

SOCIAL SCIENCES

OCTOBER, 1957

25¢

New World

LIBRARY
OCT 1 1957
REVIEW
DETROIT

**THE DISARMAMENT TALKS
AND
THE PEOPLES CRY FOR PEACE**

JESSICA SMITH

Moscow Youth Festival

Ralph Parker

From Czechoslovakia

Eleanor Wheeler

Soviet Circus in Burma

Helen and Scott Nearing

NEW WORLD REVIEW

OCTOBER 1957

Moscow Youth Festival And After	Ralph Parker	3
Letter from an American Student		5
Soviet Circus in Burma	Helen and Scott Nearing	7
Literary Discussion in Czechoslovakia	Eleanor Wheeler	13
New Features of Soviet Economic Advances	Victor Perlo	18

The Disarmament Talks	Jessica Smith	21
-----------------------	---------------	----

The Peoples Cry for Peace		27
---------------------------	--	----

BOOK REVIEWS

<i>Into China</i>	—Claude Roy	35
-------------------	-------------	----

<i>The Lamont Case</i>	—Philip Wittenberg	36
------------------------	--------------------	----

<i>Russia Revisited</i>	—Louis Fischer	37
-------------------------	----------------	----

<i>Days of the Phoenix</i>	—Van Wyck Brooks	37
----------------------------	------------------	----

<i>Labor Fact Book—No. 13</i>	—Labor Research Associates	38
-------------------------------	----------------------------	----

JESSICA SMITH, *Editor*
MURRAY YOUNG, *Managing Editor*

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

Vol. 25, No. 9, October, 1957. Re-entered as second class matter June 27, 1951 at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Subscription \$2.50 per year. \$1.25 for 6 months (Canadian, \$3.00, foreign \$3.50 a year. Draw money orders or checks payable in New York). Published monthly by the N.W.R. Publications, Inc., 34 West 15th Street, New York 11, N. Y. Indexed in Bulletin of the Public Affairs Information Service. Phone: CHelsea 3-0666.
PRINTED IN U.S.A.



IMPORTANT ANNOUNCEMENT TO OUR READERS

Because of various delays brought about by our moving into new offices and because of extensive preparations for our special enlarged November issue, we have omitted the September issue of *New World Review*.

HOWEVER

Each subscription will be extended one issue to make up for this omission.

—The Editors.

We are making special efforts to bring you an exceptional issue for November marking the 40th Anniversary of the Soviet Union. Among the contributors to this issue will be Anna Louise Strong, Scott Nearing, Rockwell Kent, Corliss Lamont, G. D. H. Cole, D. N. Pritt and a number of other distinguished writers. We would suggest that you place your orders for extra copies now.

Your response to our Summer Survival Fund was generous, but our goal was not reached. We must again ask you to help us make up the amount.

PLEASE FILL OUT AND MAIL TODAY

NEW WORLD REVIEW

7th Floor,
34 West 15th St., New York 11

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

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

Name

Address

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

Moscow Youth Festival and After

by RALPH PARKER

ALMOST a month has passed since the torches were waved in farewell to the 34,000 young participants in the World Youth Festival at the great Luzhniki stadium in Moscow. Yet Moscow is reluctant to strip itself of its gala dress. Car-owners who lent their automobiles to the organizers during the festival still sport the flower emblem—each petal a continent—which acted as an Open Sesame to the most hallowed precincts during that memorable fortnight. The above emblem, executed in styles ranging from Gerasimov to Picasso, remains stuck on windows, walls and the sides of trucks. At the Nikitsky Gate a thirty-foot pile of dummy books marks the beginning of an avenue lined with cut-outs of the world's favorite literary characters. There are open-air concerts every fine evening in the Manège Square, and the crowds there are almost as dense as during festival days. Up against the crenelated red walls of the Kremlin the marquee still stands, though the immensely long beer bar that drew so many guests during the Kremlin romps has been dismantled.

These are but a few of the out-

ward signs that the festival is dying hard, and, of course, there are other material things, deriving from the festival, that have become permanent features of Moscow. There is no doubt that people who had become accustomed to accepting the drabness of the Moscow street scene in a spirit of resignation learned during the festival how much pleasanter the place looks when a few window-boxes are put up, an awning spread here and there, a patch of bare asphalt converted into a garden. And how many women took the plunge from dreary into bright colored skirts! Moscow learned new habits during the festival.

The impact on people's minds was perhaps even greater. It is difficult for anyone who missed the festival to realize how completely involved in the event the whole country became. I learned this when I drove over the bridge across the Bug to enter the Soviet Union from Poland two days before the festival opened. Officials were distributing festival emblems to every automobile using the new tourist route into the USSR. When we drove up to the rebuilt station at Brest we found the place decorated with banners welcoming the trainloads of participants coming in every few hours from Paris, from the Channel ports, from Denmark and Western Germany. In truck-drivers' cafes along the 750-

RALPH PARKER, NWR correspondent in Moscow, formerly represented the "New York Times" in the Soviet capital where he has lived for many years.

mile highway to Moscow, Soviet delegates to the festival were to be met and at a restaurant beside the monument to the partisan Zoya we joined a hilarious party of young people who were being given a send-off to Moscow.

Moscow greeted us with millions of colored lamps. The decoration of the city turned out to be rather disappointing, for the immense scale of new Moscow with its broad streets and long vistas, the great sweep of the facades of buildings which, poor as they are in detail, make a breathtaking ensemble—this dwarfed the efforts of the young artists and architects. But one forgot this when the searchlights formed a great spiky crown in the sky above the Kremlin and when the midnight firework displays were given. Actually, it was the public that proved to be the most decorative element in the city. No one who participated in the drive through the city on the opening Sunday will ever be able to forget the dense rows of smiling, hand-waving people, old and young, which lined the streets. Many foreigners were reduced to tears by the warmth of the reception.

Moscow was a city of many moods during the next fortnight. One night it was in carnival spirit as elaborate creatures from the Book of Beastes were borne through the streets or floated down the river. On another the entire center of Moscow fell solemnly silent as people's minds went back to the horrors of Hiroshima and reflected on the dangers of another war. A spirit of searching enquiry brooded over the new university buildings of the Lenin Hills during the day, but in the evening those young people who had taken

part in serious discussion or had listened to the world's leading intellectuals, were to be seen revelling in the pointed satire of the Polish students' Bim Bom concert party or jiving to British and Italian jazz bands.

The cultural events provided people from all over the world the opportunity to broaden their knowledge of each other's contributions to the arts. Young China listened to John Osborne's angry young Jimmy Porter's scornful tirades* against the class distinctions that riddle the British welfare state. Young Russia argued to the verge of fisticuffs in front of abstract art from Belgium, Britain and West Germany. Africa provided ballet lovers with abundant opportunities to extend their knowledge of the dance. A remarkable mime-artiste from Israel entertained an audience of 16,000 in the open air theater in the Gorky Park. The best productions of the Moscow stage were on view, free to festival participants: Mayakovsky's *The Bed Bug*, the Okhlopkov *Hamlet*, the Maly Theater's production of Tolstoy's *Powers of Darkness*, not to mention opera and ballet at the Bolshoy. One had the chance of seeing one of the finest collections in the world of French Impressionists and Post-Impressionists at the Pushkin Gallery while if one insisted one could get the curators of the Tretyakov Gallery to show one early Chagalls and Maleivich's.

And yet, with all this abundance of set programs, and this wealth of cultural treasure to choose from, it was the unorganized side of the festival that seems to have made the

* *Look Back in Anger* by John Osborne, one of three plays brought by English companies and staged at the famous Moscow Art Theater.

deepest impression both on foreigners and Russians. The fortnight was aptly described by someone as a great conversation. Few foreign participants could have left Moscow without having entered a Moscow home or at least of meeting young Russians in private for serious conversation. And in these talks people were as eager to air their points of difference as those on which they agreed. Abstract art, Hungary, the concept of freedom, jazz, socialist realism, Christianity and Marxism, the parliamentary road to socialism, were there any controversial subjects that were not covered during those talks?

Sometimes these friendly arguments took place in extraordinary circumstances. In the Kremlin, for instance. There were two evenings when the young people took over the Kremlin lock, stock and barrel. As we walked up the slope to the battlemented Borovitsky Gate two Russian girls came up and asked us our nationality. "Welcome to guests from England" they called back through the portal. "Welcome to the Kremlin" came in chorus from a group of youngsters within the gate. We were led through the Kremlin gardens to the square between the three cathedrals where Turkmenians were dancing a wild fling. We went over the state apartments and posed under the great chandeliers of St. George's Hall. But later, when the formalities were over, people provided themselves with beer and sandwiches and sat on the lawns to argue and argue and argue.

The effects of this great conversation are likely to be far-reaching. The understanding of the world by

Russians and the understanding of the Soviet Union by foreigners have been handicapped in the past by a lack of personal contact. The Sixth World Youth Festival did much to reduce that handicap. It will be more difficult henceforth for the "experts" on either side to deceive the common man. Prejudices have been shaken if not entirely removed. A million handshakes, a million smiles may not mean much in the balance of war and peace, but a million questions answered candidly, a million ideas taking root in young, fertile minds—that can and should count.

Letter from An American Student

Patricia Lamski, who wrote this letter to her family, is a student at Moorhead College, Moorhead, Minnesota. She is an 11th generation descendant of Scotch-English immigrants who were charter signers of the New Haven, Connecticut Colony in 1637. Her grandfather homesteaded in North Dakota in 1905 and operated a cattle ranch there for thirty years. Her father is a foreman in a North Dakota packing-house.

Moscow, July 29, 1957

Well, we're on our way. The festival started yesterday, Sunday, with a parade down the heart of Moscow. Every nation was in its respective costume. The people lined the streets and it was estimated that two million people watched the parade. They lined the streets so solidly that there was only room for the buses to go single file down a six-lane street.

They cried "Peace and Friendship," threw flowers, and ran alongside shaking our hands. One guy grabbed my hand and dragged me the length of the bus. My hand was swollen and hurt a bit, but is fine now. I have never seen anything like it in my entire life. It took us four hours to go twelve miles.

We then paraded around Lenin Stadium, which seats 103,000 people. All 32,500 delegates sat in the middle and listened while representatives from five countries spoke. I even got a picture of Khrushchev. It's not very clear, I'm sure, as he was seated quite a distance away.

After the speeches, all of the Republics of the USSR gave a demonstration in physical culture. It is impossible to exaggerate the beauty of thousands of young men and women who are all in step with every movement the same, doing ballet and gymnastics to classical music. They built pyramids of fountains, with water flowing over, that were just tremendous.

We go everywhere in buses, and on the way home, even though it is after midnight, the people are so crowded around that the buses have to go down alleys and back streets. Everyone is very nice to us and they are so happy to see the "Americanskis."

The food is very good and the beds are OK. The city is decorated with lights and banners. They say they spent 3,000,000 rubles, or \$300,000, just fixing up the city, to say nothing of the Lenin Stadium which they built last year for this festival. There are so many things to take pictures of.

Tonight there is a concert between the Poles and U.S., and afterward the section of Moscow that is sponsoring the U.S. is giving us a party.

Our days are filled to the brim with things to attend. The seminars haven't started yet but will soon.

The saying here is "In the name of Peace and Friendship," so, in the name of peace and friendship, I'd better close now.

