

SOCIAL SCIENCES J

SEPTEMBER, 1960

25¢

DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRARY SEP 12 1960

# **New World**

**REVIEW**

*August not published - see inside front cover*

## **THE CONGO STORY**

**Chinese Climb Mt. Everest**

**ANNA LOUISE STRONG**

**Van Cliburn Tours the USSR**

**RALPH PARKER**

**"Cuba - Yes!"**

**VICTOR RABINOWITZ**

**Vignettes of Soviet Life**

**BERNARD KOTEN**

**ESSAY CONTEST AWARDS**

# NEW WORLD REVIEW

SEPTEMBER 1960

|                                                 |                    |    |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------|----|
| The Congo                                       | Jessica Smith      | 3  |
| Music and Friendship—Van<br>Cliburn in the USSR | Ralph Parker       | 9  |
| "Cuba—Yes!"                                     | Victor Rabinowitz  | 13 |
| The Women of Africa Meet                        | Shirley Graham     | 19 |
| Vignettes of Soviet Life                        | Bernard Koten      | 22 |
| The Chinese Climb Mt. Everest                   | Anna Louise Strong | 28 |
| "From China to Peru"                            | Archie Johnstone   | 33 |
| Essay Contest Awards                            |                    |    |

## BOOK REVIEWS

|                                                                                                                                   |              |    |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|----|
| <i>A Clash of Cultures—Some<br/>Contrasts in American and<br/>Soviet Morals and Manners</i><br>—Vivian and Vincent Hal-<br>linan— | Murray Young | 46 |
| Friends' Peace Pamphlets                                                                                                          |              | 47 |

JESSICA SMITH, Editor  
MURRAY YOUNG, Managing Editor

ESLANDA ROBESON  
Our Rising Correspondent  
Editorial Consultant on Negro and  
Colonial Questions

Vol. 28, No. 8, September, 1960. Second  
Class postage paid at New York, N. Y. Sub-  
scription \$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 Bul-  
letin of the Public Affairs Information Ser-  
vice. Phone: CHelsea 3-0666.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.



## To All Subscribers

As a necessary economy to help  
us through the summer months, we  
did not publish an August issue. All  
subscribers will receive an extra issue  
later to make up the full 12 for the  
year.

We sent you a most urgent letter in  
June asking for funds. The response  
while generous fell far short of what we  
needed—and now we must ask you  
again. If you did not for some reason  
respond to our letter please do so now.  
Or if you did respond, won't you try  
very hard to add to the money you sent  
earlier?

In these troubled days events hurry  
upon each other with such breathless  
speed that it is not always easy to see  
the direction they are taking. NWR  
helps you to understand more clearly  
the bewildering changes and crises: see  
for example the two articles in the  
present issue on the Congo and on  
Cuba.

To continue this service in the way  
that will be most useful to you we must  
—and immediately—have more funds.  
Please use the form below and send it  
to us today.

## Please Fill Out and Mail Today

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

I enclose \$..... for your  
Sustaining Fund.

I pledge \$..... monthly for your  
continued publication.

Name .....

Street .....

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

# THE CONGO

by JESSICA SMITH

*All the seething national and world events of the past two months cannot possibly be covered in a single issue. With the cold war on again full force as a result of the U-2 incident and both major parties and their candidates accepting it as the main tenet of their foreign policies, and pledged to increase arms spending, we believe disarmament remains the most pressing issue of our time.*

*Despite all the negative factors working against progress in this field and that of ending nuclear tests, we draw hope from the great mass demonstrations for peace that took place in connection with the party conventions and especially around Stevenson and Hiroshima Day, and the continuing activities of many organizations in this field. We believe a basis exists for an effective mass peace movement. New opportunities for pressure now arise, as disarmament comes up at the U.N.*

*Meantime, the burning immediate question internationally is that of the Congo, which has a vital bearing on the issue of peace, and on which the people's voice must also be heard.*

**"WORLD'S BIGGEST GIVE-AWAY,"** *U.S. News and World Report* headed an article on June 20, and went on to bemoan the fact that on June 30 the Belgian Congo, treasure house of Africa, would be given away to its 13,500,000 black natives!

This magazine with close Wall Street ties, boasts of being America's "Class News" magazine, and the fact that incomes of its over a million readers average above \$15,000, indicating the measure of their "executive responsibility." (Ad in *New York Herald Tribune*, March 15)

It's quite clear why this "responsible" group of people should shudder at the idea of such an inexhaustible source of riches as the Congo slipping out of the hands of white people and being "given away" to its rightful owners, the black people who live there, whose blood and toil and lives have gone to swell

the incomes of the Belgian colonialists and others who have taken away their wealth.

This attitude, shared by many others in our country, fed by numerous reports seeking to show how "unready" the Congolese are for independence, helps to explain the travail in the Congo today, where every effort is being made by the colonialists and their local stooges to keep things in a state of disorder to prove they cannot manage without white masters. It also explains the delays in carrying out UN Security Council decisions. Our government, with its falling international prestige, must take a posture of anti-colonialism and try not to alienate the neutralist and newly liberated nations, whose role in the UN is becoming increasingly important. Thus it has had to support measures to get the Belgian troops out of the Congo. At the same time U.S. Am-

assador Lodge must heed the big monopolists who are maneuvering in every possible way to keep control of the riches of the Congo, and especially Katanga, its wealthiest province.

And then too, there is the cold war to be fought through efforts to block Soviet aid and influence, and the fear that if the UN does not take action, the other African nations and the socialist world will.

The new air of freedom blowing through the whole colonial world of the past tells us that the Congolese, as all other peoples, are indeed ready for independence. If they have not been trained for the work that they must do, this is only due to the deliberate policy of their former Belgian masters and their imperialist allies, as the tragic history of the Congo so clearly shows.

### **Background of Belgian Rule**

Once there was a kingdom in the Congo, which flourished from the 14th Century until it was preyed upon by the slave traffic which took millions of African lives, fell into a decline, and was ruled by various tribal leaders. In the 1880's an American explorer, Henry Morton Stanley, ("Dr. Livingstone, I believe") tricked the African chieftains into signing their country away to Belgium's King Leopold II, who in 1885 proclaimed himself the ruler of the "Congo Free State", taking all the land for his own except small actually cultivated patches, forcing the natives to deliver set quotas of rubber and ivory, on pain of being shot, having their hands and feet cut off, or their wives held as hostages.

Later Leopold began to exploit

the rich minerals that lay in the Congo's earth. In 1906 he founded the Union Minière du Haut Katanga, letting in a British company, Tanganyika Concessions, with a 40 per cent share. While recent newspaper reports have spoken of Rockefeller interests acquired in this company in 1951, it was not generally known that the Rockefellers were in there from the beginning. We are indebted to *Worker* reporter Art Shields (August 14) for information he found by going back to the financial pages of the *London Times*. The Belgian-British monopoly needed capital badly, and the *London Times* noted (August 11, 1906) that the necessary funds had been furnished by John D. Rockefeller. This was officially denied, since John D. the Baptist did not want his name connected with the horrible atrocities in the Congo. On August 29 the *London Times* reported that its story on Rockefeller was published on good authority, and that "one of the financial groups of which he is a prominent member had found, or helped to find, the sinews of war for the Tanganyika Co."

By now the world was becoming aghast at the horrible atrocities visited on the Congolese people, many of them recounted in eyewitness reports by missionaries, and besides, other countries wanted to share the loot, so in 1908 Leopold was forced to turn over the Congo to the Belgian Government (for a sum of 246,500,000 francs, loaded on the Congolese as a national debt). Fabulous profits had been reaped in the meantime, Leopold made a fortune of \$20,000,000. Belgian and foreign corporations retained their

investments, and began to reap still greater profits in the new "Congo Free State."

After Belgium's annexation of the Congo, which the U.S. was the first to recognize, some of the more fiendish atrocities were eliminated, but cruel exploitation and genocide went on. Suffice it to say that there were 30,000,000 people in the Congo in 1884—today there are 13,500,000, plus some 125,000 Europeans, mostly Belgian administrators, engineers and managers. (Many have now fled.)

The Belgians officially described their rule as "vigilant paternal supervision." A system of forced labor continued. Wages were among the lowest in the world, starvation and disease were everywhere. With labor so cheap, the Belgians did not bother to build roads in the interior. A system of porters is still used—the delivery of one ton over a distance of 100 kilometers taking 30 men four days of backbreaking toil.

In a country of over 70 large ethnic groups, speaking 400 dialects, tribal animosities were kept alive in an effort to prevent Congolese unity.

Education has been denied the people. Hardly a third are literate. Of the 1,200,000 Congo children who have been in government and missionary schools in recent years, less than 10,000 reach high school, about 27,000 vocational school. Higher education has been forbidden until recently. Congolese were forbidden exit visas (passes were necessary even to leave their native villages) — a mere handful have been educated in Belgian or other foreign universities. In all the Congo there are said to be 17 university graduates

today, and not a single native doctor, engineer or lawyer. Two native universities opened a few years ago are partly empty and provide only a trickle of graduates.

Only 12 Congolese held administrative posts in the colonial government, otherwise all administrative posts in government, industrial or other institutions were held by Belgians. Congolese were admitted only to the lowest ranks of the civil service. A Congolese army of 25,000, the Force Publique, was led by the Belgians—not a single African officer was trained.

During World War II and after, African industry and towns began to develop at a faster pace than before, and new large industrial areas and communities appeared. It is true that some Congolese benefited in new housing, hospitals, schools and jobs. But these advances affected only a minority of the native population. And along with higher wages came mass unemployment too. While the Belgians boasted of desegregated public facilities, the opposite was generally the rule. Wrote Patrick O'Donovan from the capital, Leopoldville, in the *New York Herald Tribune*, July 31, bemoaning the loss of what had been "an apparently prosperous colony and a reproach to liberals":

The cities rose, splendid, white and permanent. It is true they were for Belgians alone.

Leopoldville, for example, boasts the six-miles-long Avenue Albert, which is among the contemporary wonders of the world. But this city of shining towers and ponderous stone mansions was for 20,000 whites, while 370,000 Africans lived separate in their native quarter . . . For the Belgian, here was all the solid comfort of Belgium, plus the sun

and the palm trees, and the friendly servants and the imperial splendor.

And the Negro pianist, Philippa Schuyler, who has been doing a series of concerts in African countries wrote in *Amsterdam News* of August 6, telling of some of the new building the Belgians had done for the Congolese:

But with all this, they maintained a general segregation. The native cities were kept rigorously separated from the European ones. In Leopoldville not even domestic servants lived in white communes. When this reporter visited Leopoldville in early 1959, no Africans were allowed as guests in white hotels and restaurants.

### **The Loot for Belgium— and Others**

Belgium's reasons for keeping the Congo in its own hands as long as it could, and then holding onto its riches even when independence had to be granted, are clear enough.

The Congo, 80 times the size of Belgium, one-third the size of the United States, is the world's largest exporter of non-ferrous metals, and the major supplier of copper to Europe. From somewhat varying figures currently reported, we estimate that the Congo produces 75 to 80 per cent of the world's cobalt, 60 to 80 per cent of its uranium, 60 to 70 per cent of its industrial diamonds, large quantities of tin, zinc, coal, radium, timber, cotton, rubber etc. Its great rivers are a mighty potential source of power, and their subsoil holds treasure in high grade iron ore and bauxite, the raw material for aluminum. The bulk of the Congo's riches are in mineral-rich Katanga province, which provides about 60 per cent of the Congo's exports, two-thirds of its

electric power and more than half the revenues of the Central Government. Most of Belgium's eight billion dollars worth of investments are centered in Katanga. Belgium's huge stake in the Congo made it possible for her, alone of all European nations, to emerge from the last war with a stable currency.

Over-all control (90 per cent) of the Congo's economy has been carried on by the Societe Generale de Belgique (a ruling power in Belgium itself), in which the U.S. Morgan group reportedly has a share. Up to five years ago the Societe issued the Congo's currency. Its chief mining subsidiary is the already mentioned Union Miniere du Haut Katanga, which "runs Katanga like a company town," according to *U.S. News and World Report*, and has been drawing about \$200,000,000 a year in profits from the Congo. White company foremen are told in a handbook "never to forget that Negroes have the souls of children."

In addition to its vast mining interests, the Societe also owned forests, textile mills, apartment buildings, factories and shipping lines. It was through the British company, Taganyika Concessions, with its big slice of the Union Miniere, that the Rockefeller acquired their 600,000 shares in the latter around 1951, recently exchanged for shares in a Congo finance company. Several American banks also have shares in the British company. American Reynolds Metals and corporations of other countries have investments in the Congo's mineral and rubber. Among other U.S. companies with Congo investments are Mobil Oil Congo (Socony affiliate), Aramco Steel, U. S. Plywood. Britain has

holdings through subsidiaries in palm oil concerns. While Belgian capital has held the dominating role, U.S. capital has increased its penetration in the postwar years. The Congo's uranium has gone into U.S. atom bombs. In 1955 Belgium signed an agreement with the U.S. to supply considerable quantities of uranium and thorium from the Congo.

*Economic Notes* for August 6 quotes a leading Washington confidential advisory letter in, mid-July:

We want African raw materials . . . cobalt, chrome, bauxite, asbestos, diamonds, copper, iron ore, manganese, uranium. . . . We can get most of these elsewhere but if we had to prices might go up.

The same service on July 12 in one of its foreign trade letters said:

Africa is considered a major battleground of free capitalism against Marxism. The United States alone can save the Western position there.

### **How Independence Was Won**

Why, it may be asked, were Belgium and its fellow colonialists and imperialists so "generous," as to "give away" all these riches and grant independence to the Congo?

In the first place, independence was not granted to the Congolese, it was won by them in freedom struggles that no longer could be blocked. In the second place, they had the support in their struggle of the whole series of newly liberated Asian and African countries, the neutralist countries, the Soviet Union and the whole socialist world, giving them both influential moral support and offering economic aid without strings. And finally, they (the Belgians) counted on the "unprepared" condition of the Congolese people

and bribery of certain elements among them, to make it possible for them to continue to keep control of the Congo's great store of wealth.

For years there had been sporadic rebellions drowned in blood. But the Bandung Conference in 1955, the conferences of the Afro-Asian and All-African peoples in subsequent years, and especially the Accra Conference, gave a new dimension to liberation struggles everywhere, and gave birth to a new determination for independence among the Congolese and the leadership to get it. Many were killed in these struggles, thousands were jailed. During the first half of 1959 there were 30 mass struggles and strikes in each of which 10,000 people participated, mainly the new urban working class among whom were many unemployed. They fought unarmed, or with sticks and stones and spears against guns and armored cars. In the Leopoldville uprisings of January, 1959 any African found on the streets was fired upon.

