

SOCIAL SCIENCES ✓

MAY, 1958

25¢

✓DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRARY MAY 12 19

New World

REVIEW

**USSR TESTS SUSPENSION
AND WORLD RESPONSE**

USA-USSR CULTURAL EXCHANGES

EAST-WEST TRADE

Victor Perlo

**ART AND UNDERSTANDING
BETWEEN PEOPLES**

Rockwell Kent

CZECHOSLOVAKIA: 1948-1958

Eleanor Wheeler

NEW WORLD REVIEW

MAY 1958

Challenge and Response
Jessica Smith 3

The Climate Changes
Murray Young 13

East-West Trade
Victor Perlo 16

Paul Robeson—Where He Stands
Louis E. Burnham 22

Art and Understanding Between Peoples
Rockwell Kent 25

Czechoslovakia—1948-1958
Eleanor Wheeler 28

USSR Tests Suspension—A Summary of Documents 33

BOOKS

Anton Chekhov
W. H. Bruford 38

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

ESLANDA ROBESON
*Editorial Consultant on Negro and
Colonial Questions
and UN Correspondents*

Vol. 26, No. 5, May, 1958. 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.

209

NWR FOR LIBRARIES

With spring the cultural exchange program signed between the USA and the USSR in January is under way, stimulating wide interest throughout the country.

As a reader of the NEW WORLD REVIEW you, of course, share with us the belief that this interest grows from the deep-seated desire of peoples everywhere to get to know and understand each other, particularly when the whole great question of peace is dependent upon such understanding.

More and more libraries have indicated that they would like to take advantage of our special library subscription rate of \$1.25 a year. This rate is made possible by donations from readers who frequently suggest with their gift the libraries to which they would like the subscription made available. Otherwise we assign the subscriptions to libraries on our list.

To be able to fulfill all the requests it is necessary for us to have a considerable increase in our fund.

If you have not sent in your contribution to the library fund, won't you do so immediately?

Please fill out and mail today

NEW WORLD REVIEW

7th Floor
34 West 15th Street
New York 11, N. Y.

I enclose \$..... for.....
gift subscriptions to libraries at the special
rate of \$1.25 per year.

Name

Address

City Zone State

Challenge and Response

**Soviet action in halting nuclear weapons tests—
How the U.S., its people and the world responded—
Can error launch a nuclear war?**

by JESSICA SMITH

ON THE ONE hand—the great outpouring of warmth and love with which all Americans fortunate enough to see them have responded to the youth and zest and artistry of the Moiseyev dancers—and the equally great surge of enthusiasm with which the Russians have responded to the genius of the tall young Texan, Van Cliburn, to whom both judges and the Moscow public unanimously awarded first prize in the International Tchaikovsky competition.

On the other—the outburst of venom and hate with which Secretary of State John Foster Dulles answered the Soviet initiative in unilaterally ending nuclear weapons tests and in unceasingly promoting negotiations for peace. Beside himself with fury that the Soviet Union has been able to win the support and acclamation of the people of the world through peace policies meeting their deepest desires, Mr. Dulles in his April 6 press conference, charged the Soviet Union with “debauching and prostituting” diplomatic exchanges into “purely an organ of propaganda.”

If the American people could vote today on which of these contrasting attitudes should determine the course of American-Soviet relations there is

no doubt that they would choose the first—the way of warmth and friendship, of exchanging our music, our songs, our literature, art and science for peaceful purposes, people to people contacts of all kinds, which would make forever impossible the hurling of bombs on each other.

How wonderful it would have been if the Soviet initiative for peace and in suspending tests could have met with warmth and welcome from our government! This alone would have done much to dissipate the cold war atmosphere. This would have been the best possible kind of preparation to insure the success of the Summit Conference which the Administration claims is its aim, though its words and actions bespeak the opposite.

Norman Cousins, writing in the *Saturday Review* for April 19 said that the Soviet decision to halt tests had resulted in two serious defeats for the United States:

The first defeat is the result of the fact that we allowed the Soviet Union to be the *first* to respond to the fast-mounting demand of the world's people for an end to the growing contamination of air and food produced by radioactive fallout.

The second defeat—and possibly a larger one—is the result of the initial

negative response of the United States to one of the gravest challenges in our history. It seemed puny, petulant, unimaginative.

And now Mr. Dulles has added a third defeat in so nakedly exposing a hatred and ill-will that could make impossible the reaching of any accommodation with the Soviet Union if the pressures from our own people, our allies and millions of others do not compel him along a road he has no wish to take, which we are optimistic enough to believe must happen.

Premier Khrushchev complimented and embraced our young Texan. Can anyone imagine Mr. Dulles embracing a Moiseyev dancer? Would it do any good for him to have a look at their joyous and wonderful doings? Probably not. Mr. Dulles basically just doesn't want to live in the same world as the Soviet Union, its institutions and its people, or more correctly, simply doesn't want the USSR to exist at all, and cannot reconcile himself to any policy not predicated on its disappearance from the world. He cannot seem to get it through his head that the only way to make it disappear would mean our own disappearance as well.

Official U.S. Reaction

The State Department was ready with its negative response as soon as the USSR announced it was ending nuclear weapons tests. Its statement sought to throw suspicion on the move because it came at the end of a series of Soviet tests and just before a new U.S. series in the Pacific. It characterized the move as part of an "official propaganda" campaign, trying to create the image

of a peace-loving Soviet Government which in fact "openly defies the United Nations with respect to both the substance and procedure of disarmament." The State Department called upon the USSR to deal with the question of disarmament in an "orderly way." (Evidently it was disorderly on the part of the Soviet Union to decide to end its own tests.) It said that "free nations" could not give up their deterrent capacity merely "in reliance on a Soviet statement of intentions for which there is no system of verification, which can be evaded in secrecy and altered at will."

On the first point of the timing of the Soviet announcement, it should be pointed out that this charge fails to take into account reports of the Atomic Energy Commission to the effect that the United States has already carried out twice as many tests as the Soviet Union. Hanson Baldwin, *New York Times* military expert, wrote on April 6 that the United States had already made 103 tests, with 18 more scheduled for this spring and summer, as against from 50 to 60 by the Soviet Union. As far as any military advantage accruing to the USSR from ending of U.S. tests at this time, it should be noted that Mr. Baldwin declared that at the present time "the United States atomic arsenal is large enough to devastate Russia many times over."

True, Mr. Baldwin also pointed out that nuclear warheads for intercontinental and intermediate missiles in which field the USSR seems to be ahead, would be tested for the first time in the Pacific. Thus, even from a purely military advantage point of view, the United States

could at least call off subsequent tests. And in any case, the Soviet Union has proposed an agreement under UN supervision for the use of outer space for peaceful purposes only.

On the question of defiance by the USSR of the United Nations, the State Department disingenuously ignores the fact that, as widely reported in the press at the time, Secretary Dulles himself flew to London during the discussions of the UN Disarmament Subcommittee last year to make sure that no agreement was reached at a point where one was near achievement under the program worked out by Mr. Harold Stassen, but opposed by Mr. Dulles. The Soviet Union, furthermore, has expressed its readiness to participate again in the Subcommittee if its composition is not weighted against the Socialist and neutral nations as is now the case.

On the question of verification, the resume of the official Soviet documents (see page 33) relating to the suspension of tests, makes amply clear that in calling on other nations to follow suit, the Soviet Union is prepared to sign an agreement on international control and inspection, which would involve stationing of inspection teams on their own territory as well as that of the other nuclear powers. The detectability of all but possibly the smallest tests has already been confirmed by majority of opinion of leading scientists all over the world, and has been acknowledged by both President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles. In this connection it is interesting to note what the United States knows of the Soviet tests even without an inspection system. Marquis

Childs wrote in the *New York Post*, April 1:

So effective is the system of detection worked out by the Western nations under American leadership that we know every detail of the recent series of nuclear tests conducted by the Russians. We know exactly where the tests were conducted. We know the yield of radioactive fallout they sent into the atmosphere. We know the chemical make-up of the weapons tested and the exact number. But all this information is labeled top secret. Technical experts have come before Senator Humphrey's Disarmament Subcommittee to put the facts in the secret record of the committee. Humphrey and other Senators have been put under the closest restrictions as to the use they may make of this material.

In his first communication to President Eisenhower since becoming Premier, Nikita Khrushchev termed the immediate ending of all kinds of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests as "the most urgent question in current international relations," and expressed the hope that both Britain and the United States would accept the proposal to halt testing, stressing particularly how much it would mean for the United States and the Soviet Union together, as the first nations to develop nuclear weapons, to come out as initiators in the ending of tests. Mr. Khrushchev said the Soviet Union would have to reconsider its action in the interests of its own security if other nuclear powers did not follow suit, "but would not like to do this." He made the point that the Soviet proposal for an agreement on this issue "provides for the establishment of appropriate international control over the discontinuation of tests."

President Eisenhower's reply followed the line of the State Department declaration. He questioned the

sincerity of the USSR on the basis of the timing of the proposal, and, disregarding the long series of Soviet proposals for the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons, accused them of rejecting proposals to this end. Eisenhower's renewed proposal that fissionable materials henceforth be manufactured for peaceful purpose only, his "Open Skies" plan, and proposal for technical studies for specific control measures that would be part of a broad disarmament program, indicated that the United States was sticking to its over-all "package program" which has been widely criticized as so complex as to make any agreement impossible.

Although President Eisenhower indicated the possibility of giving up tests after the completion of this spring and summer's series, Secretary Dulles at his April 1 conference declared that further tests might be necessary after those at Eniwetok. He declared that there was "no substance" in the Soviet action, and charged the Soviet Union with wanting to end tests "quite apart from and unrelated to any program for doing away with the weapons themselves." A study of the Soviet proposals over the years makes clear that they have advocated from the beginning the complete banning of nuclear weapons, proposed the ending of tests as an immediate and independent step because it could be done without complex arrangements, as a *first step* toward *complete elimination of nuclear weapons*.

Asked to define our policy with regard to nuclear testing, Mr. Dulles replied with a pained reminder of all the U.S. efforts to eliminate

nuclear weapons, allegedly blocked by the USSR, but went on to insist that "governed by humane considerations, the United States must continue to refine them, develop them into distinctive, discriminating weapons which can be used defensively for military purposes." The adjective "discriminating" seems an odd one to describe weapons which no matter how "clean" can still blast millions of people to eternity. Will the weapons be endowed with the capacity to discriminate between military and civilian, babies and adults, the innocent and the evil, Communists and Capitalists?

With the unctuousness of Pecksniff himself, Mr. Dulles declared that in considering the problem of giving up tests, "we could not in fairness to our responsibilities and our duties to the American people, perhaps to humanity, desist from a program which we believe to be sound, merely from propaganda advantages."

Oh, no, we could not give up "our free press . . . our intelligent political opposition . . . our allies who have to be consulted . . . and dedication of the American people to high principles . . . in order to get a propaganda advantage in the world."

Propaganda Advantage— or Sound Policies?

However, some sections of the free press and the political opposition, America's own allies and increasingly large sections of the American people, seem to have very different ideas than Mr. Dulles as to whether concrete steps saving them from the prospects of atomic annihilation would constitute a mere "propa-

ganda advantage." They would rather like that kind of propaganda.

