

**Page Denied**

Next 1 Page(s) In Document Denied

JUN 20 1958

# A Closer Glimpse Of Russia's Ruler

By Marquis Childs

MOSCOW.—After you are settled in your seat and the Soviet airliner has gained altitude, a pretty hostess, Russian model, offers the passengers magazines. There are two, the *Soviet Union Illustrated Monthly*, a fairly professional picture magazine, and *Culture and Life*, containing articles on a variety of subjects from choosing a career to decorating an apartment.



Childs

The note struck repeatedly and consistently throughout both magazines was, first, the happiness and well-being of the Soviet people and, second, their desire for peace and their abhorrence of war. To one visiting the Soviet Union for the first time, this was the initial impression of what appears inevitably as the outstanding difference between the two worlds of East and West. It is the total and complete indoctrination of the Soviet citizen.

There is nothing new in this. It corresponds with the fundamental belief of the Communist order. But to the visitor from the West, seeing for the first time how 200 million people are enclosed within this doctrinal framework, it must seem to be an astonishing phenomenon.

For the great mass of the Russians, it would appear to be taken for granted. There are some who look longingly out and perhaps a few who stray. But in the great mass of those who work so hard, so intently, so fiercely, the number must be very small.

THIS REPORTER on his first day in Moscow had an exchange with Nikita S. Khrushchev that was proof to him that in discussing the Russian position on the issues dividing East and West, it is wrong to use the word "propaganda." The exchange took place at one of the big embassy receptions where the members of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, ordinarily so seclusive, make themselves available to all comers in a crowded cocktail party atmosphere.

Khrushchev spoke with the half-humorous, half-stern manner characteristic of him about the truth which should be evident to everyone in the great issues of war and peace. But was there not, the reporter suggested, a truth that lay somewhere between the Russian perspective and the American perspective, and wasn't it necessary to try to find that truth?

But Khrushchev would have none of that—going around in circles. As he so often does, he had recourse to a homely Russian analogy about the "White Bullock." This is a story of an old peasant

woman who was forever taking her white bullock out to graze and forever coming back to the village to report that the bullock had strayed away.

To this observer, Khrushchev seemed to believe every word that he spoke. This was not "propaganda" that he was putting out for a circle of reporters and diplomats in an embassy drawing room. For in this solid affirmation this short, thick man in a nondescript gray suit was the center, the core, of national conviction as beamed to the farthest corners of the Eurasian land mass by every means of modern communication.

THIS IS the meaning of Khrushchev and the Soviet system today, and it is breathtaking in its comprehensiveness and its pervasiveness. Whatever struggle and rivalry may lie below the surface, no one may, in the ordinary course of events, see. And it is only the outsider who may speculate about what happens behind the Kremlin walls.

But what this great, solid, seemingly impervious mass means for the future and a negotiated settlement is something else. The first tentative step—cultural exchange—has been taken and the heralds of culture and learning are flying back and forth as though the great divide did not exist.

Van Cliburn was a huge success, enchanting a people who love music and for whom the tall, dramatic young Texan represented something new and spectacular. The joyous vigor and vitality of the Moiseyev dancers have similarly captivated America. The Bolshoi Ballet has been appearing in Paris, where every seat was sold out months before, and the ballet and Russia's other prize cultural exhibits are being sent to the Brussels World's Fair in a lavish display of what this country can offer.

The Philadelphia Orchestra has just won wide acclaim here, both from audiences and from reviewers, who are often critical not only of foreign artists but their own.

WASHINGTON POST  
AND TIMES HERALD

## Moscow Exhibits Stress Sputniks

By Marquis Childs

MOSCOW—At the permanent exhibition of agriculture and industry covering at least as much ground as the Brussels World's Fair on the outskirts of Moscow, the big attraction is a newly installed display of the three sputniks that the Russians have orbited in outer space. It is the center of a visible national pride in the faces of the crowds that stream in and out of the building.



The sputnik display is part of the exhibit of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, and the building it occupies, formerly given over to one of the 15 component republics, is close to the main entrance to the exhibition. In the entrance hall is a replica of Sputnik No. 1, which was launched into space on Oct. 4, 1957. In the adjoining hall is a model of a half section of Sputnik No. 2, and at the end of the hall is the interior of the nose cone of No. 3, with all its complicated instrumentation.

Around the walls are related exhibits. One that attracts a great deal of attention is a replica of the compartment in No. 2 in which the dog Laika traveled and the instruments that recorded the heart beat and the respiration of this first living creature to move out of the earth's atmosphere.

The crowds are so dense that it is difficult to push one's way through the building, and in the crowd are some of the contrasts of this extraordinary country that represents so many different levels of living, so many layers of the past. Here are peasant women with kerchiefed heads and the withdrawn, somewhat suspicious look of country people.

THEY OBVIOUSLY have had only a distant knowledge of this fantastic new achievement of science in which their country has led the way. How much they take in, one can only surmise, but it is a fair assumption that they understand at the very least that this has been done for them by their government.

You see occasionally in the crowd bearded old men who look as though they had come out of Tolstol or Chekov. They have survived the whole sweep of wars and revolution, the long and terrible ordeal of the Russian people, to stand briefly in the light of this new era.

And throughout the crowd, among the most curious and the most eager are young men in uniform—such a wide variety of uniforms and insignia. One would guess that perhaps as many as thousands throng the sprawling exhibition grounds in groups of three or four and on escorted tours of 20 or 30. Among them are all the varied races of the Soviet Union, the Uzbeks and the Turkmens with their Oriental faces alongside Nordic-looking blondes.

This huge exhibition that shows so much of the industrial and scientific achievement of the mid-20th Century offers still another contrast. The architecture is approximately that of the Chicago World's Fair of 1893 with a touch of Coney Island, and the buildings and the grounds have, therefore, for the Western visitor a curiously old-fashioned look.

BUT, AS WITH everything in this grimly purposeful system, the objective is far more than entertainment. For the Russian people this is an education in what their government is doing for them, and on the simplest level in the agricultural pavilions it is to teach them how to improve their cattle, hogs and poultry.

