

Bad Time for Washington and Moscow Not to Be On Speaking Terms

U.S. policy is dangerously rigid. We keep the door shut against Peking, thus denying ourselves the advantages of a divide-and-rule strategy in dealing with the Soviet bloc. At the same time we treat Khrushchov with hostility, although this might mean his overthrow by the "hards" inside the Kremlin who agree with Peking on the hopelessness of trying to co-exist peacefully with the "imperialist" powers. It is going to be hard for Khrushchov to argue on his return to Moscow that his ideas of peaceful collaboration with capitalism have been successful, and he is going to have to play tough to maintain his own position. Coming events will show how stupid was our unwillingness to let the neutral powers save face all around by "forcing" a meeting between Eisenhower and Khrushchov. The symbolic value would have been great, and would have made it easier for a new administration to deal with the Russians.

Series of Crises Ahead

A whole series of crises lies ahead which will shake the UN and the world: Algeria, where Moscow is swinging over to a revolutionary policy in competition with Peking; Berlin, where Khrushchov is under pressure to show that he can get results; the Congo, where Western intrigue has destroyed the fragile beginnings of parliamentary government. Africa is a series of time bombs: Angola, Rhodesia, Kenya, and the Union of South Africa. The more one studies the situation the more statesmanlike appears to be Senator Mansfield's recent speech suggesting that the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. negotiate a neutralization of the area to facilitate its movement toward independence. To have the U.S. and U.S.S.R. virtually not on speaking terms during the months ahead is a catastrophe. The fact that Khrushchov's rudeness as well as Eisenhower's laziness (there is really no other word for his indifference to the UN proceedings) share responsibility is no consolation.

Kennedy's simple-minded emphasis on more growth and more arms is a very inadequate response to the complexities of the changes taking place in the world: the emergence of a soon-to-be-dominant neutralist bloc in the UN, the British Labor Party's vote for neutralism and renunciation of nuclear weapons, de Gaulle's not so dissimilar fight against unilateral atomic decisions by the U.S. Fresh thinking, abandonment of old clichés, are required but nowhere in evidence.

NOTE: Because of the Pauling hearing, we were unable to cover the historic argument in the Supreme Court on the

Kennedy on Nuclear Tests and Arms

Senator Kennedy has always been more friendly to what is called "arms control" than to disarmament. The tendency is apparent in his letter to Thomas E. Murray, who advocates resumption now of nuclear testing underground and in outer space. While rejecting this idea "at this time", Senator Kennedy is ambiguous. At one point the Senator speaks of the worldwide hope of an agreement to ban all tests. But in explaining what he would do if elected, he talks of seeking an agreement "of which limitations upon nuclear tests, weapons grade fissionable material, biological and chemical warfare agents will be an essential and integral part." This means acceptance of the idea of biological and chemical warfare as part of the permanent and legal arsenal of mankind and it implies limiting rather than abolishing nuclear tests.

There also seems implicit in Senator Kennedy's reply the idea of accepting the spread of nuclear weapons to other powers. Thus he pledges himself to "invite leading nations having industrial capacity for production of nuclear weapons" to a conference to seek agreement "upon means of international control of both the production and use of weapons grade fissionable material and also the production of nuclear weapons." Again this speaks of "control" not of agreement to prevent the spread of such weapons or of their renunciation. "Control" is the Pentagon's hope because it can open the door to endless negotiation about arms quotas, while the arms race goes on.

The Review of the International Atomic Policies and Programs of the United States just released by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy reports that the early hopes of cheap atomic power have fizzled, and with it the hope that by spreading atomic reactors for peaceful uses we could slow up the nuclear arms race. It warns, on the contrary, that "in the absence of lessened tensions and effective safeguards, achievement of widespread atomic power could in fact make the arms limitation problem more difficult." To "control" nuclear arms in this context may only be to legalize and facilitate their spread. Mr. Frank Aiken, the Irish Foreign Minister, continuing his year-after-year crusade at the UN against the spread of nuclear weapons, warned in his speech on August 6, "Every addition to the list of countries possessing nuclear weapons increases the danger of their use for defense, for aggression, for revenge or for revolution." This is the perspective blurred by talk of limitation and control.

trio of cases testing the constitutionality of the Smith Act's membership clause and of the registration provisions of the Internal Security Act.

Origin and Progress of the Struggle to Make the Congo Safe for Democracy

"Colonel Mobutu . . . once did a seven year stretch in the Congo army. . . . After independence, Lumumba . . . made him chief of staff . . . he grew angry at Lumumba's whimsical use of the military. . . . Mobutu became a frequent visitor to the U.S. embassy and held long talks with officials there. One afternoon last week, Mobutu conferred with officers at Camp Leopold, and got their cheering support. That night he went to Radio Congo and abruptly announced that the army was taking over."