Writes Peter Ritner, in *The Death of Africa*:

No one in a position to know believes the published estimate that only 47 Africans lost their lives in the crucial two days. It seems certain that 500 or more were killed; and some people put the toll as high as 3,000. This is not to count the tens of thousands of passless Africans whom the government picked up afterwards and shipped back to their counties. . . .

As liberation spread from one African country to another new strength accrued to the Congolese freedom movement, and in February of this year Belgium had to yield. Independence was agreed upon at a round table conference

in Brussels, attended by Patrice Lumumba, Joseph Kasavubu and others released from imprisonment for their part in the liberation struggles. In the elections for an Assembly and Senate that preceded liberation, the 34-year old Lumumba, head of the National Congolese Movement, emerged as the most powerful political figure in the Congo, despite Belgian maneuvers against him, and thus was given the right to form the first Government of the new, free Congo Republic. Joseph Kasavubu, head of the Aboko party (Association of the Lower Congo) was elected Chief of State by the combined new Houses of Parliament.

On the day of independence (June 30) Robert C. Ruark, "African expert" of the *New York World Telegram and Sun*, who considers colonialism the only hope for the Congo, gave Belgium's game away in an article noting its fears of what would happen to the money and the people who have made such vast fortunes for Belgium and the world from the Congo's almost limitless riches. He wrote:

The greatest hope of the moneyed interests was that independence would bring such chaos that a new kind of economic colonialism might be imposed, with the white man continuing to run things, but under a black figurehead whose material wants might easily be appeased in wine, women and flashy cars, plus a Swiss bank account.

*U.S. News and World Report* tells us (August 30) that Belgium had counted on the 25,000 African army under its white officers and the Belgian troops remaining at the Congo bases, to keep order so that Belgians could continue in all the leading

jobs they had failed to train Africans to do and protect its \$8 billion investment.

But what they had not counted on was that the Congolese should mutiny against their white officers, as they did on July 6, demanding promotions and higher wages and an end of their brutal treatment. Things calmed down when the new Congolese Government removed the white officers.

Meantime, in the midst of provocations and rumors of rape, murder and looting, the whites began to flee. No doubt some of the deplorable things charged happened. This would be inevitable at such a moment. But no one spoke of the thousands of native women raped then and years before by the whites—such incidents just were not rape. And it may be doubted that in the midst of all this the native people perpetrated more crimes than one may read of in a week in the newspapers of any of our great civilized American cities.

How much of what happened was due to provocative rumors was apparent from many newspaper accounts. It was reported that many of the white inhabitants were terrorized in advance by stories that on independence day the Congolese were going to take over all the homes inhabited by white people, and the white wives as well.

In a story headed "How Rumors Bred Panic," George Sibira wrote from Leopoldville in the *New York Herald Tribune*, July 9, that an army of whites was fleeing the Congo, shouting, screaming and crying, with the word rape heard everywhere. The fleeing crowd "driven to fury

(Continued on page 40)

# Music and Friendship— *Van Cliburn in the USSR*

by RALPH PARKER

ON THE FACE OF IT, managing the USSR tour of a young American pianist during the summer of 1960 should have been a tough assignment. It was a period when the U-2 incident, followed by the collapse at the Summit, and trouble in Cuba and Congo had brought the word American here into increasingly frequent juxtaposition with such words as "spy," "aggression," "imperialism" and so on. One wondered whether the goodwill which had gradually been accumulated by such events as the U.S. Exhibition at Sokolniki, the visits of dozens of distinguished American scientists, artists and writers, and of thousands of less distinguished tourists, the successes of Soviet artists in the U.S., had all been squandered. Were we back in the bad old days, one asked oneself?

After all, Van Cliburn's USSR tour had been planned as something like the peak of a more intense period of American cultural activity in the Soviet Union than had ever taken place before, with Isaac Stern, the noted violinist, Roberta Peters, the lovely, gifted Metropolitan Opera soprano, and finally the brilliant young Texan who had won the Tchaikovsky Gold Medal in Mos-

cow two years previously, representing the arts, the "My Fair Lady" company the show business, and a number of Hollywood productions—notably "Marty"—the movies. And this "American Summer" should have closed with the biggest show of all—the state visit of Dwight E. Eisenhower.

As we all know now, that anxiety about the way the Cliburn tour would go was proved to have been quite groundless. The 17 concerts Van Cliburn gave in Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Tbilisi, Yerevan, Baku and Sochi—two of them to audiences of 17,000—were sold out within a few hours. By popular demand six or seven of them were televised in entirety. "I could book Cliburn one hundred concerts on the spot," we were told by the director of the Moscow Philharmonica.

There are two aspects of this success that I should like to dwell upon. First, the attitude of the USSR Ministry of Culture and other Soviet official organizations towards the Cliburn season proved that when the Russians contended that they wanted cultural relations to continue despite the deterioration in inter-governmental relations they meant what they said. Far from attempting to curtail Van Cliburn's triumphant tour they had exerted every effort to prolong it, increasing his appearances by 50 per cent, which, so far as I recall, is something that has never happened be-

---

**RALPH PARKER**, our Moscow correspondent, has lived in the USSR for almost two decades. He is also Moscow correspondent for the British weekly *New Statesman*, *The Times* of India and other publications.

fore with a foreign artist here. It seemed to embarrass no one in any official position that every appearance of the young American, whether in the concert hall or in a hotel lobby, in a shop or a museum, was the occasion of a rousing demonstration. Unorganized street demonstrations are rare events in Moscow, and I can remember nothing to match the gathering of hundreds of Muscovites after midnight outside Cliburn's hotel on the night of his twenty-fifth birthday. It would be stretching things too far to describe this as a pro-American demonstration, yet no one ever forgot, or was allowed to forget, that Van Cliburn is an American pianist. Did not an article in *Pravda* describe him as a worthy representative of the great American people? And was it not Cliburn's words, spoken in Russian after his farewell concert, that he brought greetings from the American people, that evoked the heartiest cheers from the thousand present?

Before going into more detail about the way the Soviet people took Van Cliburn, let me deal with another aspect of his success—the reaction of the critics. Now, most of the critics had heard him play before and most of them had praised his 1958 playing enthusiastically. It was not surprising then that the starting-point of nearly all serious criticism was whether Van Cliburn had justified the hopes placed in him two years ago. Had the young pianist matured? How had his repertoire grown? And the critics were not content to answer such questions with fulsome, unqualified praise; they paid the pianist the tribute of seriousness. Here are a few extracts.

Professor Hentova, a Leningrad critic who wrote a book about Van Cliburn, contributed a criticism to the *Leningradskaya Pravda* in which she wrote:

After listening to Van Cliburn's first five concerts we are justified in saying that the Soviet people made no mistake in their assessment of this artist's gifts and prospects. Van Cliburn is certainly one of the greatest pianists of our time. He possesses what is perhaps the most precious quality of true talent—a limitless will and desire to attain perfection. Whatever he plays we always hear the ardent spirit of a restless artist who is never satisfied with himself. As before, his playing stirs our feelings deeply. Its effect can be described in Beethoven's words: it flows from heart to heart. In many respects Cliburn has changed. Perhaps his playing has lost some of its youthful impetuosity, its tenderness, its spontaneity. That is quite natural. The formative period is over. Cliburn has gained confidence and independence. He has clearly set aims. He has chosen his repertoire boldly. . . . With age and experience he has become stricter and more restrained in his interpretation. Previously his playing was dominated by its spontaneous ardor; now that is held in rein and controlled by the artist who evaluates his own performance in a sober, critical spirit.

In Kiev too a critic referred to the pianist's maturity. "His interpretations have deepened. We saw new features of his splendid talent" (He played Schumann 2nd and Rachmaninov 3rd there). In Tbilisi, capital of Georgia, the critic Margarita Vachnadze wrote under the title "The Cliburn Legend Confirmed."

"Cliburn has kept his charm," wrote a *Literaturnaya Gazeta* critic. "But his impulsiveness is now more controlled by reason, his intellect is exercising its authority. He feels freer, bolder, more independent."

And *Izvestia*: "It might have been thought that Cliburn's phenomenal virtuosity and youth would push him into bravura, into showing off his tremendous technical powers. Happily this has not happened." And *Pravda*: "The performances of the Brahms and Prokofiev concerti permit us to say that Van Cliburn has deepened and broadened his artistic range."

But this review of the reviews would not be complete without some extracts from the remarkable article written in *Sovietskaya Kultura* by Professor Heinrich Neuhaus, the famous teacher of Sviatoslav Richter, Emil Gilels and others. Noting that no foreign pianist who has visited the Soviet Union since the Revolution—and they include Artur Schnabel, Cortot and Petri—have had so phenomenal a success, or have been accorded so much affection or greeted with such wild joy as the very tall young Texan with the enormous hands and the delightfully boyish face, Neuhaus attributes the "secret" of the American's art to a certain naiveness which is common to all great artists, and which includes the qualities of sincerity, spontaneity and truthfulness. Richter had said to Neuhaus after he met Cliburn in 1958: "He has the psychology of a 14-year-old boy." To which Neuhaus replied: "And thank God for that!" "He is the real and brilliant successor to Rachmaninov" wrote Neuhaus.

These extracts, which scarcely do justice to the thoroughness of the Soviet reviews, should suffice to show that Van Cliburn's USSR tour was taken as a serious musical event and not only as popular sensation.

This is not the place, nor have I the qualifications to attempt a professional analysis of the pianist's gifts, but a few observations on his appeal to the Soviet public may throw some light on one or two peculiar aspects of it. In the first place there is ample evidence to show that Cliburn greatly encourages both the appreciative listening to music and the making of it. We were told in Leningrad that since Cliburn's performances there in 1958 there has been a marked increase in the study of the piano; and letters from children and students reaching Cliburn in his "fan mail" left him in no doubt that he had made Liszt, Schumann and even Prokofiev more accessible to the average Russian listener.

Wherever Van Cliburn played, his visit was anticipated by queues of thousands. A queue of 7,000 formed outside the Leningrad Philharmonic Concert hall when the box-office opened, but this is nothing compared to the number of those who way back in 1958 formed the "unofficial" queue. One of the most highly-valued of the gifts Cliburn took back with him to the States was a dog-eared school exercise book which is a record of one of the queues. Its members used to meet on the first day of the month at the foot of Pushkin's statue outside the Russian Museum in Leningrad to re-register their places in the queue. Then, when Sol Hurok announced that Van Cliburn was returning to the Soviet Union, the members of the queue met every Sunday, and then, as the date of the Leningrad concerts approached, every day. The dog-eared exercise book shows that not one of the 300 devotees dropped

out of their two-year vigil. After this, it is sad to have to report that only two or three were fortunate enough to get tickets. Yet they took their disappointment well. One such queue sent up to the platform a magnificent laurel wreath ("enough for three years *borshch*" someone said irreverently) bearing the inscription "With gratitude to Van Cliburn from long-suffering members of the queue who failed to get tickets."

Let me not create the impression that Cliburn's admirers in the Soviet Union are a local version of the teen-agers who pursue fashionable pop-singers in some other lands. Admittedly, there was an element of hysterical adulation in some of the demonstrations which made it quite impossible for Van Cliburn to move from his hotel rooms without the use of elaborate subterfuge, but I am inclined to attribute this to that phenomenon that is to be found in the Soviet Union no less than elsewhere—a possessive loyalty of the younger generation to those of its members who have deservedly reached the pinnacle of fame. Here as elsewhere young people wish to assert themselves, and look for their heroes in their own ranks. After all, their heroes in older generations have let them down. Art may know no frontiers, but the axiom is no less true of youth too. Remember the Moscow Youth Festival? Often, when I was trying to steer Van Cliburn to safety through dense crowds of admirers, I could sense the unspoken criticism of the youngsters around us. What right have you—a stout middle-aged man—to keep us away from our "Vaniushka"?

A surer sign of the quality of Soviet appreciation of Van Cliburn was the nature of the gifts he received from the oldest generation of musical Russia. What greater honor could the young Texan have been accorded than the invitation from the aged Alexander Goldenwieser, friend of Lev Tolstoy, contemporary of Rachmaninov, to visit him in his home; or that from the director of the Scriabin Museum to play on the Russian composer's piano, or the autographed photograph of Tchaikovsky presented to Anton Rubinstein that the great pianist's last surviving granddaughter sent Cliburn from her home in Leningrad; or the pair of silver cuff-links that had once belonged to Sergei Rachmaninov and were now being passed on to Cliburn by an old viola player in Moscow? Were not these marks of appreciation the gesture of the old generation passing on the torch to a young man who showed signs of being worthy of a great tradition? Men and women who felt an intimate bond with the Russian romantic composers and pianists recognized in the American youth a true heir.

The love of the Soviet people for Van Cliburn, which is in no small degree a love for the American people, is infectious and I admit to writing under its spell. But I don't think I am losing my judgment when I say that in this modest, hard-working, self-critical poet of the piano the American people have found a true Voice of America. And it is important for American-Soviet understanding that in these critical months that Voice was not jammed.

# "Cuba-Yes!"

by VICTOR RABINOWITZ

**L**AST SPRING every bookshop in Havana had on prominent display a paper bound volume entitled "Weekend in Guatemala." Its subject, of course, was the civil war in Guatemala which, in a few short days in the summer of 1954, resulted in the overthrow of the progressive regime of Jacobo Arbenz Guzman. Many of the booksellers in Cuba had attached to the book a slip reading, "Will There be a Weekend in Cuba?"

The story of the revolt in Guatemala is familiar to every Cuban patriot. In March, 1952, the Guatemalan Government inaugurated a program of agrarian reform in an effort to alleviate the severe poverty of the Guatemalan farmers. The program was in fact a mild one, at least by Cuban standards, and for over a year United Fruit Company, largest landowner in Guatemala, was able to stave off operation of the law by extensive legal proceedings. Nevertheless, the program raised loud cries of "Communism" in the U.S. press—cries dutifully echoed by the press of Batista's Cuba, Peron's Argentina and other Latin-American dictatorships.

Even before 1954 it became apparent that a revolt was brewing. The Guatemalan Government attempted to buy arms from the

United States, but was refused. When Guatemala turned to Poland for help, this was used as additional evidence of "Communist infiltration" in Latin-America.

