages, protection and safety. It checks on housing, vacations and health. Its job is to help make life easier for the workers. The union sees about education, entertainment and sports for its members. It helps in the administration of the mill and takes up all complaints and grievances. The shop stewards have close contact with the trade union council and report on problems regularly. If workers feel their specific grievance is not taken care of, they raise it at department, shop or local meetings and can appeal to higher bodies if necessary.

All new workers are given special training to learn the safety rules and how to avoid accidents. Conspicuous posters illustrate the best ways to do a job. There are special safety committees who keep constant watch that safety rules are observed.

The fire department on the premises is well equipped, and there is a fire fighting crew always on duty.

Protective and work clothes, such as smocks, overalls, kerchiefs and caps, are given to the workers free of charge and washed at the mill's expense. Air masks are also provided on some jobs, such as cleaning un-

der machines. Most of the workers get a liter (little over a quart) of milk daily at work, free of charge. There are shower rooms at their disposal.

Health protection is an important part of working conditions in all enterprises in People's Poland. At the Piotrkow mills, in addition to the emergency first aid rooms, there is the well equipped health center which keeps a strict check on the health of all workers. Regular yearly examinations are given and special treatment when necessary. Workers are sent to the hospital if required and to sanatoriums or convalescing homes. They receive paid sick leave. Up to three months, they are paid by the mill, after that, by the National Social Insurance Fund. And, of course, the worker is guaranteed work upon recovery.

The health center has two regular doctors and five nurses on duty at a time, and dentists working on two shifts. When needed, specialists are called in. All examinations and treatment at the health center or hospital are free—paid by the National Health Fund to which the mill contributes.

Pregnant women go to the health center for regular check-up and are given lighter jobs at no reduction in pay. They are given three months maternity leave with full pay.

Vacations for textile workers are on the following basis: After one year of work, 12 days vacation; after three years, 15 days; after 10 years or more, 30 days. Time is counted from when a worker first began, including time worked in capitalist Poland.

All places of work have to arrange for suitable living places for the workers. Due to the destruction by the Nazis and the generally inade-

quate housing conditions that New Poland inherited, there is still a housing shortage, despite the tremendous construction going on. Meanwhile, every available housing space is used, including old buildings—some even lacking modern facilities. Housing projects are constructed along with industrial plants. In Piotrkow, a housing project is being built not far from the mill. Of the 17 big apartment buildings, four had already been finished and work on a number of others was pretty much advanced when we were there. Families with children have first preference. Rent, gas, electricity and other utilities amount to about 10 per cent of the wage.

A large workers' hotel was among the first building constructed in the housing project. Young people who come from outside of Piotrkow and some couples or families waiting their turn for an apartment reside here. We saw many of the facilities to make life interesting for the hotel residents who live in big, light, clean, airy rooms, tastefully furnished. There is a recreation hall (in addition to the big recreation hall on the mill grounds) and various sports facilities. Workers who live here eat their main meal in the mill dining room and get their other meals and snacks either at the hotel dining room or prepare them in their rooms.

The nursery takes youngsters up to 3 years old. The kindergarten takes the 3- to 7-year-olds. Both are lovely buildings with big windows bringing in light and sunshine. Plenty of space around for gardens, play yards, swings, and so on. There are the various rooms for playing, sleeping, eating and, of course, lots of toys. Every day each child gets an examination, four meals, and

suitable clean clothing. In winter they get regular sun-lamp rays. Nursing mothers come from the mill twice daily to nurse their babies. All care is taken to insure the best possible sanitary conditions and a restful atmosphere.

We went to their 320-acre farm, located a few miles outside of Piotrkow. The bulk of the meat, vegetables and milk for the mill, hotel, nursery and kindergarten is supplied by the farm. It also provides a good deal of meat, sausages and vegetables for sale to the workers at reduced prices.

Part of the big recreation hall is used for the general dining room. A big spacious kitchen prepares good nourishing meals daily which the workers can buy at a very low price. There is also a canteen and provision store.

The union representative told us of various handicraft and repair shops where the workers can get things done at 25 per cent discount. This year they plan to open a barber shop and beauty parlor for the mill workers.

Education, sports and culture play a very important part in the life of all workers in Poland and this is true also in Piotrkow. In addition to the regular training course for new workers, there are various other courses for other trades, such as for electricians, or special courses for university and college entrance examinations. Evening classes are given for those who did not get previous schooling or those who want to finish their elementary education. A library and a book store are situated right in the mill.

Various sports teams are organized, such as fencing, ping pong and volley ball, and hiking, swimming, skiing, bike riding are also popular.

The mill workers have a song and dance ensemble of 70, a theater group of 25, an orchestra, chorus, and other cultural groups. These groups perform not only at the mill or in Piotrkow, but also in other cities and towns and they compete with other groups.

