

IS SENATOR M'CARTHY THE AMERICAN HITLER?

(See Page 2)

THE MILITANT

PUBLISHED WEEKLY IN THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING PEOPLE

Vol. XVIII - No. 31

267

NEW YORK, N. Y., MONDAY, AUGUST 2, 1954

PRICE: 10 CENTS

Report Vietminh Delegates See Deal as Sellout

By Joseph Hansen

Will the Indochinese people meekly accept the partition of their country that was carried out at the Geneva conference? This was the major question still to be answered

Senators Stall on Flanders Move Against McCarthy



SEN. FLANDERS

By John F. Petrone

JULY 28 — The extended U.S. Senate debate on atomic energy may result in postponing Senate debate and voting on the Flanders resolution to censure McCarthy for conduct "unbecoming a Senator," now scheduled to be called up on July 30.

But aside from the atomic energy debate, there is a strong possibility that the Senate may duck the Flanders resolution altogether by tabling it.

Only a handful of Senators have announced their support of the Flanders resolution. Almost all the others would like to be relieved of the necessity to take a stand for or against it. Eisenhower has refused to take a position pro or con.

The McCarthyite forces are utilizing this situation to line up votes to table the resolution, and are meeting with sympathetic response from the many Republicans and Democrats who want to get off the spot.

This was indicated on July 23 by Paul G. Hoffman, chairman of the Studebaker Corp., former head of Citizens for Eisenhower, and spokesman for 23 prominent individuals who urged the Senate to pass the Flanders resolution.

Reached by telephone, Hoffman told the N.Y. Post that the primary purpose of the new group is "to head off moves by the Senate Republican and Democratic leadership to pigeon-hole the Flanders' motion."

"Hoffman expressed fear that strong bi-partisan pressure to avoid a showdown on McCarthy by tabling the Flanders resolution was making headway."

Hoffman is in a good position to know what is going on in the Senate.

COOL TO MOVE

It is no secret that the Senate GOP leadership looks coldly at any anti-McCarthy moves. Earlier, the Senate Republican Policy Committee had voted to oppose the original Flanders move to strip McCarthy of his committee chairmanships. The Policy Committee vote was UNANIMOUS, even though it included Sen. Margaret Chase Smith, Eisenhower Republican who was a target of the McCarthyites in the recent Maine primaries.

The Senate Democrats, with few exceptions, would also be happier if they never had to vote yes or no on the Flanders resolution. McClellan, leader of the Democrats on the McCarthy committee, persuaded Flanders to put off debate on his censure resolution.

as the text of the infamous deal between the Kremlin and the Western powers at the expense of Indochina was made public July 23.

The hysterical screams of the China Lobby about a "Munich" served to help cover up the real essence of the Geneva agreement. When Sen. Knowland of California, for instance, called it "one of the great Communist victories of this decade," the natural tendency was to assume there must be some fire where there is that much smoke.

This impression was further deepened by the bland assurances of Moscow that the carving up of Indochina "will prove a new victory for the power of peace."

Which set of liars are we to believe?

Grave doubt as to the validity of the Knowland thesis is cast by many responsible voices in the capitalist press itself.

For example, the July 22 Wall Street Journal noted "that the West's defeat is not an unqualified Communist victory." It also noted that "the question arises why they are now agreeing to call off the war... they already have the French on the run — now would be a better time than later to run them all the way out."

VICTORY IN SIGHT

Columnist Marquis Childs, in a special dispatch from Geneva to the July 23 Newark News declared, "There was every reason why the Communists should not have granted an armistice. The Vietnamese had ample resources to sweep on to victory."

The July 22 Manchester Guardian observed that the terms are "quite favorable to the French." The French are given ten months "for the main regroupment of military forces, and that is a long period." The agreement "gives time also for the French to remove the more valuable military stores from the Hanoi area, thereby preventing them from falling into enemy hands."

The Guardian also notes that the truce line near the 17th parallel is much better than French Premier Mendes-France could have expected "considering the military position."

Moreover, the areas left in French hands "is a good bargain when one remembers that the Vietnamese have penetrated large districts in the south, even near Saigon."


On top of this "Laos and Cambodia... remain intact and all the Vietnamese forces there are to be evacuated or disarmed (except in two small areas...)"

Summing it up, the Guardian declares that "these are good terms — better, indeed, than could have been expected."

In fact, they are so good that "they should be regarded as a triumph for the diplomacy of Mr. Eden"

(Continued on page 2)

Secret Union-Smashing Plan Exposed by IUE-CIO Paper



Gov't Taught Builders How to Profit 10,000%

By Carl Goodman

If you don't know how to rob the public, the government will teach you. This was revealed last week at the investigation of the Federal Housing Administration conducted by a Senate Committee under Homer Capehart (R-Ind.).

(1) A Los Angeles builder, Arthur B. Weber, told the Senate Banking Committee that FHA officials conducted a school for builders to show them how to put up apartment buildings under FHA loans without any money of their own. Weber cleared \$378,000 in windfall profits on two projects and later sold his interest in them for an additional \$125,000.

"The man from Washington got up to a blackboard," Weber said according to a UP dispatch of July 22, "and showed us how we could wind up taking architects fees and builders fees of 5% each when we didn't pay them. He appealed to we builders to help out in the terrific housing shortage and said we could do it without investing any money."

"We builders" learned fast and well. "We" took — with FHA connivance — not only the architects and builders fees but everything else that "we" could

get away with. "Windfalls" ran as high as \$5 million dollars on a \$50,000 investment, or 10,000% profit. These windfalls were paid for by tenants out of rent. Senator Capehart estimated that half a billion dollars all told have been grabbed by builders in "windfall" loot.

