

STARS

University of Central Florida
STARS

PRISM: Political & Rights Issues & Social Movements

1-1-1951

Must there be war?

Joseph Clark

Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/prism>
University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in PRISM: Political & Rights Issues & Social Movements by an authorized administrator of STARS. For more information, please contact STARS@ucf.edu.

Recommended Citation

Clark, Joseph, "Must there be war?" (1951). *PRISM: Political & Rights Issues & Social Movements*. 550.
<https://stars.library.ucf.edu/prism/550>

MUST

THERE BE

WAR?

HERE IS THE ANSWER . . . BY THE FOREIGN COR-
RESPONDENT OF THE NEW YORK "DAILY WORKER"
AFTER MORE THAN A YEAR OF FIRST-HAND OBSERVA-
TION . . . AN ON-THE-SPOT REPORT FROM MOSCOW...

By **JOSEPH CLARK**

15

10¢

MUST THERE BE

War?

by Joseph Clark

New Century Publishers: New York

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

JOSEPH CLARK is presently in Moscow as correspondent of the New York *Daily Worker*. Since his arrival in the Soviet Union in the summer of 1950, his vivid on-the-spot reportage of life and activity in the U.S.S.R. has appeared in numerous magazines and other publications in this country, including *Masses & Mainstream*.

A veteran of the last war, he served in the infantry and was awarded the Silver Star for heroism in action.

He is the author of several booklets including *Hell-Bomb or Peace?*, *Behind the Berlin Crisis*, and, earlier this year, *Who Wants War?*, all published by New Century Publishers.

MUST THERE BE WAR?

Some folks throw up their hands and say: "What's the use of trying to do anything about it—war is inevitable."

True, similar voices of despair were heard at previous turning points in history—on the eve of World War I and again in 1939, just before World War II broke out—maintaining that war was inevitable.

But today the danger looms more dreadful than ever before. This time the threat of *atomic* destruction hangs over us.

War already rages in Korea. Fighting goes on in Indo-China and Malaya. Danger signals appear in Iran and Yugoslavia, with Anglo-American intervention in the former and the development of the latter as a U.S. armed satellite.

Every day the big business interests which run our newspapers and radio tell us we have to prepare for World War III. They have already named the "enemy"—the Soviet Union. Along with the Soviet Union, they include China and the Peoples Democracies of eastern Europe—peoples which have taken the road to Socialism—800,000,000 people in all, making up over one-third of the human race.

The big-money interests tell us that the two differing social and economic systems in the world today can not live together in peace. So 70 billion dollars were voted by Congress for war. Millions of families in the U.S., living at below-subsistence levels, must pay higher taxes to cover this huge sum. We are also made to pay higher prices for food, clothing and rent because our entire economy is being diverted to one purpose—preparations for war.

Must we pay this price? Must we and our families face sudden death in World War III?

At least 700 million people have said: *NO*. They have signed a plea for a five-power peace pact between the United States, the Soviet Union, Great Britain, China and France.

But how can a five-power pact bring about peace? What's

behind this peace movement that has aroused such hope and enthusiasm among tens of millions of people in all lands? So many other plans and proposals for peace have failed in the past, why should this one succeed?

Before World War I, military alliances were formed among the big powers. The rulers of Britain, France and Tsarist Russia on the one hand, and Germany, Austria and Italy on the other, said they were forming these alliances for "defense" and for peace. That myth was shattered when the shells began to explode in the summer of 1914. Those military alliances were formed, as military alliances are always formed, to make war—not peace.

Then, after World War I, something else was proclaimed as the way to peace. A League of Nations was formed. But soon it became clear that its dominant powers were using the League as an alliance against the socialist Soviet Union which had arisen on the ruins of Tsarist Russia. Later these powers still refused to make the League of Nations a body to bring together the Western powers and the Soviet Union even though they faced a common danger—the aggression of the Berlin-Rome-Tokyo axis. On the contrary, they made World War II inevitable by building up Germany's and Japan's military might for a crusade against Communism. And after all, who does not remember that the Nazis and the Japanese militarists were the "champion" anti-Communist crusaders in their day.

In the very midst of World War II however, a different idea arose for preventing war. This idea was born out of the common struggle against fascism. It was sealed in agreements among the five major powers—the U.S., the U.S.S.R., Britain, France and China at the war-time conferences of Cairo, Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam.

"Big Five" Cooperation for Peace

The idea was simple but logical. If there was to be peace, the mistakes of the old-time military alliances must be avoided as well as the mistakes of the old League of Nations. *Peace would be maintained only if the five major powers cooperated together to maintain peace.*

Thus, President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Stalin agreed at Yalta and Teheran on the outlines of a new world organization—the United Nations. It would be different from the ill-fated League of Nations in that the Big Five would be given permanent seats in the Security Council. And it was this Security Council that was given the power to prevent aggression and maintain peace. As written into the charter of the UN at San Francisco in 1945, these five permanent UN Security Council members had to act unanimously against violators of the peace.

