

SOVIET PLAN for World Peace

EASE INTERNATIONAL TENSION

The Soviet Union is again exerting every effort to prevent the capitalist countries from drifting along to anarchy and war.

The letter which the Soviet Prime Minister sent to London last month is of the utmost significance to the peoples of the whole world: It embodies a practical plan for world peace and security; it expresses the sentiments and desires of the peoples of all countries; it is the only alternative to war.

Unfortunately, influential sections of the capitalist press here and overseas have not only suppressed important aspects of the letter, but they have even ridiculed the Soviet proposals for world peace.

Here, briefly, are the main peace proposals which Mr. Bulganin on behalf of the Soviet Government and people, urged Mr. McMillan to accept:

MIDDLE EAST

To safeguard peace in the Middle East the Soviet Union appeals to the Great Powers to strictly adhere to the principles of peaceful settlement of all their disputes in this area, and to respect the sovereignty and independence of the Middle East.

The Soviet Government assures Britain that the Socialist countries do not "underestimate Britain's economic interests in the Middle East", but insists that negotiations and not force be used to safeguard these interests.

EUROPE

Dealing with the situation in Europe, the letter states that the further development of international relations largely depends on the position of the Soviet Union and Great Britain, especially with regard to the main problems of world peace and security ... And behind the proposals which follow this statement must be mobilised the people of every country.

- To eliminate the intensification of the dangers of war, the manufacture of all nuclear and other dangerous weapons must be banned.
- The Great Powers must agree to the immediate banning of nuclear tests.
- The banning of nuclear weapons and tests is easily attainable because it requires no intricate organisational measures and can be reliably controlled.
- This matter can be separated from the general problem of disarmament and settled independently and quickly.

END SYSTEM OF MILITARY BLOCS

The Soviet Union and Britain have similar interests in safeguarding peace. "It is not accidental that the two countries for many centuries have been drawn into every armed conflict in Europe."

NATO has divided the European continent into two antagonistic military camps which has created relations of distrust and suspicion and the basis for war.

Thus the Soviet Union appeals to Britain to bring an end to the division of states into military blocs.

However, the Soviet Government concedes that it will be difficult to abolish the military alignments of the Powers immediately.

It proposes therefore, that the big Powers should come to terms on

/temporary

temporary transitional measures which will gradually lead to a permanent system of collective co-operation between all states, which is the only guarantee of world peace. The proposal suggests the conclusion of a treaty of non-aggression between the NATO members and the Warsaw Treaty States; and the acceptance of a general European Treaty on collective security which will make possible the final elimination of the military blocs.

TRADE

Peaceful co-existence and trade between capitalist and socialist countries are two conditions which the Soviet Government regards as vital in the struggle for peace.

Mr. Bulganin's letter lays emphasis on the necessity for improved British-Soviet relations and for extensive cultural, technical and scientific exchange between the two countries. Britain has been told that the Soviet Union does not underestimate her role in the international sphere as a "great industrial, commercial and maritime power," and that the traditional commercial contacts between the two countries must be re-established.

The Soviet Government makes a tremendous trade offer and promises to increase her purchases in the U.K. to the amount of £800 to £1,000 million, given a corresponding increase in the export of Soviet goods to the U.K.

JEWNS in the SOVIET UNION

The Soviet Union was the first country in the world to outlaw anti-semitism and every other form of racialism. Thus it was that the 20th Congress revelations and subsequent charges of unjust acts against certain Jews in the Soviet Union caused a great deal of anxiety in progressive circles.

In order to investigate this matter a British delegation went to the Soviet Union, and Professor Hyman Levy was given the specific task of investigating and reporting on the treatment of Jews there. The delegation was allowed every facility and freedom to conduct its investigations in an adequate manner; and its members had private and frank talks with many Soviet Jews.

The most gratifying result of the investigation was the establishment of the fact that at no time since the inception of the Soviet State has there ever been an expression of hostility for the Jews on the part of the Soviet people; and that the acts against certain Jews that were committed were carried out surreptitiously by a group of officials under Beria, who feared the reaction of the Soviet people to these perversions.

The following are the main points made by Professor Levy when he returned to London:

From private conversations which Professor Levy had with Jews he discovered that the years 1948-52 were known among them as "the black years", the period during which many prominent Jewish poets and writers were arrested and charged with treason, while some were executed.

This situation was shared by other national minorities besides Jews. But let it be said that this fear did not emanate from any general feeling of antagonism from among the Russian population, but from official sources; from the security police in fact.

From 1953, tremendous efforts have been made and are being made to prevent such a state of affairs from ever happening again.

SUSLOV INTERVIEW

Just before the delegation departed, it had a long interview with Mr. Suslov, the chairman of the Central Committee, and the question of the Yiddish theatre and press was raised clearly and specifically. Suslov replied that unless there is a specific demand for them from Soviet Jewry, these things would not be re-instituted.

He proceeded to explain: It is important to recognise that ghetto life has disappeared from the Soviet Union. It began to be broken up

/when

when, with the early days of the revolution, the restrictions on Jewry were removed. Young Jews joined the Party in large numbers and moved out to distant areas of the new socialist state to help in reconstruction, and to organise and help administer the distant Republics, which had hitherto been almost illiterate.

These young men lost their Jewish affiliation and became completely Russianised. Very many of them have married non-Jews, and while they still understood Yiddish, have almost completely lost the power of expressing themselves in it, as the delegation found. This phenomenon is, of course a commonplace in Jewish history and can be seen in Britain and elsewhere to-day.

During the war, the Nazis destroyed thousands of towns and villages, many of them previously occupied by Jews, the inhabitants of which had been hurriedly evacuated by the authorities, in order that the wholesale destruction visited by the nazis on Jews in Germany and Poland might not here be repeated.