In the All-Union building, which is just beyond the main entrance of the exhibition, one wall is covered with a huge map of the USSR illustrating with a series of colored lights the progress of electrification in the country. As the groups come through, the guide gives his lecture and the lights flash on, first those showing the dams and power stations built in the early decades, next those built after the war, and finally the big projects now under construction.

A large illuminated graph shows the achievement for 1957 of 209 billion kilowatt hours, and projected for the next 15 years a total of 800 to 900 billion kilowatt hours.

The Soviet citizen can hardly help but be impressed with this demonstration. But it is also designed to impress the numerous foreign visitors who come in a constant stream of delegations from all over, but particularly from the uncommitted nations of Asia and Africa.

# Mood in Moscow: 'Peace' and Plenty

By Marquis Childs

MOSCOW—Premier Khrushchev, in his latest note to President Eisenhower, spoke with strong resentment of the proposal of the United States to "guarantee" the security of the Soviet Union. He said the Soviet Union does not need guarantees, since it can defend its own interests.

There are few who would dispute this statement. No one can doubt Russia's military power today. While it has been proclaimed that the armed forces have been reduced by more than two million men, the strength of the military establishment in every department is unquestioned.

But at the same time it is rarely referred to. The May Day celebration this year showed little or no evidence of new military prowess, and Soviet officials never speak publicly of the weapons in the Soviet arsenal and their capability. Not since the Suez crisis of nearly two years ago, when notes to London and Paris declared that rockets would rain down on those capitals if the attack on Egypt did not cease, have such claims been made.

The emphasis is all on peace, with references to the evidence of Soviet strength carefully screened. This, too, is a source of strength, for the constant repetition of the peace theme must impress the neutral and uncommitted nations that live in fear of another war.

FROM THE internal viewpoint as most Western observers see it, the Russian people are better off than they were a year or two ago. Great new apartments are going up on the outskirts of Moscow. This leads the average citizen to believe that before too long he will be able to have an apartment for his own family rather than sharing it with another family.

In the dress of the crowds in the street there is today far more color than two years ago. A bright sweater, a print dress, a spring hat stand out. There is such a vogue for checked shirts for men that the supply always falls short of the demand. One index of change—the number of women wearing lipstick—is sharply up.

In the great department store adjoining Red Square, goods of every kind, from pastel lingerie to all kinds of canned food, are on display. Prices seem very high, but they must be put alongside the fact that for certain basic necessities such as rent the Soviet citizen pays a much smaller share of his income than he would in the West.

Khrushchev has promised that the Soviet Union will in a relatively short time surpass the United States in the

production of consumer goods, and in his public appearances he gives every evidence of being confident of doing just that. The signs and symbols of Soviet strength are undeniably in that direction.

WHAT THE reporter so new to this world inevitably asks is whether the latest Khrushchev note, with its stern insistence on the righteousness of the Soviet position, is compatible with this strength. Or is it, as some Westerners are saying, defensive and evidence of uncertainty and even weakness?

The answer may lie in the emphatic tone in which the note rejects, as so often before, the United States proposal to discuss the situation in Eastern Europe in the countries which Moscow designates as "people's democracies." This is considered by the Soviet Union as intolerable intervention, and if it is insisted on by the West, there will be no summit conference.

Pravda, on the morning that the executions of the leaders of the Hungarian uprising were announced, carried a story from Budapest headlined, "Hungarians Unanimously Approve Decision of Court." It gave interviews purporting to come from Hungarian citizens expressing their belief in the sentencing of Imre Nagy and his associates to death.

The meaning of this is unmistakable. The security of the Soviet Union is related to Eastern Europe and it is connected, moreover, with the American bases which are on the periphery of Eastern Europe. Anything which threatens to alter the situation in the states bordering the Soviet Union will be met with implacable resistance.

This is a fundamental fact of present-day Russia. It may seem to alter from time to time as circumstances change. But no matter what the effect on Western opinion or on the prospect for a negotiated settlement of the cold war, this, in the view of one observer, is unalterable.



Childs

WASHINGTON  
AND TIMES HERALD

# The Ugly Face of A Mob in Moscow

By Marquis Childs

MOSCOW—The rule is apparently: One demonstration in the West, a comparable demonstration in Moscow. With one or two exceptions, that has been the practice so far and it seems likely, under Moscow's stern new policy, to go on being the practice.

Under that policy the Soviet Union intends to repeat again and again by every means of communication the charge that Imre Nagy and the others executed and imprisoned as a result of the Hungarian uprising were guilty of treason and their execution completely justified. If the protest demonstrations in Western capitals have produced any result, it is a stiffening of the determination not merely to stand behind the decision but to champion it with the persistence and all the resources of the Communist bloc.

The demonstration before the West Germany Embassy had far more punch than the demonstration against the Danish Embassy. The Germans in Bonn had thrown bottles of blue ink at the Soviet Embassy. The Russian demonstrators threw bottles of blue ink at the German Embassy here.

BUT THE demonstration in Moscow had behind it something of the passionate feeling of bitterness and hatred toward the German invaders that lies below the surface as a result of the terrible punishment that the Russians took in the first two years of World War II. Banners said, "Remember Stalingrad." Stalingrad was the scene of the last-ditch stand of the Russian army that turned back the Nazis with appalling casualties on both sides. A woman in the crowd screamed, "They murdered my husband! They murdered my husband!"

A deep undercurrent of feeling in the crowd, contrasting sharply with the rather casual and even cheerful rock-throwing at the Danish Embassy, found an outlet in sharp criticism of Americans who were there either as reporters or tourists.

One of the demonstrators, carrying a banner proclaiming the desire of the Soviet Union for peace and speaking English, demanded of several Americans why the American Government was against Soviet Russia and everything that Russia did. He said that he had fought at Stalingrad and been badly wounded there and he wanted no more war.

Wasn't it true that the Americans wanted war? he asked. It did little good telling him that it was not true, since he had heard so often another version of the same aims and intentions.

The scene in the street before the broken and bespattered facade of the embassy, with the crowds chanting various slogans, was curiously depressing. It seemed a repetition of what had happened in turbulent and uncertain days leading up to World War II. Under the brooding heat of Moscow's summer, which has come on with a rush, all the hostility and the fanatical hatred of the past boiled up in the grim and angry crowd of men in shirt sleeves and women in light dresses.