In other words, the United Nations, as Roosevelt, head of the most powerful capitalist country and Stalin, leader of the Socialist Soviet Union, saw it, and as it was formulated in the charter, would not be an old-time military alliance and it would not be used to gang up against any of its members. These aims, however, were violated when the United Nations was converted into its very opposite and when, in contradiction to the war-time agreements and, following Roosevelt's death, in direct opposition to its charter, it was converted into a war-making body sanctioning wholesale murder of women and children, as in Korea.

What had happened to the hard-learned lessons of our war for survival against the Hitlerite anti-Communist alliance? Why were Roosevelt's belief in the possibility and imperative necessity of the peaceful co-existence of the U.S.A. and U.S.S.R., and the war-time agreements he made, exploded so soon after his death?

The men in the banking houses of Wall Street never wanted any truck with Roosevelt's war-time agreements and they said so right out. Their stake in the war was not the defeat of fascism—it was much more even than the 51 billion dollars profit (after taxes) they made during the war. It was nothing less than imperialist world domination they wanted. And they were determined that under no circumstances should the war-time bonanza of profits be allowed to run out when the war ended. If we follow closely each turn of the economic cycle and events that took place from 1946 on, we will see how President Truman reversed Roosevelt and took us step by step along the bankers' path leading to war.

In 1946, industrial production declined in the U.S. Along came the President with the Truman Doctrine. He dispatched arms to Greece and Turkey and proclaimed a policy of establishing military bases all over the world. Up went the index of production. Profits of big business increased.

In 1947 the business index began to fall again. So the Marshall Plan was launched. It was announced as a plan for European economic recovery. Actually it turned out to be a plan for militarizing the countries of western Europe. At the same time the rich got richer and the poor got poorer in all the Marshallized countries as their business came under Wall Street influence and domination. So up went production in the U.S. and up went the profits of big business.

But by 1949 we again came to the beginning of an economic crisis. The workers and small farmers had not benefitted from the business boom. Prices of goods went up and real wages declined. The workers couldn't buy back all the goods they themselves were turning out.

So, early in 1949 Truman announced a 40 billion dollar budget with half of it going for war preparations. In January of 1950, the President upped the budget and the military ante still more. Again the production index rose—profits for the rich zoomed.

But toward mid-summer of 1950 the economy began to sag again. That's when that Roosevelt-hating, Axis-loving old man, John Foster Dulles, was dispatched to Korea. In a jiffy another evil old man, the collaborator with the Japanese after Pearl Harbor and the Wall Street puppet in South Korea, Syngman Rhee, sent his armies across the 38th parallel as he had been threatening to do for a long time.

Once more the Wall Street financial journals began to confide to each other that things were looking up. Dun and Bradstreet, which advises big business investors, said: "the effect of the Korean crisis on business was salutary."

Joe, from Chicago, lies dead in a rice paddy 7,000 miles from home. His mother and father are asked to be satisfied by what Wall Street says right out, that Joe's death improved "business prospects."

Every day anxious mothers and fathers scan lists of casual-

ties. But the Wall Street paper, *Financial World*, declared on March 7, 1951: "Most corporate statements for the first quarter of 1951 will make pleasant reading for investors."

The Korean aggression shot corporate profits up above the war profiteering levels of World War II. The ten billion dollar a year average of the war became over 20 billion a year with Korea. General Motors alone in 1950 made over 830 million dollars profits after taxes. Standard Oil of New Jersey made over 400 million. Both corporations reported still greater returns for the first part of 1951.

When men with war contracts in their pockets talk about "defense against Communism" they have something very special in mind. The big business economist Roger Babson admitted in the *New York Times*, on October 3, 1950, that our economy was heading for a bust and that "prosperity" was only a bubble. Babson wrote:

"If it hadn't been for the Korean affair which has given business and employment a shot in the arm this bubble would be bursting now."

The people of our land were paying for Wall Street's Korean profits in greater speed-up on the job, in higher prices for all commodities and, worst of all, in the dead and maimed of the war.

A basket of food that cost \$10 in 1939 cost \$23.75 early in 1951. And the Administration came through again for Wall Street by its policy of freezing wages but allowing prices to rise.

A Spectre Haunts Wall Street—Peace!

The only thing that worried Wall Street now was peace. Thus the *Wall Street Journal* of March 16, 1951, carried a special report from Washington: "Waning war scare brings a let-down here and across the country." But on the 23rd of the same month the *Wall Street Journal* revealed what the government was going to do about this let-down. It reported that in Washington "they're shaping up a concerted drive to boost mobilization fervor."