POST WAR PERIOD

When the war was over, and the nazis were swept back, only a fraction of the original populations of those areas returned to their homes or what was left of them. Thereafter, it was maintained, Soviet Jewry consisted of far-flung groups. Yiddish as their principal tongue was no longer representative. The younger generation hardly spoke it. The Yiddish theatre languished, and the Jewish population generally and even the actors themselves were continually being urged to contribute towards its maintenance. After the first few nights it played to an empty theatre. The Yiddish papers lost money. The sale of Yiddish books and periodicals died down. In any case the Jews in the Soviet Union spoke many languages, dependent on the history of that group and the route it had followed as it moved into Russia generations ago. In these circumstances, it was argued there was no case for the specific and artificial encouragement of Yiddish culture.

If there actually existed a demand for it, if a large enough group of Soviet Jews put forward a request for it, they could have their own theatre and press.

There Jewish cultural life spontaneously expressed itself, facilities would be given; but no artificial encouragement would be forthcoming.

IN POSITIONS OF IMPORTANCE

The delegation found that far from Jews now being deprived of positions of importance in Soviet life, there were to-day many Jews in leading positions. For example, it was found that of six judges of the Supreme Court with whom the delegation discussed the legal aspects of these matters, two at least (Greenberg and Gershensohn) were Jews. There were many Jews on the staff of the State Library.

Many State Ministers, directors of collective farms, scientists and technical directors of industrial concerns were Jews. The head of the State Publishing House for Foreign Translations, the editor of the Natural Science Section of this concern, three of the four assistants to the editors of the European Department of "Pravda", members of the editorial board of the "Communist" were Jews. These were all in Moscow.

In Leningrad the director of the Leningrad Orchestra (Badchen), the director of the Vulcan works, the director of the Comedy Theatre (Sachs), the director of the Park of Culture (Kantorovitch) were Jews. Many Jewish singers and pianists performed on the radio and in concert halls (Appelbaum, Anna Gusek, etc.), and frequently Yiddish concerts were held.

PUBLICLY EXPOSED

The violation of Soviet Law, which resulted in the unjust treatment of individuals in the Soviet Union cannot be excused. But, as William Gallacher said when he returned from there last year: There is no-one in the Soviet Union who does not feel deeply ashamed that such a thing should have happened.

Furthermore, it is only in a country like the Soviet Union where constructive criticism is encouraged, that such a perversion of the law could be so vigorously and publicly exposed and those responsible removed and punished.

British M.P.'s urge MacMillan to Respond to Bulganin's offer of Friendship

Return Premier Bulganin's offer of friendship and help save Britain and the world from the slide to atomic war. This is the message to Prime Minister Macmillan from Labour M.P.s in Lancashire, Yorkshire and Scotland.

MR. GEORGE CRADDOCK:

"I hope the Government will examine the Bulganin letter seriously as a contribution to lessening tension in the world. Any step that helps to ensure peace and concord for the people is welcome.

"I would like to see Mr. Macmillan take up the invitation to go to Moscow to continue the talks. Until we reduce our very large defence expenditure our standard of living can scarcely improve!"

MR. R.E. WINTERBOTTOM:

"While I have not read the full text of the letter, I hope that it will lead to some control of atomic and hydrogen weapons.

"The nuclear tests all over the world ought to be banned as a danger to humanity."

MR. W.T. PALING:

"Anyone who has world peace at heart ought to encourage the Heads of Governments. Long correspondence will not get us very far.

"There is a growing opinion all over the world that the hydrogen-bomb tests should never take place, no matter in what country. More and more people are becoming terrified of the consequences and are demanding nuclear disarmament. The Bulganin letter can be the start of making this a reality."

MR. KOINI ZILLEACUS:

"Even the present Government cannot go on being H-bomb Herods and pro-lidical maniacs about preparing for war, like inverted Micawbers, waiting for something to turn down on any approach for peace.

"Mr. Macmillan must seize this chance and go to Moscow whether the Americans like it or not."

MR. JOHN RANKIN:

"If the letter is sent in a friendly tone I hope that the Prime Minister will reply in friendly terms."

RUSSIA DID BEST TO STOP SUEZ WAR

Correspondence published by the Soviet Government warned Britain and France not to attack Egypt.

Premier Bulganin pointed out in a letter, French Premier Mollet on Sept. 11th, that France had mobilised an army of 500,000 against the "defenceless people of Algeria." But he warned that a war begun by France and Britain "against the armed Egyptian people" could only result in serious consequences, above all for Britain and France.

Extracts from the Bulganin-Eden correspondence follow:

BULGANIN to EDEN: Sept. 11th. Minor wars could grow into major ones and "the Soviet Union cannot stand aside from this question. We wish to warn you in a friendly way ...

He referred to apparent readiness to begin military action against Egypt, and warned such action would lead to damage to the Suez Canal, to oilfields and pipelines.

EDEN'S DENIAL

EDEN to BULGANIN: Sept. 16th: Mr. Bulganin's letter seemed to be based on a complete misconception of the British Government's position.

"You spoke of official declarations of the readiness of Britain and France to land forces on Egypt's territory. No such official declaration has been made ..."

On Oct. 31st, Britain and France began bombing Egypt,

FOR
PEACE
and
FRIENDSHIP

Contents

1. Who Is Sabotaging Peace Efforts at Disarmament Meeting?
2. African Representation At Youth Festival
3. An Open Letter To Howard Fast
4. Japan - American Colony?

PRICE 30.

AUGUST · SEP. 1957

BULLETIN OF THE S.A. SOCIETY FOR PEACE
AND FRIENDSHIP WITH THE SOVIET UNION

BOX 2920
JOHANNESBURG

WHO IS PREVENTING DISARMAMENT & PEACE?

