

Questions of the day

By JOHN GATES, *Editor of The Worker*

QUESTION: Hasn't Truman said in his recent speeches that he favors peaceful settlement of world differences? What then stands in the way of such a settlement?

ANSWER: Nothing stands in the way but the imperialist foreign policy of the U. S. government. The Truman Administration, backed by the GOP, blocks all negotiation for peaceful settlement and has rejected all offers of the USSR and China for peace talks.



GATES

It is true that something "new" has been added recently to Truman's speeches. The Truman-Attlee communique said that "we stand ready, as we always have, to negotiate a peaceful settlement of the Korean conflict. . . . We shall do everything we can . . . to seek a peaceful solution of existing issues."

Truman said further in his "emergency" speech: "There is no conflict between the legitimate interests of the free world and those of the Soviet Union that cannot be settled by peaceful means."

Without commenting at this moment on which world is really the free world, I want to ask a few questions.

On what occasion since June 25 when the Korean Civil War began did Truman and Attlee ever show any readiness to negotiate a peaceful settlement? They rejected every effort of the Soviet Union, the Korean Democratic People's Republic, India and People's China in that direction. It was

not until the disastrous defeat of MacArthur's "home-by-Xmas" offensive that words about negotiation began to find their way into Truman's speeches.

Truman for the past several years has rejected every single request of the Soviet Union and anyone else who has proposed negotiation on the grounds that it is dangerous to negotiate, that you can't do business with Communists, that the sole U. S. policy is the use of force.

He has been forced to talk about negotiations now only because military defeat and his threat to drop the A-bomb has frightened and opened the eyes of new millions of people to the catastrophic consequences of U. S. aggressive foreign policy.

This talk, however, is not worth the paper it is printed on because in deeds Truman does the opposite. If Truman is ready to negotiate, why does he refuse even to discuss the Soviet Union's proposal for international control and iron-clad inspection of atomic energy? Why does he refuse to discuss the five-power peace talks proposed by the USSR? Why did Austin block the formation of a UN Commission to discuss a settlement of Far Eastern issues?

The crowning proof that Truman's readiness to negotiate is nothing but a phony maneuver is shown by the German question. The USSR recently stated that it "would not tolerate" the rearmament of Germany and asked for a four-power Foreign Ministers' meeting to bring about a united, democratic, peaceful Germany with all occupation troops withdrawn.

At first the U. S. Government sought to dismiss this peace proposal in its usual manner as just "propaganda," but the fears of the peoples of Europe, including the German people, of a revived Nazi war machine forced our State Department to maneuver.

In words, the three western powers occupying western Germany make believe they are ready to agree to a conference. But suddenly they have become champions of extending the agenda of such a conference. It must not be restricted to the German question, they say. But why then have they rejected all the proposals of the USSR and China to negotiate all other issues?

Above all, at the very moment they are sending notes about a four-power conference, they are moving full speed ahead to rebuild a Nazi army. Refusing to talk with the Soviet Union, they are actually conferring with Adenauer about the new Nazi army. The press reports that Adenauer emerged from talks "broadly smiling." Remember the happy smiles of Hitler and Mussolini as they emerged from the Munich talks! The same press reports also that the West is "prepared to grant any concession" to the West Germans to get them to come into an army commanded by Eisenhower.

Make any concession necessary to the Nazis—make no agreement whatsoever with the Soviet Union—that is the real policy of the U. S. Government. If not reversed by the people it will lead to world war just as Munich did.

This catastrophic course for America is called "no appeasement." It means no peace. Ex-President Hoover, who backed Munich, who opposed the FDR policy of US-USSR collaboration for peace, says: "We want no more Teherans and Yaltas. We are grateful Truman has denounced such a course." That proves how ready Truman is to negotiate.

The American people must force the government to live up to its words. The safety and genuine national interest of America lie along the road of peaceful coexistence and competition between the USA and the USSR.

(Readers should send their questions to John Gates, 35 East 12th St., New York 3, N. Y.)