In addition, various professional theater, ballet, opera and other groups from Lodz, Warsaw and other cities bring their art to the workers

in the mill and the people of Piotrkow. The union also organizes excursions to many places both to nearby spots as well as to places throughout the country.

What has been accomplished in Piotrkow mirrors similar achievements throughout People's Poland. In an atmosphere of peace, much more can be done. This is why the Polish Government and the people so deeply desire peace.

The German Manifesto

Millions of people in West Germany continue to support the German Manifesto proclaimed at a great meeting of protest against German rearmament in Frankfurt on January 29th, by leading Social Democrats, officials of the West German Trade Union Federation, and prominent churchmen. The full text of the Manifesto against rearmament follows:

"On the basis of our earnest concern for the reunification of Germany we are convinced that the hour has now come to call solemnly upon the people and the Government to oppose decisively the growing tendency towards a final splitting of our nation.

"The answer to the German fateful question of the hour—whether our nation should be reunited in peace and freedom, or whether it must live in unnatural state of partitioning and progressive human 'growing apart'—depends today mainly on the decision on the Paris Agreements.

"The establishment of German armed forces in the Federal Republic and the Soviet Zone must extinguish for an indefinite period the chances of reunification, and must increase the tension between East and West. Such measures would intensify to an unbearable de-

gree the conflict of conscience of a great part of our people.

"The frightful fate would be realized that brothers from one family would face each other in different armies with weapons in their hands.

"At this hour every voice which is free to be raised must make itself heard in a great shout of warning.

"Immeasurable responsibility would be borne by those who do not see the great danger that the ratification of the Paris Agreements would slam the door to Four Power negotiations on the restoration of the unity of Germany in freedom.

"We appeal to the West German Federal Parliament and Federal Government to do everything possible to see to it that the Four Occupation Powers take account of the desire of our nation for unity.

"Agreement on a Four Power agreement on unification must take precedence over the formation of military blocs. The conditions can and must be found which are acceptable for Germany and her neighbors to secure, through the reunification of Germany, the peaceful coexistence of the nations of Europe.

"The German people have a right to reunification!"

Linking the Soviet Seas

by **NIKOLAI MIKHAILOV**

RIVER transportation isn't very fast, but it's cheap and capacious and therefore very important, especially in the Soviet Union, where there are more rivers than anywhere else and bulky freights have to be transported long distances.

The total length of river shipping in the USSR is nearly the same as that of railways, but though the latter can be built anywhere, the direction of rivers has been predetermined by nature. Nature therefore must be corrected.

The Moscow River gave the capital of the Soviet Union its name, but when the city had grown large the river could not supply it with sufficient water. Moscow stood on the banks of a shallow river. In just one month of spring three-quarters of the river's annual discharge was lost, and in the summer it barely flowed. Half the river's water was consumed by industry.

Two important riverways skirt Moscow: the Volga on the north, and the Oka, in which the Moscow River falls, on the south. Only small ships could reach the city passing through the old locks on the shallow river. Moscow River port handled a fraction of the freight handled by the Mos-

cow railway junction. From the Volga to Moscow bulky freight—timber and building stone—went by train instead of by cheap water route.

This has now been eliminated. In 1937, a canal was built to join the Volga River with the Moscow River. It is called the Moscow Canal.

The dam on the Upper Volga at Ivankovo raised the river 55 feet, forming the "Moscow Sea."

The canal, nearly 80 miles long, intersected the gently sloping highland between the Moscow River and the Upper Volga. Electricity made the water flow up, not down; five automatic stations using screw pumps drive the water to the divide. During navigation the stream is equivalent to approximately three times what the Moscow River used to be in summer.

To raise the level of the Volga water by 124 feet much power is required. Some of it, however, is returned, for while flowing down towards Moscow, the water turns the turbines of hydroelectric stations.

The load on the Moscow electrical network is not uniform; no system is. Cities, villages and industrial enterprises need more electricity evenings, and less in the day and at night.

The hydroelectric stations erected on the canal produce electricity for the network during the evening peak hours, when the maximum is required. The pumps raising the water in the canal work at a different time—they receive current from the network during the period when the minimum amount is required, when the network has a surplus. In this way the canal straightens out the curve of Moscow's power supply.

After the dam was constructed, the level of the Moscow River at the Kremlin rose nearly ten feet. Now the deep river accommodates ferries, motorships, refrigerator ships and self-propelled barges. Triple-deck ships sail from the capital of the USSR to the Volga and along the Volga to the Caspian Sea. Moscow has become connected by a deep waterway with the country's main riverway.

In addition, the canal also supplies Moscow with water for drinking and other purposes. After standing for 100 days in a forest reservoir, half the water taken from the Volga goes into the Moscow reservoir, which no longer experiences any shortage.

A DEEP waterway has also been constructed from the middle of the USSR to the Far North.