The *New York Post* said editorially April 2:

It is democracy, says Mr. Dulles, that causes much of our trouble. . . . We submit that this explanation should be thrown out of court. . . . Was there any semblance of free, open discussion as to what course we should take in anticipation of the Soviet move? . . .

We do not say that a free people always acts wisely when it has access to all the facts. We do say that Dulles and his cohorts in the AEC and the Pentagon have long operated on the principle that the people must not be allowed to know too much. Surely it is supreme arrogance for Dulles to assert now—in the light of perhaps the biggest blunder of his ill-starred career—that he is a victim of the democratic process.

E. W. Kenworthy reported in the *New York Times*, April 1, that there was a widespread feeling in Washington that the points made by the State Department "would not effectively counter the impression made by the dramatic Soviet announcement." Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn (D-Tex) said on a CBS program following the Soviet announcement: "On the talk of the Summit and the talk of stopping the explosions of these bombs, Russia has beaten us on propaganda all around the world. . . . We have got to have another Summit conference and the sooner we get agreement with Russia on what we are talking about and get at it the better it will be. . . . I have always thought that the explosion of those dangerous things should be stopped."

Senator Theodore Francis Green (D-R.I.) Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, declared "The fact remains that the announcement will be welcomed generally through-

out the world. The fact still remains that we are once again on the defensive. The fact still remains that our own policy has permitted the initiative for peace once again to pass to the Soviet Union." Senator Green reported his constituents were asking him when nuclear bomb tests would be stopped.

A few days later, Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D-Minn), urged President Eisenhower to accept the proposal that the United States join Russia in banning nuclear tests provided there is agreement on adequate inspection. Senator Estes Kefauver (D-Tenn) called on the President to announce that the United States would suspend the tests after the Pacific series.

Subsequently (April 10) Senator Humphrey announced that the Senate Disarmament Subcommittee, of which he is chairman, would begin hearings on the possibility of suspending nuclear weapons tests. Noting that this country has a "substantial lead" over the Soviet Union in nuclear weapons, Senator Humphrey said on a radio program:

We have more to gain from a cessation of tests than anyone else, from a moral point of view, a political point of view, and a technical point of view.

While spokesmen for the State and Defense Departments and the AEC have all taken the position that continued tests are necessary, the fact that there are departmental differences as well as differences with America's allies which have prevented the formulation of any clear-cut disarmament policy in Washington, was underlined in a dispatch by James Reston in the *New York Times* of April 4. He indicated that it is not yet clear whether the United

States is prepared to separate the question of a ban on tests from that of halting production of nuclear material for weapons, formerly linked in America's package program. According to Mr. Reston, the President instructed the State and Defense departments and the AEC to make a complete review of the U.S. disarmament policy and come up with some sort of a unified program in three weeks, in preparation for talks with the Soviet Union.

Also reflecting dissatisfaction in Washington circles with the U.S. response to Russia's move was an article by Harrison E. Salisbury in the *New York Times* for April 6. Referring to the demand in Washington "for a re-evaluation of U.S. propaganda policy," Salisbury said that many Administration critics said that the real point was that propaganda could not substitute for policy, and that they argued:

Thus far Washington does not yet seem to have grasped the lesson that sound propaganda can only flow from sound policy and that in planning policy the propaganda effects must be accurately assessed from the very beginning. . . . Month by month Moscow has been displaying closer and closer correlation between propaganda and policy. . . . In each Soviet propaganda success—sputnik, summit and testing—the record seems to indicate that U.S. policy rather than U.S. propaganda failure or Soviet astuteness was chiefly responsible for the American defeat.

Salisbury declared that Dulles had permitted himself to be out-manuevered and had failed to take into account the new and versatile policy of the Soviet Union since Stalin's death. The Administration's critics, he said, consider the time clearly ripe "for a reappraisal of the policy

which underlies propaganda and from which propaganda flows."

Walter Lippmann (*New York Herald Tribune*, April 3) wrote that Secretary Dulles' dismissal of the Soviet action on tests as a mere propaganda stunt which we in our "open and free society are unable to match" is "a dangerous form of escapism from the hard realities of the world situation." Referring to Mr. Dulles' statement that the United States desires to eliminate nuclear weapons, Mr. Lippmann pointed out that our military power in the world is built on the deterrent power of nuclear weapons, and that "the elimination of nuclear weapons would make quite impossible the strategic containment through a network of alliances to which he [Mr. Dulles] is committed." Mr. Lippmann continued:

This is the real reason why American propaganda works badly. If we can not or will not revise our policies, Mr. Dulles would do better to be candid and to tell the world frankly that we cannot suspend tests because we cannot abolish nuclear weapons without a revolutionary change in our foreign policy.

All this applies to much more than the particular issue of nuclear testing. American propaganda is in trouble not because the Russians are able to lie with impunity but because in so many critical areas American propaganda is trying to sell policies which for one reason or another are obsolete, are fictions, are profoundly unpopular.

The Response of U.S. Public Opinion

We have been reporting from month to month on the growing public movement in this country for ending tests and a new approach to U.S. foreign policy. In this connection we warmly recommend the article

in the *Monthly Review* for April 1958, "War-War or Jaw-Jaw" in which Edgar Snow gives the most comprehensive review currently available of responsible American opinion on these issues up to the time of the Soviet announcement.

Since the Soviet action, the influential National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy has had a third full-page ad in the *New York Times* (April 11) and other leading newspapers throughout the country. Calling attention to AEC reports that the United States is the hottest radioactive place in the world (in New York alone radioactivity has increased by fifty per cent in the past year) the ad says we *must* postpone our nuclear tests to restore our moral standing in the world. These ads call for letters to the President, Congress, the press and organized activity, and are accompanied by an extensive series of meetings addressed by many leading Americans. The campaign is backed by distinguished public figures in professional, religious, educational, cultural, labor (though not enough!) and other circles, and by such groups as the Quakers and the Women's International League who have long been active for disarmament.

Among recent developments which highlight public feeling, was the suit brought on April 4 in the Federal District Court in Washington against Secretary of Defense Neil H. McElroy and the AEC to enjoin members of the latter from conducting any more tests, with efforts to be made to bring similar suits in England and the USSR. Among the plaintiffs are Dr. Linus C. Pauling, Bertrand Russell, Norman Thomas,

and other leading scientists, clergymen and others from the United States, Britain and other countries, as well as a group of Japanese fisherman. Then there was the impressive "Walk for Peace" in which hundreds of people from nearby cities converged on Good Friday and Passover eve to petition the UN for unconditional ending of tests, sponsored by groups affiliated with the Fellowship of Reconciliation, Quakers, National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, Peacemakers, WIL and others and including many students and young people.

A dramatic demonstration is being made by the sailing of the ketch "Golden Rule" into the 390,000 square mile danger zone proclaimed by the United States in the Marshall Islands test area. The five Quakers and others manning the ketch have announced they will defy the AEC regulations barring U.S. citizens from the area.

Among the many individuals hailing the Soviet initiative were Dr. and Mrs. Corliss Lamont, who had previously addressed both President Eisenhower and Premier Bulganin urging the unilateral ending of tests and who wired President Eisenhower appealing to him to end the Spring tests in the Pacific "in the name of humanity." Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt expressed regret that the United States had said flatly we would refuse to bar tests. (*New York Post*, April 13)

Impact on the World

In other countries, response to the Soviet initiative has been even more widespread than here, and the official American reaction has been

met with increased hostility. In Britain, according to a dispatch by Drew Middleton from London (*N. Y. Times*, April 1), the Soviet decision has increased pressure on the Conservative Government by the Labor Opposition in the House of Commons and a wide variety of other groups calling for nuclear disarmament. (See article by Gordon Schaffer in April NWR) The correspondent noted that whatever divisions there were on details of disarmament program, the suspension of Britain's nuclear weapons testing program was one issue on which all opponents of Government policy agreed. Almost the entire British press, from right to left, noted the impact of the Soviet announcement on uncommitted countries and proposed that Britain and the U.S. follow suit. The *London Times* (April 1) found Washington's reaction "far too heavy-handed to appeal to anyone," and (April 6) referred to the "widely held belief" that the U.S. leadership "is fumbling, disorganized and self-centered and speaking in accents of a decade ago." *The Daily Mirror*, with one of world's largest circulations, called on Prime Minister Macmillan: 1) to suspend bomb tests; 2) to ground H-bombers [U.S. and British] flying over Britain [with live bombs] and 3) to delay building missile sites until after the Summit talks. While Prime Minister Macmillan "stood firm" in the face of the volley of demands that the Government follow the Soviet lead, opposition leader Hugh Gaitskell begged him for a positive rather than a negative response, and Aneurin Bevan urged that he "show a little more moral courage." Britain's most spectacular dem-

onstration for nuclear disarmament began with a mass rally April 4 in Trafalgar Square and a protest march to Britain's Atomic Weapons Research Establishment at Alderston 50 miles away.

In West Europe generally, the Soviet action was welcomed, the U.S. response deplored. In France, which officially joined the U.S. and Britain in rejecting the Soviet proposal, there was a growing recognition that the West had to do something to counteract the effect of the announcement, and the average person hailed the Soviet move. Throughout the Scandinavian countries the Soviet action was enthusiastically greeted.

In West Germany, the Soviet action was hailed among the many groups making up the massive opposition to the Adenauer policies. Even Chancellor Adenauer himself had to take this into account in saying, according to *Reuters* (April 1) that "if the new Russian proposals on atomic arms represented a serious offer there was the possibility of the general, controlled abolition of atomic weapons." The influential *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* called it an announcement "of far-reaching psychological value" which had "put America and Britain in an awkward position."

But the main focus of the Social Democratic, church and other opposition and the peace forces in Germany is on the decision to arm Germany with nuclear weapons, which they are seeking to prevent. The West German workers have organized a referendum on the question. The Executive Committee of the German Trade Union Federation (6,000,000 members) has called

for demonstrations against the nuclear arming of Germany, and pledged support to any workers who refused to take part in building missile launching bases. Petitions to ban nuclear rearming have been signed by 48,000 students in universities and engineering institutes many hundreds of students have marched in protest. Some 900 physicians signed a warning to the government that there was no defense in atomic warfare. Mayor Willy Brandt and other leading West Berliners signed a declaration against nuclear arms for Germany. Pastor Niemoller called for a general strike against nuclear weapons. The whole question has given rise to sharp dissensions in NATO circles in Western Europe.

Throughout Africa, the Middle East and Asia the Soviet action has been hailed enthusiastically.

Nowhere, as is natural, has the reception been as warm as in Japan, first victim of the atom bombs and greatest sufferer from the continued testing. Japanese officials, including Foreign Minister Aichi Fujiyama and Chief Cabinet Secretary Kiichi Aichi have welcomed the move as an answer to Japan's repeated requests to end testing and called again on the United States to cancel its forthcoming tests. All strata of the Japanese public hailed the Soviet move. Japanese school children marched with banners to the Soviet embassy bearing thanks.

