

~~SOCIAL SCIENCES~~ ✓

SEPTEMBER, 1958

25¢

New World

REVIEW

✓ DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRARY SEP 6 1958

ARABIA: THE CONTINUING REVOLT

John O'Kearney

CHINA'S GOOD EARTH

Helen and Scott Nearing

TRENDS IN SOVIET MUSIC

Ralph Parker

THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

Jessica Smith

NEW WORLD REVIEW

SEPTEMBER 1958

The Middle East Crisis	Jessica Smith	3
Arabia: The Continuing Revolt	John O'Kearney	9
China's Good Earth	Helen and Scott Nearing	15
Toward Modern Themes in Soviet Music	Ralph Parker	25
A Tolstoyan Visits the USSR	Olga Biryukov	28
The Khrushchev-Eisenhower Exchanges		31
The Security Council Meeting		37
MUSIC AND BOOKS		
New Soviet Recordings	Sidney Finkelstein	43
The Question	Henri Alleg	44
No More War	Linus Pauling	45
Our Nuclear Adventure	D. G. Arnott	45
Inspection for Disarmament	edited by Seymour Melman	45
On Nuclear Energy	Donald J. Hughes	45
To End Nuclear Bomb Tests	Corliss Lamont	46

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

ESLANDA ROBESON
Editorial Consultants on Negro and Colonial Questions and UN Correspondents

Vol. 26, No. 8, September, 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 209
PRINTED IN U.S.A.

TO OUR READERS

As you know, we skipped our August issue for reasons of economy. But the world does move! The events of this two-month period have brought us close to the brink again, and have placed grave new responsibilities on us.

We have already had to use up some of the money we saved to add a few extra pages to this issue, in order to try to catch up with some of the events that have thrown the Middle East and the world into new turmoil.

And we are still short \$2,000 of the amount required to cover the summer period. This must be made up if we are to meet the needs of our readers for material that will help in carrying on the struggle for withdrawal of U.S. troops from Lebanon, for real negotiations with the Soviet Union for peaceful solutions in the Middle East and everywhere, for an end to nuclear weapons testing, an end to the cold war.

We count on you to make it possible for us to do our part in this grave emergency. We need the remaining \$2,000 before the next issue goes to press. We urge you to send what you can at once!

Please Fill Out and Mail Today

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

I enclose \$..... for your EMERGENCY SUSTAINING FUND.

I enclose \$..... for renewal of my subscription ☐ \$2.50 one year ☐ \$1.25 for six months (check one).

Name.....

Street.....

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

The Middle East Crisis

by JESSICA SMITH

As we go to press, the special General Assembly meeting on the Middle East has concluded with a historic unanimous vote adopting the resolution offered by the ten Arab member nations.

The operative part of the resolution calls on the UN secretary General "to make forthwith, in consultation with the governments concerned . . . such practical arrangements as would adequately help in upholding the principles of the Charter in relation to Lebanon and Jordan in the present circumstances and thereby facilitate the early withdrawal of foreign troops from these two countries."

The resolution welcomes reaffirmation by the Arab states of their Arab League commitments "to respect the systems of government established in the other member states." It calls on all UN member states "to act strictly in accordance with the principles of mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty, of non-aggression, of strict non-interference in each other's internal affairs, and of equal and mutual benefit." (These are the Bandung principles.) It also invites the secretary General to consult the Arab countries "with a view to possible assistance regarding an Arab development institution designed to further economic growth in these countries."

Both the Western-backed resolution, which was vaguer on the question of troop withdrawal, and the Soviet resolution, asking immediate troop withdrawal, were withdrawn. Secretary Dulles, heading the U.S. delegation, expressed regret that the Arab resolution did not provide for a stand-by UN "peace force" (actually a police force against "indirect aggression"), but said this question would be taken up by the U.S. at the forthcoming regular General Assembly session. Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko stated that if the resolution did not result in troop withdrawal, the USSR would again raise the question.

ONCE AGAIN the Dulles' policies have brought our country and the world to the brink of a new world war which might have already begun had not the mighty opposition from governments and peoples all over the world and the strong and steady efforts of the Soviet Union to find a peaceful solution checked it.

Never has United States prestige sunk so low, never has the bankruptcy of its foreign policies been exposed so clearly, never have the dangers of war resulting from them been so universally recognized as in its action of dispatching some

15,000 battle-ready marines and troops with heavy equipment, tanks and planes to intervene in the internal affairs of Lebanon, (the token withdrawal of a battalion does not change the situation) and its support with military and other supplies for British armed intervention in Jordan. Never has U.S. contempt for the will of the people been so clear as in these efforts to suppress the Arab national liberation movement.

Despite all the protestations by the Administration that its actions are only to support the "independence and integrity" of small nations

threatened by "international communism" it is generally recognized that no such threat exists in the Middle East, that the liberation movement is wholly indigenous that, in fact, U.S. policies are concerned not with protecting the independence of small nations, but with protecting the independence of feudal kings and potentates from the will of their own people to be free of them and of domination by imperialist nations.

In this case, "international communism" is supposed to be working through the United Arab Republic, although the UN's own Observation Group has denied any intervention in Lebanon on the part of the UAR.

Only the absence in the United States of a peace movement comparable to that which exists in most countries of the world has prevented the focussing of public opinion in the mightiest protest against U.S. foreign policies that has yet been heard, to match expressions of this kind around the world. Whatever progressive and peace groups U.S. cold war repressive policies have still permitted to exist, have indeed spoken out. Groups like the Quakers, the Women's International League, important church groups and civic organizations and prominent individuals have called for the immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops from the Middle East. Letters to the press all over the country show the deep dissatisfaction of the public. Most significant of all, large sections of the press itself, which usually supports U.S. policies, has opposed them in this case.

The Negro press, inevitably equating the repressive actions against the Arab peoples with the shameful

repressive actions against Negroes in America, has either sharply opposed or failed to give any support to U.S. Middle Eastern policies. Radio and TV programs have brought to the people generally more realistic accounts of the actualities of the situation than has ever before been the case. Opposition in Washington itself, and even in Administration circles, has never been so vigorous.

Attacks on U.S. Policy

One of the first attacks came from the conservative *Wall Street Journal*, which, it should be understood, is in general in favor of U.S. anti-Communist policies, but considers them misapplied in the Middle East and denies that Arab nationalism can in any way be identified with Communism. In an editorial on July 16, the day after the dispatch of the U.S. Marines, this Wall Street organ warned of the consequences for years to come of a decision to establish by force an order of our own choosing in the Middle East. The editorial said it was necessary to understand what we are really fighting for in the Middle East; it is no sense a "battle against Communism as an ideology or against Communist aggression." But rather, "What we are struggling against in the Middle East is a rising tide of the people's deep emotions" the tide of Arab nationalism and unity, which did not originate with Mr. Nasser and would not disappear with Mr. Nasser. And what are we fighting for? *The Wall Street Journal* declared:

The most direct answer is that we are fighting for the oil fields of the Middle East. . . . Of course it is by no means certain that Arabian oil in the

hands of the Arabs is denied to the Western world. . . . But in any event, if this is the reason we are ready to fight, then it is not a crusade against Communism and aggression upon which we ride but a frank power drive of precisely the kind we have long deplored in others.

On July 28, the *Wall Street Journal* charged that a fateful dimension had been added to the Eisenhower doctrine in promising help to governments threatened internally as well as externally, and that its plain implication is that:

The United States may henceforth intervene in any country whose government feels itself threatened from any quarter. The threat no longer has to be that of Communist attack. . . . If dissidents anywhere now want to overthrow their government, that government can now appeal to us on the basis of Lebanon. . . . Are we to rush troops to the defense of any government anywhere that feel itself threatened from any source for any reason?

While the *New York Times*, which had previously opposed armed intervention, did an editorial flip flop when the Marines landed in Lebanon, its columns have been full of material opposing the move. Its military commentator, Hanson Baldwin, has taken a similar position to that of the *Wall Street Journal* in a number of columns. On July 16 he wrote that the landing of the Marines in Lebanon may ultimately produce just what it is intended to prevent. He deplored "the readiness in Washington to use military force to maintain in power a regime that has lost much of its popular support," and declared that this action would "do more than any other event since the Port Said attack to knit together Arab nationalists throughout the Middle East." On

July 20 he warned of the obvious dangers of a shooting war since "The use of military force must always involve risks and these risks are far greater in the nuclear age."

Walter Lippmann, commentator of the Republican *New York Herald Tribune* and a chain of other papers throughout the country, has consistently opposed U.S. Middle Eastern policy. He wrote on July 17 of the "fundamental error"

. . . in believing that the way to stabilize the Middle East is to align as many Middle Eastern countries as can be persuaded to join, in a military alliance against the Soviet Union. . . . It is absurd to suppose that a great power like Russia can be excluded from a region which is as close to her and as important to her as is Central America to the United States.

The policies based on this misconception, have blown up and are in ruin. They were based on theories which are contrary to the facts of life, and they were certain to fail. . . . We should seek a settlement by negotiation, recognizing that both the Soviet Union and the United Arab Republic are powers and have interests with which we must reach an accommodation.

Congressional opposition to the Administration's action in the beginning was directed more against the failure of President Eisenhower to notify leaders of either party of his action in advance, than toward the sending of troops itself, although a few Democratic Senators somewhat cautiously opposed it. The Democratic leadership went along with Government policy. Senator Hubert Humphrey, (D-Minn.) one of the first to speak out, wrote in *The Reporter* magazine for August 7 that the landing of the marines "was an act of desperation capping seven

years in which we have groped for a policy without ever succeeding in producing one." As the immediate dangers of the situation seemed to recede, Democratic members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee gained courage, and put on "the heaviest organized attack in this session of Congress on the foreign policies of the Administration." (*New York Herald Tribune*, August 9)

The opening gun came in a strong speech August 6 by Senator J. W. Fullbright (D-Ark.) who called for a complete reorientation of our foreign policy on the basis that it is "inadequate, outmoded and misdirected" and based on a false appraisal of our own interests and the state of the world. He charged that we are now "looking squarely into the abyss of war" and that our predicament is due to "our readiness to use the specter of Soviet Communism as a cloak for the failure of our own leadership." As for our dealings in the Middle East, he said he considered the Eisenhower Doctrine and the Baghdad Pact "worthless." He also called for a new look at our Far Eastern policy, particularly our relations with China—"We cannot forever ignore 600,000,000 people on the mainland of China, but what are we doing to make it possible to deal with them on the best terms possible?"

Senator Humphrey supported the Fullbright speech, and called for the resignation of Secretary Dulles. Other Senators joining in criticism of government foreign policy are Senators Mike Mansfield of Montana, John J. Sparkman of Alabama, Wayne Morse of Oregon, Theodore Francis Green of Rhode Island, Estes Kefauver of Tennessee, and

John J. Kennedy of Massachusetts. Republicans generally supported the Administration, but Senator George D. Aiken of Vermont voiced approval of constructive criticism.

"Indirect Aggression"

While alleged "indirect aggression" is the main charge of the Administration against Communist nations today (since they have never obliged by engaging in direct aggression) it should be noted that this has been at the basis of the whole cold war anti-Communist policy of both Democratic and Republican Administration from the Truman to the Eisenhower Doctrines, although never as bluntly spelled out as now. The policy is coming under increasing fire on all sides because the "indirect aggression" label is being applied to all kinds of internal change under the pretext of being Communist-inspired, and because the opposition to "indirect aggression" on the part of our government must inevitably itself become "indirect aggression," in bolstering up regimes unwanted by the people. This policy, in the name of anti-Communism, is in fact today being applied to supporting reactionary regimes against even mildly liberal democratic regimes that might succeed them, since such regimes might consider the interests of their own people more important than those of the American monopolists.

The NATO pact, signed in April, 1949, a military alliance against the Soviet Union, had as a major purpose, implicit if not explicit in the text, to help reactionary governments remain in the saddle and give them the means of suppressing democratic movements of the peo-

ple. In the *New York Times* of March 1, 1949, describing the purposes of the pact, James Reston wrote: "The Executive Branch of the Government is convinced that some of the Western European nations must have military aid, not only to defend themselves against external aggression, *but primarily to bolster their police powers against their own Communists.*" (Italics mine)

The Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, signed at Rio in 1947, while ostensibly a treaty binding the United States and Latin American countries in a pact to meet armed attacks against any American state from outside the hemisphere, also had this implicit purpose. It was made explicit at the Tenth Inter-American Congress in August 1954 in a declaration at Caracas engineered by Secretary Dulles "against international Communist intervention." (Guatemala voted against it; Mexico and Argentina abstained.)

In the SEATO pact, signed September, 1954, Secretary Dulles committed the United States not only to aid in defense against outside aggression, but to "counter subversive activities directed from without." (To Dulles all "subversive" activities are directed from without.)

The Eisenhower Doctrine, as explained by John McKearney in his excellent article on the Middle East elsewhere in this issue, while technically designed to protect Middle Eastern countries against "overt attack" has been and is being used on the "indirect aggression" pretext.

At the recent Baghdad Pact meeting, July 28-29 in London, Secretary Dulles committed the United States

to full membership as against its previous partial membership, and to a statement declaring the members, "determination to maintain their collective security and to resist aggression, direct or indirect."

Secretary Dulles told the meeting the United States would act in this connection "even at great risk"—in other words, that the United States is willing to risk war to keep unpopular regimes in power.

The new Republic of Iraq was not represented at London, although the former Kingdom of Iraq had been the only Arab nation willing to join (other members being Iran, Turkey, Pakistan, Britain, and now the United States.) In a desperate move to save the pact, the United States and other Western powers have now recognized Iraq. The irony of this situation is that the United States at first assailed the formation of the Iraq Republic as a particularly flagrant case of "indirect aggression" and gave the overturn in Iraq as the motivation for sending its troops to Lebanon. U.S. recognition of Iraq is recognition of the bankruptcy of its own policies.

