

DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRARY JUN 7 1960

JUNE, 1960 SOCIAL SCIENCES

25¢

New World

REVIEW

THE SPY PLANE AND THE SUMMIT

The Economics of Disarmament

VICTOR PERLO

Why They Return to the GDR

GEORGE LOHR

Mr. Durdin and Comrade Kuo

ELSIE-FAIRFAX-CHOLMELEY

From Stone Age to Space Age

ARCHIE JOHNSTONE

PEACE TRENDS IN U.S. LABOR

NEW WORLD REVIEW

JUNE 1960

The Spy Plane and the Summit	Jessica Smith 3
International Women's Assembly	Helen Alfred 11
Why They Return to East Germany	George Lohr 14
The Hiroshima Panels	Rockwell Kent 18
Mr. Durden and Comrade Kuo	Elsie Fairfax-Cholmeley 20
From Stone Age to Space Age	Archie Johnstone 24
Economic Consequences of Disarmament	Victor Perlo 29
Peace Trends in U.S. Labor	35
The Chain of Progress	Edgar P. Young 40

BOOK REVIEWS

<i>Friends and Enemies: What I Learned in Russia —</i>	Adlai Stevenson 45
<i>Interval of Freedom—Soviet Literature During the Thaw —</i>	George Gibian
	Murray Young 46

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

•
ESLANDA ROBESON
Our Roaming Correspondent
Editorial Consultants on Negro and Colonial Questions

Vol. 28, No. 6, June, 1960. Second Class postage paid at New York, N. Y. Subscription \$2.50 per year. \$1.25 for 6 months (Canadian, \$3.00, foreign \$3.50 a year. Draw money orders or checks payable in New York.) Published monthly by the N.W.R. Publications, Inc., 34 West 15th Street, New York 11, N. Y. Indexed in Bulletin of the Public Affairs Information Service. Phone: CHelsea 3-0666.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.



PLEASE NOTE

The last day for receiving entries in our essay contest on the subject "A Peace Program for Our Country" was May 31. Results will be announced in a forthcoming issue, and in the succeeding issues of the magazine the prize-winning essays will be published.

We are continuing the special subscription offer of nine months for one dollar (\$1.00) we made in connection with our essay contest for those interested in the results.

These essays, coming from young students and workers all over the country, provide an interesting insight into how those younger citizens, upon whose shoulders the future of our country and our world rests, regard the problems and the possible solution of the problems that face them.

Apart from the great interest of the prize-winning essay, regular reading of New World Review will provide you with invaluable information on international affairs in the crucial months ahead.

Send in your subscription today.

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

I enclose () \$1.00 for special 9-month essay contest sub, or () \$2.50 for a year's subscription to be sent to:

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

The Spy Plane and the Summit

by JESSICA SMITH

WITH THE TRAGIC breakup of the Summit conference occurring as we go to press, we cannot here give a full account of the three day happenings in Paris that brought this result. What we have done, for the benefit of our readers, was to keep a chronological record of the events that preceded them, from the press, official statements and documents, beginning with the first revelation of the U.S. spy plane over the USSR which caused the final breakup in Paris.

These facts—and more fully than we can give them—merit the most careful study by all Americans. In assessing the reasons for Premier Khrushchev's refusal to negotiate in Paris, we must fully understand the events that pushed him into this position. We must face up with absolute clarity to the responsibility of our own government in bringing this situation about, because only this knowledge, and new pressures on the part of people against U.S. militaristic attitudes that led to the debacle, can arm us with the weapons to continue the struggle for peace on a higher and far wider level than before. If there had been sufficient mass pressure from the American people in advance, all this might never have happened.

When Mr. Khrushchev arrived in Paris, the official position of the United States was still complete justification of its violation of Soviet frontiers and sovereignty by military espionage planes and of their con-

tinuance. This was confirmed in a TV interview by Vice President Nixon as late as Sunday evening, May 15, a few hours before the conference was to open. The situation was further worsened when Secretary of Defense Gates, in Paris as one of the President's advisers, ordered a worldwide alert of U.S. combat forces, an action considered one of the preliminaries to actual war, to coincide with the opening of the Summit meeting.

In his opening statement on May 16, Premier Khrushchev said the Soviet Government could not take part in negotiations under the threat of continued violation of its borders. He said that he would be ready to participate in the conference—

... If the United States Government were to declare that in the future the United States will not violate the State borders of the USSR with its aircraft, that it deplores its provocative actions taken in the past and will punish those directly guilty for those actions.

He also suggested that the visit of the President to the Soviet Union be postponed until such time as conditions for the visit were better, since the Soviet people could not welcome him with proper cordiality at the present time.

President Eisenhower declared in his speech that the "ultimatum" of Premier Khrushchev on conditions for participating in the conference, would never be acceptable to the United States. He did declare, however that "In point of fact, these

flights were suspended after the recent incident, and will not be resumed."

This statement could hardly be taken as a firm guarantee, since the President declared that the suspension of the flights referred only to his own tenure of office. This amounted to a declaration that the United States might resume a policy infringing Soviet sovereignty and international law under a new Administration. Nor did the President express any regret over the incident. Premier Khrushchev pointed out later that he had thought the United States might apologize since it had apologized to Cuba when an intruding American plane had been shot down there recently.

It is reasonable to assume that if President Eisenhower had been willing to go at least halfway toward meeting Premier Khrushchev's conditions, the latter might have been willing to go on with the conference.

Premier Khrushchev, in fact, demonstrated his willingness for further discussion of the matter when he was invited to meet with the three Western Ministers the next day. He said he would meet them for the purpose of "further clarification" of the positions of both sides, but not for an official Summit meeting.

President Eisenhower, however, insisted that if Mr. Khrushchev agreed to attend, *this would mean that the Soviet Premier had abandoned his conditions.*

This action, on top of the President's refusal to meet Khrushchev's main conditions, ended the possibility of holding the conference. Premier Khrushchev proposed that conditions for one might be more propitious in six or eight months—

after the U.S. national elections.

One of the most illuminating commentaries on Mr. Khrushchev's position was made by Republican commentator Walter Lippmann on May 17, as the conference tottered on the brink of failure. He pointed out that Mr. Khrushchev, after the capture of the plane, had opened the door to the President for a diplomatic exit from his quandary. Mr. Lippmann continued:

Undoubtedly Mr. K. knew that Mr. Eisenhower must have authorized the general plan of the flights but he preferred to let the President say, what in fact was a sorry kind of truth, that he did not authorize this particular flight. The diplomatic answer would have been to say nothing at the time or at the most to promise an adequate investigation of the whole affair. Instead, Mr. Eisenhower replied that he *was* responsible, that such flights were necessary, and then he let the world think, even if he did not say so in exact words that the flights would continue. This locked the door which Mr. Khrushchev had opened. It transformed the embarrassment of being caught in a spying operation into a direct challenge to the sovereignty of the Soviet Union.

This avowal, this refusal to use the convention of diplomacy, was a fatal mistake. For it made it impossible for Mr. Khrushchev to bypass the affair. Had he done that, he would have been in a position of acknowledging to the world, to the Soviet people, to his critics within the Soviet Union, and to his Communist allies, that he had surrendered to the United States the right to violate Soviet territory. *No statesman can live in any country after making such an admission.* (Italics added.)

For our understanding of Mr. Khrushchev's position we must also go back even before the flight, to the hardened cold war attitudes expressed by State Department and Government spokesmen before the conference, which indicated an un-

willingness for any real negotiations on Germany and Berlin or the vital disarmament issue.

The door has been left open for a later conference. The processes of negotiation can continue at Geneva and on many levels. The fight for peace is still to be won, and we believe that those who must be in its first line are the American people.

Khrushchev Speech to Supreme Soviet

May 5. The first part of Premier Khrushchev's report to the Supreme Soviet outlined the new program for abolishing taxes for the working people, increasing their income, reducing hours of work, expanding consumers' goods production, and improving living standards generally.

Turning to a review of foreign affairs, the Soviet Premier emphasized that the basic principles of Soviet foreign policy are "for an enduring peace, for peaceful coexistence and cooperation with all states." He stressed the importance of the Summit conference, and declared "If the vital problems of the day—disarmament and a peaceful settlement with Germany, including the question of West Berlin—are solved, the problem of improving East-West relations will solve itself."

However, he went on, recent statements and actions in the West gave little ground for hope of reaching concrete solutions at the Summit. He charged that influential circles in the United States, with the Pentagon as their bulwark, had recently stepped up efforts to continue the cold war and the arms race. He referred to recent statements by Herter, Nixon, Dillon and others who

shape U.S. foreign policy and who had been advocating an inflexible policy with regard to Germany and Berlin, as an ill omen for the outcome of the Summit conference. He continued:

Unfortunately, these speeches have been approved by the President of the United States himself. . . . Or take the fact that President Eisenhower announced he would not be able to stay in Paris for more than seven days. . . . I do not doubt President Eisenhower's sincere desire for peace. But though the President is the highest authority in the United States, there are evidently circles which restrict him.

Mr. Khrushchev indicated that if Mr. Nixon were instructed to carry on negotiations in President Eisenhower's absence there could be little hope of reaching any agreements, as he had the impression the Vice President was not concerned with ending the cold war and the arms race.

Incursions of U.S. Planes

Premier Khrushchev then made his sensational announcement "on aggressive acts directed in the last few weeks by the United States against the Soviet Union." The first of these was the intrusion of a U.S. plane into the airspace of the USSR from Afghanistan on April 9; the Soviet Government decided against making a protest but ordered military commanders to act if another plane intruded. The next occasion was the May First holiday:

That day, early in the morning, at 0536 hours, Moscow time, an American plane flew over our frontier and continued its flight into the interior of the Soviet land . . . the plane was shot down.

The question then arises: Who sent this aircraft across the Soviet frontier? Was it the man who is Commander-in-

Chief of the American armed forces who, as everyone knows, is the President? Or was this aggressive act carried out by Pentagon militarists?

Mr. Khrushchev charged that this action must have been taken by elements who wanted the Summit meeting to fail. He said that naturally feelings of indignation had been aroused among the Soviet people, "but we must be ruled not by our emotions, but by reason," and it would be wrong to assess this incident as a precursor of war. He concluded:

Once again, we repeat that disarmament is the right way to preserve peace and in such conditions no country would be able unilaterally to arm and attack another. The Soviet Union once again calls on the Government of the United States to end the cold war. All states must act peaceably so that calm, peace and happiness can prevail.

First Washington Version

May 5. Following Premier Khrushchev's announcement, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration issued a statement which said in part:

One of N.A.S.A.'s U-2 research airplanes, in use since 1956 in a continuing program to study gust meteorological conditions found at high altitudes, has been missing since 9 o'clock Sunday morning (local time), when its pilot reported he was having oxygen difficulties over the Lake Van, Turkey, area. The airplane had taken off from Incirlik Air Base, Turkey. . . . If the pilot continued to suffer lack of oxygen, the path of the airplane from the last reported position would be impossible to determine. If the airplane was on automatic pilot, it is likely it would have continued along its northeasterly course. The pilot, as are all pilots used on N.A.S.A.'s program of upper-atmosphere research with the U-2 airplane, is a civilian employed by the Lockheed Aircraft Corporation. . . .

The statement carried descriptions of the scientific instruments and activities of the plane. At a press conference, a spokesman for the NASA said the plane carried no military equipment of any kind, denied that it carried any radioactivity detection instruments.

This confirmed the State Department version. Its spokesman admitted that the plane might have crossed the frontier by accident, the pilot having lost consciousness because of failure in his oxygen equipment. Denying that the plane was on an aggressive, provocative mission, he insisted: "There was no deliberate attempt to violate Soviet air space, and there never has been." The State Department asked the USSR for more details about its "unarmed, weather research plane piloted by a civilian."

In the meantime Secretary Herter's special assistant, Charles Bohlen, gave reporters a background briefing on the official explanation, earnestly speculating on Khrushchev's motives.

The *New York Herald Tribune's* Robert J. Donovan wrote:

Congress reacted with shock and anger today at Prime Minister Khrushchev's announcement. . . . But at the White House there was icy silence.

The paper charged Premier Khrushchev editorially with a "murderous act" and "the most inflammatory speech that has come from the lips of a responsible head of any great power since World War II." More sober comment came from James Reston of the *New York Times*, who, commenting on Senator Mike Mansfield's (D., Mont.) accusation against the Russians for

"shooting first and complaining later," asked:

Suppose the Soviet Union had a base in Mexico from which planes went aloft daily along the Texas border: sometimes bombers, sometimes weather planes, sometimes photo reconnaissance planes. Suppose they strayed over the United States from time to time. Would Washington "shoot first and complain later"?

Khrushchev Supplies New Data

May 7. In his concluding speech before the Supreme Soviet, Premier Khrushchev declared that the statements issued by Washington were completely untrue. The intruding plane, he said, had been shot down by a rocket at an altitude of some 65,000 feet over Sverdlovsk, about 1300 miles from the Afghanistan border. The pilot, Francis Gary Powers, alive and in good health, had been brought to Moscow along with the remains of his plane and its special instrumentation, and had confessed to his mission of military espionage. Powers said he originally had served as a first lieutenant in the U.S. Air Force, at a salary of \$700 a month, but in 1956 had gone over to the Central Intelligence Agency, at a salary of \$2,500 a month. Khrushchev reported that preliminary investigation had established the following:

This was a real military reconnaissance aircraft fitted with various instruments for collecting intelligence. . . . The task of the plane was to cross the entire territory of the Soviet Union from the Pamirs to the Kola Peninsula to get information on our country's military and industrial establishments by means of aerial photography. Besides aerial cameras the plane carried other reconnaissance equipment for spotting radio networks, identifying the location and frequencies of operating radio stations and other special radio engineering equipment.

Mr. Khrushchev showed the delegates a number of the photos developed from the captured films showing airfields with fighter planes and other installations. He also said there was a tape recording of signals of ground radar stations.