FROM THE DETROIT TIMES, SEPTEMBER 2

PATRICIA LAMSKI, author of the above letter, was interviewed by the *Detroit Times* on her return from the Soviet Union. The following are excerpts from the interview:

"Patricia pooh-poohed any thought that the Soviet government might have guided or shepherded her tour. She declared: 'The city of Moscow was ours, practically. The Russian people are so simple and genuine you couldn't help loving them. They're just like anyone else. They're very eager to find out about the rest of the world and they were so nice to us.'

"They don't want war and we don't want war. Nobody wants war really. I think fighting between nations is kid stuff.'

"She said lack of knowledge of the Russian language did not make things difficult, because: 'A great many of the Russians seemed to have a little knowledge of English or to be studying it.'

"One of Patricia's most vivid impressions was when students sent up peace doves. One of them alighted on Old Glory and she hoped this might be symbolic."

Soviet Circus in Burma

by HELEN and SCOTT NEARING

EN ROUTE to India we stopped off for two days in Burma. From our plane we went straight to the Strand Hotel in Rangoon. There, while waiting to be assigned our room, we picked up the day's paper, *The Burman* of January 22. With top heading, on the front page, was a headline "RUSSIAN CIRCUS". We were delighted to read further that "The Soviet Circus now in Rangoon will put on performances from January 23 to 31. All performances will be at the Pyidawtha Ground. Bookings for seats may be obtained at the Jubilee Hall on performance days between 10 AM and 3 PM."

We are not regular circus goers, but we had heard much of these Russian performers. They had been in India for two months, playing in huge stadiums in Bombay, Calcutta, Madras and Delhi. A friend in Calcutta said that police had to use tear gas bombs to break up the crowds milling around the ticket office, and that 2 rupee tickets were selling for 20 rupees a week before the show opened. He said they played before 800,000 people through all of India.

The NEARINGS have recently completed a tour of the South East Asian countries. Their book about America, "USA Today" was published in 1955. Scott Nearing, author of many books on economics, lectures widely throughout the country.

The Russian troupe had been all over Europe too. We had read of their triumphal progress through Belgium and France in the spring, and then of the furor they created in London during the summer of 1956. The Queen had stayed away from the premiere, but after reports of the fabulous show reached her, she had the good sense to attend the second evening. The gymnasts, acrobats and jugglers were lauded as tops, and London seemed particularly taken with one of their clowns, who, in an old suit and hat and no make-up, with just a simple silly face and simple silly actions, rocked the crowds.

To have a chance to see all this, and a Burmese crowd's reaction, seemed too good a thing to miss. We had only one more night in town; if we were lucky, we could get in to the first performance. The next night we would be gone.

On the morning of the 23rd we saw large ads in the papers: "Mad-deningly sparkling illusions. Amazing extravaganza of physical culture and thrilling entertainment by classical gymnasts. Flashing and nimble acrobats, stunning equilibrists, stupefying illusionists. Master magicians and jugglers and world famous clowns". It was the same old circus spiel found all over the world: The Greatest Show on Earth.

Speaking not a word of the local

language and knowing not a soul in Rangoon, we had to find our way about alone. We got a free-hand sketch of a map, located the Jubilee Hall, and in the heat of the middle morning started to walk through the city streets. Chinese and Indians seemed as numerous as Burmese. The market places were so crowded with sellers and goods and customers that we had to elbow our way through slowly. First came the cloth markets, then jewelry and toys. There were flowers in great piles, and fruit and vegetable halls. Sidewalk sellers squatted with their few wares on the ground before them. Women carried their produce in trays on their heads. The streets were edged with merchandise of every conceivable kind.

After much walking we reached our destination. Crowds of circus fans jostled before the box office of Jubilee Hall where arrangements for the sale of tickets were incredibly inept. It was only because we were obviously foreigners that we got our tickets without being pushed hither and yon for hours without getting any nearer the one tiny wicket. With our precious yellow papers in our hands (we could not read a word printed on them, nor tell for what or where it was; we had merely shoved in some money and got something back!) we went triumphantly back to town.

As no seats were reserved, we left for the circus grounds in the late afternoon, for a 7 o'clock performance. The stadium, we heard, held 10,000, but we wanted good seats. Already decorations were up when we reached there, and peddlers busy establishing themselves on nearby streets. Food and drink stands were

selling out, and small boys congregating at the entrances.

There were many posters on the stadium walls, advertising the circus. Over half of them were torn or partly scratched out. Only then did we realize that all of the population might not be so enthusiastic about a Russian circus in Rangoon. There were undoubtedly conservative, regressive and anti-Communist elements there (as in most places in the world) who would not appreciate a lovely flower if they found out it had blossomed behind the Iron Curtain; and who would certainly not attend a performance or applaud a Russian artist, or tolerate such infidels in their midst, if they could help it. This might make the evening even more eventful.

When the gates opened, an hour and a half before the show was to start, there was a rush of enthusiastic youths for the top tier of benches on the bleachers. We foolishly took ground seats, closer to the stage, which we later regretted, as we could not see as well from there. However, we were right by the main aisle and could see everyone come in.

We had not been there long when half a hundred armed Burmese police marched in and stationed themselves facing the audience. It was a grim sight. Later in the evening, as the show got under way, most of them moved farther back, near the exits. Eventually we had three or four immediately behind us.

We watched the people crowd in and fill up the seats. There seemed no end to the streams of humanity, young and old, who filed by. Gaily saronged Burmese men and women,

flow
ban
chi
Ch
Bo
Pro
lies
the
bea
tigh
(pe
brig
T
ous
the
ora
mor
of
ove
som
all
mov
crow
In
the
circ
um-
stag
stor
mes
low
exit
leve
ches
bras
plish
the
the
ance
Ju
gan
and
push
amb
terin
sligh
Rus

flowers behind their ears. Tall turbaned Hindus, their women and children in beautiful silken saris. Chinese in jackets and trousers. Boys with grey-haired mothers. Proud fathers escorting whole families. Young mothers with babes in their arms. A troop of young beauties, all with white jackets and tightly wrapped bright red skirts (perhaps a dancing team) came in, bright as flowers.

The oddest and most conspicuous element in the audience were the spots of color made by the orange robes of the young Buddhist monks, who looked completely out of place at a circus. We counted over fifty, sitting in the audience, some singly but most in groups, and all seemingly entranced by the movement and excitement of the crowd.

In the center of the sports field the Soviet visitors had built their circus "ring." It consisted of a medium-sized circular stage. Behind the stage, facing the stands, was a two-story crimson tent, hung with Burmese and Soviet flags. The curtained lower level served as entrance and exit for the performers. The upper level was occupied by the circus orchestra, composed of woodwinds, brass, a few strings and an accomplished accordion player. Through the circus acts and between them the music paced the entire performance.

Just before the performance began there was a different movement and tone to the stream of people pushing by us. The foreign guests, ambassadors and diplomats were entering. After the small-boned and slight-statured natives, the burly Russians, English, Germans and

Americans looked huge and incongruous. They went to the reserved section in the very front. (We heard later that every member of the Burmese Cabinet except the President, who was off on vacation, attended the opening, and the majority of the foreign ambassadors.)

The crowd settled down for the beginning of the show. Every seat in the giant outdoor stadium was taken. The sun had set in an orange glow. Lanterns were lit in festoons around the stadium as darkness fell. It was a warm and perfect night.

Suddenly great floodlights illuminated the central ring. A pink-turbaned gentleman, the former Burmese Ambassador to Moscow, read a welcome speech from U Nu, who was away at Taunggyi. In the message to the Circus, U Nu expressed his belief that though international good will and friendship, world tensions could be reduced. He had, in that firm belief, travelled widely. In the Soviet Union he had seen and enjoyed the circus, the ballet, and the songs and dances of the Soviet nationalities. So great was his appreciation of the finer points of such artistic expressions that he had requested the Soviet leaders to send the circus to Burma "to further the interest of Soviet-Burmese friendship." "I am confident," U Nu said, "that this circus and its members will help much in the development of Soviet-Burmese friendship."

The next speaker was the Minister of Education and Culture for Burma. Then the leader of the Russian circus, Mr. Volochin, said a few words, followed by the Russian Ambassador to Burma. Cameras snapped, huge bouquets were handed to each speaker, and the

impressive formal opening was over.

Again the crowd settled back in their seats, but soon stood up. The orchestra was playing the Burmese national anthem and followed it with the Russian national anthem, with the audience at attention.

The moment came when all lights were put out and one could glimpse dark figures scurrying to positions in the ring. A flourish of trumpets, a blaze of lights, and the show was on. A troupe of dazzlingly beautiful (or so they seemed) sequin-sparkling young girls and men paraded round the ring in various formations, carrying huge billowing pastel tinted flags. The crowd roared its approval and jumped onto their chairs for a better view. "Down in front" was yelled by those in back who could not see. But more and more hopped on to their chairs. Everybody wanted to see everything. Some younger folk even balanced on top of the backs of their chairs. The police in the audience tried to maintain order, but finally they too were joining in the general excitement and standing on chairs and clapping.

The first solo performer, however, was seen by all—even by the small boys perched like birds on the branches of trees outside the grounds, and by the massed people on roofs, balconies and in windows of nearby houses. A trapeze artiste, brilliantly sparkling in a scanty costume of sequins postured and leapt and hung by her teeth far above the heads of the crowd. She was watched with rapt attention while she went through some amazing calisthenics, and received clamorous applause.

Exceptionally clever jugglers fol-

lowed her act. They ran plates from arm to arm, and over their heads. They tossed all manner of things in the air and caught them all, of course. They balanced large tables on their outstretched fingers and on their foreheads. And they ended up by filling the air with endless Russian fur caps and catching them all on their heads. The famous clown appeared and attempted, with full sympathy of the audience, to imitate the tricks.

A group of strong men and acrobats took the stage, building human pyramids, turning double somersaults, balancing, leaping and tumbling. The finale came when the strongest of the strong men fastened a 16-foot pole in a socket on his belt and held it straight into the air. One of his fellow performers nimbly climbed the pole, doing a handstand on top while the strong man held it steady. The acrobat then hung on horizontally, first with two hands, then with one hand, the other hand widely extended, while the strong man swung the pole in an ever-widening circle. Finally the acrobat on top of the pole was whirling round and round through the air, balanced on one foot and one hand, in a circle that covered almost the entire stage.

More antics followed the strong man and the acrobats. The clown appeared with a ten-foot pole held gingerly in both hands, on the top of which he balanced a pail of water. As he moved clumsily around the stage, the water slopped out of the pail—a cupfull here, half a cupfull there. When he reached the edge of the stage the clown stumbled, the pail teetered on the slanting pole over the heads of the fine ladies and

gentlemen of the diplomatic corps. The gentlemen ducked, the ladies screamed, the audience was in an uproar. The pail tipped and fell. It was empty, and was fastened by an invisible wire to the top of the pole. The diplomats and their wives were saved from a wetting. The audience roared with laughter and applause.

Then came the finest tight rope walkers we have ever seen. These men in bright green and red costumes balanced and postured and knelt and sat and lay on a high length of wire. They ran and skipped and danced along it, changed places, and even walked backwards on it. The crowd went mad and responded with furious applause. The clown came up before them and set up a slack piece of wire while everybody laughed. After various feeble efforts, he managed to hold himself on the wire. Then he went through about ten minutes of amazing acrobatic work, all on the wire. He took off his coat and shoes and tried to put them on again, sitting on the wire and getting all mixed up with it. He pretended to fall off it, all the while convulsing the audience as well as winning their respect, for he was singularly adept.