While committing itself to the struggle against "indirect aggression" in its series of military pacts with other countries, the United States itself adopts indirect aggression as an instrument of its own foreign policy not only in the application of the pacts, but in the Mutual Security Act under which Congress annually appropriates large sums of money for purposes of subversion in all socialist countries.

It is hardly surprising therefore, that the Administration should have encountered such a barrage of

hostile criticism from the press, and all sober commentators, in its announced policy of making "indirect aggression" the focal point of its plains for discussion in the now abandoned Security Council meeting and in the General Assembly. A dispatch from Washington to the *New York Times* (Aug. 11) said:

... Many officials are worried that the Soviet Union may possibly have come into possession of Baghdad Pact documents since the revolution in Iraq. One official said last week "There may be embarrassing pitfalls along the road of indirect aggression."

USSR Seeks Peaceful Solution

Meantime, the Soviet Union has set a firm course for peaceful solutions in the Middle East, and throughout the world, and, as always, in support of genuine people's liberation movements.

It is important to remember, although it has been lost in the shuffle, that on July 15, on the very day the U.S. troops landed in Lebanon, the Soviet Government sent a note to the Governments of the European nations and to the United States proposing that a treaty of friendship and cooperation be concluded among European nations.

While temporarily turning to the solution of the Middle Eastern crisis as the immediate task, the Soviet Union has continued its efforts toward bringing about a summit conference on disarmament and larger issues as soon as possible. Soviet scientists are meeting in Geneva with United States scientists to work out means of detecting tests of nuclear weapons which could be the basis for an agreement for the suspension of such tests, and it is reported that an agreement is near.

Mr. Khrushchev has proposed to the United States a similar meeting of experts to study jointly the practical aspects of the problem of measures to prevent the possibility of surprise attack, which the United States considers a matter of paramount importance in any disarmament agreement.

Meantime, the Soviet Union has been doing everything possible to help find a peaceful solution for the Middle East, and to avoid any action that might exacerbate the situation. Reports from Moscow made clear that there has been no talk in Moscow of the sending of volunteers to the Middle East as there had been during the Suez crisis. Mr. Khrushchev told a group of Indian editors and correspondents on July 29:

If one speaks of the participation of volunteers of other countries in the development of events in the Near and Middle East, then that would denote a real war. But it would be better if no such war took place. There should be no volunteers there, nor troops sent there by the order of some governments.

On his arrival in this country to head the USSR delegation to the UN General Assembly session, Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko said his delegation would work for the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Lebanon and British troops from Jordan, and to find a solution "in the interest of generally preserving peace in the world and particularly in the Middle East."

The position of the Soviet Union on Middle Eastern events is made clear in the following accounts of the Khrushchev-Eisenhower correspondence and its participation in the Security Council meeting.

(Turn to Page 31)

Arabia: The Continuing Revolt

by JOHN O'KEARNEY

FOR THE THIRD time since the enunciation of the Eisenhower Doctrine in January, 1957, we have brandished the colossus of our military might in the face of Arabs, only to heighten the anti-Western, anti-imperialist fervors of an oppressed people in their struggle against the despotisms which a misguided sense of American self-interest would seek to preserve.

The fancied wrong to American self-interest which has been made the pretext for Dulles-Eisenhower conduct in the Middle East is the "indirect aggression" which the Secretary of State incessantly lays to "Nasserism" and "international Communism." It was this fancied "indirect aggression" which brought down the corrupt monarchy in Iraq, and was, as the Secretary told a news conference on July 31, "the cause of the United States and United Kingdom going in" to the Lebanon and Jordan. The argument and proof to the contrary, by which the Secretary of State apparently has not been shaken, is the reaffirmed report of the United Nations that the opposition revolt in the Lebanon was direct and Lebanese.

JOHN O'KEARNEY is a New York newspaperman who has spent years abroad. The material in this article was drawn in part from his book on the Middle East and the Eisenhower Doctrine, "Red Mirage," published in London earlier this year by Mac Gibbon & Kee.

President Eisenhower, presenting Secretary Dulles' "Plan for the Middle East"—the Eisenhower Doctrine—in a special message to Congress within a few months of the Suez episode of 1956, said there was "general recognition in the Middle East and elsewhere that the United States does not seek either political or economic domination over any other people," but he had come to Congress to ask for executive authority to use the armed forces of the United States "to secure and protect the territorial integrity and political independence of such nations requesting such aid against overt armed aggression from any nation controlled by international Communism."

In subsequent debate Senator Estes Kefauver attacked the whole plan as an imposture, saying:

Beneath those which appear on the surface are two underlying purposes to be served by the resolution: The first is to warn Arab countries not to nationalize oil concessions held by American companies; the second is to permit immediate intervention in the event such nationalization does take place, without any delay being imposed by Congressional opposition or debate.

Nor had the President himself left any doubt that oil was the main issue. The blocking of the Suez Canal during the aggression against Egypt a few months before had demonstrated the "immense import-

ance" of the oil of the Middle East, he said, but his finest voice he saved for this:

Then there are other factors which transcend the material. The Middle East is the birthplace of three great religions . . . which teach that the spirit has supremacy over matter and the individual has a dignity of which no despotic government can rightfully deprive him. It would be intolerable if the holy places of the Middle East should be subjected to a rule that glorifies atheistic materialism.

At the same time, in the same message, he admitted that Russia had only an undefined "power politics" interest in the area—having more oil of her own than she needs.

The first application of the Eisenhower Doctrine came in April, 1957, when the Sixth Fleet was used to maneuver the downfall of the Nabulsi Government in Jordan. Premier Suleiman Nabulsi was a nationalist and a socialist, closely allied with the Syrian-born Baath Al-Arabi Al Ishtiraki, the party of the Arab Socialist Renaissance, the party of "positive neutralism," preaching an elementary socialist program only slightly more militant than Fabianism. Nabulsi's first aim was administrative reform. He came to power with a clear mandate to abrogate the Anglo-Jordanian Treaty and align the nation closely to Syria, Egypt and Saudi Arabia. But he alarmed Washington by declaring for full diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union and China.

I was told in Amman, in August, 1957, that for months before Nabulsi's fall the U.S. Embassy there was distributing handsome bribes among the Bedouin leaders upon whom King Hussein depended for

loyalty of the army, to palace politicians such as Samir Rifai, the present foreign minister, who is also an agent of the Iraq Petroleum Co. at a salary of £4,000 a year, and lastly that Hussein himself was given \$10,000,000 under the table as the price of his breaking away from any alliance with the Syrian and Egyptian movement for Arab unity.

In June, 1957, in Damascus, Khalid Baqdash, the only Communist Deputy in the Syrian National Assembly, had told me even he did not propose the expropriation of oil fields. ("Equitable oil agreements, yes; but an act of expropriation would deny us [the Arab world] our markets.") Yet Nabulsi had to go, because every step towards Russian-approved neutralism diminishes the cluster of American satellites, and because every step towards administrative and economic reform in the Arab world is a threat to the corruption and despotism upon which the extortionate profits of oil depend.

The second application of the Eisenhower Doctrine came only a few months after the Jordan affair. Syria had concluded an arms agreement with the Soviet Union and was about to borrow economic development money from Moscow at a very favorable rate of interest. Simultaneously, she shook up her army command, arresting several officers whom she accused of plotting with the United States to bring down the Syrian Government in favor of a regime which would collaborate with Washington against Moscow. State Department spokesmen, running counter to the opinion of every knowing observer east of Green-

wich, asserted that the army shake-up was a Communist *coup*. Dulles, in Washington, was visited by the British Ambassador, Sir Harold Caccia, who later told reporters that Syria seemed to have moved "very far" towards becoming a Russian satellite. State Department spokesmen hinted hopefully of a possible counter-revolution. The President expressed fears of Syrian aggression against her neighbors. An airlift of arms was ordered for Jordan. Arms were rushed to Iraq and Saudi Arabia. The Pakistan satellite let it be said by "authoritative sources" that the Baghdad Pact powers should "turn the tables on the Syrian Communists."

It is acknowledged everywhere outside the myopic range of Washington-minded thinking that Syria developed in the years since her liberation from the French the soundest free enterprise economy in the Middle East. She did it without foreign aid, and with far less direction of pure business by government than there is in the United States.

The third application of the doctrine in its undisguised purpose was the recent dispatch of marines to the Lebanon, backed by British paratroopers in Jordan, because of the obsessional belief that the *coup* in Iraq was Communist, and that its success would fan the flames of Red revolt against King Hussein and against the treacherous America-directed sycophantism of President Camille Chamoun and his foreign minister, Charles Malik.

The Arab nationalist movement of our time, in which the Secretary of State finds aggression, dates back to before World War I. Out of the Turkish revolution of 1908 came a

growing and open demand for self-rule by the Arabs of the Ottoman Empire. They formed literary propaganda groups and secret societies, and held a conference in Paris in 1913, at which they demanded complete freedom from their Turkish rulers. With the outbreak of the war in 1914 the British sought Arab support where they could, and in 1916 Sherif Hussein, a great-grandfather of the present Hussein of Jordan and of the recently assassinated Faisal of Iraq, led the Arab Revolt. Hussein agreed to declare war on Turkey. In turn, Britain pledged herself to support Arab independence and allotted Hussein a subsidy of £200,000 a month in gold.

Briefly, before World War I was over, the British and French secretly agreed to carve up the Arab Middle East in apportioned spheres of influence, and through the Balfour Declaration the British further laid the ground, against strong protest, for what the Arabs charged was Zionist invasion.

The end of the war saw the establishment of an independent Arab monarchy at Damascus, under Faisal, son of Hussein, and a strong movement in Iraq to give a throne in Baghdad to Faisal's brother, the Emir Abdullah. The Arabs of Palestine clamored for joining with Syria as a first step toward unity, pointing to the promises of President Wilson's Fourteen Points.

The Fourteen Points were damned, however, and at the San Remo Conference of 1920 France was given mandatory power over the Lebanon and Syria, including the sanjak of Alexandretta, since returned to Turkish rule, while

Britain took Iraq and Palestine, including Transjordan. The French were given a share of Iraq's oil. Arab insurrection flamed. British and French troops doused it in blood. In imposing her will upon the Arabs, Britain chose their governments for them. The Faisal who had been King of Syria became King of Iraq. The Abdullah the Iraqi wanted became the subsidized puppet ruler of Transjordan. Nationalist sheiks were deposed and replaced by men susceptible of bribed reliability. The rest of Arabia, aside from the mandates, the long independent Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, and Yemen, which inherited careless independence from the ruins of the Ottoman Empire, fell to British domination as protected sheikhdoms.

And then, after many rebellions put down with violence, came World War II. French and British dissension, the Atlantic Charter, the United Nations, many things subsequently modified conditions in the Arab Middle East. France got out of the Lebanon and Syria in 1946, and Britain relinquished her last mandated powers when she left Palestine in 1948.

But the greatest change brought on by the war was the intrusion of American oil interests in Saudi Arabia at a time which saw the Middle East develop into the world's vastest pool of oil wealth. In April of this year the known reserves were estimated at 264,500,000,000 barrels, only a little short of three times the estimated reserves of the Western Hemisphere, and the prospect is that there is much still to be found. From the whole pool, including non-Arab Iran, the international oil

cartels were removing for export, in April, 3,690,000 barrels of crude oil a day. A great part of this is pumped through pipelines across Syria and the Lebanon from Iraq, and across Jordan, Syria and the Lebanon from Saudi Arabia. The concessions are chiefly British, American, Dutch and French.

In Iraq, considered alone, the total capital investment of the oil companies is believed to be about \$300,000,000. Every year they extract oil valued at about \$500,000,000 in crude profit, of which Iraq gets half. But there are still vast profits to be taken from distribution of the refined products, of which the Iraq Government gets nothing. About 57 per cent of all the oil produced in the Middle East is taken out by American companies.

In January, 1957, President Eisenhower said:

If the Middle East is to continue its geographic role of uniting rather than separating East and West, if its vast economic resources are to serve the well-being of the peoples there, as well as that of others, and if its cultures and religions and their shrines are to be preserved for the uplifting of the spirits of peoples, then the United States must make evident its willingness to support the independence of the freedom-loving nations of the area.

The President clearly was mouthing the words of his Secretary of State. At the time of the so-called August crisis in Syria, eight months later, Saudi Arabia's King Saud was momentarily cool towards Damascus. The Secretary ordered that he be given jet planes to guard himself against aggression. This "freedom-loving" monarch of a kingdom which is the exclusive preserve of the

Arabian-American Oil Co. was a ruthless tyrant. In the open slave markets of Saudi Arabia it is still possible to buy a human being more easily than you could buy a sheep, because sheep are sometimes scarce. Slave market prices range up to \$10,000 for young and comely females. Middle-aged humans of fair muscle can be got for a little as \$120.

In "freedom-loving" Iran, the Shah is an absolute dictator. Oil revenues of the Iranian Government in the next six years are expected to be no less than \$1,000,000,000. In the same period the profits to the oil consortium, which is 80 per cent Anglo-American, are expected to exceed \$2,000,000,000. But a World Bank Survey has found that the average real value of wages throughout Iran is expected to rise in that time by less than 1 per cent. The only freedom the Shah tolerates is the freedom of his chosen courtiers to plunder the state. Year after year the American taxpayer has given millions of his "aid" dollars to balance the Iranian budget, while oil revenues are used to develop vast tracts of private land on which the owners pay no taxes.

"Freedom-loving" Jordan has been under martial law since April of last year. Thousands of her political opposition are either in concentration camps, in exile, or in the grave. The maintenance of "freedom" in this gerrymandered monarchy has cost the American taxpayer more than \$80,000,000 in hard cash and arms since the overthrow of the nationalist Nabulsi Government 16 months ago. Her puerile monarch has been bribed by the State Department, without whose largesse he could not

eat, to betray the cause of Arab nationalism by denouncing as Communists all men who demand reforms and freedom. The poorest of these wretches he hangs in the public squares. For him who has money there is always a minister to take a bribe for a jail break.