Until six weeks ago it seemed as if at least a partial agreement would be reached at the Disarmament talks. All hopes of this achievement were, however, temporarily dashed to the ground when, at the United Nations Disarmament Sub-Committee the U.S., French and British delegates frustrated every attempt by the Soviet delegation to reach agreement on the vital problems of disarmament and the suspension of nuclear tests.

Mr. Stassen, U.S. delegate, announced that his government would be prepared to reduce the U.S. armed forces (provided there was similar reduction of the armed forces of the U.S.S.R.) to two and a half million within a year, and subsequently to 2,100,000 and 1,700,000 if the first-stage reductions were effectively carried out and if adequate progress was made towards solving "major political problems".

He added that the transition to the second and the third-stage reductions would require further negotiation.

The French and British representatives, M. Moch and Selwyn Lloyd respectively, supported the limits of armed forces proposed by Mr. Stassen and declared that Britain and France would be willing to accept 700,000 as the limit for their armed forces in the second-stage reduction and 650,000 as the limit in the third stage.

Both stressed the need to solve "political problems" during the transitional periods.

Mr. Stassen said that he would refrain from commenting on the Soviet Union's proposal to suspend nuclear tests for two or three years!

The "political problems" requiring solution were not mentioned by any of the delegates and were raised, obviously, for the purpose of destroying the possibility of acceptance of the Soviet proposals for the elimination of the war threat to the peoples of the world.

Mr. V.A. Zorin, the U.S.S.R. delegate, exposed the function of the British, French and U.S. delegates - to protect the interests of the armament manufacturers.

He said that the announcement made by the United States delegate did not provide a clear idea of the steps which the government of the U.S. considered possible for the reduction of the armed forces by stages.

"What method does the United States suggest for recording the figures of the two stages - the second and the third - which he mentioned, and would those figures be valid, since it has been suggested that each of the stages in the reduction of armed forces should be followed by further negotiations? If we keep in mind that the first stage negotiations on the reduction of armed forces and armaments have been going on for a number of years, then if we were to plan further negotiations for each of the subsequent stages, I am afraid that neither our children, nor even our grand-children, would live to see all these stages of reduction carried out."

Mr. Zorin asked Mr. Stassen what political conditions were necessary in order to pass from one stage to another in reducing armed forces, what negotiations were meant in the transition from one stage to another and, lastly, what were the deadlines for the transition from one stage to another which the government of the United States had in mind.

He criticised Mr. Stassen for failing to clarify the question of armaments and budgets which were an important aspect of the problem of reducing armed forces and conventional armaments, and for refusing to deal with the Soviet Government's proposals for the suspension of tests of atomic and hydrogen weapons.

Mr. Zorin pointed out that the Sub-Committee had recently been receiving more and more proposals from governments and public organisations with the imperative demand for the suspension of nuclear tests. "The ending of tests has now become the most burning issue of the day and its solution is demanded by the overwhelming majority of countries and nations." He showed that the majority of physicists, biologists, chemists and doctors had been unanimous in saying that the continuation of tests of atomic and hydrogen weapons created a grim danger to mankind.

"Naturally", said Mr. Zorin, "there are still forces interested in the arms race and, consequently, in the continuation of atomic and hydrogen weapon tests. However, in order to reach an agreement we should heed the peoples' demands for peace and international security and not the voice of those who stand for the continuation of the arms race. We cannot therefore overlook the attempts to hedge the termination of atom and hydrogen weapon tests by a number of conditions which tend to complicate the reaching of an agreement."

Mr. Zorin went on to say that members from a number of western countries were making the ending of tests conditional on the discontinuation of the manufacture of fissile materials for military purposes, despite the fact that it was recognised to an increasing extent that the question of nuclear weapon tests should be singled out from the problems of disarmament and settled separately, as proposed by the Soviet Government.

He said that the conditions laid down by the western powers was making the discontinuation of tests and the removal of nuclear weapons from national armaments impossible.

"For eleven years the Soviet Union has been pressing for such an agreement. However, we have invariably come up against the objection of the western powers.... What is more, they are even refusing to pledge themselves not to use atomic and hydrogen weapons.

"..... A strange situation is taking shape. When we propose that the problem of banning atomic and hydrogen weapons be settled as a whole we are told that we are asking too much and that we must proceed cautiously and gradually. Now that we suggest a simple measure, which is a concrete step towards solving the problem of banning atomic and hydrogen bombs, with the establishment of the appropriate international control, the western powers insist that this question be made conditional on the discontinuation of the production of fissile materials for military purposes. In other words, it is proposed to make the question of ending the tests conditional on the problem which it has so far been impossible to solve precisely because of the stand taken by the western powers themselves. These demands cannot be regarded otherwise than as an attempt to complicate the solution of the question of ending the tests of atomic and hydrogen weapons."

Mr. Jules Moch, representing the French Government, made the possibility of settlement more remote by suggesting that agreement on the discontinuation of the tests be made dependent on the consent, not only of the states now possessing atomic and hydrogen weapons, but also of all other countries. He said that France would not be bound by an end-the-tests agreement between the U.S., the U.S.S.R. and Britain.

Replied Mr. Zorin: "Does M. Moch consider.... that agreement on the discontinuation of nuclear tests can be reached only when all countries developed atomic and nuclear weapons and tested them, and that only then will it be possible to take a decision on discontinuing the tests?"

"It is not hard to see that M. Moch is in fact authorising any state to torpedo agreement on the discontinuation of the tests, and, strange as it may seem, is the first to avail himself of this authorisation.