On Friday, June 19, 1954, a small army led by Col. Carlos Castillo Armas invaded Guatemala from Honduras. No one was surprised; there had been evidence of an imminent invasion for many weeks. Guatemala immediately demanded and got a weekend session of the UN Security Council, charging aggression by Honduras and Nicaragua and alleging aid to the invaders from the United States. Ambassador Lodge denied U.S. participation, though it was generally known that the rebels were armed with weapons recently purchased here (our embargo apparently applied only to legitimate governments, not to counter-revolutionaries); that the rebel air force was manned by U.S. pilots and that the C.I.A. had played a prominent role in planning the revolt.

A resolution to transfer the dispute to the Organization of American States was vigorously protested by Guatemala which felt that the O.A.S. was then, as now, an instrument of American foreign policy. The resolution was vetoed by the Soviet Union which joined Guatemala in its charges of aggression.

While the UN debated, the troops of Armas advanced with little effective opposition. They were joined by portions of the army which had

---

VICTOR RABINOWITZ is a well-known New York attorney who has specialized in labor and civil liberties questions. He has made several recent trips to Cuba.

always been lukewarm in its support of the Arbenz government. Many landless peasants, impatient with the slow progress of the land reform movement and confused as to the policies of their government, supported the rebels or were apathetic. In less than two weeks the fighting was over. The defeat of Arbenz, was widely viewed as a major victory for John Foster Dulles.

Can this victory be repeated in Cuba? Can a counter-revolutionary force be armed by the United States and be given the support and encouragement necessary to overthrow Castro? Can the UN again be neutralized while an attack from outside defeats a great social revolution?

This writer thinks not, in part because the very fact that Guatemala happened once makes it difficult for it to happen again. In fact, the Dulles "victory" in 1954 has done more than any other single event to discredit our foreign policy south of the Rio Grande. In Mexico, in Venezuela, in Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Peru and Argentina, governmental support of an attempted repetition of the Guatemalan episode might well result in serious internal trouble and the State Department knows it well.

The failure of the Security Council to take action was universally attributed to our control over that body and many small nations are still uneasy whenever Guatemala is mentioned. That unfortunate country has become a symbol of American imperialism, just as Nicaragua had been thirty years before, and Vera Cruz even before that. Moreover, the large number of new African nations joining the UN this

year and next will make it even harder for the State Department to dominate that body.

When, in July, Cuba made charges of economic aggression against the United States, the question once again came up as to whether the Security Council had jurisdiction of the dispute rather than the O.A.S. Everyone agreed that the UN had jurisdiction and Cuba consented to preliminary hearings before the O.A.S. only on the repeated promises made by the United States as well as others, that the jurisdiction of the Security Council on the Cuban question would be preserved.

When Castro assumed power on January 1, 1959, the example of Guatemala was fresh in his mind and he learned many valuable lessons from the errors Arbenz had made. There are not, in Cuba, any remnants of the Batista Army standing by to join in a counter-revolution, because the Batista Army has been replaced by a large people's militia and a small but intensely loyal armed force which still proudly calls itself "the Rebel Army." There will be no large landowners to rally the counter-revolutionaries in Cuba, no United Fruit Company to provide sustenance and support for the reaction, because there are no more large landowners in Cuba. There will be no hostile or apathetic farmers in Cuba who will watch passively while the Castro regime is overthrown. For the Castro revolution was their revolution—fought by them, won by them and existing to give them the dignity and happiness which their national hero Jose Marti taught was their birthright.

The importance of the break-up of the large landed estates in Cuba

—the first stage of agrarian reform cannot be overstated. No other country in the Western Hemisphere has done nearly so much so quickly. Cubans, naturally proud of the accomplishments of their revolution, look with some scorn on the reform movements of other lands. "The population increase in Bolivia is so fast and the land reform is so slow," they say, "that every year there are more landless peasants." The revolution in Mexico? It stopped fifteen years ago. "We've done more for our people in eighteen months than any other revolution has been able to do in five or ten years." They may exaggerate, these enthusiastic and exuberant Cubans, but they have a great deal to boast about, and their pride in their revolution and its accomplishments is unbounded.

There is still another reason why it is unlikely that the "Weekend in Guatemala" can be repeated in Cuba. In 1954 the Soviet Union was still recovering from the shock and disorientation resulting from the death of Stalin. Its economy had not yet fully recovered from the war's devastation. It gave its support to Guatemala in the United Nations and its allies sold Guatemala a few shiploads of arms, but it was not in a position to provide significant aid, either military or economic to a tiny nation halfway around the globe surrounded by hostile governments completely under State Department domination.

1960, however, is not 1954. Cuba can get from the Soviet Union the arms it needs to defend its revolution. The support and encouragement, both military and financial, which Guatemala lacked, are readily

available to Cuba. And most important of all, the economic aid which Cuba needs to make its revolution a success, thus eliminating significant internal support for counter-revolution, will, it now seems clear, be supplied by the Soviet Union, the Chinese Republic and other socialist countries.

Just how this came about deserves consideration, because it should teach a lesson to our State Department. Failure to learn from this experience may well mean the difference between a successful and a disastrous policy toward the rest of Latin-America.

A few basic principles, first.

Professor Paul Baran, in his brilliant theoretical discussion of the growth of underdeveloped countries, *The Political Economy of Growth*, (Monthly Review Press) pointed out that the major problem faced by any underdeveloped country which achieves its independence from colonialism is the accumulation of the capital necessary to permit industrialism. In past centuries, countries like the United States and Great Britain were able to accumulate this capital over a period of many generations, often at the cost of severe hardship to their inhabitants. But the new emerging countries of the world do not have generations in which to develop as we did. Their populations are growing rapidly and their people are understandably impatient for their share in the comforts of modern civilization. If they are unable to provide at least some relief from their dismal poverty, sooner or later their people will seek a new and better way.

An underdeveloped nation on its

way to economic prosperity may, in the modern world, accumulate capital in one of two basic ways. It may invest a tremendous proportion of its production in heavy industry with a corresponding reduction in the production of consumer goods. This road results in great hardship to the population which must postpone the enjoyment of the fruits of the revolution, sometimes for many years, while an industrial plant is being built up. Basically, this was the path followed by the Soviet Union, a path made necessary because there were in 1917 no well-developed industrial nations willing to provide the aid which would have made the suffering of the ensuing years unnecessary.

Or a "hungry" nation may seek aid from well developed industrial countries which are able and willing to provide such aid. Such assistance, however, if it is to accomplish its purpose, must consist of capital goods, not consumer goods. Furthermore, the resulting productive capacity must be owned in the underdeveloped country, not by its wealthy patron, or the pattern of colonialism will simply be repeated. As a practical matter, such aid from without must be utilized to develop a socialist economy.

And so the newly emancipated Cuba, while prepared to make great sacrifices of its own, necessarily looks to wealthy and industrially developed countries for aid. The policy of the United States since the Second World War has been to minimize aid which would assist in the building of socialism. The fact that agrarian reform, absolutely essential to the success of any revolution in an underdeveloped country,

necessarily would affect in an adverse fashion the economic interest of large American landowners in Cuba, made it even less likely that economic aid would be forthcoming from the United States. In fact, as we know now, almost as soon as Cuba adopted its agrarian reform law our government assumed an attitude of extreme hostility to the new government of Cuba. We gave refuge to scores of Batista henchmen who have maintained a constant barrage of counter-revolutionary propaganda from our shores. Planes based on our territory carried out numerous bombing raids on the sugar field of Cuba. Many of our most influential Senators and Congressmen and almost all of our press have engaged in a ceaseless propaganda barrage against the "Communist" government of Fidel Castro. This, despite the fact that hundreds of millions of dollars of American investments in Cuba remained untouched.

In February, 1960, the Cuban Government entered into an extensive trade agreement with the Soviet Union, by the terms of which the latter agreed to make extensive purchases of sugar over a period of ten years. There was nothing in the treaty which threatened the security of the United States; it did not call for the purchase of arms or for the establishment of a base in Cuba. It did not even provide for the purchase by the Soviet Union of strategic materials, such as nickel. But to our State Department and to our press, this was an alarming step. The specter of Soviet economic competition has been haunting our business community for some time, and here the specter had appeared just off

our coast. Taking refuge in the universal counter-attack, the cry of "Communism" was again raised.

To most Cubans this reaction was incomprehensible. Every "Norteamericano" visiting Cuba in February and March was asked over and over again: "Why do you call us Communists just because we trade with the Soviet Union? Are we not allowed to trade with anyone in the world with whom we can make a good bargain?" To the farmer who for the first time saw a chance to work twelve months a year instead of the four months provided by a sugar economy, who could see with his own eyes new housing being erected either for him or for his neighbor twenty miles away, to such a farmer the cry of "Communism" had little meaning.

The State Department reacted to this treaty and to the events that followed in a violent and unfortunate fashion. Instead of becoming reconciled to the fact that an independent Cuba intended to pursue an independent economic policy, trading wherever it could, we treated the trade agreement almost as though it were an act of war. What followed may be summed up by noting merely that each time the United States sought to impose additional sanctions on Cuba, the Soviet Union responded by offering to supply the needed goods. Thus, when American refineries in Cuba refused to refine Soviet oil (a tactic which undoubtedly would have brought Cuba to its knees ten years ago), Cuba was able to seize the refineries and turn to the Soviet Union for the additional crude oil it could not get from U.S.-controlled producers. When the United

States cut Cuba's sugar quota, the Soviet Union and its socialist allies promptly took up the slack. When United States technicians who had worked in the mines and mills of Cuba were withdrawn, the socialist countries stood ready to supply the necessary assistance.

If the State Department had determined a year ago to force Cuba into the arms of the Soviet Union, it could not have done a better job. Obviously, it is wasteful for Cuba to send sugar many thousands of miles away to the Soviet Union or China when there is another customer only ninety miles distant. An oil tanker can make many trips to American-owned oil wells in Venezuela in the time that it takes to make one trip to the Black Sea. Traditionally, Cuba has always dealt with the United States; many of its citizens speak our language and are accustomed to our business procedures. To change all of this is wasteful and injurious, not only to Cuba but to the United States as well.

Our foreign policy, however, has left Cuba with no alternative. The more we seek to apply economic sanctions, the more Cuba is certain to turn to the only countries in the world who stand prepared to help.

This is not to say that the road of Cuba will necessarily be easy or that the revolution is sure to be successful. As is pointed out above, reliance by Cuba on countries thousands of miles away is wasteful and there is little enough wealth in the world to justify waste. There are, both in Cuba and in countries immediately surrounding Cuba, strong counter-revolutionary forces which, no doubt, will continue to plot the

overthrow of the Castro regime. It may be assumed that the regime itself will undergo serious stresses from within, will have to make accommodations, will have to educate its own people as it proceeds. No revolutionary government has an easy path, as the history of every revolution in the past three hundred and fifty years has shown.

But the Cuban Revolution, guided by young, imaginative, honest

and courageous men and women, looks to the future with unbounded confidence and enthusiasm. It has the support of the overwhelming majority of its people. It has the good wishes of millions of friends both in this country and elsewhere. It has the support of many powerful allies. It may yet provide leadership toward a happy and prosperous future for all of the countries of Latin-America.

### **CORLISS LAMONT'S MESSAGE TO JAPANESE PEACE CONFERENCE**

*The fifteenth anniversary of the bombing of Hiroshima on August 6, 1945 was observed by the Sixth Annual World Conference for the Banning of Atomic and Hydrogen Weapons and for Total Disarmament meeting in Tokyo. We print below excerpts from a letter sent by Dr. Corliss Lamont to the Conference.*

**TO THE JAPAN COUNCIL against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs:**

Every sincere believer in peace in every nation should give active support to the Sixth World Conference against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs and for Total Disarmament.

Horrible and inexcusable as was the first atom bomb attack at Hiroshima, let us remember that today a hydrogen bomb possesses 50 times the explosive power of that original experiment in nuclear warfare. One single H-bomb could devastate the whole of New York City or Moscow or London or Tokyo; and the radioactive fallout would extend for hundreds of miles. This frightful danger of nuclear weapons confronts all human beings everywhere.

While the Soviet Union has made its share of mistakes in foreign policy, I regret to state that it is my own government, the Republican Administration of President Eisenhower, that still constitutes the chief obstacle to the abolition of atomic and hydrogen weapons. Yet America, the nation that first invented the atom bomb and first dropped it on two populous Japanese cities, has a special and supreme moral obligation to see that all such satanic devices are gotten rid of permanently.

Of course Communists work against the nuclear horror. The point is that intelligent individuals and groups, regardless of differing economic, political and religious viewpoints and whether they are to be classified as conservatives, liberals or leftists, necessarily support both the abolition of nuclear bombs and disarmament in conventional weapons. This is a matter of sheer self-interest, of the elementary struggle for survival. Disarmament all along the line is equally to the self-interest of nations as a whole.

There is little indication that the American Government is aware of these truths; or if aware, will take the needful measures to implement them. Hence the peace movements in various countries allied to the United States—such as England, Italy, Japan—assume an added importance reaching far out beyond their national boundaries. If these movements can persuade their respective governments to say "No, thank you" to American military and nuclear bases on their soil, that will be a tremendous step forward and will help the American people to force their government to adopt a genuine peace policy. In fact, the more countries that become truly neutral in the Cold War, the better chance we have of liquidating both cold wars and hot wars.

Ac  
N  
live  
tion  
and  
des  
atta  
bee  
of f  
her  
sion  
can  
Des  
A  
of  
vari  
ed  
won  
achi  
settl  
The  
side  
up t  
criss  
ting  
up t  
and  
years  
a sn  
Briti  
  
SHIR  
many  
Frede  
and  
laborn  
B. Dr  
visitin  
count

# The Women of Africa Meet

by SHIRLEY GRAHAM

Accra, Ghana, July 26, 1960

**N**OT SINCE the chaotic days when the woman of Africa lived in constant dread of separation from her children by raiders and slave traders, when her men desperately fought off one wave of attackers after another, has there been such a get-together of women of the African continent as was held here in Accra July 14-21. The occasion was The Conference of African Women and Women of African Descent.

Accra, capital of the Republic of Ghana, has been the source of various historic conferences, initiated mostly by men. But Ghanaian women have played a vital role in achieving full independence and in setting up the Republic of Ghana. Their Builders Brigades have worked side by side with men in opening up the broad, new roads which now criss-cross the country, in constructing bridges, and schools, in putting up the handsome public buildings and modern homes which, in three years, have transformed Accra from a smug, ramshackled outpost of British imperialism to the impres-

sive, beautiful capital of a proud and dignified people. Ten women are now members of the new Parliament; a woman Magistrate presides over the court, another woman Judge decides cases; one of the District Regional Commissioners (corresponding to our State Governor) is a woman. And the Market Women of Accra is a highly organized business association which wields powerful political influence.