(2) The Labor Department, according to the July 23 N. Y. Times, announced that it expected to uncover evidence that workers on some FHA backed housing projects had been underpaid millions of dollars in wages. Secretary James P. Mitchell charged that builders had misclassified workers and falsified payroll records. Thus builders piled up their wealth by cheating construction workers as well as tenants — all this on federally insured loans.

(3) While the FHA program to build housing projects by means of "private enterprise" created many new millionaires, it also enriched established members of American wealth. Three members of the DuPont family shared in "windfalls" from a Delaware project. Jack Chrysler cut himself a juicy slice of the melon on a project in Columbus, Ohio. Clint W. Murchison, Jr., whose father is

a Texas oil millionaire and a financial backer of fascist Senator McCarthy, made \$1,550,000 "windfall" profits on two military housing projects on an investment of \$30,000.

The program under which builders are raking in money is Section 608 of the National Housing Act. The program is supposed to help the so-called middle-income group, whose earnings range from \$3,000 to \$5,000 a year. This is the income group to which a third of the population belongs. It is composed in great proportion of organized workers and of families with more than one wage earner.

Instead of helping these workers, Section 608 has become the means of mercilessly fleecing them. In addition to being squeezed for windfall profits, which in some cases amounts to \$5 per apartment per month, tenants are gouged for the fantastic "operating" profits that go to the builders.

So profitable is the operation of these projects that Dr. Daniel Givinson, a dentist who invested \$50,000, cleared \$2 million dollars in six years without even making any "windfall" profits. His yearly 660% came from rents and operating fees.

Documentary Proof Reveals GE Scheme to Restore the Open Shop

American Big Business condemns "planning" as "socialistic." But the corporations themselves never miss a chance to initiate and execute their own plans to cut wages, undermine unions and raise profits, regardless of the disastrous effects on the lives and conditions of their employees.

Details of one of these secret plans recently fell into the hands of the IUE-CIO News and were fully documented in the July 19 issue of that paper. It was a 10-year expansion plan of General Electric, discussed at a conference of the highest GE officials in Schenectady last April. Other corporations in other industries have similar plans.

Here are the main points in the GE plan:

(1) Make many little plants out of the big ones. (Smaller unions are easier to handle.)

(2) Move jobs of present GE employees to "smaller towns" where we can have a more favorable labor market. (Which means, IUE-CIO News explains, where "GE can get the same work done for rates 80c, 90c, and even \$1 an hour under what it now pays.")

(3) An intense speedup to get double the amount of present

production by 1963 without any increase in the present labor force. (Even if production is not doubled, the aim is to "increase the productivity of our workers by 100% in the next ten-year period.")

(4) Introduce sharp rate-cuts on practically every job that is not moved out.

(5) "A more rapid evolution of mechanization with more complete automation in some product lines," the aim of the new automatic equipment being to dispense with the services of thousands of present workers.

Was First Big Company to Accept McCarthy Plan Against Workers

General Electric has more than one "plan" for weakening the militancy of its workers. Besides carrying through its "runaway" campaign, it is also the first big corporation to accept and execute McCarthy's demand that employers should fire any worker who fails to "cooperate" with congressional witch hunt committees or who refuses to testify about his political beliefs and associations.

GE is also acting tough in current contract negotiations with IUE-CIO. It refuses to offer more than a 2.68% wage raise, insists on an 18-month instead of a 12-month contract, and rejects the IUE's demands for a 5-cent hourly raise, a \$1.25 an hour minimum wage, equal pay for women workers and some safeguards for jobs of present GE workers in the company's "decentralization" plan.

ONE OF THE GIANTS

GE is one of the giant corporations and the biggest in the electrical, radio and TV industry. After deducting for "depreciation," it reported total assets of \$1,697,000,000 at the end of 1953, making it the eleventh biggest manufacturing corporation in the country. It employs 225,000 workers and had an income of more than three billion dollars last year.

Over half of GE's workers are in seven cities where the company employs 10,000 to 40,000 people — Schenectady, Lynn, Evendale, Erie, Pittsfield, Syracuse and Fort Wayne. GE proposes to "decentralize," that is, to run away from these and other cities like Bridgeport, Philadelphia, New York, Providence, Holyoke, Fitchburg and Cleveland to smaller towns with lower wage rates and states with worse anti-labor laws. As one GE official put it, "So we may expect to hear more of GE plants like Edmore, Mich.; Limerick, Me.; Jonesboro, Ark.; and Waynesboro, Va."

Another GE official cited with joy "the runaway of hundreds of jobs from Schenectady to Bloomington, Ill., undertaken because GE found that it could get the same work done for costs far under what Schenectady workers were being paid."

UNION POSITION

What, asks the IUE-CIO News, is behind "the cold-blooded attitude with which GE is approaching this plan of throwing thousands and thousands of its employees out on the street?"

And it answers: "Only one thing is behind it: profits."

"Already GE is making the highest profits in its history. 'GE's rate of profits is far beyond any other company in the electrical industry. But that isn't good enough for the new crowd of officials who are running GE. They demand more. And more...'

"What will happen to the city of Lynn (and the other big GE cities) under this policy?"

"If GE has its way they will be replaced by... dozens of other new runaway shops where GE can get the same work done at rates only half as high as are paid the people in the plants now."

In short, GE proposes to expand at the expense of the jobs, wage rates, working conditions and health of the men and women on whose toil GE has grown rich. It intends to grow fatter by making the unions weaker.

NOT UNIQUE

That GE's plan is not unique is proved by the fact that many other industries are running away from their present locations — especially to the open-shop South.