Childs

IN THIS city of astonishing contrasts, to be an hour or two later in the great white and gold hall of St. George's in the Kremlin, at the reception for the King and Queen of Nepal, was to have the sensation of being on another planet. Here was the diplomatic corps (minus the West German Ambassador), many of the diplomats in full uniform, with medals gleaming under the massive chandeliers.

Nikita S. Khrushchev, in a short black coat and wearing only the two highest decorations of the Soviet Union on his lapel, looked solemn and preoccupied. The official host, President Voroshilov, read a speech, interpreted into English, full of fine rhetoric about the peace-loving citizens of the Soviet Union and the peace-loving Nepalese people and the necessity for a summit conference and for ending nuclear tests.

The trumpeters in the musicians' gallery, high up in the glittering hall with its symbol of St. George and the dragon out of the days of the Czars, blew their trumpets each time a toast was drunk. And the guests, dressed in so many diverse costumes of East and West, attacked the long banquet tables laden with all kinds of food and drink.

The business of demonstrations will go on, one assumes, and so will Kremlin receptions. But what relation they have to the urgent necessities of the world today, it is a little hard to see.

WASHINGTON POST  
AND TIMES HERALD

## Patriotic Appeals Fuel Soviet Drive

By Marquis Childs

MOSCOW—A great deal has been written in the West about the compulsions of the system of Soviet communism. But comparatively little stress has been put—and it may be one reason why Russia is consistently underestimated—on the never-ceasing appeal to the individual to contribute to the common good of the Socialist fatherland.



Childs

It begins when Ivan Ivanovitch listens to the early morning news on the radio, and it goes on throughout his day until, as he is enjoying himself in the evening at the Gorki Park of Rest and Culture, he confronts at various points in that huge recreation area the appeal—and it is phrased as an appeal—of his government to give more of himself to the building of socialism.

The individualist from the West may discount this as rhetorical, boring and sentimental. But Western observers here with long and expert knowledge believe that the patriotic appeal is an important element in the will with which the Russian people work at their allotted tasks. Ivan Ivanovitch is by nature and by heritage deeply patriotic, and what he hears and reads in his daily life constantly identifies his country and his government.

THE POSSESSIVE pronoun "your"—your factory, your forest, your collective farm—is invariably used in calling on him to work hard to be careful about forest fires, to raise milk production, to give special care and attention to machinery. While the outsider has no way of judging the degree to which this identification is accepted, it can scarcely help but influence the attitudes of a people who know nothing of the psychology of individualism.

The students who have just graduated from the university and from the technicums and institutes are now going out to give two weeks or more of service on the collective farms and on other state enterprises. Their departure for this voluntary labor is represented by the official line as having a good time in the process.

Here again it is impossible for the outsider to appraise the balance as between the voluntary and the compulsory, but it is significant that the objective of the state is to make it voluntary—a gift to the government that has given these young people such a thorough education, not only free but with a stipend paid during the student's college years.

Those who have contributed largely to the achievements of the Communist state are not only well rewarded in a material way but they are constantly held up to the public for admiration.

IN GORKI Park, which is such an astonishing combination of amusement park, Chautauqua lecture course and a wooded retreat visited on a weekend of good weather by literally hundreds of thousands, one comes suddenly upon a shrine in which large photographs of the Lenin Prize winners for recent years are displayed under glass with a record of their achievements.

Except for the composer, Dmitri Shostakovich, and the leading male dancer of the Ballet Othello, Vokhtang Chebukiani, they are virtually all scientists. Photographs of the leading atomic physicists, chemists and geophysicists have the place of honor underneath a big inscription, "Long live the people of the Soviet Union who have built socialism."

The moral in all this is obvious: If you have the brains, then your government will give you every opportunity to go and do likewise.

One of the phenomena that impresses every visitor is the line three and four deep extending seven or eight blocks across Red Square and into the park at the foot of the Kremlin walls waiting to get into the tomb where Lenin and Stalin are embalmed. There is nothing compulsory about this, yet they stand sometimes in the rain for hours, hoping that the mausoleum, which is open only three hours a day, will not have closed before their turn comes to file slowly past the remarkably lifelike figures of the two Communist leaders.

The identification of past and present, the use of the motive force of patriotism, is relatively new since the Revolution. Stalin during the war made repeated patriotic appeals, invoking the names of great Russian generals and heroes out of the past. This is today one of the powerful motivating forces in a society with enormous drive.

## Some Snapshots in A Moscow Album

By Marquis Childs

MOSCOW -- Arriving with varying emotions of fear, suspicion and wide-eyed wonder, American tourists in increasing numbers are this summer discovering Russia. The total this year is expected to reach 3000, and it is likely to be at least twice that number next year if the Soviets continue to encourage visitors by granting visas with a minimum of red tape.



Childs

Many of the Americans are here on business or they are delegations arranged for under the cultural exchange agreement negotiated between Washington and Moscow. Seven American women doctors have just completed a tour and a delegation from the American plastics industry is having a look at certain aspects of Soviet industry.

But some of the visitors are just tourists out to see the sights. Five years from now it may be as commonplace as visiting Paris or Rome.

Today, however, the American in Moscow for the first time has somewhat the feeling of having penetrated into the fastness of Tibet and the lamissary of the Grand Lama. He nervously clings to John Gunther's *Inside Russia* and he spends a sleepless night, or perhaps two or three, until his passport is returned to him.

SOME OF THE more glossy types are beginning to come--travelers who have been everywhere except Russia and always on de luxe ships and in de luxe hotels.

The impression they take away is an unhappy one. The eggs at breakfast were cold, and even the caviar didn't live up to advanced billing. Their attitude is that the Russians may be able to send up sputniks but they can't run a hotel properly, and when they go back and lecture to the Women's Club and Rotary on their experiences under communism, they are likely to contribute their small mite to the American sense of superiority.

