WHO— WHAT— WHY—

•

Norbert Muhlen's account of the uprising of the East German proletariat against the dictatorship of the proletariat represents reporting in its true and classic form: When something happens you find someone who was there and you ask questions. The best results come, of course, when a trained reporter fully provided with background information questions an intelligent witness. Mr. Muhlen, a German economist who opposed the Nazis and subsequently became an American citizen, was in Berlin and knew what questions to ask an east Berlin worker after the events of June 16 and 17. Mr. Muhlen has written for *Reader's Digest* and *Commentary,* and this year published *The Return of Germany.*

Isaac Deutscher, internationally known expert on Russian affairs and regular contributor to these pages, needs no introduction to our readers. His latest book, *Russia: What Next?,* was reviewed for *The Reporter* (July 7) by George F. Kennan. The article we now publish dealing with the situation as Mr. Deutscher sees it after Beria's fall is an abridged version of a supplementary chapter he has written for his book.

ANOTHER regular *Reporter* contributor is **Ralph E. Lapp,** a nuclear scientist who has taken part in many of the government's atomic-energy programs. Preoccupied in his latest article with defining proper and improper areas of secrecy, Mr. Lapp wrote *Must We Hide?* His most recent book, *The New Force,* reviews the present situation in atomic energy and deals with industry, government, and the production of energy for nonmilitary purposes.

Living in New York one meets, these days, a lot of disappointed Republicans—and not a few Democrats—who would have liked having Representative **Jacob K. Javits** as mayor of their city. But it looks as if Mr. Javits would remain in Washington continuing his constructive career as a Congressman. His views on how Congressional investigations can be regulated are of special interest.

NOW on a visit to this country, **Hugh Gaitskell,** former British Chancellor of the Exchequer in the Labour Government, writes for us about the Labour Party's new manifesto. The increasing talk about a possible general election in Britain this fall makes Mr. Gaitskell's article particularly timely. With his party now in the opposition, he is an active frontbencher and a leading anti-Bevanite. Only forty-seven years old, Mr. Gaitskell, an economist in a country where economists can go far in government, has made an international name for himself.

The fastest-growing profession in Washington seems to be that of the snooper. **Ralph Robin's** short story is more than the portrait of an unpleasant young man; it points to a public danger. The author is a chemist who has become a successful writer of science fiction. He has also been published in the *Yale Review.*

THE STAFF of *The Reporter* spent a busman's holiday this summer sampling the fare available in paperbound books. In preparing a section on paper-backs, we had valuable assistance and advice from people in this highly competitive business. One thing we learned was that the industry is older than we thought. In a 1952 Bowker Lecture published by the New York Public Library, from which we reprint an extract, **Freeman Lewis,** executive vice-president of Pocket Books, Inc., tells some of the ancient history of his business.

Meyer Levin, who provides a general survey of the field, has direct experience with paper-backs: His *The Old Bunch* is about to be issued by Permabooks; Signet is doing his *Frankie and Johnny* (retitled *The Young Lovers*).

The Reporter

A FORTNIGHTLY OF FACTS AND IDEAS

VOLUME 9, NO. 4 **SEPTEMBER 1, 1953**

THE REPORTER: Entered as second-class matter at Dunellen, N. J., under the act of March 3, 1879. Published every other Tuesday, except for omission of two summer issues, by Fortnightly Publishing Company, Inc., 220 East 42nd Street, New York 17, N. Y. Subscription price, United States, Canada, and U.S. Possessions: One year $5, Two years $8, Three years $10. All other countries: One year $6, Two years $10, Three years $13. Please give four weeks' notice when changing your address, giving old and new addresses. Indexed in *Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature* and *Public Affairs Information Service.*

HARLAN CLEVELAND

The Closed Door in China

"ALL government—indeed, every human benefit and enjoyment, every virtue and every prudent act—is founded on compromise and barter." Edmund Burke was talking about "Conciliation with America," but he might have been talking about the political conference on the Far East that is now to take up where the soldiers left off.

The President has chosen to talk rather than fight. He must now decide what we want out of these talks, and how we are going to get it. But Syngman Rhee and a good many Republicans see in negotiation the beginnings of appeasement. Once the conference starts, will the American negotiators be able to negotiate?

WHAT we should want is clear enough. It is the containment of Communist China: getting Chinese troops out of Korea, an end to Chinese aid to the Vietminh in Indo-China, the abandonment of Communist ambitions in Formosa. It does not mean regaining the mainland for the Chinese Nationalists. Desirable as that would be, it is a goal beyond the reach of U.S. power, an operation to which the United States has been careful not to commit itself.

Our old Open Door policy in China was based on the recognition of China's weakness. This weakness invited the stronger nations to quarrel among themselves for trade concessions and slices of territory. In our time China threatens the peace not through weakness but through growing and reckless strength. The China of hopeless domestic disorder and lordly foreign *taipans* has passed away. In its place there exist a strong and effective army of over three million men, a more centralized direction of affairs than that fragmented society has ever had imposed on it, and a growing industrial strength.

When Mao's power was turned loose in Korea, a new stage in China's long history began. As we fought back, we took the first step in creating a new policy that might be called the Closed Door in China —aimed at preventing not the aggrandizement of other nations at China's expense but China's aggrandizement at the expense of its neighbors.

Does a Closed Door policy mean we abandon the hope that the mainland of China may in time be ruled by more temperate and co-operative leaders? Not at all. But the last three years have proved that short of general war, the Chinese Communist armies are rather difficult to take territory away from. When the Red tide ebbs in China it will be because the free countries of Asia, with our help, have demonstrated that social progress and a rising standard of life come faster, and are spread around more widely, than they can be in countries where the secret police and a slogan-happy one-party bureaucracy get things done with slave labor.

A Closed Door policy demands also a continuation of the costly preparedness that enabled us to check the enemy in Korea. If the United States lacks the military strength to stop another reckless lunge from China, the political conference can turn out to be merely a screen behind which the Communists prepare their next aggressive move.

Sitting down at a table with the Communists is not an Asia policy; promoting economic development and building a protective system of security pacts are the beginnings of one.

They Can't Have It Both Ways

The Chinese Communists will enter the negotiations with two aims. They want to be considered by the whole world as the government of China, and they want to extend their influence beyond their own borders as far and as fast as their growing strength permits. They must be made to realize that they cannot have both. Their eagerness for international "face" gives us the opportunity to check their eagerness for expansion.

In exploiting this opening, President Eisenhower needs the greatest leeway. It appears that he will have almost none. A unanimous Congress, Secretary Dulles, Adlai Stevenson, the President himself, and practically everybody else have come out flatly against the admission of Red China to the United Nations. This is an entirely logical reaction, since the Chinese Communists have the unique distinction of being the only nation that has waged war on the world peace organization.

But maybe we have all been answering, very emphatically, the wrong question. What we have all been asking ourselves is, "Should the Chinese Communists be substituted for the Nationalists in the United Nations and take their seat in the Se-