This poses a threat to the labor movement as a whole. It had better do some planning too — and its plans had better include militant job action, the launching of an immediate campaign to unionize the South, and independent political action to secure legislation to end the "runaway" assault on the workers' job security and living standards.

SEATTLE LONGSHOREMEN WELCOME LEGLESS VET

By Frank Powers

SEATTLE, July 25 — The success of James Kutcher's stay in Seattle demonstrated that the Velde Committee's invasion here last month has not completely intimidated the local labor movement and its allies.

The legless victim of the "loyalty" purge got a good reception from the much red-baited Longshoremen's union and its newly affiliated stewards' department, the former Marine Cooks and Stewards. After hearing Kutcher, the executive board of Local 19, ILWU, voted to contribute \$25 toward helping him regain the job from which he was fired in 1948.

A subsequent membership meeting approved the recommendation. A letter sent with the check said, "Although the membership does not subscribe to Mr. Kutcher's political views we feel he is entitled to a hearing before the courts of the land."

Kutcher was warmly introduced at a meeting of the stewards' department by William Gettings,

ILWU regional director, who said in part:

"This man was fighting screening before most of us ever heard of it... If more guys had supported him at the beginning, instead of thinking his case was unusual and would never happen to them, none of us would be in the fix we're in now with screening and McCarthyism... This man has kept up a terrific fight, the same kind of fight all of us are in today, and he deserves all the support we can give... I read his book ('The Case of the Legless Veteran') about six months ago. It's a fine book and you all should read it and get copies for your friends."

The cooks and stewards, who are fighting for their life against the "loyalty" screening

(Continued on page 2)

Senate Aids Monopoly Grab for Atomic Control

By Art Preis

"America's monopoly corporations have sensed the possibility of super-profits from private control of the atomic energy industry. They have launched a campaign to take it over and exploit it for their own gain."

So warned The Militant on June 19, 1950, more than four years ago. The warning was based on a revealing article in Collier's magazine by David E. Lilienthal, former chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, who demanded that the atomic energy industry be "freed" from "government monopoly" and turned over to "free enterprise."

What we then described as the "opening shot" in the "monopoly drive for atomic control" has now developed into a victorious major offensive signaled by passage in the Senate of the administration-sponsored atomic energy bill. This bill has as "one of its

purposes," according to the July 28 N.Y. Times, "to favor private industry in the development of atomic power." That, in fact, is its chief purpose.

OUTRIGHT ROBBERY

The Senate atomic energy bill passed by a vote of 57 to 28 on July 27, after a 13-day debate. Attempts to delay passage of the bill, called a bigger "giveaway" than the tideland oil deal, were ended by a sizeable defection from the ranks of the Democrats who lead the opposition. Almost a third of the Democrats swung over to support the bill.

"Giveaway" is really too mild for this bill. It is a steal—an outright robbery. It will enable private corporations to grab direct ownership and control of the atomic energy industry, now government-owned and built by the American people at a cost of more than \$12 billion.

Leland Olds, former chairman of the Federal Power Commission and a leading power expert, puts the matter conservatively in the July 17 Nation when he says that the atomic energy bill will "unquestionably prove the most far-reaching piece of legislation in its effect upon our social order of any in recent times. At stake is the question of who shall control the ushering in of the atomic age."

By the "ushering in of the atomic age" is not meant the production of atomic weapons to wipe out mankind, but utilization of a source of unlimited power for peacetime production that could virtually revolutionize all industry and open the way for universal bounty.

The lengthy debate in the Senate revolved mainly around secondary features of the atomic energy bill. Much discussion centered on a provision of the bill designed to empower the Atomic Energy Commission to carry out a directive from Eisenhower to build a generating plan for a

private utility combine to replace power that the Tennessee Valley Authority has been providing the AEC.

This is a very sordid business. It has been correctly called part of a payoff to the private utilities corporations for their support of Eisenhower. Under this portion of the bill the AEC would contract with the Middle South Utilities, Inc. and the Southern Company to build a \$107-million steam plant at West Memphis, Ark., which would feed 600,000 kilowatts of electrical power into TVA. TVA would be forced to buy this expensive power over a 25 year period at an estimated \$180 million above regular TVA costs for producing power and to resell this power to the public.

This proposition, however, deals primarily with the question of TVA as a source of government-owned public power. Important as this issue is, it is by no means the main one involved in the bill.

The vast cost of building and operating atomic energy plants and equipment means that only the most powerful private financial interests and corporations can take advantage of the oppor-

tunities provided by the bill. This, in the words of Leland Olds, "would clear the path for an unparalleled control of the country's economy."

WHAT SAFEGUARDS?

Those liberals, union and farm leaders who have opposed the atomic energy bill have not really objected to turning atomic energy over to private capitalists. They have simply insisted on "safeguards" to protect the interests of the publicly-owned or cooperative power systems. But this would not keep the monopoly giants from taking over where big capital is required.

To safeguard the atomic future of the American people means to set up a Workers and Farmers Government which would not only retain full control of the atomic energy industry but would develop its full useful possibilities to the maximum and gear them to all the other basic industries, which likewise would be nationalized.

ALP, Liberals Face '54 Election

By Harry Ring

The Liberal Party in New York is rather gloomily "celebrating" its tenth birthday. Its ten-year history was summed up in the June 14 New Leader by one of its principal founders, David Dubinsky.

Dubinsky sadly notes, "But we have not attracted great forces to our party. . . The big question for the future is whether there is enough political, moral and financial strength in New York to support a party of quality without an early promise of quantity."

The Liberal Party was organized by Dubinsky and other Social Democratic union leaders after they lost a fierce struggle for control of the American Labor Party to the Stalinists, with whom they had founded the ALP in 1936.