Act followed act, far into the night. Each individual and group performance superb in its field, and each gripping and thrilling adults and grandmothers and grandfathers as well as youngsters. Indeed, the audience was almost the best part of the show. When the circus began and the floodlights went on, the members of the audience were lolling, chatting, smoking fidgeting—in ten thousand individual ways. Within minutes they were an in-

tegrated group. None were lolling. They were stretching their necks and opening their eyes wide, to see all they could. As the performance proceeded, they laughed together, shouted together and applauded together.

We particularly watched the armed police, scattered through the audience. At the outset they seemed indifferent, scornful, some of them quite hostile. Before the first act ended, they had joined the audience—laughing, gesticulating, parking their guns and pressing forward to see what they could. The artistry and mastery of the circus performers had destroyed their military discipline and separateness from the crowd, and incorporated them into the audience.

This was the first time that the Russian Circus had played in Rangoon. Local citizens who read the advertisements in the papers or on billboards hardly knew what to expect. Those who paid admission to the stadium were of both sexes, all ages, and a wide range of ideas and beliefs. Many ticket holders had come to enjoy and applaud, but just as surely there were many who had come to scoff or make mischief. The snap and vigor with which the circus opened won attention. Before the first act was half over it commanded respect and secured admiration. The performers were past-masters in their varied professions.

Judging from its long series of successes, within and outside the Soviet Union, Moscow's circus would make a hit in any village, town or city, almost anywhere on the six continents. Its phenomenal effectiveness in winning and holding audience is more than a tribute to the

virtuosity of individual performers. It reflects credit on the judgment of those early followers of the Bolshevik regime who decided that they would have a circus which would be the best ever. Then and there they set up a circus school in which performers and technical workers were strictly trained for many years. From that day to this one of the jobs of Soviet education has been training circus personnel. The immensely creditable performance which we

(along with ten thousand other circus fans) watched in Rangoon is the product of a system of technical training designed to prepare men and women to take their part in carrying on the life of the world, and to equal or excel anyone else who is trying to perform the same task.

We are grateful to Helen and Scott Nearing for letting us have this article, which has been published in Japanese in the monthly "Sekai."—The Editors.

SOVIET WOMEN APPEAL TO AMERICAN WOMEN ON BANNING NUCLEAR TESTS

WE HAVE RECEIVED from the Soviet Women's Committee an appeal addressed to all women and women's organizations of the United States and Great Britain calling for action on prohibition of nuclear weapons. The appeal calls attention to actions already taken by many national and international women's organizations, and describes the mass campaign being carried on by the people throughout the USSR for prohibition of nuclear weapons and ending of tests. The appeal says in part:

We appeal to you, women and mothers of the United States and Great Britain, on behalf of millions of women in the USSR.

Though our political views and our way of life may differ, all these differences vanish in the face of the danger that threatens us, our families, and our children.

We are all mothers and we all want a good and peaceful life for our children. We all want peace and well-being in our families and homes. Each of us is ready to do all in our power in order to protect our children from this danger.

In the name of the present and future of the children of the whole world we call on you, our sisters in America and Britain, to leave no stone unturned, to make your governments hear the voice of the peoples, the voice of the mothers of the whole world, the voice of reason and of love.

Use all your energies and influence to make them conclude an agreement suspending the nuclear weapon tests for a long period of time and so expedite the complete prohibition of these tests.

Much depends on you today.

Let us do our great duty as mothers.

We must protect our children from the danger of an annihilating atomic war.

Literary Discussion In Czechoslovakia

by ELEANOR WHEELER

THE SPRING air of Prague, 1957, was filled with literary discussion, some of it a re-evaluation of the spring 1956 Writers' Congress, some an interchange between the various literary journals, some a sober realization of what the effect was of the confusion among the Hungarian writers before last October's events, some an echo of the literary discussions in the Soviet Union. It has been a period of earnest and responsible discussion, for there is a growing awareness here that the superstructure of art, literature, esthetic values and ethics does not automatically grow out of the economic base, does not entirely or necessarily of itself change as the economic system changes, but must also be consciously directed by the builders of socialism, and in turn influences the tempo and quality of that building.

As Jiří Hendrych declared at the meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party on June 13, in his report on the Party's ideological work: "The new socialist society cannot develop spontaneously, its basis, its entire structure, grows with the broadest masses of workers

acting on it actively and consciously. Therefore the educational work of the Party takes on constantly greater and more decisive significance."

Ever since the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU—and even before that—there had been a realization that an insistence on having literature used chiefly as a tool to illustrate the truths of socialism often did more harm than good to the cause. Culture could be a weapon, but should not be a bludgeon. The Czechoslovak Writers' Congress (see NWR August and September, 1956) was the sharpest point of criticism of the postwar years' harvest of literature. Even at that time, however, warning voices were raised against extreme individualistic approaches to literature, a blowing up of the poet's ego by encouraging him to call himself the "nation's conscience" (as did poets Seifert and Hrubín), and a besmirching of past literary output by saying "now we'll write the truth." President Zapotocký said then that he himself had never knowingly written falsehoods in his literary work, although he may have been many times mistaken, and he did not believe other representative writers had been guilty of conscious falsification, either.

As time passed, the criticism of

ELEANOR WHEELER, a frequent contributor to "New World Review," has lived in Czechoslovakia with her husband and four children since 1947.

some of the speeches at the April Writers' Congress became more precise. The Czechoslovak writers stood solidly behind their government's position at the time of the Hungarian crisis and did not sympathize with the Hungarians who encouraged the uprising—although the majority did not join in the cries of some that the critical notes in Czechoslovakia in April had been exported to promote the Hungarian crisis in October. Then the discussions of the plenum of the Soviet Writers' Union in April of this year could not fail to have an effect here also, with the criticism of Soviet writers who had fostered a pessimistic, individualistic or even, it was said, nihilist approach to literature. Czechoslovak writers realized more and more that when atomic weapons are being stockpiled in western Germany, plots hatched in Indonesia, the air polluted with radioactive dust, the Middle East in turmoil, disarmament at a stalemate, they would be naive or worse to fall for the cold-war line of over-emphasizing individualism and nationalism.

Instead of saying "Czechoslovak writers" in general it would be more helpful to give cases. Norbert Frýd, for instance. His *Card File of the Living*, a novel based on Frýd's personal experiences in Dachau, was considered by many to be the best Czechoslovak novel of 1956. Filled with political maturity, it is also notable for the individual human characterizations. With this background of life experience and with this mature literary credo, Frýd is not going to be deceived by crusades to "liberate" writers behind the Iron Curtain, even though he does sometimes make critical remarks about

individual instances of some heavy handed literary criticism.

Or take another example, Vašek Kaňa. He was brought up in an orphanage and knew from his own life history the hardships an apprentice had to undergo in the First Republic. His autobiographical novel describing this, *Devastated by War*, was very popular both in the original form and in the abridged version for young people. It shows that he has the basis for putting literary debates in their historical and economic perspective.

A still further example of what I mean by "Czechoslovak writers" is one of the younger generation, Jan Otčenášek, First Secretary of the Writers' Union and author of best-seller *Citizen Brých*. This novel was the first successful attempt to portray a wavering middle-class intellectual during the 1948 February events. Brých becomes more and more involved in activities which he would not be able to justify to the authorities and in panic tries to cross the border. When he sees the type of people who are also trying to flee the country, he turns back, not wanting to identify himself with them. He looks forward, at the end of the novel, to throwing himself into work, finding a *modus vivendi* in a society he does not wholly agree with. No hurrahism, no waving of banners. The hero has a quiet acceptance that the reader feels is positive and will eventually develop into a more affirmative understanding of socialism.

A different kind of writer is poet Vítězslav Nezval who has been known to snort at the phrase "socialist realism" and to act as a temperamental individualist. His biograph-

ical
pea
nal
hoc
his
Pra
and
men
ing
nom
com
of F
ber
to a
tura
thea
in t
T
the
here
his
cork
195
wha
self-
of s
had
unp
195
mee
ers'
as a
ism:
"
artis
whic
to tr
com
Seco
by r
to h
shou
abro
mon
have
deno
only

ical sketches which have been appearing in the weekly literary journal *Kultura*, show a pleasant childhood and youth, alternating between his quiet Moravian birthplace and Prague, joining the leftwing poets and artists of the 1920's from sentiment and conviction rather than being forced into their ranks by economic straits. But he has been no comfort to the litterateurs of Voice of Free Europe, either. He is a member of the Cultural Council, helps to advise the editorial board of *Kultura*, writes for the Czechoslovak theaters and is generally prominent in the cultural world here.

The attempt to make F. Hrubín the hope and hero of reactionaries here and abroad also failed. It was his self-critical remarks which uncorked the flood of criticism at the 1956 Congress. But at that time what bothered Hrubín, unlike a few self-nominated heroes, was the fate of some other poets who he believed had been unjustly passed over and unpublished in the period 1945-1955. At the June 26 membership meeting of the Czechoslovak Writers' Union this year, Hrubín said, as a non-Party supporter of socialism:

"The relation of the poet and artist to the people is a problem which does not and will not cease to trouble me. . . . I often hear from comrades that my remarks at the Second Congress are being misused by reaction over the border in order to blacken our conditions here. I should like to tell these gentlemen abroad that I have nothing in common with them and never want to have. If they ascribe reactionary tendencies to me they should know not only my contribution to the [Con-

gress] discussion, but also my work which shows what side I'm on and what I'm fighting for."

When writers like President Zápotocký, V. Kaňa, Marie Majerová and others, who sprang from the working class, speak about socialist realism they know just what they mean. They mean the truth they have been trying to make heard all their lives, the truth of working class struggle and the battle to change an unjust world; and this socialist truth must be told in an artistic enough way so that it will be effective and be absorbed by the reader.

Taking the floor at the June 26 session as a member of the Writers' Union, President Zápotocký again rejected the claims of some writers that they had been pressured into falsifying between 1945 and 1956, as he had rejected them in his speech to the 1956 Congress: "If they lied, it was because they wanted to be attractive; they shouldn't shove it onto anyone else. . . ." He conceded to the young writers their "right to make mistakes," but reserved for the more experienced the counter right to criticize these mistakes. Again he reminded the writers of the class basis for domestic and international struggles and quoted Mao Tse-tung's "On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People" where Mao says, "On the surface those two slogans—let a hundred flowers blossom and a hundred schools of thought contend—have no class character: the proletariat can turn them to account, so can the bourgeoisie and other people. But different classes, strata and social groups each have their own views on what are fragrant flowers and

what are poisonous weeds." Thus the President of Czechoslovakia, who is also one of the leading writers of the country, quoted a Chinese statesman to sum up what is commonly recognized as the boundary to criticism campaigns.

The writers had been so sharply criticized in the discussion at the meeting of the Central Committee on June 13 that some exaggerated predictions were made that the literary scene would return to the pre-Twentieth Congress and pre-Second Writers' Congress situation. These people were forgetting that, although the main report by Hendrych did stress the fight against revisionism, did criticize the "liberalistic" errors of some literary journals and reproach those Communists who had not countered "harmful" trends at the 1956 Writers' Congress, did warn against formalistic experimentalism which produces an art incomprehensible to the people, still he also stressed that this art must be based on a "multiplicity of forms, a contest of individuals in art and of original talents, personal styles and forms." Furthermore the pessimists forget that the situation is never static. Certainly there are dangers inherent in an insistence that art be understandable to all the people; art may thereby be forced to a mediocre level. But it is up to all artists to see that this does not occur. (A movement is now on, for instance, for a general popular esthetic education.) It is not an immediate matter of "let there be light," but of daily action.