The Soviet Premier said the only true item in the U.S. statements was that the plane had been stationed at the American-Turkish air base at Incirlik, east of Adana, Turkey. Powers had testified that he was serving with the 10-10 unit, which for cover purposes is under control of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, but in reality conducts high altitude military reconnaissance. For this mission he had flown first to Pakistan. Khrushchev quoted Powers:

I was to take off from Peshawar airfield in Pakistan, cross the national frontier of the USSR and fly across Soviet territory to Norway. . . . During my flight over Soviet territory I was to switch on and off the equipment over certain points indicated on the map. I believe my flight over Soviet territory was meant for collecting information on Soviet guided missiles and radar stations.

The Soviet Premier also noted that the plane had violated the national sovereignty of Afghanistan by flying over its territory without permission. He further stated:

All the time of the flight over our territory the aircraft was under observation and was brought down as soon as the order was received.

The pilot, according to Khrushchev, baled out by parachute instead of using the ejector device which was equipped with an explosive charge which would have blown up the plane, and very likely the pilot too. The pilot was also equipped

with a poisoned pin which he was to use if captured, but did not, because, as Khrushchev put it, "Everything alive wants to live."

Other items with which Powers was equipped were: A noiseless pistol; 7,500 rubles in Soviet currency; gold francs wrapped in cellophane; West German, Italian and other currency; two extra gold watches; seven ladies' gold rings. "Why was all this necessary in the upper layers of the atmosphere?" asked Khrushchev, "or perhaps he was to fly still higher and seduce the Martian ladies?" He continued:

What could be the reason for such a reckless step? The United States proposal on the "open sky" is well known. We rejected this proposal and the American military then decided to "open" the Soviet sky by themselves. But there are rules of international law, there are national frontiers and no one has the right to disregard these laws and to cross the frontiers of other countries.

The Soviet Premier said he still believed in the desire for peace and friendly relations evidenced by Americans he had talked with on his visit here, but that the "militarists from the Pentagon and the monopolists connected with them seem to be unable to call a halt to their war effort." He also said he was quite willing to believe that President Eisenhower knew nothing about the plane incident, as had been indicated in Washington. But, he asked:

How can men live quietly when war or peace—and it has to be emphasized once more that war in the present conditions would be the greatest calamity and disaster for scores of millions of human beings—depends on a contingency: when whether there should or should not be war depends on men who are capable of playing with fire?

For the time being we qualify this aggressive act by an American plane which has violated our frontier as one aimed at nerve-racking, rekindling the cold war. . . . This is so far not preparations for war, for a war of today. Yet this provocative and aggressive act has elements of preparations for the war of the future. . . .

A few hours after Khrushchev's announcement of the nature of Powers' mission in the USSR the White House announced that the United States was planning unilaterally to resume underground nuclear testing. (Although this matter was currently under discussion in Geneva, and the Soviet delegation had only just agreed to joint underground testing as part of the scientific program to determine the detectability of tests under 20 megatons.)

U.S. Acknowledges Spy Flights

May 7. Late on the same day of Khrushchev's revelations, the State Department issued an acknowledgment that they were true, after clearance with the President, who was golfing at Gettysburg. The State Department also acknowledged previous air espionage missions, previously denied. The statement said:

. . . As a result of the inquiry ordered by the President, it has been established that insofar as the authorities are concerned, there was no authorization for any such flights as described by Mr. Khrushchev.

Nevertheless, it appears that in endeavoring to obtain information now concealed behind the Iron Curtain a flight over Soviet territory was probably undertaken by an unarmed civilian U-2 plane.

It is certainly no secret that, given the state of the world today, intelligence collection activities are practiced by all countries and postwar history certainly reveals that the Soviet Union has not been lagging behind in this field. The

necessity for such activities as measures for legitimate national defense is enhanced by the excessive secrecy practiced by the Soviet Union in contrast to the free world.

One of the things creating tension in the world today is apprehension over surprise attack with weapons of mass destruction. To reduce mutual suspicion and to get a measure of protection against surprise attack, the United States in 1955 offered its "open skies" proposal—a proposal which was rejected out of hand by the Soviet Union. It is in relation to the danger of surprise attack that planes of the type of the unarmed civilian U-2 aircraft have made flights along the frontiers of the free world for the past four years.

Senator Lyndon Johnson (D., Tex.), Senate Democratic leader, called for support of the President in the crisis, declared that however far Khrushchev might push his "saber rattling," all Americans will act "to preserve their freedoms—right to the limit." Representative Chester Bowles (D., Conn.), said it was "irresponsible and reckless" for the United States to allow an American plane to fly over the Russian border while this country was trying to arrange a successful Summit conference.

May 8. Dispatches from Washington emphasized anger, dismay and confusion in the U.S. capital city. James Reston wrote:

This was a sad and perplexed capital tonight, caught in a swirl of charges of clumsy administration, bad judgment and bad faith. It was depressed and humiliated by the United States' having been caught spying over the Soviet Union and trying to cover up its activities in a series of misleading official announcements. (*New York Times*, May 9)

In Congress there were calls for an investigation of CIA activities.

In the midst of the primary campaign in West Virginia, Senator Hu-

bert Humphrey (D., Minn.) declared that Mr. Khrushchev had us "on the run" in the propaganda battle, "because we haven't been telling the truth." On the other hand, Senator John F. Kennedy (D., Mass.) termed Premier Khrushchev's attitude "extreme, belligerent and menacing."

Robert J. Donovan, apropos of the Administration statement that it was necessary to guard against surprise attack, commented:

No one in authority believes today that the Russians will attack. Indeed American policy is based on the contrary assumption. But in such a life-and-death matter the United States is not going to leave any more to guesses than it has to. (*New York Herald Tribune*, May 9)

(In this connection it should also be noted that Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates Jr. stated in a speech on April 26 that under our present and planned defense "No rational leader of the Soviet Union could make a decision to attack the United States." And the official U.S. *Army Information Digest* published an article May 4 declaring that Khrushchev does not believe in surprise attack and that "Moscow does not appear to be undertaking the extremely expensive task of developing military might capable of eliminating by first strike the ability of the West to retaliate." At the same time, talk of preventive and preemptive war has been renewed in Pentagon circles.)

Boasting of all the successful intelligence flights of U-2 planes in the past, *New York Times* military expert Hanson Baldwin, wrote that the whole trouble in this case was "one man's instinct for survival." (If the

guy had just committed suicide as he was supposed to do, everything would have been just ducky.) That the only trouble was we got caught, and an error in timing was, in fact, the line of a large part of the press. The *New York Post*, however, calling for a full investigation and airing of the facts, declared editorially:

The United States has suffered another massive setback in the international political war. It is a defeat so humiliating, so unnecessary and so plainly the result of gross negligence, confusion and inertia in high places (mingled with folly on lower levels) that we dare not let it be buried in the sacred archives of security. . . .

Almost as fantastic as the bungling of the plane incident was Washington's timing of the announcement that the U.S. is resuming underground atomic blasts.

This time, too, was chosen for the announcement that a Pentagon spy satellite is planned for the fall. According to the *New York Times* story:

It will be the initial test in a photo-intelligence program, Project Samos, whose mission this country has set forth with complete candor: to photograph every inch of Communist territory and thereby help close the "intelligence gap" that so severely handicaps the United States defense efforts.

Throughout Europe, Washington was blamed for reckless actions before the Summit. "Embarrassment, concern and dismay were common reactions in Western Europe. . . . The newspapers, echoing widespread unofficial comment, were unrestrained in their criticism of the United States" (*New York Times*, May 9). "A chain explosion of worried, angry and vitriolic criticism blistered the air across two continents today as America and Europe

debated the effects of the U.S. plane incident." (*New York Post*, May 9.)

Reactions were harsh in France, Sweden, West Germany and other countries. Turkey, Norway and Pakistan denied acquiescence in the flight.

Secretary Herter on U-2 Flight

May 9. Secretary Herter issued a "clarifying" statement, charging the USSR with responsibility for post-war conflicts and with keeping the world in a state of apprehension over its intentions. He declared that while the Soviet leaders have "almost complete access to the open societies of the free world," supplemented by vast espionage networks, "they keep their own society tightly closed and rigorously controlled." The development of modern weapons, he said, points up the danger of "surprise attack and aggression," enhanced with the "threats of mass destruction frequently voiced by the Soviet leadership."

The United States, he said, had sought to lessen this threat through its "open skies" and other proposals, but in the absence of Soviet cooperation, would be "derelict in its duty not only to the American people but to free peoples everywhere if it did not . . . take such measures as are possible unilaterally to lessen and to overcome this danger of surprise attack." Declaring the United States "has not and does not shirk this responsibility," he continued:

In accordance with the National Security Act of 1947, the President has put into effect since the beginning of his Administration directives to gather by every possible means the information required to protect the United States and the

Turn to page 41

International Women's Assembly

by HELEN ALFRED

IT WAS from first to last a stimulating, and at times a deeply moving experience to attend the International Women's Day Assembly at Copenhagen during the third week of April. Here, in the 2000-year old state of Denmark, more than 900 handsome and progressive-minded women from 72 countries gathered to consider the status of women around the world today—yesterday, and tomorrow—fifty years after the first International Women's Day. They had traveled to Copenhagen from the four continents, and from the great islands and archipelagoes, from nations that had been independent states for centuries and from lands in which the people are still engaged in bitter struggles to free themselves from colonialism and suppression. Thirty lively and enthusiastic women, of whom twelve were Negro, made up the United States delegation.

Included in this great gathering were agricultural, industrial and office workers, doctors and nurses, lawyers, public administrators and members of national and local legislative bodies, educators, musicians, actresses, dancers, social workers, women active in labor unions and cooperative associations—all commit-

ted to work for world peace and their nation's welfare.

As they surged into the Congress Hall on the opening day they presented a gay and striking scene in their varied and colorful costumes—the tall erect Africans in their bright cottons and high-piled organdy bandanas; the Chinese, walking straight and with dignity in their long, sheath coat-dresses of fine printed silk; the sari-draped small ladies of India and Pakistan; some of the Scandinavians in hand-embroidered native dress; the olive-skinned Indonesians in their brilliant batiks. And all possessed of a spirit of camaraderie and happiness at being there with the more sedately costumed women of the "Great Powers" and other western countries.

The Assembly had been initiated and was sponsored by a special international committee of women from many States. The American group was very proud of the fact that Mrs. Cyrus S. Eaton was the U.S. President of the group of ten women from various countries who formed the international presidency of the Assembly. Unable to attend in person, as she had expected to, Mrs. Eaton sent a tape-recorded greeting to the Assembly.

The Danish women served as exceedingly cordial and ever good-humored hostesses, meeting all guests at airports and railway stations, arranging for hotel accommodations, serving as guides to the vari-

HELEN ALFRED, one of the early workers for Public Housing in this country, was a founder of the National Public Housing Conference and its director for twelve years. Miss Alfred is editor of Peace Publications.

ous delegations, and answering the innumerable questions put to them. A complicated organizational task was involved, and was performed efficiently and graciously.

Mrs. Anna Westergaard, former member of the Danish Senate and Chief Controller of Traffic of the Danish State Railways, in opening the Assembly, stated:

I would like to stress first of all that our assembly does not have a partisan political character. Those who are meeting here are not coming together as representatives of certain political opinions or beliefs, but as individuals having the desire to take part in a discussion and study of the problems of women in the broad sense of the term—that is, concerning the past, present and also, as far as possible, the future. . . . We want to contribute in every field to the improvement of living conditions of women in order that we can attain the same level, the same influence, the same responsibility as men everywhere, and that we can obtain the same rights in society.

The program of the Assembly took form in speeches, reports, and messages from all corners of the world, delivered at two all-day plenary sessions, and in six discussion groups in which the individual women participated, according to their special preferences and interests. The subjects considered at the panels were: Participation of women in economic life; Civil rights of women; Participation of women in public life; Social achievements enrolling women to reconcile their activities; Tasks of women's associations and of all women for the relaxation of tension, disarmament and cooperation between the peoples.

Despite differences of nationality and experience, it was an extraordinarily harmonious, friendly group,

though during the discussion periods and the preparation of panel reports there was lively controversy. Every race, creed, color and political conviction was represented among the delegates, so it could scarcely have been otherwise. The African delegations obviously felt it was important to give at least as immediate attention to the critical situation in their countries as to those of Algeria, Germany and Korea. Some difficulty was found in reaching a proper evaluation of the progress of women's economic and political progress in some of the Western nations along with those of the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China and the other socialist countries. The women of the latter, in reporting the equality of the sexes, stressed the necessity for women, in striving for equal opportunities for service and achievement, to prepare themselves to be competent comparably with men.

At one of the serious panel discussions an unintentionally humorous highlight offered relief. A beautifully dressed, veiled lady who had the fortitude to remain a spinster in one of the few remaining lands of polygamy stated this thesis: Women can never hope to achieve equality with men so long as they fall in love with them, and are willing to honor and serve them. Her speech received hearty applause, as well as scarcely restrained laughter!

Another, and quite literal highlight, was the dramatic torchlight parade. It began early one evening at Congress Hall, the Assembly headquarters, and continued through the streets for some blocks to the beautiful Town Hall. The delegates, and some of the husbands

and children of the Copenhagen women, sang their national songs and did gay folk dances as they paraded. It was a gala and altogether delightful demonstration. Another extra-curricular entertainment that provided rare pleasure was an international women's concert at the Tivoli—singing, dancing, and the music of instruments unknown to many of the delegations—and all by outstanding professional artists.

Throughout the entire program of the Assembly there was continued accent on the removal of tensions from among nations and peoples, on the urgency of ending all atomic tests, on general disarmament, and on the building of a lasting peace. The final session ended with the approval of resolutions, drawn by special committees, to be presented by representatives of the Assembly

to the Summit Conference, the Ten-Power Disarmament Conference, and the Heads of the Four Great Powers. The message to President Eisenhower, as to the others, ended:

"Women realize the tremendous possibilities in a world where war has been rendered impossible. Disarmament would afford the opportunity to put an end to the physical and mental distress which results from both war and the armaments race, and to employ the world's wealth and the discoveries of science to raise the standard of living of the peoples and permit the flowering of human endeavor in all fields of activity.