"There is at present nothing that can prevent an agreement on halting nuclear weapon tests. The question today is: Are the western powers, and the United States and Britain, prepared to agree on the suspension of atomic and hydrogen weapon tests for two or three years? We await a reply to this question from all the delegates of the Subcommittee, and in the first place from the delegates of the United States and Britain. A reply is also awaited by all peoples of the world who only recently, at the Colombo session of the World Peace Council, made an impassioned

appeal to all governments to halt instantly all tests of atomic and hydrogen weapons.

"Any attempts to complicate the solution of this question by various conditions will be regarded by the world public as unwillingness to co-operate in a businesslike manner in solving the disarmament problem and in taking practical steps that would put an end to the arms race and eliminate the threat of atomic war."

LARGE AFRICAN
CONTINGENT
AT
YOUTH FESTIVAL

About 130 flags of different countries of the world fluttered in the streets and squares of Moscow when the Sixth World Festival of Youth and Students opened in the Soviet capital on July 28th.

More than 30,000 delegates and other guests from all parts of the world and some 70,000 young people from the republics of the U.S.S.R. are in Moscow for the event.

Almost all African states are represented at the Festival. The largest delegation, consisting of 36 persons, comes from Senegal.

African countries represented at the Festival for the first time are Upper-Volta, Mauritania, French Guinea, Chad,

Cubangui Chari, Gabon, Sierra Leone and Ethiopia. Delegations have gone also from Ghana, Middle Congo, Cameroon, French Sudan and Dahomey.

Highlights of Festival entertainment will be two international and two national concerts of African culture.

This year's Festival, bursting with the creative vitality of thousands of youths from nearly every country in the world, will be the most magnificent and inspiring yet held.

WILL U.S.A. and
U.S.S.R. EXCHANGE
TELEVISION & RADIO
PROGRAMMES?

The U.S. Secretary of State wrote to the Soviet Ambassador in Washington recently, suggesting a regular exchange between the two countries of uncensored radio and television programmes.

The Soviet Ambassador replied that these questions should be considered, together with other questions concerning the development of links between the Soviet Union and the United States, including that of the removal of all artificial obstacles raised by the American side.

It was further stated that the development of contacts between the two countries was greatly hampered by the provision in the American immigration rules - contrary to universally accepted international standards - which requires the fingerprinting of Soviet citizens as an indispensable condition for their entry into the United States. The Ministry suggested that the two governments begin negotiations on the development of the links suggested by the Americans.

AN OPEN LETTER TO HOWARD FAST



Recently the Johannesburg "Zionist Record" reprinted a lengthy extract from an article by the American novelist Howard Fast, announcing his break with the American Communist Party, in which he declares his "disenchantment" with the Soviet Union. "In Russia", he writes, "we have socialism without democracy.... without civil liberty.... without morality". In this "Open Letter", Alan Doyle, well-known contributor to progressive journals in this country, replies to Mr. Fast.

My dear Howard Fast,

Recently I read an article of yours which (probably without permission or payment) has been reprinted in the Johannesburg "Zionist Record". There is no evidence that this paper had ever before noticed the existence of the writer Howard Fast.

I write you more in sorrow than in anger. The pleasure and inspiration I have received from your books, particularly "Freedom Road" and "The Last Frontier", make me your debtor, irrespective of what you may say, write, or do in the future.

This new article of yours is different from anything you have written before. Instead of arming the fighters for freedom it disarms them. Instead of inspiring it depresses.

The political party you choose to belong to is your own affair. Reading your article one wonders how you ever did come to join the Communist Party. The Old and the New Testaments and the writings of Jefferson and Lincoln, how rich in wisdom, hardly comprise an adequate theoretical foundation for a member of an advanced workers' party working in the stronghold of international reaction at a time of supreme world crisis. I think you are a brilliant novelist, whose books have contributed and will contribute much to the cause of human freedom and progress. But I do not think you have a very deep understanding of socialism.

My complaint against you is not that you left the Communist Party but that in doing so you found it necessary or advisable to make so unbalanced and hysterical an attack against the Soviet Union. After all, there is no shortage of American anti-Soviet writers. You must know that the reason that the Zionist Record and other reactionary publications all over the world will seize upon this article is not that you really have anything new or important to add, but purely and simply because it is you, Howard Fast, who is saying it.

And what is it, after all, that you are saying? That you are shocked and disappointed to learn that socialism has been built in Soviet Russia "without" those conditions of ideal libertarian democracy which may have been preached by Jefferson and other theorists but have never been practiced in the United States or any other State on earth.

The question you do not face and do not answer is whether socialism could have been built, in the historical conditions of backward Russia, surrounded by a hostile world, in any other possible way. Was it not precisely this problem - the need for the workers, after the conquest of power, to build their own State, i.e. repressive machinery, to overcome the thousand ties that bind to the past - which was foreseen by Marx, with his extraordinary insight, when he minted that historic phrase, the dictatorship of the proletariat?

"Totalitarianism" you write. Yes, it is true that, the way it turned out, the use of State power in the Soviet Union became harsh and extreme. It is true that, during the later phase of Stalin's leadership, with all his prestige and success, he became a law unto himself, arbitrary and intolerant; that monstrous blunders, injustices and excesses were committed. Do you think you are the only one who was shocked by those revelations?

But, have you forgotten the circumstances under which the Republic of Soviets was born, amidst the fires and thunders of a great war? The civil wars and wars of intervention that followed, with practically every opposition group and party joining the enemy invader? The receding tide of revolution over Europe in the twenties when the Soviet socialists had to watch (from what they had thought of merely as the advanced post of a victorious world march to socialism) their comrades in one country after another fail in their bid to attain the summit of power? Their hard decision to go ahead by themselves and undertake the truly superhuman task of building socialism in one country? Have you considered what that task meant - a truly gigantic straining of the entire resources of the whole people; spartan renunciation of every non-essential in material wealth; an all-out mobilisation compared to which America's "war effort" was a picnic? And do you really imagine that anything less than what you call "totalitarianism" could have pulled the country victoriously through that mighty labour?