A few hours after Truman dismissed Gen. MacArthur news tickers carried a New York dispatch saying:

"The stock market's first reaction to the dismissal of Gen. MacArthur was dismay and prices dropped fractions to more than \$2.00 a share. . . . War stocks were hardest hit."

Soon, however, it became clear that Truman had no intention of following up the dismissal of MacArthur with a dismissal of the MacArthur policies. On the contrary, the war was to be stepped up in Korea. More billions were to be appropriated for war preparations. The drive for more war bases and additional bomber fields—from Norway to the Azores, from Greenland to Taiwan—was accelerated. War alliances and deals were consummated with Turkey, Franco Spain, Portugal. So now the ticker dispatches read as follows: "Trading quieter and prices moved up."

Did the Government really feel that our country was in danger from the Soviet Union? Out of their own mouths we can prove that what they feared from the Soviet Union was not war but the "danger" of peace!

For example, Wall Street got the jitters when the Soviet Government proposed a meeting of the Big Four Foreign Ministers to negotiate the demilitarization of Germany and arms reduction by all the Big Four powers. Early in March Newbold Noyes wrote in the *Washington Evening Star*:

"The plain truth is that the more genuinely conciliatory Russia proves in her approach to the proposed Foreign Ministers Meeting the more bothered we are likely to be."

When the deputies of the Foreign Ministers actually met in Paris the *New York Herald Tribune* columnist, Stewart Alsop, wrote: "A nightmare is beginning to haunt those principally responsible for American policy." What was that nightmare? Was it the threat of war? Was it "Russian aggression?" Perish the thought. Washington's nightmare, Alsop wrote, is the "danger" of peace and a settlement with Russia. He wrote that "any German settlement at this time, *on any terms*, is disastrous." Get that "on any terms" and you'll realize why the

government in Washington avoided the "disaster" of peace and genuine settlement and, instead, broke up the Paris conference.

Why was the United Nations charter exploded? Why was it converted into a war alliance in Korea? Who is responsible for the reversal of the Roosevelt-Stalin agreements? Let's get the answer from those who benefited from that reversal. In its February 17, 1951 issue the Wall Street magazine *Business Week* had a leading article calling the year of the Korean war, "Wall Street's Golden Year." It told how the big brokerage firm Merrill, Lynch, Pierce, Fenner and Beane in 1950 "smashed all records" for profits. The magazine continued:

"Project these figures to the rest of Wall Street and you'll see what a golden year 1950 was for the stock and commodity houses."

In the Spring of 1951 the wave of sentiment for ending the Korean slaughter grew so strong that Wall Street had another case of the jitters. On May 16 the financial pages of the *New York Times* reported:

"Stock prices experienced the sharpest decline since March 13. Brokers ascribed the break to widespread peace rumors. Traders are fearful that the end of hostilities might halt re-armament and catch leading companies with swollen inventories unbalanced for peacetime production."

Wall Street's fears became still more pronounced when Soviet UN delegate Jacob Malik proposed negotiations for cease-fire negotiations. "*Law-makers warned against idea truce could bring lasting peace,*" the *New York World-Telegram & Sun* headline screamed.

Soviet's Persistent Fight for Peace

It is argued that regardless of Wall Street and its special interest in armaments and war, the attitude of the Soviet Union has made agreement and a lasting peace impossible. So, let us turn to the record again. We have seen the Wall Street attitude, now let us examine the position of the Soviet Union on the possibility of the co-existence of the socialist and capi-

talist systems in the world today. What are the words and what are the deeds of the Soviet Union?

The first words and the first deed of the Soviet Government when it was established in 1917 was an appeal to end the first world war. This was announced in the peace decree of the new Soviet Government on November 8, 1917, one day after it was established.

Then, in 1920 the first head of the Soviet state, V. I. Lenin, outlined the idea of the co-existence of the two differing social-economic systems in an interview which appeared in the *New York American*. In that interview with Karl H. von Wiegand, Lenin said that the Soviet Union stands for peace and peaceful trade with the United States. Lenin upheld a policy of mutual non-intervention in the internal affairs of both countries.

In 1927 an American labor delegation, composed largely of American Federation of Labor leaders, visited the Soviet Union. They received an interview from Joseph Stalin. They asked Stalin if agreements were possible between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. Stalin replied:

"I think that such agreements are possible and expedient in conditions of peaceful development.

"Export and import are the most suitable bases for such agreements. We need machinery, raw materials (cotton for example), semi-manufactured (metallic, etc.); the capitalists need markets for such commodities. Here you have a base for agreement. The capitalists need oil, timber, cereals, while we need markets for such commodities. Here you have a base for agreement. We need credits; the capitalists need good interest on credits. Here you have another base for agreement, this time in the line of credits, and it is moreover well known that Soviet agencies are the most punctual repayers of credits."