The most sensible and hard-headed American tourists this reporter has encountered were two GIs who drove in from Frankfurt, Germany, in three Volkswagens. They were intensely interested in everything they saw, but at the same time they were questioning and skeptical.

They were met at the Polish-Russian border by three Intourist guides, one for each car, who drove them to Mos-

cow and accompanied them on all sight-seeing tours. The guides, two men and a woman, were also young and they and the visitors were quickly on a friendly basis.

BUT WHEN IT came to arguing politics, the young Americans found themselves up against a stone wall. Specialist Third Class Oscar D'Angelo of Chicago told of one of their arguments with a guide as follows:

"We said, 'We love our country just the way you love your country, but we don't say everything our country does is right because we know it isn't and we're willing to make concessions. But you say everything you do is right.' And then I said I wanted to ask him something. I asked him if he loved his wife and if he thought she was a wonderful woman. He said he thought she was the most wonderful woman in the world.

"Well, I said, she makes mistakes, doesn't she? Yes, he said, she did, but it wasn't the same as with his country. We just couldn't get anywhere with them."

To argue politics with an Intourist guide is an exercise in futility, since his or her indoctrination at least matches that of a member of the Politbureau. But it may, nevertheless, be a healthy thing to do, leaving on both sides a residue, if not of understanding, then a knowledge of how wide are the ideological differences separating the two sides.

While the tourist who comes for 10 days may qualify as an expert before the Rotary Club when he gets back home, it is the Westerner here as a more or less permanent resident who feels this extraordinary nation.

The permanent resident feels for the wide-eyed visitor a pitying contempt--if only he stayed a little longer he would know how much he didn't know. Yet if the tourist takes away no more than a small view of the Russian people, he may have made a contribution, however small, to the vast problem of existing together in an incredibly dangerous world.

## The Puzzling Role Of Soviet Religion

By Marquis Childs

MOSCOW—No aspect of this extraordinary society is more puzzling to the Western observer than the status of religion.

While it has been reported that something resembling a religious revival has been taking place, with more and more young people attending church and participating in church ceremonies, this would seem to be definitely an exaggeration. But in religion, as in so many other fields, communism is rediscovering the past and adapting it to its own objectives. The past is, of course, the Russian past, or, to put it more precisely, the elements of that past which serve Communist aims.



Childs

A striking example of what has been taking place can be seen in Kiev, capital of the Ukraine, which was once the chief center for both the Christian and Jewish religions and was known as "the Russian Jerusalem." To visit the Monastery of Lavra on the outskirts of Kiev is to have some idea of the transition taking place and the remarkably different layers of development that exist side by side.

Lavra, part of which dates back to the 11th century when its deep caves were occupied by famous hermit monks, was before the revolution one of the two or three holiest places in Russia. After the revolution, in the phase of aggressive atheism, electric lights were put in the caves and the mummified saints and other objects of religious veneration were made a kind of chamber of horrors to illustrate the superstition and uselessness, from the Communist perspective, of religion.

SINCE THE war part of Lavra, including the caves and one of the churches, has been restored to the church. The electric lights have gone and the devout as well as tourists and sightseers carry lighted tapers that shed a soft glow on the coffins, with their glass lids containing the mummified bodies of elders and venerables attired in richly embroidered vestments.

In the section of the monastery retained by the state, steel scaffolding surrounds the 300-foot bell tower. Restoration is to be completed next year. The Germans, four months after they occupied Kiev—they held it for more than two years—blew up the 11th century Cathedral of the Assumption with its early frescoes. So thorough was this act of wanton destruction that it cannot be restored.

The restoration at Lavra and the work being done on religious monuments in other cities represent a considerable investment at a time when the state is straining every muscle to build industry and agriculture. One can only conclude that since nothing is done here for whim or caprice the investment—small, of course, in relation to the vast sums being spent on industry and transportation—was considered worthwhile if only to recall the greatness of the Russian past.

In rediscovering the past, which is part of the theme of patriotism that is an important element in today's ideology, the Communist party is taking little or no risk. Young people almost invariably tell the visitor that in Russia very few people believe in God.

YET AT THE same time a search for new forms to give life a broader and even a happier content suggests that there is a realization of the need for what the church once provided on this level. The Young Communist League, with up to 20 million members under 30 years old, has recently been encouraging wedding ceremonies at the registry office, with bride and groom in formal dress, presents and wedding repast.

The Russian church has more often than not in times past been an instrument of the state. At the time of the Hungarian uprising and the world indignation that greeted its suppression, the statements given out by church authorities here closely paralleled those of the state.

But religion, however one may construe its significance under present circumstances, is a major fact. Russia claims to be the fourth Moslem power in the world, and this is not unimportant in Communist relations with the Arab world. On his recent tour of the Soviet Union President Nasser of the United Arab Republic is said to have been deeply impressed with the status of Moslems in Central Asia.



# Russia Shows Skill In Wooing Guests

By Marquis Childs

STALINGRAD—It is on the constant stream of visitors from the uncommitted countries of the Middle East, Asia and Africa that the achievement of the Soviet Union in constructing new cities and new industries has its greatest impact.



Childs

The Westerner brings with him certain questioning doubts. He is inclined to look at the flaws and to wonder how long this intensive effort can be sustained and what its cost will be for the long pull.

But the guest from India or Egypt or Ghana sees that a country which 40 years ago had a backward and largely illiterate peasant population, comprising up to 80 per cent of the total, has today industrial production of an advanced order. The tractor plant here, with its 30,000 employes on three shifts, rebuilt immediately after the war, sells tractors to India and China.

The delegations from the uncommitted countries are keenly aware that the problem of a backward peasantry is very much with them. The lesson plainly is that if Russia can overcome it, then they can, too, and in the same way that it has been done here—through communism.

THE COST of bringing this unending stream of visitors to the Soviet Union and giving them the grand tour is obviously great. But that it pays off in winning friends can scarcely be doubted.

Recently the King and Queen of Nepal were given the full treatment, during a three-week visit. Nepal is a small country adjacent to Tibet and India, with a people who live an almost primitive agricultural life. But it is of great strategic importance and the honors shown the King and Queen and their extensive entourage could not have been greater if they had been monarchs of a major power.

