to the Chinese Communists. But a Chungking attack on Yenan would probably bring Russia to the aid of the left-wing Yenan regime. Should this happen, the United States would be placed in a difficult position, particularly in view of the Grew-Hurley policy of supporting Chungking. It is reported that American military equipment has already been used against the Communists by Chiang Kai-shek's forces.

Chiang's attitude parallels that of certain circles in our own State and War departments which were opposed to Russian participation in the Far Eastern war and have been hoping for peace with Japan before the Soviet armies establish themselves too strongly in Manchuria and Korea. What is now needed is closer liaison with the Russians, swift measures to end the Chungking-Yenan tension, and new men and policies in dealing with the problem of post-war Japan.

One World or None

BY FRED A. KIRCHEWY.

The bomb that hurled Russia into the Far Eastern war a week ahead of schedule and drove Japan to surrender has accomplished the specific job for which it was created. From the point of view of military strategy, $2,000,000,000 (the cost of the bomb and the cost of nine days of war) was never better spent. The suffering, the wholesale slaughter it entailed, have been outweighed by its spectacular success; Allied leaders can rightly claim that the loss of life on both sides would have been many times greater if the atomic bomb had not been used and Japan had gone on fighting. There is no answer to this argument.

The danger is that it will encourage those in power to assume that, once accepted as valid, the argument can be applied equally well in the future. If that assumption should be permitted, the chance of saving civilization—and perhaps the world itself—from destruction is a remote one.

Solemn official talk is going on in Britain and here about controlling the use of the new force. But the talk is unpersuading. The atomic bomb represents a revolution in science—the greatest revolution ever accomplished. It calls for a comparable revolution in men's thinking and in their capacity for political and social readjustment. Not a hint of that has so far emerged in high places, either here or in Britain. And so far no leader of one of the lesser states, from which the new knowledge has been withheld, has passeded to open his mouth. No one has spoken the simple truth that the exploding atom has exposed to the whole world.

President Truman announced that he would recommend to Congress the establishment of an appropriate commission to control the production and use of atomic power within the United States. He has promised that the secret of the bomb will be kept by the three nations that hold it until "means have been found to control the bomb so as to protect ourselves and the rest of the world from the danger of total destruction." Secretary Stimson says that "substantial patent rights" have been assured to the American, Canadian, and British governments to prevent independent exploitation of the discovery. Do these plans and promises mean anything? Or are they conventional, official, high-sounding nonsense?

First, if anything is sure about the atomic bomb it is that no physical protection against it will ever be possible. The bomb dropped on Nagasaki was far more advanced than that dropped two days earlier on Hiroshima. Both were crude beginnings. We have already been promised that their successors will be enormously improved. Soon they will be propelled by rockets—similar to Hitler's V-2s—and directed exactly to their destination by radar. When this is achieved, not only will armies and fleets and island bases and strategic frontiers all have been made obsolete, but widespread annihilation can be accomplished by any power, or even group of men, that can command atomic energy.

And that leads to the absurdity of an attempt to limit control of this force to the nations that now hold it. President Truman is whistling to keep our courage up. He knows that other nations are working on atomic explosives. Before it defeat Germany was on the edge of success. Sweden and Denmark are carrying out intensive experimentation. It is not likely that Russia—which knows how to keep a secret better than any other country—has lagged behind the rest. Are we to be asked to believe that the Anglo-Saxon peoples have alone been granted the god-like power to crack atoms? The secret was guarded long enough to enable us to smash Japan. It will not last much longer. The present "trustees" of this force had better stop thinking in terms of control by themselves and begin to figure how a world is to be run in which every nation equipped for research and modern production will soon be able to make and propel atomic bombs.

So what sense is there in setting up an American commission to control the production of atomic power? Perhaps a little. Already certain private interests in this country have let it be known that, while they recognize the government's present right to monopolize the manufacture of atomic bombs, they are not prepared to accept government control over future use of the new energy. And Secretary Stimson's phrase, "substantial patent rights," is at best equivocal. It suggests that certain less substantial but perhaps highly valuable patents may already be in the hands of Du Pont or General Electric. And so a commission may be of some value, at least as an interim safeguard. But it will be well for us to remind Congress that the men it appoints will be dealing with a source of power discovered through the expenditure of $2,000,000,000 of public money—taxpayers' money. That power belongs to the people if no other ever did.

Suppose the United States, Canada, and Britain attempt, as they seem prepared to do, to corner the knowledge of atomic power even for a brief period. What will be the effect of this monopoly? First, it will convert the three Anglo-Saxon nations into a monstrous threat to the rest of the world. Are other countries likely to accept with equanimity the fact that we and the British hold the secret of total destruction? Who but ourselves is going to trust us with such fantastic power? It would be healthy if Americans, just for a moment, would put themselves in the position of, let's say, the Russians or the Chinese, and try to see what this "democratic trusteeship" looks like from the vantage-point of Moscow or Chungking. No nation shut out from our closely guarded knowledge can possibly do other than speed
up its own collective effort to gain the same ground. The policy announced by the President is power politics raised to a cosmic degree; if continued it will insure an era of desperate competition in destruction, which can have only one outcome.