"In the realization of these aims, Mr. President, we can assure you of the unanimous approval and support of women throughout the world."

MRS. CYRUS S. EATON SENDS GREETINGS

To the Presidency and All Participants
Celebrating the 50th Anniversary of
International Women's Day

With deepest regret that I am unable to share the wonderful experience of this momentous occasion with you in person, I extend my heartiest greetings and congratulations.

May your voices, united for peace and freedom for all nations at this critical time, resound throughout the world to inspire hope and courageous action in the hearts of women everywhere, so that "man to man, the world o'er shall brothers be" for evermore.

MRS. CYRUS S. EATON.

CYRUS S. EATON RECEIVES LENIN PEACE PRIZE

CYRUS S. EATON, leading American industrialist of Cleveland, Ohio, was one of the recipients this year of the International Lenin Peace Prize. Other recipients were President Sukarno of Indonesia, Laurant Casanova of France who is one of the initiators of the peace movement, Alexander Korneichuk, a Soviet writer long active in the peace movement, and Aziz Sharif of the Iraqi Republic.

Mr. Eaton was cited as "a public figure whose activity is an example of courageous service to the lofty idea of peaceful coexistence between the peoples."

In a public statement Mr. Eaton said that he was "deeply appreciative of this high honor" of the Soviet award.

Why They Return to East Germany

by GEORGE LOHR

A HANDSOME, red-haired lad of 21 sat opposite me in a comfortable office of the center for new settlers at Barby, a small town in the German Democratic Republic located not far from the border of the Federal Republic of Germany. "Why did you decide to leave West Germany and to move here?" I asked him. "I've had my fill of army life," was the answer.

When he was 18, he had hitchhiked to France for a vacation. In the city of Lille, after the usual night with lots to drink and pliant girls which a "friendly" stranger had provided, he found himself the morning after signed up for a five-year stretch in the Foreign Legion. Last year he managed to escape, and he returned to his home in the FRG, and to his job in the coal mines. But early this spring the dreaded letter came, ordering him to report for military service which in West Germany is compulsory. That's when he quickly packed his little bag, and came across the border. In the German Democratic Republic, military service is voluntary.

Herman Rothe, the elderly but bustling director of the center, told me that lack of enthusiasm for service in the Bonn army is one of the chief reasons for the steadily growing influx of West Germans. Per-

sonal discussion with other youngsters bore this out. Of the 700 people staying in the center at the time of my visit, 75 per cent were below the age of 25, and of those the great majority were young men. Other main reasons for West Germans moving to the GDR are bad housing conditions, unemployment among the Ruhr miners, the attraction of the steadily rising living standard in the GDR, and just plain family problems brought about by the division of the country.

In 1959, there were 63,076 new settlers from West Germany, 17 per cent more than in 1958. Of these, 15,769 were youth of military service age. Of the total, two-thirds, or 41,585, were returnees who had left the GDR and found things not to their liking in Chancellor Adenauer's state. Three times as many unemployed miners left the Ruhr and came to work in the GDR mines than the previous year. There were also 2,400 peasants, many of whom had gone bankrupt, or agricultural workers anxious to join a co-op.

This sprawling center, a former castle belonging to a count, is one of five. It was opened last year to help take care of the increased stream of settlers, and a crew of construction workers is now busy repairing and enlarging it, so that it will be able to house 800 people. The center in Berlin is also being enlarged.

As I talked to the director and his assistants, I could see, through

GEORGE LOHR was foreign editor of the *Daily People's World* from 1947 to 1950. He has lived in Europe, chiefly in the German Democratic Republic since 1951.

the window looking down at the courtyard, a large group of his guests drinking in the timid rays of the spring sun, chatting and laughing away. For most of them, the stay at the center, usually 10 to 14 days, is like a vacation. Some of the men, however, go to work in one of the small factories around town to earn a little money.

On one side of the courtyard, six cars were parked bearing West German license plates. "Some of them come across the border in their cars," Rothe explained. "A few others also arrive on foot. But most of them arrive by train." He said there is a special waiting room at the border for the new settlers, where they also are fed and where attendants provide such care as heated milk for the babies. Once a day, toward evening, a special bus brings these newcomers to the center. As soon as they arrive, they are assigned their rooms, couples by themselves and single people four to six together.

Then come interviews with social workers and other experts to discuss such things as what city or town they would prefer moving to, what work they have done or would like to do, and any other matters having to do with adjustment to the new life. There are also health examinations, and anybody needing care gets free medical service.

"As soon as a new settler steps on the soil of our country," Rothe explained, "he is entitled to all the privileges of social insurance, just like any other citizen."

Food at the center is free, of course, and from what I could see about equal in quality to that served in the canteens of the factories here.

Everybody also gets pocket money, enough for cigarettes or some beers in one of the bars in the town. Those who overdo the drinking are called before a committee of their peers, a first introduction to a system of collective responsibility. By the way, I didn't see a single policeman around the place, the whole afternoon I spent there.

As soon as arrangements for a job and a place to live are made, the new citizens are put on a train. Those with cars are given gas money to get to their destination. From then on, they are the responsibility of the authorities of whatever town they are going to settle in. Of course, not every wish as to work and location can always be fulfilled, but every effort is made in that direction. For instance, a man who had owned a butcher store in West Germany and had gone bankrupt, was very pleased when he was given a job in a meat packing plant in East Germany. The unemployed miners from the Ruhr are usually anxious to get back to digging coal, and those from the rural areas join an agricultural cooperative.

The big problem is housing because modern apartments, while cheap, are by no means in surplus. It would also not be fair to give these newcomers preference over GDR families who have been on the waiting list for a new flat over a period of years. The problem is usually solved by giving the new settlers dwelling places vacated by old, established families moving into new homes.

For many of those arriving, these places are still a big advance over what they had in the FRG. Take the case of the slender, 37 year-old

Ruhr miner and his wife, a brunette 28 years old. (All names in this report are intentionally omitted, by request of those interviewed.) She and her former husband left the GDR some years ago, lured by the glamor of the West. Like most such new arrivals in West Germany, the only place they could find was a cubbyhole in a large hall, partitioned off to house 17 families. The partitions, made of plywood, were only six feet high, she recalled, and not covered on top, so that the din was maddening. Everybody knew what the neighbors were doing or saying at any given time, there was absolutely no privacy, and she admitted with a blush that "during all the time I lived there, I never undressed fully once because you never could tell who would be peeking across the partition." Their cubbyhole adjoined the center hallway, so it had no window, cooking had to be done across the courtyard in a community kitchen, and heat for the whole hall was provided by two old tile stoves.

Three years ago her first husband deserted her, and she met her present one who was living then with his parents in already cramped quarters. He tried to get an apartment, but the only ones he could find were far out of reach for a miner's wage. There was nothing else to do but move in with her, and in that miserable hole she also raised her baby, now two years old. In addition to that, work for him became more and more scarce and, as he said, "\$1.75 unemployment relief a day for three people doesn't go far in West Germany." They talked it over, and "here we are, and very happy with the fine reception we've

gotten." She insisted I look at the baby. "He does nothing but sleep, sleep all the time, because for the first time he is in a quiet place." I went with them to their room, and sure enough, the little shaver was sound asleep.

I knocked at another door, and there was a young woman, her baby girl playing in the crib. "I couldn't stand it any more, the three of us in a tiny room, and the landlady always asking more money," she reported. "I can see that here is a good place for working people. My husband is only an ordinary laborer, but they received us here as though we were hotel guests."

Many of these people, once they are permanently settled, write to the director of the center, thanking him for the care and attention they have received. Rothe showed me a whole file of letters, some laboriously scribbled, and I picked out a few samples. A miner who is very happy in his new job, another worker announcing that he is sending some books for the center's library, another inviting Rothe to come visit him "so you can see yourself how well I live," and a mother and daughter, working in the same factory, saying they found that life in the GDR is good for the workers.

Another letter is from a worker who also had left the GDR a few years back, thinking he would have a better deal in the Federal Republic. Disillusioned, he returned and is now back at work. In his letter of thanks, he expressed great surprise that he hadn't been punished for having left originally. He is back in his old construction gang "and the whole family is very happy because 'Pip' is back."

Rothe laughed when I read this letter out loud. "Even when those who left originally come back, they often still believe that propaganda stuff spread in the West that they are going to be punished. This is an absolute lie. They are treated like everybody else, just as if nothing had ever happened."

As he walked with me through the grounds toward the gate, I saw the plasterers and masons hard at work. "I see you are getting ready for a lot more business," I remarked jokingly. "Oh sure," he said, "the number that's coming is going up all the time, and it's going to keep increasing in ratio with the improvement of our living standard here. More and more begin to recognize that the future Germany is here, not over there with the Nazis in government."

The West German press, of course, won't admit the increase in the flow eastwards, and of late has carried on a big propaganda campaign about a large number of peasants allegedly going to the West rather than join agricultural co-ops. It is true that there has been a big campaign in the GDR this spring for the formation of co-ops, an absolute

necessity if the backward countryside is ever going to be transferred into mechanized, efficient enterprises. But this reporter has convinced himself, by sampling various newly formed co-ops, that the number of peasants that have left as a result of this campaign is by no means large.

It is a fact that the number of those going West still exceeds that of those coming East, but the trend is changing, and that is the important thing. The lure of the superabundance in the shop windows of the Federal Republic is gradually losing its attraction as the socialist government here is more and more able to supply the population with the good things of life.

The current seven-year plan, which is making good progress, has the goal of reaching and surpassing West Germany's living standard. News travels fast between relatives and friends in divided Germany, and every new achievement in the GDR finds its echo in letters, not least in letters sent by these enthusiastic new settlers. All in all, Herr Rothe's optimism in enlarging the center he is responsible for seems well justified by the march of events.

MARK TWAIN COMMEMORATED IN INDONESIA

THE FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY of the death of Mark Twain was commemorated this spring in Djakarta, Indonesia by a meeting jointly sponsored by the Indonesian Peace Committee and the Indonesian Consultative Agency for Culture.

Poets, writers, young people of a variety of political beliefs, and the Chairman of the Indonesian Communist Party, D. N. Aidit, attended the meeting.

"The greatness of Mark Twain lay in the fact that his works reflected the views and aspirations of the American people and defended the rights of the oppressed," said a member of the Presidium of the Indonesian Peace Committee in a speech at the meeting.

In the course of the evening passages from Mark Twain's writings were recited and American songs about Twain's life were performed.

The Hiroshima Panels

by ROCKWELL KENT

"The last time I saw him he declared sarcastically that I was crazy, that I failed to understand that in this space age only 'ladies with dogs' could be interested in novels . . . and so on and so forth."

LAST summer Ilya Ehrenburg received a letter from a young woman, a student in Leningrad, appealing for counsel in a distressing disagreement that had arisen between herself and the young scientist to whom she was betrothed. He, it appeared, dedicated to science, was contemptuously intolerant of the humanism that prompted her deep interest in the arts. Recognizing the young woman's problem to be of more than private concern, Ehrenburg, duly concealing his correspondent's identity, answered the letter with an article in *Komsomolskaya Pravda*, and thereby precipitated a discussion that, continuing for months, was to embrace the whole problem of the moral destiny of Soviet Man. And while Ehrenburg, in the two articles he contributed to the discussion, recognized, as did other correspondents, that far from there being properly a *conflict* between art and science each was the other's complement, there were surprisingly many to whom Man's sensibility, his soul, was of little or no consequence in the make-up of the purely rational being that our scientific age would

evolve. It is noteworthy, in passing, that so esoteric a discussion should have evoked thousands of letters and been given space for months in an important Soviet newspaper.

Referring to the frequent use by the partisans of the young scientist of the "terms beloved of American journalists, 'the atomic age,' 'the space age,'" Ehrenburg continues: "The new society (the Socialist society) presupposes not only a development of technology but development of man's consciousness; not only the development of space exploration but development of man's spiritual world; not only a rise in material well-being but a deepening of human emotions." And quoting some of the technologists as saying, "It's not the artists and the philosophers who make life," he continues: "But technology is not the fighter; it is merely the weapon. The bomb that was dropped on Hiroshima was a technical achievement, but it was technology directed against man." Without debating whether or not it is the artists or scientists who *make* life, it can be said without fear of contradiction, now that Hiroshima has been mentioned, that it was the scientists and the technologists who, at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, *destroyed* life—demonstrating by the wanton incineration of four hundred and twenty thousand men, women and children what technologists unhampered by restraints of heart and soul could lightly do. God save the world from them!

ROCKWELL KENT, distinguished artist and writer, is Chairman of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.

Whatever mankind's initial reaction to these acts may have been, it was for John Hersey, by his story in the *New Yorker* and his subsequently published book, to awaken many of us to the full enormity of the crime and make us realize the fundamental inhumanity of those who had committed it. It was for a writer, an artist of the deepest sensibilities, one who had been to Hiroshima, seen that ruined city, talked with three of the very few who had survived, to stir our consciences. But that was fifteen years ago. New generations—too young when Hiroshima happened to have been impressed—have entered their maturity. And the older generations—forgetful, maybe, or grown callous—condone or openly support such preparations as might bring its re-enactment with a thousand times more power, and not just two cities but the world and all mankind its field: But Hiroshima's ghost has not been laid.