The truth of that statement became very clear with the development of trade between the two countries. As a matter of fact, during the worst days of the depression in the '30's some plants kept their workers on the job only because the Soviet Union was buying and paying punctually for their products.

Today, of course, the vast industrialization of the Soviet Union has changed its needs. Nevertheless, it still seeks peaceful trade and business relations with all countries who will reciprocate. At this very time, when the U.S. government has cut off all exports to the Soviet Union, the latter tries to keep open normal business channels. It even continued to sell manganese, chrome and other strategic materials to the U.S.

With the rise of Hitlerism in Germany, it was the Soviet Union which took the initiative in rebuffing his theory of an inevitable clash between the socialist and capitalist world. Thus, after the remilitarization of the Rhineland by Hitler, the Soviet government called upon the west European capitalist countries to organize joint action against further Nazi aggression.

Again, when Hitler invaded Austria, the Soviet Union appealed to the British, French and other west European capitalist "democracies" to band together against new Nazi moves. As before, the Soviet appeals were rejected.

Then, when Hitler threatened to swallow up Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Union once more sought East-West cooperation to prevent this tragedy and thereby prevent World War II. The Soviet Union tried to invoke its treaty with France to get joint action against Hitler's aggression, but the French government turned this down, too. Instead the western capitalist "democracies" organized the Munich betrayal. They handed Czechoslovakia over to Hitler and they made World War II inevitable. In other words, they approved Hitler's thesis of inevitable war against the Soviet Union. They were delighted by the idea that the Soviet Union would be the main target of Nazi aggression. But thereby they brought doom down on their own countries.

Starting in the late 1920's, the Soviet Union had startled the world disarmament conferences by proposing disarmament. The proposals of Litvinov in behalf of the Soviet Government were turned down. But this sincere and persistent effort of the Soviet Union to safeguard peace made a profound impression on the peoples of the world if not on their reactionary governments.

Capitalist Powers Engineered Munich Betrayal

Then the Soviet Union signed pacts defining aggression and pledging non-aggression with its neighbors as well as with France and Italy. But, as we have already seen, France and the Chamberlain crowd in England, with the full connivance of their friends in our country, chose the Munich sell-out.

In our own country the Hitler idea of a crusade against Communism was also very strong among the big business interests, in the newspapers they controlled, and in the government. Thus, not only the Hearst press but the *New York Times* supported the Munich sell-out. Not only John Foster Dulles, but a certain senator from Missouri, Harry S. Truman, agreed with Hitler's idea and the idea of the Japanese militarists of "crushing Communism."

Our buddies who fell at Malmedy and Anzio, Guadalcanal and Alsace are a silent rebuke to those wisecracs who agreed with Hitler's anti-Communist crusade. President Roosevelt therefore decided to discard this Hitlerite idea. That's why, at Yalta, Teheran and Potsdam, the idea of Soviet-American friendship was substituted for the Munich idea.

That is also why Roosevelt insisted that in the new United Nations there must be a clause providing for unanimity of the Big Five in any measures designed to prevent aggression. The rock on which the UN was to be founded was to be this Big Five unity and collaboration. In other words, the co-existence of two systems and Soviet-American friendship was to take the place of Munich and the Hitlerite crusade against Communism.

Once the war was over, did the Soviet Government give up its ideas of peaceful co-existence? The answer is in the record.

In 1946, Elliott Roosevelt visited Moscow and had a talk with Stalin. F.D.R.'s son asked Stalin directly whether he thought the U.S. could live in peace side by side with a Communist government. Stalin replied:

"Yes, of course. This is not only possible. It is wise and entirely within the bounds of realization. In the most strenuous times, during the war, the differences in government did not prevent our two nations from joining together and van-

quishing our foes. Even more so is it possible to continue this relationship in time of peace."

That same year, Alexander Werth, Moscow correspondent of the *Sunday Times* of London, asked Stalin whether chances of cooperation between the western world and the Soviet Union would decrease. Stalin answered Werth:

"I do not doubt that the possibilities of peaceful cooperation, far from decreasing, may even grow."

We Americans are supposed to be a very practical and business-like people. Sometimes we mistrust words, especially the words of statesmen. Deeds and business are supposed to talk louder than words. Well, right after the war the Soviet Government came to the American government with a business proposition.

The Soviet Union sent a note to Washington proposing trade and credit to be paid back with interest. Weeks went by —no answer from Washington. Months went by, in fact six months passed, and finally a lame excuse came from the capital. The Soviet note had been "lost," the State Department said!

Thus our war-time pledges went aglimmering. And what else could you expect when the bankers and generals who had hailed the Munich sellout of 1938 were put in charge of all government posts after the war?