In India, where "Halt the Tests" has become a national slogan, Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru and Congress Party President U. N. Dhebar welcomed the Soviet announcement. Nehru said "A good step is a good step whenever taken,"

however conditional. In a speech at New Delhi (*New York Times*, April 5) Nehru said "the rise to the Premiership of Nikita S. Khrushchev . . . reflected the continuing process of liberalization in the Soviet Union." In a special message to Premier Khrushchev Nehru said that India was "particularly happy" about the Soviet decision to halt tests, and hoped the other countries would follow suit.

Quoting comment in the Indian press, A. M. Rosenthal (*New York Times*, April 2) wrote "Moscow's decision to suspend nuclear tests is likely to win the Soviet Union more political credit in India than almost any step since World War II."

Can Error Launch Nuclear War?

For ourselves, for our children, for humanity, may Americans of every walk of life, and especially our great trade union movement match the fervor of people throughout the world and speak out in greater numbers and more emphatically for the ending of tests, the nuclear arms race, the cold war. Every day brings new evidence of the increasing dangers of radioactivity and the deadly Strontium-90 to people everywhere and future generations, and of the ever present possibility of an accident that could set off a world nuclear war.

On April 8 the *New York Herald Tribune* carried a story by Frank H. Bartholomew, President of the *United Press*, headed "Can Error Launch an Atom War?" Writing from Offutt Air Force Base in Nebraska, he described a flight of B-52 jet bombers of the United States Strategic Air Command, headed to-

ward an enemy target, "carrying thermo-nuclear bombs, capable of more destructive force than the combined American and British forces delivered in all of World War II." This, he says is not practice. Every SAC base in the world had just received a flash that "the radar scopes indicated a convergence of foreign objects flying toward the United States," flight time for missiles from Eastern Europe to the United States being only 30 minutes. Enemy missiles would strike the target in the U.S. in eight minutes from now! True—there is a "Fail Safe" plan whereby if the planes do not receive word to go on they turn back at a certain point. This time, planes have been flashed the signal that the objects were only meteorites. But where, in the safety plan, is the margin for human or mechanical error, for madness or adventurism? And what are Soviet bomber planes supposed to be doing when they see a flight of U.S. bombers headed in their direction? Have they a foolproof safety plan?

The author says that such flights have happened "not once, not twice, but many times. . . ."

The great counter-offensive striking force of the Strategic Air Command has been sped on its way by alerts created by meteoric flights registering on the Dew-line radar scopes, or by interference of high-frequency transmitters creating artificial "blips," or by the appearance of foreign objects on the scope flying in seeming formation, which never have been explained. . . . Time does not permit holding bombing aircraft on the ground while alarms are investigated. The investigations take place while the bombers are on their way toward the target.

So little time to make the deci-

sion meaning life or death to millions and millions of people! So little time for the American people to awaken to these dangers and take the decision and the actions that will insure that these horrifying risks will be ended forever!



After the above was set in print, the Soviet Union called a meeting of the UN Security Council on the ground that such flights as those described above constituted a threat to the peace. The Soviet complaint, based in part on the UP story quoted above (the truth of which was confirmed by U.S. Air Force officials) charged provocative flights of the U.S. Strategic Air Force over the Arctic in the direction of Soviet frontiers.

At the Security Council session on April 18, the United States denied that any provocative flights had taken place, insisting that the U.S. bombers were merely engaged in practice flights made necessary by "aggressive policies" of the USSR. U.S. Delegate Henry Cabot Lodge insisted that a foolproof system prevented any U.S. aircraft from proceeding to their target (admittedly the Soviet Union) in case of false alarm. He did not answer the legitimate fears aroused around the world that through human fallibility, accident or madness the aircraft could proceed to its target and drop its bombs. He did not answer the warning of Soviet delegate Arkady Sobolev that Soviet fliers, alerted to a flight of U.S. bombers coming in their direction, might also take the air, and that a meeting of the air fleets of both sides over the Arctic could plunge the world into the maelstrom of atomic war.

Due to the insistence of Mr. Lodge that the question be brought to a vote at the same session, without fuller debate and an opportunity for Mr. Sobolev to make a considered rebuttal, the Soviet delegate withdrew his draft resolution under which the Security Council would call on the United States "to refrain from directing its military aircraft armed with atom and hydrogen bombs, toward the frontiers of other states," thus averting what was indicated as a sure defeat of the resolution at that time, and leaving open the possibility of raising the question again.

The Climate Changes

by MURRAY YOUNG

APRIL 14 may well become an historic date in American-Soviet relations. For on the evening of that day a hundred young representatives of the Soviet Union's many peoples danced their way into the hearts of a cheering audience at the Metropolitan Opera House in New York, the first performance of a three-week engagement that opened a tour of major American and Canadian cities.

The same evening at a gala celebration in Moscow a young American pianist, Van Cliburn, played to his fellow contestants in the International Tchaikovsky music contest and received the first prize, presented by Dmitri Shostakovich, to the rapturous applause of the audience.

The enthusiasm so generously expressed both in New York and Moscow comes at a decisive moment in the relations of the two countries and lifts the hope that is the core of the enthusiasm to a declaration that this is the way men should speak to each other: through dance and music, through poetry and art, through mutual delight in the accomplishment of all creative forms which give life richness and meaning.

Against this wholly human goal, what have the peoples of the world labored under during the terrible years of the Cold War? The omi-

nous shadow of mutual destruction and death growing ever more oppressive, forcing a sense of utter uselessness across every hope for the future.

Who does not remember the incredible issue of *Collier's* magazine (now defunct) for October 1951, at the very peak of the Cold War, with its pictures of an atomized Moscow arrogantly controlled by its American "liberators" who had imported for the presumed delight of the now "free" citizens a production of a garish Broadway musical called "Guys and Dolls"? The date of this "liberation" was, in the wishful thinking of the editors, to be 1960.

By the spring of 1958 how differently it has all turned out!

For all the ghastly fantasies of the "leading experts" who supplied *Collier's* with its material, the past several years have seen exchanges between the two countries in many fields: science, agriculture, medicine, music. True these exchanges were at long intervals and the visits were ordinarily brief, but contact was established all the same, interest was aroused, curiosity grew, the natural sympathy of people working in similar disciplines developed in many directions—and then came the advent of the two Sputniks.

And now a 23-year-old pianist from Kilgore, Texas storms the musical heights of the ancient city of

Moscow, carries away the top prize and wins the open-hearted applause not only of the ordinary Soviet music lover but praise as well of the most distinguished Soviet composers and musicians. While in New York the high leaps and exuberant whirls of the Soviet dancers on the stage of the Metropolitan seemed to the delighted audience a real "Rites of Spring" heralding the end of a long and bitter winter.

And yet how the old attitudes hang on! The *New York Times* of April 15 quotes Henry Cabot Lodge as having said in a recent speech that Michael Todd held the opinion that "the USSR wants any American-made film that shows American life at its worst—it will show anything that depicts Americans as hoodlums or morons." Then the *Times* proceeds to list some of the movies reported to be under consideration by the Soviet delegation now in this country to negotiate for an exchange of films: "The Bridge on the River Kwai," "Oklahoma!" "The King and I," "A Farewell to Arms," "12 Angry Men," "Marty," "The Great Caruso," "Summertime," and "The Eddie Duchin Story."

The late Michael Todd, or the present American delegate to the UN, seems not to have been talking to the point.

For the point today is clearly a reaching across the barriers of the past ten years to understanding and sympathy between our two peoples with the knowledge made unmistakably clear by the very threats of the Cold War that either this human relationship is achieved or the ominous fears of nuclear warfare continue to shut off any hope of a future for us both.

The Cultural Agreement (see NWR for March) signed in January between the two countries is an official acknowledgment of the demands of the people for a way out of the seemingly hopeless impasse of the threat of nuclear war. Cast in somewhat provisional terms, the realization of the full possibilities of the program must of course be largely dependent upon the widely expressed will of the American people, their insistent demand that peaceful co-existence become a reality. That there is any other choice seems today to exist only in the minds of the Cold War "warriors" who unfortunately retain their leading positions and rage impotently against the world-wide desire for peace.

According to the *New York Times* for April 13 some 500 students have applied for the exchange programs now getting under way between the USA and the USSR. Already five student editors have left for the Soviet Union, their Soviet counterparts to arrive here in May. This small group is to be followed by 40 students who are to go for a visit this summer with an exchange visit here of 20 Soviet students. These visits are preliminary to the exchange of 20 American and 20 Soviet students for the full academic year starting this fall, to be followed in 1959-60 by an exchange of 30 students. There are also to be exchanges between professors of the leading universities of the two countries in the course of the next two years.

For millions of Americans the exchange program may be said to have opened with the Bob Hope hour-long television program from Moscow on April 5th. Briefly but with

enormous impact we were treated to fascinating glimpses of the Bolshoy Ballet with the great Galina Ulanova, David Oistrakh playing the violin, the famous clown Oleg Popov teetering on a tightrope, and other superb circus acts. All of this was sheer delight and was praised throughout the country.

Jack Gould, television critic of the *New York Times*, after expressing some severe reservations about the questionable taste of some of Mr. Hope's "wisecracks" in the sequence taking place in the American embassy, ended his account of the program thus:

Mr. Hope closed his program with some lovely and poignant scenes of Russian children. Here he spoke of peaceful co-existence, understanding and avoidance of global destruction. Who would have thought a few years ago there could be such a change in the world climate that a viewer would be hearing Mr. Hope broach such subjects?

In the universality of cultural artistry there indeed may be a ray of hope for a divided world. Surely, it is worth exploring further, as Mr. Hope so effectively demonstrated on Saturday evening. —*N. Y. Times*, April 7, 1958.

Mr. Gould's words must in their own way have been echoed in the hearts of millions of Americans who watched with absorbed attention.

AMERICAN ARCHEOLOGISTS IN THE USSR

ART NEWS for April 1958 reports on the visits to the USSR of two archeologists from the University Museum, Philadelphia:

Dr. Froelich G. Rainey, director of the Museum, "observes that the Russians are very active in archeology, working inside their own borders, particularly in European Russia, Siberia and Russian Armenia, digging on sites of villages and cities of the Stone Age, of the Scythians, Greeks and Romans. Important finds, particularly of Scythian gold objects, have been reported. Russia spends more money on archeological research than Americans do." Their publications are excellent, Dr. Rainey says, and are made available to the West. He adds:

"Archeological objects are usually given academic exhibition, mainly for study purposes. Objects of greater esthetic interest are exhibited to the public in the archeological section of the Hermitage in Leningrad."

Professor Samuel Kramer, a specialist in cuneiform studies, "reports a quite free situation within his profession, with great enthusiasm for scholarly studies. Russian scientists are trying to maintain a 'basically scientific' objectivity. Still, like all workers in the field, they inevitably choose and stress certain data from the mass of available material, and in this way, Prof. Kramer explains, Russian scientists do stress the 'material and economic' aspects of ancient cultures. But Prof. Kramer remarks that our two countries actually can supplement each other's work. Though cuneiform studies progress freely, he found little activity in Biblical and Hebrew studies, which do not fall within the Marxist sphere of interest."

Professor Kramer worked two months at the Hermitage in Leningrad. In exchange a Russian archeologist spent two months working at the University Museum in Philadelphia.