And it all had to be done at a forced pace, under the menacing canons of imperialism, with Hitler's Germany - specially created, financed and plotted for the purpose of an invasion - building up the mightiest army in history on the borders of Soviet Russia.

7

Have you forgotten (but I should not ask, you cannot have forgotten) Salingrad and Leningrad and the days when nothing but the Soviet people and the might which, out of their vast labours and sacrifices (and I include the sacrifice of many of those individual liberties which we brain-workers hold so dear) they had created stood between the whole world and the monstrous barbarism of Hitler's fascism? You speak of injustices to Jews in Russia and Poland, and I cannot condone injustices to any group of people, especially on grounds of nationality or race, anywhere in the world. But Jews have, I think, some duty to speak and write with restraint about the Red Army and the Soviet Union, which saved the whole people from extermination.

I believe in civil liberty. In fact in the dismal conditions prevailing in my country (not unlike yours in that respect) I find I have to spend most of my time fighting for it. But I do not think we must make an absolute of this question, important though it is.

All socialists, for that matter, believe in the fullest measure of individual liberty where "the free development of each is the condition for the full and free development of all". In fact we look forward to the ultimate withering away of the state and the ultimate realisation of the state of perfect freedom envisaged by the great Anarchist philosophers.

The relative absence of much personal freedom in the Soviet Union is no more characteristic of socialism than the relative development of it in, say, Britain, in her exceptionally secure position, lasting for over a century; as the leading capitalist country enjoyed an exceptional measure of civil liberty; habeus corpus and free speech prevailed and great revolutionary exiles found sanctuary there, (Part of the price was the abject denial of the slightest vestige of freedom or democracy to the millions of colonial slaves under the British crown). But at best British freedom has been limited and partial and served to conceal the real domination of her deeply-intrenched ruling class: As for America, even in the efflorescence of bourgeois democracy, you yourself in your historical novels have drawn too powerful and painful a picture of the content of plutocratic "freedom" for the poor, the weak, the oppressed, to need reminding of it now.

Despite its limitations, I do believe that Soviet democracy has given more genuine freedom to the millions than history has ever known. But we are dealing here precisely with those limitations. I am convinced that they grew precisely out of the position of the Soviet Union as the pioneer country of socialism, fighting for its very existence in historical conditions which are unlikely ever to be repeated—mainly because of the existence of the U.S.S.R. itself. In a sense it has been an "emergency" regime from the Tsarist

past; fighting grimly to preserve essentials with the faith and knowledge that the young generation would reap the harvest and enjoy the refinements which the hostility of the imperialist encirclement denied to those who made the revolution and stormed the heavens.

We are accused, and we blame ourselves, for being too uncritical of Soviet Russia in the past, for not seeing or perhaps closing our eyes to the "hellish revelations" of the Kruschov report. (By the way, are you sure how much of these "revelations" was authentic, or how much was added by the State Department and its intelligence service?) But what are we, who stand for peace and friendship among the nations, to do now? Must we - as you apparently now are doing - accept all the rubbish that is dished up as "news" by the American and British newspapers, inveterate foes of socialism, the working people and the Soviet Union? Rubbish about Hungary, rubbish about Egypt, rubbish about anti-Semitism.

The transformation of Russia over the past forty years has been extraordinary and without precedent in the annals of history. The hardships and sacrifices involved in that forced march from Tsarist backwardness to the pinnacle of industrial development were not publicised by the Soviet Union - though luridly exaggerated by the "free world" you and I live in.

Is that very surprising? Is it not unbalanced and naive on your part now when the Soviet leaders feel the strength to speak of these things of the past (some of them the more tragic in that they were unwarranted and unnecessary) to speak of their former concealment as "the most incredible swindle in modern times". What is really the most incredible swindle is the suppression of the facts of the amazing Soviet achievements by the organs of public enlightenment over a period of forty years throughout the world.

Please take this long letter - which still leaves unsaid half the things that are in my mind - from a strange fellow-writer in a faraway country, in the spirit in which I write it. Your writings have inspired us in the past; I hope and believe that they will do so again in the future, that you will return to the road you took with such passion, courage and human insight, in the past - Freedom Road.

Very sincerely yours,
ALAN DOYLE.

500,000 VISITORS
= 1956 =

Last year 561,000 Soviet people travelled to 61 countries, of whom 88,700 had gone as tourists, or for health, religious or family reasons; 400,000 had gone for business purposes etc. During the same period 487,000 visitors from 84 countries had come to the USSR. This was disclosed at a recent press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists by Vladimir Ankudinov, President of In-Tourist, the Soviet Union's travel bureau.

JAPAN - AMERICAN COLONY?

MR. KISHI'S WASHINGTON VISIT.

The Japanese people are highly critical of the discussions which took place between their Prime Minister, Mr. Kishi, and leading members of the United States Government last month.

Mr. Kishi accepted Washington policy relegating Japan to the status of obedient executor of U.S. imperialist plans in the Far East and Asia. This has caused widespread dissatisfaction in Japan especially since the majority of the people there demand an independent policy based on the principles of peaceful co-existence.

In return for his gift of Japanese enslavement to U.S. ruling circles, Mr. Kishi received nothing for the people of his country. American armed forces will not be withdrawn from Japan and the Prime Minister was ordered to increase sharply the strength of his army. The unequal treaties and agreements imposed upon Japan will remain, economic pressure applied by the U.S. will not be lifted.

The main reason for the critical state of Japan's finances is her unequal trade with the United States. For the past three years Japan has been compelled to buy from the U.S. 1,000 million dollars worth of goods more than she was able to sell to that country.