The betrayal of our war-time pledges led to the outbreak of "small wars" in various parts of the world. But who was involved in the fighting? The Russians?

When the Dutch made war on Indonesia there wasn't a Russian anywhere within 3,000 miles of the fighting.

When the French made war on Indo-China, where were the Russians? In Russia.

When Britain's Transjordan Legion made war on Israel, where were Soviet troops? In the Soviet Union.

When U.S. forces equipped and organized Chiang Kai-shek's war against the people of China, where were the Soviet troops who had defeated the Japanese Kwantung army in Manchuria? They had returned to the Soviet Union.

And, finally, when President Truman ordered American soldiers into Korea, where were the Soviet armed forces? In the U.S.S.R.

So, the initiators of a new anti-Soviet alliance had to think up a new argument. They said the Soviet Union "instigated" all the trouble through some sort of remote control. They said the Soviet Union was "exporting" communism to Asia and elsewhere.

Where Liberation Struggles Stem From

Way back in his pre-war interviews with the writers Emil Ludwig and H. G. Wells, Stalin had shown how absurd it was to talk about the "export of revolution."

The Indonesian people didn't need anyone to tell them that they wanted independence. Nor did the people of Indo-China, Palestine, China, Iran, Korea.

Did anyone have to export the idea of independence to the American colonies in 1776?

Even Acheson's "White Paper on China" had admitted that the Chinese people wanted no part of the corrupt, graft-ridden, oppressive Chiang Kai-shek regime, any more than the people of Viet Nam wanted the French play-boy collaborator with the Japanese, Bao Dai.

Wherever you have feudalism and foreign rule, people will rebel against it. Wherever there is exploitation and oppression, the people oppose it. The struggle for freedom is as old as mankind itself. The fight of labor against capitalist exploitation and oppression went on long before there was a Communist government in the Soviet Union. A century and a half ago American workers first banded together to fight their employers who were denying them the right to a decent livelihood.

Poverty, exploitation, denial of civil rights, the cycle of boom and bust—these things were responsible for the inevitable struggle of the workers against their big business oppressors everywhere.

It wasn't Karl Marx, or V. I. Lenin, or Joseph Stalin who were responsible for the *conditions* which gave rise to the struggle of colonial people for independence, of peasants for land and of the workingclass for Socialism.

But is it so hard to discover the real foreign intervention in Indonesia, Indo-China, Malaya, Palestine, China, Iran, Korea and in western Europe? In all those places Rockefeller's Standard Oil, the House of Morgan's General Motors and other big Wall Street firms had invested millions of dollars. Wall Street was picking up the investments and interests of the big pre-war empires such as the British, French, Dutch, Belgians, etc.

The arms for the invasions of Indo-China, Indonesia, Palestine and China were supplied by the merchants of death with offices on Wall Street in downtown Manhattan. And the government did Wall Street's bidding.

How could it be otherwise with the War Department in the hands of investment bankers like James Forrestal or Robert A. Lovett?

Every peasant village razed to the ground in Asia meant money in the bank for the Wall Street firms. Today, every American who dies in Korea brings gold to the coffers of these ghoulish war profiteers.

Who Is Blocking Peace?

Take any issue that has come up between the United States and the Soviet Union, examine the facts and see who is blocking the chances of settlement and peaceful agreement.

On Germany, the Wall Street interests and their administration were dead set against the Potsdam agreement from the moment it was signed. The Potsdam agreement, for example, provided for the demilitarization of Germany. But in western Germany Hitler's generals—Halder, Guderian, Heusinger and the whole nazi general staff—are now working on the first 250,000-man contribution to a new Wehrmacht. The Washington government has forced its Marshall Plan penitents and mercenaries in the Atlantic Pact to agree to the remilitarization of the Ruhr and the rebuilding of a German Wehrmacht.

What is the Soviet position on Germany? You can read it in the Potsdam agreement which is reviled by the Munich men who control our government. The Soviet government supported the proposal of the east German Democratic Republic

for uniting Germany, signing a peace treaty, evacuating all foreign troops and getting a guarantee to ban the resurgence of a fascist military machine.

But the wisecracks say this is a bluff. OK! But what do you do in a poker game when you are so sure that the other man is bluffing? You call the bluff, don't you? However, instead of agreeing to the Soviet proposal for a peaceable solution of the German issue, Wall Street's government in Washington has called on the Nazi scum to rebuild their divisions. That is why they broke up the Paris conference of the Big Four foreign ministers' deputies which was supposed to prepare a Big Four conference on the German question.