Dubinsky explains why the Social Democrats and Stalinists organized the ALP in the first place. He bluntly dispels the illusion that they wanted to build a genuine labor party in opposition to the capitalist parties. Says Dubinsky, "There was, first of all, the need for a party for those who would not vote for Roosevelt on the Democratic line."

While the issue of organizational control led to the parting of the ways for the Stalinists and Social Democrats in 1944, they have both clung to the same fundamental policy that united them in 1936. Both have used their parties to corral labor votes for capitalist politicians with whom they had made or hoped to make deals. Both parties have run their own candidates for major offices only when the major parties offered them candidates so odious that they lacked the courage to try to palm them off on their supporters.

LEFT HOLDING THE BILL

Dubinsky now describes the fruits of supporting capitalist politicians. He quotes Liberal Party chairman Alex Rose as saying, "After most of these campaigns we found ourselves in debt but the candidates did not feel themselves indebted." Dubinsky ruefully continues, "They were elected; they kissed us on the forehead; they waved us farewell; and we were left holding the bill."

With the mentality typical of a well-fed union bureaucrat, Dubinsky roundly berates the party's rank and file for its present sorry state, complaining bitterly that they have failed to support the party organizationally or financially.

The thought apparently has not occurred to him that a program which produces only a "kiss" and a "farewell" doesn't inspire much money or energy.

Meanwhile, the ALP leadership, which for a brief period was forced by the major parties into a course of seemingly "independent" politics, is now grimly determined to end this unwillingly assumed "go-it-alone" policy, no matter how hard the capitalist politicians boot them in the teeth.

On May 6 ALP leader Paul Ross declared that while he did not view the situation as "static" there was slim chance for a working coalition with the other parties in 1954, and therefore the ALP was compelled to run its own gubernatorial slate. However, he said, when it came to congressional and local campaigns, they would support candidates, "regardless of affiliation," on the basis of a "commitment to fight one or another specific aspect of McCarthyism." What constitutes "one or another" was not explained.

BACK MARCANTONIO

The first candidate to win the ALP's endorsement is Vito Marcantonio, seeking to recapture the congressional seat he lost in 1950.

Formerly the most powerful single leader of the ALP, Marcantonio quit the party last November after the Stalinists knifed the ALP's mayoralty candidate to support Tammany's Robert Wagner. He then announced the formation of a district-wide "Good Neighbor" party, which is simply a new name for the personal machine that he astutely

maintained throughout the years of his alliance with the Stalinists.

Marcantonio was beaten in 1950 when the Republicans, Democrats and Liberals ganged up on him with a single candidate, James A. Donovan, a reactionary Tammany wheelhorse. This year Donovan has again been nominated by the GOP and has Tammany's support for the Democratic nomination. But in the Democratic primary, Donovan has a New Deal opponent, Caspar Citron, supported by some labor leaders; and the Liberals, repelled by his open pro-McCarthyism, have refused to endorse Donovan this time.

Marcantonio sees a chance for a comeback in this split among his opponents. He entered the race with a pledge to fight for peace, civil rights and social legislation. He made clear that he was running independently because a state law makes it possible to exclude him from the major party primaries.

On the ballot he has designated himself only as "independent." For his emblem he has chosen the black hat made famous by his political inspirer, the late Fiorello La Guardia.

From under that hat, when La Guardia was Mayor, came some awfully "radical" speeches. And from under it also came the city sales tax, the subway swindle, the breaking up of unemployed demonstrations and the clubbing of striking workers.

... Legless Vet

(Continued from page 1)

on the waterfront and against Lundeberg's rival AFL stewards union, responded to Kutcher's talk by buying copies of his book. Kutcher also spoke to AFL glass workers and pile drivers locals, selling copies of his book there and elsewhere.

Kutcher's tour ended up with a public meeting at Independence Hall of the Church of the People, which cooperated in preparing the meeting. Ray Roberts, executive secretary of the local Fellowship of Reconciliation, chaired the meeting. His talk touched on his recent trip to Europe and on the contrast between England, where people can express their opinions or demonstrate publicly without police interference, and the U.S., where people are afraid to say what they think.

Kutcher gave an excellent talk both about his case and the general fight against McCarthyism.

While many liberals bought copies of the Kutcher book, the liberal organizations did nothing to help the meeting. The local press gave Kutcher's tour no publicity, except for a release by the Americans for Democratic Action in Seattle disavowing connection with the Seattle branch of the nonpartisan Kutcher Civil Rights Committee.

This ADA announcement came after its president, Wendell Phillips, had given the Seattle KCRC permission to send its announcement of the Kutcher meeting to the ADA mailing list. When the leaflet was mailed with the ADA return address on it, the right wing of the ADA had a fit.

Robert Block, of the Block chain of shoe stores in Seattle, speaking for the ADA, told the Seattle Times, "We have absolutely no connection with the Seattle Kutcher Civil Rights Committee." Since the local KCRC had never given the local ADA credit for any connection, this statement was an obvious attempt to discourage ADA supporters from attending the meeting. This blow at the civil liberties cause also represented a defeat for the younger members of the ADA here, who have been trying to make ADA into a fighting liberal organization instead of a left cover and tool for the Democratic Party.

Last night the Seattle branch of the Socialist Workers Party held a social reception for Kutcher. Proceeds were donated to the KCRC.

Is It True that Sen. McCarthy Doesn't Aim to Be U.S. Hitler?

By George Breitman

The pro-McCarthy sections of the capitalist press have a stock reply to the charge that McCarthyism is fascist: "That's what the communists say." Logically, this answer is absurdly irrelevant. But in an atmosphere where guilt by association has become the foremost principle of political thought in capitalist circles, and where it is dangerous to be found saying anything that "communists" say, it carries a great deal of weight.