In "freedom-loving" Lebanon more than half the populace backed the rebellion to unseat a president who had sought unconstitutionally to perpetuate a Tweed Ring rule. Millions of American dollars have been dumped into the Lebanese cesspool of political corruption in return for the regime's willingness to repeat its clamorous denunciations of "Nasserism and international Communism."

The "freedom-loving" Iraq of the late Premier Nuri es-Said was a stronghold of oppressive feudalism, where powerful sheiks maintained their own private armies, ran their own private courts free of any code of law, where oil wealth had brought only one freedom to the common man—the freedom to move his increasingly worthless body from newly mechanized farms to the most wretched squalor of quickly growing urban slums. It was a land where protest even of the mildest sort meant jail, and of a greater sort, death. It was the seat of the Baghdad Pact, itself the spinster mother of an effort to establish a grand Pan-Islamic alliance, led by our bankrupt ally, Turkey, in reaction to Arab nationalism.

Only July 31 Secretary Dulles told a press conference: "Now let me say on Arab nationalism, there is no opposition that I know of on the part of the United States to Arab nationalism. There are plenty

of good reasons why there should be greater unity among the Arab nations. The United States encourages that."

This statement may actually be a portent of the last flip in the flop of policies which have made the United States a ridiculous menace to the peace of the world. It may be an augury of sanity reimposed upon the State Department, an acknowledgement forced by public opinion that the Secretary cannot deal with the Middle East as he could with natives who could be terrorized by a gunboat, but with men such as Michel Aflak, the Syrian Secretary General of the Arab Socialist Renaissance Party, who in June, '57, told me:

"We made ourselves fully acquainted with the struggle between the ideologies before, during and after World War II. We studied world problems and gave a human trend and outlook to our Party. We came to the conclusion that the world, for all its struggles, its pronounced ideologies, did not raise itself above its own contradictions. We thought the Arab world was called upon to make its contribution to the settlement and definition of world problems. In connection with this, the idea of neutralism was conceived, neutralism as an active force, not merely a neutralism which is neutral because it stands aloof. This was based on the recognition that

each nation has its own problems, for which it may sometimes have to fight, but which are not necessarily solved by alliances with other nations, with their quarrels.

"Arab federation," he said, "is a principal aim. The federation of Syria, Egypt and normally, Jordan, should take place first. And political union should go hand-in-hand with socialist reform. There have been many schemes for federation in other forms, all aiming at more and more exploitation of the Arab countries. British-oriented and Eisenhower Doctrine people wish to create nationalistic chauvinism among the Arabs, and would give a corrupted orientation to the Arab world. Unity, giving us the resources of the Arab world for ourselves, is a necessary condition. The Arab world is predominantly agricultural. It must go through an industrial revolution before it can achieve socialist revolution in its fullest sense. This it cannot do until it has been unified."

But though there may be an augury (not to be literally divined) in Secretary Dulles' protestation at the July 31 press conference, it was in itself, literally taken, a mendacious statement; and it was clear in President Eisenhower's speech to the UN General Assembly on August 13 that the State Department will accept no more change of the *status quo* in the Middle East than perforce it must.

OXFORD CONFERS DEGREE ON SHOSTAKOVICH

OXFORD UNIVERSITY in June presented Dmitri Shostakovich the honorary degree of Doctor of Music—the first time this degree has been conferred on a Soviet citizen.

In presenting Shostakovich the Public Orator said, "It is the first time on which it has been my lot to express your appreciation for a Russian. May this be the happy omen of a dawning age!"

China's Good Earth

by HELEN and SCOTT NEARING

We are privileged to present our readers two sections from the forthcoming book by Helen and Scott Nearing recounting their visit last fall and winter to the Soviet Union and People's China. Entitled The Brave New World, the book is to be published in October. The section below is part of the introduction to the book, followed by one of the chapters describing the Nearings' experiences in China.

A NEW WORLD IN THE MAKING

WE RAN into beggars almost everywhere during our previous winter's journey through the Middle East, South and West Asia. In some places they buzzed about us as flies buzz around a drop of honey. We had something; they wanted it. They held out their hands, appealing with every artifice at their command. Some of these mendicants were tottering on the edge of the grave. Some of them were hardly out of the cradle. It was a harrowing experience to face need, dire poverty and semi-starvation at almost every turn. These fellow humans were asking for something; they had nothing to give in return. They were destitute, and to them we looked wealthy. "Something for nothing," they pleaded.

This is the social life pattern of a large part of the Old World: get without giving. The beggars live by that system; so do the rich. The beggars live off hand-outs, and the rich live on rent, dividends and other unearned income. The ethics of the

Old World is based on the formula: Get all you can for as little as you can, and where possible, get something for nothing.

Early in November, 1957, we found ourselves, together with a considerable number of other fog-bound travelers, in the Prague airport. Among us were people from many nations and from every continent. Long-robed, dark-skinned Africans; small-boned and delicate Koreans and Burmese; turbanned Hindus and Nepalese were held up for days, together with Italians, French, Australians, Britishers and a few Americans.

Prague is in Czechoslovakia, a part of the socialist New World. Two distinctive Nepalese, Old Worlders, sauntered along a road near the airport. We saw them pause beside a group of playing children who stopped their game and gathered, chattering and excited, around the strangers, attracted by their unusual attire. The Nepalese felt called upon to make a friendly gesture. They held out something the children had never seen before—Nepalese coins. The children danced up and down but made no effort to grab the money. One Nepalese handed a coin to a small boy who fingered it eagerly and then gave it back. "Take it," said the Nepalese, holding out the coin again. The boy looked longingly, then turned and ran away, to

his mother, who was standing with other women not a great way off. In a moment he was back, with a Czech coin of equal size. This he handed to the Nepalese and then gladly took the strange money in return. The Nepalese tried again with another coin. Each child who wanted a foreign coin found one of his own to offer in exchange.

With our Asian experience fresh in mind we watched the little drama with great interest and some astonishment. Here were strangers in the Prague streets trying to give away money. No child would take it until he was able to make an exchange. Here was something for something, not something for nothing, as was the case in the Old World.

We wondered whether this incident in the Prague street was a chance episode, or was it something new under the sun? During the weeks that followed, as we penetrated more deeply into the New World, we saw this drama of something for something repeated again and again. Not one beggar did we see in the socialist countries. We saw youngsters (especially in Moscow) on the street, in schools, outside the hotels, eager for coins, postage stamps, pins, mementoes,—but only on condition that they could return something of equal value.*

On another and higher level we found the same principle operating.

* The *New York Times* of March 3, 1958, reported an interview with Blanche Thebom, the Metropolitan Opera singer, who visited the Soviet Union in the winter of 1957. "It was the children, with their excellent manners, their fairness and direct ways, that completely won Miss Thebom. . . . In Kiev, Miss Thebom encountered, as she did in the other cities, crowds of children who wanted to trade coins. On the edge of the crowd, she noticed a little boy who appeared very anxious to trade but obviously had come without his Russian coins. When Miss Thebom tried to give him some coppers, he refused, saying that 'it would not be fair.' Finally, she persuaded him to surrender a pin he wore as a suitable barter."

The people everywhere in the socialist countries were eager and avid to take an active part in the life of their homes, schools, organizations, state or country, offering their energy, talents and capacities. In return they reaped rich rewards in education, better living conditions and security. Here was the same consistent pattern of something for something repeated throughout a whole society. At length we were convinced. We were in a New World. Something for something was part of its ethic.

CHINA'S GOOD EARTH

CHINA'S LAND area is 3,860,000 square miles, or a quarter greater than the area of the United States. Over 90 per cent of the country is in the north temperate zone. South China is sub-tropical. Two-thirds of China is mountainous. On much of the remaining third, rice and cotton can be successfully grown.

During our travels around the world we do not remember seeing better earth nor more careful cultivation and utilization of the soil. Never have we seen stretches of such fertile land, much of which, after producing crops for centuries, is probably at least as productive today as when first cultivated. Chinese people tend their land and conserve it with ceaseless loving care. On no other basis could they support the present population of 650 millions.

Centuries of Floods

Nature is not always friendly. In China as elsewhere there are floods and droughts. Such disasters are made more destructive by the absence of forests. It is possible to

travel for miles even in the most fertile parts of China without seeing any grouping of trees that could be called a forest. No one seems to know when the Chinese hills were denuded. Soil and climatic conditions would lead one to assume that at some time they were covered with trees. Mountainous areas in the more remote parts of China still are heavily forested.

Since there is no forest floor to hold water on many of China's hills and mountains, falling rain and melting snow rush in torrents down the bare hillsides and into the streams and rivers. The result is waterless hills and flooded valleys. The concentration of rainfall in the summer months increases the probability of soaked earth, quick runoff, flash floods for part of the year and water shortage for another part. Flood danger is increased by the steep gradient of Chinese rivers, which flow rapidly from some of the world's highest mountains toward the plains and the sea.

Rivers like the Yellow, the Min, the Huai and the Yangtse have been flooding periodically for centuries. The Yellow River, second largest in China, is known as "China's sorrow" because in the last three thousand years the river has broken out of its banks about 1,500 times. On 26 occasions it has changed its bed in the lower reaches, causing great loss of life and property.

Efforts to control the turbulent Chinese rivers began many centuries ago. About 250 BC, a brilliant governor and engineer named Li Ping built a diversion dam and a series of canals in an attempt to control the Min River. The project included two major canals, 620 distribution

canals and 2,200 irrigation ditches with a total length of 724 miles. The project irrigated half a million acres. Practically all of the construction work was done by hand. Parts of this canal system, begun more than 2,000 years ago, still are being used. After 1949 the system was repaired and greatly enlarged. Despite these and many similar efforts, alternating flood and drought have continued to play havoc with China's agriculture down to the present day.

Since Liberation

Flood control, hydro-electric power development and irrigation were given top priority immediately after Liberation. One of China's most intractable and destructive rivers, the Huai, was scheduled for control by 1957. Much of the work on this river was completed by 1956 and the heavy floods of 1957 did a minimum of damage. Extensive projects are now under way on the Yangtse, the Yellow and other rivers. The 46 dams scheduled for the Yellow River will not be completed until about 1975. When this "staircase project" is finished, the Yellow River should be flood-free and its waters should be so completely under control that they can be used for productive purposes.

Since Liberation the People's Government, while planning eventual river control, has handled each flood situation as it arose with vigor and determination. During the summer of 1957 in Northwest China, one rainy spell lasted for 28 days. The result was a record flood level. Before Liberation the entire district would have been heavily inundated, with immense losses of property, livestock and human life. But 1957

was different. River dikes had been raised and strengthened and materials had been gathered and stock-piled to take care of normal flood waters, but this was no normal flood. Volunteers were called for. Students, farmers, workers, government employees and soldiers were mobilized to meet the danger. Three hundred thousand men and women entered the battle. The flood fighters were organized like an army. Engineers were assigned to each division. The provincial governor, the party leaders, trade union officials and military officers were at their posts day and night. High winds drove great waves against the dikes, which gave way in places. Deeds of heroism were performed. Lives were lost. But the reinforced dikes held. After four long weeks the rain stopped, the sun came out, and the battle was won. Only the united, organized, ceaseless efforts of this flood-fighting volunteer army had prevented a major disaster.

Flood control projects, if successful, will reduce flood losses, provide hydro-electric stations, improve river navigation, furnish increased water for irrigation. Perhaps no single reform put into effect by the People's Government since Liberation has done so much to win and hold public interest and confidence as flood control. For the first time in written Chinese history, the people are becoming masters and not victims of their rivers.

We were so fortunate as to see the beginning of a flood control project in Central China, near Wuhan. Both the Yangtse and the Han Rivers flood in the summer. Flood water in the Yangtse rises 60 feet above the low water level. The

Yangtse at Wuhan is nearly a mile wide, has a swift current, and in flood is 130 feet deep in mid-stream. Dealing with the Yangtse is no child's play.

Where the Han joins the Yangtse there is a large area of lowland which is regularly flooded. The 60,000 people who live in the area not only suffer from flood damage, but sicken and die from the presence of a parasite that survives in periodically flooded land. After years of discussion and planning, it was decided to build a circular dam around this area between December 1957 and March 1958. We were in Wuhan in mid-December.

Mass Volunteer Labor

One day as we crossed the new and splendid Yangtse bridge which links the cities of Hanyang, Hankow and Wuchang, we met a column of students, four abreast, swinging camping equipment and extra clothing from bamboo poles across their shoulders. The column of several hundred young people stretched out for blocks. It was a Saturday morning. "Is this a weekend camping party?" we asked. "No, indeed," was the answer. "These young people are going up to work on the new circular flood control dam, several miles from here. They have quite a walk ahead of them. This is a replacement shift. Every two weeks new volunteers go to this project. On their way they will pass others who have finished their two week shift and are returning."

We decided then and there to go to the spot if we had to walk ourselves. Bright and early next morning we were provided with rubber boots and a British jeep and were

out at the dam site in company with one of the responsible engineers. It had been raining for days. The place was muddy, but the sun was bright. It was a sparkling day.

With the aid of a contour map we were given a picture of the whole project. Dikes already existed along the Yangtse and the Han Rivers. The circular dam, connecting the existing dikes, would close the gap and exclude flood water from a large portion of land. Construction surveys had been made, levels established, the lines of the dam staked out with long bamboo poles, cuts and fills were determined and grade stakes set.

Students, office workers, government employees, soldiers, peasants, —all volunteers, were doing the work. We know that it is difficult for Westerners to understand mass volunteer labor, because they have been taught to call it slave labor and to believe that all volunteer mass labor belongs in that category. In emergencies due to war or fire or flood, westerners may volunteer and take a hand for brief periods. Once the emergency is over, however, they sink back into individualistic indifference to broad social needs. We can think of no Western country where a call for voluntary labor on a long-range peacetime government project would win the cooperation of more than a few hundred socially-minded people who could see the project as a whole, its relation to social well-being, and who would gladly cooperate—giving time, energy, and sometimes sacrificing money and family to help in the larger scheme. The Chinese respond readily to calls for group work projects and are busy with such jobs all over China.