Lying between the White and Baltic Seas is a rocky divide of ancient granite chipped by a glacier and overgrown with coniferous woods. On one side of the divide are the USSR's agricultural areas and on the other, the Khibini Mountains with rich deposits of raw material for fertilizer. On one side are the cities and factories, on the other, supplies of timber and stone.

Only one means of transportation formerly crossed the divide—an overburdened railway. A water route,

THE AUTHOR

Nikolai Mikhailov is a prominent Soviet geographer and writer. He is a member of the editorial board of the magazine *Soviet Union*, and his books have been published throughout Europe and in our country. Among his books published in the United States are *Land of the Soviets*, *The Russian Story*, *Soviet Russia*, and *The Sixteen Republics of the USSR*. This is the third article of a series.

cheaper and capable of carrying vast loads, skirted Scandinavia by sea, but it was more than 3,000 miles long. But a waterway could lie straight across the divide and be many times shorter!

In 1933, the Stalin White Sea-Baltic Canal was built. A belt of water 140 miles long went over the divide at a height of 354 feet. It joined the Sorokskaya inlet of the White Sea with the Povenets inlet of Lake Onega; Lake Onega had already been connected with the Baltic Sea. The Scandinavian peninsula became an "island."

The whole map of the northeastern part of the Soviet Karelo-Finnish Republic has been made over. Old river beds have dried up and new ones have been created. The Povenetska River has disappeared. Lake Vyg, raised 20 feet in height, covered scores of islands. Dams are supporting reservoirs almost equal in area to Lake Sevan in the Transcaucasus. (Lake Sevan, nearly two and a half times the area of Lake Geneva, is 545 square miles.) Villages have been removed to a new shore. The rail-

way line has been moved back. In the canal area timber is sawn and processed, paper is made, minerals extracted, stock raised and vegetables grown. New industrial cities have appeared: Byelomorsk, Segezha, Povenets and Medvezhyegorsk.

During the war the front crossed the southern part of the canal. Structures were destroyed. When dam No. 20 was blown up the stream of water gushed down to Lake Onega, destroying all barriers on its way. It dug a new bed, in some places as much as 45 feet deep.

By 1946, however, the canal was rebuilt, in time for navigation for the first postwar summer.

IN 1952, the old dream of the Russian people came true—the Volga and the Don were joined by a canal.

Until then, the Volga, which falls into the inland Caspian Sea, had no outlet to the Black Sea, and therefore no way to the ocean. The country's main river highway ended in a blind alley.

In geological antiquity the Caspian and the Black seas together formed a part of a basin which washed a hard chunk of Russian tableland. Then the Manich depression, which had lain under the water, came to the surface and separated the Caspian Sea, converting it into a lake. The Caspian was already shut in when people first appeared on the Volga.

Until recently the Volga, highway for many cargoes, in its course southward never reached the most important southern industrial center of the USSR, the Donets coal basin, which was off side. In the lower reaches, the timber floated down from the north, was taken out of the water, put on railway flatcars and carried across land to prop up the Donets mines.

The Volga area needs the Donets coal basin. Only a short time ago, coal had to be hauled 300 miles by freight car and then dumped into barges before it could be moved along the river.

It seemed as though the Volga itself tried to meet the people's desire half-way. From the Zhiguli Mountains it continues westward, in the direction of the Donets basin. It seemed almost ready to break through to the Azov Sea, which is connected by a strait with the Black Sea. But the hilly Yergenei ridge intersects the Volga, and, breaking into a sharp bend, the river recoils again to the east, to become lost in the closed, disjoined Caspian Sea. At the bend where the Volga passes closest to the Donets basin, a city has grown up, and here freight was transferred from water to land. The city was called Tsaritsyn, and in Soviet years was renamed Stalingrad.

Just where the Volga bends westward, another river approaches it. This is the Don which flows to the Donets coal basin and then falls into the Azov Sea. The two river bends are only 31 miles apart.

This narrow neck, waterless and treeless, and covered by wisps of dry grass, had long been used by people to go from the Don to the Volga, from the Black Sea to the Caspian. Over the ages this narrow strip of land had been trampled by millions of feet, and rutted by countless wagon wheels.

But now the land has been cut through. Over the high hump of the Yergenei there has now been thrown a stream of water, the Volga has been connected with the Don, and the Caspian Sea has been artificially made a limb of the ocean.

The water of one river could not be let into the bed of the other by

gravity, for the land between the Don and the Volga is high. The canal was not dug through the ridge; rather it was thrown across it—ships go up to the divide and down the other side over a staircase of locks. At the top, water had to be pumped into the bed of the canal. Three stations pump this water from the Don. Water from the Don is used because this river flows higher than the Volga. Besides, the Don has been raised, its waters being held up by the dam of the Tsimlyanskaya hydroelectric station.