It is not, therefore, surprising that it was Ghanaian women who first called this Conference of African Women. And the vision and broad concept of these women is shown by the fact that their call went out not only to the women throughout Africa, but also embraced those women in whose veins flows the blood of Africa, who by fate have found themselves planted elsewhere.

Thus it was that twenty-five women of African descent in the United States came to this Conference. They came from seven different communities in the east, central and Pacific cities of the United States. Few came as official representatives of organizations, but, as I explained to the Conference, all were members of many and various organizations. And all these organizations would receive reports and would know about the discussions and findings of this historic Conference. I declared that our number was evidence of the very real interest and concern of

---

SHIRLEY GRAHAM is the author of many books, including biographies of Frederick Douglass, Phyllis Wheatley and Booker T. Washington. She collaborated with her husband, Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois, with whom she has been visiting Ghana and various European countries this summer, on "In Battle for Peace."

Negro women for their sisters in Africa.

Unlike the women from other countries, we did not come as an organized U. S. delegation. However, at the first pre-conference briefing of all groups we were informed that since on important conference matters such as final resolutions only one vote could be allowed for each country it would be necessary for us to organize as a delegation and elect a chairman. Our group met and the writer was elected head of the U.S. Delegation—largely because she had been in Ghana since July 1 and therefore was best acquainted with the general lay-out of Accra—which at first strikes the newcomer as complicated.

After two working and get-acquainted days, and a Sunday of sight-seeing, the Conference was officially opened by Osagyefo Kwame Nkrumah, President of the Republic of Ghana. A brilliant and colorful assembly of two hundred delegates and observers, attired in various and multi-colored national dress awaited him. (I am bringing home samples of the extraordinarily vivid and beautiful cottons in which these women dress. The movement is sweeping Africa to discard the "missionary" type of dull European clothes which have been imposed upon the peoples of Africa and to return to the garb of their fathers).

Heads of delegations were seated on the platform. Upon the President's arrival we were formally presented to him. Then, he addressed the assembly, first paying tribute to the women of Ghana who, he said have been "solidly behind the Ghana revolution," who have "flocked to the nationalist banners, and, side

by side with the men, fought heroically until freedom was achieved for Ghana". He stressed that "A free Africa wants and is determined to make its own contribution to the world. This can be done in an atmosphere of political and economic freedom." He urged African womanhood to "bring your feminine influence to bear in persuading your brothers, husbands and friends of the importance of African unity as the only salvation for Africa."

Response to the President was made by Mrs. Florence Mahoney, leader of the delegation from Gambia, who assured him that "Women of Africa and African descent would always remember their responsibilities in the struggle for the emancipation of Africa as well as the need for unity among women of Africa and of African descent which alone will conquer everything."

A brief glance at the subjects which were presented by papers and followed by discussion on this opening day will give some idea of the scope and importance of the Conference. Judge Annie Jaigge (Ghana) dealt with the "Legal Status of Women, Marriage, Property, Suffrage and Inheritance." Speaking on "Women in Business, Professional and Civic Life," Mrs. Ruth Adjorlolo (Ghana) said "Men and women are equally responsible for what happens in the home, the community and the state. The progress and prosperity for which we cry can only come when women shoulder their share of civic responsibilities and walk side by side with our men as co-workers for the good of the community and for the state to which we belong."

Mrs. Efua Sutherland (West Af-

rica's outstanding poet) posed several important questions: "Are we ready to be realistic about Africa? Are we ready to shed our confusions? To shed them in our personal lives and in our homes in order to qualify for participation in the new national life? Are we ready to be original and reject what can only be described as the carbon copy mentality? Why be a carbon copy when we can be original? The re-strengthening of Africa's creative genius depends entirely on our being able to face these challenges with honesty."

Mrs. Anna Hedgeman (USA) presented "Women in Public Life"; Mrs. Wede Mitchell (Liberia), "Fundamental and Mass Education."

With such wealth of material thrown out on the opening day it can be imagined that every session of the Conference was crowded and lively from nine o'clock in the morning—with a break for lunch—until far into the night. The Nigerian delegation presented a broad and comprehensive survey of "Economic Cooperation and Expansion of Trade as it Affects Women in West Africa"; problems of health in different parts of Africa were taken up by experts in this field; nutrition; a representative from the United Nations F. A. O. discussed agricultural developments in rural communities and answered ques-

tions related to agricultural needs and possibilities.

Over and over again the development of the "African Personality" and the essential need of unity were stressed. Dr. Aisha Abdurrahman, Professor of Arabic Literature, University of Ain Shams (Egypt) appealed to African women "to let your children imbibe the spirit of nationalism so that future generations might protect themselves from any form of colonialism that might raise its ugly head on the African continent." She warned that all books and films from imperialistic nations must be carefully scrutinized and many of them deemed unfit for distribution in Africa. "We cannot afford the luxury of watching dangerous criminals committing murders, gangs of thieves robbing banks and beating up people and other crimes prevalent in the civilized world."

Cablegrams of sympathy and support were sent to the women of South Africa and to the Congo Republic. Following an invitation from the Tunisian delegation, the Conference voted to hold its next session in Tunis in 1962.

I close not because there is not much more to report, but because I know the limitations of space. But I shall be writing and talking about this historic Conference of African Women and Women of African Descent for a long time to come.

#### WILLIAM FAULKNER AND ARTHUR MILLER

WILLIAM FAULKNER was voted the best foreign writer published in Poland in 1959 and Arthur Miller's *The Crucible* the best play produced in Polish theaters in a questionnaire answered by 150 Polish writers.

The Soviet film *The Fate of Man* received most votes as the best film of the year, with second place shared by the Polish *Ashes and Diamonds* and the American pictures, *High Noon* and *East of Eden*.

# Vignettes of Soviet Life

by BERNARD KOTEN

**T**RAVELING without notebook or camera, certain vignettes strike in your mind, and some of these I will share with you.

One little meeting on a train stays in my memory especially. On my way from Leningrad to Tallin some months ago, I shared a train compartment with a naval engineer who said this was the first time he had ever been so close to a foreigner, and if I didn't mind, could we talk the night through without sleep? We talked and talked about his country and mine, his people and mine and about ourselves. He told me about his work. He had been a naval engineer for many years and had served in Leningrad all during the famous siege as had his wife, who was a doctor. His work keeps him on board ship most of the time and when he isn't doing that he is teaching. The point he made most strongly to me was that his work was concerned with the running of ships but never with any military operations related to ships. He told me proudly he had never done any direct war work on board ship, and wanted nothing to do with anything associated with war.

---

BERNARD KOTEN is Curator of the Library for Intercultural Studies in New York City, and Instructor in Russian at New York University. He has led a number of tour groups in recent years to the Soviet Union.

## ***Talks with Stalingrad Workers***

Last month I spent a day at a Stalingrad tractor plant with a group of American tourists I had taken to the Soviet Union. We were permitted to wander around the plant practically at will, with the Chief Engineer and the Director standing by to answer any questions that popped into our minds. It took us a little while to realize what seemed so natural and strange at the same time. We had expected to see the usual work pressures in a plant run on a conveyor belt, but everyone seemed completely relaxed. The workers along the belt chatted with each other, took smoke breaks, and talked with us very freely as we walked among them.

At one point a group of workers walked up to us and asked us what our nationality was. When they learned we were Americans they asked whether we would mind if they talked to us a while. What they wanted to talk about was how much they hated war, what fearful memories they had of the war as youngsters and how sad it had made them to have us send the U-2 over their cities just before the Summit Conference, at a time when relations between our two countries seemed to be improving so. They wanted us to know they had only the warmest feelings towards us as fellow human beings, but were

really concerned that none of us should suffer the consequences of war ever again.

Other workers came over just to say hello or to ask about working conditions in America, or what we thought of the tractors they were putting out. They asked no one for permission to come and talk with us and no one stopped them.

### **Tadzhik Collective Farm— and the U-2**

In Tadzhikistan, the Chairman of a collective farm where we spent a day was a lot less charitable with us about the U-2. He said it seemed we had rather a nerve to send over a U-2 and then to expect to be accepted as guests. However, after a lengthy discussion on the desire of people all over the world for peace, and whether or not there was collective responsibility for an act of aggression, which they considered the sending over of the U-2 to be, we settled down to learn about how this farm was run.

We learned that this was one of the first farms in the USSR to switch from the workday\* pay arrangement to a weekly wage scale. This our Tadzhik farm friends felt to be an important step along the road in the transition from socialism to communism, in helping to eliminate the difference between town and country, worker and farmer. The farmers we talked with liked it also because it meant they knew what their weekly income would be as a regular thing. This new system is now spreading throughout the country. These farmers took a spe-

cial pride in being among the first to make the change.

The farmers were also very proud of the fact that over 80 percent of their young people who went out to the big cities for a higher education came back to the farms to apply their new knowledge right on the farm. The Chairman himself had been a local boy who had got his degree in agricultural economy and came back home to be elected, at the age of 26, the farm chairman. The veterinarian, the doctor, the zootechnician and the agronomist were all also local young people who had returned after getting their diplomas in Stalingrad, Tashkent and Moscow.

I got a warm embrace from the Chairman on leaving, but he cautioned me not to take this as an apology for his U-2 questions. He meant the questions seriously and would go on raising such questions. The members of his collective farm were asking him about such things as the U-2 and he felt he had a responsibility to them to find out how Americans themselves felt about it, and he would, of course, tell them about his meeting with us.

While attending a Khachaturian concert in Yerevan, conducted by Khachaturian himself, we sat next to what seemed like a sweet little old Armenian lady all dressed in white. We learned all about her during the various intermissions. She was a canneries engineer and had worked in canneries all over the Soviet Union—in the Arctic, in Central Asia, in central Russia, in the sub-tropics along the Caspian; and she, too, wanted us to know that she thought sending over the U-2 made for a sad time for us all.

\*The workday is a unit of payment for farm work, based on work performed in terms of quantity, quality or time.

"You don't know how much we need peace to build a good life for ourselves. It is much more important, you know, to send a rocket to the moon, than spy planes over each other's territories." And she thought, by the way, that the first one to go to the moon should be a woman and preferably herself. "I think it ought to be me because I have already experienced, with absolutely no effects on my health, living and working in every possible kind of climate, and know I could take the pressure and climate changes required for a rocket flight to the moon."

### ***Humor as a Weapon***

Everywhere we went we found an active use being made of posters, wall newspapers and cartoons to point up various shortcomings in Soviet life in satirical and humorous ways and to try to bring about corrections in this way. An issue of the humorous magazine *Krokodil* especially struck us. In this issue there is a series of six cartoons. The first one shows a woman chauffeur driving the boss and the caption indicates that the boss, Peter Petrovich, has nothing against women driving (the Russian word means both driving and governing so there is a play on words here). The second cartoon shows a trio of women athletes standing on a platform showing they have taken first, second and third places in a competition. The caption says that the same Peter Petrovich is very glad to have women rise to their rightful height. The third cartoon shows a ballerina in motion and indicates that our Peter hails the women's movement. After two more pictures

in which Peter hails women's advances, in the last cartoon we see a meeting of a directorial board made up of men only and the caption says: Only not in his own enterprise.

In big cities and in small, store windows on the main streets are turned over to what have been called TASS windows since Maykovsky's time (TASS stands for the Telegraph Agency of the Soviet Union). It isn't much fun to see a caricature of yourself with the head an actual photograph and the verse below clearly stating your name, address and place of work, to point out that you, a salesman in such and such a place, always do a little weight cheating by putting your fingers on the scales or that you save rare items either for family or for people who give you special tips—or that maybe you beat your wife.

You will probably want to avoid, too, being the one of whom a big papier maché figure is put up, face and name and all, in a local park of rest and culture or in the belawned courtyard of a factory, to show that you tippie a little too much.

There is a little postcard put out in Leningrad captioned: Papa, mama, half a liter and I. It shows papa and mama wheeling a carriage with a baby in it in one direction and on the way back mama and baby pushing the carriage with a red-nosed, drunken papa in it.

### ***They Read on Escalators, Too***

We were interested in the amount of reading we saw being done everywhere. Elevator operators pull out a book to read during waits. But drivers—taxi drivers, truck drivers—

have  
Wait  
in t  
title  
the  
toye  
and  
thou  
ever  
wen  
ing  
tors  
the  
train  
long  
enow  
peop  
thei  
read

Wor

In  
mad  
foun  
tion  
but  
worl  
the  
Its f  
lent  
educ  
not  
scho  
high  
ing  
man  
with  
her  
and  
worl  
was  
baby  
that  
favo  
and  
from  
stud

have a book ready for waits, too. Waiters and waitresses sit and read in their breaks. We glanced at book titles and found the classics to be the most popular: Tolstoy, Dostoyevsky, Galsworthy, Shakespeare and moderns like Sholokhov. We thought we had seen reading under every possible condition until we went into the subway and saw reading under still another! The escalators in the subways there go all the way from the surface to the train platform and sometimes it's a long, long ride down, and sure enough on one ride we counted 20 people who pulled books out of their pockets and stood quietly reading all the way down!

### **Work, Study and Baby Too**

In a factory in Tashkent that made agricultural machinery we found a very active school in operation. It was called an evening school, but it functioned during the day for workers on evening shift and during the evening for those on day shift. Its function was to give the equivalent of a complete high school education for any worker who had not had a chance to finish high school and wanted to go on to higher studies. We were there during exam time and one young woman had come for review and exam with a baby in her arms. We asked her how come, and she said she and her husband had arranged their work and study hours so that there was always someone to pick up the baby at the nursery on time, but that he was a football fan and his favorite team was playing that day and there was no keeping him away from the stadium. So all the other students took turns with the baby

as she took her review and exam. Nobody thought it strange.

### **Human Relations**

Another interesting relationship we noticed was between our young chauffeur and our young woman guide in Stalinabad. Every time they had to wait for us they took out a chess board and played a game of chess on a very familiar level. During the work period, however, she was in charge and the relations were very much those of worker and supervisor.