This was evident in the remarks of First Secretary Otčenášek at the June 26 membership meeting mentioned above. He firmly stated that

they were following the positive tendencies in the 1956 Congress, as they had come to stand for a critical and unschematic approach to culture. He asserted that they had already laid the basis for the "sole path of development for our literature, a full expansion of battles of opinion and discussion," and that this basis was an improvement of relations among writers on the grounds of mutual trust and respect.

Poet Jan Noha of the Writers' Union's presidium, also stressed that the present leadership of the Writers' Union "came out of the elections of the Second Congress and corresponded in nature to its positive aspects—by its frankness, its workaday character and the preservation of all principles of democracy, collectivity in decision, with full understanding for the specific character of art and literature."

This brief outline of recent discussions and remarks on literature is intended to give the American reader an understanding that the situation in literary criticism is never rigidly fixed, although there are common and stable aims. These can be briefly described as a continuance of the cultural heritage while working toward socialist goals, participation of cultural workers in the struggles of the general population to build socialism, cultural workers putting their talents in the services of the peace movement—all the while perfecting the means of artistic expression, searching for new forms to correspond to new content.

There are things one misses in the program and in the performance. There are no works of art yet which explore frankly the mistakes made

under socialist administrations or the problems of rehabilitation and injustices. There is nothing here to compare with Galina Nikolaieva's new Soviet novel *On the Difficult Way*, for instance, let alone a Dudintsev (parenthetically I wonder how many of those who have put Dudintsev on their banner have actually read *Not by Bread Alone* and are willing to have the eccentric lone-wolf hero as their ideal). There is as yet no acceptance of Mao Tse-tung's insistence that "Decisions on exoneration and rehabilitation should receive the same measure of publicity as the original mistaken decisions." But the way is open for such a policy. And the correct principle of continuous discussion is being adhered to, with at least verbal recognition given to the value of criticism.

Little things point to a trend: an article in *Literary News* which calls for re-publication of a children's classic with Mr. and Mrs. Beetle as heroes, drawing many humorous analogies with the insect world, but running counter to the official attitude on a Higher Providence, and

therefore not published for several years; the inclusion of Kafka on publication lists; art exhibitions which are not wholly realistic; topics for films which are more daring.

The criticism is not as bold as that of the Chinese who declare with Mao Tse-tung (*op. cit.*), "Marxists should not be afraid of criticism from any quarter. Quite the contrary, they need to steel and improve themselves and win new positions in the teeth of criticism and the storm and stress of struggle. Fighting against wrong ideas is like being vaccinated—a man develops greater immunity from disease after the vaccine takes effect. Plants raised in hothouses are not likely to be robust. Carrying out the policy of letting a hundred flowers blossom and a hundred schools of thought contend will not weaken but strengthen the leading position of Marxism in the ideological field."

The contributions of the Chinese statesmen and philosophers to socialist thinking have been enormous in this last year. They are constantly quoted in Czechoslovak literary debates. To my mind a good thing.

HUNDRED FLOWER POLICY CONTINUES

KO CHING-SHIH, leading Chinese official, said recently in a speech to the Shanghai People's Congress:

"Our objective is to create a political situation in which there is both centralism and democracy, both discipline and freedom, both united will and personal ease of mind, and vitality to serve the interests of the socialist revolutions and socialist construction.

"This is the general direction of the political life of our country. Therefore, the general guiding principle on the correct handling of contradictions among the people and the policies of letting a hundred flowers blossom and a hundred schools of thought contend, long-term co-existence and mutual supervision must be carried through. They certainly will not be stopped half-way because of the struggle against the rightists."

NEW FEATURES OF SOVIET ECONOMIC ADVANCES

by VICTOR PERLO

THE UN's 1956 Economic Survey of Europe* includes the best analysis of current economic developments and problems in European socialist countries that this writer has seen. A whole series of new methods are being used in these countries. They do not involve any departure from socialist principles. Nor do they involve reckless attempts to escape from underlying economic laws, such as the requirement that production of capital goods must increase more rapidly than production of consumers goods in order to achieve the most rapid long-range gains in both. The new departures revolve about a central theme—the attempt to realize more effectively the basic economic objective of socialist society—the maximum satisfaction of the ever-rising material and cultural needs of the people. This review is limited to a discussion of a few of the major developments in the USSR.

In this country, certain opponents of peaceful coexistence are striving to convince themselves and the public that socialism is undergoing a near-mortal economic crisis. The UN report shows that they are completely wrong.

VICTOR PERLO, is a well known economist and frequent contributor to New World Review. His latest book is "The Empire of High Finance," published by International Publishers.

In the 1957 plan, Soviet industrial production is scheduled to rise "only" 7 per cent, as compared with the 11 per cent rise in 1956. Of course, 7 per cent is more of an increase than the United States has ever realized in time of peacetime prosperity. We have exceeded that percentage only when taking up the slack of depression-idled capacity and labor.

But this did not prevent *Fortune* magazine from citing the 7 per cent as evidence of some grave crisis in the Soviet economy; which, its editors thought, marked the end of steady and rapid growth and a breakdown of the system of socialist planning. *Fortune* attributes the slower rate of rise to the reduction in new entrants into the labor force as a result of lowered birth rates during World War II. It looks forward to increasing Soviet difficulties on this account in the years ahead.

Actually, according to the UN report, this is not a major problem, partly because reductions in the size of the Soviet armed forces contribute more civilian manpower. Signifying the lack of strain in this area, pension regulations have been amended to reduce the incentive to

*Economic Survey of Europe in 1956, United Nations Economic Commission for Europe. Columbia University Press, N. Y. 1957.

older people to continue working.

The main factor in the lowered planned increase is the need to correct previous imbalances in production. Over the years, the USSR has tended to increase production to finished goods more rapidly than output of basic raw materials—steel, coal, electricity, etc. The intention in 1957 is to decelerate final product manufacture, in order to accumulate larger stocks of basic materials. As shown by American experience, adequate stocks of raw materials permit a smoother and more efficient growth in final product manufacture, with no interruptions on account of "bottlenecks." And in a socialist economy, there is no chance of the opposite difficulty—so characteristic of our capitalism—the piling up of huge stocks owing to faltering demand that can only be liquidated through lay-offs and depression.

For a long time, many western observers predicted that agriculture would prove the Achilles heel of Soviet economy. Their arguments were fed by the comparative stagnation of farm output after the initial post-war recovery. But since 1953 Soviet agriculture has finally entered a period of steady and accelerating growth. Output increased 5 per cent in 1954, 10 per cent in 1955, and 14 per cent in 1956—compounded, a gain of 32 per cent in the three-year period; which already is bringing improved food supplies to industry.

After taking several tacks in farm policy, with indifferent success, the Soviet Government has finally found some of the keys to unleash the potential energy of the USSR's vast farm population. One such key

has been the raising of state procurement prices, both for the compulsory delivery quotas, and for the over-quota voluntary sales to the state. Practice has shown that a narrower spread between these prices and the freely bargained farm market prices provides a greater incentive to collective farmers to raise their output. With the improvement in supplies, farm-market prices have started to decline, so that in 1956 free market prices for food were only 3 per cent higher than in 1940—a situation beneficial to the urban population dependent on these markets for a substantial proportion of their food supplies. At the same time, through higher state delivery prices, combined with higher deliveries, farmers' incomes from sales to the state rose 80 per cent between 1953 and 1956.

The other major factor in Soviet agricultural advance has been the success of the virgin lands program in Siberia and Kazakhstan. Experts here, who predicted outright failure after the drought-affected harvest of 1955, should amend their views after the excellent yields of 1956. It is already apparent that, even if good crops are limited to alternate years, the new acreage will prove a highly efficient source of added bread-grain supply, freeing much land in the Ukraine and southern Russia for fodder crops with which to meet the ambitious goal of catching up to American per capita meat, milk, and butter supplies within the next few years. Data in the UN report show that real progress was made in this direction in 1956, but that there is still a very long way to go.

A contribution of the report is

the frank discussion of the problems created by the system of private plots which collective farmers own. While providing them with a goodly portion of their personal food supplies, and—through free market sales—considerable cash income, these plots are much less productive per unit of labor than the collective and state farms proper. Moreover, when collective farmers concentrate on “their own” plots, there is a corresponding reduction in the seriousness of their efforts on the socialist enterprise.

During the post-war Soviet policy has generally aimed at reducing the importance of private plots, but so far with only limited success. The clinging to the private plot is deeply rooted in peasant psychology. The report suggests that only when the city can supply a large variety of goods to the farm cheaply—as in the United States—will the majority of collective farmers find it immediately advantageous personally to devote their efforts exclusively, or nearly so, to the collective.

A very interesting section of the report deals with recent Soviet reforms in labor conditions and social amenities, such as the minimum wage law, the reduction in the work week, and the improvement in old age pensions.

The Soviet Union now provides retiring workers with pensions equalling at least 50 per cent of their wages (and 60 per cent in the estimated average); a ratio established as desirable by social security experts here, but never approached in our own legislation.

The UN Report shows that the People's Democracies of Eastern Europe are striking out in the same

general directions as the USSR. However, initial successes have been more spotty in these newer socialist countries.

Nevertheless, progress, in living standards is definitely taking place, and there is general economic advance, which should pick up momentum as the heritage of the past in material and cultural backwardness is overcome. Recent reductions in Eastern European military budgets should free substantial resources for a sharp short-term gain in conditions. The large long-term credits recently granted by the USSR are shown in a very impressive listing—covering all of the European People's Democracies as well as India, Indonesia, and Afghanistan. With the changes underway in the Eastern European countries, it is reasonable to expect that these new and larger credits will be used even more effectively in economic build-up than earlier Soviet aid achieved in these areas.

Recently, Dulles and others like him have been brutally frank in stating that they strive to continue the arms race, in part, to put economic pressure on the socialist world in the hope of creating an economic and political crisis. Recent socialist gains show the bankruptcy of that policy—so costly to American taxpayers, and so profitable to American arms merchants. Undoubtedly the relaxation of international tensions, and the reduction of armaments, for which most of humanity is striving, will make possible a great upsurge in well-being in the socialist world, with none of the problems of adjustment faced by the militarized capitalist countries.

The Disarmament Talks

by JESSICA SMITH

NEVER HAVE so many people been united around a single issue as are the people of the world today united around the general issue of peace, and the specific issue of ending nuclear weapons tests as the most urgent and feasible first step toward averting the ultimate disaster of atomic war.

The compelling urgency of the suspension of nuclear weapons tests and other disarmament measures is daily pointed up by new warnings of scientists of the terrible radiation hazards to present and future generations. The vital need of steps toward ending all war is pointed up by the "little wars" in Algeria and Oman and the dangers of new conflicts in the Middle East, arising around Jordan and Syria. The Administration has rejected the renewed Soviet proposal for joint action with the United States, Britain and France to renounce the use of force in the Middle East, and instead threatens the application of the Eisenhower Doctrine, which authorizes the use of U.S. armed force to defend Middle Eastern nation against "overt armed aggression from any nation controlled by international communism," under which heading apparently come all efforts to establish friendly relations with the USSR, and to remain neutral as between East and West. This policy has already meant a stepped up arms race in the Middle

East and the ever growing danger of small wars that can spread to large ones.

The announcement by the Soviet Union of the successful testing of an intercontinental ballistic missile, which the United States is also striving to perfect, points more insistently to the need to stop this mad race for the "ultimate" weapon, which no nation can ever finally win, and which only brings closer the possibility of the ultimate annihilation of civilization.

There is no security for mankind in the present precarious balance of weapons of mass annihilation between the great world powers, no guarantee that because of the ultimate disaster atomic war would bring to all participants no one would start it. It could happen by accident, by an act of insanity. Until atomic weapons are banned, this monstrous danger remains.