A Breughel Painting

On the day of our visit to the Wuhan site, 60,000 workers were building the circular dam. The rain-soaked soil was too soft for heavy machinery. All work was being done with spades, mattocks, and baskets hung on the ends of bamboo carrying-poles. Each reed basket held three to four shovelfuls of heavy clay soil. As the baskets were filled, the carriers hooked them onto their poles, raised them to shoulder height, and with each arm balancing a basket, proceeded at a fast walk or trot to the dumping points, chanting the while a sequence of short musical grunts.

The dumped earth was rammed into place by heavy wooden blocks attached to bamboo poles. Eight to twelve men or boys handled each tamper. A crew leader called out a slogan, "Here's to it, boys! Let 'er go!" Then he and the crew raised the tamper shoulder-high, and with a shout released it.

On our visiting day, there were 12,000 students, government employees and soldiers, and 48,000 peasants on the job. The peasants received one Chinese dollar, plus food, for an eight hour day. The soldiers got their rations. The students and government worker volunteers paid for their board and got no wages. Most of the workers were men. Many were young boys and girls. Each group of volunteer workers came for a shift of 14 days. The peasants could stay on for the duration of the job.

Before a group of volunteers went to the dam site, their elected representative visited the project, reported the number of workers for whom he

spoke, and arranged for quarters in the temporary barracks. Volunteers were divided into work teams of 700. Sub-teams containing 100 were divided into squads of 10 each. The squads selected their leaders. Qualified organizers headed the teams and sub-teams.

We stood on top of the 65 foot high river dike and followed the row of center poles with our eyes. As far as we could see there were work teams, sub-teams and squads. "How many people are at work right down below us?" we asked our engineer guide, indicating a wide circle. "There are ten work areas at the moment on the whole job," he answered. "Between six and seven thousand people are at work in this area. Next week we expect to have 100,000 volunteers working in 15 to 18 areas. The work must progress quickly. By March the farmers will begin their planting. We must put the rip-rap and other finishing touches on the project before that time."

We watched the ant-like scurrying groups of blue-clad figures who covered the ground below us and filled the air with their musical chants. It was a wide canvas and a fit scene for a Breughel to paint.

The Nearings Take Part

We went down over the curve of the river dike to the meadow level where only the first few feet had been filled in by previous squads. We walked over to a group of girls who were digging and hacking away at a mound of earth just outside the limits of the dam. When we asked for the privilege of handling some of the earth ourselves the smiling girls handed over shovels and we dug

in the good brown earth for a while and filled a few baskets.

Dodging trotting earth-carriers on the way, we walked over to some lads who were pounding down the dumped earth with tampers. The boy's leader smiled and waved, while the others cheered the arrival of foreign observers. With mighty slams they worked the tamper.

Toward the end of our visit the whistle blew for lunch and all over the vast field of operations the teams stopped work and gathered at various feeding depots where soup, rice and vegetables were ladled out in dishes, pans, cups and bowls. Those nearest us clustered round to look over the new arrivals. The crowd was friendly and curious. We tried English, Russian, German and French on them. Most of the replies were in Chinese, but elaborated with smiles and handshakes. As we turned to go, a lad called out in good English, "Tell your people at home that we want peace and friendship." We called back and waved at him. With the others, he stood waving until we disappeared over the top of the dike.

It was easy to understand the enthusiasm and ardor of the volunteers in this collective enterprise. The plan was before them in their mind's eye. They saw the dam rising inch by inch. Each basketful made a minute difference in the level. Each day's work began at the level reached the previous day. Each day's work showed as the earth-mass grew. All were helping together at a project they could understand and for an object in which they believed. At night they would sink into sleep, tired, but happy at the work accomplished.

We would have liked to stay longer (for hours or days or weeks) helping in this joint effort to build a dam and stem the floods. Not only would we have enjoyed the work and the physical exercise (as those others were enjoying it that day) but the exhilaration of being a small part of such a vast cooperative effort was tingling and heart-warming. We left the place with real regret. It was a finer sight than the Taj Mahal or Niagara Falls. It was a living contribution of willing hands to a socially necessary task. Tens of thousands of people, organized and well-led, working on a planned project of which they understood the importance, equipped with only shovels and baskets, accomplished wonders in 14 consecutive work days. Since Liberation such projects have been organized, started and finished off, one after another, all over People's China. Many others are still in the making.

Wuhan Bridge

We were looking over the new Wuhan Bridge across the Yangtze in Hopei Province. The bridge is particularly useful as it connects the several parts of the three river-divided cities of Wuhan, Hanyang, Hankow and Wuchang. It is an imposing structure built on nine piers anchored by piles into the rock of the river bed, and is nearly a mile long. It carries two railway tracks, six auto traffic lanes and two side-walks on its two levels. Hills on each bank were partially cut away for the bridge approaches. All of the work on the approaches and much of the bridge work had been done by volunteers. "What sort of people were these volunteers?" we asked. A poet,

who was also an official, answered "All sorts," then mentioned casually that he himself had put in a year on the bridge job.

When floods occurred in pre-liberation days the laissez-faire technique was to let the flood victims follow their own roads to survival, walking the highways until they found shelter, and begging until they were given food. Big floods drove out refugees by the hundreds of thousands. The People's Government follows a very different pattern, inspiring and leading joint efforts of volunteers to work at the projects before emergencies arise, and when there are emergencies organizing the victims and providing for their needs as they would for equal numbers of soldiers.

In December, 1957, Vice-chairman Chu Teh addressed the National Water and Soil Conservation Conference in Peking. He pointed out that water and soil conservation was a colossal national task. "The loss of water and soil on 190,000 square kilometers of land," said he, "has been controlled since Liberation. This achievement has increased the people's confidence and provided a fund of experience for future work in this field."

"According to surveys," said Chu Teh, "1.5 million square kilometers of mountainous and hilly land (nearly a sixth of China's territory) were subjected to soil erosion. Year by year this diminished the fertility of the soil and decreased the capacity to absorb water, reduced crop yields and caused droughts and floods. Big dams and other water conservation can only become really effective after water and soil conservation work is done," he declared.

"Make the Brown Hills Green"

Flood control by means of dikes and dams, is at best patchwork, helping only to handle flood water after it has left the hills. Dams, catch basins, emergency spillways, canals and locks have their uses for power generation, transportation and irrigation. But deforested hills will produce flash floods that do vast damage. There is one way and only one way to hold water in the hills and release it gradually. That is to establish and maintain a green carpet of grasses, shrubs and trees over every available acre of the water-shed. Heavy grass sods and a thick carpet of litter and humus on the forest floor are the best reservoir with which to hold the melting snow and falling rain.

The People's Government tackled floods with dikes and dams. At the same time it organized a program designed to cover China with grasses, shrubs and trees. "Greenize China; make the brown hills green" was the slogan. The drive is far advanced. Species have been selected, seeds collected, nurseries established. Greenizing China was part of the First Five Year Plan.

Each province, city, village and cooperative has its quota and its plan for fulfilling the quota ahead of schedule. One cooperative we saw near Hankow had a greenizing program which called for the planting of both fruit and forest trees. In 1956 the cooperative planted 600 fruit trees; in 1957, double that number. Their program for 1958 called for 6,000 fruit trees. At the same time the cooperative forestry program was going equally well on a considerable area of bare mountain land, hardly

useful even for grazing. "Our planting schedule for forest trees is well advanced," said the chairman of the collective. "Unless we have unforeseen set-backs, we will complete our five year program in three years. The people are interested. The work will surely be done ahead of schedule."

We drove through some hills along the middle reaches of the Yangtse River. Our guide was a veteran forester who had been trained in the Yale School of Forestry, in New Haven, Connecticut.

"You see those hills," he pointed on both sides of the road. "Three years ago there was not a shrub or a tree on them. Look at them now. The two-needle pine which was planted two years back is beginning to take hold. It has missed here and there; these places will be replanted, but the over-all results are better than average."

As we drove along, we saw hill after hill carrying a low green cover. Two-needle pines were everywhere, building their root systems. After another year or two the young trees would begin to shoot up.

We Heard Singing

We had reached a point near an engineering college. It was late afternoon. Long sun shadows lay across the fields. We heard singing, and looking up we saw a line of young people streaming along a path that led down from the mountain-side. They carried spades and mattocks. In answer to our inquiry as to what the young people were doing, our friend pointed up the mountain. There in long symmetrical rows were small heaps of newly turned red-brown earth—hundreds of spots.

"These students have assumed responsibility for the preparation of a block of tree planting," he said. "They dig the holes carefully, putting top soil on one side and subsoil on the other. When the small trees come from the nursery, they will put the top soil at the bottom of the holes, around the tree roots. The sub soil will fill in on top. This method takes a little time, but it pays in the long run."

We asked whether the trees could be planted without water. "Yes," he answered, "if the planting is done just before the rainy season."

We had seen a number of goats in the neighborhood. Would they bother the new plantings, we wondered. "That is a trouble for us," the forester acknowledged. "When these trees are young, grazing animals easily uproot and destroy them. We are trying to keep the animals out of the district."

Our guide waxed eloquent. "Here we are with a program to greenize the bare hills of China within ten years, and we will do it. The Chinese are the most reasonable people on earth. If you can convince them that something like reforestation or dam building should be done and can be done, they begin to do it, and it is almost impossible to stop them. They take it up with enthusiasm, work at it collectively, and keep at it until it is finished, no matter how long it takes."

"In fact," he said with a grimace, "sometimes two programs carried out with full force collide. While we are planting trees, another government department is advocating an increase in most animals and dairy products, and other enthusiasts are pushing colleges and all manner

of institutions and factories out of the cities and into the country. The grazing animals, the school buildings and the factories all take land which has been planted with our seedlings.

"Here is a major problem," he continued. "We need forests. We also need more food for an increasing population. We need more schools and factories. However, China is big enough to resolve this contradiction. Whatever our decision, we must have a green China, and the people will help us make it so."

"Into the Mountains"

People's China has a program for controlling and using water. It has a second program—greenizing the land. A third program is being conducted under the slogan: "Into the mountains."

China is rich in people but poor in cultivable land. Ages ago the valleys and fertile slopes were occupied. There remained about two-thirds of the land surface of China, covered by steep and high mountains. Three-fifths of China is at least 6,000 feet above sea level. Life seemed easier in the lowlands, so people had turned their backs on the mountains and settled in the valleys.

Yet the mountains presented endless challenges and opportunities. They were rich in minerals, some underground, some on the surface. Almost everywhere in the mountains there was water power with which grain could be ground, cotton could be ginned, electricity generated and distributed. Some handicraft co-operatives were already established; others could be set up to use local raw materials. Herbs could be

gathered. Forest crops of nuts and fruit could be harvested. The mountains were filled with undreamed possibilities for utilizing nature. Therefore, proclaimed the planners of the new society: to the mountains!

A campaign was already under way while we were there to send capable young people from their city jobs into the countryside, where they could take advantage of the tempering effect of bread labor and could offer their skills and their book-learning to the villagers. City-bred intellectuals were volunteering by the tens of thousands to go out to the villages. Work on bridges and dams presented a challenge which young men and women from the city were accepting. This back-to-the-mountains concept involved an even more radical change in their way of life.

Mountain life offered the Chinese people a widened and a tougher challenge, coupled with more than a touch of romance and adventure. City people had often read of frontier life in the roadless and trackless mountains. They had read of Europeans crossing the sea and trekking to the Far East and to the Rocky Mountains in North America. Now they had an opportunity to explore, to discover, to build roads and houses, to develop areas which in many cases were without human inhabitants. China has its own wild west and its own mountains, its own opportunities for adventure, for opening up new sources of natural wealth, for greatly enriching the motherland. If a year or two in the villages was counted on to remake the city dwellers and leaven village life, an equal time spent in the mountains might do that and more.

Living the Good Life

This concept of a whole people awakening to the benefits to be derived from linking mental work and physical work was one of the most spectacular developments we saw in China and one of the closest to our own hearts and way of life. Many years before, we had turned our backs on city life, had gone up into the Green Mountains, set up a subsistence homestead and established a frugal economy which enabled us to work outdoors at hard physical labor, to join our neighbors in co-operative projects, and to read, write and carry on our educational work. We thought it the only decent way to live—a purposeful combination of work and leisure, of solitude and of sociability, a sharing and working together.*

In China we found a whole nation living simply and carefully, planning their periods of country and city living as we had done, recognizing the importance of physical and mental labor and of community projects, and striving to find a balance among all three. No wonder we felt at home as we never had in extravagant, gadget-mad, pleasure-mad, modern America.

As the First Five Year Plan moved toward a successful conclusion, millions of Chinese were adapting themselves to a communal way of life and thousands were leaving the cities (and all that that way of living implied) and were tracking bravely and joyously toward the mountains. Like the valleys and the lowlands, the mountains were also part of China's good earth.

* The story of those years is told in our book *Living the Good Life*, Social Science Institute, Harborside, Maine, 1954.

Toward Modern Themes in Soviet Music

by RALPH PARKER

MMUSIC WAS one of the arts dealt with in a Central Committee decree during the post-war ideological campaign associated with the name of Andrei Zhdanov. Since February, 1948, however, when the decision on Muradeli's opera "The Great Friendship" was taken, until quite recently, little more was heard of the Party's attitude to music. There were, of course, statements from time to time, in connection with individual operas or sessions of the Composers' Union, where the principles of "realism" and "kinship with the people" were emphasized; and not long ago the former editors of *Sovietskaya Muzika* came in for some authoritative criticism for daring to revise the orthodox periodization of the history of Russian and Soviet music in a way that tended to reassess the "modernistic" trends in 20th century music. "They endeavored," it was said, "to slur over the fundamental difference between our socialist art with its new, deeply progressive, ideological and artistic qualities and the art of the old, bourgeois world."