A riverboat entering the canal from the Volga, at the southern end of Stalingrad, goes up nine locks on a steep incline, and rises 288 feet. Thus it climbs the divide, the backbone of the Yergenei. Then it sails in the artificial bed, passes through a hollow 52 feet deep, sails on, and finally descends 144 feet down the gentle slope through four locks. It is now in the Tsimlyanskaya Sea. Including all of the bends and turns, 62 miles have been covered from the Volga. The route lies across the Tsimlyanskaya Sea, which has a surface area equal to one-half of the Rybinsk Sea. And 111 miles beyond comes the descent through two locks below the Tsimlyanskaya hydroelectric station dam. Thence, the route goes straight to the Don, to Rostov, and to the Azov Sea.

Between the Tsimlyanskaya dam and Rostov a few small hydrotechnical developments are going up, which will make the Don deeper. But even now the water from the Tsimlyanskaya Sea prevents the Don from becoming as shallow in summertime as in the past.

A waterway has been built to carry lumber and oil to the Don, and coal, metal and grain to the Volga.

All of the seas in the European

part of the USSR are now connected. From Moscow it is now possible to sail to Leningrad, Archangel, Astrakhan, Rostov and Odessa, in other words, to the Baltic Sea, Arctic Ocean, the Caspian, Azov and Black seas.

But the Volga-Don Canal did not merely facilitate transportation. The Tsimlyanskaya hydroelectric station of 160,000 kw. capacity supplies current to industry and agriculture.

Today, it is a pleasant summer trip to travel by motorship from Moscow on the Volga and the Volga-Don Canal. Sailing past Stalingrad and entering the canal, passengers see the huge locks with their sculptured arches and the even slopes of the canal planted with trees and flowers, and finally they sail on the expansive sea-like reservoir on the Don which has been created right in the center of the steppes.

But I have been more fortunate than those passengers for I saw the canal under construction. I saw how it was all being built, and how it grew.

In the autumn of 1950 I rode and partly hiked over the entire route, from beginning to end. I saw the small bay on the Volga beyond the southern outskirts of Stalingrad where the entrance of the canal had been dug and where today there stands a monument to Stalin. I saw the staircase of locks leading to the top of the divide and then down. Along the entire way I saw veritable mountains of earth that had been dug from the bed of the canal and piled up in huge banks.

And behind those high earthen ridges huge excavators raised their arms. On the most intricate section of the divide I came upon the largest of them—walking excavator "ES-14/65." A group of 60 schoolchil-

dren, on an excursion to see this giant, all easily found room in the bucket.

I was struck by the clarity, I should say, the ease with which the builders could see the future.

The first lock on the bank of the Volga was then nothing more than a pit with the water not yet pumped out. The bank was heaped with reddish brown earth. The walking excavator was only then beginning to bite into the divide. Villages were being removed to other places; houses taken apart being carted away. Yet everyone I met spoke of the canal as though they had already seen it with their own eyes.

Crossing a large field near the divide I found myself in a village that was being built. The main windows all faced one way. Why? "We are building so that the view will be on the future sea," was the explanation given to me.

In one place, right in the center of the vast dry steppe, I saw high concrete towers. They rose in the middle of an even, open and totally uninhabited locality. It turned out that these were the piers for a huge bridge. All around was nothing but undulating steppe, neither water nor road. The water and road were to come later, but the bridge was going up.

I shall remember this bridge in the waterless steppe as long as I live as a perfect example of the confidence the people had that their plans would be carried out.

Today with the Volga-Don Canal completed, a deep river lies in the dry steppe.

That is how water basins are

joined together and the contours of rivers are changed in the Soviet Union.

Hydrotechnical developments are everywhere eliminating shut-in water basins, creating a unified river system, producing electric power, irrigating fields, developing fisheries and improving the water supply of cities and industry.

The time will come when the Dnieper will be joined by a waterway with the Volkhov and Western Dvina rivers. This route will lie along the ancient Russian trade route from north to south. From Kiev it will be possible to go by water to Leningrad and Riga. The Oka in the future will be connected through the Desna and Zhizdra with the Dnieper, and through the Pronya with the Don; and the San will be joined with the Dniester.

And perhaps a waterway will even be thrown across the Ural ridge, from the European part of the country to the Asian. Sverdlovsk, which stands on the eastern side of the ridge, already consumes water from the Chusovaya River, which flows on the western side. Some of the water from the upper reaches of the Chusovaya has been thrown across the Iset by means of a canal, and the waters of the Volga and Ob basins mix in the ponds of the city of Sverdlovsk.

It is possible that in the future a part of the discharge of the Siberian rivers which flow to the Arctic Ocean will be turned southward, and some of the waters of the Siberian rivers Ob and Yenisei will be made to flow to Central Asia, to the Caspian Sea.