Statement in London

It is a matter of the deepest disappointment that in spite of the growing dangers to peace and insistent worldwide demands for progress toward disarmament, the London meetings of the UN Disarmament Subcommittee recessed in stalemate, and that earlier hopes of at least some minimum agreement proved unjustified. But we must not permit this disappointment to become pessimism, or to lead to any slackening

of the great worldwide crusade for disarmament and peace. The London conference in fact had tremendous value in airing East and West viewpoints, in bringing out the differences, pointing up areas where agreement might be reached, and above all in serving to mobilize and focus world opinion.

The hopes of the world now turn to the new session of the UN General Assembly, where the issue can be debated in a wider arena. This means new responsibilities for the American people in analyzing and understanding the Administration's program and why it failed of acceptance at London, and in demanding new and more realistic policies.

After many months of assuring the American people of their determination to achieve some results at London, however small, and talk of a new serious disarmament program that could not fail, the Administration, after delayed and piecemeal presentation, finally offered the complete Western plan at the London Conference on August 29, through U.S. delegate Harold Stassen.

Even before the final unveiling of the plan, serious doubts were being raised in many quarters as to American intentions by the propaganda about the "clean bomb" which could only be achieved by continued testing, and the fanciful Pentagon-inspired pictures of neat, limited little wars fought with small nuclear weapons, each side adhering strictly to the rules until, of course, the other side broke them.

Secretary of State Dulles did nothing to quell such doubts in his July 22 broadcast on U.S. disarmament policy when he stated in categorical terms:

Now let me, first of all, make clear that when we talk about disarmament, we don't use that word in any literal sense. No one is thinking about disarming the United States or the Soviet Union, or any other nation. What we are seeking is action in the field of armaments which will reduce the danger of war. . . .

It is not practical to assure the abolition of nuclear weapons. . . . We do not propose to eliminate nuclear weapons or the possibility of their use. . . . Until we see serious proof that the Soviet really means arms limitation, our safety primarily depends on having the best weapons, large and small, that we can develop. This means continued testing. Testing makes it possible to develop even smaller weapons and to insure that larger weapons will have less radioactive fall-out.

It could hardly be stated more plainly that the principle of deterrence, based on having "the best weapons," and not the ending of the arms race, remains the basis of American policy. This explains the insistence on the aerial inspection program to eliminate "surprise attack," which, in fact, has nothing to do with disarmament. This was pointed out editorially by the authoritative weekly, *New Statesman*, in its August 3 issue. Commenting on Mr. Dulles' trip to London, which *New Statesman* inferred was for the purpose of guiding the disarmament negotiations back to lines "approved of by the chiefs of staff," the editorial noted Mr. Dulles' primary concern with aerial inspection zones, which—

All have the same object—and it is primarily a military one—to remove the possibility of a surprise attack. The Pentagon recognizes that the weakness of a deterrent policy is that surprise could still give either side a crucial military advantage, and that it is only when sur-

prise has been eliminated that the deterrent becomes absolute. But this is a very different matter from disarmament . . .

Rather, it appears to take for granted the inevitability of war and to concentrate on obtaining a superior military position instead of eliminating the possibility of war by ending the arms race.

Additional light was thrown on the U.S. position by Marquis Childs in the *New York Post*, September 9. He reported that in private conversations in Washington, Harold Stassen indicated that his authority in London had progressively been cut from under him as disagreements had developed within the Administration. Childs continued:

Stassen's attitude could, in fact, be described as almost despairing. If you deliberately want to prevent achieving any disarmament, he told at least two persons with whom he talked, then you do the following:

You make your proposals so complicated and so far-reaching that the other side is almost certain to reject them.

You impose on the negotiator the necessity to check and recheck and check again with officials back home before he can advance another step in the negotiations. In other words, you make it as difficult as possible to carry on a frank face-to-face discussion on the terms of a disarmament agreement.

You tolerate—if you do not actively encourage—officials who say publicly that there is no possibility of getting a disarmament agreement and that an agreement would, in any event, be unworkable if not undesirable.

With this background in view, and nothing in the final U.S. program to show a different approach, it is not surprising that the Soviet Union found the proposals unacceptable.

Failure to reach agreement at London is now being laid at the door of the Soviet Union, which is accused of rejecting every American proposal.

It should be remembered that Soviet delegate Valerian Zorin outlined a comprehensive disarmament program at the very beginning of the subcommittee sessions last March, and when it was rejected by the Western powers, issued a new set of partial proposals on April 30 (see June NWR), in which many concessions were made to the Western viewpoint.

Since the proposals of the Soviet Union came first and since the American program constitutes a wholly different approach, a fair interpretation would seem to be that the United States had rejected the Soviet proposals rather than the other way around. While there has been much talk of compromises to meet the Soviet position, every part of the U.S. program is inextricably bound up with every other, and everything that has been presented as a "concession" is in fact tied to conditions that the whole course of the negotiations has demonstrated the Soviet Union would not accept.

It should be clear by this time that in the present atmosphere of tension and hostility, no elaborate inspection system involving throwing open the whole territory of either nation to the other, or teams from either nation inspecting atomic installations on the other nation's territory, such as the United States proposes, is yet possible. One has only to consider how welcome Soviet planes flying all over the United States, or Soviet inspectors visiting Los Alamos would be, to have the

answer. The only feasible kind of preliminary agreement is one that would be self-enforcing.

This has been recognized by the Soviet Union in its proposal that the question of suspending nuclear weapons' tests for two or three years, be separated from all other questions, and be made unconditional and immediate. This is in line with the position taken today by the majority of the world's people. While having originally proposed that this step be taken without inspection arrangements, since present day technical facilities assure that all tests anywhere can be detected immediately, the USSR made the concession to the Western viewpoint that international detection teams could be stationed on the territory of the atomic powers and the Pacific testing grounds.

The Western Proposals

A great deal was made of the announcement that the United States is now ready to consider suspending tests for two years instead of the ten month period previously proposed. But test suspensions are tied up to complex conditions. In the final Western program, the cessation of tests for one year is linked with the banning of the production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes, and the entering into effect of an elaborate inspection system covering both aspects, as well as with an aerial inspection system. Only if all parties concerned are satisfied with the inspection arrangements, will a further one-year suspension of tests go into effect.

Banning of production of fissionable materials for weapons should certainly be a part of any

over-all disarmament program. But it must be noted that no mention is made in the U.S. program of destroying existing stockpiles of fissionable materials or of nuclear bombs, of which both sides already have sufficient to destroy the other, or of banning the use of existing bombs. In fact, the use of nuclear weapons is legalized in the statement: "Each party assumes an obligation not to use nuclear weapons *if an armed attack has not placed the party in a situation of individual or collective self defense.*" Thus a border clash of indeterminate origin could be transformed into full-scale atomic war. The Soviet proposal calls for renunciation of the use for military purposes of atomic and hydrogen weapons of all types, and steps toward agreement on their complete banning, ending of their production and destruction of stockpiles.

The U.S. plan provides for the reduction of the armed forces of the Soviet Union and the United States to 2,500,000 within one year, France and Britain to 750,000 each. The USSR has also proposed these figures for the first stage, to be followed by a further reduction which it considers would indicate sufficient seriousness toward disarmament and lessening of tensions to make feasible for it the first step, which taken alone, in view of the greater population of the USSR, would leave it in an unequal position. Under the U.S. program, however, any further reduction would be conditional on "progress toward the solution of political issues," including the question of Germany which remains the most knotty of all problems between the United States and the USSR,

made more so by the recent NATO decision to place atomic weapons at the disposal of Western Germany.

No provision is made in the U.S. program for the reduction of military expenditures which the USSR considers must accompany the reduction of armed forces.

The U.S. program proposes a "technical committee" to study an inspection system "which would make it possible to assure that the sending of objects through outer space will be exclusively for peaceful and scientific purposes." The Soviet program goes further in its proposal to ban all types of atomic and hydrogen weapons, which would apply to nuclear warheads on all such objects.

All other aspects of the U.S. program are tied in with its aerial and ground inspection proposals offered as "Safeguards against the Possibility of a Surprise Attack." The first variant is to throw open the whole of the United States, Alaska, and Canada and the whole of the Soviet Union to such inspection which hardly anyone can take seriously as a realistic proposal under present conditions. The alternative is the Arctic Region, Canada, and a section of the Western United States and the Eastern Soviet Union and Europe, subject to the consent of the West's European allies. Both variants are unacceptable to the Soviet Union since they do not include extensive areas where U.S. military bases are located. The USSR has, however, accepted the principle of aerial inspection and proposed that it be applied over an area covering both NATO and Warsaw Pact territories and sections of both the Soviet Union and the United States,

and at one point in the discussion agreement on aerial inspection zones seemed near.

Another section of the U.S. program further elaborates the question of international control and inspection measures. The final point emphasizes that the program is offered for negotiation "on the understanding that its provisions are inseparable," which can hardly be interpreted otherwise than a statement that it is, in fact, non-negotiable.

Nothing is said in the U.S. program about the Soviet proposals for the abolition of military bases, the reduction of the armed forces of the United States, the USSR, Britain and France in Germany, reduction of NATO and Warsaw Pact forces and the ending of war propaganda.

Appended to the text of the proposal was a U.S. statement to the effect that it constituted "a practical, workable plan for a start on world disarmament." The statement explained that while it was formally advanced on behalf of Canada, France, the United Kingdom and the United States as members of the subcommittee, it also bore the approval of Italy, Belgium, Luxembourg, Iceland, The Netherlands, West Germany, Norway, Denmark, Greece and Turkey and incorporated the views of other nations.

The Soviet Position

In declaring that the Western proposals contained nothing new and were unacceptable, Valerian Zorin again raised the demand of the Soviet Union for unconditional and immediate suspension of further tests, divorced from the other measures which could only lead to "a maze of difficult problems."

The Soviet government summed up its position on the Disarmament talks in a lengthy statement on August 27, presented to the conference by Mr. Zorin, which constituted its answer to the Western proposals thus far submitted, which were all put together in one package in the West's final proposals.

The Soviet statement declared that the subcommittee had failed to make any advance toward solution of the problems before it. It called attention to the fact that during the sessions the NATO Council, meeting at Bonn, had decided to place atomic weapons at the disposal of a number of West European states, including West Germany, and that the United States had started stationing atomic task units on the territory of West European NATO countries.

The USSR charged the West with making it impossible to reach agreement on suspension of nuclear weapons tests by linking it up with other measures on which agreement had proved difficult, and asked "What is the use of the American proposal on the discontinuation of the manufacture of fissionable material for military purposes if after its acceptance the manufacture of atomic and hydrogen bombs in the USA will go on as before and atomic weapons will still not be prohibited?" On the "deterrent" policy, the statement said:

The Soviet Government declares again that the states should renounce the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons. Trying to justify their unwillingness to agree on the prohibition of nuclear weapons, the leaders of the Western states are fond of repeating the fact that possession of nuclear weapons by states allegedly exerts restraining influence and

diminishes the possibility of atomic war. This is a downright fraud. On the contrary, history shows that an armaments drive has always led to its logical end, that is, to war.