Atomic energy should no more be controlled by a few sovereign nations than it should be by a few private companies. "Free enterprise" for nations has been wiped out by the discovery. When President Truman went to the microphone to explain the agreement reached at Potsdam, the first atomic bomb had already exploded. So he discussed the Potsdam arrangements side by side with his proposal for controlling atomic energy. The fantastic incompatibility of the two items apparently did not strike him. But it is clear as water that no collective arrangements can stand in the face of the power held by America and Britain. Even the modest, halfway security measures adopted at San Francisco and written into the United Nations Charter can hardly be expected to survive such a situation. At the very minimum, the United Nations must be made trustee of the atomic bomb. Otherwise the idea of collective agreements to keep the peace may as well be abandoned.

But this minimum is far too small to provide any serious measure of safety. For the San Francisco charter is itself a collective agreement based on power. As Edward R. Murrow said the other day, the big nations have "created an organization and made laws from which they are exempt." In other words, there is no rule of law to which all nations are equally subject. The authority of the United Nations rests in the coalition of great powers which form its core. How much value can such an organization have even if the control of the atomic bomb should be vested in it? It cannot dominate the world, for a single nation, small or large, possessed of the facilities to make the new explosive, would have as much power to threaten peace and terrorize other nations as one or all of the Big Three—or Four—or Five. And any one of the large nations, ruled by a new Hitler, could reduce the world to slavery—or to dust. In the space of a day the World Security Organization grew from childhood to senility. Now it must be replaced.

If we are to survive our new powers we must understand their full meaning. We shall have to move fast, both internationally and within each country. No longer can we afford a world organized to prevent aggression only if all of the great powers wish it to be prevented. No longer can we afford a social system which would permit private business, in the name of freedom, to control a source of energy capable of creating comfort and security for all the world's people. This seems self-evident, and so it is. But it calls for changes so sweeping that only an immense effort of will and imagination can bring them about. A new conference of the nations must be assembled to set up a World Government, to which every state must surrender an important part of its sovereignty. In this World Government must be vested the full control over atomic energy. And within each nation the people must establish public ownership and social development of the revolutionary force war has thrust into their hands. This program will sound drastic only to people who have not yet grasped the meaning of the new discovery. It is not drastic. We face a choice between one world or none.

**Negrín’s Policy is Winning**

**BY J. ALVAREZ DEL VAYO**

Mexico City, August 12

On Wednesday, August 8, the long-desired agreement between the Spanish Republican parties and organizations in Mexico was finally reached. Republican leaders agreed on a procedure which will make all the institutions of the Republic operative in exile. Having joined with Dr. Negrín in virtually all the discussions of the past three weeks, I know what skill and patience were required to bring the factions together; and in the two meetings held last week, Dr. Negrín surpassed his own previous record of successful conciliation.

The first meeting of the representatives of the parties took place on Tuesday. Twenty-six parties and organizations were represented, exactly the number of all the political groups in Mexico. A sensational fact was the participation of two representatives of the Prieto faction, Otero and Albar. The meeting was called on twenty-four hours’ notice under the pressure of the news from Spain itself, indicating that Franco might replace himself with a new military government created in his own image. When word of the meeting leaked out to the Spanish colony, the general comment was, "Negrín has accomplished what nobody else has been able to do in six years." The same view, in almost identical language, was expressed the following day by Martinez Barrio when a formal agreement was confirmed and signed in the presence of Dr. Negrín.

Under this agreement a meeting of the Cortes is to be called to formalize the parties’ choice of a provisional President of the Republic, in the person of Martinez Barrio. This will make it possible for the present government to submit its resignation and a new government to be named in accordance with the constitutional procedure.

Only two groups failed to sign the agreement. These were the Socialist faction gathered around Prieto and a small fraction of the syndicalist organization, the C. N. T. Four sections of the latter organization did sign. The representatives of the Prieto group failed to appear at the meeting of August 8 but sent instead a letter in which they raise three points: First, they doubted that there was such urgency as Negrín claimed for reaching an agreement in twenty-four hours. Second, they challenged the right of some of the groups invited by Negrín to participate, to demand recognition as regular political organizations. Third, they opposed any solution not based on the sanction and participation of the Cortes.

The first objection is not shared by other Spaniards here or in Spain. On the contrary, everyone has been counting not the days but the moments until an agreement could be reached. The second objection has an ironical flavor, for the Prieto group, organized in Mexico at the instigation of Prieto, is only a dissident fraction of the Spanish Socialist Party which has put itself outside the control of the party.