Can We Meet the Russians Halfway?

Here you can find the best current answers in the words of:



A leading American capitalist, Cyrus S. Eaton, has of late turned his attention to the East-West conflict. He sponsored a notable meeting of free world and Communist scientists at Pugwash, Nova Scotia, which led to an appeal by a group of Soviet scientists for further contacts to consider the meaning of nuclear weapons and what to do about them.

Let's Meet the Soviets Half-Way

by CYRUS S. EATON

The men who met at Pugwash spoke not only for themselves but for associates in various parts of the world. There wasn't the slightest restraint on the part of anyone—all talked as scientists, not with nationalistic or political objectives.

There will be no solution, no road to peace, as long as nobody will trust anyone else, as long as one side is trying to bamboozle the other. At Pugwash none of that existed. Each scientist there believed what the other scientists were saying. And in a sense they couldn't fool each other—they were all men with the widest knowledge of atomic energy, and of the hydrogen bomb. I didn't see a single instance where one man was trying to put something over on someone else. They were trying to deal with facts, not with illusions and prejudices.

Everyone warned in advance that the Russians would never go along. But after a day all of us were convinced that the Russians were being completely honest, completely frank. Therefore, it made for a remarkable community where the cards were all on the table, where everyone was aboveboard with everyone else.

I realize there are people who would say I was deceived, taken in. Others would say the whole thing was gotten up to put over a Russian scheme. The Russians had nothing to do with getting the party up. I think, in fact, they approached it with some caution.

The Russian today, whether he's dealing with pure or applied science, is the equal of anyone else in the world. When these scientists were in Pugwash this summer, I took friends of mine from the Western countries aside, and said: "Is there anything that our top scientists know about nuclear warfare, about the power of the atom, that they don't know? Is there anything we have that they don't?" They said: "They have everything we have, and more."...

When Pugwash came along, I asked the Russians to send over some of their leading scientists, and they responded.

I don't suppose you'd find anyone in the world more dedicated to capitalism and democracy than I am. But I think the best way to destroy these two institutions in America is to go to war with Russia.

The longer we put off finding a common ground the tougher it's going to be to find. Russia has tremendous resources, and her people have a great willingness to work and a strong love of country.

Leave Russia alone, let her deal with her economic theories and

practices—time would have a big effect on these. But to build places all around them from which we can launch bombs and missiles gives that nation a solidarity that it would not have if they didn't feel the Western World was plotting to destroy them.

So I take the declaration of these 155 top scientists seriously. I think that any man who refuses to respond to that approach is lacking in wisdom, and not serving the best interests of the United States.

I think the more contact we have between people of the two nations the quicker we'll realize we are all human, with weaknesses, with limitations, and that for better or for worse we had better agree not to annihilate each other. Either we'll live together or we'll perish together. I'd like to see constant exchanges between scientists, educators, artists, people of the two countries.

We're faced with a condition, whether we like it or not, in which Russia has all the instruments of modern war, and it just doesn't make sense to continue that kind of an armaments contest. This is

the time for anyone who feels this way to speak up.

I think you'll find the average businessman, connected with industry, realizes as keenly as I do that World War III would be the destruction of mankind.

This is the great time for people to speak up, and those can speak most effectively who can't be suspected of susceptibility to a bribe or to flattery. It's an awful reflection on our country to suggest that if we mix freely with the Russians we'll abdicate everything we believe in, everything we stand for. . . .

What should be the mechanics of our answer to the Soviet proposal? This depends on the scale, on whether a few scientists or a large group will be involved. Perhaps we'd have to have it under the auspices of a government, but this inevitably carries a stigma with it. We can't hold it in the United States, because the United States won't allow representatives from Red China. This is a policy—like barring newsmen to China—in which it's hard to find any intelligence. It's a madness that suggests a lack of wisdom in our handling of these fateful problems.

It would probably be held in Canada, the West Indies or India. The Chinese, Russians, Poles, Slavs are all willing to go to Canada, and that perhaps is the place to have it.

All indicates a willingness on the part of scientists to do their part toward cooling the passions of statesmen.

I think the more conferences we have under as many auspices as possible, taking in people with no axe to grind—and scientists are probably as disinterested as you can find—the better.

It's certainly something colleges and universities can back. Certainly anyone who is a capitalist ought to go for it—because in a



war all the material accumulations of the past would go. One hydrogen bomb would lay this great city in rubble.

Never before have the penalties of follies been so great.

We need a spell of humility. To us, one of the most sobering thoughts must be that all the men who produced the first atomic bomb were not Americans—they were Italians, Danes, Poles, Germans. How could we have persuaded ourselves no other nation would ever devise one—when, while it was created on United States soil, it was created by brains from other parts of the world?

We're suffering from the great success we had in World War I and World War II. We convinced ourselves we were invincible, that we were the darlings of the gods. We ought to stop boasting about ourselves and stop maligning other people, whether Chinese

or Russian.

As the great powers on the two sides of the gulf which today divides the world both declare their willingness to meet again at the summit, their proposals appear to be so far apart as to preclude any meaningful agreement. One view of the situation and how the deadlock may be resolved is expressed here.

The Propaganda Contest

by WALTER LIPPMANN

We are engaged, so we are telling ourselves, in a propaganda contest with the Russians: We must prove to mankind that we rather than they are the true champions of peace. Although the progress of this contest cannot be scored exactly, we know on no less an authority than Mr. Dulles himself that at this stage of the game the Russians are leading. The best evidence of this is that there is mounting popular pressure in the Western world in favor of accepting their proposal to hold another meeting at the summit.

The idea of a meeting at the summit has become the rallying point of the opposition parties in Western Europe, and there are important signs that the idea is making deep inroads among the parties which support the governments. In Germany, the furious success of Mr. Kennan's lectures has been a clear sign of the strength of the opposition to Dr. Adenauer's government. On the question of a parley at the summit, Mr. Macmillan is on the political defensive at home, and even here the President and Mr. Dulles have felt that they must in some measure bend with the pressure.