KRUSCHOV'S INTERVIEW WITH EDITOR OF "ASAHI SHIMBUN"

In contrast to this policy, which reduces Japan to a major colony of the U.S., stands the Soviet proposals - rejected by Mr. Kishi although based on the true interests and aspirations of the Japanese people.

The U.S.S.R. offers Japan peaceful co-existence, economic and political equality, a policy reiterated a few weeks ago by Mr. N.S. Kruschov in an interview with Mr. Tomoo Hirooka, editor of the Japanese newspaper, 'Asahi Shimbun'.

Mr. Hirooka asked Mr. Kruschov if it were not possible to amend the Soviet-Chinese Treaty of Friendship and Alliance which regarded Japan as a potential enemy, thereby hampering the establishment of friendship between Japan and the Soviet Union.

Mr. Kruschov: "The Soviet Union is willing to discuss this matter, but for this the necessary conditions

must be created. The creation of conditions which will make possible a change in the wording in the Soviet-Chinese Treaty depends mainly on Japan. She should show goodwill, and first of all recognise People's China. Why has Japan not yet recognised the Chinese People's Republic? Is it possible that she wants to attack her? It is Japan who must establish friendship with her neighbours. Recognise the Chinese People's Republic and the Korean People's Republic, develop trade with them, and then the conditions will be changed and it will be possible to change the wording in the Treaty Our economic interests do not clash with the economic interests of Japan, but your interests do clash with the United States because you are its rival. But there will be no competition between us. We can sell you coal, ores, timber, oil and similar raw materials. The Chinese People's Republic is a vast country which can also sell you raw materials and purchase your industrial goods.

Why doesn't Japan do what is profitable to her? She does not do it because she depends on the United States... She is compelled to take into consideration the United States, which has planted its military jackboot in Japan."

Mr. Hirooka asked how friendship could be restored between Japan and the Soviet Union and what steps should be taken in this respect.

Mr. Kruschov: "...Let us think of our future, of our goal. And here the main thing is trade, the establishment of good-neighbourly relations. Let us take coal as an example. I think that our coal will cost you less than the American coal We can also sell you food and other goods cheaper than the Americans. Do what is more advantageous to you economically, act so as to bring about mutual advantage. We can buy a lot of goods from you. The Chinese People's Republic, too, can become a big market for your goods.

Why then don't you develop trade with us and China? Is it not profitable to your capitalists? Is it not profitable to your people? Let us act reasonably. Conclude a peace treaty with us! Let Japan take some steps and we shall consider what concrete steps should be taken.

The development of friendly relations between the two countries, said Mr. Hirooka, could not be promoted while the Soviet Union held the two islands of Habomai and Shikotan which, by its own admission, belonged to Japan.

Mr. Kruschov: "As soon as the Peace Treaty is signed the islands will be immediately turned over to Japan."

"I do not know what is preventing Japan from concluding a peace treaty Can it be that you want to start a war against us? Who prevents you from concluding a peace treaty? There are no forces opposed to a peace treaty

within your country. Apparently, it is a matter of external forces. If we returned the Islands before the signing of the peace treaty it would seem that we would be helping the external forces retarding the conclusion of the treaty.

But if the Americans were to return to you the island of Okinawa I would approach our government with a proposal to turn the islands of Habomai and Shikotan over to Japan even before the signing of the peace treaty. It is my opinion that you are not exerting enough pressure on the United States to make it return the island of Okinawa."

Mr. Hirooka suggested that the Soviet Union should set an example to other countries by being the first state to end nuclear tests.

Mr. Kruschov reminded Mr. Hirooka that Mr. Eden and the two socialists, Guy Mollet and M. Pineau, unleashed an aggressive war against Egypt because it was a weaker country.

"If we cease our tests we shall weaken our defence potential in some measure. But it should be remembered that it is our power that deters the forces of war and strengthens those of peace. Will not a certain weakening of our power be an incentive for the imperialist force to undertake an adventurous step? You will recall the recent bellicose statement by the American General Norstad, commander-in-chief of N.A.T.O. armed forces, in which he asserted that the Soviet Union could be destroyed in a matter of hours. Such unreasonable hotheads exist and we cannot forget about them.

"We do not want to be like the lamb who is defenceless against the wolf."

Mr. Hirooka: "Please take into consideration that I personally am a peace supporter. We in Japan are waging a stubborn struggle against those who do not want peace. In my opinion the most important thing is not to foist one's ideology upon others. I personally believe that no objections could be raised if the Japanese people themselves became supporters of the communist ideology. But this must be done by the people voluntarily, without this ideology being foisted upon them from without.

Mr. Kruschov: "We also stand for this. I agree with you. This is exactly how it should be."

57,000,000 ACRES OF NEW LAND!

:" As compared with 1953 the area sown to grain crops in the USSR has increased by 23 million hectares (nearly 57 million acres). Most of the additional area is in Kazakhstan and Siberia. This year the collective and state farms are expected to take in about 35½ million tons of sugar beet - double the figure for 1940.

FOR
P E A C E
A N D
F R I E N D S H I P

SPECIAL ANNIVERSARY
ISSUE

1917-1957
FORTY YEARS

ARTICLES ON THE SOCIAL,
CULTURAL AND SCIENTIFIC
DEVELOPMENTS IN THE
SOVIET UNION

PRICE 30

ISSUED BY THE S.A. SOCIETY FOR PEACE AND
FRIENDSHIP WITH THE SOVIET UNION · BOX 2920 · JHRG

EDITORIAL

AFTER FORTY YEARS

November 7th, 1957, marks the fortieth anniversary of the Russian socialist revolution and the foundation of the modern Soviet State. This, the most momentous event in modern history, has from the very beginning been accorded the most extraordinarily mixed reception.