Their tour illustrates the great pains the Russians take not only with royalty but with all visitors whom they want to impress. This was not a matter merely of a show in Moscow with a Kremlin reception and then sending them on their way with an escort for a sightseeing trip. On the main streets in each of the half dozen cities they visited, Nepalese flags were displayed with the flags of the USSR, and the highest authorities received them with honors at each stop.

The royal pair spent two and a half days at Stalingrad. They were shown the schools, theaters, the tractor plant and, of course, the great power dam being constructed on the other side of the Volga. While they may have felt at times that their hosts were relentless—when the full treatment is planned, then you get the full treatment—but coming from their capital of Katmandu, which has altered its ways little, if at all over the centuries, they must have seen in this reconstructed city a vision of the future.

AFTER THE Nepalese came a delegation from Iceland, and at the same time East Germans and part of an Indian trade delegation were going the rounds. The new Intourist Hotel in Stalingrad is one of the best in the Soviet Union, with everything spick and span.

The major stress in this highly organized effort is on Asia. One sees visitors from India everywhere. They come in delegations representing youth, sports, trade. Their pictures appear in the newspapers and they are whirled from place to place in big black Zis limousines. This, it is hardly necessary to add, is very flattering, particularly when your host is picking up the bills.

As with so much that is happening in Russia, it is not difficult to project the curve of the future on the basis of what has already come to pass. It is a safe guess that this drive to win friends and influence people by the guided-tour method is only in its beginning phase.

Many areas still in the early construction or reconstruction stage are out-of-bounds for foreign visitors. As additional centers are opened up, the grand tour will be extended to take in more man-made wonders marked with the Communist label.

The well-trained guides pour out an endless flow of statistics, usually in the language of the visitor, no matter how obscure that language may be. They would have an improbable sound if it were not for the fact that before his eyes are tangible accomplishments in stone and steel.

## New Surprise Due From Soviet Labs

By Marquis Childs

PARIS—Soviet Russian scientists and engineers are on the verge of another major breakthrough in the conquest of outer space. They have completed all preparations for launching Sputnik No. 4, which will contain a live animal, probably a dog, that will be returned to the earth along with the recording instruments in the nose cone.



Childs

This was learned from sources in Moscow believed reliable shortly before this reporter left the Soviet Union. It is, of course, the kind of information the Russians carefully screen by their censorship, since their policy has been to announce the successful orbiting of their sputniks only after this is an accomplished fact.

Those directing the earth satellite program are completely confident that they have solved the recovery problem and that a dog such as Laika, who perished in Sputnik No. 2, will be the first living creature to travel in outer space and return. If they are proved right, and a number of highly secret tests have prepared the way for the final experiment, then after a relatively short interval a manned satellite will be sent up.

IT IS POSSIBLE that the expected triumph of Sputnik No. 4 will be timed for National Aviation Day, which comes at the end of the month. Soviet citizens are constantly reminded of the edge that Russian sputniks have over those of the United States.

There is no doubt that satellite launchings have failed in the Soviet Union. Top specialists have admitted this privately. It is believed that the intention was to send Sputnik No. 3, weighing a ton and a half, aloft on May 1, which is a major Communist holiday, but the successful launching did not take place until May 15.

But with control of information as complete as it is in the Soviet Union failures cannot be documented. The Soviet citizen—and the rest of the world—get only the news of the successes. These, beginning with No. 1 last Oct. 4, have been formidable.

The entire stress in Russian discussion of earth satellites has been on their peaceful purposes in the exploration of outer space. This ignores the fact that a launching device capable of sending a ton and a half satellite into orbit is obviously powerful enough to send an intercontinental ballistic missile many thousands of miles. The propaganda of peaceful research fits the main theme of "peace-loving Russia" standing out against the "warmongering Western powers."

Having seen something of the surface of Russian life, which is so often harsh, drab and primitive, the returning visitor must wonder how such a people have been able to forge so far ahead in this field vital to survival both in science and in national defense. The answer would seem to be twofold.

FIRST IS the capacity for concentration in a completely controlled society. The Russian people might like more automobiles and more television sets, not to mention more food and more clothes, rather than sputniks. But they cannot make their desires known except in the most limited way, and brains and skill and money are concentrated on what the Communist hierarchy believes to be an absolutely essential goal.

Second and probably more important is the fact that incentives, the practical incentives of cash and other material rewards, are at work in those fields on which the hierarchy wants to concentrate—notably in science, technology and national defense. This means more initiative, resourcefulness and even daring in such fields. The Soviet scientist with his big apartment (by Russian standards), his country place, his car and chauffeur and his comparative freedom to travel has good reason to work hard. What is more, he is constantly honored in public and he pays virtually no income tax because there is virtually no income tax in the Soviet Union.

That is why it is most unwise—a perilous form of wishful thinking—for the West to discount or dismiss claims that are carefully spelled out by Moscow, whether these claims have to do with sputniks or with future industrial productivity. And it is a little foolish to be startled each time some new announcement heralds another "We are likely to hear more of these and perhaps in the near future."

# USSR Has Trouble With Nasser, Too

By Marquis Childs

PARIS—The disaster in Iraq, coming as the latest and perhaps decisive blow to the position of the Western powers in the Middle East, is certain to put a new strain on the Western alliance.

In the de Gaulle government here and in the Macmillan government in London are the principal architects of the policy of October, 1956, which led to the British-French-Israeli attack on Egypt. These men



Childs

have convinced themselves that it was American intervention on the side of Egypt—combined with threats from Moscow to send rockets against West European capitals—that frustrated the attack on Egypt and thereby saved President Nasser whom they had hoped to overthrow. While they are publicly discreet, in private they trace the subsequent disasters to failure to topple Nasser which they blame largely on the United States.

But the Western view of Nasser as subservient to Moscow and the objectives of Moscow is, as this reporter can assert on the basis of information from Western observers in Moscow, not shared by the masters of the Kremlin. They went all out to give him the full treatment in the course of a state visit to the USSR, yet in response he showed considerable restraint and reserve. More important, shortly after he had returned to Cairo, he went to Yugoslavia to visit Marshal Tito who had just come under violent renewed attack from the Kremlin and of the satellites and Red China.

