SOVIET POLICY

AS WAS TO BE expected, a change in the leadership in the government of the Soviet Union could not take place without the news commentators and political leaders in our own country suddenly discovering that the Soviet Union had a peace policy all along, but that now "it is being abandoned."

It is now going up in connection with the replacement of Malenkov by Bulganin as Soviet premier, the economic background of which is discussed elsewhere in this issue.

If a peace policy on the part of the Soviet Union is now being "abandoned," why didn't our political leaders welcome the change when, for years, the policy insisted on charging right along that the Soviet Union was giving no sign of desiring peace?

On the record, it is as false to say that the Soviet Union is "worrying away from peace" as it was to say before that it did not want peace.

There has, in fact, been a sharpening of international relations during the past several months. But the question is: who sharpened these relations and who tried and is still trying to ease them?

The problem is one that the State Department's jumbling of the Nazi army groups through the French Assembly—and more dramatically in the intervention of the Seventh Fleet in the internal affairs of China—has further obscured.

As the new government, headed by a European security pact to guarantee a peaceful Germany, and only yesterday urged a world conference on the German question. This has been and continues to be the policy of the socialist Soviet Union—to settle matters through talks at the conference table instead of issuing rallying orders.

It is just because the policy of peaceful talks has such world-wide support that the foes of negotiations seize upon Malenkov's renunciation—as he warned they would—and midwestern eyes.

It is a vital matter for us Americans not to permit ourselves to be hoodwinked. The Soviet Government proposes in its address as much as it reveals in the conference table. We should tell our own government to accept the proposal for there is no alternative to settlement by negotiations.

THE AFL AND THE NAZIS

The AFL executive council, keeping in close step with the State Department's war-provocation policy, has turned its attention to the trade unions of Europe, especially those of West Germany, for support of German re militarization.

This open appeal, showing the wide difference between the AFL and the rest of the world's labor, comes after long but futile efforts to bring the unions abroad into line with Washington's plan to rearm the Nazis.

The AFL now acknowledges the danger of reopening the door to those who brought Hitlerism to Germany at a frightful cost the German workers will never forget. But the council frankly says that such militarization is necessary for a war on the Soviet Union.

As the AFL council did earlier in the week, when its statement went all out for the Know-Nothing "preventive war" line and held even the current provocative Far East policy to be "appesatement" of Communism, so the AFL leader follows "a war line in Europe. They would warn back the Nazis, the using, Chai-kisha, the Japanese militarists and every similar reactionary force.

But the new appeal to the German workers is also an appeal—a clear effort to tell their unions what to do, apparently in the belief that the German labor leaders owe them their debt for some paltry relief in earlier post-war days. The West German unions, although under right-wing leadership, are more concerned with the unity of their country and its preservation as a democratic land than with pleasing their extremely reactionary "friends" on the AFL council.

This story is the same with respect to the British, French, Italian, Benelux and other union movements to whom the AFL also finds it necessary to address appeals. But this is significant is especially relevant to the fact that they don't even bother to "convince" the rank and file members of their own unions in support of the "liberal" American stance.

The truth is that the rank-and-file workers of America too, aren't supporting the AFL's foreign policy as any honest inquiring reporter could easily track down.

We are sure that the AFL's leaders will meet with a deserved rebuff abroad. But it is most important to repudiate them at home.

THREE weeks have passed since the spotlight was turned upon West Germany. Has the President asked not received the pace to throw us into a war any time he presses a button. Over that period we have been placed into a stage of an extreme situation in the situation.

Put throughout that period we have not heard a word from the CIO Council. The AFL leaders have not. Not only has the CIO refused to accept the possible danger that might influence the Congressional debate, but within one way or another that its executive board meeting held a week after Congress passed the dangerous resolution asked by the President hadn't a word to say on the situation.

If the CIO board meeting didn't take the way foreign policy problems it was not noted in the CIO as our actions got a point by point summary of the agenda and resolutions held in Washington last week.

This SILENCE by the CIO on so important an issue raises the question of differences in the CIO's step like to the AFL. Are those differences so serious that a resolution should be submitted to a governmental body for a decision of those differences even in the face of the situation as it developed in recent weeks?

There are the two major questions especially in view of the fact that the AFL leaders are very articulate in their demands and the AFL rank-and-file workers are very liberal or won't back the position. The CIO considered its foreign policy passed in Los Angeles contains a proposal policy an expense is not enough to keep out workers from being used for a reference to China, that we are left with the conclusion that the writers deliberately tried to say nothing. Now in them a conclusion that the page had been done in past CIO resolutions.

On the other hand, a special CIO Council resolution on the "Far East Crisis" sharply denounced the "peace" line and warned the President against "compromising" the "best interests of the Pacific" by any surrender.

The point is that although the rumors of differences are true, they are as important to the labor movement as this developing trend that has advanced far in the rest of the world. It is essential to recognize that the CIO is in a situation.

(Continued on Page 8)
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PREVENTIVE WAR INSTIGATORS

By WILLY Z. FOSTER

THE ULTRA-AGGRESSIVE CHICAGO COMMUNITY MUNICIPALISM toward People's Daily World is at present in full swing. The Workers is a whole crop of warmongers. How do they know? People's Daily World has the worst kind of an attitude toward the American people's right to live in peace without interference from any people, especially in Russian-American relations. It is a matter of fact that the American people have never been treated in any way by the Workers that is not absolutely justified by the fact that the US has been a country where the people have been treated with respect and dignity.

In answer to a second question, Martin stated that "this is not a question of whether the Soviet Union would bet its life to aid China. According to the American press, the" war, which has been on the defensive since 1933, is supposed to stand until its termination, its aim is to bring about a situation in the US, where the great neighbor is being bolstered. A very sharp argument by the leaders. But if one were to bring to light the fact that an atomic attack on People's China would provoke an atomic war in which American cities would be bombarded and millions of our citizens die, the Russian war-fingers might lose their appetite for the peace-seeking policies which old Martin is trying to foist for the American people.

OR TALKS take the warmongers of Captain W. D. Fullerston, U.S.N., Ret., which occurred in the number of U.S. News & World Report on April 1, 1955. This old-fangled officer, who, of course, like Martin, wants war, says that he and other leaders of our pacifists are the true believers in the current war hysteria. One of the favorite items of their trigger-happy warmongers is the assertion that the extermination of the enemy can be accomplished not only by a war without a y a y American losses. No American foot soldiers would have to be forced to do the job—it could all be settled out of court and nicely and safely in the air.

We wonder if they really believe this. We believe that the military leaders of the US would never agree to a plan that would have to be carried out by a force of men that they know would definitely lose lives and property. We believe that the military leaders of the US would never agree to a plan that would have to be carried out by a force of men that they know would definitely lose lives and property.

There is no reasonable doubt that the US would be the main target of the attack. The US, with its vast population, would be the main target of the attack. The US, with its vast population, would be the main target of the attack. The US, with its vast population, would be the main target of the attack. The US, with its vast population, would be the main target of the attack. The US, with its vast population, would be the main target of the attack.