TOUGH TALK OR PEACE TALK?

A HEADLINE in Hearst's Daily Mirror sums up the big business press interpretation of Soviet events:

SOVIET OPENS

NEW REGIME

WITH H-BOMB

TO GRAB IMPRISONED "MATOSOS"

THAT was supposedly based on Soviet foreign minister Molotov's extensive review of foreign affairs. But let's see. Why didn't the press take the following from Molotov's speech as their text?

"What can one say of the relations between the Soviet Union and the United States?

These relations leave room to wish for better ones.

Is such an improvement possible between the USSR and the U.S.A. Quite possible. For this, however, it is necessary that not only the government of the Soviet Union but also the government of the U.S. strive for this."

But what pleasure would the press get out of a headline such as:

SOVIET OPENS

NEW REGIME

WITH H-BOMB

U.S.-SOVIET RELATIONS

Understandably the press and everybody else in the world stood up and took notice when Molotov said that the Soviet government is ahead of the U.S. in H-bomb production. Molotov followed that up by saying:

"We propose to the United States to compete not in the manufacture of atomic weapons but in the utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes."

Again and again the "experts" and dollar and a word commentators talk about a "new" tough policy. But what was Molotov being "tough" about?

He was being tough about the threats that have been made for many long years about how the U.S. has the A-bombs and the H-bombs needed to level Moscow and all other Soviet cities.

Molotov made it clear that whoever takes to the H-bombs will perish by the H-bomb. And even Gen. Douglas MacArthur caught a whiff of that terrible threat in his recent speech. The A and H-bombs must be banned under a system of international inspection and control. This the Soviets have proposed.

Molotov was also being "tough" about the two major issues which have led to recent sharpening of world tensions. One is the move to rearm western Germany. The other is occupation of Formosa and other Chinese islands by U.S. armed forces in violation of the Cairo agreement.

But it is the arming of a new Wehrmacht headed by the Nazi general staff a policy W anti-Fascists defend. America's sons in two generations were nailed and killed by German militarism. And is Chiang Kai-shek's residence in Formosa with a single American life?

Clearly and unequivocally the new Soviet government has said it is ready to sit down with us and settle all outstanding questions.

Americans will prefer the conference table to H-bomb devastation.

TRICKLE-DOWN FOR SCHOOLS

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER's message on school construction is in line with the rest of the administration's program of providing for social needs with an eye-dropper while giving away to the rich by the truckload.

Sen. Lister Hill, chairman of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, properly described the President's proposal as an "offer of interminable delay on the one hand or a meager dole on the other."

But basically, the President's plan is not for substantial grants to states to build the much needed schools, but an offer to purchase bonds, at an interest, if no private purchasers are willing to take the final bonds. The states would owe to the federal government. As on health, we are offered some more "insurance" of programs instead of real and immediate help.

Sen. Lister Hill's bill, on the other, backed by labor, calls for an outright grant of a half billion a year to the states for two years for emergency school construction.

All labor and other organizations concerned with the growing deficit of class rooms and shortage of school teachers should back the Hill bill.

Regardless, however, of what form federal school construction aid takes, none of it should go to states that defy and evade the Supreme Court's ban on school segregation.

That is the proposal of the ALEC. This proposal is all the more in place in view of the ruling by the State Supreme Court of Delaware, holding that the transfer of all-white children to all-white schools was a violation of the state's law. Thus Delaware, like several of the southern states, is openly defying the law of the land—reducing from it.

Significance of Bulganin's Election

By WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

HARDLY had the news been announced of the resignation of Malenkov as premier of the Soviet Union and the election of Bulganin in his stead, than the ever-vigilant war mongers in this country were springing into action, striving to turn this incident to their Undying purpose of rousing the whole world to war.

With their usual gospel-like futility, they declared that the change in the Soviet leadership had led for the salvation of the American people. Malenkov was a man of peace, they said, whereas Bulganin is a man of war. The meaning of all, they declared, is that it will bring more warfare pressure upon the U.S. from the U.S.S.R.

This is all sheer rubbish. It only goes to show that everything is good for war to those armament manufacturers and Wall Street financiers. There is absolutely nothing to the fairy tale that whereas Malenkov was for peace, Bulganin is for war. Whatever secondary changes may be in the Soviet leadership, they do not affect the development of heavy industry and agriculture, time alone will tell.

BUT ONE THING is absolutely certain, the basic foreign policy of the USSR will remain, as before, firmly and unalterably committed to the preservation and cultivation of world peace. Peaceful co-existence of the social and capitalist states is the fundamental policy of the Soviet government.