Nasser joined with Tito in appealing to the two big power blocs to compose their differences. Western diplomats believe this infuriated the Kremlin.

WHAT THIS signifies, in the view of one observer, is that "communism" and Soviet influence are too simple an explanation for Nasser and what is happening in the Mideast. The Communists are fishing in these troubled waters, conspicuously in Yemen, and it is hardly necessary to add that they are overjoyed at the explosion of the Baghdad Pact. But the force of fanatic Arab nationalism, a force consistently underestimated by American policymakers, must be given a high place in any reckoning of the tragedy that now seems to be nearing a terrifying culmination.

In Moscow this reporter was told by a Western diplomat with close Mideastern connections that shortly before Nasser left on his Russian visit he received the American Ambassador to Cairo, Raymond Here, who is reported to have given him broad assurances, including the suggestion of a greatly expanded aid program.

It is pertinent perhaps to ask how much credence was put in any assurance that Nasser may have given in return. But if there is to be a really thoroughgoing investigation of American foreign policy, as is suggested in Washington dispatches, cause and effect in relation to the current disaster must be traced back much further.

WHILE AGAIN it is concealed by the polite surface, many knowledgeable Europeans blame the United States for Nasser. They believe it was American policy and to some extent American intrigue that helped to overthrow Mohammed Naguib and install Nasser in his place. American diplomats were apparently convinced that "they could work with" Nasser more closely than with Naguib, who is still under house arrest in Egypt. Naguib's overthrow took place in April, 1954, and disillusion came almost at once as Nasser launched his campaign of militant nationalism with virulent attacks on the "imperialist" powers.

Little more than a year after he came to power, and this in any realistic inquiry into American foreign policy is the central development, Nasser made his arms deal with Moscow. At the time of the summit conference at Geneva three years ago Secretary of State Dulles had information about that deal. But in the atmosphere of goodwill generated there President Eisenhower failed to confront Khrushchev and Bulganin, who was then Premier, with a request for information on what this signified and what Russian intentions in the Mideast were.

Since Geneva the story has been one of almost continuous drift, with each new calamity bringing closer the threat of unmitigated disaster. For America's European allies dependent on the oil of the Mideast, the showdown is close.

WASHINGTON POST  
AND TIMES HERALD

## French Dismayed By Lebanon Move

By Marquis Childs

PARIS—While in public discretion is the order of the day, in private high officials of the de Gaulle government make no secret of their dismay over the use of American forces in Lebanon at this particular moment.

Perhaps in the American view the landing of the Marines was an inevitable last-ditch action. But it came as the French, under the leadership of General de Gaulle, were making a long-deferred effort to win Moslem support in Algeria by "integration" of the Arab and European populations to try to bring the rebellion to an end.

In the French view the landing of the Marines will be interpreted throughout the Arab world as another effort by the white "colonial" powers to impose their will in the Middle East. This reaction can only help the leaders of the National Liberation Front, who have continued to defy the pacification effort of de Gaulle and his cabinet and to insist that independence for Algeria is the only answer.

AS INFORMED French officials see it, the American move was too late, not merely in relation to the uprising in Lebanon but with respect to the whole problem of Arab nationalism in recent years. They speak, too, with a frank realization of their own grave errors in the Middle East when just before and during World War II they sought to exercise a protectorate over Lebanon and Syria. Similarly in North Africa the old colonial approach culminating in the bitter and costly war in Algeria has been proved worse than futile and the current attempt at "integration" is an effort to rectify past errors.

For Foreign Minister in his cabinet de Gaulle picked Maurice Couve de Murville, a career diplomat with long experience and broad knowledge who is also a hardheaded realist. Couve de Murville's associates recall today that when he went to Washington nearly four years ago to be Ambassador for a brief interval he gave the State Department his very frank view of the almost-total unreality, as he saw it, of Western policy in the Middle East.

He said then that the effort merely to suppress Arab nationalism could result only in continuing disasters. Arab nationalism was a force that had to be reckoned with, and the use of Western arms would only delay a reckoning which was bound to be more costly with the passage of time.



Childs

In his view the Western powers were repeatedly putting their stake on cards that had already lost their value. One such card, however much one might admire his pro-Western outlook and his integrity, was the veteran prime minister of Iraq, Nuri as-Said. The tragedy that has befallen Nuri and his country was clearly forecast against the rising tide of Arab nationalism.

THE TIDE owes something to communism and something to President Nasser and the continuing propaganda barrage from Cairo. But it is also a force that is self-generating in the fact that the Arab lands have continued to exist in the mid-20th century under feudalism and a primitive tribalism.

It is the French who are likely to pay the heaviest price for the latest explosion in the Middle East. Forty per cent of France's petroleum supply comes from Iraq, and this is paid for in francs. If this is to be cut off the deficit can be made up from Western Hemisphere sources but the cost will have to be met in hard currency. That would mean a new strain on French finances just as the de Gaulle government is trying to check inflation and put France's financial house in order. Responsible officials make no secret of their conviction that if this happens dollar help from the United States in one form or another will be essential.

The present French determination is to stand clear of the American action taken in Lebanon. French warships will be offshore, but unless French lives are immediately endangered the marines on those ships will not land.

The strong feeling among responsible officials here is that the American landing has achieved little or nothing and that the way in which it was carried out was slightly absurd, making the United States and the West look foolish in Arab eyes. Only by withdrawing the Marines as quickly as possible can the consequences of the action be overcome.

## Lebanon: Way Out Seen in Neutrality

By Marquis Childs

PARIS—As farmers pray for rain in the midst of a drouth, so America's European partners are today hoping prayerfully for a policy from the United States in the Middle East. Time is rapidly running out—it can be measured in days rather than weeks—with the prospect that the present intolerable position of the West will soon be frozen in perpetuity.



As seen from this continent where a working relationship with the Arab states is of vital importance, the way out lies in a frank declaration by the United States of the neutralization of Lebanon. This small nation, divided between Christians and Moslems, with its important trading interests would then become the Switzerland of the Middle East.