East-West Trade

and the U.S. Recession

by VICTOR PERLO

OVER six years ago, in December, 1951, I entitled a *New World Review* article "Operation Boomerang." The article said:

In the long run, cutting off trade with the socialist world will prove even more harmful to this country than to western Europe. The tremendous expansion of capacity in this country for war purposes poses for U.S. industry the most urgent marketing problem ever known. Trade with the socialist world, on a very large scale, is an absolutely essential ingredient of such a program [for peaceful prosperity].

The boomerang has had a long flight, but has finally returned with multiplied destructive momentum, contributing to the worst economic crisis in America since the 1930's.

The one phase of world capitalist economy that grows in the midst of the general slump is trade with the socialist world, or East-West trade. Here are the figures, as compiled by the U.S. Government:

East-West Trade, 1953-57

Year	Billions of Dollars
1953	\$3.0
1954	3.6
1955	4.5
1956	5.5
1957	6.1
(1st half, annual rate)	

Having doubled in three and a half years, East-West trade continues to mount, while trade among the capitalist countries, which had been growing more slowly, is now declining.

In Wall Street it is fashionable to talk of "growth industries." No capitalist country surpasses the United States in developing new industries and opening up new resources. Now the growth industries of the post-war decade have become over-expanded, and the American economy is in a severe slump. All this while American industry is locked out of the most spectacular growth opportunity in modern times—the socialist markets. The United States, which leads in so many facets of world economy, accounts for a puny 2½ per cent of East-West trade, and that in items of little economic significance.

The Washington architects of the cold war stopped American trade with the socialist world, and tried their utmost to stifle East-West trade altogether. Its rapid growth has been one of the several major defeats inflicted on them recently.

During the Korean War American

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.

trade with socialist countries was almost wholly eliminated, and other capitalist countries curtailed theirs. The Battle Act, prohibiting U.S. foreign aid to countries engaging in trade with the socialist world against State Department wishes, was used as a club to force adherence to the embargo policy. A Coordinating Committee (COCOM) consisting of the NATO powers and Japan, was established to regulate the international embargo, with a special committee (CHICOM), for China trade.

Features of East-West Trade Growth

But at its worst, this effort had only a limited success. Most of the billion-dollar drop in East-West trade between 1948 and 1953 consisted of the abolition of U.S.-Socialist trade. After the Korean War, the other COCOM members increasingly defied Washington. Their trade with socialist countries increased 240 per cent between 1952 and the first half of 1957 (annual rate).

In 1957 England, after prolonged negotiations with Washington failed to bring agreement, unilaterally ended all special discriminations against China, and thereafter has conducted its China trade on the same less discriminatory basis as with other socialist countries. China's trade with capitalist countries rose 33 per cent in 1956 alone, and exceeded the total value of Kuomintang China's international trade of 1948. Total Chinese foreign trade, mainly with socialist countries, is now many times that of Kuomintang China.

East-West trade includes a rising proportion of goods for industrial development which Acheson and Dulles tried especially hard to bar from the socialist countries. For example, West European exports of rolled steel to Eastern Europe rose from 400,000 tons in 1955 to 1,000,000 tons in 1956. An ever-widening range of machinery is involved, with the USSR recently contracting for the import of a complete tire factory from Britain.

The State Department also tried to prevent trade between the underdeveloped countries and the socialist world, in order to maintain the monopoly of raw materials which international cartels enjoy, and to maintain the economic dependence of these countries on the major capitalist centers. But Asian and African countries are turning increasingly to the socialist world for trade, to escape from economic domination by foreign monopolies and political impositions by the corresponding governments; as well as to take advantage of the development, equipment and technical aid provided by socialist countries on such favorable terms. During the first 7-8 months of last year 48 per cent of Egypt's exports, 25 per cent of Iran's, 21 per cent of Turkey's, and 11 per cent of Ghana's and Ceylon's, went to the socialist countries. Latin American countries are also increasing their participation. Canada this March arranged to sell 45,000 tons of wheat to China, while the new Diefenbaker Government announced it will make its first order of business the prevention by the State Department of U.S. auto companies from selling cars made in Canada to socialist countries. This

is regarded by the Canadians as a violation of their sovereignty.

In general, the capitalist countries are showing more and more resentment against U.S. interference in their trade with socialist countries. This year will certainly see a further significant reduction in the remaining restrictions which America's allies continue to impose on East-West trade, despite all efforts of Washington diplomacy to check that trend.

To summarize the trend, in longer perspective: Since 1938 Soviet foreign trade has multiplied, in volume, by 6 times, and its trade with countries that have remained capitalist has doubled. The trade of all socialist countries with the capitalist world is now more than four times as large as the total foreign trade of the USSR in 1938.

Obviously, the embargo policy has failed dismally. Meanwhile, in January, 1958, U.S. exports were 10 per cent below the year earlier level, and preliminary data suggest a steepening of the decline subsequently. Next to the drop in domestic investments, the fall in foreign trade and investments has been the largest underlying cause of our present economic crisis. The embargo policy, by diverting trade to the rivals of U.S. companies, makes matters worse. How long can such a bankrupt policy continue?

The Khrushchev Interview

On the first day of spring, Eric Ridder and H. E. Luedicke, publisher and editor respectively of the very conservative *Journal of Commerce*, interviewed N. S. Khrushchev, who has since become Soviet

Premier, in Moscow. This interview may influence American-Soviet relations more than volumes of Dulles press conferences and diplomatic conversations. For Ridder and Luedicke represent important forces in the world of foreign trade. And they expressed complete agreement with Khrushchev on a striking feature of the interview—the position that East-West trade is vital *most of all* as an aid to achievement of peace, and then for its economic benefits. The *Journal of Commerce* men took Khrushchev's last sentence to fashion their headline:

"Khrushchev Sees Peaceful Co-existence Achieved Through East-West Commerce."

Here is their comment on the interview, with a scarcely-disguised slap at Dulles' diplomatic methods:

Since the politicians thus far have been unable to break down the wall of suspicion that exists between the capitalist and the socialist worlds, it is at least worth a try to let businessmen attempt to overcome the existing impasse.

This cannot be done by such political maneuvers as "calling someone's bluff" or persistently questioning his good faith.

Trade, we feel strongly, can do the trick if both sides are sincere in their attempts to get together and if current impediments to a resumption of trade are removed.

To get anywhere, both parties will have to do certain things that up to now have been treated as taboo.

On our side, there is the list of strategic materials that in its present form no longer serves any useful purpose. On the Russian side, there is the matter of driving foreign business men to frustration by making them cool their heels, often for weeks, before they can see anybody in the Ministry of Foreign Trade.*

* This and following quotes from the Ridder-Khrushchev interview are from the *Journal of Commerce*, March 27, 1958.

A special note, in view of the powerful anti-Chinese forces in this country, was Ridder's interjection to assure Khrushchev that he favored opening up trade with China as well as with the European socialist countries.

The originators of the embargo thought socialist countries couldn't get along without American-controlled goods, that they would be brought to economic crisis and ultimate political capitulation. Khrushchev took up the fiasco of this strategy, when he declared:

Nothing doing! Life has had a good laugh at the sponsors of this policy. The whole world knows of the achievements of the Soviet Union and of all the socialist countries in the fields of economy, science and technology, military technology included.

The Western Powers by following this unrealistic and disadvantageous policy merely aggravate their own economic difficulties. The utter ridiculousness of the lists of so-called "strategic goods," banned or limited for export to socialist countries, is ever more frequently sharply assailed by many noted personalities in the West, as well as by the Western press. These lists include many goods which we now export ourselves, and many others which we, perhaps, would not have bought anyway . . . owing to the development of our own industry.

To End the Recession

Despite its growth, Khrushchev considers the present level of East-West Trade far from adequate. His claim as to the potential for America of East-West trade is dramatic:

The Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China and other socialist countries could purchase goods of American origin in great quantities.

Thereby the current recession in American industry could be eliminated on a sound basis. (My italics—V.P.).

A bold claim! To end the "current recession" in American industry is a tall order. If East-West trade is to do a major part of the job, the U.S. share in it must mount rapidly to the billions of dollars per year. In years past, many commentators have tried to prove that a large volume of U.S.-Socialist trade was impossible. These included both reactionaries anxious to rationalize the cold war, and progressives favoring East-West trade, but anxious to dissipate any illusions that it could cure the problems of capitalism.

Yet it would be unwise to set aside Khrushchev's claim as "propaganda." Recent events prove again that when Soviet leaders claim their country can reach a certain goal, the claim is usually realized. Of course, in this case the claim depends partly on the willingness of American authorities. Assuming that, can the socialist world absorb enough of our goods for East-West trade to be a vital factor in reversing the economic decline in the United States?

The evidence in the affirmative is stronger than ever. Bearing in mind the rapid growth of socialist economies, and the fact that capitalist restrictions still cause considerable diversion of trade from the most efficient channels, it is certain that East-West trade could double again in three and a half years given the elimination of political restrictions. It could reach \$12 billion yearly by 1960-61.

What part of that could the United States have? During the great crisis of the 1930's Soviet orders kept quite a few American factories open. In 1931 Soviet pur-

chases accounted for 66 per cent of our farm machinery exports, 75 per cent of heavy electrical equipment exports, and over two-thirds of machine tool exports. But the total volume of Soviet business then was insufficient to decisively affect the general economy, our exports to the USSR running well under \$100 million yearly.

But now Rumania, with less than 2 per cent of the population of the socialist world, offers to buy for cash \$100 million of industrial equipment in the United States. However, Premier Stoica told a *New York Times* reporter, difficulties over export licenses might compel his country to place the orders in Western Europe. Considering the socialist world as a whole, the potential demand and purchasing power for American equipment is literally scores of times greater than that of the then still weak, still impoverished USSR.

Here is another way of looking at it. In 1938 the United States supplied 29 per cent of Soviet imports. Since then the leadership of the United States in capitalist industry has grown considerably. It is particularly rich in those highly technical products which all socialist countries can use to advantage in their planned industrial and agricultural construction. Despite the head start of European companies, American firms could soon regain between one-fourth and one-third of the total socialist market—that is, they could gain trade in the billions yearly. The export part of this trade would be concentrated in capital goods, the main seat of unemployment and depressed activity in the United States.

I doubt whether any single factor will bring the depression to an end. But certainly East-West trade can contribute more than all of the measures so far taken or even talked about by the Administration and the political leaders of both parties. And I am convinced that there will not be a peaceful restoration of high-level economic activity here without East-West trade playing a major role in the upturn.

Who Will Open the Gates?

Periodically, during the cold war, various companies have tried to do business with the socialist world, and their top executives have spoken in favor of East-West trade. Almost invariably they have knuckled under to the restrictions, without conducting the kind of public fight American big business is quite capable of when it really wants something.

Why? In many cases companies dickering for East-West trade were bought off with military orders. For many corporate giants military business was more profitable, and required continuation of the cold war. Then one must consider the great influence in American affairs of the oil companies, which fear competition from Soviet and Rumanian products on world markets, and desperately hate socialism, whose spread can lead to nationalization of their most profitable foreign investments. Moreover, so long as business generally was good, East-West trade did not appear as an urgent necessity to big corporations.