A foreign policy for peace in the USSR or in any other social country, does not depend upon this or that particular Communist holding the government. The Communist Party, with the mass of the people behind it, leads; and it decisively for peace. Peace is built into the very structure of the Soviet system; it is of the life-blood of Soviet socialism.

THE USSR is a country where workers rule, where human exploitation has been abolished, where the interests are owned by the people, and where production is carried on for the benefit of the whole people. In such a country there is no place for war, whether it be for imperialist aggrandizement and inextricable despotism of the United States, or for aggressive warming-up.

The American people are not now, never have been, and never will be in the front line of attack from the Soviet Union, regardless of whether the government be headed by a Lewis, a Stalin, a Malenkov, or a Bulganin.

The USSR, People's China, and the European Communist Democracies are not the enemies of the American people, but are their best friends.

The war danger now threatening the American people comes from an altogether different direction—from the agents of big capital, the Eisenhower administration, and all who are running the United States government. They speak and act, not in behalf of the democratic interests of America but in the interest of monopoly capital, whose inevitable arrogance and insatiable greed is the elementary cause of all imperialist war. The agents of monopoly are the only ones who could plunge the American people into war, a war that could only (Continued on Page 8)
Adenauer War Talks Stir Angry Resistance

BULLETIN
FRANKFURT, Germany, Feb. 9—A angry crowd, opposing West German rearmament, yesterday stormed a Munich railroad station hall in which West German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer appeared for ratification of the Paris agreement to reunite Ger-

By PHILIP RUSSELL
MUNICH, Feb. 9—The re-
presentatives of the Social Demo-
cratic party’s anti-rear-
manent manifest has evolved over-
the country has caused the West
German Chancellor, Konrad Aden-
auer, to start a Government contro-
versy.

In spoke in Frankfurt yester-
day, and he will speak in Han-
over tomorrow and Hannover, West-
prefecture.

In Nancy, the Social Democrat
member of the Lower House Gov-
ernment distributed anti-rear-
manent leaflets to workers coming out of the car’s big factories. The leaflet said that those who want to work, to work out, and to improve the “New order.” Therefore nego-

In Cologne, the 5,000 workers at the Ford factory have sent a pro-
test to the Adenauer Government and the trade union move-
ment, which they may not have supported the manifesto issued in Frankfurt. The Joint Trade Union move-
ment to conduct a referendum among its members on rear-
acement.

Home trade unions also asked the T.U.C. to conduct a publicistic on rearmament in order, they say, to make sure that this does not happen without a referendum. It also asked the T.U.C. to talk to the Government in the working out of a concilia-
tion plan, which they fear would otherwise lead to a new war.

To test feeling on the front, the Social Democrats polled 61
trial referendum in the Nettel-
burg suburb of Hamburg, where

What’s On?

WASHINGTON, D.C., March 2—The Senate Labor Committee today began hearings on the “State of the Union” report which would allow some 1,600,000 mem-
bers of the armed forces to keep their GI educational benefits.

Senate Unit Okays GI Education bill Washington, Feb. 8, The Senate Labor Committee today began hearings on the “State of the Union” report which would allow some 1,600,000 mem-
bers of the armed forces to keep their GI educational benefits.

Join Paul Robeson and Nora Stanley in celebrating with WILLIAM L. PATTERSON Victory Dinner $3.00 per Plate TONIGHT (TUES.) SMALL’S PARADISE 726 W. 125th St. (corner of 125th and St. Nicholas Ave.) Reservations by 6 P.M. (approx.) $1.50 per Person civil rights committee, a ymca, 56th st., n. y. n. a. a.

Adenauer War Talks Stir Angry Resistance

Here in Bavaria a leading trade union official reports that more than 90 percent of the German workers are angry at the Adenauer Government.

I talked to two building workers here—30-year-old Helmut Hoff, a Vater, and Rudi Quist, whom I asked, “Do you think the government should have agreed to the Paris agreement?” and Quist added with a smile, “Yes, but it won’t last.”

Another building worker on the subject said, “I just want to be left alone to live in peace. I don’t want to know anything about it, and I have no use for another army.”

On my way to Munich, from Karlsruhe, I spoke with the engineer of a freight train, which is going a train a carloader, who said, “I am not interested in being a member of the German army but let us have negotiation first.”

A Defender of the Reich who is trying to tell his family that his life has been an adventure in the combat against Hitler. He was the first of a series of small demonstrations spread throughout the country which started with a small demonstration in Munich, where a showman, under the auspices of the “National Socialist Party,” held a public rally. The showman said that anyone who would not help to put an end to this kind of activity would not be able to make any progress in the future.