The conservative leaders and forces in the Western and Eastern nations regarded the accession to power of Lenin and his associates with undisguised horror and dismay. Firm believers in the governing mission of the upper classes with their superior education, training, leisure and wealth, they looked upon the claims of the Russian workers and peasants - the majority of them at the time illiterate and sunk in the deepest poverty - as an insolent affront to all established authority, which could not but have unsettling effects in fostering rebellion and disaffection among unruly elements among their own populations and in their colonies and dependencies. The influential owners of landed property and industrial resources saw in the socialist experiment a threat to their possessions. Those, especially, who had investments in the Tsarist empire felt they had been robbed. Many upholders of religious, racialistic, idealistic and other ideologies hostile to Marxist materialism saw their cherished beliefs challenged and imperilled.

Hence the reaction of all such groupings, with all their power and influence in the affairs of their countries, was to wish with all their hearts for the early collapse and disappearance of the young Soviet republic. They backed up these wishes with force to make them come true. The embattled armies of the Allies and the Central European powers diverted forces from the great war of mutual destruction which they were engaged in, in order to assist the Tsarist detachments in the civil war against the Bolsheviks. Direct intervention armies were sent to Russia. All diplomatic and commercial relations were broken off.

In later years, Winston Churchill publicly lamented that he and his friends had not been more successful in their attempts to "strangle the Bolshevik revolution in its cradle."

But these reactions from conservative elements in the outside world were not unanimous or typical of public response to the momentous events in Russia. Among the leaders of the labour and socialist movements in Europe there was much sympathy with the Russian Communists: nor was this sympathy confined to such "extreme" elements as the British Socialist Party, the German Spartakus League of Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, or the South African International Socialist League under the leadership of men like Andrews, Bunting and Jones. Right-wing labour leaders like MacDonald and Henderson, trade unionists like Ernest Bevan, indeed all Labour men, felt and said publicly that whatever one's views as to the tactics of the Soviet leaders they ought at least to be given a chance to carry out their experiment without outside

intervention. Strong "Hands off Russia" movements sprang up in Britain and many other countries. Coupled with unexpectedly fierce resistance from the newly formed Red Army, this opposition had the effect of ending direct military intervention, though not of ending the economic and diplomatic blockade which in some ways (compare the present "cold war") has persisted for the past forty years, in one form or another.

Similarly in colonial territories the Russian revolution was hailed as the beginning of a new era. The Soviet leaders had proclaimed their belief in equality and independence for all nations, and the victims of imperialism everywhere responded with great sympathy and enthusiasm. Even such leaders as General Hertzog and Dr. Malan in South Africa shared these feelings -- until they realised that the Soviet leaders included dark-skinned peoples in their concept of human equality and fraternity!

Though conditions have vastly changed today, the controversy that was born forty years ago still rages throughout the world.

The Soviet State survived the years of famine, civil war and foreign intervention.

It survived the isolation imposed upon it by the outside world, the economic blockade and diplomatic quarantine, the "cordon sanitaire."

It survived the fierce propaganda war, which kept repeating everywhere that it was bankrupt, in turmoil, on the verge of collapse.

It survived the bitter internal dissensions that developed in the strains and stresses of its forced march to industrialisation and self-sufficiency.

In June, 1941, it survived the sternest test of all: it withstood the tremendous shock of a surprise attack by Hitler's gigantic army, flushed with easy victories in the West and fed by the resources of all conquered Europe. And it rallied to expel the invaders and save all humanity from Nazi conquest.

Not only has the Soviet Union survived all these internal and external threats to its continued existence, it has also continued at a dizzying and truly astounding tempo, to develop its human and industrial resources.

The Soviet Union is still not as wealthy a country as the United States of America. Per capita industrial output in the U.S.A. is still more than double that of the U.S.S.R. (It is about 2.6 per cent as great.)

But when it is remembered that in 1913 (the year of greatest pre-revolutionary production in the old Russian Empire) American production was more than 13 times that of Russia; that the intervening period saw the Soviet Union repeatedly devastated by years of ruinous and unwanted warfare, including the two world wars

during which the U.S., far from the scenes of battle, actually greatly speeded up its economic development; then the vast magnitude of the Soviet achievement will be appreciated, and the overwhelming likelihood that it will soon overtake the remaining gap.

Today, with twenty percent of the world's industrial output (as compared with 2.3 per cent in 1917) the U.S.S.R. ranks first in Europe and second in the world in volume of industrial output.

A backward, peasant country has been transformed into a front-rank industrial and modern agricultural power.

A largely illiterate population has been transformed into a highly educated public, including over six million trained specialists and professional people. Soviet science, engineering and technology are admittedly the most advanced in the world.

These facts are no longer matters for debate or differences of opinion. Their proof is written high in the heavens as the two first man-made moons transverse their awesome and inspiring orbits about the globe.

Facts are stubborn things. Those who forty years ago felt nothing but illwill towards the great experiment in a new way of life that was then begun have not abated their malice today. They still seize upon changes in leading personnel as evidences of "grave instability" -- though ministerial changes are commonplaces in every modern country and France has got to the stage of permanent Cabinet crisis. They still cling stubbornly to the illusion that the Soviet Union can be sealed off, isolated, ignored and conquered by a "grand alliance" of the capitalist world -- though that illusion of wishful thought was disproved in 1917, and 1941, and through all the years of "cold war"; and is today nothing but raving lunacy.

We cannot afford that lunacy any longer.

We of the Society for Peace and Friendship with the Soviet Union, maintain as we have done throughout the years of our Society's existence that South Africa's most vital interests are bound up with a policy of mutual friendly relations with the U.S.S.R. We do not claim, and never have, that Russia today is a utopia. We do not say that the path her people have followed is a feasible or desirable path for the people of our own country, for we South Africans must solve our own problems in our own way.