On Japan, the Munich sell-out artist Dulles was given a free hand to put over another violation of Potsdam and other war time agreements. A "treaty" was signed providing for the resurgence of Japanese militarism and for the military occupation of Japan by U.S. troops. But what kind of treaty is it if the major powers of Asia scorned it, including China, India, Burma, and, of course, the Soviet Union?

And what is the position of the Soviet Union on a Japanese peace treaty? Again, you can read it in the war-time agreements. As a very minimum, the Soviet Union said that all the countries who were in the war together against Japan should have a conference to *confer* and work out a peace treaty. Isn't a conference of equal participants, including the next-door neighbors of Japan, preferable to a dictated settlement by Dulles and Acheson? Why should we be afraid of negotiations instead of a plot to rearm those who were responsible for Pearl Harbor? Is it so long ago since we said "Remember Pearl Harbor" that we are ready to reward (and rearm) our enemies and punish our friends in Asia?

On China, can we hope for a secure peace in the world today without carrying out the charter of the United Nations which gives a permanent Security Council place to China? We used to say 50,000,000 Frenchmen can't be wrong. Are 500,000,000 Chinese wrong? Maybe some Americans don't like their politics, but it is the government of the Chinese people and who are we to tell them to submit to Chiang Kai-shek?

Would we allow a foreign government to tell us how to

govern ourselves? Would we permit a foreign government to supply arms to a gang located, let us say, in Long Island, and who decided they were the real government of the U.S. and levied war against us?

Atomic Weapons and Peace

On the atomic bomb, what are the obstacles to international agreement? Hardly a day passes but someone in Washington tells that the Russians oppose an agreement on atomic energy control. They say that our Baruch proposal in the United Nations was a magnanimous offer but the Russians are opposed to international inspection.

Let the record speak! What are the exact proposals of Baruch and of the Soviet Union on atomic weapons?

Baruch proposed an international agency to own and control atomic energy production facilities all over the world. The heart of the Baruch plan is not inspection. It does not provide for banning the bomb. The heart of this proposal is the *ownership* of atomic resources by a world body. What kind of world body? It specifically provides for an agency controlled by exactly the same voting majority which sanctioned MacArthur's war against Korea.

Naturally this plan is favored by the Monsanto Chemical interests, by the duPonts, General Electric, General Motors and the other corporations now making millions from atomic bomb production.

But how could anyone in his right mind expect the Soviet Union to agree to such a plan? Would we agree to hand over our atomic resources to an international agency controlled by a Soviet voting majority?

The American people want no part of atomic war. We know that the awful destruction of entire cities, of women and children, would be a calamity worse than any other the human race has ever experienced. What kind of plan, therefore, would ordinary common sense say is needed to control atomic energy?

First of all there must be international control. There must be international inspection with the right to go anywhere for such inspection. And together with control and inspection, *the*

atomic bomb has to be banned. Ah, but would the Russians agree to such a plan? Let's look at the record—in the UN this time.

On June 11, 1947 a proposal was made in the UN Atomic Energy Commission for a strict system of international control and inspection of atomic energy resources and production facilities. The plan provided that this international agency would have the power to:

1. Investigate the mining of atomic raw materials all over the world.
2. Check existing stocks of atomic materials everywhere.
3. Check atomic energy production operations.
4. Observe and check on the technical controls of atomic production.

In addition to periodic inspections of atomic facilities all over the world, the international body would have the right to send inspectors whenever they have cause for suspicion anywhere, anytime.

Furthermore, in the day-to-day operations of this control and inspection system, *no veto power would be allowed.*

Who made that proposal? Was it the U.S. or the British representatives in UN? On the contrary, they voted against it. The proposal was made by Andrei Vishinsky for the government of the U.S.S.R.

And as recently as October 6, 1951, Stalin, replying to the question of a *Pravda* correspondent, said flatly that "*the Soviet Union is not only opposed to the employment of atomic weapons, but is in favor of having them banned and their production discontinued.*"

Doesn't this prove beyond shadow of a doubt that a basis exists for negotiations and agreement on the banning of atomic bombs?

What other issues divide the U.S. and the U.S.S.R.? Trade? We have already seen that, as against the U.S. embargo, the Soviet Union promotes East-West trade.

The "iron curtain?" Where is that located? In little more than a year spent here in the Soviet Union I have seen American trade unionists and workers from almost every capitalist country come to the Soviet Union. These have in-

cluded conservative A.F. of L. and C.I.O. representatives as well as conservative trade unionists of Great Britain. I have also seen sportsmen from western countries, musicians, artists and scientists as well as businessmen who traveled up and down this country.

During this same period, Soviet sportsmen visited France, musicians visited Italy and Belgium, trade unionists visited Britain, France and Italy, writers visited India, and lots more places. Then I also remember how, not long before I left for the Soviet Union, the composer Shostakovich and the novelist Fadeyev were rudely ordered out of our country on 24 hours notice.