When Ira Maruki and his wife, Toshiko, received news of the Hiroshima tragedy they hurried to the stricken city to search for their relatives and give what aid they could to the survivors. The horrors of the scene they witnessed, the human agony, has never left them; and as time transmuted the hatred of the perpetrators, that they must at first have felt, into enduring sorrow, they too—obsessed by it as was the Ancient Mariner by personal remorse—consecrated their lives (they were both painters) to the creation of such a memorial as might be to all mankind an everlasting reminder of the horrors of war and a moving evocation to the peoples of the world to live in brotherhood and

peace. These are the *Hiroshima Panels*.*

The eleven panels—done with ink on paper and sparingly colored—are of heroic size, each measuring six feet by twenty-four; and one may well believe that little of their grandeur has been lost in the reproductions (some of them in full color) that, in book form and accompanied by the Marukis' poignantly descriptive text, are now available to us. Their impact upon this writer was literally shattering. Although the hideousness of what we had done at Hiroshima and Nagasaki had entered my soul, burdening me with the sense of guilt that all Americans must share, not until I opened the pages of the book and saw its pictures had I realized the full horror of the abomination we had perpetrated. These panels that combine the power and grandeur of Michaelangelo, the terrifying realism of Goya's etchings of the *Peninsular War*, and the tenderness of Kathe Kollwitz, transcend the field of art and, defying critical evaluation, become to the beholder a terrifying living experience to which only action can be the response. Only the commentaries of the two artists, appearing as lengthy captions beneath the pictures can convey in words the panels' awful import; only these panels can complete the message of the words. And from the disaster that science and its heartless masters may bring upon us only the conscience of mankind, awakened, roused to action as those Hiroshima panels have the power to do, can save us.

* *The Hiroshima Panels*, by Iri Maruki and Toshiko Maruki. Order through National Guardian Buying Service. \$2.00.

Mr. Durdin and Comrade Kuo

by ELSIE FAIRFAX-CHOLMELEY

THE *Atlantic Monthly* not long ago put out a special issue on "the first ten years of Red China." In the leading article, Tillman Durdin of the *New York Times*, an experienced reporter who knew China, as I did, in the old days of Kuomintang corruption and oppression, admits that "material results . . . have been remarkable and impressive." But he tries to cast a shadow on them by saying that they have been achieved by "methods . . . ruthless, devious, and destructive to traditional human values." This is the super-lie used widely and deliberately to fool the American people into believing that while socialism may be good for producing more machines, food, clothing and shelter (how long the powers-that-be took to admit even this!), it "kills the soul" and turns man into a "slave." Really, that term is much better applied to the newspapermen who trim their tune to please those who own their source of income. How long would the chief Far Eastern correspondent of the *Times* last in his job if he wrote the great human truth of socialist China—that the hope and joy of hundreds of millions, once nameless and disinherited, now raised to dig-

nity and masters of their own future, is behind the material achievements.

Precisely this is what strikes the thousands of travelers who come here from every country in the world—except, alas, the United States whose government does not let them. Description alone cannot convey the new atmosphere. How often we residents in China are chided as I recently was by an Englishman: "I think, living here, you begin to take things for granted. Nothing I have read has prepared me for the spirit of the people—the buoyancy, the confidence, the happiness." And a seasoned Danish woman writer, ultra-conservative in politics, said to me: "Those faces of the people, those smiling faces, can't lie. But how can I write what I've learned? My readers won't believe me." They wouldn't have the chance. Her right-wing paper would not print it, nor would she dare submit it, as she herself told me, lest they put her down as "brain-washed."

The people smile because this new land is their creation and they have flowered with it. Saying this, I think of Kuo Wen-ping, whom I met at a conference in Peking last fall. He was one of 6,000 workers from all over China who gathered in the new Great Hall of the People to exchange experiences, obtain briefings on national production results and plans from the heads of government, and discuss their own problems and plans. Today, still only

ELSIE FAIRFAX-CHOLMELEY who now lives and works in Peking, was correspondent in China of the *London Daily Telegraph* during the Sino-Japanese war. She is the wife of Israel Epstein.

25 years old, Kuo is vice-director of an enamelware factory in Chungking with big newly built shops, 1,500 workers and blocks of three-story apartment buildings for them to live in, which has grown out of a little handicraft backyard operation with 30 workers, where Kuo, ten years ago, began as a boy apprentice.

Then he was a half-starved, illiterate refugee from the poverty-stricken countryside, of the kind that used to die of hunger in millions as a "commonplace" in old China. Now he has educated himself into a chemical engineer, has written a textbook on electrolytic processes in the manufacture of enamelware, and learned two European languages. Confident, friendly and exuberant, he is typical of China's new proletarian intellectuals, without whom her "leaping" industrial advance could not happen. If this is "slavery," Mr. Durdin can make the most of it. As for "destruction of traditional human values" it is true that the tradition of slavery has been smashed, never to return, but the human values have bloomed as never before.

Sitting in the marble-floored lobby of the magnificent building in which the nation's highest congress meets, and in which he now feels a master, Kuo told me of his life.

"My father, a farm laborer with no land of his own, died when I was seven. My sister and I ran around barefoot, almost naked, and always hungry. Mother earned a little money by taking jobs with the rich. I remember how once when she had to leave us alone for several days, there was nothing to eat in the house, I just sat on the earthen

floor whimpering. My sister went out foraging for leaves and grass to boil for soup. That was all we had. When Mother came back, we all cried out our misery together.

"I earned my first pennies almost as soon as I could walk," recalled Kuo, "collecting firewood on the hillsides. My sister used to do laundry in the Yangtze. When she was only nine, she fell into the water, was swept away and drowned.

"I never played and laughed as children should. And when I and the neighbors' boys grew bigger, we often had to sleep out in the open away from home, because we were afraid of being press-ganged into the Kuomintang army. That was worse than poverty because the officers stole the rations, and few lived to come back."

Had things remained as of old, Kuo Wen-ping would now at 25, be half worked to death like his father, if he hadn't, indeed, perished earlier. But the liberation came when he was fourteen. He made his way to an aunt living in Chungking, and near her home was the handicraft workshop making enamel mugs, largely wrecked by Kuomintang soldiers in flight, but with about thirty workers still on the premises. With the help of the new city authorities they were able to restart production at the beginning of 1950 and agreed to take Kuo as a learner. "For the first time in my life I felt a ray of hope which aroused my energies," says Kuo.

Political classes for workers began almost immediately and he joined them. "In discussions with other workers I soon began to understand that the roots of my past suffering lay in the old order of

society. I learned that it was through the long struggle of the toiling people themselves that it had been overthrown. I learned and felt deeply that the new order was our own to guard and develop. So I threw myself into our movement to improve the tools and methods of work. But I was illiterate and could only depend on my fellow-workers for information. It was an accident that opened my eyes, not only to the need to know how to read and write but also to learn elementary physics. I and a friend, not knowing the laws of leverage, tried to shift a heavy bar by brute force. It swung out and hit my head giving me a severe concussion."

Instead of being left to recover or die by himself, as in the old days, Kuo was taken to hospital where he lay for several months, receiving the best medical care available. "What gave me the will to live, work and study more intensely than ever before," he says, "was the concern everyone showed. Leading workers and staff members from our factory frequently came to visit me. They told me of the progress being made, discussed workshop problems, and gave me all kinds of encouragement."

Returning, Kuo worked and studied hard. By 1954 he was able to join the fifth grade of an evening school the factory had just started. He finished primary school in two years but felt this was too slow. So he decided to work on his own through a middle school course, normally another six years, concentrating on mathematics, physics and chemistry. For the next seven months he spent every spare moment at his books. "I used to read

each paragraph again and again," he told me, "until I got the point. I learned all the formulas by heart. But I still seemed to understand very little. I worried so much that I began to have constant headaches."

But the Secretary of the Communist Party in the factory, who had considered Kuo a fine example to all, came to encourage him to persist. "'It makes my head split,' I told him," said Kuo. "But though that was what I answered, I still had a conflict in my mind. I saw how the factory was developing and I was still sure that none of us had the right to remain ignorant. If we didn't learn to run our new machines, no one would do it for us.

"When a comrade with more education was assigned to help me, I took the books out of the drawer. It was still tough. Formulas I learned today, flew out of my head tomorrow. My headaches came back. One of my mates said: 'You'd better rest your brain.' After six months I gave up again."

"But," says young Kuo, "the thoughts crowded in just the same. I'd suddenly think of how, before liberation, my life was no better than an animal's. Now we workers were masters of the country. How could I say things were difficult. I had food, shelter and clothing. Working conditions were good. There was a chance to study. Life had changed but China was still backward. Who would move us ahead?"

He buckled down once more, but this was not the last time he wavered. "It was study, stop, study, stop, but always finally study again," he told me. The Party and fellow-workers with more education always

helped swing the balance in a positive way. He worked heroically to train his memory. "I realized," he said, "that one remembers things one sees all the time or which make a deep impression. So I wrote out formulas on pieces of paper and pinned them on my mosquito net and on the walls. I even wrote them on the backs of my hands so they'd always be in front of me."

Finishing middle school in a couple of years, he went on to college courses which he expects to finish this June.

"Didn't your work suffer?" I asked him. He looked at me in surprise. For the whole purpose of his study was not to "get away" from work, but to make it go better. When, two years ago, a small library of rather advanced books on enamelwork came as a gift to the factory from the German Democratic Republic and Poland, no one in the plant could read them. Kuo decided he must do it. With the help of a dictionary he labelled the words for every piece of equipment in the factory and every one of its materials and products and put them up on his walls. He also hung a list of simple questions on one wall and the answers on the opposite one. "Standing in the middle of the floor I'd ask myself: 'Are you going to dinner?' and turn around to see if I got it right. I told no one what I was up to and such strange sounds came from my room that people looked at me strangely, thinking I was going crazy, until I finally explained," he laughed. Now he has a firm foothold on both languages and, with his dictionaries, can use all the technical references.

Today Kuo is confident, relaxed

and full of gay spirit. "I've been able to put every bit of knowledge I gained over the past ten years to use," he said. "The trouble is, it is still not enough. We need more scientific and technical knowledge. My own experience has shown me how right our Communist Party (he joined in 1953), is in its call on all the people to make themselves both 'Red' and 'Expert.' Red means treasuring, having faith in and carrying on our socialist revolution. It's what moves everything else. But we have to be expert, too, more expert than the capitalists. Of course, I'm still only on the threshold of both."

On his plans: "To deepen my study of science, to broaden my knowledge, learn more languages. I, a former peasant, have come to Peking and can sit in this great hall we have built. Could we have done it yesterday? But we are advanced today only in comparison with the miserable past. We still have a long way to go, and we've all got to learn to get there. We're learning from each other right here."

The bell rang calling him back to the sessions. He got up, smiled and gripped my hand hard. There's your "slave," Mr. Durdin! As for me, I think I met one of the world's new, truly free people. Thousands of them milled around me on their way to their seats. All, in their faces and gait, had Kuo's confidence.

I remembered Mao Tse-tung's remark, "revolution splits the human atom." Sputniks and Luniks fly as socialism's messengers to the universe. Behind them are men and women of Kuo's revolutionary breed. And on our earth too, they aim high, at human values unknown to Mr. Durdin's "tradition."

From Stone Age to Space Age

by ARCHIE JOHNSTONE

THE term Northern Peoples applies to all those formerly backward groups, from the European Lapps to the Asiatic Eskimos, who live on the Arctic Sea coast and its hinterland from the borders of Norway to the Bering Straits—that is, about half-way round the world at this latitude. Some groups live far to the south, for instance, the Tuva of the Altai Mountains whose economy is based not only on the “Arctic” reindeer, but also the camel and yak of central Asia.

The 26 nationalities (some with several mutually-unintelligible dialects that have multiplied the obstacles to their progress) number less than a million, but their territory is much greater than all of Western Europe. Much of this territory is marked “Unexplored” in pre-Revolution maps.

They are in themselves, immensely interesting people but—with a word of apology to the many Evenks, Mansi, Nentsi, Komi and others I have met in east and west Siberia and northern Europe—the main interest in them lies in the object-lesson which their recent history presents to the world today, and especially to those in Africa and elsewhere who claim that “backward-

ness” is something innate, immutable, and perhaps even divinely decreed—and, of course, a statesmanly justification for the withholding of equal citizenship.

It is true that these peoples, if left to themselves in their shaman-ridden isolation, could never have compressed a hundred centuries of progress into less than half a century. But the Russian philologists, anthropologists and others who have helped in this transformation are the first to stress that its real basis was the innate intelligence (as distinct from acquired knowledge) of these peoples. What they lacked was light, not sight.

“We have given them the first essential tool of modern knowledge—literacy—and now they’re getting on with the job themselves.” Professor Voskoboynikov, one of the pioneer philologists in this field, told me.

I had a glimpse of how they’re “getting on with the job themselves” when I visited the Northern Peoples faculty of the Hertzen Institute in Leningrad, where several hundred young people from Arctic communities are being trained for educational work (in the widest possible sense of the term) in their own regions. Graduates of this institute and of others in Leningrad, Novosibirsk and Khabarovsk have already attained country-wide distinction in many spheres, including the higher reaches of physics that take us into Outer Space. Several members of the

ARCHIE JOHNSTONE has lived in the USSR since 1947. Formerly editor of the British Embassy newspaper in Moscow, he now writes for a number of British and U.S. publications. A collection of his articles, *Ivan the Not-So-Terrible*, was published in 1958.

Supreme Soviet are from the Northern Peoples.

To say that most of these peoples were illiterate before the Revolution gives little real idea of their state. They had no written language to be literate in. They didn't even have an alphabet of their own. Many had never even heard of written speech.

Thus for a long time the only possible teachers-to-be were the few Russians who had spent years among the Northern Peoples not only compiling vocabularies but also discovering the rules of languages whose users had no idea that they followed grammatical rules when they spoke. I am told that this was a heart-breaking task: I can well believe it.

And the task is not nearly completed. One snag can be illustrated by a now-classical example. Missionaries to a northern tribe who had never even heard of sheep translated "Lamb of God" as "Little Seal of God," but when they came to the New Testament injunction "Feed my sheep" they were stumped: one does not "feed" seals!

Another classic example—reminding us that the languages of "simple" people are not simple or easy to learn—is the Eskimo sentence-word—

Savigikiniariartokasuarmaryotitogog

which means, "He says that you also will go away quickly in a like manner and buy a pretty knife." The final "og" means "he says," but, it cannot stand alone as a word. Nor can most of the other components of this jaw-breaker.