This is a small step and a modest one. But it could serve to assure not only the Arab states but uncommitted nations everywhere that the United States is not seeking to force any power, however large or small, to be aligned on one side or the other. A declaration in favor of the neutralization of Lebanon would have a powerful effect in the General Assembly of the United Nations, paving the way for approval of a U.N. force to take over from the Marines.

ABOVE ALL, it is essential to act before the American force is frozen into immobility in Lebanon. The consequences of this, seen from the European viewpoint, are all too painfully evident. In Lebanon proper the discontent with such an occupying force is bound to grow as it has already begun to do. Incidents of terrorism and sabotage will certainly increase, breeding disastrous hatreds on both sides.

The consequences in neighboring Iraq would be equally serious. At this writing Brig. Gen. Abdul Karim el-Kassem, Iraq's new premier, has shown no haste to hold out the hand of alliance to President Nasser in Egypt. On the contrary, every effort has been made to assure the West that Iraq's oil will continue to flow and even that Iraq still considers itself a member of the Baghdad Pact.

But several months of American occupation, with the frictions it would engender and the hostile propaganda inevitably flowing out of that occupation, and General Kassem could be expected to swing over to Nasser. In the first steps toward neutralization the French might be of help. While the men around General de Gaulle were not all of the same opinion, the government from the first decided against participating in any intervention in Lebanon.

There are obstacles in the way of even such a small and modest step toward ending the continuing retreat of the West before a force that cannot be suppressed by tanks and planes. Neutralization of even such a small country as Lebanon would mean for Secretary of State Dulles an admission that the Eisenhower Doctrine was invalid in the face of the kind of rebellion that overthrew the government in Iraq and that has left Lebanon torn and divided. But the general opinion here is that the Eisenhower Doctrine is in any event nearly as outmoded historically as the Crusades, which in the Middle Ages sought to recover the Holy Land from the infidels.

WILLINGNESS to neutralize one Middle East country suggests that the whole area might eventually be neutralized. But surely neutralization is less abhorrent than the spread of Nasserism in its present virulent form. And to fly the flag over what remains of the Baghdad Pact is not enough for the Middle East, with Iraq the only Moslem member of that pact now in dubious position with a government that came to power by destroying those who had first aligned the country with the Western-inspired pact.

But the most serious obstacle to any successful withdrawal from Lebanon is the involvement of the British in Jordan. British pressure has begun to keep American forces in Lebanon, so long as the British troops must stay to keep King Hussein in power in the country next door.

Prior to the occupation Hussein had only the most limited support in Jordan. Presumably he can be sustained so long as the troops remain. But what happens when they withdraw is a question no one can answer. As the uncertain heir of Britain's Arab policy during and after World War I, young Hussein may prove in the near future to be an acute embarrassment.

# Summit Forecast: Thunder and Fog

By Marquis Childs

LONDON—The mess into which the Western allies have fallen in their separate ways of looking at the summit can scarcely be exaggerated, and yet no one here believes that it is possible to prevent the wrong meeting at the wrong place at the wrong time.



Childs

On the contrary, this reporter has been told that if the United States were to try to postpone or call off the proposed session within the framework of the United Nations Security Council, the reaction here would be such as to shatter the bond between Britain and America almost beyond repair.

This is a measure of the hope so widely held and so shrewdly exploited for political ends in this tight little island. It is the hope that by confronting the Russians a settlement can somehow be worked out that will relieve the fear and the tension under which the world lives.

What becomes evident, therefore, is that only Nikita S. Khrushchev himself can prevent the meeting from taking place in New York on or about Aug. 12.

SHORT OF some drastic and far-reaching initiative that is not now in sight, the course the meeting will follow is already fairly evident. Khrushchev and the Russians intend to exploit to the fullest the intervention in Lebanon and Jordan. Even if the Marines have already pulled out or a date for their leaving has been set, this will be effective propaganda to the Arab states that will presumably be participating in the conference.

From the Western side, Secretary of State Dulles is preparing an offensive that will serve notice, as he already has done several times, that Britain and the United States are not coming as prisoners in the dock. This offensive is being built around the charge that the real danger is from internal subversion planned and directed by Moscow.

Dulles is preparing to call the grim roll going back as far as the absorption of Estonia and Latvia into the Soviet empire at the outset of World War II to prove that independence is anathema to the Russian masters. This roll call goes on through the civil war in Greece, the seizure of power in Czechoslovakia and the Communist wars in Indochina and Korea. The indictment is a massive one and is certainly calculated to arouse Khrushchev to new heights of fury.

For the moment that seems to be the only likely outcome of the confrontation in New York. One practical objective might have been the discussion of an

arms embargo in the Mideast, even though it is very late for such a discussion in view of the widespread shipment of arms by both sides.

BUT THE suggestion of an embargo comes up against the fundamental difference between Moscow and Washington, as Dulles made clear in meeting with the ministers of the Baghdad Pact Council in London on Monday. Asked by Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko some time ago whether he would include Pakistan, Turkey and Iran, the remaining Eastern members of the Baghdad Pact, in any Mideast arms arrangement, Dulles replied firmly that, of course, he would not.

It is the arming of these three nations with borders adjoining or close to the Soviet Union under the containment policy that has caused real and profound fear in Moscow. To Moscow, containment is encirclement. Consequently, any embargo which exempted, at the very least, Turkey and Iran would be, from the Russian viewpoint, worthless. To leave these two powers in an exposed position, open to the kind of subversion that leads to a "friendly government"—that is, a submissive Communist government—would be unthinkable for the West.

For the moment, no one seems to have any idea how to rise above, even for purposes of debate, this implacable difference of outlook. Furthermore, both sides being vulnerable, there will be all the more reason to make the loudest possible propaganda noises.

One may well ask then who is to profit from the meeting in New York. The answer is that, under present circumstances, no one, at all, since the propaganda battle seems likely to end in a draw. Yet, having by their own devious uncertainties got themselves onto this slippery slope, the Western powers can find no way to rescue themselves.

# Why Tories Dance To Summit Tune

By Marquis Childs

LONDON—An almost comic reversal in the tides of political fortune is taking place here which gives a new look not only to Britain but to the world scene.