But we do say with all seriousness and earnestness that we must learn to live in friendship with the Russians. We cannot afford, on a feeble and dishonest pretext, to drive out as we have done, the Consulate of a great, friendly and powerful country. We can no longer afford to treat with disdain a country which is becoming an increasingly important customer for our agricultural products, and which could become a still more important factor in our country's prosperity. The Russians have

no ill-will towards us; they give us weather reports which benefit us greatly, and could give us a great deal more if only we would stop treating them as moral lepers because they do not share the somewhat eccentric views of the ruling party in South Africa. Our Government only makes itself ridiculous in the eyes of the world when the censorship bans famous nineteenth century classics of literature because they were printed in the U.S.S.R., or persecutes members of our Society when they try to open the eyes of the public to the folly and absurdity of our Government's attempts to kraal off our people from any contact with Soviet culture, science, films, artists or sportsmen. As well issue an order forbidding Sputnik to fly over South Africa.

Warmly congratulating the Soviet peoples on the fortieth birthday of their State, we pledge ourselves to spare no efforts in the future to carry forward our mission of building peace and friendship between our two countries!

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
//////////

AFRICA WANTS TO LIVE
IN PEACE AND FRIENDSHIP
WITH THE SOVIET UNION

In these days when breath-taking events are taking place in the Soviet Union, it is natural that people throughout the world should want to know more about that country and its people. We in South Africa are no exception to this desire. In fact whenever a Soviet ship sails into Table Bay, there is widespread excitement. In spite of official 'Iron Curtains' thrown round it, the more daring actually swim to the ships. There is everlasting yearning to watch Soviet ballet or the Moscow Dynamos, and a host of other things that people hear, vaguely, go on in the Soviet Union.

Perhaps it took the launching of Sputnik to really crush the walls which impeded the flow of knowledge about the Soviet Union and almost overnight all the official theories about 'Soviet backwardness', 'lack of creative abilities' on the part of the Soviet people, were swept away by force of sheer reality.

One of the questions that have been brought up by the recent scientific and military achievements of the Soviet Union is to seek assurance about the friendly intentions or otherwise of the U.S.S.R.

"Are the Soviet People friends or enemies?"

THE SOVIET PEOPLE AND AFRICA

At a time when the Soviet Union is celebrating its fortieth anniversary it is proper to examine the relations of the people of South Africa as well as Africa as a whole, with the Soviet Union.

Let us start with a territory like Tangiers which is situated in the most Northern part of Africa.

This little territory was brought under international control towards the end of the Second World War, when a treaty was agreed upon by Britain, France, the U.S.A. and the Soviet Union. In terms of this treaty the Soviet Union had a right to participate in the administration of Tangiers. But the Soviet Union declined because they refused to sit with the representatives of the Fascist Franco Spain.

Now with the Imperialist talk of 'Soviet penetration in Africa' one would have expected the Soviet Union to have jumped at the opportunity to have a foot-hold in Tangiers.

Here is another example, the situation in Algeria. With the political crisis there one would expect a 'Russian consul' to be darting around with copies of 'Pravda' all over the French territories and also advising the insurgents about how to 'poison wells' etc. But as far back as 1951 - long before the present tension reached such proportions, the Soviet Union closed its Consulate.

Of all African countries Egypt brought the house down when she entered into trade agreements with the Soviet Union. The Egyptians were accused of 'bringing Russia into the Middle East and Africa.' Yet the truth of the situation is that even with the arms deal, Egypt only approached the Socialist camp when it was clear that the United States and other Western countries would conclude trading agreements only if Egypt agreed to enter into their military alliances and comply with their political conditions.

An Egyptian Army officer, Major Salam Salem, explained the position this way:

"Egypt would co-operate with all states on either side of the 'Iron Curtain' which supported her aims. But with none which with-held Freedom and Dignity from Egypt."

Another interesting example of Soviet co-operation with countries in Africa is that of Ethiopia. Long standing friendship exists between the peoples of Ethiopia and the Russians. As far back as 1896 the Czar sent Red Cross units to Ethiopia and established a hospital which is still maintained by the Soviet Government. Moreover, there exists long standing ties between the Russian Orthodox Church and the Ethiopian Coptic Church. In the recent World Youth Festival in Moscow, delegates from Ethiopia participated and recently a group of teachers and librarians went on tour in the Soviet Union.

Another step the Soviet Union is taking with relation to African states has been the establishment or intention to establish diplomatic relations with Ghana, Tunisia, Liberia and the Sudan. And recently delegations from Madagascar, Senegal and West Africa toured the Soviet Union.

Collection Number: AD1812

RECORDS RELATING TO THE 'TREASON TRIAL' (REGINA vs F. ADAMS AND OTHERS ON CHARGE OF HIGH TREASON, ETC.), 1956 1961

TREASON TRIAL, 1956 1961

PUBLISHER:

Publisher:- Historical Papers, University of the Witwatersrand

Location:- Johannesburg

©2012

LEGAL NOTICES:

Copyright Notice: All materials on the Historical Papers website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be reproduced, distributed, transmitted, displayed, or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

Disclaimer and Terms of Use: Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page) for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

People using these records relating to the archives of Historical Papers, The Library, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, are reminded that such records sometimes contain material which is uncorroborated, inaccurate, distorted or untrue. While these digital records are true facsimiles of the collection records and the information contained herein is obtained from sources believed to be accurate and reliable, Historical Papers, University of the Witwatersrand has not independently verified their content. Consequently, the University is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the website or any related information on third party websites accessible from this website.

This document is part of a private collection deposited with Historical Papers at The University of the Witwatersrand.