

# Knowland versus Eisenhower

By WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

AS THE CHIEF spokesman in Congress for the war-now elements, Sen. Knowland is demanding an air and naval blockade of People's China, in retaliation for the recent imprisonment of American flyers in that country. Such a blockade would, of course, be an act of war, as Secretary Dulles made clear in his Chicago speech Monday night. Knowland's line is that of the "preventive war" crowd who, to win world domination, want to open up a third World War upon the slightest pretext, or upon no pretext whatever.



The Eisenhower administration, however, is not accepting the Knowland war-making move — Dulles definitely rejecting it in his Chicago talk. The issue between the two is being presented to the American people and the world as though, while Knowland is for war Eisenhower is for peace. But to believe this would be a dangerous illusion.

What we have to do with here is not a fight between the peace and war forces within the Republican Party, but a row between two groups of warmongers over strategy and tactics. Behind this dispute lies also the sinister attempt of the extreme right wing pro-fascist elements to seize the leadership of the Republican Party.

KNOWLAND is one of the wild jingoist group which, drunk with the vast military power the United States has built up, would use this power here and now to precipitate the war issue by launching into an all-out attack against the Soviet Union, Peoples China, and the Peoples Democracies of Europe and Asia. They are the "go-it-alone" group, who nevertheless believe that if the United States opened up this war the other capitalist nations would be com-

pelled to back it up. They would plunge the world into a catastrophic war.

Eisenhower is the spokesman of the other pro-war group, who take a position that in what they plan for an eventual war, the United States, from the outset, must have the support of major capitalist allies — if possible, Britain, Germany, France, Japan, etc. Hence, his general policy is based upon the consolidation of the broadest possible coalition and the skillful pressing of this alliance into war.

Dulles in his Chicago speech also made it clear that such precipitate action as the blockade of Peoples China would "impair the alliance of free nations" — a consideration which does not at all worry the Knowlands, McCarthys, Judds, Jenners, and other atomaniacs and "preventive war" fanatics, who want war, allies or no allies.

Just now there is a big build-up of President Eisenhower taking place in the press, radio, and television as the great world figure of peace. But the reality is that the President, realizing that the overwhelming majority of the American people are opposed to war — including large numbers of business men — and seeing how the demagogic use of the peace slogan saved the Republicans from an even more serious defeat in the November elections, is consciously setting forth to win in 1956 on the basis of even more hypocritical peace talk — for he has obviously set his cap for a second term.

The Eisenhower administration, like Truman, Stevenson, Douglas, and other top Democrats, is following a pro-war line, but more cunningly than the bull-in-the-China-shop McCarthys and Knowlands. His basic war policy is expressed in his determination to rearm a fascist West Germany — a plan which has much alarmed the Socialist countries and has forced them, for the first time, to move towards forming a defensive military alliance among themselves.

Eisenhower's warlike rearming of reactionary Japan is also

highly provocative; his continued occupation of Formosa, which is a part of China, is but little short of actual war, and his airplane patrolling of Russian and Chinese shorelines is a brazen infringement upon the national sovereignty of these countries.

THE SPECIAL DANGER of war-now Knowlands and McCarthys is that, on the basis of some imagined or concocted "incident," they will force this country into war. Hence, the war-now crowd must be fought up and down the country. But a "putschist" danger is also not alien to the line of the Eisenhower government. Once again, Mr. Dulles in his Monday night speech, re-endorsed the administration's war-like "liberation" policy, which means nothing less than the incitement of civil war within the boundaries of Socialist countries, if possible. Added to all this, the Eisenhower administration has decided, as in the flagrant case of Guatemala, that any attempt of the peoples anywhere to set up advanced types of democratic governments, constitutes Soviet Communist subversion, which must be put down by force.

During the past couple of years, by the ending of the Korean and Indochinese wars, considerable relaxation has taken place in international relations, and mass peace sentiment is growing apace all over the world. Consequently, many warmongers, including Eisenhower and Dulles, have been compelled somewhat to modify the tone of their political utterances. But let us not make the mistake of believing that they therefore have become champions of genuine peace. The people must demand deeds, not mere words from Eisenhower.

Beneath the thin skin of their differences over political strategy and tactics, Knowland and Eisenhower, and the big business forces behind them, represent a common danger of war. They must be fought by the masses, especially by organized labor.