A year ago, even six months ago, the Labor Party was as confident of victory in the next election as the Democratic Party is in America today. The Conservative government of Prime Minister Macmillan was on the run.



Childs

In one bye election after another, Conservative majorities dwindled to the vanishing point. Just by sitting it out and not rocking the boat, the Laborites were sure to win—or so they thought.

Now all that has been changed and within Labor's ranks defeatism is as rampant as the complacent optimism of a short time ago. It all seems a nasty Tory trick, with the Laborites charging that Macmillan has clipped his droopy Edwardian mustache and given his gentle upper-class way of speech a brisk going-over as part of the process of presenting England with the common-man touch.

There can be no doubt of the passionate intensity of that desire. In response to Russian Premier Khrushchev's latest proposal for top-level talks on the Middle East crisis, every newspaper in Britain with one or two exceptions said with varying degrees of enthusiasm, "Let's have the talks just as quickly as possible."

AS A BOLD GAMBLER the Prime Minister knows that he has little to lose and much to gain by going to the summit. If the talks end in sound and fury, he can say that after all he had reluctantly consented to the meeting in large part at the insistence of the Laborites, whose views were plainly proved fallacious.

These are the melancholy reflections of the Labor Party leaders. Hints have been thrown out that the Conservatives will force a snap election in October before the bloom on the prosperity can be dimmed by the recession in world trade that has begun to have some effect in Europe, and by the reaction to a possible dock strike.

But the Conservative government, with its majority of roughly 50 in the House of Commons, has nearly two more years to run and the best guess is that Macmillan will not take his chances on an early vote but will wait to face the voters until shortly before he is to go out of office.

Tradition—and despite the loud noises of the "angry young men" tradition is still a powerful force in Britain—goes strongly against the return of another Tory government. Not in 200 years has a political party come to power three times running.

But the Labor opposition has had little to offer, sounding more and more the plaintive note of "too, too." As seems to happen more and more often in this strange time, governments survive by inertia as much as for any positive or constructive reason.

ACTUALLY, of course, the reasons for the reversal are not hard to find. They lie first of all in the remarkable success the government has had in holding prices steady while the country has prospered. By every index— incomes, productivity, employment, the gold and dollar balance—Britain is doing very well.

Incomes were 5 per cent higher in the first quarter of the year; unemployment is only 2 per cent of the total working force. While the general decline in world trade is causing some worry, it has not yet begun to affect the British position.

But important as the flourishing prosperity is, together with the steady price level, the way in which the Macmillan government has captured Labor's favorite issues also counts heavily.

Behind his smooth Edwardian facade—he married the daughter of the Duke of Devonshire—Macmillan is a shrewd political gambler. Although the official Tory line for export purposes is that the government was really rather reluctant (not, however, nearly as reluctant as Washington) to go to the summit, the truth is that Macmillan has cleverly exploited the deep desire here to try to negotiate an end to the cold war.

WORLD  
AND TIMES HERALD

# Britain's Gamble On Arms Policy

By Marquis Childs

LONDON—With still another election always just around the corner, the free world is forever faced with the whims and the fancies of the voter and his yearning for, if not the good old days, then the best possible imitation of the care-free life before cold wars were invented.

A shrewd political gambler Harold Macmillan, has gone a long way to please the British voter. In a most extraordinary debate in the House of Commons, member after member of Macmillan's own party rose recently to charge, in effect, that his government was gambling with the safety of Britain and with the stability of the Western position in far-flung areas of the world.

This charge grew out of the proposals made by Defense Minister Duncan Sandys. In the debate, Sandys was defending the government white paper on defense reorganization that will have the result of cutting the army back to 185,000 men, letting conscription come to an end in 1960 and further reducing Britain's troops committed to NATO and now stationed in West Germany.



Childs

CONSERVATIVES, many of them highly regarded in the party and in the country, stood up to say that this was a dangerous reduction of Britain's strength when foreign policy commitments make it necessary to have troops in every corner of the globe.

One of the principal critics was former Conservative Minister of Defense Anthony Head, who insisted that to scale the army down from roughly half of its present size of 320,000 would necessitate drastic curtailment of British foreign policy and colonial commitments. He pointed out, too, that to let the draft lapse two years from now would be a serious risk, since a situation might arise in the future calling for the use of troops that would not be available and then, politically, it would be almost impossible to reintroduce conscription.

"My fear is," he said of the need to reimpose national conscription, "that because of the great political difficulties, the question might be shirked. If it is shirked, we will go down below the conventional army safety limit and we may find ourselves pushed much nearer to using atomic weapons or introducing foreign and colonial policies which are against everything we ought to be doing in the cold war."

This is the heart of the matter—greater and greater reliance on the nuclear deterrent in the pattern of America over recent years. So distinguished a retired soldier as Air

Marshal Sir John Slessor has repeatedly underscored the danger of relying on nuclear weapons.

THE AMERICAN Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean bristles with massive atomic weapons, but the question Slessor and others are asking is: In a situation such as that in the Mideast, whom can these weapons possibly be used against? The nuclear deterrent may deter the all-out war, but it cannot check the small wars and threats of war that chew away at Western strength.

One of the few Labor members to protest the proposed cuts was Richard S. Crossman, who argued that neither side could afford to play politics with British commitments and the strength-in-being to sustain those commitments. Privately, Labor Party leaders were saying dispiritedly that while the critics might be right, how could they be expected to take such an unpopular stand? Accused of being for restriction (rationing), how can we be for conscription?, they wanted to know.

Labor Party policy is, of course, for drastically cutting commitments in such trouble spots as Cyprus and Jordan.

To the outsider, it seemed that this important debate on which so much may turn for Britain and the West in the years to come was treated with something like a conspiracy of silence. Perhaps because neither Laborites nor Conservatives want to face up to the embarrassing issue of conscription, it was reported in brief and scarcely commented upon.

Without any effective challenge the government will scale back the military establishment, and this may mean votes at the next election. It could help to break a 200-year-old precedent and return a government of the same party three times in succession. But what it will mean for the safety of this island kingdom and Western Europe only the peril of events still to come will determine.