Anyhow that's the way David Lawrence, in his July 20 syndicated column, begins his refutation of the charge that McCarthy is "another Hitler." This, he contends, is "the most persistent piece of Communist propaganda." That ought to settle the matter for all real patriots, but for some reason he finds it necessary to try to show that it is untrue as well as "Communist propaganda."

— maybe because the charge is "swallowed nowadays by not a few Americans." Following are his arguments:

(1) "It will be noted that the Wisconsin Senator has never had anybody put in a concentration camp."

That's true. McCarthy has smeared, terrorized, ruined and driven many people out of their jobs, but he has never put anybody in a concentration camp. But neither did Hitler — before he became dictator of Germany in 1933. On that basis Lawrence could have argued in 1932 that Hitler too was not a fascist because he lacked at that time the power to imprison his opponents.

This is one of the favorite tricks of McCarthy's apologists — comparing Hitler AFTER he came to power with a McCarthy who is still trying to come to power. It is also one of the main stumbling blocks of some anti-McCarthyites, who can't get it into their heads that the McCarthyite movement, four years old and in an early stage of its development, necessarily will not resemble in EVERY respect the features of the Hitlerite movement in its 14th year.

If the American workers wait until McCarthy actually is ABLE to throw people into concentration camps before they open a life-and-death struggle against the fascist movement he leads, then it will be too late for them to do anything to stop fascism. Anyone who advises us to wait and see

what McCarthy will do after he gets into power — as Lawrence does with this argument — is helping to bring him to power.

(2) McCarthy, continues Lawrence, "has had the temerity to stand up for two Jews — Roy Cohn and David Schine — at a time when an anti-Semitic campaign originating in Germany has been waged to exorcise the two young men who served on the Senator's staff."

That there were undertones of anti-Semitism in the attacks on Cohn and Schine is undeniable. But that doesn't make McCarthy a non-fascist. He hired Cohn and Schine as window-dressing — in the same way a Negro porter in his plant, or even a Negro clerk in his office. It was a deliberate attempt to ward off the accusation of anti-Semitism that has hampered previous fascist demagogues in this country, especially since Hitler's wholesale slaughter of Jews made anti-Semitism "unrespectable."

At this stage of the game McCarthy still prefers to avert conflict with the Jews as a whole, just as he is anxious to delay until he has won the fight with the labor movement as a whole until the ground has been fully prepared for it. For the time being he is content to leave violent Jew-baiting to the Gerald L. K. Smiths (although McCarthy's probes have unmistakable tones of anti-Semitism too: Fort Monmouth was a case where he automatically treated every Jewish employee as a suspect).

This proves that McCarthy has different problems to contend with than Hitler had in the early stages of German fascism, and that he is handling them differently. It doesn't at all prove that he has different basic objectives than Hitler or that he will not make use of openly racist methods at a later stage.

(3) "Also," Lawrence argues, "the Wisconsin Senator could hardly be regarded as a potential Presidential candidate by anyone who really knows American political customs. For neither political party has looked with favor on giving the Presidential nomination to a Catholic since Al Smith was beaten so badly in 1928."

This is not really an argument against the charge that McCarthy is a fascist, but an argument that he has no chance of becoming President. Even on that level it is not helpful to Lawrence's cause. Because almost exactly the same argument was advanced in the 1920's to convince people that Hitler could never become ruler of Germany.

Hitler was not a native of Germany. In fact, he was not legally a citizen of Germany, having acquired his papers by fraud. Until he became Chancellor he was always terribly afraid of being deported to Austria.

The German Lawrences used to say: "Hitler became Chancellor or President? Not a chance. Our political customs would not permit us to be governed by a foreign-born politician, no matter how powerful he may be."

But political customs — American as well as German — change, as Roosevelt's third term should have taught Lawrence. If the American ruling class decides that it needs fascism in order to preserve capitalism, it will not hesitate to support the strongest fascist leader merely because of his religious affiliations, any more than the German ruling class hesitated because of Hitler's national origin.

Political customs change. And fascism, which aims at the destruction of democratic and parliamentary traditions and procedures, is one of the things that makes them change.

Besides, it is conceivable that McCarthy might become fascist dictator not by being elected President at the beginning, but

Are They Two of a Kind?



MC CARTHY



HITLER

what McCarthy will do after he gets into power — as Lawrence does with this argument — is helping to bring him to power.

ANTI-SEMITISM

(2) McCarthy, continues Lawrence, "has had the temerity to stand up for two Jews — Roy Cohn and David Schine — at a time when an anti-Semitic campaign originating in Germany has been waged to exorcise the two young men who served on the Senator's staff."

That there were undertones of anti-Semitism in the attacks on Cohn and Schine is undeniable. But that doesn't make McCarthy a non-fascist. He hired Cohn and Schine as window-dressing — in the same way a Negro porter in his plant, or even a Negro clerk in his office. It was a deliberate attempt to ward off the accusation of anti-Semitism that has hampered previous fascist demagogues in this country, especially since Hitler's wholesale slaughter of Jews made anti-Semitism "unrespectable."

At this stage of the game McCarthy still prefers to avert conflict with the Jews as a whole, just as he is anxious to delay until he has won the fight with the labor movement as a whole until the ground has been fully prepared for it. For the time being he is content to leave violent Jew-baiting to the Gerald L. K. Smiths (although McCarthy's probes have unmistakable tones of anti-Semitism too: Fort Monmouth was a case where he automatically treated every Jewish employee as a suspect).