The Western proposal to permit the use of nuclear weapons in self-defense was termed a formula actually legalizing their use rather than leading their prohibition. The USSR statement declared that the attempts to put question of control and aerial inspection in the forefront showed that the Western powers were not really interested in disarmament, further demonstrated by the fact that they had placed the question in the hands of NATO, their military alliance, which builds all its calculations "on the use of atomic weapons, on the continuation of the arms drive, on the preparation for a new war." It said that it was an absolutely abnormal and intolerable situation for the question of disarmament to be in the hands of countries "whose ruling circles are not interested in disarmament . . . when not only a number of important states interested in the solution of the disarmament problem are kept out of the work of the United Nations subcommittee, but entire continents, Asia, Africa, and Latin America, are not represented at all."

In conclusion, the Soviet Government statement stressed that agreement on disarmament can and should be reached, that real opportunities exist for agreement on the most urgent measures toward disarmament, and called again for agreement on primary first steps, such as ending of tests, in order to pave the way for gradual solution of the problem of disarmament as a whole.

—September 10

The Peoples Cry for Peace

IN DEVELOPING their own activities for peace and the ending of nuclear weapons tests it is important that the American people should be fully informed of the great national mass movements to this end that are developing all over the world. Leading religious bodies, scientists, women's groups, youth, labor—all sections of the population are speaking out. In all the socialist countries, in the Bandung countries of Africa and Asia, the question of agreement on ending tests has become a matter of national concern. In England, the British Trades Union Congress has called for immediate end of atomic and hydrogen bomb tests and manufacture.

Cutting across national boundaries, more and more international conferences are being held to urge action on the atomic powers. We have tried to bring our readers as much news of these movements as possible within our space limitations, and cannot now recapitulate them all, but can only mention a few of the most recent actions that have been only meagerly reported in the American press.

Of special importance was a historic meeting of world famous scientists from ten nations, representing both West and East at Pugwash in Nova Scotia which took place July 6-11. This meeting grew out of the appeal issued two years ago by Albert Einstein and Bertrand Russell that scientists assess the dangers to mankind of nuclear warfare, and calling for an end of war itself. The

scientists came together at the home of Cyrus Eaton, Cleveland capitalist.

Separate committees considered the hazards of the use of atomic energy in peace and war, problems of control of nuclear weapons, and the social responsibility of scientists. The full text of their findings was published in *I. F. Stone's Weekly*, for July 22.

The scientists warned against the hazards of tests, and the disaster of unprecedented magnitude that nuclear war itself would mean, whether "clean" or "dirty" bombs were used. They found that if tests were continued at present rate for another 30 years there would be 100,000 additional cases of leukemia and bone cancer and genetic effects over many generations, while in nuclear war itself hundreds of millions would be killed and immeasurable genetic effects would result. They warned especially against the peril from small wars, in which the great powers might intervene on opposite sides, and the difficulty of limiting them.

They concluded: "The principle objective of all nations must be the elimination of war and the threat of war hanging over mankind. War must be finally eliminated, not merely regulated by limiting the weapons that may be used." The elimination of war, they said, calls for lessening of tensions, an ending of the arms race, a control system, and recommended:

"The prompt suspension of nu-

clear bomb tests could be a good first step for this process."

American scientists who signed the statement were Prof. H. J. Muller of Indiana University; Prof. Eugene Rabinowitch of the University of Illinois, Editor of the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*; Prof. Paul Doty of Harvard University, former President of the American Federation of Scientists; Prof. Walter Selove of the University of Pennsylvania; Prof. Victor Weiskopf of Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Prof. David F. Cavers, Associate Dean of the Harvard Law School.

In addition, the statement was signed by three Soviet scientists, one from the Chinese People's Republic, one from Poland, three from Japan, two from Western Europe, three from Great Britain, one from Canada, one from Australia.

On the twelfth anniversary of the dropping of the bomb on Hiroshima the Third International Conference for the Prohibition of Atomic and Hydrogen Weapons opened in Tokyo. The proceedings of this conference should have been followed by everyone in our country, on whose conscience must lie forever the action which brought it into being. There was little news of it in the press.

The Conference, held August 6-16, was attended by some 4,000 Japanese delegates, and about a hundred delegates from 25 countries and 10 international organizations of Asia, Africa, Europe, America, Australia and the Pacific Area, representing the most varied social systems, ideological views and religious creeds. At the final plenary session, attended by 10,000 people, three important declarations were adopted.

In "The Tokyo Declaration" the opening demand was for *an international agreement for an immediate and unconditional prohibition of nuclear tests*.

In addition, the Declaration demanded prohibition under international control of the manufacture, stockpiling and use of nuclear weapons; banning of the export of nuclear weapons from possessor-countries to any other countries; worldwide controlled disarmament and failing that, partial disarmament; urged simultaneous dismantlement of all military blocs, dissolution of military bases and withdrawal of all military troops from foreign territories.

In an "Appeal to the United Nations and the Governments of the World" the conference called particularly on the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union to agree immediately and unconditionally on the ending of tests to pave the way for the other measures outlined above and called upon the United Nations and all governments to do everything in their power to secure such agreement.

A final resolution outlined specific joint actions in all countries toward fulfillment of the above demands.

The "Clean Bomb" Hoax

The fears of the American people about radiation hazards from nuclear weapons tests and the measureless horror of nuclear war itself, cannot and must not be stilled by the efforts to make them believe that "clean" bombs can be made, nor by all the present talk of "limited" nuclear wars "guaranteed" not to expand into big ones.

Three atomic scientists of California University's Radiation Laboratory, Dr. Ernest O. Lawrence, Dr. Edward Teller and Dr. Mark M. Mills, visited the President June 24 in the company of Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. The scientists told the President they "had reduced the radioactive fall-out from a hydrogen bomb explosion by 95 per cent." And, the President revealed at his press conference the next day, they assured him, "give us four or five years to test each step of our development and we will produce an absolutely clean bomb." He seemed to suggest that on this basis continued testing would be a good thing.

There was an immediate outcry against the "clean bomb" hoax, on both scientific and moral grounds. Numerous scientists have already testified that there is no such thing as a clean bomb, on the ground that while the fusion bomb (H-bomb) by-products are relatively non-radioactive, no way has yet been found to generate sufficient heat to trigger it except through fission (A-bomb) which produces extensive radioactivity and fall-out.

The AEC's recent handbook, "The Effects of Nuclear Weapons" (quoted by Hanson Baldwin, *N. Y. Times* military expert, Aug. 4) makes clear that there is not and cannot be any such thing as a completely "clean" nuclear weapon.

The Summary, issued in August, of the May-June hearings of the Chet Holifield Special Subcommittee on Radiation of the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, pointed out that the hearings had shown that while some kinds of explosions produced less radioactivity

than others, there is no such thing as an absolutely "clean" weapon, that there was "general agreement that any amount of radiation, no matter how small the dose, increases the rate of genetic mutation in a population." The Los Alamos Chapter of the Federation of Atomic Scientists, regretting the possible effect of the "clean" bomb views on London disarmament negotiations, declared: "The choice that faces us is not so much between 'clean' and 'dirty' bombs, but rather between a world in which war and, therefore, nuclear bombing will occur, and a world in which we shall be free of this scourge."

Watson Davis, Director of *Science Service* (*World-Telegram*, June 25) pointed out that the idea of a "clean" bomb was being utilized as an argument for continued testing, although it was still not known how a "clean" bomb could be made. He declared that in any case, existing stocks of "dirty" bombs on both sides would be used if there were a worldwide atomic war:

War in atomic phases is dirtier than ever, with bigger and worse explosions, including the radioactive explosions that extend through damaged germ plasm to many generations and warp human heredity. The arguments for peace are more compelling than ever.

Senator Mike Mansfield (D-Mon.) declared in a speech before Congress on July 13 that even a bomb 96 per cent clean "would still release more fall-out than the atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima," that there would be no way of insuring against use of dirty bombs in actual warfare, and that no bomb could be used without killing hundreds of

thousands of people. He said a temporary standstill on tests might reduce a health hazard to the human race, and proposed new efforts to end the cold war and reach agreement with the USSR.

The *New Republic* asked editorially in its July 15 issue: "Is it 'cleaner' to be vaporized by H-bomb blast than to be poisoned by H-bomb fall-out?" They said the request of Lewis Strauss and his AEC scientists for five more years of tests seemed to them not a request for time to produce a "humanitarian" bomb, but "for a continuation of the arms race." James Avery Joyce, in an article in the *Nation*, July 6 declared: "The present search for a 'clean' bomb marks the depths of fatuity to which the military mind can descend in its total disregard for ethical values."

Saturday Review Editor Norman Cousins, who encouraged Dr. Albert Schweitzer to issue his appeal against tests, declared in a July 13 editorial that to call any bomb "clean" that in a split second can incinerate millions of human beings, "is to make an obscene farce out of words." He said that what the world is waiting for "is not a better way to make 'clean' hydrogen explosives, but a better way to get rid of dirty wars." Suggesting that government policies might be developing along the lines of the scientists "clean" bomb recommendations, he declared:

If so, and we pursue a policy of unlimited testing, then the present disarmament negotiations are fruitless. For the President had previously stated that any ban on nuclear testing must be tied to a ban on nuclear armaments. If, therefore, we now insist on continued testing, it can only mean that disarmament itself is doomed. What is most serious is

that we are in effect announcing that we don't want what the world's peoples are clamoring for—specific and concerted action that can bring the big nuclear killers under control. . . . Soviet Russia has been charging us with insincerity. If we now confirm that charge by what we ourselves do, then we will have suffered a loss in the world that no quantity of hydrogen explosive however 'clean,' can offset.

U.S. Demands for End of Tests

In the rising protests of the people of the United States against the continuance of nuclear weapons tests there has been a marked increase in the activity of religious groups in the past few months, and also in some labor groups, with a number of leading labor officials speaking out for the first time.

The Quakers deserve a tremendous amount of credit for the wide mobilization of public opinion through their petition campaign urging the President to take the lead in the banning of tests. In mid-July the New England American Friend's Service Committee delivered 10,000 signatures to President Eisenhower, with a second ten thousand well under way. In Northern California 10,000 AFSC petition signatures were sent in August, with a campaign going on in Southern California as well. Petitions are being circulated in the Mid-West and in other parts of the country. The petitions have also been circulated widely among Protestant ministers in various parts of the country, many of whom have preached sermons on the issues. The petition campaign has in many communities led to the joining of various community leaders in meetings statements and in newspaper adver-

tisements on the issue. As a result, there have been hundreds of thousands of signers.

In late June a group of trade union, religious leaders, scientists and educators joined in an appeal to the President along the lines of the Friends' petition. Signers included Frank Rosenblum, Secretary-Treasurer of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, Patrick E. Gorman, Secretary-Treasurer of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters Union, Ed Marciniak, Vice-President of the American Newspaper Guild and President of the Chicago Guild, and Editor of *Work*, published by the Catholic Labor Alliance.

Early in July a telegram was sent by 83 scientific, religious, educational and labor leaders to the President urging that agreement to ban testing be reached at London talks. Signers included E. Raymond Wilson of the Friends' Committee on National Legislation, President Walter Reuther of the United Automobile Workers; President James B. Carey of the International Union of Electrical Workers; President Joseph E. Beirne of the Communications Workers of America; James G. Patton, President of the National Farmers' Union; Norman Thomas; Robert Nathan, Chairman of Americans for Democratic Action; Charles C. Price, former Chairman of the Federation of American Scientists.

Henry J. Cadbury, Chairman of the American Friends' Service Committee addressed identical letters to President Eisenhower, Prime Minister MacMillan of Great Britain and Premier Bulganin of the USSR urging moral leadership toward the ending of tests.