A more serious snag, common to almost all the northern tongues is that abstract terms—most of them essential to a proper understanding

of our complex, highly-organized modern life—are practically non-existent. Only after an abstraction has been explained in concrete terms, which is no easy job, can it be given a name, either imported or built up from existing native words.

Names for modern concrete objects present less difficulty, but even in the same small language group you find that the fishermen and sea-hunters call an airplane a bird-boat while their reindeer-men neighbors ("neighbors" can be hundreds of miles apart) call it a winged sleigh.

Even half a century ago when their economic development was not far ahead of that of the reindeer-men of central Europe following the last Ice Age, their keen intelligence surprised the rare explorers and traders who visited them. They put to thousands of ingenious uses everything that a very unbounteous Nature placed within their reach.

Though illiterate they were "literary" in their deep love for the folk-stories and legends which gave at least an allegorical account of the history of their race and of the creation of the world. They were also the creators of many works of "spoken fiction"—stories told about their own life and surroundings. Many of these stories have now been preserved in written form; several have been published.

They were also—and still are—an extremely artistic people. Their carvings, embroideries in the weirdest assortment of materials, and pictures are astonishingly beautiful. (The Ethnographical Museum in Leningrad, by the way, is a must for visitors interested in these matters.)

A curious feature of their art is that although some of the nationali-

ties have a better sense of perspective than much more "advanced" cultures, they seem to lack the simple technique of shading to give a three-dimensional effect to some everyday object. Even today Northern children often dismiss as unreal a shaded drawing. This, I am told, is probably due to the extremely diffused light and the absence of well-defined shadows, even in the brief summer.

•
Today their lives are full of strange contrasts and contradictions. Here are some of the examples given to me by Northern students at various institutes and by anthropologists and other scientists in this field:

The younger generation tends to laugh at those of its elders who, even when they have learned to work and maintain certain machines, treat their charges as if they were well-loved animals, or even humans. They are not merely careful of their machines, they are *kind* to them, speak encouragingly to them, pity them if they are "in trouble" and so on.

People who have never seen a horse or a cart are quite familiar with airplanes and helicopters. Several Northerners are pilots of airliners.

Many skilled carpenters who work with "imported" sawn timber have never seen a tree larger than the knee-high trees of the tundra.

To induce children to attend school, teachers used to hand out pipes and tobacco. It was once quite common to see a mother giving her babe-in-arms (or on her back, papoose-style) alternate draws at her pipe.

A herd of 1,000 reindeer needs 300 square miles of moss pasture a year. A teacher with his school-tent, goes with the herdsman and their families on their months-long circuit of the pastures.

The Nanai word "mapa" means man, or male, or husband, or bear. The word for "swan" is pronounced "cuckoo." There is no word for "law" or "government" and the title given to the Soviet regime is a word meaning "custom."

An 18-year-old Khanti girl was recently acclaimed champion hunter of the USSR.

The names which nationalities gave themselves were often variations of Ourselves, We, the True People, Brothers, etc. Their better-known names (now largely abandoned) were given by outsiders and were usually offensive—The Dumb Ones, the Bubblers, etc. (because their language was incomprehensible).

Although the 26 nationalities have many features in common that link them in an east-to-west chain, their anthropological ties run mainly southward. The Lapps (now Saami), Mansi and Nentsi are branches of the Ugro-Finnish language group which includes the Estonians, Hungarians and Finns.

Despite their language link with Europe, the Lapps have songs indicating that their ancestors lived near Lake Baikal, thousands of miles to the east. Also, they have the broadest skull-ratio of all the Northern Peoples.

Many of the Mansi I met were blonde. Some of the girls looked "typically British."

During the centuries when wars, invasions and counter-invasions

swept over Southern Siberia and Russia the Northern Peoples remained at peace with their neighbors.

At any get-together in the teepee-type *chooms*, stockade-like *balagans* and marquee-size *yarangas* and *yurtas*, the main, and almost inexhaustible, topic of conversation is hunting, fishing and shooting—as in the stately homes of England!

Recent researches have established many more anthropological links between the Mongoloid northerners of Asia and the "Indians" of North and South America. Whether there was ever a land-bridge between NE Asia and NW America remains an open question.

With the dramatic decline in infant mortality and the widely-ramified health service, the once sharply-declining population is increasing rapidly. Thanks mainly to the better-balanced and more varied diet, the women are much slimmer than their mothers were. Both men and women age much more slowly.

Helicopters, storm-warning systems and other innovations have sharply reduced the once-heavy toll of life among seal- and walrus-hunters on drifting ice.

The atomic ice-breaker Lenin and its successors will make the Arctic Seaway an even greater means of lateral communication for the Northern Peoples.

A Khanti student told me: "Some of the old folk still tell stories about the magical powers of the shamans. It would teach them a lot if they could be taken to see Kio." (Kio is the great Soviet illusionist who had a big success in England.)

An Evenk told me: "The only

bath my father had in his first twenty years was when he was a newborn babe—as was the custom then, he was licked clean by a husky. This dog hardy ever left his side. It guarded him from wolves and other dangers when he lay asleep and walked beside him when he was learning to toddle to give him a "crutch." In some tribes baby-sitter dogs are trained to rock the swinging cradle when the baby cries. Shades of Nana, the nursemaid-dog in "Peter Pan"!

I doubt if anywhere in the world there are dogs with so self-possessed, businesslike and purposeful a bearing as the hunters' huskies I saw in the Tuff territory (East Siberia) last year. Even when off-duty they seem to be proudly aware of their responsible role in the life of the community. The Tuffs by the way, are just as tough as their huskies are husky: a boy of ten who hasn't killed a bear unaided is considered a bit of a sissy.

Although the Siberian Husky (as is recognized by the American Kennel Club) is a distinct breed—rather longer-legged than the Malamute and Eskimo breeds of North America—they vary greatly in size and color.

For example, in the Komi country they are fox-red; in Yakutia they are pure white; my own husky, from the Lower Ob, was black, silver and white.

In the old days after long periods of hunger the coast-dwellers could consume 10 lbs. of meat a day: the new generation has lost this "ability."

One Tungus dance, to the accompaniment of a chorus's rhythmic grunting, is said to ante-date the

"invention" of singing, perhaps even of speech.

Although there are traces of a loose feudal system in the history of some of the tribes, most of them have skipped all the intermediate stages between primitive communism and modern communism.

Northern students get only half the usual stipend, but the state pays for all their food, clothing, accommodation and fares home for their annual vacations.

In addition to the traditional land and sea hunting, fishing and reindeer breeding (now largely mechanized and scientifically directed and collectively run), the Northern Peoples now work the many new mines (coal, iron, oil, lead, wolfram, nickel, lithium, gold, diamonds, etc.) and the new agricultural, food-preserving, chemical and other industries in their regions.

The many "synthetic" alphabets created for the Northern Peoples are all based phonetically on the Russian alphabet, with numerous

additional characters (for sounds not represented in any existing alphabet).

In all of the higher grades children are taught all subjects except their own language in Russian, and now Russian is the means of communication not only between the language groups but between dialect groups.

This system—attacked in the early days by fanatical "anti-pan-Russianists"—has proved its worth a hundred times over. It opens the doors to all Russia's store of knowledge, and through it, to the world's store.

And it won't remain a one-way borrowing of knowledge. Already several Northern writers—notably Ritkhev of Chukotka whom many English readers love—have written works that have been translated into many Soviet and foreign languages.

I am looking forward to the time when some of the keen-eyed Northern lads and lassies whom I have met will get together and compile an authoritative work on the Northern Peoples.

ARTISTS IN CHINA

SIR HERBERT READ, in Washington to attend the Congress of Artists and Writers where he reported on his recent month's visit to People's China as a guest of the Chinese Government, talked to reporters about his experiences and observations in China.

He said that most Chinese writers and painters support themselves by teaching, working in publishing houses, of which there are an exceptional number, or illustrating books.

In the universities, Sir Herbert reported, there were large departments of art, architecture and archeology. Architecture is taught in the most practical way; he found the students actually participating in the building of the new Peking Opera House, not just making projects and models in the class rooms.

When he was asked if he had sensed any resistance by artists towards the revolution, Sir Herbert replied:

"I had the overwhelming impression that the artists, like the people, were fanatically devoted to what they regarded as a re-creation of their society, a re-creation that transcends politics."

The New York Times, April 19.

Economic Consequences of Disarmament

by VICTOR PERLO

THERE won't be any economic consequences if we don't have disarmament. If the people leave it to big business to decide when they must accept some disarmament, if ever, Wall Street will call the tune and determine some major consequences.

If the people fight for peace and disarmament, and become the driving power that finally forces the government to accept real disarmament, they will be in a stronger position to influence corresponding economic policies. Such policies, expressed in a people's program that meets the needs and stirs the souls of tens of millions, can help mobilize a vast force for peace in America.

There are two weaknesses in the typical liberal approach to disarmament. First, there is no fight for disarmament to accompany the presentation of an economic program—often excellent, but futile without the prior struggle.

Second, they concentrate on economic "planning" of construction projects, as if everything were a technical problem. There are plenty of blueprints. What is needed is political "planning" to win the needed policies.

VICTOR PERLO is the author of *Empire of High Finance*, published by International Publishers. His forthcoming book *USA and USSR: The Economic Race* will also be published by International.

Some trade unions, liberal economists, columnists like Sylvia Porter, concentrate on the six and a half million getting employment out of the cold war, on preventing some "disaster" from "unplanned" disarmament.

I concentrate my attention on the 13 million jobs that can be won by the American people out of the fight for disarmament.

I say flatly—there will be no disaster from disarmament! True, if left to big business, not much good will come out of it either for the people. But if the people pick up the ball, a tremendous amount of good can come out of it.

Disarmament is the greatest opportunity of the century. It is no danger.

So far as the business cycle is concerned, it will permit new stimulating forces to become decisive, in place of the worn-out cold war stimuli. If released, these can spark general economic advance for a considerable period. But even if not, even if profits are reduced and growth slows, disarmament can mean better living conditions and less unemployment.

It opens the way to realizing Roosevelt's Bill of Rights. This was a great charter won by the American people in the battles against monopolies at home during the 1930's and against fascism abroad during World War II. Here it is:

In our days these economic truths have become accepted as self-evident.

We have accepted . . . a second Bill of Rights under which a new basis of security and prosperity may be established for all—regardless of station, race or creed.

The right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries, or shops or farms or mines of the nation.

The right to earn enough to provide adequate food and clothing and recreation.

The rights of farmers and small business men to earn a living without unfair monopoly competition.

The right of every family to a decent home.

The right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health.

The right to a good education.

Those rights were promised the people with peace. The promise was betrayed by armament profiteers, by international oil combines, by peanut politicians, by short-sighted labor leaders. The people got no peace. The people got no economic Bill of Rights.

If we finally force the peace, we can force the delivery of the Bill of Rights too.

There are many points in the detailed economic program for disarmament to realize the Bill of Rights. I have selected just three of them.

Housing

Have you read the chamber of horrors described by the enterprising *World-Telegram* and *Sun* reporter Woody Klein, of the desperate struggle for existence in the modern city jungles of downtrodden millions?

Of the rats and roaches and filth and cold, the leaks and the crashing whiskey bottles?

Do you know that the number of slums in America is increasing

all the time? That there are 15 million substandard dwelling units, inhabited by 50 million people?

The AFL-CIO says that to overcome this by 1975 we must have 2.3 million housing units built yearly, or 35 million in the 15 years. Of these, it implies, 900,000 yearly must be low-cost public housing: "A large-scale, low-rent public housing program to provide decent homes for low-income families . . . must be the cornerstone of the nation's housing effort." (from *Labor's Economic Review*, Sept., 1959.)

And this would also be the cornerstone of all the public construction programs that must come in with disarmament.

Nine hundred thousand units would cost \$12 billion, of which the cost to the government for capital payments and operating subsidies would amount to about one-fifth, or \$2.5 billion. The remainder would be borrowed through regular private channels used for public housing programs. The \$2.5 billion of direct outlay amounts to barely 5 per cent of the military budget. For the fifteen years it will take less than we spend on the military in a single year. And for that, we can house everybody in America decently!

The housing program ties in with the two main social and economic questions facing Americans today.

The first is civil rights. In view of the dubious record of the AFL-CIO on this front, I was pleasantly surprised to note the forthright way in which they put the question:

Housing conditions are especially bad for Negroes. Despite the atrocious dwelling in which minority families are forced to live, the acute shortage of housing they can obtain, even of the worst quality, has forced them to pay

very high rents even for the most unsanitary, decrepit kinds of shelter.

To help provide equal housing opportunity, the Federal Government should assure an opportunity to obtain adequate housing to all families without regard to race, color, creed or national origin. This will require that all housing built with the aid of Federal funds or credit or any other form of financial assistance should be made available to minority families on an equal basis with all other families.

Secondly, it ties in with economic competition with the USSR. The Soviet Union has less housing space per family than we have. But they built 3 million housing units in 1959. They will rehouse 88 million people during the seven-year plan. Everybody will have plenty of room in good, modern dwellings by 1970. Considering our smaller population and smaller growth in population, and larger average housing unit, the 2.3 million units per year goal of the AFL-CIO would make a good competition with the Soviet effort. Let's do it promptly. To the Senators screaming about a missile gap, I say: Let us prevent a housing gap!

And let me point this out. Because of the leverage provided by use of private mortgage and bond money for most of the funds, the budget dollars devoted to low-cost housing go very far indeed in providing jobs. The 900,000 per year of low-cost units will provide 1,800,000 jobs, or 45 per cent of all civilian employment connected with the arms program.

Shorter Work-Week

There has been a chorus of propaganda against the shorter work-week associated with cold war thinking. In 1957 Walter Reuther soft-pedaled

the UAW drive for a shorter work-week because, he claimed, the Soviet Sputnik forced everybody to work harder to avoid falling behind the USSR.

Of course, the auto companies laughed at this. Even while he was arguing this position, they were laying off hundreds of thousands of auto workers, and the final touch was in 1960, when they surpassed 1957 production with many fewer workers, through general practice of overtime, that is, of more than 40 hours per week, and the worst speed-up in a quarter of a century.