But at the end of May this year the Central Committee issued a brief

RALPH PARKER, NWR correspondent in Moscow, formerly represented the "New York Times" in the USSR where he has lived for seventeen years. Mr. Parker has translated into English a number of recent Russian novels.

statement, supported by a long article in *Pravda*, that is being placed on the same level as the original 1948 decision that it rectifies. This statement, it is true, is by no means a revocation of the Zhdanov edict. In fact, it elevates it to the level of a document for which the Party General Committee took responsibility, making no mention of Zhdanov's name, and stating that "on the whole" it had played a positive role.

And yet the latest decision on music has been welcomed in musical circles—and far beyond—as a helpful encouragement to experimentation and a severe rebuke to a certain category of critics. It has been recognized as a condemnation of methods employed in the administration of musical life at the expense of originality, and as a serious attempt to remove the most serious obstacle to composing modern opera.

On the face of it, the new decision does not seem to say much. After asserting that the development of Soviet music since 1948 had confirmed the correctness and timeliness of the Party instructions, it concedes that the appraisal of the work of some composers had been "unfounded and unjust" and that such gifted composers as Shostakovich, Prokofiev, Khachaturian, Shebalin, Popov, Myaskovsky and others were far too sweepingly described as ex-

ponents of an "anti-popular formalistic trend in art." Stalin's subjective attitude to art, it stated, had been partly responsible for the "unfair and unjustifiably sharp assessments of the work of several talented Soviet composers."

The long *Pravda* editorial devoted to the subject goes into much more detail. It begins by placing the 1946-48 decisions on questions of literature and art in their historical setting. They were taken, *Pravda* said, when the "cold war" had already started and when socialist ideology was under heavy attack. The Communist Party made it its task to raise the standard of all ideological work and to combat tendencies to remove art from the field of politics. This led it to condemn those composers who, for one reason and another, neglected in the early post-war years the "great and stirring themes of our times"—the spirit of victory, in short.

In these and similar passages in the *Pravda* editorial we are provided with a revealing glimpse of the problems that faced Russia's leaders in the sphere of the national morale during the difficult days of post-war reconstruction, when it seemed to them necessary to "rear the Soviet youth as cheerful and exuberant people devoted to the country, having faith in the victory of our cause, undaunted by obstacles and able to overcome any difficulties."

It is, however, in the later passages of the *Pravda* editorial that Soviet intellectuals find the message for their work in the less tense situation of today. Taking its note from the Central Committee, *Pravda* describes the general evaluation of Soviet music made in 1948 as "unjustifi-

fably harsh" to many works written prior to that date, including Dzerzhinsky's opera *And Quiet Flows the Don*, Khrennikov's *In the Storm*, Shostakovich's Fifth and Seventh Symphonies, Prokofiev's ballet *Romeo and Juliet* and his *Alexander Nevsky* cantata, Myaskovsky's Sixteenth and Twenty-first Symphonies, Khachaturian's violin concerto and *Gavaneh* ballet. The sweeping manner in which the composers of these works were condemned, maintained the editorial, was nothing less than a deviation from the line on cultural questions that Lenin himself had laid down. "Lenin taught us to be solicitous and attentive to masters of creative art. Suffice it to recall his remarkable letter to the *Pravda* Editorial Board over the one-sided criticism of Demian Bedny: 'As for Bedny I continue to *stick up for him*. Don't pick on human foibles, my friends. A talent is a rare thing. It has to be regularly and tactfully supported. It will be a sin, a great sin, upon your hearts . . . if you don't win over a talented contributor, if you *don't help him*.'"

The "peremptory condemnation" of operas such as Dankevich's "Bogdan Khmel'nitsky" and Zhukovsky's "From the Bottom of the Heart" were flagrant contradictions of this Leninist line, *Pravda* wrote. "It is clear that such appraisals could in no way inspire composers to the great and complex work of creating an opera on a modern Soviet theme." In that sentence we find the clue to the problem that has puzzled many observers: Why, at this stage, was this Central Committee decision necessary?

The Party leadership has lately been studying the question of the

subject matter of the arts, especially ballet, cinema and opera. From its point of view the situation cannot be considered satisfactory. The last two new operas produced at the Bolshoy Theater dealt with the Decembrist rising of the early 19th century and the 1905 period. The most ambitious film productions of the past eighteen months have been painstaking reconstructions of Russian life forty years ago. The setting of Khachaturian's latest ballet at the Bolshoy is ancient Rome.

Various measures have been taken to encourage composers and choreographers to write ballets on modern Soviet themes, some pointed advice has been given to the film industry, and now we have the decision on music being mainly intended to encourage modern opera.

But how are composers to be encouraged? The *Pravda* editorial is firm about this. "The chief method of the Party in educating the artistic intelligentsia has been and remains the method of convincing, of explaining to it the major tasks of communist construction. . . . The Communist Party teaches us that in questions of literature and art it is necessary to be high-principled, considerate and attentive to artists, helpful in supporting their creative initiative."

Today the Party's influence is being used to convince composers of opera to be bolder in their portrayal of the contemporary scene. "The new content of life imperatively demands new operatic forms and a new tonal and melodious speech."

In their reactions to the Party's decision leading Soviet composers have generally welcomed the rebuke

that it administered to hasty, subjective criticism, and the encouragement it offers to the experimenter. Khrennikov, the First Secretary of the USSR Composers' Union, thinks that the statement shows that the Party has "deep confidence" in the intelligentsia. Shostakovich wrote that he was "deeply moved" by the decision which "opens up wonderful prospects for Soviet music's further advance along the road of realism. . . . We want Soviet music played more widely and more regularly in our concert halls and opera houses. . . . I would like to call on our music theaters, philharmonic societies, radio, on all whose duty it is to propagate Soviet music, to play more Soviet music."

Turning to music reviewing and criticism, Shostakovich wrote: "The unfair evaluation in 1948 fettered the creative thought of music critics and scholars. Now that these mistakes have been corrected they must unpinion themselves and sharpen their pens in order to assess the work of our composers more exactly. . . . We need well-intentioned, highly professional criticism like air. Many praiseworthy works undeservedly forgotten must be resurrected. . . ."

Khachaturian as well called on the critics and the press to write more about Soviet music and to criticize it seriously. The composer Kabalevsky considers that the decision will result in broader performance of Soviet music. Minister of Culture, Mikhailov, spoke at a meeting of the necessity of a more attentive attitude towards artists and outlined measures being taken to encourage the writing and performance of Soviet opera.

A Tolstoyan Visits the USSR

a letter by OLGA BIRYUKOV

The following letter was written by Olga Biryukov, daughter of Peter Biryukov, biographer of Tolstoy and leading Tolstoyan, to a member of the Russian Doukhobor religious sect which settled in British Columbia in 1899. Some 3,000 of these Doukhobors are now in the process of negotiating for a resettlement on land given them in the Omsk district of Siberia by the Soviet Government. Olga Biryukov's letter was written after a visit to the Soviet Union last summer.

The Doukhobors first appeared among the Russian peasantry in the 18th century. Though similar in certain respects to the Quakers, they subscribed to a far more extreme interpretation of the teachings of Christ. They practice non-violence, refuse military service in all forms, and will not permit their children to be educated in governmental schools.

Considered obnoxious by both the Russian Orthodox Church and the Government, the Doukhobors were persecuted throughout the 19th century. Finally their suffering became so great that Tolstoy, who shared many of their beliefs, made their persecution known to the world. The Society of Friends in England sent funds to help alleviate their suffering and joined them in a petition to the Tsar asking that they be allowed to migrate. The permission was granted and 7,000 of them ultimately settled on land allotted them by the British Columbian Government.

Relations between the government and the group negotiating for migration to the Soviet Union have long been stormy. Known as "Sons of Freedom," they represent the most extreme branch of the Doukhobor sect.

According to the New York Times of Aug. 16, the Canadian Minister of Justice has announced that the B. C. Government is prepared to pay the fares to the Soviet Union of the some 3000 members of this

group and to release their children now confined in a government dormitory school where they were forcibly placed when their parents, on the grounds that Canadian public schools were militaristic, refused to allow them to attend.

ON MY JOURNEY by automobile—Geneva-Moscow, Moscow-Geneva—I passed through the vast expanses of Russia and was amazed at the great stretches of uninhabited land still left in European Russia. The automobile highways were excellent, especially in the USSR.

My impressions are so numerous that I hesitate to speak of them. I want first to understand everything better; to "classify" everything in my mind and come to a clear appraisal, from which I can draw conclusions. I found out a great deal but it is only one-hundredth part of what I wanted to find out, even during a short stay in Moscow, much of which was spent in conversations with my brother and his wife, and with the old-time dear friends, Gorbunov, Chertkov, Sergeyenko and others, who as you know were all close friends and co-workers of Tolstoy.

They, and especially Misha Gorbunov, son of Gorbunov-Posadov, who was Tolstoy's personal secretary, told me of all they went through during the war and in the years since. At any rate, there is still a

handful of people who tenaciously cling to their ideals of non-violence, vegetarianism, and so on. Some of them had suffered cruelly. But where is there a place on this earth where such people do have real freedom? Where are they fully understood?

My impression in general is that the broad masses of the Russian people are satisfied, willingly support the government, and take an active part in it. If there are rumblings and complaints, these complaints are against each other and also against themselves for the mistakes that are being made, and because the program of building socialism is not being carried out with sufficient zeal. But without exception all the people approve of socialism and consider that the basis of Communist-Soviet power is morally higher and more progressive than the basis of the bourgeois system. A return to the old is just as impossible as that the earth would start spinning in reverse.

Soviet citizens are amazed at the West's accusation that the Soviet system lacks "freedom." For it is in the USSR that everyone is educated in his desired field at government expense; that the road to life is equally open to all and does not depend on the amount of money one has; that there is no sign of discrimination because of sex, race, and so on. Medical care is free for everyone; there is work for all; there are no extremely rich or extremely poor—instead there is an approximate level of material well-being for everyone.

It is true that the Soviet philosophy does not have any other aim than the material well-being of its people, which includes the development of

science and the arts. But at least the fact that they—the Communists—are materialists is admitted frankly. And this frankness demonstrates a high moral level. Moreover, the Communists do not cover up this materialism with a hypocritical mask of "Christianity," as it is done in the West. In reality the materialism of the West is more vulgar and more selfish than that of the USSR. It is true that the government imposes its philosophy, but this philosophy has given so much to the Soviet citizen to fill his life with that he is not affected by the lack of a certain amount of ideological freedom. This lack is felt only by the extreme idealists. I think it is in the USSR that a new type of human being will develop; one who will be a new, progressive man, without the mystical belief in God, and so on, but with a firm basis of moral rules, by which he will be guided in life. Such a type is already noticeable there, and I was happy to see it.

If the Doukhobors will not change within themselves, they are not advised to return to the USSR. But there are immense stretches of wonderful land that have to be cultivated, and the government would assist greatly with machinery, providing the Doukhobors would not throw any blocks into the wheels of the program of socialist construction. If the Doukhobors agree to this, their transfer to the USSR could be easily arranged. But if by their behavior, they obstruct the building of socialism, they will not be tolerated in the least. Nevertheless, I am convinced that everything which is reasonably just and directed to the good of all (the open-hearted, honest and positive traits of a human being)

will at all times be appreciated in the USSR.

There are in the Government and among the Communists very nice and noble people who instinctively (without any theories) differentiate between good and evil. It has nothing to do with Marxism. My own older brother is a convinced Communist and a marvelous person. In the ordinary Russian soul there is so much human kindness, which is strongly felt in the USSR. This kindness will in the end, without doubt, take the upper hand over everything.

I declined an invitation to go to Yasnaya Polyana to work for the 50th Anniversary of Tolstoy's death which they are preparing to cele-

brate in 1960. I do not believe in the cult of the personality, even for Tolstoy. I do not want to work for the glory of an "individual" even if that individual is Christ himself.

The chairman of the Doukhobor delegation to the Soviet Union wrote me that the question of land is very acute with the Doukhobors at present. I hope that it will be solved by the collective acquisition of land in the USSR, and the return to communal life. The farmers do live in something like communes in the USSR (*kolkhozi*) and therefore their system is morally higher than the bourgeois-capitalist system.

Translated from the Russian by Daniel Sigal

THE STOCKHOLM CONGRESS

THE CONGRESS for Disarmament and International Cooperation met in Stockholm July 16-22. Unfortunately a delay in the mails has prevented publication in this issue of an article we expected giving an account of what happened there.

Attended by people of good-will from all over the world, the Congress registered unity on questions of disarmament and nuclear tests and on the need for withdrawal of foreign troops from the Middle East. The Afro-Asian delegates to the Congress passed a special resolution on the latter question. Protesting the landing of U.S. forces in Lebanon and British forces in Jordan, the resolution said in part:

"... We are convinced that all these warlike and aggressive measures are designed to suppress the national aspirations of the Arab peoples for independence, peace and unity. . . .

"We realize that these tragic happenings in the Arab world are not isolated or disconnected events but are integral part of the larger pattern of imperialist domination which has for centuries overshadowed the destinies of the Afro-Asian peoples. China, Korea, Vietnam, Indonesia, Egypt and now Algeria, Lebanon, and Jordan are all links in the same infamous chain. Because of this we are deeply aware of the unity of interest which binds us together against the designs and interests of the imperialist aggressors—a unity which makes the tragedy of any member of the Afro-Asian family a collective tragedy for us all. . . .

"We appeal to the people of the world to exert their concerted pressure on their governments to stop this wanton aggression . . . to bring about the withdrawal of all foreign troops from all the Arab countries."

The Khrushchev-Eisenhower Exchanges

THERE HAS been a great deal of talk to the effect that Mr. Khrushchev "killed" the much-discussed summit conference under UN Security Council auspices, "turned a somersault" in rejecting it after previously accepting the idea, and that this alleged turn-about was forced upon him during his meeting in Peking with Mao Tse-tung.