This proves that McCarthy has different problems to contend with than Hitler had in the early stages of German fascism, and that he is handling them differently. It doesn't at all prove that he has different basic objectives than Hitler or that he will not make use of openly racist methods at a later stage.

(3) "Also," Lawrence argues, "the Wisconsin Senator could hardly be regarded as a potential Presidential candidate by anyone who really knows American political customs. For neither political party has looked with favor on giving the Presidential nomination to a Catholic since Al Smith was beaten so badly in 1928."

This is not really an argument against the charge that McCarthy is a fascist, but an argument that he has no chance of becoming President. Even on that level it is not helpful to Lawrence's cause. Because almost exactly the same argument was advanced in the 1920's to convince people that Hitler could never become ruler of Germany.

Hitler was not a native of Germany. In fact, he was not legally a citizen of Germany, having acquired his papers by fraud. Until he became Chancellor he was always terribly afraid of being deported to Austria.

The German Lawrences used to say: "Hitler became Chancellor or President? Not a chance. Our political customs would not permit us to be governed by a foreign-born politician, no matter how powerful he may be."

But political customs — American as well as German — change, as Roosevelt's third term should have taught Lawrence. If the American ruling class decides that it needs fascism in order to preserve capitalism, it will not hesitate to support the strongest fascist leader merely because of his religious affiliations, any more than the German ruling class hesitated because of Hitler's national origin.

Political customs change. And fascism, which aims at the destruction of democratic and parliamentary traditions and procedures, is one of the things that makes them change.

Besides, it is conceivable that McCarthy might become fascist dictator not by being elected President at the beginning, but

Bright Idea

The doom of property rights in the United States is foreseen by Herbert U. Nelson, officer of the National Assn. of Real Estate Boards and the American Real Property Federation. Among the bright ideas he suggests for averting this "doom," according to the Cleveland Plain Dealer, is the prohibition of public housing and rent controls.

Kutcher gave an excellent talk both about his case and the general fight against McCarthyism.

While many liberals bought copies of the Kutcher book, the liberal organizations did nothing to help the meeting. The local press gave Kutcher's tour no publicity, except for a release by the Americans for Democratic Action in Seattle disavowing connection with the Seattle branch of the nonpartisan Kutcher Civil Rights Committee.

This ADA announcement came after its president, Wendell Phillips, had given the Seattle KCRC permission to send its announcement of the Kutcher meeting to the ADA mailing list. When the leaflet was mailed with the ADA return address on it, the right wing of the ADA had a fit.

Robert Block, of the Block chain of shoe stores in Seattle, speaking for the ADA, told the Seattle Times, "We have absolutely no connection with the Seattle Kutcher Civil Rights Committee." Since the local KCRC had never given the local ADA credit for any connection, this statement was an obvious attempt to discourage ADA supporters from attending the meeting. This blow at the civil liberties cause also represented a defeat for the younger members of the ADA here, who have been trying to make ADA into a fighting liberal organization instead of a left cover and tool for the Democratic Party.

Last night the Seattle branch of the Socialist Workers Party held a social reception for Kutcher. Proceeds were donated to the KCRC.

How We Can Win!

You have read the story of Trumbull Park. You have seen that capitalist politicians have actually aided the racists.

To win at Trumbull Park requires a break with the Democratic and Republican parties — the parties of Big Business and big landlords. For years the unions and the NAACP have followed a "lesser evil" policy. They think that deals can be made with Democrats or Republican politicians to win concessions for the people. Events at Trumbull Park prove them wrong.

When racist mobs attacked the home of a Negro family at Trumbull Park, what did the Democratic mayor do? What did the Democratic City Council do? What did a Democratic party machine, with Democratic precinct captains in every neighborhood including Trumbull Park, do? The answer is nothing.

what McCarthy will do after he gets into power — as Lawrence does with this argument — is helping to bring him to power.

(2) McCarthy, continues Lawrence, "has had the temerity to stand up for two Jews — Roy Cohn and David Schine — at a time when an anti-Semitic campaign originating in Germany has been waged to exorcise the two young men who served on the Senator's staff."

That there were undertones of anti-Semitism in the attacks on Cohn and Schine is undeniable. But that doesn't make McCarthy a non-fascist. He hired Cohn and Schine as window-dressing — in the same way a Negro porter in his plant, or even a Negro clerk in his office. It was a deliberate attempt to ward off the accusation of anti-Semitism that has hampered previous fascist demagogues in this country, especially since Hitler's wholesale slaughter of Jews made anti-Semitism "unrespectable."

At this stage of the game McCarthy still prefers to avert conflict with the Jews as a whole, just as he is anxious to delay until he has won the fight with the labor movement as a whole until the ground has been fully prepared for it. For the time being he is content to leave violent Jew-baiting to the Gerald L. K. Smiths (although McCarthy's probes have unmistakable tones of anti-Semitism too: Fort Monmouth was a case where he automatically treated every Jewish employee as a suspect).

This proves that McCarthy has different problems to contend with than Hitler had in the early stages of German fascism, and that he is handling them differently. It doesn't at all prove that he has different basic objectives than Hitler or that he will not make use of openly racist methods at a later stage.

(3) "Also," Lawrence argues, "the Wisconsin Senator could hardly be regarded as a potential Presidential candidate by anyone who really knows American political customs. For neither political party has looked with favor on giving the Presidential nomination to a Catholic since Al Smith was beaten so badly in 1928."

This is not really an argument against the charge that McCarthy is a fascist, but an argument that he has no chance of becoming President. Even on that level it is not helpful to Lawrence's cause. Because almost exactly the same argument was advanced in the 1920's to convince people that Hitler could never become ruler of Germany.

Hitler was not a native of Germany. In fact, he was not legally a citizen of Germany, having acquired his papers by fraud. Until he became Chancellor he was always terribly afraid of being deported to Austria.