The next article: How they are changing the courses of the rivers in Soviet Central Asia so that they will irrigate deserts.

THE YALTA PAPERS

WHAT the Yalta Papers (full text in *New York Times*, March 17) actually prove is something quite else than the State Department intended to prove in releasing them.

They showed that the wartime grand alliance of the democratic powers made possible the victory over Germany and Japan and saved the world from fascist enslavement. They proved that negotiations with the Soviet Union were both possible and necessary, and that Soviet leadership had the capacity of realistic assessment of the flexibility and readiness to make concessions that such negotiations require. They showed a common realization that the continuance of this war-time cooperation into the postwar period was the only basis on which future peace could be maintained and the highest national interests of the participants served.

The State Department, and the Republican leadership, intended to prove by the release of the papers, that the Yalta Conference represented a "sell-out" of the interests of the Western powers; that Soviet participation in the war against Japan was unnecessary to victory; that negotiations with the Soviet Union are futile; that postwar difficulties have arisen because of unnecessary concessions to the Russians and a betrayal of America's interests by a dying Roosevelt, thus bolstering the McCarthy thesis of "twenty years of treason."

It must be noted that whatever may be considered part of the official Yalta record has long been known. There are no new revelations. The papers cannot be taken seriously as a complete official document. No stenographic report was kept. The papers include a mish mash

of notes jotted down by various participants, with no differentiation between serious negotiations and dinner table conversations, chit chat and asides made with no idea they would ever be published. Somewhat different versions of conversations appear in the notes of different people. Often they break off abruptly while the note-taker goes out "to get a glass of water."

Undoubtedly the State Department counted on no one actually reading through the whole 200,000-word record as released. In fact it is almost impossible to wade through it. What the State Department counted on for its effect was rather the various commentaries and interpretations whereby the actual proceedings could be twisted to its own present purposes.

The purpose of the State Department in attempting to torpedo the idea of big power negotiations and bring new pressure to bear for the rearming of Western Germany was made clear in a Washington dispatch to the *New York Times*, March 31, which said:

The State Department said today publication of the Yalta papers helped pile up votes in France and Germany in favor of ratification of the treaties to arm West Germany.

The dispatch quoted a letter by Thurston B. Morton, Secretary of State for Congressional Liaison, to Senator Humphrey (D-Minn.), saying that Secretary Dulles had made up his mind to publish the documents on March 15, they were released March 16, and ratification of the Paris treaties by West Germany was completed March 18.

The purpose of the Republicans to utilize the documents to discredit

Roosevelt and the Democrats, was revealed when the Senate Republican Policy Committee on March 30 started circulating a campaign handbook for the use of Republican speakers in attacking the Yalta agreements. The booklet echoed the familiar charges of espionage and treason at Yalta, blasted the Roosevelt Administration, and charged Roosevelt with "deceitful proposals and comments."

The State Department's action has already boomeranged, both internally and internationally, and has not enhanced the Secretary of State's popularity.

The British, who had opposed publication, are indignant. Churchill charged that the record contained many inaccuracies. The *London Times* of March 18 deplored publication as "prodding a few old wounds among allies." On the same day the *News Chronicle* called it "classic clumsiness" and said "a few vote-hungry American politicians" had now made it harder to bring about the top-level discussions for which the whole world is waiting and hoping. And the *Daily Mail* declared that Mr. Dulles had made "a diplomatic blunder of first magnitude."

The sober Republican commentator, Walter Lippmann, in the *New York Herald Tribune*, March 31, criticized what he called a "misapplication of the principle of open diplomacy," by Mr. Dulles. He questioned the accuracy of Mr. Dulles' statement that the Yalta papers were "put out in the normal course of procedure in accord with the State Department's policy of publishing periodically papers of public interest," and declared that if a policy were pursued of making public every uttered word of public men we would all be "back in the caves grunting at one another."

In view of the current falsifications of what happened at Yalta, it is worth recalling some of the statements previously made by participants in the conference.

For example, there is the book written by the late Edward Stettinius, Jr.,

who was present at Yalta as Secretary of State: *Roosevelt and the Russians: The Yalta Conference*, published in 1949. Summing up the record of the conference, and emphasizing the conciliatory attitude of Premier Stalin and Deputy Premier Molotov throughout the proceedings, Stettinius wrote:

The record of the Conference shows clearly that the Soviet Union made greater concessions at Yalta to the United States and Great Britain than were made to the Soviets.

In his *Roosevelt and Hopkins: An Intimate History* (1948), Robert E. Sherwood quotes Harry Hopkins as saying to him after Yalta:

We really believed in our hearts that this was the dawn of the new day we had all been praying for and talking about for so many years. We were absolutely certain that we had won the first great victory of the peace—and by "we," I mean *all* of us, the whole civilized human race. The Russians had proved that they could be reasonable and far-seeing and there wasn't any doubt in the minds of the President or any of us that we could live with them and get along with them peacefully as far into the future as any of us could imagine. . . .