General Electric Corporation, in its post-Sputnik propaganda, went even further. It suggested that workers should have to sacrifice by working 48 hours per week at the same pay they now get for 40 hours. Employers, of course, would have to have profits maintained or increased, so that they would have plenty to invest in more defense production to compete with the USSR. That would be their "sacrifice."

Finally Nelson Rockefeller in 1959, speaking to the state AFL-CIO convention, claimed that for the last three decades the working week had been cut three and a half hours per decade, and that this process must stop to permit successful economic competition with the USSR.

The actual history is that American labor was the pioneer in fighting for the shorter work-week, all the way back to 1887. And in winning it. From 1890 to 1940 there was a cut of 20 hours in the work-week, or four hours per decade. Then there has been none at all during the last two decades. War and cold war stopped the progress cold, and through overtime and "moon-

lighting," the actual work-week averages more today than two decades ago.

America's leadership in winning a shorter work-week is in danger.

In Britain, the conservative TUC is demanding a cut from 48 to 40 hours, citing the example of other countries, including the example of the 35-hour week planned in the USSR.

Yes, the USSR is now almost down to 40 hours per week and in another two or three years will get ahead of us if we stand still. American labor is twice as productive as British and Soviet labor. It is entitled to a shorter work-week. It needs it for holding onto jobs and adding to them.

The Russians cut the work-week 6 hours in five years and sent up Sputniks and Luniks at the same time.

Perhaps if we match the Russians in reducing the work-week, we will match them also in the size and quality of our sputniks.

How about that, Mr. Reuther!

East-West Trade

For many years leaders of American high finance were worried about their allies' "dollar gap." Now they are worried about their own dollar gap. Thanks to the cold war the American balance of payments is running the unprecedented deficit of \$4 billion yearly, and everybody is afraid the almighty dollar may be unpinched—devalued—dethroned.

The one and only solution is to end the cold war, and its six-billion yearly drain on the balance of payments. And at the same time disarmament will open the greatest opportunity in our history for rebuild-

ing foreign trade into a major economic growth factor.

Already East-West trade has been of crucial value to Britain, and other European countries, and to many raw material producing countries in providing markets, avoiding currency devaluations, and providing supplies of needed materials and equipment for industrialization.

Look at the picture. The socialist countries have 36 per cent of the population of the world outside the United States, 45 per cent of its industrial production, and 70 per cent of its economic growth. That means they provide at least as large a potential market as the entire capitalist world, outside the United States—a market that is racing upwards with its Soviet Seven-Year Boots and Chinese Leaps Forward—a market that buys above all things the kinds of specialized, major machinery which no country can produce like the United States!

We can sell as much to that market as to the entire rest of the world. Simple arithmetic says we can sell it \$15-\$20 billion yearly. That could be the most important peacetime growth factor for the American economy in a number of decades.

But everybody has been indoctrinated with a half-dozen reasons why it supposedly won't work.

Let's look at the facts. In seven years, 1952-59, East-West trade jumped from \$3 billion to \$8 billion. And it's growing more rapidly than ever. Only Americans got none of it. In terms of our economic position, we should get one-third or one-fourth.

Of course there are difficulties. Let's consider them seriously and

accurately — and not one-sidedly.

It is said that the socialist countries have nothing to sell us; they sell mainly raw materials and foodstuffs, and we have substitutes.

The answer is: So does almost everybody else sell us mainly raw materials and foodstuffs, which comprise 70 per cent of all our imports! What's more, in view of increasing relative exhaustion of our own low-cost supplies in comparison with our growing use, the demands for foreign raw materials and foodstuffs of certain types will tend to grow. Take away discriminatory laws and regulations and the socialist countries will win a good share of it. This may be disadvantageous to American companies who have invested in Brazil and Turkey to make profits out of cutting off of Soviet manganese and chrome, but it will be beneficial to the United States generally.

Chinese exports to us in the years 1926-30 exceeded those of Mexico, France, India, Australia. If poverty stricken China could ship us \$150 million yearly of bristles, tungsten, antimony, carpet wool and other items in the 1920's, how many times more could modern, on-surging China send us today?

Moreover, the quantity of our exports need not be limited to that of our imports from socialist countries. Undoubtedly, with the progress of disarmament, normal terms for export of capital goods will be resumed, and these include credits of substantial period, and in some cases long period.

Moreover, the USSR may send some gold, as it is a very large producer and has supplies, and has sent significant amounts to other coun-

tries. Even such an inveterate anti-Soviet propagandist as Henry Luce rubs his hands at the prospect of getting Soviet gold, now that he worries about the backing of the dollar. *Fortune* editorializes: "The more gold the Russians release to the West, the better for free multilateral trade carried on by private enterprise."

And the multilateral trade is another means by which the socialist countries may be expected to buy more from us than they sell us, in turn selling more to countries with which we traditionally have a net import surplus.

Another argument against East-West trade is that the USSR has a state trading monopoly, which is unfair competition with our free enterprise. Our poor, delicate, defenseless flower of free enterprise! Like the international oil cartel, which handles twenty times as much oil in international trade as the Soviet trading monopoly.

Of the same quality is the charge of socialist country dumping. A fine charge for an American to make, when the U.S. Government practices systematic dumping that surpasses the dumping of all other governments combined. In fact, there is every evidence that the USSR does not engage in dumping, according to any reasonable, moderate description of the term. Here is the *Journal of Commerce* description, written last October 20, of the outcome of the trade agreement concluded in 1959 between Britain and the Soviet Union:

"The Russians are pursuing a pricing policy which has silenced all fears of dumping, but which is consistent with the drive to earn as much sterling as possible."

These and other arguments are motivated politically and by special interests of armaments, oil and foreign, colonial-type investment. They are not valid. The fact is that East-West trade has a potential of many billions, as previously indicated. And I think that in the space of a four-year program of complete and total disarmament, American trade with the socialist world could rise to \$5 billion yearly on the export side—and go on from there in succeeding decades.

Program Summary

Let us draw up a balance sheet of our disarmament program in terms of jobs. There are now roughly 6.5 million people employed on account of the munitions budget—including 2.5 million in the armed forces, 3 million engaged in production and construction, and 1 million civilians employed by the armed forces and at AEC establishments.

Our housing program will provide jobs for 1.8 million. Other public works, which we haven't gone into, will provide another 1.8 million. The 35-hour week will mean an additional 4 million jobs. East-West trade and other measures to advance trade will account for a million jobs. That makes a total of

8.5 million jobs, or 2 million more than are available through the cold war. And that isn't all.

A major part of the program is to end poverty in America through higher minimum wages and the establishment of minimum family incomes, fair employment practices, a program of national health insurance, improved social security, and a GI Bill of Rights for former munitions workers.

The higher purchasing power of the people resulting from these measures will increase domestic markets enough to provide another 5 million jobs.

All this means that the grand total will be 13.5 million, or double those now in cold war jobs. It will keep all of these people employed, take care of existing unemployment, and the growth in the labor force for several years to come.

In summary, disarmament will not automatically solve our economic problems. But it will create a climate in which they can be solved.

The American people can take advantage of this climate, and create it by fighting for disarmament, to improve their lot markedly within the framework of horizons they themselves have established in past political and economic activities and battles.

AN AIRPLANE NAMED "POETRY"

"POETRY" is the name of the plane to be bought with the donation that was sent to Cuba by Chinese poets in answer to an appeal to the poets of the world by the Spanish poet Rafael Alberti and the Cuban poet Nicolas Guillen.

The Cuban newspaper *Hoy*, commenting on the gift, said, "A donation of poets has been received from China, the great country where the Chairman and leader of the Revolution is a poet. This is another act of friendship for and recognition of the Cuban Revolution from the center of new-born Asia . . . showing that Cuba is not alone in its just fight for independence and national honor."

PEACE TRENDS IN U.S. LABOR

CONTINUING our survey of U.S. peace groups and trends, it should be noted that during this past month, prior to the Summit conference, pressures for disarmament and the ending of nuclear tests and other peace activities have been accelerated by such groups as the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, the Quakers and others whose work was reviewed in our two previous issues.

Some of the main peace activities scheduled for May such as California's "Little Summit" meeting, and SANE's Madison Square Garden Rally, will serve to direct the thoughts of many thousands of Americans toward constructive solutions at the Summit conference. Yet how far we are from being able to mobilize any demonstration comparable to the great Aldermaston Easter march of the British people, climaxed by the 120,000-strong meeting in Trafalgar Square! The most serious deterrent to the achievement of a broader and more vigorous peace movement in this country is, of course, the AFL-CIO cold-war approach to international affairs. The tragic result of this is that the official preparations of organized labor for the Summit conference amounted to an effort to insure its failure rather than its success.

AFL-CIO Conference on World Affairs

For this conference, held in New York April 19-20, with the stated purpose of helping to "provide for

direction for U.S. foreign policy on the eve of the Summit," President George Meany rounded up a roster of military and big business figures known for their advocacy of cold and preventive war. The limited discussion allowed from the floor, however, showed that even among the scant 200 top-officials comprising the labor part of the audience, there was at least some misgiving about the backward world political outlook to which they themselves still lend support.

Conference chairman George M. Harrison, President of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks opened the proceedings by warning of "the seriousness of the Communist threat to human freedom, to our national security and to world peace."

Meany, in his keynote speech, proclaimed that labor "knows the score"—the score being that "The threat to human survival and progress stems from one source and one source only—Soviet Russia." Urging no "appeasement" of the Soviet Union, he declared that we must serve notice on Mr. Khrushchev "that the free world will proceed, at whatever cost, to achieve overwhelming superiority—militarily, economically and technologically . . . Only then will the danger of war be reduced. . ." Calling for an America armed to the teeth, for a Dulles policy of inflexibility, he yet managed to wind up with the statement that the trade union movement believed in negotiations with the Soviet Union and controlled reduction of armaments.

Major General J. B. Medaris, form-

er commander U. S. Army Missile Agency, got a standing ovation after his speech. He criticized the Administration for its "over-kill" policy, said we had plenty of bombs and missiles but not enough bombers; he advocated a global aerial striking power whenever American interests were endangered, and a mobile army corps for a "swift limited war."

Dr. Henry A. Kissinger of Harvard, limited nuclear war advocate, spoke like a mouthpiece of Adenauer (who sent a greeting to the conference), warned of the dangers of relaxation and disengagement, and declared Europe could not be defended without Germany.

Prof. David N. Rowe of Yale University, did the honors for the China Lobby and Chiang Kai-shek.

The only address lacking the anti-Communist line was that of Dr. Ernest C. Grigg, chief of the United National Community Development Group, the only Negro guest speaker. He urged the elimination of colonialist concepts about Africa, understanding of the great social changes there taking place and a positive attitude toward them.

At the dinner concluding the conference, Douglas Dillon, Under Secretary of State, set forth the views of that part of the Administration which seems determined to reach no accommodation with the Soviet Union on any issue. He cast doubts on the good faith of the Soviet Union, spoke of its "grave and continuing threats to peace," declared America would not permit "the courageous people of Berlin to be sold into slavery," and altogether expressed the most pessimistic views of anything being accomplished at the Summit, (views which indeed, his own speech could

only bolster if it truly expressed U.S. policy).

Peace Trends in U.S. Labor Begin to Emerge

The one hopeful note at the CIO-AFL Conference was the opposition to the official policy expressed from the floor, however weakly, which showed the rifts in the united cold war policy Meany and his henchman, Jay Lovestone, had hoped to achieve.

A. H. Raskin, *New York Times* labor reporter, wrote on April 20 that Meany's position "stirred immediate dissent from leaders of the CIO. They voiced belief that the time had come for more stress on disarmament and peaceful coexistence."

Al Hartnett, IUE Secretary-Treasurer, received a warm reaction to his proposal that reciprocal US-USSR trade union visits would help to ease world tensions, although Meany angrily answered that such fraternizing would be a "betrayal of free unionists." IUE President James Carey made some rather confused statements in which he seemed to wish to disassociate himself from the Meany policy while at the same time agreeing with it. UAW President Walter Reuther also seemed to be backing slightly away from a cold-war position in speaking of disarmament and the urgency of bringing People's China back into the family of nations. Victor Reuther, of the AFL-CIO International Affairs Committee, took exception to a speech on Latin America, attacking the "oversimplification" of "attributing all trouble in Latin America and elsewhere to communism."

A fresh breeze blew through the conference when Evelyn McGarr, of

the Montreal IUE, taking the floor after General Medaris' speech, said:

In Canada the labor movement is working for world peace and negotiations. We consider that the funds used for building bigger bombs can serve better purposes in meeting the needs of the people.

Prior to the conference, cracks were already beginning to show, at various levels of the AFL-CIO foreign policy edifice. Within the UAW itself, Reuther's attitude contrasts with that of Secretary-Treasurer Emil Mazey, who, at a conference on "Labor's Stake in Peace" sponsored by the Chicago American Friends Service Committee in late February, called for an end to nuclear weapons tests, for universal disarmament, and for recognition of the Chinese People's Republic and its admission to the UN. Addressing a Detroit Sane Nuclear Policy rally in late April, Mazey repeated his Chicago speech in full and criticized labor leaders for not having mobilized their membership for peace in advance of the Summit meeting. He expressed his disappointment over the speeches at the AFL-CIO World Affairs Conference: "There was no balanced program presented and it certainly was not the kind of discussion we needed at this time."

Further down the UAW scale, the need to enlarge labor's role as a peace force has been under examination for some time. Carl Stellato, president of Local 600 at the giant Ford River Rouge plant, who plans to run for Congress, wrote last December in the union paper:

The labor movement must keep abreast and be a part of history as it is being made. Now is the time when we in the labor movement can be captains of our fate and help steer events into chan-

nels for peace; to do anything else . . . would be detrimental to the best interests of the workers of our nation. . . .

Other sections of U.S. labor throughout the country have started slowly up the road toward peaceful coexistence.