It was interesting to notice the work relationships on board a boat we took from Stalingrad to Rostov, too. The waitresses in the various dining rooms treated the woman restaurant director on board more as if she were their mother, friend and teacher, than their boss. I noticed they went to her not only for work instruction and advice on how to carry out certain tasks, but also to discuss personal problems, both theirs and hers—family problems, love affairs, what color suited them best, and we didn't notice any of the pressure usually felt in restaurants. Some of our people felt, however, that a little of this pressure might have been desirable. You didn't always get waited on as fast as you might want. Waiters and waitresses seem to make their own tempo.

### **Youth and Socialism**

One of our tour group members, a devout church goer, was most struck by the youth. What impressed her was the lack of rough house in the streets and in the parks crowded with young people. What struck her even more was the var-

iety of wholesome entertainment available for the young people, and the extent to which they availed themselves of it. The cities were full of parks and theaters and the parks and theaters full of young people attending concerts, folk dances, exhibitions, discussion groups, lectures, sitting in park open-air reading rooms, walking in groups of as many as ten, arm in arm, talking and laughing. To her they seemed like young people at a Sunday church picnic, rather than like the wild Communists she had expected to find.

In Leningrad there is an interesting new shop. It specializes only in new things available on the market: new gadgets for the household, new toys, new clothing accessories. The young chemical industry is contributing a great deal to these novelties. We found there in abundance articles that even last year we had brought friends as gifts because they were unavailable in the Soviet Union—electric hand mixers, fine little cameras, vegetable juicers, small vacuum cleaners.

Every city is experimenting with at least one self-service store. You get what you want and get out much faster, but for some reason they are not as popular as the other stores yet.

It is strange because compared with last year the sudden flurry of style and color comes as a pleasant shock. You realize all of a sudden that it is not as easy to tell local people from foreigners as it used to be. An awful lot of the girls have been hit by the Brigitte Bardot bug and walk along on high heels with bouffant short skirts, tight waists and beehive hair-do's, although most

girls have Italian cuts, and lipstick isn't a strange sight anymore either. The boys, too, have abandoned wide for narrow trousers and with a general interest in stylish dressing the old Styliagi (style hounds) have mostly disappeared and do not cause the trouble they used to. Most young people are interested in dressing well and in listening to jazz, but don't let that fool you into thinking that this means they have abandoned socialism. They are a thinking youth and a questioning youth, but I found them, in the main, firmly convinced that communism is man's only eventual way of living. They seem to enjoy going out to work on collective farms for a month during summer vacations and they approve more than their elders of the school reform which requires a two-year interim working period before entering the university. At the schools many of the instructors told us that the work-study programs are already bearing fruit in a much more serious attitude to study, but they did complain that students were getting experiences that teachers weren't, and that they found that this involved a certain amount of separation between teachers and students. Many of the teachers we spoke to felt that this work experience might be useful to teachers, too.

### **And Finally**

I have been sorting out my impressions and coming to some conclusions concerning what I heard and saw in the last months in the USSR—in Moscow, Stalingrad, Rostov, Tbilisi, Yerevan, Baku, Tashkent, Stalingrad, Samarkand, Leningrad—ten cities and six republics.

I find today's Soviet man a thinking, analytical human being. He is most concerned with helping to build a happy, prosperous society—not just for posterity, but for himself. He wants to dress well and in good taste, he wants to eat well, he wants to live well and comfortably, he wants plenty of reading and culture in all its forms. He wants serious music and he wants jazz.

He wants all of this not only for himself, but for his whole country, for the whole world. And he is uncommonly aware of the need of peace for himself and the world to attain all of this. The memory of war is still painful and sharp. He wants no more.

He is convinced that it is from socialism and collective living that he can attain these ends. But he is no less convinced that everyone else has the right to attain these ends in his own way. He wants not to interfere in the way of life of others, and he wants no one to interfere with his way of life.

The U-2 incident has made the average Soviet man and woman more sad than angry. Just when the two great powers seemed to be finding a way to live in peace and friendship! Why?—they kept asking us—and drank toasts with us to a return of decent, good, friendly relations and a lasting guarantee of peace.

### NEGRO DOCTORS VISIT THE SOVIET UNION

A GROUP OF SEVENTEEN NEGRO doctors, twelve of them accompanied by their wives, spent two weeks in August examining medical facilities in the Soviet Union. Sponsored by the National Medical Association which comprises 5,000 physicians in 44 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, the British West Indies, Panama and Bermuda, the group was headed by Dr. Edward C. Mazique of Washington, D. C., president of the Association. (See NWR, March, 1960, for an article by Dr. Mazique's wife, Jewell R. Mazique, about her trip to the USSR last year.)

In announcing the trip, Dr. Mazique emphasized that the visit was for the purposes of spreading goodwill as well as for inspecting Soviet medical services. Expressing his concern that human relations have not kept pace with our material development, Dr. Mazique said, "If the social barriers which have separated men and partially rendered the benefits from science null and void are to be overcome the physical scientists must apply techniques for exploring the atom and penetrating mountains to reaching people," thus helping to create conditions without which medical science cannot advance.

"The physician," Dr. Mazique added, "must become convinced that if science is divorced from people it ceases to be a creative force in life and that his medicine will not in the long run extend longevity. It will only prepare man for destruction."

The doctors making the trip with Dr. Mazique are: Dr. Arthur C. Logan, Dr. Richard M. Carey and Dr. Vaughan C. Mason of New York City; Dr. Charles S. Ireland of Washington, D. C.; Dr. Leroy R. Swift of Durham, N. C.; Dr. Kenneth W. Clement, Dr. Clifton R. Hines, Dr. Joseph P. Martin and Dr. Creed F. Ward of Cleveland; Dr. Alegro J. Godley; Dr. Ehtelene J. Crockett, accompanied by her husband, Attorney George W. Crockett, Jr., of Detroit; Dr. Thomas R. Peyton of Los Angeles; Dr. Henry F. Shorter, of Atlanta; Dr. Margaret E. Grigsby of Washington, D. C.; and Dr. Joseph L. Carwin and his wife, Dr. Joyce Y. Carwin, of Stamford, Connecticut.

Beside the two weeks the group spent in the USSR, they also visited Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, France and England.

# The Chinese Climb Mt. Everest

by ANNA LOUISE STRONG

Peking, June 2.

**I**F ANY in the West saw the statement by the conquerors of Everest—beg pardon, the residents call that mountain Jolmo Lungma, but the West calls it by a Britisher's name—that the victory was due to "the correct leadership of the Communist Party," they doubtless threw down the paper with a snort of disgust. Even I, inured to slogans, sighed: "Can't they leave politics out of a mountain-climb?"

The answer is: "They cannot leave it out."

For whether or not you like it, it really was the collective spirit that put the Chinese on top of that peak by the difficult, hitherto unclimbed northern side, some twelve hours ahead of the blizzard that drove back the Indian expedition on the easier southern side. The Chinese climbed in a "socialist way." And if you ask how socialism differs from capitalism in climbing mountains, I note three differences, and there may be more.

1) Twenty-nine men climbed the mountain, and climbed hard parts of it four times over, that three might make the top.

2) All twenty-nine shared the

**ANNA LOUISE STRONG**, world famous correspondent and author of many books on the USSR, China and our own country, has been visiting in China for over a year. Last summer she visited Tibet with a group of correspondents, among whom she was the only American—and the only woman.

planning, the action, the plaudits.

3) The top leaders did not make the summit and did not try to. They gave their talents to getting three other men up. Two leaders climbed to within a thousand feet of the summit, and spent a night and a day there, gulping oxygen all the time in the zero cold, in order to scout the safest, shortest way for the final dash. Then they dropped out, their energy spent. But their work paid off when the final team of three that made the summit found, on that last terrible day when every step was torment, that their leaders had ensured them against a single unneeded step.

By contrast take the well-known capitalist method. A famous mountaineer went out from Europe, in search of greater victory and renown. He hired several score Nepalese or Tibetans to get him to the top. By the laws of sport he walked it on his own two feet. But the carrying of packs and the setting of camps were done by hirelings. The first man who ever made it was a Briton\* but later his Nepalese guide claimed that he, the Nepalese, was first at the top, and hauled the other man up. Nobody else can know. All the other Nepalese were hired labor, long forgotten. That kind of organization lacks punch.

\* Edmund Hillary and Tenzing Norkey, the Nepalese guide, reached the top of Mt. Everest on May 29, 1953. The top was reached twice in 1956 by two separate groups.

Chinese have been climbing mountains just four or five years. It takes time to learn mountaineering. A Swiss mountaineer predicted a short time ago that by 1970 the Chinese might be climbing real mountains! It was May 25, 1960, when three Chinese, one a Tibetan, made the top of the world's highest peak by the hardest northern side, which nobody had ever been able to climb before. They made it by climbing the socialist way.

Twenty-nine comrades made the assault, all sharing the plans and the honors, all giving utmost strength. Thirteen of the twenty-nine, and one of the final three, were Tibetans, their names were listed along with the rest. That may be why all the local Tibetan villagers rushed up to the Base Camp to welcome back the victors and why Lhasa went crazy with drums and gongs and firecrackers to celebrate. It was a people's victory, not a personal one.

Details of the climb now arriving from Tibet give an epic of a two-and-a-half months' collective struggle, an appalling yet inspiring tale of utmost endurance and daring. It is also a tale of collective planning and selfless actions by leaders in service to the group. All those twenty-nine men climbed as high as 26,568 feet, which puts them all among the very top mountaineers of the world. Some of them climbed much of the distance many times, until they knew it in sunlight and blizzard, in dawn and midnight. All knowledge was shared.

They reached the foot of the mountain March 19 in a blinding blizzard. Shrieking winds hurled a wall of snow and sand hundreds of feet above them, blotting out the

landscape and the peak. They set up there their Base Camp, with weather and radio station, with clinic and provisioning base. It was 16,894 feet elevation, two thousand feet higher than Mt. Blanc in Europe or Mt. Whitney in the U.S.A. But here it was only a start.

Here for five days they crouched in tents, discussed and agreed on their plans for climbing. When tents were torn away by winds in the night, the men crawled in pitch dark snow to dig themselves billets again. The Base still had breathable though rather thin air.

The plan called for three preliminary climbs, each higher and higher, to acclimatize the climbers and to set up seven "altitude camps" on the way to the top. From these three climbs they would return to Base Camp to rest in honest air. Then would come the fourth climb, rising steadily through the seven camps and then building an Assault Camp, from which the last dash to the summit would be made.

Each of these preliminary climbs was itself a great saga of daring and victory beyond the reach of normal human effort. The first began March 25 when the blizzards cleared into dazzling sunlight and blue crystal sky. The first day they went up the East Rongbuk Glacier and made a camp at 17,712 ft. elevation, finding old camp sites marked by empty tins and wornout mountain boots of British make. The second day they climbed through ice seracs exploding under a blazing sun into millions of lethal missiles, detoured an impassable wall of ice, cut steps up a lesser wall, made a second camp at 19,350 feet.

The third day they climbed a vast

ugged terrain of steep ice, split by spider-webs of deep crevasses, with hard crust scarcely dented by spikes of mountain boots. Here the fair weather left them; a driving storm hurled clouds of snow, blotted visibility to a few yards, dropped temperature to zero Fahrenheit. They roped up and climbed against the wind, making camp in a storm at 20,992 feet elevation.

On this day they found the corpse of a long-dead mountaineer, lying at the foot of a slope, preserved by the everlasting cold. The body and head were shrunken beyond all sign of race, but the bits of green down clothing were of British make. They dug a grave in the snow and buried him in the storm.

On the fourth day the main party turned back to the Base Camp to rest in relatively normal air, but a group of six went ahead, to scout the approaches to the terrible North Col and prepare the plans for the second main preliminary climb.

Here is no space to tell of the treacherous North Col, its colossal avalanches, the howling blizzards that swept it, the hours and days of struggle that discovered those cracks in the ice that are called ice chimneys, up which men climb by pressing backs against one side and knees against the other and inching slowly up. By the time the main party was ready for the second main climb, four "roads" had been found up the North Col by the advance party, and "improved" by ropes and light ladders across crevasses and steps cut in ice slopes.

The main party advanced in its second climb while the advanced scout group went down to the Base Camp for honest air and rest.

Thus they climbed two months in blazing sun or blizzard, till they had fixed seven "altitude camps" above the Base Camp, at ever higher levels, Camp Seven being at 27,222 feet elevation, until the route became familiar in all its aspects and dangers. Eleven men went no farther than Camp 6, at 26,568 feet elevation; thereafter they kept the supply line open. Sixteen men prepared at the Base Camp for the fourth and final climb.

For two of the twenty-nine was reserved a special task. Shin Chanchun, leader of the expedition, and the best-known alpinist of them all, after leading the third main climb and establishing Camp 7, did not return to the Base Camp with the rest, but climbed far beyond with Wang Feng-tung, deputy secretary of the Communist Party group. They reached the upper part of the formidable "second step," the almost vertical cliff of the northeast ridge that leads to the summit. Here they dug a cave in snow and spent the night at 28,208 feet elevation, some 900 feet below the final peak itself, and gave the next day to scouting the safest, shortest route to the summit.

Then these two leaders returned to Base Camp, their climbing done. They did not share the fourth and final drive. They had done a job as exhausting and difficult as the summit climb itself, scouting for a night and a day at 28,208 feet the way for those to come.

The fourth and final climb began May 17 from the Base Camp. Sixteen men, under deputy leader Hsu Ching, climbed steadily through the route they now knew well, through all the Seven Camps, and set up the

final A  
tion—  
summed  
Hsu C  
for t  
them  
in th  
chose  
Th  
and  
chun  
Tin-  
from  
Kun  
left  
A.M  
as g  
reach  
the  
A.M  
had  
teen  
feet  
The  
step  
star  
far  
eve  
7  
cia  
sun  
del  
the  
M  
ter  
wh  
su  
ba  
th  
M  
n  
b  
n  
fr  
d  
t

final Assault Camp at 27,880 elevation—a march and task that consumed a week. Then on May 24 Hsu Ching coached the chosen three for the last assault and directed them on their way, himself staying in the Assault Camp with a second chosen team of three in reserve.

They were three men, all young and able mountaineers: Wang Fuchun, 25-year-old geologist; Chu Tin-hua, 25-year-old lumberjack from Szechuan, and 27-year-old Kunbu, a Tibetan soldier. They left the Assault Camp at about 6 A.M. by the mountain's time, listed as 9:30 A.M. Peking time. They reached the summit at midnight on the mountain, announced as 4:20 A.M. May 25, Peking time. They had climbed only 1,253 feet in nineteen hours, an hour for every 66 feet, a minute for every average step. These were short, hard, terrible steps. The two expedition leaders, starting lower down, had climbed farther, and had saved them on every one of those steps.