Now it is different. East-West trade means the difference between profit and loss for many, between survival and failure for some. Dur-

ing the last, minor recession, Chrysler officials explored the possibility of sales to China. Today, Chrysler's output is off 57 per cent, and a new \$250 million debt hangs over its head. The Ridder-Luedicke interview is a sign that business pressure for opening East-West trade will surely multiply during 1958. But one cannot count on capitalists to dislodge Dulles and his foreign policy.

For American workers who *need* jobs to eat, and whose interest in peace is more consistent, it is absolutely vital that our restrictions on trade with the socialist world be ended. Only a few labor unions, however, have spoken up for East-West trade. The AFL-CIO omitted it from its anti-depression program

adopted in Washington in March. How many more million workers will have to be laid off before this omission is corrected?

The unions can be decisive on this issue. Given the existing balance of forces at home and internationally, all that is required is for the American labor movement to catch up to conservative capitalists like Ridder and Luedicke, not to speak of Cyrus S. Eaton. This would be enough to put the balance on the side of peace, and would presage a more peaceful foreign policy, including the opening of East-West trade.

NOTE: In Victor Perlo's article "Soviet Economic Gains in 1957," *NWR*, April, 1958, the figure for increase in real wages per worker should read 7 per cent.

AMBASSADOR MENSHIKOV ON U.S.-USSR TRADE

"THE SOVIET AMBASSADOR to the United States, Mikhail A. Menshikov, renewed his appeal for a resumption of broad trade between the Soviet Union and the U.S.

"Mr. Menshikov said his country would provide a ready market for the purchase of U.S. machinery and equipment, including diesel locomotives and other transportation equipment, as well as various types of consumer goods.

"As for Soviet exports to this country, he promised to ship 'only goods in which you are interested, without any harm to American industry and American workers.'

"The Soviet diplomat made his remarks in a talk before the Economic Club of New York at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel. A trade agreement with the U.S., he said, 'would be welcomed by the Soviet Union,' but he assured his audience, 'Our country can exist and develop even though it has no trade with the U.S.'

"'Moreover,' he added, 'we firmly believe that the sufferers because of the absence of this trade are American businessmen and the American national economy. . . .

"The Soviet ambassador made a special point of citing that industrial production in the Soviet Union in January and February of this year was 11% above the first two months of 1957. This, he said, proved the effectiveness of the Soviet steps last year of breaking up the responsibility for industrial management into economic regions."

Wall Street Journal, April 16

Paul Robeson- Where He Stands

by LOUIS E. BURNHAM

✓ **I**T IS one of the shameful consequences of the Cold War that the American most honored abroad is most cruelly persecuted at home. For Paul Robeson the U.S. Government and all sorts of reactionaries reserve a special spite; upon him, the peoples of the world have showered that most precious of bounties—their love.

Here is a contradiction the American people should, in their national interests, quickly resolve. It is unthinkable that the peoples of the world will ever cease their affection for one of the greatest personalities of our times; we must stop the persecution. We must do so because on this issue, as on so many others today, the world is right and our government is wrong.

Prime Minister Nehru of India summarized the reason for the world's affection when he called upon 370,000,000 Indians to join the world-wide celebration of Robeson's 60th birthday last month. The occasion deserved recognition, he said, "not only because Mr. Robeson is one of the greatest artists of our generation, but also because he has represented and suffered for a cause which should be dear to all of us—the cause of human dignity."

LOUIS E. BURNHAM, formerly editor of "Freedom," is a member of the editorial staff of the "National Guardian."

The source of that dignity and the reason for Paul Robeson's unyielding battle to secure it for all men are made plain in a unique and timely volume, *Here I Stand*.^{*} In it Robeson recounts the engrossing story of his boyhood, his views on the struggle for Negro freedom and on world affairs, and how he came to hold them.

Most Americans can point to one or another of the triumphal highlights of Robeson's career: the record-smashing performance of "Othello" in 1944-45; the tumultuous response to his first rendition of "A Ballad for Americans" on a nationwide radio hookup in 1939; his conquests of Europe as an internationally famous artist; his athletic exploits at Rutgers as a four-letter man and All-American football end.

Few, however, outside of his family and closest friends, go beyond these highlights to Paul Robeson, the boy, growing up in Jimcrow Princeton and in Somerville and Westfield, N. J. There, in the tender but firm hands of his father, Rev. William D. Robeson, the character of the man was molded. There he learned to strive for excellence, not as a means of dominance over others, but as an expression of personal integrity. There, through keen competition in sports and scholar-

^{*} *Here I Stand*, by Paul Robeson. Othello Associates, New York, 1958. \$2.50. Paper ed. \$1.00

ship, he discovered: "Equality might be denied, but I *knew* I was not inferior." Most important, from his father who had been a slave and was now the beloved teacher, pastor and patriarch of the community, he learned that an humble station in life need not be a barrier to any man's claim upon human dignity.

And even before Robeson, the boy, there were the roots from which he sprang, sunk deep in this land and extending back to a proud past in Africa. His father escaped from Martin County, N. C., on the Underground Railroad and helped others do the same. His mother was a school teacher and member of a prominent Philadelphia family. Her great grandmother had baked bread for George Washington's troops and in 1787 founded the Free African Society, first mutual aid organization of American Negroes.

This background, simply and artfully told in the first six chapters of the book, provides a special dimension of meaning to Robeson's actions in the current struggle for peace and freedom. We recall them when a Congressman at a committee hearing interrupted his account of his experiences in the Soviet Union with the question: "Why did you not stay in Russia?"

"Because," retorted Robeson, "my father was a slave, and my people died to build this country, and I am going to stay right here and have a part of it just like you. And no fascist-minded people will drive me from it. Is that clear?"

For all who read this book it will be crystal clear.

In a literary market staggering under the weight of ante-bellum and Civil War books which exalt

the slaveholder and demean his victim, "Here I Stand" is a welcome affirmation of the kind of heritage upon which Americans must build if they are to restore their lost liberties.

There is no ambiguity, either, about what Robeson stands and fights for. He believes in the worth of Africa's culture and fights for its liberation; he believes in the common humanity of all peoples and fights for world peace; he believes in socialism and opposes its detractors; he believes in Negro freedom and is the scourge of its enemies.

Above all, Paul Robeson believes in struggle as a rule of life. This struggle can win equal rights for the Negro people now, he contends. But it must be conducted without let or hindrance, must provoke the initiative of the masses of Negroes, and must be led by men and women whose unmixd dedication is to their people.

It can win, he believes, because the pressures of world events demand it and the preservation of American democracy requires it. Robeson has hope because he believes "the vast majority of Americans, the indifferent and lukewarm as well as the most progressive, are not going to give up their democratic heritage in order to deny that heritage to fellow citizens who are colored."

But the initiative, he believes (and here he means much greater initiative than any yet displayed) must come from Negroes, themselves.

There is an initiative, too, that all Americans who want peace and friendship in the world must take: that is, to reclaim our national honor by restoring to the nation

and to mankind this great world citizen of our time. This responsibility must fall first of all to the peace fighters, the civil liberties advocates, the trade unionists—the progressive “other” America—whose

platforms he has dignified with his commanding presence and magnificent voice.

As a first step in this direction, *Here I Stand* should be required reading.

AUTOMATIC COAL MINES IN THE USSR

PLANS are now completed and construction will begin this year in the Donets Basin of a completely automatic coal mine, able to produce six million tons a year.

All operations from advancing the cutter-loader to the transport of coal will be automatic.

Television cameras on the face machines will enable the operator to control them from a panel at the entrance to the seam.

All waste brought up from below will be sent immediately to nearby materials plants for processing.

Support for the working will be provided by mechanical “walking” props and the coal mined by a system of long columns and chambers. During preparatory work sectional concrete supports will be used.

The main shaft-conveyor will deliver coal direct to the railway wagons, eliminating the need for storage space on the surface. The amount of waste will be reduced to a minimum by careful programming of the machines.

Capital cost per ton of annual output for the new automatic mines will be between a half and two-thirds that of ordinary mechanized coal mines.

This new mine is the first of a series on which Soviet mine designing institutes have been working for some time.

Soviet Weekly, London, April, 20

“THE CHALLENGE OF SPUTNIK”

Since “Sputnik I” was launched last October . . . 5,200 U.S. high schools have made changes in their curricula or requirements.

5,800 U.S. high schools are planning extensive changes.

Thus, more than half of nation’s 20,000 senior public high schools have moved to meet the “challenge of Sputnik.”

The Gallup Poll, April 5

Art and Understanding Between Peoples

by ROCKWELL KENT

An exhibition of Rockwell Kent's paintings and drawings held in the Pushkin Museum of Fine Arts in Moscow from December to February attracted a steady stream of visitors and evoked much enthusiastic comment in the Soviet Press. One of the leading Soviet artists, D. Sharminov, reviewing the exhibit concluded his article by saying:

"Rockwell Kent's art is near and understandable to Soviet viewers. The exhibition broadens our knowledge of present-day art in the United States of America, for art is one of the greatest means of intercourse between peoples. As Kent himself says, it is a general, visible language, created to express feelings and thoughts necessary for people. The highest aim that art can serve, writes Kent, is to help people to a deeper understanding of life and a greater love of it. It is for this love of life and man that we value Rockwell Kent as an artist. For this love of life and man, we esteem him profoundly as an outstanding fighter for peace and understanding among peoples."

On the occasion of his 75th birthday last June, a celebration was held in Moscow attended by distinguished Soviet artists and writers. Mr. Kent's application for a passport to attend was denied by the State Department as was a subsequent application for a passport to take part in the 200th Anniversary Celebration of the founding of the Russian Academy of Fine Arts held in December.

Mr. Kent, who is Chairman of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, has sent us this interesting exchange with the Soviet art critic Anatoli Chlenov.

WRITING to the Soviet art critic, Anatoli Chlenov, in appreciation of his generous review of my Moscow exhibition (*New Times*, No. 1, 1958), my comments in exten-

sion of his own remarks were considered worthy of publication (*New Times*, No. 10). It was "tremendously heartening to me," I wrote, "to learn of the popular success that the show has been; and while this is not ever to be taken as proof that works of art have lasting value, it is, however, what must be expected of art that will endure. Our critics are inclined to write for an esoteric minority, never seeming to take into consideration that term—of, I believe, Soviet origin—'a people's art'. The appearance of popularity that current unintelligible art has achieved rests on the exploitation of people's cultural inferiority complex. It is a technique that is used in American advertising: 'What will your friends and neighbors think if you don't have . . .'"

"I was particularly touched by your recognition of my 'Americanism' and your words about the importance of cultural interchange to promote that understanding which is basic to friendship. It is true that in America little is known of Soviet art. It is perhaps consistent with our present unhappy foreign policy that there exists in America no 'VOKS,' no officially approved or sponsored organization for the promotion of cultural interchange. And it is expressive of the prevailing mood of this time that artists—writers, painters, musicians, actors—are in general without the courage

to promote such a movement, or even to take a concerted stand for peace."