An editorial in *Carpenter*, official monthly of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, in late 1959 stated that it was almost incredible that peace should be a matter of fear and that all that was required was "a little of the same zeal for waging peace that we always show for waging war." The editorial favored a substitute program for arms expenditures, one that would channel funds for construction of schools, hospitals, and other such projects to meet the people's needs.

The Minneapolis AFL-CIO central labor body in mid-February stated in its official organ, *Labor Review*, that establishment of a U.S. Department of Peace, with a Secretary in the presidential cabinet, would be a far greater aid to world peace than would boasting of our atomic power.

The International Woodworkers of America adopted a resolution at its convention for exchange of union delegates with the USSR.

The National Maritime Union will send a three-man delegation headed by president Joseph Curran to visit the Soviet Union in July. In accepting the invitation of the Sea and River Workers' Union, Curran wrote:

It is only on the basis of people meeting face to face and examining each others' work and conditions without restrictions and with a free and open mind that the tensions existing throughout the world can be diminished. . . . We look forward with keen anticipation to this visit and hope it can further the development

of genuine understanding between our people and our two countries which is so essential to the maintenance of world peace.

The Amalgamated Clothing Workers call to its convention May 30th at Miami Beach has stressed that "attainment of peace is the overriding problem." Signed by President Jacob Potofsky and Secretary-Treasurer Frank Rosenblum, it read in part:

A peaceful solution must be found to ease international tensions, lest the world be destroyed by the products of its own science. A necessary step toward achievement of this solution is the development of a sound and universal disarmament program as speedily as possible.

The Amalgamated's local and joint board organizations have given serious consideration to the important 10-point program of the 1960 Campaign for Disarmament, reprinted in full in *Advance*, organ of the Union.

The *Advance* also carried a report of discussions at ACW meetings led by Stewart Meacham (former assistant to Potofsky, and present head of the Labor International Affairs Commission of the American Friends Service Committee) who urged union pressure on the U.S. Government in behalf of peace.

While there are not many examples as yet of cooperation by organized labor groups with the broad peace movement, the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy sponsor list at least includes three trade union leaders—Patrick E. Gorman, International Secretary-Treasurer, Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen; O. A. Knight, President, Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers, and Walter Reuther.

The Independent Unions

The International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, led by Harry Bridges, has constantly differed with AFL-CIO leadership on international relations. Not only after they tendered warm greetings to Premier Khrushchev when he visited San Francisco, the union's executive council adopted resolutions in favor of a Summit meeting, cessation of nuclear weapons tests, denial of nuclear weapons to any German state, exchange of trade union delegations between the USA and the USSR, China, and other Socialist countries. It called for gradual relaxation of the trade boycott and steps toward elimination "of obstacles to the full and complete exchange of goods between all nations of the world." The ILWU sent a 3-man delegation to the Soviet Union in late 1959 (see March NWR for their report). They conferred with the U.S. Embassy in Moscow and found that these diplomatic officials did not agree with Meany as to the non-existence of Soviet trade unions. The ILWU was the first American trade union to send a delegation to the USSR since the cold war began. A second group of its officials subsequently were delegate guests of the East German trade unions.

Impetus stemming from the ILWU pro-peace stand is discernible in noteworthy peace activities of organized labor on the West Coast, particularly those of the San Francisco Labor Council and its affiliates. In connection with an all-day conference of 123 delegates held in early January, questionnaires were distributed, for priority listing of specific

issues President Eisenhower should call to Congressional attention. When the count was taken, a surprise write-in issue—A Fair World Peace—topped the list. The Building Trades delegates moved for a broader conference, held in mid-March, which called on U.S. labor to back "a program of ending nuclear tests, cutting armed forces, slowing our war machines," and for participation in a "great nationwide public debate dealing with the transition to a peacetime economy."

The opinion of organized labor in South Clara County, California, was publicized in mid-March by James P. Loughlin, president of its Central Labor Council, when he stated that the U.S. should "set the

example for the good of world peace" by permanently discontinuing nuclear testing" regardless of what Russia does. He also advocated recognition of People's China.

The 1960 political program of the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America which, like the ILWU, is outside the AFL-CIO, puts primary emphasis on peace, calling for an end to the crushing burden of huge armaments and stressing that a reduction of government expenditures for military purposes "offers no threat to jobs and wages of working people." Both the UE and the ILWU are conducting continuing studies on economic problems of disarmament.

Prepared by NWR Research Department

TO THE MEN AT THE SUMMIT

PEOPLE THE WORLD OVER look to you the representatives of the most powerful nations to reduce and eliminate the massive danger to human life represented by a nuclear arms race in an atmosphere of rising world tensions. The present situation requires genuine leadership. We urge you to give effective disarmament first consideration in your historic meeting. In particular, we are looking to you to resolve the few difficulties that stand in the way of a treaty ending nuclear weapons tests. This achievement would be hailed by all people as a tangible step toward durable peace. At this narrow place in human history, you have an unprecedented opportunity. We wish you success.

Lester Pearson <i>Canada</i>	Max Born <i>Germany</i>	Martin Niemöller <i>Germany</i>
Brock Chisholm <i>Canada</i>	Shinzo Hamai <i>Mayor, Hiroshima</i>	Lord Boyd Orr <i>United Kingdom</i>
Bertrand Russell <i>United Kingdom</i>	Canon L. John Collins <i>United Kingdom</i>	Norman Thomas <i>United States</i>
Philip Noel-Baker <i>United Kingdom</i>	Martin Luther King <i>United States</i>	Ilya Ehrenburg <i>U.S.S.R.</i>
Clarence Pickett <i>United States</i>	Abbe Pierre <i>France</i>	Martin Buber <i>Israel</i>
Andre Trocme <i>France</i>	C. Rajagopalachari <i>India</i>	Carlos P. Romulo <i>Philippines</i>
Pablo Casals <i>Puerto Rico</i>	Norman Cousins <i>United States</i>	

This statement appeared in the New York Times, May 13.

The statement is being circulated in the U.S. by American Friends Service Committee, Fellowship of Reconciliation, Friends Committee on National Legislation, National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, United World Federalists.

The Great Chain of Progress

by EDGAR P. YOUNG

AN INTERESTING example of the "chain reaction" effect of economic aid given to underdeveloped countries on the lines advocated by Premier Khrushchev during his visit to India, and as practiced for several years past by the USSR, and more recently by other countries of the socialist bloc, has been given by Bulgaria and China.

As recently as 1957, the present writer when visiting Bulgaria had the privilege of being one of the first "Westerners" to see the vast new non-ferrous mining enterprise, among the largest and most up-to-date of its kind in Europe, which had then just been established in the Rhodope Mountains with the help of the USSR.

The very next year, in March 1958, the Bulgarian state organization *MINPROEKT* secured contracts for the establishment of two such enterprises in China, for which all the plant and machinery were to be manufactured in Bulgaria.

Two years have passed since then, and on February 24 of this year the first of these contracts was completed. At Si-din, in the Kwangsi-chuang Autonomous Region of South China, the Vice Chairman of the Regional People's Council, Fu Yu-tien, formally took over from *MINPROEKT*, in the presence of the Bulgarian Ambassador to China,

Peter Panchevsky, and his commercial counsellor Ivan Palov, a lead-zinc mining enterprise, comprised of two underground workings and one surface working, a modern flotation plant capable of handling 400 tons of ore daily and extracting from it 15-20 tons of lead concentrate and 80-90 tons of zinc concentrate, and a modern village to house the workers, with necessary public services (sanitation, water, electricity), and with generous social facilities, such as are to be found in what used to be "the wilds" of the Bulgarian Rhodope Mountains.

The plans for all this were worked out by Bulgarians, on the basis of their own recent experience, in the short period of five months; all the plant and machinery (the new enterprise is highly mechanized) was made in Bulgaria; all the "know-how" was passed on to the Chinese from Bulgarians, most of whom had only recently acquired it from the Russians.

The other contract for a similar enterprise, with a daily capacity of 1,000 tons of ore, is still being worked on in the province of Liaoning, in Northeast China, after which the Chinese will doubtless be in a position to equip and establish such enterprises for themselves—and also for other countries. And thus the great "chain reaction" of progress will be continued.

THE SPY PLANE AND THE SUMMIT

(Continued from page 10)

free world against surprise attack and to enable them to make effective preparations for their defense.

Under these directives programs have been developed and put into operation which have included extensive aerial surveillance by unarmed civilian aircraft, normally of a peripheral character but on occasion by penetration. Specific missions of these unarmed civilian aircraft have not been subject to Presidential authorization.

The Secretary closed with the comment that far from damaging the Summit meeting, the incident should help underline the importance of its making an earnest attempt to achieve agreed safeguards against surprise attack and expressed the hope that Premier Khrushchev would cooperate to this end. His statement was universally interpreted as expressing the U.S. purpose of continuing espionage flights.

The same day, Mr. Herter and CIA Director Allen W. Dulles were briefing members of Congress along the foregoing lines in a 90-minute secret session with leaders of both parties. Press reports said questioning reflected widespread dismay over the timing, risks involved, and apparent lack of Presidential control. Congressional comment generally showed sharp division on the question of permitting clandestine flights over Soviet territory. Senator Mansfield warned:

This incident or any other of this kind might well have accidentally set off the holocaust of nuclear conflict.

Editorial comment across the country, excerpted by the *New York Times*, showed confused and divergent opinions. The majority, how-

ever, whether upholding or opposing our government's action in sending the spy plane, castigated the timing and method of handling of the incident. Many reflected the cold war double standard approach of seeking to put the blame on the Russians for the whole thing, instead of on those responsible. An important point was made by the *St. Louis Post Dispatch*:

It is easy enough to say that everybody engages in espionage and that the only misfortune is getting caught. But aerial mapping of bombing targets is something different from the ordinary run of espionage. It is the kind of action we would bitterly resent if applied to us. *It is the kind of action appropriate in wartime, or the brink of wartime, but it is highly provocative at any other time.* (Italics added.)

Arthur Krock wrote in the *New York Times*, that whatever Government agency was responsible:

The timing either implies incompetence and/or irresponsibility in the use of the discretionary authority which the agency has been given by the President. Or it implies an assumption of authority that merits severe punishment. For such an assumption not only would violate the laws and the Constitution, it also *would in effect lodge the decision of peace or war in subordinate government hands.* (Italics added.)

Walter Lippmann went further. He asked if the authority "to order a deep penetration of Soviet territory with a military reconnaissance plane is in some headquarters not in Washington," how then could we know "that the authority to strike a blow is not also outside of Washington?" and moreover:

In this affair, there is on the record as we know it serious prima facie evidence, not only of unusual immorality, but of inefficiency. Why did not the

President forbid all such flights when the summit meeting was agreed to? It is not enough to say that he did not authorize this flight. Why did he not forbid it?

The *Wall Street Journal* (May 9) warned of the danger of accidental war from such incidents:

Sending a cloak-and-dagger operative into Russia to pick up papers is one thing. Sending an unidentified plane far into Russia is quite another. A cloak-and-dagger operative could hardly start retaliatory missiles on their way. A plane, even unarmed, might. So while we are as mindful as anyone of the need for intelligence about what is going on inside Russia, it still seems to us that someone is playing with matches.

Meantime, on May 9 in Moscow, at a reception in the Czechoslovak Embassy in celebration of Victory Day over the Nazis, Premier Khrushchev emphasized the Soviet desire for full disarmament, with controls that would permit flying over Soviet territory. He called the U.S. flight a provocation, deliberately timed to injure the Summit conference. Terming the U.S. State Department's explanation alarming and dangerous, he warned that any planes sent over Soviet territory would be shot down and counter-measures would be taken. He continued:

I should say this: Those countries that have bases on their territories should note most carefully the following: If they allow others to fly from their bases to our territories we shall hit at those bases.

Khrushchev declared he did not wish to heat up passions and no conclusions should be drawn interfering with good relations with the United States:

Today I declare once again that we want to live not only in peace but also in friendship with the American people.

The American people want no war, I am sure of this.

The Soviet Premier recalled that the day after General Nathan Twining, then Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force, had been welcomed as a guest in the Soviet Union, a U.S. plane had flown over the Soviet Union as far as Kiev, but at that time it was decided to make no protest. He urged an end to the exchange of threats, and instead the establishment of peaceful and friendly relations, mutually advantageous trade, cultural exchange and tourist travel. Mr. Khrushchev went out of his way to express his conviction that the U.S. Ambassador, Llewellyn Thompson, had nothing to do with the matter, and ended with a toast "to the end of wars, to the end of provocations, to peace and friendship between the peoples."

Soviet Note of Protest

May 10. Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko delivered to the U.S. Embassy in Moscow the formal protest of the USSR against the "flagrant violation of Soviet state boundaries" by the U.S. military aircraft. Recounting the facts the note said the pilot of the plane "will be brought to account under the laws of the Soviet state." The note declared that according to the May 8 State Department announcement, contradicting earlier statements, this and earlier violations of Soviet boundaries for the purpose of military espionage were an official expression of U.S. Government policy, meaning in fact that they would be continued, and that the Soviet Government was compelled "to give strict instructions to its armed forces to take all necessary measures" against

such incursions. The note concluded:

The Soviet Government would sincerely like to hope that the Government of the U.S.A. recognized in the final analysis that the interests of preserving and strengthening peace among the people, including the interest of the American people itself, whose striving for peace was well demonstrated during the visit of the head of the Soviet Government, N. S. Khrushchev, to the U.S.A., will be served by the cessation of the aforementioned dangerous provocative activities against the USSR, by cessation of the cold war, and by search through joint efforts with the Soviet Union and other interested states for a solution of unsettled international problems on a mutually acceptable basis, which is awaited by all people.

In Congress an attempt was made to create a show of bipartisan unity to strengthen the President's hand at Paris, through speeches by Senate Democratic leader, Lyndon B. Johnson of Texas, and Representative Clarence Cannon, Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee. Both justified the incident and assailed Premier Khrushchev for his reaction to it. "The American people," said Senator Johnson, "are united in a determination to preserve our freedom and we are not going to be shaken from that course." Vice President Nixon and other Republicans congratulated him. Cannon's speech, boasting of frequent U.S. penetration into Soviet territory by as much as 1300 miles, was a ranting denunciation of Premier Khrushchev for his strenuous objections and "vicious vindictiveness."