The German Lawrences used to say: "Hitler became Chancellor or President? Not a chance. Our political customs would not permit us to be governed by a foreign-born politician, no matter how powerful he may be."

But political customs — American as well as German — change, as Roosevelt's third term should have taught Lawrence. If the American ruling class decides that it needs fascism in order to preserve capitalism, it will not hesitate to support the strongest fascist leader merely because of his religious affiliations, any more than the German ruling class hesitated because of Hitler's national origin.

Political customs change. And fascism, which aims at the destruction of democratic and parliamentary traditions and procedures, is one of the things that makes them change.

Besides, it is conceivable that McCarthy might become fascist dictator not by being elected President at the beginning, but

by getting some stooge elected President and having himself appointed, say, Attorney General. Hitler, we should recall, was defeated in a Presidential election but became dictator by being appointed Chancellor; only later did he name himself President.

WITCH HUNT COMMITTEES

(4) "Those who spread the fiction about 'another Hitler,' however," try in vain to find a parallel between American investigating committees, which have to be authorized by a vote of either house, and the removal of dissenters by a one-man dictatorship government."

In effect Lawrence is saying here: "How can you compare McCarthy, who after all proceeds with the legal authority of a majority of the Senate, with Hitler, a one-man dictator?"

McCarthy, it is true, has "legal" authority for his fascist activities. But so had Hitler. Though Hitler represented a minority party in Parliament, he was "legally" appointed Chancellor by President von Hindenburg and then a majority of Parliament voted to approve his appointment and adjourned after "legally" giving him totalitarian power to carry out his fascist program.

Of course Hitler, before becoming Chancellor, was never a Senator, a top figure in the ruling party or chairman of an investigating committee authorized by the Senate to hunt out "subversives." That was Hitler's hard luck. If he had had such advantages, he might have come to power sooner than he did.

While Hitler had to work from outside the government, often under government attack and for a time even imprisoned by the government, McCarthy is able to carry on a great deal of his work from inside the government and under its protection for the most part. What these things show, we repeat, is that McCarthy operates in a different situation than Hitler, not that he has different aims or less ability in using parliamentary devices to promote totalitarian ends.

Lawrence's attempts to deny the fascist character of McCarthyism are not very effective. Maybe he'd better stick to the tried-and-tested answer that the whole thing is "communist propaganda." It's not only the most successful, it's also the only "strong" argument he has.

While 700 delegates at the NAACP convention in Dallas, Texas, listened to a lot of glowing oratory about winning first-class citizenship in the U.S., many of them were burning over the Jim Crow indignities inflicted upon them by hotels and eating places. Many had to stay in private homes of Negroes because there was no other place to go.

... See Geneva Deal as Sellout

(Continued from page 1)
and the energetic initiative of M. Mendes-France."

In an article, "Red Truce Easy on France — Why?", William H. Stringer of the Christian Science Monitor (July 22) says that it is "puzzling" why the Communists accepted the 17th parallel truce line "when they had the military power to shove much farther south, and the conference-table prestige to make more rigorous demands."

He found it even more puzzling in view of that fact that "it is no masterstroke of Soviet diplomacy to send France's Premier back to Paris as a hero with hands strengthened for rebuilding French elan and perhaps even moving France toward ratification of the long-stalled European Defence Community treaty."

Joseph C. Harsch of the same newspaper found the Stalinist concessions "surprising." (July 24.) "The Communists signed away, at least nominally, vast territories south of the new truce line which they have controlled administratively and militarily over the entire period of the Indochina war." He felt that "something apparently unusual was involved on the other side of the table."

Another extraordinary concession made by the Stalinists was the agreement to postpone elections in Vietnam, which they could easily win now, until 1956. And in France the Stalinists hailed the whole perfidious deal carving up Indochina.

This action of the French Stalinists constitutes one of the worst betrayals in their long record of crimes against the working class. It climaxes their eight-year refusal to exercise the power they could easily have wielded to force the French imperialist armies out of Indochina.

EXPECT EVEN MORE

French imperialism appears to have good grounds for expecting even more from the Stalinists. Joan Thiriet, Paris correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, wrote July 22, about "guarantees" that may be given "for the transfer of profits and the right of private enterprise" in the small section of Indochina left to the Vietnamese under the agreement.

On July 23 the Associated Press reported that Peking radio had broadcast that "Ho Chi Minh's forces have promised protection for private industry and commerce in North Vietnamese areas coming under their control."

Why was the Kremlin willing to hand western imperialism such enormous gifts? Most of the answers offered are not worth the paper they are printed on. But there is one exception. Joseph C. Harsch said in the July 24 Christian Science Monitor that "London" does not view the victories of the Indochinese people as ascribable to the Kremlin "but

rather as the local success of native nationalism, not initiated by Moscow and perhaps not even desired by Moscow."

This gives us a real clue to Moscow's reasons for the unwarranted concessions. They constitute a demonstration by the Stalinist bureaucracy of its willingness and capacity to unite with Western imperialism in common action against the aspirations of the colonial peoples and against the socialist revolution.

But what is the reaction of the Indochinese workers and peasants to such a gross betrayal of their interests?

Tillman Durbin, special correspondent of the N. Y. Times, indicated the answer in a July 24 dispatch from Geneva: "Evidence has accumulated here that Vietnamese leaders are not entirely happy about the peace settlement for Vietnam. A number of members of the Vietnamese delegation have declared openly that pressure from Chinese Communist Premier Chou En-lai and Soviet Foreign Minister Vyacheslav M. Molotov forced their regime to accept less than it rightfully should have obtained here."