All this does not correspond with the facts, as will be seen by an examination of the Khrushchev-Eisenhower correspondence.

On July 19, Mr. Khrushchev wrote to President Eisenhower warning of the grave danger of war arising from the United States armed intervention in Lebanon and that of the British in Jordan, and declaring that the most correct solution would be the immediate withdrawal of the occupationist forces. He said the USSR "could not remain indifferent to what is happening in the Middle East, next to its borders," and could not keep aloof "when the question of war or peace is being decided."

Declaring that history has left "only a small margin in which to avert war, to prevent the annihilation of many millions of people, the destruction of great material and cultural values," Khrushchev proposed an immediate conference of heads of Government of the United States, Britain, France and India, with the participation of the UN Secretary General, "to take urgent measures to stem the beginning military conflict." He said his government believed that "a solution

can and must be found conforming to the vital interests of the people of the Middle East, ensuring their sovereign rights and with due regard for the interests of all states associated with the countries of this area."

Taking into account the West's interest in oil and other resources, he pointed out: "But the nations of this area do not deny this opportunity to the Western powers. They demand only one thing: that this problem be solved on an equitable and mutually profitable commercial basis which is the most reasonable principle."

He suggested that the conference also consider the problem of discontinuing arms deliveries to the Middle East, as previously proposed several times by the USSR.

Far from by-passing the United Nations, Mr. Khrushchev explicitly proposed that the summit conference work out concrete recommendations to end military conflicts in the Middle East "and submit them to the Security Council so that this UN body can study them with the participation of representatives of the Arab states." He said he was ready to meet "on any day, at any hour, the sooner the better," in the United States, in Geneva, or the capital of any other neutral power. Similar communications went to Great Britain, France and India.

All comments from Washington made clear that President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles wanted no summit conference.

Eisenhower's reply was sent July

22. He denied that peace was threatened by U.S. action in Lebanon and, in the face of worldwide alarm over U.S. and British military intervention, declared sourly: "I am not aware of any factual basis for your extravagantly expressed fear of the danger of general war."

Defending the U.S. and British actions as designed to "help small nations regain their independence," Eisenhower charged that "The real danger of war would come if one small nation after another were to be engulfed by expansionist and aggressive forces supported by the Soviet Union," and compared the situation in the Middle East today with "the destruction of the independence of small nations [by Hitler] during the 1930's which led to the Second World War." Insisting that the United States is not dedicated to the perpetuation of the status quo in the Arab world, he declared blandly "The United States recognizes and sympathizes with the yearning of the Arab peoples for greater nationalistic unity."

The President said that the Soviet proposals "would tear down the orderly processes which nations have established for the maintenance of international peace and security" and that the Soviet Union was bound by the UN Charter to take this matter to the Security Council. Pointing out that under the UN Charter heads of governments might represent member nations on the Security Council, he wrote: "If such a meeting were generally desired, the United States would join in following that orderly procedure."

Even this backhanded invitation was due only to British pressure,

since Prime Minister MacMillan was faced with strong demands from the British Labor Party and wide sections of the British people that a summit meeting be held.

Mr. MacMillan's reply was much more cordial. After briefly denying Khrushchev's interpretation of British action in Jordan, he went on: "However, although I reject your premises, it by no means follows that I reject your conclusions. Indeed, I agree with you that it would be useful if heads of government could find an early opportunity to meet and discuss the Middle East. . . ."

Proposing the Security Council as the best forum for such a meeting, he outlined the following formula:

It would not be the intention of Her Majesty's Government that any resolutions should be put forward at this special meeting of the Security Council unless they arose out of previous agreement. In other words, the object would be to reach fruitful agreements rather than to register differences by votes. . . . I hope that we may meet soon in New York in accordance with the plan I have suggested.

This formula was very close to Khrushchev's own plan that the big powers come together, and then submit their recommendations to the Security Council.

General de Gaulle accepted the idea of a summit meeting and Prime Minister Nehru said he would attend if the other powers concerned wished him to.

Khrushchev replied to President Eisenhower the next day, July 23. He noted with satisfaction that his proposal for a summit meeting had "found a positive response." *Refer-*

ring specifically to Macmillan's terms for a meeting within the framework of the Security Council, as quoted above, he said that such a meeting would be acceptable. He reiterated the proposal that India be invited to take part as "her participation would be useful, in contrast to the participation of one of the so-called permanent members who actually represents no one." (A reference, of course, to the representative of Chiang Kai-shek) He also proposed that representatives of the Arab states concerned should be invited to take part in the discussion in the Security Council. He said the Soviet Union would be represented by the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR [Khrushchev]," and proposed that the meeting begin on July 28.

The acceptance threw the Administration, which evidently had not expected it, into a tizzy.

The President in his response of July 25th said that Khrushchev had misunderstood him, and insisted that all arrangements and procedures of the Conference must be made under Security Council rules. No mention whatever was made of the MacMillan plan for the big powers among themselves to concentrate on the problem of reaching agreement, which, it cannot be too strongly stressed, *was the only type of meeting to which the USSR had agreed.* The letter made clear that the United States was prepared at the meeting to bring charges of "indirect aggression" against the USSR; Felix Belair wrote from Washington in the *New York Times*, July 26:

The intention of the letter . . . accord-

ing to officials who helped with its preparation, was to put Mr. Khrushchev on notice that the United States was prepared to put the blame for the Middle East crisis squarely in the lap of the Soviet Union working through the Egyptian-Syrian United Arab Republic. . . .

The President's irritation at the prospect of having to defend his course in the Middle East was clearly evident. . . . Nothing could be clearer from President Eisenhower's letter than that this Government is in no hurry to convene any summit meeting that may be held.

It was increasingly clear, in fact, that the U.S. Government actually wanted no summit meeting at all, certainly not one which would reach any sort of accommodation with the USSR or easing of the situation in the Middle East; and that if a meeting could not avoided, then it was to take a form making any sort of agreement impossible, and would be used as a new arena for continuing the cold war against the Soviet Union.

Khrushchev's answer of July 28 charged that the United States was delaying the convocation of a summit meeting and did not, in fact want to take measures for a Middle East settlement. He termed the proposal to turn the whole question over to an ordinary meeting of the Security Council a step backward from the Macmillan plan; since the Security Council had not been able to reach any decisions on the situation in Lebanon and Jordan, it was necessary for a five power meeting, with the participation of the UN Secretary General, to meet and find a solution of the problem.

This was the more urgent, he said, because U.S. troops were continuing to land in Lebanon, U.S. reinforcements from Europe were being

flown to the Middle East and Turkey, the emissary of the State Department, Murphy, was "interfering without ceremony in the internal affairs of Lebanon," the London Baghdad Pact conference "looks like a bloc against the Arab countries," and these efforts to extend the area of conflict in the Near and Middle East made all the more necessary the convening of a five power meeting as he had originally proposed to meet and find a solution.

It was this kind of meeting only, connected with the Security Council, but not just an ordinary meeting of the Security Council attended by the heads of the big powers, that Khrushchev made absolutely clear he had in mind. He asked for a clear answer as to whether and when the United States was ready to take part.

Meantime, fresh from his Baghdad Pact commitment, Mr. Dulles at his July 31 press conference, gave a pre-view of what any kind of summit conference or Security Council meeting attended by heads of government, would be like in his view. Such a meeting, he said, would "dispel the false allegations that there is aggression being carried on by the United States or by the United Kingdom in the Middle East. It would on the other hand, I think, show the danger there of indirect aggression. . . . Thereby it might tend to stabilize the political situation."

Asked whether all that would come out of the meeting would be charges and countercharges, he replied:

. . . If the practices of indirect aggression as they are being developed at the present time are allowed to persist in the world, and if no way is found to

check that, then I think the world is indeed in grave danger of war. . . . I believe that if the Soviet Union does not want a new war they will almost have to agree that these practices should be brought under some kind of control by the United Nations. . . .

The Dulles proposal for what the meeting ought to accomplish was a United Nations standing group which "could go to any place which felt itself endangered by this type of indirect aggression and throw a kind of mantle of security around it." (In other words, the UN should be used to keep reactionary governments in power against the will of the people anywhere in the world.)

President Eisenhower's August 1st reply again turned down any kind of big power meeting on the Middle East such as Khrushchev had proposed. He denied that the United States had embarked on a policy of delay, although the whole world could see this policy at work. Assuming the mantle of protector of small nations he declared that Khrushchev's proposal of leaving the decisions to the big powers meant that "the desires, the dignity, in fact the security of the smaller nations should be disregarded." He renewed his proposal that the Middle Eastern question be taken up by a special meeting of the Security Council "which would permit direct discussions among heads of government and foreign ministers." No mention whatever was made of the possibility of informal meetings outside the formal Council ones, or of resolutions only on the basis of agreed decisions as proposed by MacMillan. The President proposed that the Security Council meeting take place in New York City, or

elsewhere, on or about August 12, adding "If such a meeting is arranged, I expect to attend and participate and I hope that you will do likewise."

On August 5 came Khrushchev's reply turning down the idea of a special Security Council meeting as not conforming in any way to the Soviet proposal for an opportunity for the big powers to confer on the Middle Eastern situation and reach constructive decisions.

Khrushchev stressed the importance given by the Soviet Union to the United Nations as demonstrated by its original introduction in the Security Council of a resolution for the evacuation of U.S. and British troops from Lebanon and Jordan, and the Soviet proposal that an emergency session of the General Assembly be called, after the Council had failed to take action. He declared that it was in fact, the United States that had undermined the United Nations in sending in its troops and presenting the Security Council with a *fait accompli*.

Mr. Khrushchev charged that under United States pressure the Security Council

... has virtually become a kind of committee composed in the main of countries included in the North Atlantic Treaty organization, the Baghdad Pact and the Southeast Treaty Organization and in which the place of the lawful representative of the Great Chinese People's Republic is occupied by the representative of a political corpse, Chiang Kai-shek.

He declared that the Security Council and the United Nations could not be completely effective without the Chinese People's Republic, that under its present com-

position it was virtually paralyzed and unable to adopt any decision independently of the United States that could effectively assist in insuring universal peace. Referring to President Eisenhower's "concern for small nations," he continued: "But can we close our eyes to the fact that we are living in an era of great revolutionary transformations, an era of the reconstruction of the social order on a new basis?" Citing Guatemala, the sending of U.S. forces to Cuba and the current U.S. "direct aggression" in the Middle East, Khrushchev said the "concern" of the United States consisted only of small nations having the kind of governments the U.S. wanted, but that "No foreign bayonets of the colonizers can check the victory of the national liberation forces. For an end has come to colonialism. Such is the inevitable progress of history. Such is the will of the people."

Warning of the grave dangers to peace in the continuing build-up of U.S. and British forces in the Middle East, he said that only the demands of the people for a summit conference to halt armed intervention in Lebanon and Jordan had prevented the expansion of aggression to other countries, "in the first instance to the Republic of Iraq and the United Arab Republic." But the danger was not yet removed, therefore, since the United States and Great Britain had evaded the convening of a conference of heads of government and since the Security Council had shown itself unable to solve the problem, the Soviet Union demanded the convening of an extraordinary session of the General Assembly of the United Na-

tions. He expressed the hope that "an examination of the question by the General Assembly, in which both great and small nations are represented, will enable ways to be found for removing the danger of war created in the Near and Middle East by the actions of the United States and will introduce calm in this area."

Mr. Khrushchev concluded by calling again for a Summit Conference to deal with disarmament and other questions as originally called for by the Soviet Union last December. Such a summit conference of the big powers was necessary, he said, because only large countries with their mighty armaments and modern weapons were in a position to commit aggressions against small nations, while small nations could not commit aggression against large, and, therefore,

We are convinced that a summit conference composed as we earlier proposed will help, with the efforts of all its participants, to find ways and means for liquidating the "cold war," to render the emergence of a hot war impossible. Let us do everything possible for the speedy convening of such a conference, which is in the interests of all states, great and small.

He urged support for his proposal of a General Assembly session "which could be a good step toward easing tension and would prepare the ground for speeding up a summit meeting."

Meantime, the Khrushchev-Mao meeting had taken place in Peking (July 31 to August 3) resulting in the widespread allegations that Khrushchev had been forced to yield to Mao's demands that there should be no summit conference un-

der Security Council auspices and to reverse his position. There was no reversal, no "somersault," as the above review of the Eisenhower-Khrushchev exchanges shows. It was the most natural thing in the world that Khrushchev should have had consultation with his most powerful ally, to whom the Soviet Union is bound by the closest fraternal ties of friendship and mutual aid. (No one questions the appropriateness of the U.S. consulting its allies.) There is no doubt that out of this consultation Khrushchev drew new strength to insist on *what he had all along demanded*. The note to Eisenhower rejecting his type of Security Council meeting and insisting on the original summit conference plan was dispatched before the meeting with Mao. It was also natural that after such a conference the Soviet Union should intensify the efforts *it has never ceased* to make and which indeed had been mentioned in previous communications, to stress the absurd and evil situation arising from the usurping by Taiwan of the place in the United Nations that belongs to the real China and its over 600,000,000 people.

The joint communique issued by Khrushchev and Mao at the end of their consultations stressed their strong friendly alliance, their common struggle for peace and the full agreement of their views on the international situation. They joined in stern denunciation of "the flagrant aggression carried out by the United States and Great Britain in the Near and Middle East," and demanded the immediate withdrawal of their troops. They called for the summoning of a real summit confer-

ence, and declared that both countries "give firm support to the just struggles of the people of the United Arab Republic, the Republic of Iraq and other Arab countries, as well as to the national independence movements of the people of Asia, Africa and Latin America."