The President Assumes Responsibility

May 11. President Eisenhower, at his press conference, upheld the statement of Secretary Herter just-

fying espionage flights over the USSR on the ground that the "fetish of secrecy and concealment" in the Soviet Union had compelled him "to issue directives to gather, in every feasible way, the information required to protect the United States and the free world against surprise attack and to enable them to make effective preparations for defense." This was what was behind his "open skies" proposal, which he intended to bring up again at Paris.

Answering a question about possible Soviet flights over the Western part of the world, the President said, "As far as I know there has never been any over the United States." On the question of the resumption of nuclear testing, the President said there had been a "misunderstanding." He said his understanding was that any new nuclear explosions would only be under the coordinated direction of a body including the United Kingdom, the USSR, and ourselves, and that no weapons testing was involved.

Meantime, in Moscow's Gorky Park, the wreckage of the plane and its espionage equipment were put on view, at a press conference held by Foreign Minister Gromyko for 500 Russian and foreign correspondents, following which Premier Khrushchev came along and answered questions. He declared that the question of the intruding plane would be taken to the Security Council, and if satisfaction were not received there, to the UN General Assembly. Mr. Khrushchev spoke very sharply of Herter's note, terming U.S. intentions to continue such flights an open threat to peace. He said that of course the U.S. State Department declaration changed his

opinion that the President had nothing to do with the affair, and that his hopes in the President had been disappointed.

Mr. Khrushchev declared that the Soviet Union had never sent planes over the United States or other countries for espionage purposes, and that in individual instances of inadvertently violating the airspace of other countries, as had happened on the frontier with Turkey and Iran, apologies had been made and those responsible punished.

The Soviet Premier stressed again his desire for normal and friendly relations with the United States:

I hope you will understand our attitude when we angrily condemn such actions. But we take a sober view of things and realize that even the sharpest polemics are better than war.

Mr. Lippmann said of the Herter avowal of our intention to violate Soviet sovereignty that no nation could remain passive when it was the avowed policy of another to intrude upon its territory. All spying is illegal, although universally practiced, but "when the spying involves intrusion across frontiers by military aircraft, it is also against international law."

May 12. Replying to the Soviet note of protest, the U.S. Government stood by the May 9 statement, insisted its policy was for "purely defensive purposes," denied any aggressive intent or any desire to prejudice the Summit meeting, and charged that it was the Soviet Government's treatment of the case which raised such questions. It said it would be prepared to cooperate in Paris in seeking agreements to reduce tensions "including effective

safeguards against surprise attack."

In Chicago, Adlai Stevenson asked: "Could it serve the purpose of peace and mutual trust to send intelligence missions over the heart of the Soviet Union on the very eve of the long awaited Summit Conference?"

May 13. The Government of Norway formally protested to the United States against the plan to land the plane in Norway, and asked that the U.S. Government take all necessary steps to prevent any similar plans in the future. It was reported that a similar protest was planned by Pakistan. There were serious reactions in Japan to U.S. spy planes taking off from Japanese territory.

Marshal A. K. Vershinin, head of the Soviet Air Force, sent a polite note postponing his scheduled visit to Washington "until a more suitable time."

Columbia Professor of Law and Director of International Legal Research, W. Friedman, wrote a letter to the *New York Times* saying that the United States has created an unprecedented situation in acknowledging the deliberate nature of its deep reconnaissance penetration and asserting its intention to continue such operations. The USSR, he said, could make the same claim, and a new World War could well be the consequence of the U.S. action. He noted:

Since 1919 national sovereignty over airspace has been the universal practice and law and reconnaissance flights by official aircraft, military or not, are therefore violations of sovereignty. Certainly this country would so interpret a Soviet flight over its territory.

The scene now shifts to Paris—and we refer you back to the opening pages.

THE THOUGHTFUL AMERICAN

Friends and Enemies: What I Learned in Russia, by Adlai Stevenson. Harper and Brothers, New York, 1959. 102 pages. \$2.95.

In lieu of a review of our own of the book written by Adlai Stevenson following his last year's extended visit to the Soviet Union, we think our readers will be interested in the final paragraphs of a review of the book which appeared in the Soviet magazine New Times, No. 32. The review, under the above title, was written by the Soviet publicist, A. Leonidov. Its conclusion follows:

... The important thing is that, his negative and biased attitude notwithstanding, Mr. Stevenson draws some highly useful and significant conclusions for American policy.

First, he contends, Washington must give up, once and for all, all its illusions and self-deception about the Soviet Union. The time has come to reckon with realities.

"We have been badly informed and are badly mistaken. The Soviet Union is a stable power system and is not on the brink of internal collapse. . . . Our emotional reaction to the rise of Communism has been to reject reality, aided and abetted of late by our political leaders. We were not prepared for Sputnik or the Soviet economic challenge. But the illusion of our superiority, together with the denial of unpleasant realities, is a bad basis for foreign policy. I hope we are fast approaching the end of this era of innocence and ignorance" (pp. 92-93).

Sound thinking, and there is no point in questioning the advisability of injecting such terms as "innocence" and "ignorance." Mr. Stevenson's over-all thought is that an end should be put to

past Soviet-American relations. He writes:

"I think we must plug patiently away at stopping the arms race, with international supervision, and forego any lingering ideas of military superiority which will only accelerate the arms race. I think it would be most realistic and helpful if we recognized the principle of equality with the Soviet Union. . . . And the hope is that little by little we can break away from the concept of each other as the enemy and reduce fear and distrust" (p. 101).

Mr. Stevenson's is not a lone voice. Similar views have been expressed in recent months by other prominent Americans—Harriman, Kennan, Lippmann and Warburg, for instance. A new school of foreign-policy thinking, it is said, is coming to the fore in the United States and the West generally—the "negotiation school" as a counterweight to the cold-war school. None of its proponents can be classed even as moderately Left. They are seasoned spokesmen of the ruling class and most of them belong to its upper crust. But realities are forcing them to revise their views and conceptions.

Men like Adlai Stevenson are coming to see that capitalism has nothing to gain and everything to lose from the cold war. Having taken a closer look at the strength, present and latent, of the socialist camp, they have decided that it is not wise to hover on the brink of a third world war. The program of the military industrial oligarchy which wants to perpetuate the arms drive in furtherance of its selfish aims, no longer suits them. They do not, of course, want to yield to socialism, which they abhor no less than the cold warriors do. But they feel that socialism cannot be destroyed by force: hence the search for

a more subtle capitalist strategy, one better adapted to the era of peaceful co-existence.

"Friends and Enemies" is a product of this sober-minded school of thought.

It is to be hoped that its conclusions will be pondered over in the West, and more especially in the United States. The more thinking Americans there are, the better for the world.

VALUES IN SOVIET LITERATURE

A Review by MURRAY YOUNG

Interval of Freedom—Soviet Literature During the Thaw, by George Gibian. University of Minnesota Press. Minneapolis. 1960. 166 pages. \$4.25.

THIS examination of Soviet writing during the years 1954-1957 by Professor George Gibian of Smith College contains some interesting conclusions about the values he believes are revealed in the portrayal of character and conflict in the novels, plays and short-stories written during this period. While 1957 marked a return to some of the narrowness characteristic of the writing of the preceding 20 years—about which Prof. Gibian is extremely critical—he appears to believe that in general Soviet writing will continue on the course indicated during the "thaw."

One of the points of greatest difference between Soviet and American writings is in their treatment of science and scientists. Prof. Gibian points out how small a place science occupies in our writing; when scientists do appear they tend to be regarded as odd and mysterious. In Soviet writing, on the other hand, the treatment is quite different:

Scientists are regarded in Russian novels as men apart from others only so far as they are more creative and capable of contributing more. The problem is how best to employ their exceptional talents. Otherwise scientists and geniuses are considered to be, not, as they sometimes are in the United States, strange bearded men with foreign accents and retorts in their hands who are at home only in a laboratory, but men and women who belong among other people, form a normal part of the public, and are particularly necessary, since they work

for the good of the society, of this generation and of the future. . . .

. . . the scientist, while regarded as a benefactor of mankind, is not viewed as if he were garbed in the vestments of a priesthood; he is rather a rationalist humanitarian and a humanist. This is one of the most encouraging conclusions to be gained from the scientist in Soviet fiction.

Professor Gibian believes that the negative characters—the "villains"—are far more revealing than the good characters—the "heroes." In writings of the pre-1954 period the negative characters tended to be survivors of the old regime with deep but concealed antipathy to socialism. In the books and plays under consideration they are, like the good characters, products of the Soviet regime. They are usually in positions of power and authority which they have achieved by their competence and energy but with a loss of the deeper human values:

By what criteria do the authors who make the deepest analysis of the nature of villainy in Soviet life judge their characters? Their decisions appear to be based for the most part on traditional liberal, humanistic values. Most Western thinkers, from Montaigne through Locke and Lincoln, could probably subscribe to them. Their ultimate measure of the value of a system of social organization is its effect on the human individual: the kind of a man it makes him. They wish man to be large, generous, unselfish, self-disciplined, free in his thinking, speaking, and acting. . . . Behind this ideal stands a tradition of Western humanism, with its stress on the free development of the self. In one feature only is there again exceptionally great emphasis among the Russian writers. Concern for the community and for the

need to work for future generations appears more deeply ingrained in the Soviet writers' ideals than among most of their Western counterparts.

The moral purposefulness everywhere evident in Soviet writing, and usually dismissed by less perceptive critics as "propaganda," Professor Gibian sees as its link to the finest traditions of American and European writing of the 19th century:

Great moral zeal is a trait shared by all the Soviet writers. Their books aim at a moral revolution in their readers. The writers burn with the desire to make people become better beings and in turn to inspire them with the zeal to reform others. The books are full of fervor based on love for a variety of objects: work and hard effort; industrial and scientific progress of Russia; the welfare of the people of the country; peace; the future generations. Their authors would evidently have understood—and been understood—by the fervent writers of New England in the period of its flowering and the Russian reformers and some of the revolutionaries of the last century. This rather old-fashioned, eager, touchingly uncynical, unskeptical, nineteenth-century idealism of the Soviet authors is one of their most surprising characteristics.

But he sees a very significant difference in the values held up for approval in Soviet writing and those proclaimed—if only by implication—in contemporary American writing:

Their view of property, of ownership of material things, is more negative than ours. . . . Soviet writers are quite anti-materialistic in regard to the owning of summer houses, cars, furniture, apartments. To desire such things is to them a sign of one's moral weakness. Far from judging the possession of wealth, good clothes, and television sets to be signs of success or of the superior worth of a person, they tend to consider them indications of the person's corruption. Soviet writers have a strong bias toward admiring poverty, suspecting riches. This bias against materialistic and bourgeois and in favor of ascetic, underdog, and prole-

tarian values, which used to be directed against the nineteenth-century *meshchane*, aristocrats, and capitalists of Tsarist Russia, is now aimed against the social elite of Soviet Russia, the Drozdovs and Kramovs ["villains" in two of the books examined].

The sharpest difference, however, between Soviet and contemporary American writing is in their two attitudes toward society, Professor Gibian believes. None of the Soviet writers, he finds, even the most critical—with the exception of Boris Pasternak—repudiate social, organized undertakings: "the earnest, dedicated sense of the linking of people together in a communal effort." Largely taken up with individuals concerned only with living their own lives and thinking for the most part only of themselves and their family, American novels are completely alien in spirit from their Soviet counterparts.

This study shows a wide knowledge of Soviet writing, discussing in detail novels such as Granin's *Those Who Seek*, Ehrenburg's *The Thaw*, Dudintsev's *Not By Bread Alone*, available in English translation, and also Kaverin's *Searches and Hopes*, Galina Nikolaeva's *A Battle on the Way*, Pagodin's play *Petrarch's Sonnet* as well as many others, none of which have been translated.

Critical of almost every aspect of Soviet writing as well as constantly critical throughout of Soviet society, Professor Gibian nevertheless concludes his study with these words:

We have lost much of their (the Russians') youthful spirit of idealism. Sometimes we find ourselves swamped in materialistic pursuits which the Russian writers would consider selfish and degrading. Most important of all often we live lives isolated from other people, lacking in a sense of common purpose which would provide us with long-range goals towards which to work and orient our lives. We could well allow ourselves to be inspired by the Russian intellectuals' greater social sense of responsibility, as well as by their contempt for the frivolities of life.

A FREE COPY FOR YOUR FRIENDS

Through the generosity of a reader
you may now send a free copy of **NEW
WORLD REVIEW** to your friends.

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

Please send a sample copy of **NEW
WORLD REVIEW** to the persons be-
low: (add other names on separate
sheet if you wish.)

To _____

Address _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

To _____

Address _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

To _____

Address _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

To _____

Address _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

To _____

Address _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

Sender _____

Address _____

A Clash of Cultures

Contrasts in Manners, Morals,
Courts, Prisons in the USSR
and the U.S.A.

An eyewitness, illustrated report
by Vivian and Vincent Hallinan

\$1.00

Order through
AMERICAN RUSSIAN INSTITUTE
90 McAllister St., San Francisco

SONG OF PEACE

Walter Lowenfels
and
Anton Refregier

Foreword by Linus Pauling

\$1.35 paper back \$5.00 cloth

ROVING EYE PRESS

Order from **NEW WORLD REVIEW**
34 West 15th St., New York 11, N. Y.

NEW SOVIET FILMS

EUGENE ONEGIN
THE CAPTAIN'S DAUGHTER
JOURNEY BEYOND THREE SEAS
THE HOUSE I LIVE IN
THE FLYING CARPET

Coming:

IN THE LAND OF THE SOVIET
LILEIA (a new ballet)

Artkino Pictures, Inc.

723 SEVENTH AVE. NEW YORK 19

Telephone: Circle 5-6570