In answer to this letter Mr. Chlenov has written me in part as follows:

"The term 'a people's art' is not of Soviet origin. So far as I know it was coined by the eminent Russian art critic Vladimir Stasov (1824-1906). 'The real fountain of a people's painting in all Europe' was in his view the classical genre-painting of the Netherlands. His credo was: realism, national originality and democratism in art. Accordingly, in his late work *The Art of the XIX Century* he held art to be not properly a solar system revolving around a unique French school, but rather as a panorama of many national schools, seen as independent equals.

"The American school too has its place in Stasov's work, and he augured well for its future (alas, he could not foresee the wave of unintelligible art). Stasov was of course a fiery partisan of a corresponding trend in the contemporary Russian school—and his views are an important part of the heritage received by Soviet art criticism as well as by Soviet art. That art should be not only a mirror of nature but also a true mirror of the way of life of each nation (painting being the sister of literature) was his ideal, and he predicted the creation and flourishing of a number of new national schools in Europe—which was in our time brilliantly proved not only in Europe but all the world round.

"Of course the great classical schools were never the offspring of an esoteric minority, but had a mighty human appeal for the nation

at large. A nation turning to esotericism nowadays runs in my view the risk of being rapidly outstripped by the most unexpected rivals in painting—for instance, by Indonesia, whose painting has become one of the best modern schools. Still I hope the strange vogue of abstract art will not prevail in the West.

"Your addenda was interesting. By the way, our VOKS was also not the height of perfection, and in view of the rising importance of contacts and interchange it has been recently reorganized into a Union of Friendship Societies with a series of countries. There are already a lot of them and I hope a Society for Soviet-American Friendship will be inaugurated here soon."

Returning to Mr. Chlenov's article in *New Times* we read:

"Whole schools of art seem to have escaped the attention of American art critics. In our turn we, who have never before seen American exhibitions, unfortunately know very little of modern American art. This state of affairs can hardly be said to be normal."

Then, following an enumeration of the various schools of art to which the diverse cultures and the widely varied scenery of the Soviet Union have given birth, he writes:

"But how can we discuss and compare when a good half of these names are probably an empty sound to our Western colleagues. How different it would be if American artists had the opportunity to make themselves better acquainted with our art and we with theirs.

"I am speaking, of course, of getting to know each other's art, not of evaluating it. After all, each one is entitled to his own taste. This sum-

mer we in Moscow saw many abstractionist, surrealist and other modernistic paintings, which many in the West consider the latest word in art. But here the public did not care for them, just as the Western public does not care for some of our Soviet artists."

And he concludes his review of the first American art exhibition in the Soviet Union with the wish "that American-Soviet cultural relations be expanded in every way. It is high time to stop the cold war in art."

It is indeed high time!

AMERICAN-SOVIET VETERANS MEET

FIVE RUSSIAN veterans of World War II arrived in the U.S. on April 20 to spent a week in Washington celebrating the thirteenth anniversary of the meeting of Soviet and American soldiers at the Elbe River in Germany.

Their hosts will be "American Veterans of the Elbe River Link-up." A week of festivities and exchanges will end Friday night, April 25, with a dinner at the Statler Hotel.

According to the *New York Times* (April 21) the five Soviet delegates are: Boris N. Polevoy, Russian novelist who covered the Elbe meeting as a military correspondent; Alexei P. Maresyev, a former Air Force major; Alexander T. Gordeyev, former Army lieutenant colonel; Ivan Samchuk, former army colonel; Yuri Voiski, former army first sergeant.

The secretary of the "American Veterans of the Elbe River link-up" is Joseph Polowsky, a bus driver in Chicago.

AMERICAN WINS SOVIET PRIZE

JOYCE FLISLER of New York won seventh place in the international Tchaikovsky violin contest held during March in Moscow. Among the judges were David Oistrakh and Leonid Kogan, violinists, Aram Khatchaturian, composer, and Efrem Zimbalist, American violinist.

SOVIET ATHLETES IN U.S.

THE FIRST TEAM of Soviet athletes ever to compete in the U.S.—eight wrestlers—took part in three matches in Oklahoma and a single match in New York during their two-week stay in this country. Welcomed by the Mayor of Tulsa, George E. Norvell, and this year's Miss Tulsa, they were presented with the key to the city. In Oklahoma City, according to *Sports Illustrated* (April 21) they were welcomed by Governor Raymond Gary who was photographed with them against a background of oil derricks which surround the capital.

Czechoslovakia 1948-1958

by ELEANOR WHEELER

Eleanor Wheeler, a frequent contributor to New World Review, had gone with her family to live in Czechoslovakia on the eve of the "February Events" of 1948 which she recounts in the following article.

The historic changes in Czechoslovakia ten years ago were very much distorted by the stories printed in the newspapers of this country at the time. It is therefore interesting to have a review of this decisive period in Czechoslovakian history by an observer who has lived there ever since.

THE 1948 "February Events" in Czechoslovakia actually lasted all that spring with at least one "event" a month, and finally crystallized in the May 9 Constitution. In February the right wing ministers resigned and—after huge demonstrations by trade unions and other mass organizations — their resignations were accepted by President Benes. By March the new cabinet was formed and the New Land Reform Act passed, favoring small farmers and landless peasants. In April the cultural workers met and agreed on a program; in May came the elections and the adoption of the Constitution which went into effect June ninth.

It may help American readers to understand these events better if I try to give a picture of them as seen through the rather opaque view of foreigners groping for their meaning. We were here at the time and saw what was going on. While we did not yet speak Czech we man-

aged to badger explanations from friends and officials, and in ten years' residence we have sorted out our impressions.

Let us start with the first "event." When I met my Czech teacher in a cafe on Friday, February 20, I noticed that the atmosphere was tense and whispery, and learned that the right wing ministers had handed in their resignations to President Benes over a small incident involving the transferring of some police captains (too complicated and unimportant to go into).

The next day was Wheeler Moving Day, to our present address, from the hotel where we had been cooped up with the boys' purchases of pickled herrings and the girls' paper doll scraps. It was bitter cold, slightly blizzardy, and we noticed people out in the inclement weather, converging on Old Town Square, carrying banners, singing and laughing. It was only later that we learned that Prime Minister Clement Gottwald had there addressed an enormous mass meeting, explaining the issues: the right wing ministers had hoped to provoke a crisis by resigning, forcing President Benes to dissolve the cabinet and form a "cabinet of experts" on the pretext of surmounting the crisis. This would actually have been illegal because a majority had not resigned, nor was there a quorum at

the cabinet meeting where they handed in their resignations. But in fact, Zenkl—Slovak Democratic Party leader—later complained from Chicago that Benes had gone back on a previously made agreement and had yielded to the pressure of the masses when he finally did accept the right wing ministers' resignation and did not dissolve the cabinet.

The day after the mass meeting in Old Town Square the trade union factory committees met. They voted overwhelmingly—nearly 8,000 to 10—in favor of the demand that the law be observed, the resignations of the right wing ministers accepted and appointments made of other members of the same parties (except for the outright reactionary ones) who would cooperate in a national front. The trade union congress also voted a one-hour strike as a show of strength, to back up their demands. Trade union branches with 2,500,000 members actually took part in the strike; only about 1,500 members did not. George got stuck on the tram that day when the moment for the strike came, saw the smiles on the faces of most who waited or got out and walked, saw the scowls, anger and fear of the minority.

We were still groping, in those February days, pretty much in the dark about what was going on. But I don't feel so embarrassed about it now, since I read a recent "inquiring reporter" account in *Literary News*, which revealed that many other people—Czechs living right here—were unaware of the tremendous events going on. One woman literally said that all she knew was what she read in the papers! So much for the reports in Western

papers at the time about violent riots and blood running in the streets. It seems to us that it is not yet realized abroad—or even here—how important this bloodless and almost parliamentary revolution was as an example of peaceful change of power.

To get back to the sequence of events—February 25 was the day of the big demonstration in Wenceslas Square, and Nora (aged eight) and I were the lucky ones. I had prepared to go to a film while Nora was in dancing class, and in my ignorance I was mighty surprised to find Wenceslas Square packed with people—so tight that I couldn't dream of getting into the movie. Besides, I sensed that what was going on in the street was more important than the pictures on the screen! People were gay and exhilarated and joking, and didn't give my U.S. army overcoat, snood and Leica a second glance.

Prime Minister Gottwald suddenly drove into the square and announced that Benes had consented to accept the resignations of the right wing ministers and to appoint others to the vacancies (on his advice as Prime Minister, representing the party that had received the largest number of votes, the Communist Party, in the May 1946 elections). When he said this a tremendous roar went up.

Nora got lost in this huge crowd, estimated by some at around 300,000. And our corny joke for weeks was that during the February Events Nora had fallen into the hands of the police: she was escorted home by them! As we wrote home then, this was the sum total of terror for us personally during the February Events, when our little girl disap-

peared in the crowds in a strange land. And when, on the following Sunday, a Negro friend came to breakfast and we asked him if he had seen terror on his way over, he replied, "Look, I can walk from one end of this city to the other and stop anywhere for a meal and not be kicked out. I've seen no terror."

That was the day the congress of farmers' commissions met. The farmers were not, of course, as enthusiastically socialist as the factory councils from the trade unions had been the previous Sunday. But they were attracted by the proposed progressive amendments to the Land Reform Act which were to lower the limit for large holdings and distribute more land to small or landless farmers, as well as provide low-cost credits and tax relief for small farmers. They also endorsed the Gottwald program.

To recapitulate: in February a minority of right wing ministers resigned over a matter of minor importance, hoping to provoke a crisis; President Benes was forced by public opinion, expressed in trade union and farmer meetings, in mass strikes and demonstrations, to accept the resignations and promise to appoint representatives of the same parties, who would cooperate in the national front.

By March the cabinet was formed, and on March 2 the foreign journalists were invited to meet the new ministers. I wrote home at the time that Minister of Information V. Kopecky "said that the work of journalists had not been impeded, and so they had hoped at the Ministry that this would spare the Czechoslovak government untrue reports. Such was not the case."

Then came the question period. The *Associated Press* correspondent asked tactfully whether "these ministers really represented the rank and file of the parties or were hand-picked by Gottwald." Dr. Plojhar, Catholic (People's Party) Minister of Health answered this forcefully and ended by stating that most of the ministers who were said to have resigned on February 20 read about it first in the newspapers. The agreement, said Plojhar, was cooked up by a small group at a supper party including Ripka, Msgr. Hala and another who were members of the cabinet. Msgr. Sramek, another member of the cabinet, did not resign himself, but his resignation was telephoned in by Hala. "Do you wonder that we demanded that these men cease to represent their parties and that President Benes cease to negotiate with them?"

Equally forceful were the replies of the members of the Czechoslovak Socialist Party (Benes' party), such as Minister of Public Works Slechta, to the query whether the new ministers did not represent a new element instead of regular old party members. They agreed that "now the old party members who had been in the party since they were sixteen years old had ousted from control the people who had come in since 1945, when these no longer had a reactionary or fascist party they could join." I concluded my report of the press conference, after summarizing more angry comments by western journalists on the Action Committee set up as interim executive bodies (with all four parties represented), and other things "westerners" did not understand or like, by saying, "I have tried to analyze

the fury of the press representatives, and think it must be because the 'revolution' was bloodless and successful. They don't like to see these reds looking so intelligent and dignified, so little like caricatures, they don't like the police force keeping order without the traditional practice of cracking the workers over the head as they did in France."