This may well have been the crucial factor that brought them to the summit ahead of the blizzard that defeated the Indian Expedition in the later hours of that same day, May 25. It also defeated any attempt by the Chinese "reserve team" which also had hoped to make the summit climb. The climbers all went back to the Base Camp, and it took them nearly seven days, till late on May 30.

Here they were met with cheers, not only from their fellow climbers, but from crowds of Tibetan herds-men and villagers, who had climbed from below to meet the victors with drums and garlands. The three victors replied that the victory was due

to the collective spirit of the New China. They told the truth. It was.

*June 29, 1960.*

THE article I sent was mailed on the basis of data wired from the base camp on the mountain. When the climbers returned to Lhasa and some of them to Peking, more data became available which was even more striking than the material I sent.

First, when the two leaders, after the third acclimatization climb, continued up the mountain to within 900 feet of the summit and spent the night in a snow cave, in order to scout the route on the following day, I spoke of them as "gulping oxygen all the time," because it is taken for granted that at such elevation one cannot live otherwise. It is now revealed that they went without oxygen all night, in order to save their supply for the next day's scouting. Spending a night without oxygen at that elevation is a feat unheard of before.

Secondly, the final assault was begun, not by three men, but by four, the fourth being Liu Lien-man, a fireman from Harbin. Within two hours they reached the famous "second step," an almost vertical, slippery wall one hundred feet high, which British explorers have found to be the final impassable barrier. They managed to get precariously to within ten feet of the top, where the wall became completely vertical and almost overhanging. After several failures, Liu tried the "short ladder" method, by which he bent, took a comrade on his back, and then straightened himself and lifted the comrade over the edge. He did this three times, but became so ex-

hausted by it that he had to stop, only 600 feet below the summit. Lying down, he turned off his oxygen and waited more than twelve hours for the others to return, saving the oxygen for them and losing consciousness intermittently by this.

Third, the other three kept on into darkness and driving wind below zero, without a flashlight, by the light of stars on snow. They were 165 feet below the summit when their oxygen gave out. They consulted, knowing that to go on was very dangerous to life. They decided to keep on, and left their breathing apparatus behind. They went with headache and troubled vision and such weakness that it took half an hour to climb up a rock three feet high, and that, when blocked by another rocky slab, they lifted one man over it, and he rested

half an hour before he could help the others up.

When they finally reached the top, and knew it was the summit because everything else lay far, far below them, they realized that it had taken nineteen hours without food or water.

It took the three men several minutes even to write their names on a piece of paper, put this in a glove and fasten it under rocks, together with a Chinese flag and a small bust of Mao Tse-tung.

They spent only fifteen minutes on top. When they got down to Liu, who was only 600 feet below them, and he offered them the oxygen he had saved, all the three burst into tears.

It is to be hoped that the entire story, in full detail, will be written in adequate style.

### TRADE UNIONISTS VISIT THE SOVIET UNION

JOSEPH CURRAN, president of the National Maritime Union, with three other leading members of the union, were guests this summer of the Soviet Sea and River Transport Workers Union. In the report to the union on his return Curran said, the people of this country "have been fed stories that the Russians are backward—that they are prisoners waiting for someone to lead them out of darkness. They are moving ahead and moving ahead rapidly. There is a tremendous difference since I was there in 1945."

Ernest Mazey of the Automobile Workers headed another group of nine unionists who visited the USSR this summer as guests of the Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Ties with Foreign Countries. Going as individuals rather than as official representatives of the union to which they belonged, the delegates agreed that the breakdown of the Summit in Paris made their trip even more imperative to ensure the continued contacts between the people of the two countries. Mr. Mazey said on his return that the members of his delegation intended to urge their unions to expand exchange visit programs with the Soviet Union. "The hospitality and friendship," Mr. Mazey said, "shown to us by the Soviet people everywhere we traveled and at every level of the Soviet population was incomparable."

In the group with Mr. Mazey were Cecil L. Patrick, Dining Car Workers Locals 848 and 849, Chicago; Jack D. Spiegel, United Shoe Workers, Chicago; Ruth Levitoff, United Textile Workers, Chicago; Marion Calligaris, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, Chicago; Sidney Lens, United Service Employees Union Local of the Building Service Employees Union, Chicago; Sam Pollack, Amalgamated Meat Cutters, Cleveland; Jay Miller, Amalgamated Clothing Workers, Hazelton, Pa.; Lillian Elner, Office Workers, Oakland, California.

# "From China to Peru"

by ARCHIE JOHNSTONE

WHEN SAMUEL JOHNSON, "with extensive view, surveyed mankind from China to Peru," his poetic flying-license gave him a range of vision denied to ordinary mortals; in Moscow these days you can, without any flight of fancy, meet mankind from China to Peru at every turn—and the world-picture you get from this cross-section of mankind is not of "the Vanity of Human Wishes" but of the innate sanity of humanity.

Nowhere else on earth can you meet so great a variety of people from all the ends of the earth, and especially the Asian, African and Latin-American countries, whose importance in world affairs some of us tend to forget until a sudden, but historically inevitable, flare-up brings them into the world's headlines.

These visitors, most of them easily recognizable by their darker skins, have been much more numerous this summer and autumn than ever before, possibly owing to the swift succession of small countries that have recently achieved independence.

Although their politics differ as widely as their national cultures and economies, the similarity—and the fervor—of their views on cer-

tain aspects of world affairs is strikingly greater than one would gather from the widest reading of the American and British press—or indeed the press of the countries concerned, for many of them are "on the market" for trade and financial aid from both the capitalist and the communist countries and are, naturally enough, determined not to antagonize either side.

These visitors—they include ordinary tourists, business men, members of trade unions and other delegations, lawyers, teachers and journalists—are "untypical" in the sense that they belong mainly to the small minority of well-educated people in their countries. Having given that warning, I shall try to summarize in question-and-answer form the many talks I have had with them. The questions are, of course, mine; the answers are in the words of various individuals but they reflect the views of practically all the others:

*Question:* Politics apart, which side does your country prefer to do business with?

*Answer:* Definitely with both. That gives us a better bargaining position. But in some ways the communist countries have what one might call an "unfair" advantage. In long-term deals with mainly one-crop countries like mine (call the "crop" tin or sugar or rubber or coffee or anything you like), fluctuations in world-prices or in currency values create risks of heavy losses

---

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.

for either buyer or seller. But the Soviet barter arrangements cut out these risks; also it is simpler, quicker and more satisfactory to sell in bulk to one purchaser, a state, rather than to private corporations; however large.

*Question:* Are there military strings attached to offers of trade agreements, loans, etc?

*Answer:* There might, in some countries, be secret verbal agreements at the top level—like the Truman-Attlee “gentlemen’s agreement” on U.S. bases in England—but the average man in an uncommitted country argues like this: A power that relies on military bases in foreign countries would naturally want to use any available pressure to extend this base system, but a country without this base system has no such military interest in a country like mine.

*Question:* What do you think are the motives behind offers of trade and financial aid to the less-developed countries?

*Answer:* Trade is trade, and we give the professions of altruistic motives from either side the full measure of consideration that they deserve. But in the terms and in the nature of the aid offered by the two blocs one can see a reflection of this situation: If all the underdeveloped countries of the world attained high industrial productivity and a balanced, self-sufficient economy, that would be a heavy blow to a country like America; but it would have no adverse effect on a country like the USSR which will take many scores of years to exploit fully its own tremendous internal resources.

*Question:* You know that Western leaders and wide sections of the

Western press have been blaming “Communist activities” for stirring up trouble in South Korea, Japan, Cuba, the Congo and other parts of the world. What is your view?

*Answer:* Although I’m a business man and more anti- than pro- communist, I wouldn’t use the word “blame” or “trouble” in regard to any event that weakens foreign domination in any country. To credit the Communists with these successes is to give them much more than their due; to allege that, for instance, the scores of thousands of Japanese and South Korean demonstrators were misled by a handful of “extremists” is to insult their intelligence—and to create new enemies. I have noticed that quite progressive Westerners raise their eyebrows when a person like myself uses words like “imperialism” or “colonialism”; they are “soap-box” words to them but to me they are normal terms descriptive of existing realities. Few people in the West seem to realize that for hundreds of millions the issue is not communism versus conservatism, or even democracy versus autocracy, but independence versus foreign domination. When you have a thorn in your foot you don’t start thinking: “What shall I put on the wound when I get home?” Your first reaction is to pull out the “foreign body.”

*Question:* What impact does propaganda from either side have on the uncommitted countries?

*Answer:* Much less than either side thinks, despite the piles of publications sent—at less than cost price, I assume—to my own and other Asian countries. The Russians would do better if they stopped

subs  
orles  
inter  
Tim  
and  
drive  
to c  
azine  
slog  
Defe  
mun  
terri  
from  
fend  
Russ  
have  
ded  
terri  
God  
for  
choo  
Q  
ques  
eith  
A  
deci  
ity

subsidizing their own heavy, humorless publications and subsidized interested American magazines like *Time*, *U.S. News and World Report* and *Reader's Digest*, which nearly drive a life-long liberal like myself to communism. Each of these magazines could have as its masthead slogan: "It is our Sacred Duty to Defend the Free World from Communism." That, to us is literally terrifying. Heaven defend us all from America's sacred duty to defend anything or anybody. The Russians have their faults but they haven't this unholy, deeply-embedded self-righteousness or this really terrifying conviction that they have God's enthusiastic OK in advance for anything the Pentagon may choose to do.

**Question:** How does the color question affect your sympathies with either side?

**Answer:** If world issues were decided by voting, the great majority of hundreds of millions of

colored people in the uncommitted countries would cast their votes for the Soviet side, not because of any preference for communism over capitalism but because the color question (and related issues like "Congo for the Congolese" and "Cuba for the Cubans") is still the main issue, even in the minds of people who have already won some measure of independence. Even the memory of living under foreign rule is enough to determine one's sympathies. In any clash the well-armed white man on the territory of an "inferior race" is to us in the wrong until he can convince us of his innocence. The chief merit of the Soviet Union in our eyes is its anti-imperialism. That wins our hundreds of millions of votes. Failure to realize this simple fact is, in my opinion, the biggest single mistake made by the pundits of the West—including many progressives—when they try to assess the strength of the forces on either side.

### LIVING STANDARDS IN HUNGARY

THE SOLID, UNMISTAKABLE fact is that Hungarians are now pretty well off. They have enough to eat—indeed more than enough for our contemporary English appetites. This is not a judgment based only on meals in restaurants, where I was always worrying about my figure. The restaurants are crowded, not only in Budapest, but in provincial towns. At the weekends, family parties dine out, the small children running up and down the aisles as tiresomely as they do elsewhere. But I also went through the covered food-market in Budapest on my own; and the show had certainly not been put on for my benefit. I have never seen a greater display, particularly of meat and salami. There was a crush of people round every stall; and they had come to buy, not to look.

The food-shops are not the only ones which are full of goods. There are clothes of every quality, from the multiple-stores to the elegant private shops which have survived unchanged from the old days. I can well believe that there is nothing to rival them in any other country east of the Iron Curtain. Again, this applies in the provinces as much as in Budapest. The peasants now have better clothes, more furniture, even better houses. . . . The government has cut down investment in heavy industry, and is concentrating on the production of consumer-goods. If Hungary still has political problems these do not spring from economic misery. The days of hardship are over.

A. J. P. TAYLOR, *New Statesman*, April 30.

## ESSAY CONTEST AWARDS

**WE PRINT BELOW** the decisions of the four judges—Rev. Henry Hitt Crane, Gen. Hugh B. Hester, Dr. Guy Emery Shieler and Dr. John Somerville—in the **NEW WORLD REVIEW** essay contest on the subject “A Peace Program for Our Country.” (In scoring the results, the tie in the Third Prize reduced the number of Honorable Mentions to nine.)

**First Prize—\$200:** Donald A. Adamowicz, student

**Second Prize—\$100:** Robert Sass, worker

**Third Prize—\$50, divided between:** David Evanier, student, and Kenneth A. Seymour, student

**Honorable Mention—\$15 each:** Mike Austin student; George Bruce Feld, student; Stephan Kopel, student; Albert Lannon, Jr., student; Enoch Lipson, student; Rebekah J. Mitchell, housewife; Nancy M. Petz, student; David R. Schiller, student; Susan Murray Sheehan, student.

*We are printing below the first and second prize-winning essays. In the next issue we expect to print the two third-prize essays.*

*Readers will notice that the essays reflect the atmosphere prevailing in the period before the break-up of the Summit conference. The deadline for receiving essays was May 15.*

*Please watch our pages for an announcement of another essay contest in a forthcoming issue.*

### FIRST PRIZE — DONALD A. ADAMOWICZ

**P**EACE or cease. This can be the only vital issue for the modern world. Without existence there can be no values, ideals or striving of any nature. Democracy, liberty, freedom, dignity, justice . . . what meaning do any of these values and concepts have outside the world of living human minds? How can any value or ideal be preserved or have any meaning if mankind destroys itself? Who will benefit from a war for “freedom or democracy” when humanity is extinct? Too many questions? The world needs more questions and less unchallenged answers.

The nuclear age makes all previous justifications or rationalizations for war completely meaningless. Prophets of gloom have been mistaken in the past when claiming humanity had achieved

ultimate power and would thus destroy itself, but that man has achieved power to destroy himself through nuclear energy is beyond question. Hiroshima and recent H-bomb tests are not delusions, but empirical demonstrations of this reality that never existed previous to 1945. No social value can be as important as the survival of humanity. To deny this is to deny life and is a self-contradiction for anyone who affirms his existence by continuing to live.

The longer the present armaments race continues, the closer humanity comes to annihilation. Modern all-out nuclear war could produce no victor, only one loser . . . the human race. It could settle nothing but the life span of humanity.

Despite this overwhelming objective

evidence that world peace must be the supreme value of our age, a great number of the world's leaders still insist in placing secondary values above it. Provincial allegiances to nationalism, "democracy," religious dogmas, etc., are still placed above world peace. What is the reason for this illogical "black-out" of the only path left open to the present day world if anything is to continue? Do they actually believe that ideas and values will continue to exist in a world without thinkers and value-makers? Can the characteristics of life exist without life? Without human existence there can be no values. Values do not exist in universal space, but in human minds. This is the only absolute that should govern the modern world. The masses as well as the leaders of the world must see the absoluteness of this principle if human civilization is to continue.