Sherwood also quotes these prophetic words which Hopkins wrote in August, 1945:

The thing the American people must look out for is that there is a minority in America who, for a variety of reasons, would just as soon have seen Russia defeated in the war and who said publicly before we got into the war that it did not make any difference which one—Russia or Germany—won. [One who said this became President after Roosevelt's death. One whose every action implies that he would have preferred a German victory—is now Secretary of State.—Ed.] That small, vociferous minority can take advantage of every rift between ourselves and Russia to make trouble between our two countries. There are plenty of people in

America who would have been perfectly willing to see our armies go right on through Germany and fight with Russia after Germany was defeated. . . .

One more item, hidden in the underbrush of the Yalta papers, is a note from Hopkins to Roosevelt towards the end of the conference, when Churchill was stubbornly opposing mention of any sum due the USSR from Germany as a basis for future reparations discussions. Hopkins wrote: "Mr. President: The Russians have given in so much at this conference that I don't think we should let them down. Let the British disagree if they want to. . . ."

The concessions made by Stalin as revealed by the Yalta papers are too numerous to give in full, only some of the most important can be mentioned. The record shows beyond any question, despite all the current after-thoughts by General MacArthur and others, that the unanimous opinion of all the military experts at the time was that it was necessary to secure Soviet participation in the war against Japan, which it was thought might continue for a year and a half after the defeat of Germany. No one at the conference considered Stalin's requests for the return of territories previously seized by Japan from Russia, and other conditions safeguarding Soviet security in the Far East, as unreasonable. They were granted without question, in some cases modified by Stalin at Roosevelt's request. That was why Roosevelt was able to say on his return that he had achieved everything he desired at Yalta, and "not at too high a price." Stalin's need to show the war-weary Russian people that their national interests were involved in entering the war against Japan was fully recognized at the time. Stalin kept his word to enter the war against Japan within three months of Germany's defeat.

As to subsequent speculations that Soviet help was not necessary, and that the defeat of Japan was already in the bag without it, official U.S. Army historian Dr. Louis Morton in an article

in *The Reporter* for April 4, 1955 discussing the factors that forced Japanese surrender, wrote:

Japanese records will not support the conclusion that the atom bomb alone accomplished that result; Russia's declaration of war had at least as great an effect as Hiroshima.

Stalin readily agreed to Roosevelt's and Churchill's requests for closer military coordination, for offensive action on Russia's Western front to help the allies, for availability of air bases for use by the West. While much has been made in various accounts of supposed Soviet unwillingness to carry out such coordination, one cannot but wonder how the Soviet leaders regarded the separate conferences that took place at Yalta of the joint Anglo-American Chiefs of Staff in which Soviet participation had never been invited although they were bearing the main brunt of Hitler's war machine.

The UN voting formula agreed to by Stalin and Molotov at Yalta, which provided for the veto in the Security Council, was that insisted upon by Roosevelt, and not, as has so often been charged, a Soviet invention.

Poland was one of the thorniest questions at the conference due to Churchill's tenderness for the Polish Government-in-Exile in England, and Roosevelt's concern for the Polish vote in this country. Despite the fact that the exiled Poles were in control of an underground movement in Poland, which was stabbing the Soviet army in the back, Stalin agreed that the Lublin Government, which represented the real resistance movement in Poland, had the support of the Polish people and was recognized by the Soviet Government, should be enlarged to include other "democratic" elements from the London Poles and within Poland.

Throughout the conference, it was clear that Roosevelt, while determined to maintain close Anglo-American ties and to save Britain from bankruptcy, was in many respects more able to find a common language with Stalin regarding the shape of the postwar world

than with Churchill. Churchill's arrogant imperialism came through constantly, especially in his determination that the trusteeship arrangements and plans for the self-determination of peoples envisaged under the United Nations would in no way interfere with England's control of any of her colonies. He showed an extraordinary tenderness for fascists, which foreshadowed his later instructions that Nazi arms be stockpiled for possible future use against the Russians, and resisted Soviet efforts to find a formula that would preclude the rise of fascists to power in the post-war governments of liberated Europe.

Yet, even so, agreement was reached on cooperation for victory, for the organization of the United Nations, for continued cooperation in the postwar world. The three leaders, Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin, agreed on the necessity for extirpating German militarism and making sure that Germany would never again threaten the peace of the world. In their final three-power communique, they declared:

Our meeting here in the Crimea

has reaffirmed our common determination to maintain and strengthen in the peace to come that unity of purpose and of action which has made victory possible and certain for the United Nations in this war. We believe that this is a sacred obligation which our governments owe to our people and to all the peoples of the world.