In fact, the workers realized quite well that the plot was to bring about a crisis on the France 1947 pattern—with the end result of excluding the largest party, the Communist Party, from the cabinet.

Even in a revolutionary situation March follows February, and so it did in 1948. The demands that had been made at the trade union and farmers' congresses were put into legislation in March. Then on April 10 and 11 there was the very important Congress of National Culture, at which leading cultural workers spoke, outlining the cultural program of the new People's Democracy. Ladislav Stoll, later Minister of Culture and now Ambassador to France, summed up the general consensus when he said:

"All of us are aware that one stage of our development has ended and that a new one has begun, that what has happened has illimitable possibilities, that it is not only a question of profound changes in our economic, social and political life, but that these alterations will have profound revolutionary effects in the realms of the spirit, thought and feeling as well, and will change the whole situation of our cultural life from the very roots. . . . There were times when the only people who represented the people and defended and interpreted their inter-

ests were the poets, while statesmen and politicians only represented the interests of the so-called elegant classes. . . . Today our creative writers and artists enter on the common task not as a decoration for the State set-up, but as a joint ruling force in the State. . . . Poets and statesmen have a common road." (See *Face to Face With Reality*, Orbis, Prague, 1948.)

At the end of May we observed the voting in the first elections after the February Events. The decision to have one-slate voting was a disappointment to us. At that time we had not seen what we have since witnessed many times: the thorough discussions of whom to put on the slate, in neighborhood and factory and cooperative farm meetings. We also, of course, recall the hopeless struggle to get anyone on the ballot in Virginia, if he was not part of the Byrd machine. But we still feel that the day will come when the alternatives will not be the full slate or a negative vote, but a more varied choice of candidates.

It might be interesting to repeat what I wrote at the time of these elections.

"Sunday we went with journalists around the polling places to see the voting. . . . In a middle class district the voting was almost entirely secret. In the workers' district it was almost entirely open and often with a proud communist raised-fist salute. The Czechs felt that this showed pride in their government, while the journalists sneered more and more openly. George and I felt like disembodied spirits because we could see what was going on in the minds of each side, while they remained out of touch with each other.

In the evening the journalists gathered at the Press Club to see the returns go up on a huge map of Czechoslovakia, drink coffee and exchange notes. On the way home at midnight we saw people still standing before the bulletin boards. Earlier the square was packed. The voters were in earnest about the elections even if journalists seemed to think it cut and dried."

On June 9 the Constitution adopted May 9 came into effect. Part of the preamble says: "We wish to be a State in which the entire economy shall serve the people and be so directed that general prosperity should grow, that there should be no economic crises and that the national income should be justly distributed. Along this road we wish to attain to a social order in which exploitation of man by man shall be completely abolished—to socialism." The full preamble, supplemented by the special law later passed punishing anyone who instigates to war, states the aims of the Czechoslovak government.

After his tour of People's Democracies, Paul Sweezy (February *Monthly Review*) came to the conclusion that it is in the interest of the governments in Eastern Europe to promote peace and that this is the path they will follow:

I have long been of the opinion that under socialism there are, outside the military power, no vested interests in war

preparations and no built-in obstacles to the full utilization of society's economic surplus for peaceful purposes. Everything I saw and heard in Eastern Europe fully confirms this view. There is, of course, no privately owned munitions industry to profit from military orders, and practically everyone now employed in making armaments (there may be a few exceptions but they are certainly of no general importance) knows that he or she personally would be at least as well off providing civilian goods and services and that society as a whole would be much better off. Further, from the point of view of those planning and directing the socialist economy, it is perfectly obvious that military production wastes the surplus which could otherwise be devoted to satisfying some of the urgent demands that are being insistently pressed upon them from all directions. . . . The life-and-death issue of our time is peace or war, and on this issue socialism is on the side of life.

Whatever mistakes have been made in other respects along this path in the last ten years, we have not seen any deviation from the aim to preserve and strengthen peace; and governmental measures are designed to promote the welfare of the greatest number, rather than the profits of the few. This is a path that was mapped out in the stormy days of Spring 1948. I hope that this brief outline of what happened then, as seen through the eyes of a foreign family living here, may throw a little additional light on how the Czechoslovak People's Democracy came to be and what its aims are.

CZECHOSLOVAKIAN FILMS ABROAD

CZECHOSLOVAKIA will take part in two international film festivals this summer. In Melbourne, Australia the two films "Journey into Primeval Times" and "Against All" will be shown. At the two Canadian festivals in Stratford and Vancouver will be shown "Legend of Love," based on a play by Nazim Hikmet, and "From My Life," a film about the Czech composer Smetana.

USSR TESTS SUSPENSION

Summary of Documents

We are here summarizing for the benefit of our readers the pertinent documents on the dramatic action of the USSR in unilaterally suspending nuclear weapons tests and appealing to other nations to take similar action.

AT THE concluding session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, March 31, Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko submitted for consideration, on behalf of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, the proposal that the Soviet Union unilaterally suspend tests of all kinds of atomic and hydrogen weapons.

After outlining the reasons behind this proposal, Mr. Gromyko introduced a draft resolution formalizing the proposal, which was adopted unanimously *at which point the suspension of tests went into effect.*

The Supreme Soviet then adopted an Address to the Congress of the United States and an Address to the British Parliament calling on them to use their influence to bring about similar actions by their own governments. It also adopted an appeal to the parliaments of all countries to support efforts aimed at the universal and final termination of nuclear weapons tests. Subsequently, Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev addressed a special note to President Eisenhower, and another one to Prime Minister MacMillan, urging that the United States and Britain also suspend nuclear weapons tests.

Address of Andrei Gromyko

In presenting the proposal on unilateral suspension of tests of atomic and hydrogen weapons, Mr. Gromyko recalled that the USSR had for several years been urging the United States and Great Britain to conclude an agreement on the complete and unconditional ending of tests.

Mr. Gromyko explained that while the Soviet Government considered the ending of tests as vital to the interests of their own and all other people, it recognized that this step would not fully remove the danger of atomic war—

Therefore, while advocating the ending of test explosions, we at the same time clearly declare that we regard as our main task that of reaching agreement with other powers on the unconditional banning of atomic and hydrogen weapons of all kinds, ending production thereof and the complete destruction of existing stockpiles of these weapons with proper control.

Since it had so far proved impossible to reach such an agreement with the United States and Great Britain, the USSR considered the ending of tests to be an urgent partial step "which to some degree will help save mankind from the fatal consequences of the present nuclear arms race."

Answering arguments raised in the West against discontinuing tests, he assailed the view of responsible U.S. circles that tests were necessary

to develop "clean" bombs as designed to divert attention from the main point, which is that the real choice before the world, as pointed out recently by a group of leading U.S. atomic scientists, is not between "clean" or "dirty" bombs "but between atomic war and a world relieved from the horrors of nuclear weapons." He assailed the supporters of the "deterrent" policy as in fact bringing closer the danger of war. Against the assertions of those who minimize the health hazards to mankind from radiation, he cited numerous opinions of world scientists who have warned against the harmful effect on the living and the unborn, especially of 9,235 scientists from 44 countries who petitioned the UN in January, and asked whether any government had the right not to take into account a risk that could fatally affect millions of human beings.

Of the fears expressed in the West and especially in the United States that the ending of tests and curtailing of war production would lead to a dislocation of economic life, Mr. Gromyko declared:

... what is most important, the danger to the economy of Western countries comes not from terminating nuclear weapons tests and not from the ending of the armaments race but rather from militarization which has caught in its vise the entire economy of the member states of the Atlantic bloc. . . . Is it not a fact that the atom and hydrogen bombs have not saved 5,300,000 Americans from unemployment in the United States today?

Regarding the charges that the USSR opposed inspection and control over any agreement on ending tests, Mr. Gromyko recalled that the

position of the Soviet Government when it had first proposed the ending of tests had been that any nuclear explosion could be easily detected by modern scientific-technical means, but that the USSR had itself submitted a proposal for control in order not to give the opponents of ending tests any excuse on this ground. He cited the specific proposal made by the USSR to the UN Disarmament Subcommittee:

. . . that an international commission be set up to supervise the fulfillment by states of their commitments to end atomic and hydrogen weapons tests and that under its direction control posts be set up on a reciprocal basis on the territories of the USSR, the United States, Britain, and in the Pacific area, including Australia.

When this failed to induce Britain and the United States to reach agreement on ending tests, continued Mr. Gromyko, it became clear that it was not at all a question of control and inspection, but rather the reluctance of definite Western circles to restrict the nuclear armaments race.

Pointing out that agreement would be comparatively easy while there were only three nuclear powers, but would become much more difficult when the number increased, Gromyko declared:

The ending of tests of atomic and hydrogen weapons would check the further spreading of these weapons, preventing any more countries from being drawn into the nuclear arms race, which, certainly, would in itself be a factor for peace.

On the other hand, the cessation of atomic and hydrogen weapon tests can and must be the first step, the gesture of mutual confidence among the powers which all the peoples are so eagerly

awaiting. A suspension of these tests everywhere would undoubtedly have an instant and most favorable effect on the over-all international situation. It would reduce the danger of atomic war which is harassing mankind and would pave the way to the solution of other international problems and, in the first place, of other questions of disarmament.

For the above reasons, Mr. Gromyko said, the Soviet Government regarded the termination of tests "as the most timely and urgent problem of the day" and was proposing it as the first item for the Summit conference, to be considered independently of agreement on other aspects of disarmament.

Mr. Gromyko recalled that when the earlier Soviet proposals for the complete and unconditional ending of tests had been turned down, the USSR proposed a two or three years suspension which would improve the international situation and facilitate further progress. The U.S. and British answer to this had been to link it up with a series of other steps too complex for any early solution, and they succeeded in getting a voting majority for this stand in the UN General Assembly, due to the obligations of many nations created by military bloc arrangements with the West, although the majority of the UN delegations were in fact in favor of the immediate ending of nuclear weapons tests. He cited both popular and official support in one form or another for ending tests in India, Indonesia, Japan, Burma, Ceylon, the United Arab Republic, Pakistan, Iran, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Finland, Mexico and many other countries, including all the Socialist countries, as well as wide popular support in Great Britain and other

countries, and also the growing movement to this end in the United States itself.

The Soviet Foreign Minister declared that if the United States and Great Britain would join the Soviet Union in ending atomic and hydrogen weapons tests, this could lead to their final cessation. However, he added:

It goes without saying that if the governments of other countries possessing nuclear weapons do not want to respond to the initiative of the USSR and react to it by continued test explosions of atomic and hydrogen weapons, the Soviet Union will have to guide itself by its own security interests in its further action with regard to nuclear tests.

The concluding part of Mr. Gromyko's address dealt with the position of the USSR on other questions of disarmament, its reduction of its own armed forces and armaments and relinquishment of military bases, and the opposition in Western European countries to U.S. rocket bases on their territory. He stressed especially the recent decision of the Bundestag of the Federal German Republic to arm the West German forces with atomic and rocket weapons as a step immensely increasing the war danger, sounding the knell for German unification, and opposed within West Germany itself by trade unions, many political parties, intellectuals and church circles, as well as arousing the fears of the people throughout Europe.