How can those who recognize the supreme value of world peace effectively pursue their goal in the midst of these challenging odds? I propose that world peace must be sought in the following two ways by those who recognize it as being the only real issue of the modern world:

1. Each peaceworker must assume the moral responsibility to avoid absolutely all types of violence and force in his own personal life. This policy must admit of no exceptions. Non-violent resistance must be the only type of action contemplated. All other alternatives as a means to settling disputes or achieving ends must be recognized for what they clearly are in the contemporary world situation, namely, insane.

2. Individual action is highly ineffective in the modern world, therefore peace organizations of various types must be formed. Even political parties that advocate non-violent means as the only method of achieving ends must be organized. These organizations must make their will known through a complete crash program of peace-proposing publicity and peace demonstrations in all countries throughout the world. Compromise

by all power elite groups must be encouraged; it must be made a virtue in complete slavery to the cause of world peace. Dogmatism and rigidity of all types must be demonstrated to be the greatest of evils.

Peace must be won by peaceful methods and by peaceful people. All other forms of peace that may be achieved are merely disguises for oppression that cannot endure.

In summary, then, each peaceworker and each peace organization must strive in every way to keep the idea of peace present in their hearts and minds at all times, and to put this idea into actual form in the world of social reality. Demonstrations, slogans, peace marches, literature, speeches, and all other possible non-violent means of giving living form to the cause of peace must be exploited. The principle of inactivity involved in the old saying, "thought without action is abortion," must be constantly fought by all devoted peaceworkers.

Peace does not imply passivity, indeed this false definition is the big reason why it has never been fully achieved. Peace in the human situation can only be achieved through vigorous social and political action utilizing peaceful methods to achieve peaceful goals.

Those who attempt to work for peace through inactivity and withdrawal, would best do their work in cemeteries, because the nature of human life is one of constant striving . . . the struggle to put potentiality into actuality. Those who abstain from this struggle can have no effect on the living, because in reality they advocate death, which can never be made the goal of the living however inevitable it may be. Every structural form present in human society today is the result of what was once a formless potential or idea in the minds and hearts of living men. These men, though in most cases long dead physically, continue to live in the various human institutions and other structural forms in present-day society that represent the living embodiment of their ideas.

Peaceworkers must live in the land of the living. They must recognize all tendencies to escape into the pleasantness of detachment and non-concern as being the force of death and stagnancy. If we really want peace we must not only preach it, but practice it as well. There is now no other way, it is either "do or die."

## SECOND PRIZE —

ROBERT SASS

A MAJOR premise required for a successful peace program is the recognition by the two opposing powers of the necessity of relating to one another as moral equals. Unless this is established all commitments and negotiations would be of no value.

If we are to construct a positive program, we must come to an understanding of the barriers to peace as being a reflection of the deep-rooted economic factors of capitalism and socialism with their respective ideologies.

In so doing, a program of co-existence can be designed based on the facts, rather than a necessary compromise for survival with the continuation of the present world tension.

The most important fact, in this respect, is the knowledge that the ideology of the Soviet Union is not a fascistic one which values military aggression and spurns any concept of the brotherhood of man and the equality of nations.

The eventual aim of such a program would then be the establishing of peaceful competition between the two systems with respect to their individual capacities to satisfy the desires and needs of the peoples of the world.

Any other approach represents a defeatist point of view as to the competitive potential of the capitalist economic system. A negative approach often resorts to militarism which would be the admittance that if we don't protect the "free world" it will become communist.

It was precisely this type of reasoning behind Hitler's attainment of dictatorial power. His capitalizing on the panic resulting from the spread of "bolshevism" eventually led to the death of almost fifty million people and the impoverishment of half the world. If we today approach the spread of communism in a similar manner, would we not be creating the conditions that led to January 30, 1933?

It is because of this lesson which history teaches us, that we must emphasize the positive aspects of a democratic philosophy. A philosophy which allows for the political freedom of choice, not only of representatives, but of systems as well. Any other outlook presents a contradiction between our concept of freedom and such facts as the Communist Party being democratically elected by the people in our allied western nations and that the revolutionary overthrow of dictatorship has enhanced the struggle for peace rather than its opposite. Working within the democratic framework would not weaken our position in the world; on the contrary, for it is the affirmation of our greatest heritage and strength.

In order to deal with the immediate obstacles to peace, I believe we ought first to return to the Roosevelt foreign policy of international cooperation for the elimination of fascism—the fascistic philosophic foundation being contrary to the formulation of any outlook on peace. In so doing, we will have accomplished the objectives for which we fought the last war. It logically follows that we can no longer support the present-day anti-democratic elements such as exist in Spain and the Dominican Republic. Can we judge dictators in respect to their being "for" or "against" the capitalist system?

Consequently, we have to clarify and re-evaluate our position in reference to our foreign commitments. This also applies to our role in the United Nations as well.

In order to participate more effectively

within the framework of the U.N. we must first clarify its purpose. Basically, the U.N. is an *unbiased* organization formed for the purpose of resolving conflicts necessary for the maintenance of peace. Thus, the exclusion of any nation defeats the very function for its existence. How can problems be solved if we do not recognize what in fact exists?

Only by strengthening the U.N. can the seemingly insoluble problems confronting us today be approached in terms other than the capitalist or socialist rationale.

Finally, our national program must adapt to the necessary conditions for peace at all costs. We must not cast suspicion toward any proposals advocating universal disarmament, the elimination of atomic stockpiles, discontinuing the present armaments race and the outlawing of nuclear testing. The building of blind power is the first step in creating world of dust. Our program must do everything to minimize the chances of destruction through miscalculation.

The expressed fear of an economic crisis following the end of the cold war policy, together with the propaganda of the proponents of the cold war, have created a hysteria polluting the atmosphere with the same dangerous effects as strontium 90 and carbon 14. A national program which allows for the

continuation of this ignorance of the real facts only adds to the fig-leaf warming the cold war.

The present war economy, aside from making the risk of war greater, contributes to higher taxes for non-consumptive production. The reduction of military expenditures, which comprise well over half the total federal budget, at the expense of hospitals, schools, and old age benefits, would now be converted to produce for peace and not destruction.

We can also aid our economy and at the same time create employment to absorb those in the armed service by the increase of trade with the socialist countries, especially the Soviet Union.

The spirit of Camp David has helped to foster a discernible growth in the movement for world peace. We must continue to encourage and support the increased scientific and cultural exchanges.

We gain nothing if we approach the present summit conference with fear and mistrust. Such suspicion can only hinder any attempts at a successful meeting where life and death questions are involved. The concern for man and the unborn children will be measured by the way in which the representatives answer the demand for peace, and in so doing, release the great potential inherent in peace as a way of life for all men.

---

### AMERICAN DOCTOR IN BULGARIA

THE EMINENT AMERICAN EAR SPECIALIST, Dr. Samuel Rosen, visited Bulgaria in February at the invitation of the Institute for Specialization of Physicians in Sofia.

At the end of his visit he said, "I have always believed that the exchange of experience and knowledge in the field of medicine is of great help in mutual understanding among nations. That is why my meeting the Bulgarian scientists and surgeons does a great service both to medicine and to the ties of peace and friendship between the United States and Bulgaria."

Emphasizing that he found operating theaters in Bulgaria equipped in the most modern manner, Dr. Rosen added, "The fact that we are establishing close ties in the field of science brings Bulgarian and American scientists closer together and is a fine manifestation of humanism."

## THE CONGO

(Continued from page 8)

by rumors alone," was panicked by every sound of cars' backfiring. Excited young men told them to lie flat to escape the bullets. "But I did not hear a single shot," wrote the correspondent, who observed the wild exodus.

Meantime, the Belgian troops moved in on orders of the Belgian Government "to protect our white nationals." The *New York Times* (July 10) stated that a foreign office spokesman in London said the British, French, U.S. and Italian Consuls in Elizabethville, Katanga capital, asked Belgian authorities for the help of Belgian troops.

The independence agreement had provided that a certain number of Belgian troops could remain at three bases in the Congo, but could not move out of those bases or go into action without specific request or permission from the Congolese Government. This was ignored. Moreover, the agreement was unratified, and rendered void in any case by the Belgian action, and in addition, reinforcements were sent from Belgium. The Congolese Government severed relations with Belgium.

### Belgium's Katanga Puppet

On July 11 Premier Moise Tshombe proclaimed secession of Katanga province, after having asked for troops from neighboring Northern Rhodesia, and now from Belgium as well. (According to Kumar Goshal, in his informative article in the *National Guardian*, the secession was planned between Belgium and Tshombe a year ago, when Congo independence became

unavoidable.) The *New York Times* correspondent (July 25) wrote that Tshombe had been called "Belgium's black puppet," and "while his government ostensibly runs Katanga, Belgium and the Union Miniere called the tune."

Belgium financed Tshombe's election and has supported his secessionist position, obviously counting on holding on to the richest part of the Congo through him, even though they should lose the rest; and the Union Miniere gave him \$25 million as soon as he announced secession. There is widespread opposition to him among Katanga Congolese. No single state has answered his call for recognition.

Many newspaper accounts have called Lumumba an "embezzler," because he was once jailed by the Belgians for using post office funds, presumably belonging to the Congolese, to help finance the Congolese liberation struggles. But only from the *Tass* correspondent (Soviet press, July 30) do we learn that Tshombe, a former businessman taking his cut from the Belgian colonialists, owed Belgian companies in the Congo upwards of 10 million Belgian francs as a result of trickery and overdrawn checks. He was arrested, but then "pardoned" by the Belgians in view of his services to them. Little wonder he has been eating so meekly out of their hands.

*Newsweek* editor Arnaud de Borchgrave, after a personal visit to Katanga, cabled his paper (August 8) that in an attempt to hold a bridgehead in Katanga, the Belgians have propped up Tshombe's "independence" with administrators, troops and money. He wrote of being detained by Belgian officials who are

now  
conti

E  
our  
It  
God  
Visi  
real  
exis  
at  
Bel  
rass  
not  
ply  
Con  
"TH  
con  
inci  
neit  
min  
—w  
chu  
Eliz  
of  
Pres  
the  
mie  
busi  
plet  
of I  
whe

In t

Al  
sever  
Cour  
the C  
And  
It  
been  
that  
have  
whol  
had  
that  
given  
ence  
TH  
July  
sweri  
Gove

now running the country, and continued:

Even in downtown Elizabethville . . . our troubles continued. At the Leopold II Hotel, Katanga Interior Minister Godefroy Monongo introduced himself. Visiting journalists, he intoned, should realize that the Congo would never have existed without "Belgian genius." Just at this moment, the local head of the Belgian Surete (FBI) walked in. Embarrassed, Munongo explained that he was not holding a press conference, but simply explaining to foreigners that the Congo owed everything to Belgium. "That's fine," said the inspector, "pray continue."

The impressions gained from these incidents—that Katanga independence is neither wholly inspired nor wholly administered by Katanga's 1.6 million blacks—was reinforced by a visit to Katanga's chubby Premier Moise Tshombe in his Elizabethville office. Outside stood squads of Belgian soldiers. Inside, next to the Premier's office sat his "military adviser," the Belgian commandant, and the Premier's personal speech writer, Belgian businessman George Thyssen. To complete the scene, the portraits of five kings of Belgium looked down from the room where Tshombe met the press.

### ***In the Security Council***

All this explains why it has taken several meetings of the Security Council to get Belgian troops out of the Congo, and specifically Katanga. And they are not out yet.

It should be noted, that it has been made clear from the beginning that all Security Council resolutions have applied to the Congo as a whole, whose admission to the UN had already been voted upon, and that no recognition whatever was given to the announced "independence" of Katanga.

The first resolution, passed on July 14 was offered by Tunisia. Answering the request of the new Congo Government for UN aid, it called

upon the Government of Belgium to withdraw its troops from the Congo and authorized the Secretary General "to take the necessary steps, in consultation with the Government of the Congo, to provide the Government with such military assistance as may be necessary." It was understood that at the request of Hammerskjold no troops were to be supplied by nation members of the Security Council, and that they would come mainly from African nations.

Mr. Arkady Sobolev, on behalf of the Soviet Government, offered amendments that would make the withdrawal of Belgian troops immediate, would condemn the armed aggression of Belgium against the Republic of the Congo, and provide that military assistance should be made available only by the African UN member states, which had already offered it. These amendments were turned down under pressure of the U.S. and its Western allies, which refused to condemn Belgium's actions. However, the USSR voted for the Tunisian resolution along with Argentina, Ceylon, Ecuador, Italy, Poland, Tunisia, and the United States. There were no negative votes. "China" (Chiang Kai-shek), France and the United Kingdom abstained.

The second resolution was passed on July 22. This was the result of a session of the Security Council called at the request of the Soviet Union whose foreign minister, Vasily Kuznetsov, had meantime arrived. While a masterly job had been done in airlifting UN troops to the Congo, the Belgians had not yet withdrawn and Tshombe was making clear he wanted nothing to do

with UN troops and wanted the Belgians to remain. Furthermore, the delegation from the Republic of Congo, headed by Mr. Thomas Kanza, was now present. (The USSR had asked originally that the debate be deferred until Congolese as well as Belgian representatives could be present.)

Mr. Kanza conducted himself with great dignity and restraint during the debate. To Belgian Foreign Minister Wigny's long list of rapes and atrocities against whites with which he justified the continued presence of Belgian troops, Mr. Kanza expressed regret if any such incidents had happened, but pointed out, as did the Tunisian delegate, that these charges were without confirmation, that there were many instances of attacks by the whites upon natives as well, that actual deaths had not occurred until the intervention of Belgian troops, and that the Congolese Government was carrying on an investigation of atrocities of Belgians against Congolese which would be reported when authenticated.

Again the Soviet Union asked for a strong resolution, calling for "the immediate cessation of armed intervention against the Republic of the Congo and the withdrawal within three days of all the troops of the aggressor from her territory." However, this resolution was withdrawn, and the USSR voted, with all the other members of the Security Council, for a Tunisian-Ceylon resolution which expressed appreciation for the work of the Secretary General, and called upon Belgium "to implement speedily" the July 14 resolution on the withdrawal of their troops, and authorized the Secretary General to

"take all necessary action to this effect."

Now, gradually, some of the Belgian troops began to withdraw, at least from Leopoldville. But most of them returned to their bases, and did not leave the territory of the Congo as they had been supposed to do. They remained in Katanga.