These facts show that the iron curtain is located somewhere in the vicinity of Sandy Hook and the Golden Gate.

But the biggest test today whether there can be peaceful settlement of issues rather than war, is Korea. Here, too, let the record be our guide.

First of all let's repeat the obvious fact that while we have hundreds of thousands of troops in action and are using Japan, both its personnel and territory, as a base for fighting in Korea, the Soviet Union doesn't have a single man in action there. And let us state that fact with full knowledge of the geography—that Korea is five to seven thousand miles from our shores—while it has a common border with the Soviet Union.

In this framework, let us see whether the war in Korea has to spread or whether it can be ended.

On July 13, shortly after the fighting started in Korea, Prime Minister Nehru of India sent identical messages to Truman and Stalin. The message suggested peaceful negotiations within the United Nations Security Council for ending the fighting. To make such negotiations complete, Nehru proposed that the Chinese People's Republic shall take its seat in the UN Security Council.

In less than 48 hours Nehru had a reply—from Stalin. The Soviet Prime Minister agreed with and welcomed Nehru's proposal. Truman was silent. Instead the State Department told Nehru: NO DICE. So the burning of Korean villages by napalm hurled from U.S. planes continued and thousands of

Americans continued to die or were crippled in this undeclared war—over 100,000, the latest figures say.

Later, other proposals were made by both China and the Soviet Union to substitute negotiations for fighting. Washington rejected them and chose the MacArthur policy of fire and sword instead of the conference table.

However, the inability of the Pentagon gamblers with human lives to get a decision in Korea, and above all the mounting horror and opposition of the American people to the war, brought the issue of cease fire to the fore again. So, when the fighting swerved around the 38th parallel Secretary of State Dean Acheson told a Senate committee that the fighting could be ended at that line. Soon after that Soviet UN delegate Malik took the initiative again and proposed direct negotiations between the opposing forces in Korea for a cease-fire along the 38th parallel.

The talks started but the military big brass and the State Department showed they were renegeing on the proposal to cease fire on the 38th parallel. Every time the North Korean representatives agreed to the terms put forward by General Ridgway, the latter upped conditions for a cease-fire. This monstrous spectacle of brazen stalling so outraged public opinion that *New York Times* correspondent George Barrett was forced to report from the Korean front that even U.S. soldiers and officers were expressing their disgust with the manner in which their own military commanders were conducting the talks. In the UN, Soviet delegate A. Y. Vyshinsky demanded that, since it was allegedly the UN, and not the U.S., which was waging the war in Korea, the negotiations should be taken out of the hands of the U.S. military and turned over to the UN. Powerful voices, reflecting the people's anger at the perpetual stalling, were raised in support of this position in England and in a number of other countries.

When worldwide resentment finally forced a temporary truce late in November, the 48-hour lull in ground fighting between Ridgway's troops and those of the Korean People's Army was brutally shattered by President Truman's words from his Florida vacation retreat: "*There can be no cease-fire in Korea until an armistice agreement has been reached.*"

Thus, the Pentagon continues to rely on bombs, napalm and guns instead of peace negotiations.

New Factors in Peoples' Peace Struggle

Since Wall Street's policy has been a war policy and since it rules the roost in Washington, what hope is there for peace? In other words, if the economic royalists have a multi-billion dollar stake in war preparations how can the people of the world prevent war? After all, throughout this century the big monopoly capitalists have consistently caused wars. Wars originated in their never-ceasing struggle for a redivision of the world's markets, sources of raw materials, and places to invest surplus capital.

An economic system based on the jungle law of dog eat dog breeds war. What reason then can we have for the optimistic belief that war can be prevented?

The primary reason is that the people of the world can, for the first time in world history, by their organized efforts prevent war and get a lasting peace. They can do this not just because people want peace so much—the common people always wanted peace. But they can be effective today because there are other laws operating in the world besides the imperialist jungle law.

When the workers took power in the Soviet Union and when they built a socialist society the entire imperialist jungle system was weakened. Peace is second nature to socialism. The factories, mines, natural resources, power and transportation are owned and controlled in common by the people. There is no such thing as "overproduction" under socialism because everything the workers produce goes back to them either directly in wages or indirectly in industrial expansion and cultural improvements.

Perhaps a single fact will illustrate the difference between socialism and capitalism. Ever since the end of the war, prices on consumer goods in the Soviet Union have gone down steadily. There have been four consecutive price cuts and prices will continue coming down.

Furthermore, the government of the Soviet Union as well as

the entire people are occupied with tremendous economic undertakings constantly to improve the well-being of the people. Thus they are building the world's biggest hydroelectric power plants on the Volga River, the world's biggest canal in Turkmenia, and enormous irrigation projects on the lower Volga, the Don, in the Crimea, the Ukraine and elsewhere.