Only with continuing and growing cooperation and understanding among our three countries and among all the peace-loving nations can the highest aspirations of humanity be realized—a secure and lasting peace which will, in the words of the Atlantic Charter, “afford assurances that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.”

Victory in the war and establishment of the proposed international organization will provide the greatest opportunity in all history to create in the years to come the essential conditions of such a peace.

Read those words again, and consider whether those who subscribe to them or those who repudiate them, best serve the interests of our country and humanity. J. S.

The Soviet Proposals

On arms reduction and the banning of nuclear weapons

WITH the decision of the NATO Council at its December session in Paris to base its whole military system on atomic weapons, and the further moves toward completing the ratification of the Paris Pacts for the rearming of Western Germany, the question of disarmament and abolition of atomic warfare takes on a new and terrible urgency.

In view of the charges that the USSR

is blocking agreement at the London disarmament talks, set up in accordance with the UN Assembly decision, it is important that the nature of the Soviet proposals be understood.

Andrei Gromyko, First Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR and Soviet representative to the Subcommittee of the UN Disarmament Commission, gave an interview to the Tass correspondent in London, March

24, outlining the Soviet Union position.

At the outset of the conference, the USSR proposed the destruction of all available stocks of atomic and hydrogen weapons, cessation of their manufacture and utilization of atomic materials for peaceful purposes only. Failing to get agreement from the other nations on this, the Soviet Union then introduced a more detailed version of the program submitted to the UN Assembly by the late Andrei Vyshinsky last fall, based on the June, 1954, proposals of Britain and France with amendments, widening the rights of the control organs to carry out inspection *on a permanent basis* in all countries. It also called for a world disarmament conference during 1955 on the general reduction of armaments and prohibition of atomic weapons, open to all countries.

Mr. Gromyko said that the first step of the proposed disarmament convention would be the reduction by all states within six months (or a year) of armaments, armed forces and budget appropriations by 50 per cent of quotas agreed upon by negotiations, taking the level of January 1, 1955 as a basis.

For this first stage, the Soviet proposals envisage a temporary international control commission to be set up under the UN Security Council to get the necessary information on implementation of the measures of arms reduction and supervise the fulfillment of obligations by the various countries.

After completion of this first stage, reduction of the remaining 50 per cent of armaments, armed forces and military appropriations is to take place within another six months or one year. Simultaneously, "the complete prohibition of atomic, hydrogen and other weapons of mass destruction should be carried out, with the discontinuance of the manufacture of these weapons and their complete removal from national armaments, along with the utilization of atomic materials for peaceful purposes only," this to be completed at the same time as the second stage of armaments reduction.

At the beginning of this second stage, a permanent international control organ is to be established, to enter upon its duties at once, described by Mr. Gromyko as follows:

The proposals of the Soviet Union directly state that such an international control agency should effect control, including inspection on a permanent basis, on a scale necessary to ensure the fulfillment by all the states of the obligations they assumed under the convention.

Moreover, these proposals point out that the international control agency will have *permanently in all countries* which have signed the convention its own staff of inspectors who will have, within the limits of their control functions, free access at any time to all objects of control.

This proposal should effectively answer the charges that the Soviet Union is blocking agreement by its unwillingness to accept any adequate international control and inspection and opposes inspection on any permanent basis.

Finally, the USSR proposed that the convention should provide that after the above measures are carried out, efforts should be made for still further reduction of armaments, down to levels necessary only for the maintenance of internal security and fulfillment of UN charter obligations.

Mr. Gromyko denied the charges that difficulties encountered in the disarmament talks are caused by the Soviet position, recounting the objections raised by the Western powers to every proposal made by the USSR. He pointed out that while on the one hand, the United States, Britain and France continued to reject the Soviet proposals for immediate and unconditional prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons, they at the same time insisted that an international control organ be set up before any measures for such prohibition were undertaken. He declared that the Soviet Union would continue its efforts to reach agreement.

Martha Dodd's Important New Novel

A review by ROBERT MORSS LOVETT

THE SEARCHING LIGHT by Martha Dodd. The Citadel Press, New York, 1955. 345 pp. \$3.50.

IN 1935, Sinclair Lewis published a book with the ironical title *It Can't Happen Here*. Twenty years later have appeared two novels based on current events which prove that it can happen here, and is now happening. Howard Fast's *Silas Timberman* and Martha Dodd's *The Searching Light* both deal with situations arising in American universities out of the pressure to make conformity in thought with the powers that be the condition of academic employment. Mr. Fast's book deals strictly with the experience of the hero in his relation with his colleagues, his superiors, and finally with the government. It is a novel *à thèse*, animated by the author's conviction and indignation. Martha Dodd's book is broader in scope, a full-bodied novel, and is important not only in its immediate protest but as evidence that she has become a novelist.