Tshombe issued threats of defiance, declared that if UN troops entered Katanga they would have to "fight their way in," called for a general mobilization.

Mr. Hammerskjold declared the UN troops would go in, and sent Dr. Ralph Bunche, who had been acting as his representative in the Congo, to reason with Tshombe. Bunche got nowhere, and the plane that came to get him, containing an advance party to prepare the way for the UN forces, was first prevented from landing by a few trucks and oil drums barring the runways, and then was permitted to take Dr. Bunche on only with an agreement that no one of the advance party should disembark. As Tshombe continued his threats of armed resistance, Mr. Hammerskjold backed down, saying he had no powers to act under such circumstances, and came back to the UN for new instructions.

Again the Security Council met, with a new delegation from the Congo attending. The Soviet Union supported the demand of the Congolese Central Government that force be used if necessary to carry out the decision to send UN troops to Katanga. Mr. Kuznetsov introduced a resolution noting Belgium's violation of UN decisions for speedy withdrawal, and imposing on the Secretary General "the obligation to

take decisive measures, without hesitating." Lacking support from the West, the USSR went along with the milder resolution on August 9, merely calling upon Belgium "to withdraw immediately its troops from the Province of Katanga under speedy modalities determined by the Secretary General" and reaffirming the position that the UN would in no way intervene or try to influence any internal conflict, constitutional or otherwise. The vote was 9-0, Italy and France abstaining.

Back in the Congo, Mr. Hammerskjold outlined a plan to enter Katanga with small contingents to replace the Belgian troops as they arrived.

Tshombe announced sixteen conditions for acceptance of the plan, including prior negotiations. The UN Secretary General said he could accept no conditions. He flew in at the head of 220 Swedish troops, refusing to take any Central Government representative along. Despite his statement that he would not negotiate, he proceeded to hold "talks" with Tshombe for two days, before Tshombe would yield. The Swedish troops then took over the Elizabethville airport, and the Belgians withdrew. At this writing, (August 15) the Belgian troops have formally yielded Elizabethville in a touching scene in which, according to the *New York Times*, General Gheysen, their commander, grasped Tshombe's hand, and his voice breaking, said "My infinite thanks, Good luck." However, Belgian officials maintained they were withdrawing to their bases only, and would not evacuate them now. The Kamina base in Katanga is also used as a NATO air base and training center.

It should be noted that there have been only token withdrawals of Belgian troops from Congo territory. While figures vary, it appears that anywhere from 5,000 to 8,000 Belgian troops still remain unlawfully in the Congo bases, or in the Belgian trust territory Ruanda-Urundi, on the border near Leopoldville.

The situation is far from solved. Tshombe now demands some sort of loose federation, which would allow him to continue to defy the Central Government's authority and keep Katanga in fact in the hands of the Belgians.

### **The Position of the USSR**

However the United Nations has dragged its feet in this affair, with the encouragement of U.S. representative Lodge, we may be glad that the world organization is in existence to air the facts before mankind and to lessen the threat of war implicit in the situation. Unquestionably Mr. Hammerskjold has had a stupendous, complex and difficult task in sending UN troops and technical aid. Yet, as a representative of the West himself, it is to be wondered whether he is truly capable of the complete neutrality he professes between East and West, between the Congolese and their former colonial masters, and whether the pressures on the U.S. and Western delegations do not affect him as well. He has tread softly indeed with Belgium and with Tshombe too, for that matter. His statements have absolved Belgium of blame; UN troops have disarmed Congolese, but not Belgian troops. And if he and Dr. Bunche had assumed a firm position from the

beginning, letting Tshombe know that the UN really meant business. It seems hardly likely that Tshombe would have carried out the armed resistance he threatened.

A good deal has been said about the "threat" of armed intervention by the Soviet Union on the side of the Republic of Congo. There has been no such threat. Premier Lumumba has indeed on several occasions declared that if the UN would not help expel the Belgian troops he would call on the Soviet Union, or indeed any nation of the Afro-Asian group in a position to help, to do so, and asked the USSR to be ready to help if required. The Soviet Union has been careful in its replies not to go against UN decisions. It has expressed full support for the aspirations of the Congo Republic to work out its own destinies. Answering the Congolese appeal on July 15, Premier Khrushchev declared:

The demand of the Soviet Union is simple—hands off the Republic of Congo.

The Government of the Congo can be assured that the Soviet Government will give the Congo Republic the necessary help which may be required for the victory of your just cause.

When it appeared the UN might not be capable of expelling the Belgian troops, the Soviet Government declared, on August 5:

If the UN cannot do so, troops should be sent from countries which would be ready to contribute to the implementation of this just act.

It is not at all strange that Lumumba should have turned to the Soviet Union, which has at all times given full support to liberation from colonialism, which has offered friendly aid without strings to all

the newly liberated nations and the Congo as well, for building up their economies and fully establishing their independence, and was the first nation to protest the intervention of Belgian troops. Lumumba has declared that only the resolutions offered by the Soviet Union in the Security Council have fully corresponded to his country's needs.

Furthermore, Lumumba has received full support from the other African nations. Nine of them jointly called on Belgium to withdraw its troops. Ghana and Guinea both offered to send troops to help expel the Belgians.

We believe that it has been the position of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries and the Asian-African countries which compelled the UN to take the actions it has.

### **Support Full Independence for the Congo Republic!**

Lumumba remains the most important and reliable leader of the Congolese people, despite provocations and efforts to undermine his authority, and it is clear that only a centralized, unified government can bring order and progress to the Congo. A dynamic and cultured man, he was graduated from a Belgian high school in Leopoldville, and then took university correspondence courses in law and literature.

When Lumumba recently visited Washington to speed the withdrawal of Belgian troops and see what technical assistance he could get, he was given a state reception. According to *Time* (August 8):

Washington officials, who had expected a ranting fanatic, found instead a poised, almost impassive man, who could respond politely and correctly in slightly accented

French to Herter's speech without recourse to notes or text, who faced a roomful of correspondents and fielded their sharpest questions with calm confidence.

Asked at a press conference about his attitude toward the Soviet Union, Lumumba answered:

For us, the Congolese people, the Soviet Union is a people, a nation like any other nation. Ideological questions are of no interest to us. Our policy of positive neutralism recommends contacts with all nations which have noble intentions as far as we are concerned, with all nations that would not come to us with the endeavor to dominate us.

He further stated that his people had a philosophy of non-violence, do not hate the white man, and that in his opinion order would be restored as soon as the last Belgian soldiers left the country.

Let the American people bring pressure on our government to support fully the carrying out of the UN resolutions, and to display "noble intentions" toward the new state, with constructive economic aid toward its great task of realizing the independence it has won. If permitted to develop in peace, there is no question the Congo Republic will show the same capabilities of carrying out all the functions of government and serving its people far better than their former white masters, as the other independent nations of Africa—there will be 22 of them by the end of this year—have done and are doing.

It is time to do away forever with the hateful racist attitudes that have dominated our attitude toward the people of Africa, along with all colonial exploitation. Once again we refer to *U.S. News and World Report*, which on August 8 reprinted

an article by Stuart Cloete declaring that without white men all these new African nations would disintegrate at once—"Africa is a black giant whose flesh is supported by white bones, nerves and sinews. When they are removed the flesh falls back, shapeless, into the forest." The *Wall Street Journal*, July 26, spoke of the "consummate arrogance" of these new "pip squeak" nations, like the Congo. Edward P. Morgan in the *AFL-CIO News* (July 16) called the Congo the "World's biggest zoo," and said it had been freed too soon. It is people with such views who have "consummate arrogance."

But there is a great new wind blowing through America too. It was felt in the glorious struggles of the people in the South this year, and the tremendous support they received by the white youth of the country. It was evidenced in the civil rights demonstrations around the Democratic and Republican conventions, forcing them to go further on this issue than ever before. The freedom of the Congolese people is part of the same struggle.

Emory Ross, a missionary for eighteen years in the Belgian Congo, where he lived with his wife and three children, wrote in a letter to the *New York Times* (July 22) that he was confident that the transition to self-government would be "creatively made" by the Congolese people and urged that Americans give them aid in education, housing, health services and other needs.

Helping and not grasping hands must be extended to the Congolese people now, to help atone for their past agonies and aid them in building a free, decent and peaceful life.

# The Hallinans Visit the USSR

reviewed by MURRAY YOUNG

*A Clash of Cultures—Some Contrasts in American and Soviet Morals and Manners*, by Vivian and Vincent Hallinan. American Russian Institute. San Francisco. 72 pages, \$1.00.

VIVIAN and Vincent Hallinan visited the Soviet Union last year and have now made available a report of what they found there. They were first of all struck by what they call the "pioneer" atmosphere of the country and stress that it is unfair to compare Soviet living standards with those of the upper classes in the Western World. At the same time they point out that there are no evidences to be seen of the distressing social and economic injustices that disfigure all the great cities of the West.

They found no poverty; food in abundance; the shops full of clothing and other commodities—and customers buying.

Above all they were deeply impressed by the peasants and workers crowding the art galleries and the theaters. Instead of telling us of the performances they saw, the Hallinans describe the remarkable audiences—the kerchiefed older women, the peasants in boots and baggy trousers, the husky working men and their wives—audiences unlike those to be found everywhere in the West. The same people they found also in the dining rooms of the best hotels, pre-empting, the Hallinans say, the whole social milieu, as they have come to dominate all phases of Soviet life, giving it, if a certain crudeness, also sincerity, warmth and sympathy—"a quality enormously human."

They found this human quality very much to their liking. The Soviet people are:

... just ordinary people but engaged

in a most extraordinary undertaking. It is such a one as you would not expect to find ordinary people involved in. It was about what you'd look for if the mighty of our own land—its bankers, financiers, industrialists, millionaires with their political representatives and their special powers and privileges should somehow depart and leave it to the working men, the farmers, the scientists, teachers, professional men—yes, even the college kids, to take over.

But ordinary people, the Hallinans point out, who have achieved their new society because of two factors: the co-operative system of socialism instead of the competitive system of capitalism and the guidance of its Communist Party, an organization greatly misrepresented and maligned by Western propaganda.

As a lawyer Vincent Hallinan was especially interested in the Soviet legal and penal system. One of the most interesting sections of the report is an account of a criminal trial before a Peoples' Court. In the course of describing the trial Soviet legal procedure is explained in detail and an interesting comparison made with legal practice in this country. In the same way a visit to a Soviet prison is both an instructive account of prison life in the USSR and a critical commentary on the much more backward methods in the West.

To illustrate their point that the Soviet approach to all problems is humane and scientific, the Hallinans compare the treatment of drug addicts in the USSR with the treatment accorded them in the United States, and similarly they compare the attitudes of the two countries toward abortions. "Horse Sense vs. Hypocrisy in Social Problems" they call this chapter.

This is a book you will want to read and give to your friends.

## Friends' Peace Pamphlets

A steady stream of pamphlets and reprints from the National Peace Literature Service of the American Friends Service Committee crosses our desk. Not having space to review them all, we are listing below some of the recent titles which we feel would be of interest to our readers. All of them may be obtained through the AFSC, 20 South 12 Street, Philadelphia, Pa., or one of its regional offices.

*But You Can't Trust the Russians*, by Glenn Mower. 1960. 31 pp. 50 cents.

A political scientist challenges the validity of the premise that disarmament is impossible because the Russians cannot be trusted to keep an agreement.

*The Case for Disarmament*, by John Swomley, 1960. 7 pp. 5 cents.

This is an analysis of the Khrushchev total disarmament proposals and provides background for disarmament talks. Reprinted from *The Progressive*.

*The Balance of Blame*, by C. Wright Mills. 1960. 11 pp. 10 cents.

Reprinted in abridged form from *The Nation*, June 6. The author of *The Causes of World War III* compares the attitudes of the USA and the USSR on war and peace.

*Danger Has Alternatives*: Reprints by AFSC. 1960. 11 pp. 15 cents.

Contains two articles: David Singer's "Surprise Attack," from *The Nation* and W. H. Ferry's "Alternatives to the Arms Race" from the *Santa Barbara News Press*.

*Germ-Gas Warfare*, by John Barden, 1960. 2 pp. 5 cents.

Reprinted from *The Nation*.

*The Politics of Survival*. 1960. 8 pp. 10 cents.

Discusses the contradiction in present U.S. foreign policy between defensive power and constructive leadership.

*Madmen at Work, The Polaris Story*, by William Cary. 1960 10 pp. 20 cents.

The Polaris submarine *George Washington* described as a grave threat to the peace of the world.

*Campaign To Make Chemical Warfare Respectable*, by Walter Schneir. 8 pp. 5 cents.

*Morals of Extermination*, by Lewis Mumford. 16 pp. 10 cents.

Reprinted from *The Atlantic*, October, 1959. Mumford calls for a new approach to foreign policy.

*Some Economic Problems of Disarmament*, by Charles Carter, 13 pp. 15 cents.

Published by the London Friends Peace Committee.

*Labor's Stake in Peace*, 1960. 16 pp. 20 cents.

Includes articles on foreign policy by Emil Mazey, secretary-treasurer, UAW, William Davidson, nuclear physicist, and Fenner Brockway, British Labor Party MP.

*Labor and the Cold War*, by Stewart Meacham, 1959. 31 pp. 35 cents.

Assessment of the cold war and its effect on the domestic economy, national security and world economy.

*Which Way the Wind? A DocuDrama* by Phillip C. Lewis. 1959. 56 pp. \$1.00.

Script for a dramatic presentation based on *Speak Truth to Power*. The Quaker approach to international affairs.

*Cuba's Revolution: The First Year*, 1960. 11 pp. 10 cents.

Contains Carleton Beals' "Cuba's Revolution: The First Year" from *The Christian Century* and Charles Wells' "Castro and Inter-American Relations" from *Between the Lines*.

*China—1959*, by Walter Gordon. 44 pp. 30 cents. From *The Toronto Star*.

## 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 \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

## NOW READY

*Bound Volumes of*  
**NEW WORLD REVIEW, 1959**

\$4.00 each

*Index alone, 35c*

Order through NWR

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

## 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  
LILEIA (a new ballet)

JOURNEY BEYOND THREE SEAS

THE CAPTAIN'S DAUGHTER

THE HOUSE I LIVE IN

THE FLYING CARPET

Coming:

IN THE LAND OF THE SOVIET  
Mussorgsky's Opera:  
KHOVANSCHINA

**Artkino Pictures, Inc.**

723 SEVENTH AVE. NEW YORK 19

Telephone: Circle 5-6570