Affirming their unanimous agreement on measures necessary to oppose aggression and safeguard peace, they reaffirmed the right of all peoples to choose their own social and political systems and the necessity of countries with different social systems practicing peaceful co-existence in accordance with the famous five principles of Bandung. All disputes should be settled by peaceful negotiations and the development of economic and cultural relations. The primary task now, in order to maintain and consolidate peace is, they declared:

To bring about an agreement among nations on reduction of armaments, discontinuance of the testing of atomic and hydrogen weapons and prohibition of their use, elimination of all military blocs and military bases on foreign soil

and the conclusion of pacts of peace and collective security.

All news reports from Washington noted the great "sigh of relief" that went up in that city on the receipt of Khrushchev's final note. While Administration sources tried to make propaganda capital by laying the blame on Khrushchev for the failure of any kind of Summit-Security Council meeting to materialize, it was clear as the noonday sun that it was the Administration's own tactic of surrounding the conference with conditions it knew the Soviet Union would not and could not accept and which would make the whole conference futile, that doomed it in advance.

James Reston, writing in the *New York Times* of August 10, called President Eisenhower's written statement expressing "regret" that Mr. Khrushchev was not coming to the UN Security Council debate on the Middle East, "a poor joke." "Mr. Eisenhower does not 'regret' Khrushchev's decision," he continued. "He is relieved and even delighted. Everybody knows that, including Mr. Khrushchev."

The Security Council Meeting

FOLLOWING a spate of reports from Washington that U.S. policy was against the sending of Marines to Lebanon, the overthrow of the feudal, reactionary regime of King Faisal II in Iraq, the very pivot and base, as it has been called, of Western military power and strategy in the Middle East, changed everything. On Monday, July 14, President Eisenhower called an emergency

meeting of the Security Council to consider the situation in the Middle East. The following day, an hour before the Council assembled, President Eisenhower dispatched U.S. troops to Lebanon in response to an appeal by President Camille Chamoun (which had been waiting and ready for whenever the U.S. wanted it) in order "to help maintain security and evidence the con-

cern of the United States for the integrity and independence of Lebanon." The action was taken, he said, because "As the United Nations Charter recognizes, there is an inherent right of collective self-defense." The reference was to Article 51 of the Charter, which envisages self-defense *against aggression*, and only until such time as the Security Council should take action. The Security Council had already taken action in June in connection with the Lebanese complaint of indirect aggression, and set up an Observation group which had already reported that it had failed to find evidence of the "indirect aggression" charged by the Lebanese government in the form of massive intervention on the part of the United Arab Republic in Lebanese affairs.

Thus the United States flouted the United Nations, and faced it with a *fait accompli*.

Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge, U.S. delegate, announced that U.S. troops had been sent to Lebanon to help stabilize the situation "brought about by threats from the outside "until the United Nations could take over." He linked the action directly with "plots against the kingdom of Jordan" and the overthrow of the Government of Iraq "in an exceptionally brutal and revolting manner." In a tear-jerking speech he described the "murder" and dragging through the streets of the body of Mr. Fadhil al-Jamali, former Iraq representative in the United Nations, who it later turned out was quite alive, and in jail. (The U.S. has since recognized this government of "assassins.")

In fact, the overturn in Iraq had been accomplished with remarkably

little bloodshed. The revolt started early in the morning of July 14, and, as General Abdul Karim el-Kassem, Premier of the new Republic of Iraq, reported to the press a few days later, by 6 o'clock of that day "we were in command of the situation all over Iraq, having everywhere the solidarity of the army and the support of the people." King Faisal, Crown Prince Abdul Illah, some other members of the royal family and former Premier Nuri es-Said did meet their death. General Kassem expressed regret for this. The plan, he said, was to make prisoners of the leaders of the Iraq monarchy. "We didn't want to kill anyone, but . . . they made a fortress out of the royal palace, so we had to fire and kill them," he told the press. (*New York Herald Tribune*, July 29). He added that it had been necessary to restrain the people from killing others of the old regime.

Mr. Lodge introduced a resolution on behalf of the United States which would have had the Security Council endorse the action of the United States in sending troops. It repeated the Lebanese Government charge of illegal infiltration of personnel and arms across the borders although the U.N. Observation Group itself had failed to confirm this. It called for the United Nations to set up an international military force "to protect the territorial integrity and independence of Lebanon." The resolution noted that the U.S. statement said its forces would remain in Lebanon only until the United Nations took over.

Mr. Arkady Sobolev, representative of the Soviet Union, stressed the findings of the UN Observation

Group that no evidence of infiltration of outside forces in Lebanon had been found, and quoted the head of the group, Mr. Gaol Plaza, former representative of Ecuador in the United Nations, to the effect that he regarded the events in Lebanon as civil war. There was a mass popular movement in Lebanon, said Sobolev, in which the people, "indignant at the reactionary and anti-popular policies of the government of Chamoun, has risen up in arms in defense of its rights." Similarly in Iraq all sections of the people "are expressing support and solidarity on the occasion of the victory of the people and the proclamation of the Republic." He said the reactions of the United States and the United Kingdom to events in Iraq were dictated by the oil monopolies. He noted that the U.S. action was in direct contravention to the Charter, since no self-defense was necessary in the absence of any attack, and at the present time the only threat that exists arises from the introduction of U.S. troops. He quoted from a strong statement issued by the Soviet Government which concluded with the words:

The Soviet Government insistently appeals to the Government of the United States to put an end to its armed intervention in the domestic affairs of the Arab countries and to withdraw forthwith its troops from Lebanon. The Soviet Government states that the Soviet Union cannot remain indifferent to the events which constitute a serious threat in an area which is adjacent to its national frontiers, and it assumes freedom of action that may be dictated by the interests of the maintenance of peace and security.

The resolution introduced by Mr. Sobolev on behalf of his gov-

ernment would have had the Security Council declare that the dispatch of U.S. troops to Lebanon was contrary to the principles and purposes of the UN Charter which prohibits intervention in domestic affairs, that this action was a serious threat to international peace and security, and call on the United States to remove its troops from the territory of Lebanon immediately.

In the course of the Security Council discussions Mr. Hammarskjold introduced new reports from the UN Observation Group "setting out the complete success with which they have met in their arrangements for inspection all along the Lebanese border." The Secretary General declared: "It is my feeling that with the result thus achieved, the Observation Group is fully equipped to play the part envisaged for it in the total UN effort with its general purpose of insuring against infiltration and smuggling of arms." This was obviously an answer to a statement by Lodge that the work of the Observation Group had met with only "partial success." More important was Mr. Hammarskjold's statement that the Observation Group would have no contact or working relationship with U.S. forces. According to Thomas Hamilton in the *New York Times*, July 17, "although the Secretary did not say in so many words that the Marines were unnecessary and should be withdrawn, a number of delegates said that his meaning was unmistakable."

In the course of the debate on the Soviet and U.S. resolutions before them, both Swedish and Japanese representatives expressed opposition to U.S. action in sending troops,

although the latter said he would vote for the U.S. resolution.

The July 18 session was faced with the British action in sending troops to Jordan. The British representative, Sir Pierson Dixon told of "threats and plots" on the part of the United Arab Republic to overthrow the government and reported that in response to a request from the King and Government to the United Kingdom and the United States to come to its aid, British forces had landed.

Mr. Lodge supported this action on behalf of the United States, (which decided to help with supplies, but not troops) charging that events in Iraq showed that "there is in the Middle East a common purpose to take over everywhere, all at once, masterminded from one source." Saying he was going to utter some words as "serious and fateful" as the U.S. had ever spoken in the United Nations, he went on:

We face a great, rough, brutal fact—the fact of the fomenting of civil strife by assassins in plain clothes instead of by soldiers in uniform. If the United Nations cannot deal with indirect aggression, the United Nations will break up.

Mr. Sobolev amended the Soviet resolution to include charges of British intervention in the affairs of the Kingdom of Jordan, and a demand for the withdrawal of British as well as American armed forces from the Middle East. He charged that the United States and the United Kingdom were engaged in a combined plot of action against the peoples of the Arab Near East, maintaining "The true reason why armed forces had to be dispatched posthaste to the Middle East is to

retain control over the sources of oil." These actions, he said, were condemned by peaceloving countries and people all over the world.

The vote on the United States resolution came first on July 18. Under the rule of unanimity of the big powers for a resolution to pass, it was defeated by the one negative vote of the Soviet Union. Sweden abstained. Japan recorded its affirmative vote "with misgivings." (The permanent members of the Security Council are the United States, the Soviet Union, Britain, France and Nationalist China; non-permanent members this year are Canada, Colombia, Iraq, Japan, Panama and Sweden. At the time of the voting the Iraq delegate of the overthrown regime was still sitting.)

Meanwhile, Sweden had introduced a resolution noting that the arrival of United States armed forces had substantially altered the conditions under which the Security Council had sent observers to Lebanon, that the United Nations had no authorization to interfere in matters essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state, and that therefore the Secretary General was requested to suspend the activities of the observers in Lebanon until further notice. The effect of this resolution, of course, was to put the United Nations on record as terming the events in Lebanon a domestic matter only, placing on the United States alone the onus for intervening in Lebanese internal affairs, taking the ground from under the U.S. pretext that the troops were there only until the UN would take over, and removing any possible misapprehension that the presence of the UN Observation

group at the same time U.S. troops were there gave sanction to the latter. The Soviet Union voted with Sweden in favor of this resolution; there were nine votes against.

Only the Soviet Union voted for its own resolution calling for the withdrawal of U.S. and British troops from Lebanon and Jordan. There were 8 votes against, while Japan and Sweden abstained.

With the defeat of their respective resolutions, both the Soviet Union and the United States went on record for the calling of an emergency meeting of the UN General Assembly.

Meantime, the Japanese representative was scurrying around trying to find some formula for a resolution which would take into account the massive opposition to U.S. and British actions among the people of Japan, which has the largest peace movement in the world outside of the socialist countries, while at the same time maintaining the Japanese Government's subservience to the United States. Earlier drafts seemed to leave the way open indirectly to transforming the UN Observation Group into an international military force as desired by the United States. In its final form, however, it was watered down under pressure from India and others, to an even more ambiguous formula.

Its preamble made no reference to the findings of the UN Observation Group, but merely referred to the charges of the representative of Lebanon concerning interference in its affairs by the United Arab Republic, and the reply of the UAR representative. It went on to propose that the Security Council:

Requests the Secretary General to make

arrangements for such measures, in addition to those envisaged by the resolution of 11 June, 1958, as he may consider necessary in the light of the present circumstances, with a view to enabling the United Nations to fulfill the general purposes established in that resolution, and which will, in accordance with the charter, serve to ensure the territorial integrity and political independence of Lebanon, so as to make possible the withdrawal of the United States forces from Lebanon.

In explaining the resolution, Japanese representative Koto Matsudaira said it did not envisage the creation of an emergency force in Lebanon, nor the type of UN force now stationed in Korea, nor a police force of any kind, but merely asked for the strengthening of the present UN Observation Group in Lebanon.

But that its wording was so vague as to cover almost any contingency was made clear when Mr. Lodge called it a constructive proposal and declared "It could lead to conditions which would make possible the withdrawal of U.S. forces from Lebanon." Mr. Lodge had previously emphasized that the United States forces would withdraw *only when a UN military force took over*, and gave no guarantee that passage of the Japanese resolution would mean withdrawal.

Mr. Sobolev opposed the resolution on the ground that while the only threat to Lebanon's independence came from the armed forces of the United States, the resolution suggested a threat from the United Arab Republic, although the Security Council had made no such finding. He said that what kind of "additional measures" were envisaged was not explained in the resolution, and that the Security Council was thus being asked to buy "a pig in

a poke." The Soviet Union could not support the resolution because

First, the draft resolution not only fails to condemn the aggressive acts of the United States and the United Kingdom in the Near and Middle East, but in fact it approves the introduction of the United States and British armed forces in Lebanon and Jordan. Secondly, the draft resolution does not contain a request for the immediate withdrawal of United States and British forces from these countries, whereas such a withdrawal should be the basis of any measures by the United Nations for settling the very dangerous situation that has developed in the Near and Middle East.

Furthermore, Mr. Sobolev said, the resolution would actually give sanction to the presence of the troops, and seeking to expand the activities of the Observation Group in an undefined manner while Lebanon was under U.S. occupation, would mean support by the United Nations of the United States intervention in the internal affairs of Lebanon, contrary to the provisions

of the United Nations Charter.

The Soviet delegate offered amendments that would approve the continuance and development of the present activities of the UN Observation Group and call for troop withdrawal. These amendments were rejected, with Japan and Sweden abstaining. Only the Soviet Union voted against the resolution itself. Mr. Hammarskjöld, having in the meantime presented to the Security Council an additional report from the observation group to the effect that any infiltration of arms "cannot be more than on a limited scale" and that they had in no case been "able to detect the presence of personnel who have indubitably entered from across the border for the purpose of fighting," declared that he would proceed according to his powers under the original June 11 resolution, and accede to the request of the Observation Group to strengthen its facilities by additional personnel.

SOVIET RESOLUTION IN THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

FOLLOWING IS THE TEXT of the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of the USSR August 12 to the emergency special session of the UN General Assembly on the Middle Eastern question.

On the Immediate Withdrawal of U.S. Troops from Lebanon and British Troops from Jordan

The General Assembly,

Recognizing the necessity of adopting urgent measures to ease tension in the Near and Middle East area in the interests of preserving universal peace,

Recommends that the Governments of the United States and Great Britain withdraw their troops from the territory of Lebanon and Jordan without delay,

Instructs the UN Secretary-General to reinforce the UN Observer Group in Lebanon in accordance with the plan presented by the UN Observer Group in Lebanon in its second report, and to send a group of observers to Jordan with a view to supervise the withdrawal of American and British troops from Lebanon and Jordan, and the situation along the frontier of these countries.

New Soviet Recordings

review by SIDNEY FINKELSTEIN

THERE ARE two aspects to the building of peaceful relations between our country and the socialist countries. One has the stern face of outer necessity. If we permit our militarists and diplomatic hot-heads to continue brandishing H-bombs, and sending them on missions towards the Soviet border, it brings up questions of our own survival. The other is one of inner desire. It is the discovery of how helpful to our own growth and progress such friendly relations can be.