The World Council of Churches, largest Protestant and Eastern Orthodox Church agency in the world, numbering 175,000,000 adherents, has called for an end of the testing of nuclear weapons by international agreements. On August 5, at the end of a nine-day session, its 90-member policy-making committee issued a long statement declaring that abolition of war itself must be the main goal, but that foregoing of tests for a trial period should be the first step in an over-all program including cessation of nuclear weapons production and successive steps toward disarmament. Member churches in all countries were called upon to further this program.

On August 22 the Third World Assembly of the Lutheran World Assembly, largest single denominational group of international Protestantism, with 50,000,000 members, called unanimously for the suspension of tests during a trial period, to open the way for a permanent ending of production and testing of nuclear weapons and disarmament.

On July 1, Dr. J. H. Jackson, President of the National Baptist Convention of the United States, representing 4,500,000 Negro Baptists in some 28,000 Negro Baptist churches throughout the country, reported on a resolution passed at a peace conference of his denomination and backed by the Convention's Board of Directors. The resolution called on President Eisenhower to take the lead in calling three international conferences: 1) of the world's leading scientists to review and announce effects of nuclear weapon tests; 2) of representatives of all the world's living religions to discuss the moral implications of

scientific findings on tests; 3) of top statesmen and political leaders to formulate united action for peace, to meet in Washington, Moscow and the Far East, with agreement by nations concerned to suspend nuclear weapons tests during the conference.

This action was endorsed in an editorial in the August issue of the *Washington Eagle*, official organ of the Improved, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the world, representing 200,000 Negro men and women in the largest Negro fraternal order in this country.

The June issue of the Methodist Peace Courier, published by the General Board of World Peace of the Methodist Church, of which the Rev. Ralph W. Sockman is President, repeated the 1956 action of the General Conference of the Methodist Church calling for discontinuance of tests by all nations, and many regional and local Methodist bodies have taken similar action, as have groups of Unitarians, Universalists, Congregationalists and other denominational groups.

The Methodist Federation for Social Action, an unofficial membership organization which stands for the complete abolition of war, called for an ending of nuclear weapons tests along with other peace actions at its 50th Anniversary membership meeting in Washington July 17-19.

At the end of July, the Rabbinical Association of America urged the United States to wipe out the shame of Hiroshima and Nagasaki by "leading the world in our disavowal of nuclear weapons" as an instrumentality of warfare. A number of leading Rabbis have taken a similar stand.

Despite the Pope's warnings of the dangers of continued testing and of nuclear warfare itself which made a strong popular impression, the Catholic Church as a whole has not been active in the issue, and leading Catholic layman in Administration and Pentagon circles have been in the forefront of those who call for a continued nuclear policy. Yet some Catholic groups and many individual Catholics have joined the worldwide campaign.

The August issue of *View*, organ of the Capuchin Fathers, declares that H-bomb tests "are sounding the knell for many human lives without benefit of a declaration of war."

The *Catholic Worker* has carried on a consistent campaign against all tests and against all war. Dorothy Day and other staff members were jailed for a second time recently for defying the Civil Defense Drill against a simulated atomic attack in New York City. Ammon Hennacy of its staff has consistently refused to pay taxes on the ground that they are used for military purposes, and picketed and fasted for twelve days at Las Vegas, Nevada, during the current tests. The *Catholic Worker* group also joined with a group of 63 pacifist leaders from thirteen states, including a number of Quakers, representatives of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, clergymen and college professors, who met in Las Vegas for a prayer vigil, a number being arrested for "trespassing" when they picketed near the proving site.

In numerous cities groups have been formed to protest continued testing. The "New York Committee Against Nuclear Weapons" formed

this summer sponsored a meeting at Town Hall on Hiroshima Day. Chairman pro tem of this group is Robert Gilmore, New York secretary of the American Friends Service Committee. Other members are Norman Cousins, Editor of the *Saturday Review*; Rev. Donald Harrington of the Community Church of New York; Rabbi Isidore Hoffman, chaplain of Columbia University; Phillips Elliot, Chairman of the Protestant Council of Churches; Algeron Black, leader of the Ethical Culture Society; Roland Watts, Counsel of the American Civil Liberties Union.

On the anniversary of Hiroshima, pickets sponsored by the War Resisters League, the *Catholic Worker*, the Fellowship of Reconciliation, the Jewish Peace Fellowship and others marched before the UN missions of the United States and the Soviet Union. Demonstrations were held in a number of other places on the anniversary. The Women's International League has carried on a continued campaign against tests along with its general work for disarmament. In many universities students and professors have followed up the appeal against tests initiated by Prof. Linus Pauling and signed initially by over 2,000 scientists.

In addition to the leading labor officials who have joined in appeals mentioned above, an increasing number of labor bodies and publications are advocating action to end tests.

In July, San Francisco dockers, through the action of ILWU Local 10, sent a resolution to the President and their Congressmen demanding the end of tests, and this position

has been supported by the ILWU organ *The Dispatcher*. *Catering Industry Employee*, organ of the Hotel and Restaurant Employees International Union, welcomed signs toward agreement on this issue that seemed to be developing at the London negotiations. Teamsters' Union publications and UAW locals on the West Coast have taken up the cry. In late July the Minneapolis AFL Central Labor Union, decrying the "glib talk of clean and dirty bombs" called for a suspension of tests "until all the hazards to mankind have been determined and controlled." The Retail and Department Store Workers' Executive Board has taken similar action. The United Mine Workers' Journal of August 1 scored the "clean bomb" talk of the AEC, and noted that elsewhere opinion is virtually unanimous that testing of atomic devices should cease. The Convention of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers Union of America, held over the Labor Day weekend, passed a resolution calling for peaceful coexistence of all countries and a ban on atomic warfare.

While there has been little response in Congress to the yearning of the American people for peace, a valuable service was performed in the May-June hearings on radiation hazards of the Holifield subcommittee in alerting the public to the hazards to present and future generations from continued testing. While there were differences of opinion on the extent of the dangers, the consensus of opinion was that the dangers are indubitable, and that there is no "safe" amount of radioactivity and especially Strontium-90. It was brought out at the

hearings that due to wind conditions the northern part of the United States and the Southern part of Canada are subject to the highest fall-out of Strontium-90 of any section of the world, no matter where tests may take place. A number of Senators and Congressmen have made statements on the advisability of ending tests. Chairman Chet Holifield (D-Cal.), has stated that the hearings refuted the AEC position that there is nothing to worry about from continued tests, that fall-out represents "a great and crucial problem of our times" and that "obviously some control and limitation of weapons tests is now mandatory."

The first attempt at Congressional legislation on this crucial problem was made by Representative Charles O. Porter (D-Ore.) who introduced in July a bill to halt further tests of nuclear weapons unless some other country exploded them first. Mrs. Edith Green, (D-Ore.) declared on the floor of the house that "There is only a dirty bomb, a dirtier bomb and a dirtiest bomb" and inserted in the Congressional Record an editorial from the *Oregonian* calling for a moratorium on tests.

Warnings of the hazards to humanity still continue. Members of the American Institute of Biological Science meeting in Palo Alto, Cal. in late July, declared that the peril point of atomic fall-out under continued testing could be reached in 1970, and may have already been reached in some parts of the world. Among those subscribing to this warning were two Navy scientists, Dr. J. D. Teresi and Dr. Curtice L. Newcombe of the Navy Radiological Defense Laboratory, and Dr. H.

Bentley Glass, Johns Hopkins University geneticist. They said tests of the nuclear powers were now spreading about 10,000,000 tons of radioactive material over the earth every year. They said some 50,000,000 tons of fall-out material had been released by United States bombs to date, with 70,000,000 calculated as the theoretical safety limit.

All this points up that no issue is more urgent today than the issue of peace and disarmament, beginning with the banning of tests of nuclear weapons, an urgent safety measure in itself and a necessary opening step toward the solution of the more complex problems of overall disarmament and the abolition of all war for which the whole of mankind yearns. We urge action by all our readers in whatever way is open to them, and will welcome correspondence and exchange of ideas on what is being done.

A very grave responsibility lies with the American people. The world is uneasy at the show of force our government is making in the Middle East and elsewhere in the world. It is aghast at the show of force that is being made in Arkansas and elsewhere in the South, where guns of the National Guard and the violence of the racists is being directed against Negro children to keep them from going to school. That these things can happen in the United States is a blow to U.S. influence abroad which no amount of military aid and dollars can remedy. If the United States wishes to regain world prestige, let the government act quickly to end this shame at home, and to lift the fears of U.S. arms policies from the peoples of the world.

Book Reviews

CHINA IS NEXT DOOR

a review by Murray Young

INTO CHINA, by Claude Roy. Robert M. McBride Co. New York. 1956. 407 pages. \$4.95.

I HAVE just returned from China. It is not at the end of the world, it is just next door. In future I shall only feel at home in a place where happiness is not defined by what one steals from the ignorant, but as the common good which brings increase by participation. Happiness must be universal or it is nothing at all."

Thus Claude Roy ends his account of several months of travel in China in his book that can be heartily recommended to anybody eager to learn about new China.

The visit of this cultivated and witty Frenchman to China was the realization of a dream begun when he read Jules Verne's "The Tribulations of a Chinese in China" as a young boy.

But he did not find the China of Jules Verne; instead he found an infinitely more thrilling China: a civilization renewing its ancient vigor with high confidence and infection exhilaration.

And this infectious exhilaration breathes from every page of his book as the author with consummate skill describes the China immediately before his eyes and fills in for the reader the rich and significant past of this vast country. Thus the reader is quickened and aroused by the sights and sounds of today's streets as Roy describes them, and is simultaneously deeply moved by the long perspectives of China's history so brilliantly indicated behind the change and movement of the present.

The world of Confucius, China under Western imperialism, San Yat-sen, Chiang Kai-shek, the Chinese Communist Party and Mao Tse-tung, the role of Chinese women, poets classic and modern, land reform, Peking opera, and the esthetic charms of Chinese tradition handwriting—

the author touches on all these and many more, weaving a pattern that is both absorbing and wonderfully illuminating about these great people who constitute a quarter of humanity.

Fascinated by all manifestations of the new in China as well as by all that is old and traditional, Roy has the following to say about the much discussed question of "brain-washing" and "mutual criticism":

"Criticism and self-criticism in modern China are only the outcome of an ancient conviction: a conviction that humanity is one, that the colors of souls and the tones of the mind harmonize; that there exists a mysterious and obvious correspondence between men, the universe, society, etc. This conviction has been expressed in various forms and in contrasting accents by the Fathers of the Church when they invented the dogma of the Communion of the Saints, by Karl Marx who maintained that in Communism 'the brotherhood of man is not an empty phrase but a truth,' and by Jean-Paul Sartre when he insists that Hell (and in consequence also Heaven) is other people."

The chapter on the Chinese language is one of the high points of the book, not only because it tells you a great deal about both written and spoken Chinese, but because the sensitivity of the author to words and language touches aspects of the Chinese character not easily got at in any other way. Similarly his exciting chapter on the classic Chinese theater is remarkable for the way in which the reader is made to see deeply into the nature of the Chinese people and into the past of which they are a product through the performance of one of the ancient, highly stylized operas.

Just as Roy uses the Chinese language or a performance of a traditional opera to explore whole reaches of Chinese life and thought, so he seizes a meeting with a peasant-soldier in the fields, or the head of a women's organization in a remote vil-

lage, or an evening's walk in a Peking park with two Chinese writers, as occasions to bring before the reader whole vistas of China's ancient struggle against oppression, poverty, ignorance.

