

DULLES LET'S THE CAT OUT OF THE BAG

By WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

THE CENTRAL purpose of the James Shepley article in *Life*, authorized by John Foster Dulles and peddling the so-called "brink-of-war" policy, is to lay the basis for a re-kindling of the cold war. By propagating the brazen lie that he thrice saved world peace by bringing the U. S. to the very edge of war, Dulles



hopes to be able to use this monstrous idea, which has shocked the world, as a justification for sharpening this country's foreign policies and for continuing war armaments on all fronts. It is a follow up of his recent statement that the cold war is on again and of his resurrection of the discredited threat of massive retaliation. It is an attempt to liquidate Geneva of its peace orientation. It fits in, too, with the spate of jingoistic pronouncements which lately have been emanating from the Pentagon. All this should put the peace forces of this country and the world on the qui viva against the schemings of Dulles and his militarist pals.

In these latest threats against world peace, Dulles blundered into a real exposure of the pro-war policy followed by the Eisenhower Administration from its inception. In the *Life* article, as well as in his subsequent statements supporting it, Dulles made it quite clear that in the Korea, (June 1953) Indo-China, (April 1954) and Formosa (January 1955) crisis, not to mention others, the State Department

deliberately tried to provoke a broad atomic war. In the article in question it is made manifest that in unfolding the "brink-of-war" policy Dulles' aim was not to bring about peace but to cause a great war. Only a blinded partisan or a political innocent could fail to note this reality.

PREVIOUSLY the Eisenhower war policy had been so heavily overlaid with demagoguery about peace that few could penetrate through this hypocritical covering to its sinister heart. But Dulles in his arrogance, has torn aside the veil so that all who want to may see and understand. The long campaign of the *Daily Worker* prior to Geneva, July, 1955, to expose the basic war character of the Eisenhower-Dulles policies has been most strikingly justified.

It was not Mr. Dulles' bringing the world to the edge of atomic war, as he boasts, that averted war in the instances cited. The pressure for peace originated in quite opposite directions. It came from the firm peace policies of the bloc of Socialist nations and from the aroused anti-war spirit of the peace-loving peoples of the world. In view of the strong peace will of these gigantic masses, Britain, France, and other allies of the United States, although subsidized with many billions of dollars of the money of American taxpayers, refused to go along with the war plans of the State Department.

In this predicament, Eisenhower and Dulles were afraid to try to force the United States to take on the war job alone. This was the general pattern of the Korea, Indochina, and Formosa crisis.

IN KOREA, the Dulles policy

was to prolong and expand the war, and, if possible, to introduce the A-bomb into it. But all this became impossible in view of the swiftly rising peace protest all over the world, and also the skillful refusal of People's China to be provoked into a broad war action by the activities of Dulles and his puppet, Syngman Rhee. Small wonder, then, that the British Government, with its people bitterly opposed to the war, had no taste for Dulles' harebrained plan of developing an Asian atomic war, with world war potentialities. The above were the factors which brought about peace in Korea, not Dulles' cynical "brink-of-war" provocations.

In the Indochina war crisis, things lined up pretty much the same. At the time the bourgeois press in this country freely stated that the United States, with its Navy and Airfleet mobilized on the scene, was all set to enter the war, wanting only Britain's agreement to go along. But that agreement was not forthcoming, what with the British people, including much if not most of big business, strongly opposed to the war. So Dulles was stymied again. It was his aggressive policy that led him to oppose the Geneva conference which ended that war, to refuse to attend the conference, and to fail to sign the armistice agreement that came out of it.

The Indochina peace, too, was brought about not by Dulles' war provocations but through the diplomatic intervention of the Soviet Union and People's China, the influence of the French Communist Party, the world-wide mass protest, and the fighting spirit of Ho Chi Minh's armies—plus the fact that France had been thoroughly licked and wanted no more of

attorney for Milam, who was freed by a jury in the Till murder case last September, announced that he was studying the *Look* article for a possible libel suit.

the war. As for Dulles, he was all along a factor not for peace but against it.

The war crisis around the Chinese offshore islands of Matsu and Quemoy was much akin to those in Korea and Indochina. Eisenhower and Dulles obviously had agreed upon a war policy, and if it did not come to pass this was primarily because of the isolation of the United States by the powerful world peace sentiment and by the desertion of its own allies.

A vital factor, too, was the refusal of People's China to embark upon the all-out war program that Dulles trying to provoke it into and which would have given him the pretext that he was scheming for, a broad Asian war.

VITALLY IMPORTANT in all these situations in balking the State Department war policy was the strong anti-war spirit of the great bulk of the American people. The people in this country hated the Korean war and they indicated this fact many times. They also wanted to have nothing to do with the "dirty" war in Indochina, as they frequently made quite clear. And their opposition to war over Matsu and Quemoy was no less evident.

This American anti-war spirit, which stood up in the face of oceans of pro-war propaganda, even by their own mass leaders, placed a disastrous obstacle in the way of the warmongers in the White House, the State Department, and the Pentagon.

During the crucial struggles around Korea, Indochina and Formosa, the *Daily Worker*, among the very papers in the

(Continued on Page 8)

FOSTER

(Continued from Page 3)

United States which did so, clearly called the turn on developing events. It thoroughly exposed the war line that Dulles was following and it indicated and supported the forces that were genuinely fighting for peace.

Dulles' "brink-of-war" policy, by which he hopes to be able to sharpen up the cold war again, should be actively opposed by an aroused workingclass and by the general peace forces. Every effort should be made to cut down the present gigantic military spending and to develop a genuine policy of peaceful-coexistence in our foreign relations. Also an insistent demand should be raised for the removal from office of that international grebrand, John Foster Dulles. He is a menace to world peace, and should have been fired long ago. Dulles must go!

President Eisenhower should also be held fully responsible for the outrageous war policies which Dulles boasts of having followed. It is absurd to suppose that the Secretary of State could have carried on such a belligerent line without the full knowledge and consent of the President. It all goes to show how hollow are the peace pretences upon which the synthetic popularity of Eisenhower has been fabricated. In the coming national elections there should be a clean sweep made of all those who helped to formulate and to apply the warlike Eisenhower-Dulles foreign policies.