—Time Magazine, Sept. 26

"Reports from the provinces said many deputies and senators of Lumumba's parliamentary delegation were ready to withdraw their support. Some 30 pro-Lumumba deputies

and senators have already defected, and Mobutu was reported ready to authorize the reopening of Parliament if an anti-Lumumba majority was assured."

—Reuters, in Washington Post, Oct. 8

"The loyalty of many political leaders to Mr. Lumumba—particularly in the interior—continued to impede reconstruction efforts of the government commission installed by Army Leader Col. Joseph Mobutu. The commission's spokesman, Albert Bolela, told a news conference the Congo's political leaders 'are not sufficiently mature to make a synthesis of western democratic institutions and the tribal realities of the Congo'."

—AP from Leopoldville, Washington Star, Oct. 9

Abrams, Attacked by Dodd, Was Also Attacked in Sunday Worker

(Continued from Page One)

Kamen had been cleared of these charges and won a libel suit against a Chicago newspaper which printed them. Perhaps all these questions were designed to distract attention from the failure of the Chairman to take any action toward a contempt citation after Dr. Pauling's refusal to furnish the names he had been ordered to bring. When the long hearing ended, Senator Dodd said such action was up to the committee.

Nixon Would Be Put on the Spot

This hesitation may have more than one explanation. Dr. Pauling's application for a review in the Supreme Court of his action to enjoin the committee is still pending before it. Failure to cite him for contempt would moot it. Then, again, with the Senate out of session, Richard Nixon would have to sign and transmit it to the U.S. Attorney if it were voted by the committee; this would make him look too uncomfortably like the old Nixon. Dodd may fear a defeat at the hands of his own committee if he asks for a contempt citation; no other Senator even showed up for the hearing—perhaps they see no mileage in pillorying a world famous scientist on so popular an issue as cessation of testing. Finally, considering the Watkins decision, Dr. Pauling's denial of communism and his ready answer to all other questions, it is doubtful whether a contempt conviction would hold up on appeal. Unfortunately Senator Dodd's larger objective does not require Dr. Pauling's conviction. His larger objective is to destroy the National Committee for A Sane Nuclear Policy, and to make people fearful of speaking up against nuclear testing and for disarmament lest they find themselves "controversial" or perhaps worse. His attack on the Committee on the eve of its Madison Square Garden meeting last May has already started a disruptive chain reaction within the organization.

The day after the Pauling hearing, as if to link him more closely, the committee released a pamphlet called "Communist Infiltration in the Nuclear Test Ban Movement" which contains the transcript of the executive hearing last May 13 which threw the nuclear policy committee into a panic. The witness was Henry H. Abrams, a New York City accountant, who had been active in organizing the Garden meeting.

He Dared Disagree With the President

"We then moved on to the Fair Play for Cuba advertisement. . . . Had I received money for signing the ad? No. Was it paid for by Cuban gold? . . . Was I aware that President Eisenhower had made a speech in which he stated that the Castro regime was a menace to the stability of the Western hemisphere? No, I was not. And did I think myself justified in holding opinions that openly defied those of the President? I brooded over this for a long incredulous moment, and then replied that I was English, and that I had been forming opinions all my life without worrying for a second whether or not they coincided with those of the President of the United States. Had my wits been active enough, I might have pointed out that Senator Dodd himself, as a Democrat, must have sometimes have found himself in the heretical position of having to defy President Eisenhower."

—Kenneth Tynan in *Harpers* for October describing his own ordeal before the Internal Security Committee. Mr. Tynan, the distinguished theatre critic of the London Observer was then guest critic on *The New Yorker*.

This release for the first time enables one to judge how much fire there was behind all that smoke. A careful reading shows nothing discreditable to Mr. Abrams except that he took the Fifth amendment on his political associations. One can infer from this that he was a party member. But it would seem from the committee's own evidence that he no longer is. Indeed the document reprinted by the Senate committee on pages 16 and 17 seems to indicate that while Mr. Abrams is being pilloried as a communist boring-from-within the nuclear policy movement, he was criticized in the *Sunday Worker* two years ago by the Communist Benjamin J. Davis for fostering Trotskyites boring from within in an Independent Socialist movement Mr. Abrams helped to launch. Mr. Abrams' connections with the Communist party, like his importance in the nuclear policy committee, seem to have been exaggerated by the Senate committee. Perhaps the availability now of the actual hearing record will make it possible more coolly to reconsider his hasty suspension without trial last May and to end any tendency to truckle to Senator Dodd.

Please Renew Early and Help Us If You Can By Adding A Gift Sub

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed \$5:*

Name

Street

CityZone.....State.....

10/17/60

Enter gift sub for \$2 (6 mos.) or \$4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name

Street

CityZone.....State.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.

Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Second class
postage paid
at
Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington 15, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: \$5 in the U. S.; \$6 in Canada; \$10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: \$15 to Europe; \$20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.