The sense of a country renewing itself under the stimulus of a revolution is wonderfully conveyed, but it is not China alone that holds the center of the author's attention as he returned to the West. He sees the whole world more clearly:

"There is an international of undernourishment and subsistence just as there is an international of wealth. But in this world which until today has been divided by the single difference of poverty and wealth, where lice, tuberculosis and trachoma were stateless, where the seal of impetigo on the skulls of Egyptian *fellahin*, Chinese peasants and Chilean miners left the same white brand of destiny in 'this little homicidal world' there is something new. It is the existence of a certain number of countries where the exploitation of man by man has definitely come to a close. I have seen it for myself and I can testify to it. . . . From now onwards there is only a single frontier between the people, that which separates communism from despair and re-conquered dignity from secular slavery. . . . I will no longer submit to living in a world which makes the co-existence of the hunger of innumerable masses and the satiation of a small number the rule of its peculiar game. I can feel really happy and free only among peoples where happiness is a principle of life and freedom not to die a living death is a fact. I only really enjoy the warmth of the sun, the music of Mozart and Monteverde, beautiful poems and lovely faces, beautiful objects and fine sentiments, in a place where my gaze does not meet another gaze of despairing interrogation or obscure reproach. Only in the countries of youth do I feel slightly consoled at the thought of my inevitable death. To be young does not so much mean having a very few years behind you. To be young means to feel very strongly that you have many years ahead of you. There are old men of twenty and dotard adolescents. This applies to races as well as to men. Very old China is also very young China: Its people are as old as its hope, as old as the twin maidens Hope and Justice."

THE LAMONT CASE

reviewed by
Royal France

THE LAMONT CASE, HISTORY OF A CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION..

Edited with commentary by Philip Wittenberg. Horizon Press, New York, 1957. 331 pp., \$5.00.

FOR the future historian the Lamont case will prove to be a valuable window into the life of our times. For us it is a mirror into which America can look and see its features, distorted as in a trick mirror in a side show, into the hideous features of McCarthyism.

One of the most distressing aspects of human life is the vast chasm that exists between the ideals that men profess and the realities that they practice. Nowhere is this discrepancy wider in the modern world than in the United States. We are the inheritors of the Judeo-Christian Code of Ethics, the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights and the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments. To a McCarthy, a Jenner or a Walter, the Bill of Rights has no more binding sanction than does the Fourteenth Amendment to an Eastland. They are words in moldy parchments, easily ignored in the face of political expediency.

A period like that of the cold war always brings the McCarthy's of history out from under the rocks or from their slimy holes into the limelight.

A case, like words such as McCarthyism, can symbolize an epoch. Such a case was the one faithfully reported by Philip Wittenberg, the lawyer who represented Dr. Corliss Lamont, in *The Lamont Case*.

While the form of the book, containing as it does all the legal documents, might seem forbidding to the layman, actually the book takes the reader behind the scenes and through the author's explanatory statements the entire situation confronting Dr. Lamont is made clear. McCarthy's procedures and his contempt for due process of law, as well as for the rules of the very committee under whose aegis the hearings were held, come out with dramatic force. We can actually almost see the workings of one of the most male-

volent and unscrupulous minds in American history.

The Lamont Case is redeemed from being a sorry chapter in our annals because it vindicated the courageous stand of Dr. Lamont, the integrity of our courts and gave renewed vitality to the First Amendment. Both Dr. Lamont and Philip Wittenberg are to be congratulated for their outstanding contribution to the restoration of civil liberties of which this case was a beginning.

FOR MR. DULLES

RUSSIA REVISITED. A New Look at Russia and Her Satellites, by Louis Fischer. *Doubleday and Co., New York, 1957.* 288 pages. \$4.00.

A BOOK to delight the heart of John Foster Dulles. Need more be said? Mr. Fischer found much that had changed since he left Moscow eighteen years before, "but no basic changes," "no political arrests," but quite a lot of boredom. He spent most of his twenty days in Moscow going sourly around collecting complaints.

He doesn't think the people of the USSR likely to make a revolution, much as he wishes they would, but feels that the "liberation of the satellites" (which he repeatedly calls for) might also bring "freedom" to the people of Russia.

He blames the Soviet Union for both the World War and the Cold War, and for practically everything bad that has happened in international relations in the last twenty years. He thinks everything might have been fine if only the West had liberated the Eastern European countries from Hitler, instead of the Soviet armies, and enabled "free world" type governments to come to power.

Mr. Fischer declares on page 122, "Whatever befalls, Russia will not be inclined to seek success through a third world war." Yet on page 276, he defends the rearming of Germany and declares the "welcome" presence of the American army "serves notice on the potential aggressor that the United States would automatically go to war in the event of an invasion of Ger-

many." He cynically invokes Gandhian and Christian principles to support his position that Soviet troops should get out but that NATO troops should stay in Europe, which leads, logically, to his final implicit call for a world attack on Russia—"The others in union will defeat her." Is this the gospel of the apostle of non-resistance and the Prince of Peace?

J. S.

AMERICAN HUMANISM

DAYS OF THE PHOENIX by Van Wyck Brooks. *E. P. Dutton. New York. 1957.* 193 pages. \$3.95.

THIS is the second volume of Van Wyck Brooks reminiscences, the first volume, "Scenes and Portraits," was published several years ago. The present book is subtitle "The Nineteen Twenties I Remember," and presents a highly personal picture of the decade following the first World War.

Mr. Brooks' concern from his earliest books has been to understand and define the nature of American intellectual and creative experience. His most important series of books, "Makers and Finders: A History of the Writer in America, 1800-1915," is a detailed study of writers in our country in which, apart from reviving forgotten names and freshly estimating established reputations, Mr. Brooks attempts to discover some essential theme that will serve to identify the work of our major writers as truly "native."

In his recollections this search for an essential "native" element is presented in terms of the author's own experience and growing maturity. In the present volume the intellectual confusion in the years following 1918 are described largely in terms of the writers and thinkers with whom Mr. Brooks was intimately associated. American intellectuals, profoundly disillusioned by the war and its aftermath, felt themselves hopelessly isolated in the gross materialism of the prosperous twenties. Many fled to Europe, others sought a solution for their problems in a variety of philosophical and mystical panaceas. Mr. Brooks presents his own wrestling with the problems of the period

and describes at length the dilemmas of many of his friends. This is a chapter of American intellectual history that should be more deeply understood.

In stating his refusal to accept the mystical solutions rampant among certain intellectuals in the twenties, Mr. Brooks gives the essence of his deepest conviction: "... nothing could persuade me that in the long run humanism would fail to include every human value. I was convinced that humankind was moving towards a synthesis that would make medieval Europe seem parochial in contrast."

This conviction is based upon Mr. Brooks' belief that the great American tradition is that which flows from the 18th century rationalist thinkers—the tradition of Jefferson and Franklin that was to last into the 19th century and flower most richly in the poetry of Walt Whitman.

A socialist from his youth, Mr. Brooks has maintained in all his writings the belief that a rationalist humanism is the basic American tradition and that it alone can bring to fruition the promises inherent in our country. Mr. Brooks recollection of the personalities and ideas and intellectual movements in the past half century as reflected in the leading writers and thinkers is a useful reminder of the complexity of our intellectual life. Looking back on the confusion of the conflicting ideas of the twenties, Mr. Brooks affords us a helpful perspective in which to view much of the confused situation today.

In a recent speech at the unveiling of a bust of Dr. Du Bois at the Schomburg Collection of the New York Public Library, Mr. Brooks described Dr. Du Bois as a "spacious man." This happy and just description of the great Negro scholar seems singularly appropriate for Mr. Brooks himself in view of his contribution to a deeper understanding of our culture.

His unfailing humanism and his insistent demand for a literature that enhances life has made Mr. Brooks a singularly appealing spokesman over the years for an American literature that would be not the property of an elite, but the cherished possession and guide of ordinary citizens building together a truly rational and human society. M. Y.

LABOR FACTS

LABOR FACT BOOK No. 13. Labor Research Associates. *International Publishers, New York.* 1957. 160 pages. \$2.00.

SINCE 1931, at two year intervals, the Labor Research Associates have issued these unique compilations. They have come to be regarded widely as an invaluable supplement to almanacs and other reference books, providing as they do facts and figures on many topics of interest to labor and progressive readers.

Of special interest in the present volume is a separate chapter on the Negro people. This is the first time since 1947 that such a chapter has appeared, an indication of the decisive growth of the Negro people towards full economic and political status.

It is also of interest to point out that for the first time information on the Canadian labor movement is included.

The economic trends for the two preceding years are concisely given in the first chapter, demonstrating clearly the increasing power and profits of big business. This chapter is followed by a presentation of labor and social conditions which provides the reader with a most valuable picture of the trade union movement, major strikes, and actual social conditions.

The chapter on Farmers supplies valuable facts on the farm crisis and its relation to prices, rural income and concentration of ownership.

The progress of civil liberties and the political development of the period are covered in the final two chapters. Here the emphasis is on the political role of labor and the minority parties with especially informative facts on the campaign contributions of the rich and their use of the press and other propaganda organs.

Organized by topics and fully indexed, this is an indispensable for all those who want exact, reliable information on all basic questions of current interest.

Now Ready
Bound Volumes
1956 NEW WORLD REVIEW
Indexed
\$4.00
Indexes alone, 35 cents

Reprints

HUNGARY IN TRAVAIL

By JESSICA SMITH

10c each—6 for 50c—12 for \$1.00

22 pages

**LAND REFORM
IN NEW CHINA**

By D. N. PRITT

10c each—6 for 50c—12 for \$1.00

22 pp.

BOUND VOLUMES

Of 1954-5 New World Review
Indexed

\$4.00 each

Indexes alone, 35c each

ORDER ALL THE ABOVE THROUGH

New World Review

7th Floor
34 West 15th Street, New York 11

For Subscriptions

NEW WORLD REVIEW

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

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

☐ new subscription

☐ renewal

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

You Will Want

**Extra Copies of Our
NOVEMBER ISSUE**

•
Important Articles on:

**40 Years of
the USSR
24 Years of
American-Soviet
Relations**

•
ROCKWELL KENT

G. D. H. COLE

SCOTT NEARING

CORLISS LAMONT

HERBERT APTHEKER

D. N. PRITT

ANNA LOUISE STRONG

•
These and other distinguished
writers have contributed special
articles.

•
Order Extra Copies at Once

10 Copies for \$1.00

NEW WORLD REVIEW

34 West 15th Street, New York 11
7th Floor

THE LAMONT CASE

History of a Congressional
Investigation

Edited with commentary by

PHILLIP WITTENBERG

Introduction by

HORACE M. KALLEN

**\$5.00 AT YOUR BOOKSELL-
ERS OR FROM**

HORIZON PRESS

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

NEW SOVIET FILMS

SCHOOL OF COURAGE

GIFT FOR MUSIC

THE FORTY-FIRST

THE IMMORTAL GARRISON

THE MEXICAN

Artkino Pictures, Inc.

723 SEVENTH AVE., NEW YORK 19

Telephone: Circle 5-6570

PAMPHLETS ON THE USSR

**HIGHER EDUCATION IN
THE USSR**

by Elizabeth Moos

32 pp., 25¢

**EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM
OF THE SOVIET UNION**

by Elizabeth Moos

64 pp., illustrated. 25¢

**WE SAW FOR OURSELVES
impressions of USSR**

100 pp., 25¢

WHERE MINERS ARE HONORED

**Report of a Scottish miners'
delegation to the USSR on
living and working condi-
tions of Soviet miners.**

32 pp., 5¢

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

Order from:
NEW WORLD REVIEW
34 West 15th Street, New York 11
7th Floor