The Supreme Soviet Resolution

The Supreme Soviet unanimously passed a resolution based on Foreign Minister Gromyko's address, containing the following operative articles:

1. To stop the testing of all types of atomic and hydrogen weapons in the Soviet Union.

The Supreme Soviet of the USSR hopes the parliaments of other states in possession of atomic and hydrogen weapons on their part will do everything necessary to have test detonations of these types of weapons stopped in their countries as well.

2. To instruct the Council of Ministers of the USSR to take the necessary steps to implement Article 1 of the present resolution and call on the governments of other states in possession of atomic and hydrogen weapons, to undertake analogous steps to *get atomic and hydrogen weapons testing stopped everywhere and forever.*

If the other powers in possession of atomic and hydrogen weapons continue testing them, the Government of the USSR will naturally be free to act on the question of the Soviet Union testing atomic and hydrogen weapons, taking the above mentioned circumstances into consideration and moreover bearing in mind the security interests of the Soviet Union.

Address to U.S. Congress

The Supreme Soviet then adopted an Address to the Congress of the United States on the discontinuation of nuclear weapons tests. After stating the considerations which led to the decision on the unilateral ending of tests by the Soviet Union, the address declared:

In the interests of all mankind, the USSR Supreme Soviet calls upon the Congress of the United States of America to support this initiative which conforms to the aspirations of millions upon millions of people in all countries of the world. The Supreme Soviet is simultaneously forwarding an Address on this question to the Parliament of Great Britain and the Parliaments of other countries as well.

The USSR Supreme Soviet is firmly convinced that if the United States of America and Great Britain, as states possessing nuclear weapons, on their part

discontinue tests of this weapon in reply to the decision of the Soviet Union, the question of the cessation of atomic and hydrogen weapon tests everywhere and for all time will be settled. This will be an important step toward stopping the atomic arms drive and safeguarding the security of all peoples. This step would undoubtedly have tremendous significance for normalizing the entire international situation and thereby would help to solve many other outstanding international problems. . . .

Realizing the great responsibility of legislative bodies to the people for the great cause of preserving and consolidating peace, the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics addresses the Congress of the United States of America with the urgent appeal to use all its influence so that the question of the discontinuation of atomic and hydrogen weapon tests by all states for all time be finally settled in conformity with the aspirations of the peoples.

The USSR Supreme Soviet would like to hope that our two countries—the Soviet Union and the United States of America—the first to produce nuclear weapons, will also be the first to cease further tests of this weapon and thereby justify the hopes not only of the peoples of both our countries but also of all mankind.

Address to All Parliaments

The Address of the Supreme Soviet to the Parliaments of all countries called for support of the Soviet initiative in suspending tests as according with the desires of millions and millions of people everywhere, and included the following statements:

The harmful effect of nuclear tests knows neither geographical boundaries nor political distinctions between states. . . . Needless to say, the primary responsibility for the solution of this problem rests with the powers which possess nuclear weapons and test them. But . . . every state, whether a great power or a small country, whether a member of the United Nations or not, can render great assistance in achieving agreement to end

nuclear weapons tests by supporting the demand of all the peoples for the immediate termination of the dangerous experiments with A- and H-bombs. . . .

The USSR Supreme Soviet calls on the parliaments of all countries of the world to lend all-round support to the efforts aimed at a universal and final termination of nuclear weapon tests in accordance with the desire of the peoples, the desire of all mankind.

An additional resolution of the Supreme Soviet appealed to the Parliaments of all members of the wartime anti-Hitlerite coalition and of all countries which suffered from Hitlerite aggression, to unite their efforts to prevent the arming of the Federal Republic of Germany with atomic and rocket weapons.

U.S. CHURCH LEADERS URGE BOMB TEST END

AMONG THE latest appeals to our government to halt all nuclear weapon tests, is one signed by 140 Protestant clergymen and educators, reported in the *New York Times* for April 20. Among the distinguished signers are nine Bishops and officials of several theological seminaries. Their statement was an outgrowth of a declaration of the World Council of Churches meeting at New Haven last August, which called on the U.S., Britain and the Soviet Union to halt tests for a trial period. After deploring that the reaction of many to the launching of the Sputniks by the Russians was that the arms race must be stepped up, the statement called upon the U.S. Government:

"... To cancel the tests scheduled for April and August in the Pacific. We deem it morally indefensible and politically disastrous to hold these tests outside American territory in international waters where people of other nations who have not agreed, and are indeed protesting, have to bear the consequences.

"To declare a moratorium on all testing of weapons of mass destruction."

ON GERMAN REARMAMENT AND REUNIFICATION

WALTER LIPPMANN, writing in the *New York Herald Tribune*, April 1, of the decline in American influence he noted in his recent European trip, declared: "I became most aware of this as I began to realize how very different is the official American view of Germany from what one finds virtually everywhere in Europe. We have been taking it for granted that the hope of the future in Europe turns on the reunification and revival of Germany. The truth, as I found it, was that the World War is not forgotten, indeed that the memory of it is reviving, and that to understand the European situation as a whole it is necessary to take account of this growing fear of German domination . . . the Adenauer-Dulles formula [of free elections to unify Germany] has a fading role among the Germans. . . . What we are going to see, it seems to me, is—as unfortunately only the Russians have had the wit to suggest—negotiations between the two German Governments [which] . . . will almost certainly broaden into some sort of political arrangement. . . . This process in the two Germanies will, I am convinced, promote and will be accompanied by a thinning out of the military forces in Germany and in Central Europe. There is every reason to believe that the future of Central Europe lies with the principles of disengagement."

In a recent speech made in West Germany, British Royal Air Force Marshal Sir John Slessor declared atomic weapons unneeded in West Germany, and said he favored neutralization of the country. (*New York Post*, April 13)

Anton Chekhov

Anton Chekhov, by W. H. Bruford.
Yale University Press, New Haven,
1957. 62 pp. \$2.50.

AT ONE point in his career Chekhov expressed deep dissatisfaction about his writing when he compared it with the earlier 19th century Russian novelists:

"The best of them are realists and paint life as it is, but because every line is steeped in the consciousness of a goal, you feel, besides life as it is, the life which ought to be, that captivates you. And we? We! We paint life as it is, but beyond that, nothing at all. Flog us and we can do no more! We have neither immediate nor remote aims, and in our soul there is a great empty space. We have no politics, we do not believe in revolutions, we have no God, we are not afraid of ghosts, and I personally am not afraid even of death and blindness. One who wants nothing, hopes for nothing and fears nothing cannot be an artist."

Chekhov's deep depression as expressed in this letter written in 1892 hardly represents the opinion of his work that has grown in the half-century since his death. Never lacking admirers in all the changes of Russian history since 1905, Chekhov's reputation today places him as the last of those great 19th century writers with whom he had compared himself so unfavorably.

Mr. Bruford's brief book assesses Chekhov's artistic achievement and places him both in the Russian and European tradition. An earlier book by the same author, *Chekhov and His Russia*, is a much fuller consideration of the social background out of which Chekhov emerged. But the present study is an admirable example of condensation that leaves the reader with a clear picture of the growth of an artist sensitive to every change in the social forces around him, steadily maturing as his intelli-

gence penetrates more and more deeply into the world in which he lives.

It is, of course, Chekhov's achievement in the short stories and great plays written in the last ten years of his life, that finally lifted him to the plane of those writers who "feel, besides life as it is, the life which ought to be" and that has won for him the love not only of the Russian people but of readers and playgoers everywhere.

Chekhov did not work on the scale of the earlier novelists—his health, his peculiar gifts directed him towards slighter forms in which truth is glimpsed almost fleetingly. But within the smaller scope of his short stories and his plays written during the course of a brief life always made difficult by miserable health, he has left us an invaluable record of a decisive era in Russian history.

MURRAY YOUNG

"THE STALIN ERA"

Still Available

Dear Friends:

I have about 100 copies of the cloth edition of The Stalin Era which originally sold for \$2.50. I shall be glad to sell them for \$1.00 each, postpaid to any address your readers wish.

ANNA LOUISE STRONG
724 East Edgeware Road
Los Angeles 26, Calif.

NEW PUBLICATION:

American-Soviet Facts

DEALING WITH CULTURAL
AND SCIENTIFIC EXCHANGES

Write to:
National Council of American-Soviet
Friendship

114 East 32nd St., New York 16, N. Y.

NOW READY:

BOUND VOLUMES

OF 1957 NEW WORLD REVIEW

\$4.00

Indexes alone, 35c each

2nd PRINTING

Special

**96 page November issue
NEW WORLD REVIEW**

Still Available

Articles by:

**G. D. H. COLE
ANNA LOUISE STRONG
D. N. PRITT
CORLISS LAMONT
J. D. BERNAL
SCOTT NEARING
ESLANDA ROBESON**

and others

25 cents each—5 for \$1.00

New World Review

34 West 15th St., New York 11, N. Y.

The Land of Soviets

The Country and the People

•
**WAGES - PRICES - HOUSING - PUBLIC
HEALTH - INDUSTRY - AGRICULTURE -
EDUCATION - SCIENCE - ART AND
LITERATURE - SPORTS - STATE STRUC-
TURE - RIGHTS AND FREEDOM OF
CITIZENS**

*Profusely illustrated with pictures, maps
and statistical tables*

249 PAGES \$1.00

Order from

**IMPORTED PUBLICATIONS
AND PRODUCTS**

4 West 16th St., New York 11, N. Y.

Write for list of other Soviet books

NEW SOVIET FILMS

**BOULE DE SUIF
IN THE PACIFIC
FESTIVAL OF YOUTH
A DAY IN MOSCOW
MALVA
CARNIVAL**

Artkino Pictures, Inc.

723 SEVENTH AVE., NEW YORK 19

Telephone: Circle 5-6570

For Subscriptions

NEW WORLD REVIEW

34 W. 15th St., 7th fl.

New York 11, N. Y.

I enclose \$2.50 (Canadian
\$3.00, foreign \$3.50) for a

☐ *New subscription*

☐ *Renewal*

NAME

ADDRESS

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

A FOURTH, REVISED EDITION OF

THE PHILOSOPHY OF HUMANISM

by **CORLISS LAMONT**

With compelling vigor this book traces the historical roots of naturalistic Humanism and discusses the premises and implications of this philosophy for modern man. The author shows that man's answer to his problems lies in affirming life in the here and now, without recourse to magical formulas or supernatural beliefs; that man's hope for a better world is through the methods of reason, science and democracy.

A powerful antidote to prevailing irrationalisms in religion and philosophy.

Comments on earlier editions of
THE PHILOSOPHY OF HUMANISM

"Readable and persuasive"—*New York Times Book Review*

"The best presentation and analysis of its subject to be found in contemporary philosophy"—*Journal of Philosophy*

"A philosophy of life in simple and honest terms"—*The Survey*

"This book is worth reading because as Christians we need to know what the opposition is saying"—*The Living Church*

PAPER—BACK EDITION ONLY \$1.45

Cloth bound \$2.49

At your booksellers or from

PHILOSOPHICAL LIBRARY

15 East 40 Street, Desk R, New York 16, N. Y.