Four long-playing recordings issued by the Monitor company, of performances put on tape in the Soviet Union, enable us to carry on our musical interchange through the phonograph. The most important is the performance by David Oistrakh of the recent *Violin Concerto* by Shostakovich, with the Leningrad Philharmonic Orchestra conducted by Eugene Mravinsky (MC-2014). It is deeply troubled music, with two brooding slow movements, each followed by a short, fiery fast movement. Oistrakh introduced it to American audiences two years ago, and his performance with Dmitri Mitropoulos conducting was issued here by Columbia records. But there is simply no comparison between that and the present Soviet recording. Not only is the orchestral support finer, but the violinist plays with a far greater passion and intensity. And when Oistrakh is moved to his depths by a work, the result makes musical history.

The same point, that Soviet performers play their own music better than anybody else, is made, but on a somewhat slighter musical level, by a "Shostakovich program," consisting of the *Ninth Symphony*, a *Festive Overture* Op. 96 and a five-movement Suite, *The Memorable Year* 1919, Op. 89 (MC-

2015). The conductor is Alexander Gauk. The symphony has a wonderful first movement, a masterpiece of hilarious musical laughter, but then seems to me to peter out, becoming artistically insubstantial. The overture is a sparkling curtain-raiser to a concert, and the suite, made up of music originally composed for a film, seems to me to exploit moods and materials handled with greater strength and richness of texture in the *Song of the Forests*.

The other two discs introduce us to an engaging side of Soviet musical life that we have not yet heard here in live performance; its love for chamber music. One brings together a galaxy of string virtuosi; Leonid Kogan and his wife, Elizabeth Gilels on violin, Rudolf Barshai and Heinrich Talalian on viola and the cellists Sviatislav Knushtetitsky and Mstislav Rostropovich. They perform with great fervor and tonal beauty Tchaikovsky's four-movement sextet, *Souvenir of Florence*, an attractive and melodious work. And as an "encore" there is a *Duo for Violin and Cello* by a Russian composer, Ivan Handoshkin, who was born a serf, lived from the 1740's to 1804, and had a melodic gift entitling him to be called an "18th century Tchaikovsky" (MC-2019).

The second is a complete 18th century program, featuring Leonid Kogan and Rudolf Barshai, the latter being not only a master of the viola, and the violist of one of the great Soviet Union string quartets, but also the conductor of the Moscow Chamber Orchestra, which plays in all the works on this disc. Kogan takes the solo role in one of Vivaldi's most beautiful works, the *G minor Violin Concerto*, Op. 12, and in a *Suite* by Rameau. Barshai plays solo in a fine *Viola Concerto* by the composer Handoshkin (MC-2018).

The Face of Imperialism

a review by MURRAY YOUNG

The Question, by Henri Alleg, with an introduction by Jean-Paul Sartre. George Braziller, Inc., New York, 1958. 123 pages. \$2.95.

THE QUESTION is the first book suppressed on political grounds by the French Government since the 18th century. It has nevertheless sold over 150,000 copies in France. With a brilliant introduction by Jean-Paul Sartre, this powerful indictment of colonialism is now available in English.

The author, Henri Alleg, a Communist and editor of the *Alger Républicain* before its suppression, describes concisely and with remarkable objectivity the tortures he was subjected to by the French paratroopers who wanted information from him, particularly the names of others.

Refusing to talk, even after extreme torture, he found that his power of resistance grew from his deep political convictions which in the first place had determined his, a Frenchman's, fight for Algerian independence and had made him, a non-Arab, at one with the victims of his country's colonial ambitions:

Every morning and evening . . . when I went to the privy, I would pass Arab prisoners in the corridor, on the way back to their collective dungeon or cell. Some of them knew me from having seen me at political rallies organized by the paper, others only knew my name. I was always naked to the waist, still marked by the blows I had received, my chest and hands covered with bandages. They understood that, like themselves, I had been tortured, and they greeted me in passing, "Have courage brother!"

His torturers, as Sartre points out in his introduction, were soldiers of a peo-

ple who had been themselves brutally tortured by the Gestapo during the occupation of France. Fifteen years were enough to transform victims into executioners.

Sartre explains the reason for this transformation and in doing so he makes clear why torture and violence must be the essence of all imperialist control:

Our army is scattered all over Algeria. We have the men, the money and the arms. The rebels have nothing but the confidence and support of a large part of the population. It is we, in spite of ourselves, who have imposed this type of war-terrorism in the towns and ambushes in the country. . . . The ratio between our forces and theirs gives them no option but to attack us by surprise. Invisible, ungraspable, unexpected they must strike and disappear, or be exterminated. . . . The "forces of order," hindered by their own might, have no defense against guerillas except punitive expeditions and reprisals, no defense against terror but terror. Everybody, everywhere, is hiding something. They must be *made to talk*.

Despite its horrifying details, the book is neither repulsive nor depressing. Alleg tells his story with the simplicity of a man who knows his cause is just and who never for one moment loses his radiant belief in the future. This is an inspiring book because in showing us the naked face of imperialism as it is, has been, and must be, Alleg demonstrates by his own endurance, courage and identification with the Arabs, why imperialism as a relationship between peoples must disappear.

The Question recalls another unforgettable testament to man's courage and power to endure, Julius Fucik's *Report*

From the Gallows, that gallant and lyrical journal written in prison during the last months of this Czech Communist's life. Fucik also refused to answer the "question," and no horror his Nazi captors could devise would make him give his comrades' names. Like Alleg's, Fucik's book sings to the very end with confidence in the future.

Fortunately Henri Alleg survived but he is still in an Algerian prison. His continued imprisonment there and this book which was somehow got out and printed for the world to read remains an accusation of French colonialism, which all the pompous speeches of de Gaulle—much admired by our press—can never conceal.

Nuclear Science and Peace

No More War, by Linus Pauling, Dodd, Mead & Co. New York, 1958. 254 pp. \$3.50.

Our Nuclear Adventure, by D. G. Arnott, Philosophical Library, New York, 1958. 170 pp. \$4.75.

Inspection for Disarmament, edited by Seymour Melman, Columbia University Press, New York, 1958. 291 pp. \$6.00.

On Nuclear Energy, by Donald J. Hughes, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1957. 263 pp. \$4.75.

TO ALL OF US who hope and work for worldwide peace and abundance these books are both encouraging and helpful. In *No More War* Dr. Pauling has put down in highly readable form many of the arguments against nuclear weapons testing and the arms race and in favor of international agreements which he has publicized so courageously in the past. The book has added value in that it makes possible more detail and more complete documentation than is ordinarily appropriate in a public address or a statement to the press, and thus represents a valuable extension of Dr. Pauling's efforts in behalf of peace.

The story in the chapter entitled "The Scientists Appeal for Peace" of the petition initiated by Dr. Pauling and signed by more than 9,000 scientists is heartwarming; clearly the majority of scientists throughout the world are beginning to be alive to their responsibilities

toward safeguarding the future of mankind.

D. G. Arnott, in *Our Nuclear Adventure*, its possibilities and perils, is also concerned with bombs, but he surveys a wider field and devotes a good section of his book to the peaceful uses of atomic energy. No American can readily appreciate that "the real crisis of our time" in the world as a whole is that of power production, but a British scientist who has served for ten years on a Trade Union Atomic Sciences Committee, as well as doing research, has a less provincial view.

Many hazards are involved in harnessing nuclear power, but Arnott does not slight the hazards of war. In discussing military matters he is not impressed by the so-called "balance of terror" as a deterrent against bombs, but by the greater weapon: "The weight of world disapproval . . . is the one thing that is certainly stronger than nuclear weapons themselves."

Inspection for Disarmament reports a study of the technical aspects of inspection to ensure compliance with international disarmament agreements. This study was undertaken by the Institute of War and Peace Studies of Columbia University, and includes papers by a number of experts; that by Dr. Orear on the detection of nuclear weapons testing had received considerable publicity prior to the publication of the report as a whole. The general conclusions are affir-

mative and optimistic on future production of weapons, and on testing; more cautious regarding the possibility of guarantees against the existence and control of concealed or undeclared stocks of war materials at the onset of an inspection system.

Technical considerations are certainly an integral part of disarmament, but it is made clear that the success of a disarmament agreement depends upon trust among people—"the greatest safety for mankind is to be obtained from the earliest, even if partial, disarmament agreements—which would serve to reduce international tensions." In other words, end the Cold War!

It is interesting to read Dr. Hughes' book *On Atomic Energy* as a prelude to the September 1958 international conference, Geneva II, for he was much impressed by Geneva I (Atoms-for-Peace Conference, August, 1955). Dr. Hughes' visit to Poland and the USSR in 1957, mentioned in his preface, was too late to be reported in this book, but he does survey briefly the achievements in the Soviet Union, Britain, and other European countries.

The main body of Dr. Hughes' book is a well written general account of atomic energy and its potential for peacetime uses. No controversial issues are discussed in depth, but the author is most persuasive on the benefits of East-West scientific cooperation. —P. M.

NO MORE TESTS!

To End Nuclear Bomb Tests, by Corliss and Margaret Lamont. Basic Pamphlets Box 42, Cathedral Station, New York 25, N. Y. 10 cents.

THIS pamphlet reprints the appeals by Corliss and Margaret Lamont to the heads of both the U.S. and the Soviet governments for an ending of nuclear weapons testing, as well as presenting an account of the groups and individuals throughout the world who

make up the vast international movement for peace.

The Lamont letters and the telegram sent to President Eisenhower after the announcement of the Soviet Union's discontinuance of testing, along with the texts of the replies received variously from the Soviet Ambassador to this country, Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko, and from Adm. Lewis Strauss, then Chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, make this pamphlet of very great value to everybody interested in forwarding peace.

The concise account of the world-wide movement for peace and an ending of the hazardous nuclear tests also included in the pamphlet gives the reader a much clearer understanding of the extent and power of this momentous struggle, the purpose of which is to insure the life of all of us on our planet.

This pamphlet which can be bought in lots of 7 copies for 50, 15 copies for \$1.00, and for 50 copies or more at a 40 per cent discount, should have the widest possible distribution.—M. Y.

Correction

A gremlin (not from the Kremlin) got into our July issue and mixed things up a bit. The error occurred in the article *The MTS and the Kolkhozi*, page 29, where it reads "By January 1, 1958, the number of cattle had risen to 66.7 million head, including 317.4 million cows." The latter figure should have read 31.4 million cows. We checked all the figures carefully, and can't imagine how that extra little 7 crept in.

Rockwell Kent, who first called the error to our attention, is now in the Soviet Union, and promises to try to count the cows for us—by the good old fashioned method of counting their feet and dividing by four.

NOW READY:

BOUND VOLUMES

OF 1957 NEW WORLD REVIEW

\$4.00

Indexes alone, 35c each

PAMPHLETS ON THE U.S.S.R.

HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE USSR

By Elizabeth Moos

32 pp., 25c

EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM OF THE SOVIET UNION

By Elizabeth Moos

64 pp., illustrated, 25c

WE SAW FOR OURSELVES

Impressions of USSR

100 pp., 25c

WHERE MINERS ARE HONORED

Report of a Scottish miners delegation
to the USSR on living and working
conditions of Soviet miners.

32 pp., 5c

For single items, add 4c postage and
handling charge, 1c more for each
additional item ordered.

Order from:

NEW WORLD REVIEW

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

NEW SOVIET FILMS

LENINGRAD SYMPHONY

THE WORLD DANCES

BOULE DE SUIF

IN THE PACIFIC

A DAY IN MOSCOW

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*
(one year)

☐ *Renewal*

Name

Address

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

Do you believe

in humanity's right to survive?
in your right to live?

Do you want

to help free the world from
"The agony of international
conflict and the fear of annihi-
lation"?

Then read . . .

**TO END
NUCLEAR
BOMB
TESTS**

A New Pamphlet by
Corliss and Margaret Lamont

The story of one couple's
vigorous protest against
bomb testing and of what
groups throughout Amer-
ica and the world are
doing in the cause of
nuclear disarmament and
peace.

Single copy 10c 7 copies 50c
15 copies \$1

50 copies or more, 40% discount

BASIC PAMPHLETS, Dept. NW

BOX 42, CATHEDRAL STATION
NEW YORK 25, N. Y.

**Soviet Composers
and Artists
on LP's**

SHOSTAKOVICH

A Festival Overture
Memorable Year 1919
Symphony No. 9

PROKOFIEV

The Volga Meets the Don
Kabalevsky: Symphony No. 4

DAVID OISTRAKH

Shostakovich Violin Concerto

SVIATOSLAV RICHTER

Schuman—Fantasiestücke
Waldscenen, March No. 2

SVIATOSLAV RICHTER

Rachmaninov Piano Concerto
No. 1
Saint-Saens Piano Concerto
No. 5

VICTOR MERZHANOV

Rachmaninov Piano Concerto
No. 3

Paganini—Liszt 3 Grand Etudes

GILELS - KOGAN - ROSTROPOVICH

Beethoven Trio No. 7

KOGAN - BARSHAI -

MOSCOW CHAMBER ORCHESTRA

Vivaldi Violin Concerto No. 12
Rameau Suite
Handshkin Violin Concerto

**KOGAN - ELIZABETH GILELS - BARSHAI -
TALALIAN - KNUSHETITSKY - ROSTRO-
POVICH**

Tchaikovsky Souvenir of
Florence
Handshkin Duo for Violin and
Cello

MARK REIZEN, bass

Mussorgsky—Songs from
Boris Godunov
Rachmaninov—Cavatina
from Aleko

**SONGS AND DANCES OF THE UKRAINE
ARMENIAN FOLK SONGS
RUMANIAN FOLK SONGS AND DANCES**

\$4.00 each

Order through

NEW WORLD REVIEW