Besides these projects there is a 15-year plan well underway for planting shelter belts of trees along all the European rivers of the U.S.S.R.

Soviet engineers are even now planning still more stupendous projects. They want to reverse the flow of the giant Siberian rivers from north to south so they can be used for vast irrigation works.

Throughout the Soviet Union you see construction of a peaceful nature. The crane and scaffolding are present in every town and city. They are building apartment houses, schools, hospitals, nurseries, theaters. Strategic materials are going into the production of ever more passenger cars, electric refrigerators, electric washing machines, vacuum cleaners, radio and television sets, electrical appliances of all kinds, greater variety of clothing and furniture, more canned goods and packaged foods as well as luxury goods of all sorts.

Then, to top all this, Soviet scientists are hard at work trying to perfect methods of using atomic energy for industrial purposes.

The Soviet peace policy has had a marked effect on world relationships and the prospects of maintaining peace. Not by intervention but by its self-sacrificing struggle against fascism and by the example of socialist achievements and its peace policy, the struggle of the workers and farmers all over the world for freedom and socialism was strengthened.

With the victory of the half-billion Chinese people over feudalism and imperialism, the whole structure of imperialism received its second most vital blow since 1917. This, together with the victory of the workers over fascism in the countries of eastern Europe, when they were freed from nazi occupation by the Soviet armies, left world imperialism gasping for air.

All these victories over imperialism after World War II had a profound influence on labor in the west and on the colonial

liberation movement. For example, in France and Italy the Communists became not only the biggest parties of the working class but the single biggest parties in their countries. And in Asia and Africa all the peoples still chafing under foreign control are beginning to burst through the seams of imperialism.

Such progress for the common man has had a tremendous influence also on the effectiveness of the world-wide struggle for peace. The peace movement encompasses every country in the world and is securing ever greater unity and cohesiveness through the efforts of the World Peace Council.

Today the fight for peace has become a lever for every other struggle for progress. Workers fighting for better living conditions, people fighting for independence, the Negro people fighting for equality, all these struggles gain strength from the fight for peace. And in turn the fight for peace shakes imperialism to its very foundations.

At the same time what is unique and significant about the fight for peace is that it embraces people of all political beliefs, all religious affiliations and varied trade union organizations. Peace is a universal need and therefore affords the possibility of universal unity.

The organized world peace front inaugurated by the World Peace Council has already had outstanding success. It has prevented the use of the atomic bomb in the Korean war so far and consequently prevented the outbreak of a world-wide atomic holocaust. This victory resulted in large measure from the success of the Stockholm petition for international control of the atomic bomb. More than half a billion people in every land signed this appeal. Their strength was in their numbers, unity and organization and they had a decisive effect on the course of world events.

Still the war makers and profiteers persist in their dangerous plans. If the people are passive there will be war. Recognizing, therefore, that the issue of peace or war lies in the hands of the people themselves, a new petition campaign was organized by the world peace movement. This plea calls for a five-power peace pact between the United States, the Soviet Union, Great Britain, France and China. Ninety-six million people in the

Soviet Union alone signed this petition for a peace pact.

People who support capitalism and people who support socialism found common ground in this united movement for a five-power peace pact. As far as the Communists are concerned, they know that Socialism can be won not through any external force but by the people of each country, through their own efforts.

As far as people of different political beliefs are concerned they realize that bombs and shells will make no inquiry of their beliefs or affiliations. Whether Catholic, Jew or Protestant, Socialist, Communist, Republican or Democrat, total warfare would be a total calamity for all.

The issue is life or death. The time is now. The opportunity is with the people and the people will triumph over war.

MORE ON THE FIGHT FOR PEACE

HOLD HIGH THE TORCH!	\$.03
by Richard O. Boyer	
PEACE CAN BE WON!25
by Gus Hall	
THE NEGRO PEOPLE IN THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM05
by Benjamin J. Davis	
FOR PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE20
by Joseph Stalin	
WHO WANTS WAR?03
by Joseph Clark	
PEACE—AND PRICE CUTS, TOO!05
by Felix Baran	
PEOPLE'S CHINA STANDS FOR PEACE10
by Wu Hsiu-chuan	
AN AMERICAN LOOKS AT RUSSIA: CAN WE LIVE TOGETHER IN PEACE?05
by Claude Lightfoot	
GRASP THE WEAPON OF CULTURE!10
by V. J. Jerome	
INTELLECTUALS IN THE FIGHT FOR PEACE15
by Howard Fast	
MUST WE PERISH?	1.00
by Hershel D. Meyer	
THE ECONOMIC CRISIS AND THE COLD WAR A Symposium	1.00

New Century Publishers • 832 Broadway, New York 3