

Is Vandenberg Now Making U. S. Foreign Policy?

By EARL BROWDER

The first week of the San Francisco conference has inescapably raised the ugly question whether the policy of FDR is being abandoned in favor of the policy of Arthur Vandenberg. One thing is certain: America has suffered a

severe moral setback. Whether this is the result of fumbling incapacity, or is a fundamental change of course, may still be debated. What is already beyond debate is the fact that the spirit of FDR did not guide the American delegation's role in the first steps of the United Nations conference.

Let us summarize what was done by the American delegation:

1 The character of the conference was changed. Called as a conference of the United Nations, this basis was violated by the inclusion of the fascist government of Argentina.

2 This decision was taken without previous consultation of the sponsoring powers, over the repeated objection of the Soviet Union, with China abstaining; that is, it was taken by two out of four sponsors. It was rushed to a vote in the Assembly without the support of a single European government except Holland, which unquestionably voted as an Asiatic colonial empire rather than a European power, and with even the British puppet delegation of India

abstaining. The decision unquestionably did not represent any consensus of opinion of the governments of the world, not to speak of the peoples. It was an example of "power politics" in the most vulgar sense of the term.

3 This decision cancelled the solemn public declarations of American policy made by FDR on Sept. 30, 1944, by Cordell Hull on Sept. 6, 1944, and by Mr. Stettinius on Jan. 28, 1945, without any change having taken place in the composition, character, or activities of the Argentine government and without even a pretense of any public explanation of the grounds for the change in policy.

4 The acceptance of the fascist Argentine government, immediately following the rejection of the Warsaw government of Poland, completely destroys the moral basis upon which the U.S. has been standing before the world on the Polish question. Ostensibly America had been demanding the completion of a more democratic and representative regime for Poland before its delegation was accepted; after the Argentine decision the suspicion is raised that in reality the delay in settling the Polish question is being caused by American demands for a Polish government more nearly like that of Argentina, that is less democratic than the existing Warsaw government, not more democratic. The issue of recognition is not involved, since many governments represented in San Francisco are not recognized by one or another of the great powers.

5 The Argentine decision definitely raises before the liberated European peoples the question whether the influence of the U.S.A. will be thrown behind the institution in their countries of regimes similar to that of Argentina, that is, regimes composed of former collaborators with the Nazis.

6 Finally, and summing up the whole question of where are we going, the first week in San Francisco, gives point to the sharp warning of the ultra-conservative Walter Lippmann that powerful circles in San Francisco are conceiving the new world organization as a means of policing the Soviet Union rather than Germany and Japan, and that of Major George Fielding Eliot that "the idea of Russia as a potential enemy rather than Russia as an active and helpful friend has taken hold on the minds of some of the American representatives to an extent which can only be described as deplorable."

All of which raises the question, which we cannot escape no matter how unpleasant and deplorable it is, whether the U.S.A. is still following the path marked out by the great Roosevelt, or whether we are now in the process of departing from that path to go over to the path of Arthur Vandenberg.

The answer cannot be given in empty words and declamations. It can only be given in deeds. The deed of sponsoring fascist Argentina has an inexorable logic which can only be overcome by equally decisive deeds in an opposite direction. Time is of the essence. America stands at the crossroads.