Martha Dodd is happily well fitted to write of American university life. As a girl she grew up in Randolph Macon College, where her father, William E. Dodd, was professor of history. Randolph Macon is one of the best of the smaller colleges in the United States—like Penfield in her story, of which the beautiful setting gives back the human theme "What man has made of man." There and at the University of Chicago, to which her father was called, she was familiar with professorial attitudes and heard discussions of academic questions which seemed so important in those days. When William Dodd was made Ambassador to Germany, she saw the later phase of Hitler's rise to power, as she has recorded in *Through Em-*

bassy Eyes and in her novel *Sowing the Whirlwind*.

It is tempting to see something of her father in her present hero, John Minot. He, like Dr. Dodd, was both farmer and professor, the best type our democracy has produced, a leader among his colleagues. His wife Julia is a complex figure, a daughter of the Southern aristocracy, who has given herself unsparingly in the struggle to help her husband in his rise to distinction. Her fine hands, roughened and disfigured by work, tell her story. Martha Dodd is the only novelist I know who along with physical description constantly takes account of hands in portraying character. Julia wavers between admiration of her husband's firmness in rejecting the oath imposed by the Regents and bitter grief that all they have striven for in life must be abandoned.

The oath is "the searching light" that seeks out the secret places in the souls of the victims, under the hard glare which it casts on the stale minds of the Regents. One by one the majority which followed John Minot is reduced by specious argument, compromise and fear, until only thirteen remain to defy the final axe of dismissal.

Martha Dodd has done well to make John Minot a specialist in Milton, as teacher and scholar. The spirit of Milton pervades his thought and action. The quotations from the *Areopagitica*, discreetly chosen, light up his teaching and speeches to his colleagues. Altogether the use of Milton gives dignity and distinction to the book, an appeal to the highest tradition of our intellectual freedom. In those days it was a mere license to print that was the test; today it is the oath—trivial de-

tails it may be argued but carrying with them the implications of conformity and suppression of truth. As Wordsworth wrote of Milton in 1802, so today, read America for England:

Milton! thou should'st be living at this hour.

England hath need of thee, she is a fen of stagnant waters.

Dr. Somerville's Book Brought Up to Date

THE PHILOSOPHY OF PEACE, by John Somerville, Ph.D. Supplemented and revised edition. Liberty Press, N. Y., 1954. 316 pp. \$3.50.

WE WISH, somewhat tardily, to bring our readers' attention to the new edition of Dr. Somerville's scholarly and inspiring book demonstrating that a policy of peaceful coexistence with the Soviet Union is the only road to survival in this atomic age. Original-

nally published in 1949, Dr. Somerville's warnings of the direction in which our government's hostile policies toward the USSR were heading, have stood the test of time all too well.

More important than ever today is the section of the book showing that Soviet ideology proceeds from exactly opposite premises and leads to diametrically different goals than fascist ideology. Dr. Somerville's refutation of the theory that Communists believe social wrongs can be corrected only by violence also takes on new importance in these days when a non-existent Communist conspiracy of violent overthrow is made the whole basis of our government's policies, and men are jailed not only for ideas alone, but for ideas of violent overthrow they never held.

Revisions throughout the book, and additions drawing lessons from the wars in Korea and Indo-China and analyzing the military mind in Washington and its concern for saving the "free world" by a course that can only mean world domination, have added strength and immediate usefulness to this study.

NEW SOVIET FILMS

All in Spectacular Sovcolor

THE LAND

THE SAFETY MATCH

VARIETY STARS

TRUE FRIENDS

COMING

ROMEO AND JULIET

BALLET

BORIS GODUNOV

Artkino Pictures, Inc.

723 SEVENTH AVE., NEW YORK 19

Telephone: Circle 5-6570

PEACE PAMPHLETS

WHAT REARMING GERMANY MEANS

by Jessica Smith
24 pp., 10¢

EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM OF THE SOVIET UNION

by Elizabeth Moos
64 pages, illustrated. 25¢

CONSTITUTION OF THE USSR
20¢

For single items, add 3¢ postage and handling charge, 1¢ more for each additional item ordered.

Order from:

NEW WORLD REVIEW
23 West 26th St., New York 10

If you want **Co-Existence**

Instead of **Non-Existence—**

Then buy, read, lend, send

SOVIET CIVILIZATION

By Corliss Lamont

First published, 1952. New and enlarged edition now brought up-to-date with an Epilogue by Dr. Lamont, summarizing Soviet developments during the past two years; an Introduction by James Aronson, executive editor of the NATIONAL GUARDIAN, on the fateful question of co-existence; and with Prof. Henry Pratt Fairchild's thoughtful foreword to the first edition.

•

Five dollars at your bookseller's. Or order direct from

PHILOSOPHICAL LIBRARY

Publishers of Books of Lasting Value

Dept. NW, 15 East 40th Street, New York 16, New York