If such admissions are openly made by members of the delegation itself, we may imagine what their feelings are, and still more the feelings of the Indochinese people.

Durbin continues that "observers" wonder if this reaction "will lead to breaches of the armistice by Vietnamese forces. It is feared that this may happen and also that some Vietnamese units may refuse to stop fighting."

REFERS TO TROTSKYISM

Then he gives a most interesting explanation: "Trotskyism always has been prominent in the Vietnamese Communist movement, and some important Vietnamese officials once were Trotskyites. The philosophical grounds exist, therefore, for opposition to the Geneva decisions."

By "Trotskyism," Durbin refers not only to the revolutionary socialist movement founded by Leon Trotsky, but to the whole nationalist drive for freedom and independence. It is against this drive as well as socialism that both Moscow-Peking and Washington-London-Paris find common counter-revolutionary grounds.

We may be sure that Moscow and Peking have already considered what measures should be taken to ward off the danger to their reactionary deal. Most likely it will be a purge in Indochina.

This, we must recall, was what followed the ceasefire in Korea. The ink was scarcely dry on the armistice papers when the heads began to roll in the North Korean government.

Maintenance of the status quo is what the Kremlin means by "peace," and that signifies suppressing those who believe that peace can be achieved only through socialism.

The Trumbull Park Riots -- Part IV

It is not enough to fight a Trumbull Park here and there. Jim Crow must be ripped out by the roots. Capitalism, the breeder of Jim Crow, must go, if Jim Crow is to end.

And capitalism will go! Workers — despite their prejudices — will fight side by side.

Capitalism breeds many evils besides Jim Crow, and everyone who works for a living gets hit one way or another more than once — wars, depressions, low living standards, insecurity. When the white worker decides to get rid of wars and depressions, he will turn to the Negro for help. Without the Negro, the white worker cannot solve his own problems.

Thus in spite of prejudice — because they need each other and because they have a common enemy — Negro and white will unite to solve their common problems.

When the workers get rid of capitalism, breeder of wars and depressions, they will have gotten rid of capitalism, breeder of Jim Crow.

When the workers organize a socialist society, they will take over the factories and the government and run them in the interests of the vast majority, instead of in the interests of the few. There will be no need of Jim Crow for, as we have seen, Big Business and its allies keep Jim Crow alive because they profit from it.

Under socialism, where the factories produce what people need instead of what makes profits for a few, there will be enough for everyone, and no one will need to fight his brother.

How We Can Win!

You have read the story of Trumbull Park. You have seen that capitalist politicians have actually aided the racists.

To win at Trumbull Park requires a break with the Democratic and Republican parties — the parties of Big Business and big landlords. For years the unions and the NAACP have followed a "lesser evil" policy. They think that deals can be made with Democrats or Republican politicians to win concessions for the people. Events at Trumbull Park prove them wrong.

When racist mobs attacked the home of a Negro family at Trumbull Park, what did the Democratic mayor do? What did the Democratic City Council do? What did a Democratic party machine, with Democratic precinct captains in every neighborhood including Trumbull Park, do? The answer is nothing.

The union leaders and the leaders of the NAACP do not feel free to mobilize a mass action against the Democratic mayor and his Democratic Party. How can they point out that the mayor is an enemy of the people and then ask the people to vote for this same bunch in November?

So long as the union leaders, the NAACP and the Communist Party have an alliance with a party of the landlords and Big Businessmen, they cannot carry on a militant struggle at Trumbull Park. They cannot carry on an effective struggle against Jim Crow anywhere so long as they support the party of those who benefit from Jim Crow, so long as they support the capitalist system, breeder of race hate.

The Socialist Workers Party is a party based on the workers, farmers and Negro people. It has no ties to any boss. It says openly that it is opposed to the capitalist system, the bosses' system.

The Socialist Workers Party supports the right of Negroes to live at Trumbull Park. It urges independent action by the people themselves through their own — not the bosses' — organizations. It urges the formation of a Labor Party, based on the workers, the farmers, the minority organizations. Such a party would be free to act in the people's interests.

No confidence in the bosses! No confidence in the bosses' parties! Confidence in a workers' demonstration! Confidence in a workers' defense committee!

The Socialist Workers Party fights side by side with the workers in their everyday struggle as it has done in Trumbull Park. It explains how to fight. It knows that action without a program, action without understanding, is bound to fail. Workers must know who are their friends and who are their enemies. They must know what ways of fighting will work.

The first step for every worker is to be willing to fight. The second step is to learn how. In the Socialist Workers Party Negro and white learn how to be effective working class leaders.

Each November, all over the country, the Socialist Workers Party runs election campaigns. The party's aim is to explain its program, to win support for its principles, to show more men and women how to fight effectively against fascism, war, unemployment and racial terrorism.

You will want to support our election campaign. You will want to join with us. You will want to help build the socialist society where the Trumbull Parks and the Ciceros will be things to read about in ancient history books — and where the brotherhood of man will be a living thing.

"The Nation" on Unions and McCarthy

The labor leaders are not waging an effective fight against McCarthyism. This is the valid criticism made by Bernard Nossiter in the July 24 issue of the liberal magazine, the Nation. "Almost every trade-union leader has announced from some rostrum his abhorrence of Senator Joseph R. McCarthy and his works," says Nossiter. "... But only a handful of the major unions have dealt directly with the threat McCarthy and McCarthyism pose to organized labor itself."

"Many of the anti-McCarthy statements have a feeble ring," says Nossiter. "They either take a lofty moral tone or picture McCarthyism as impeding the holy war against Communism."

"Even after adopting anti-McCarthy resolutions," he points out, "few unions have followed through with action." He cites as labor's greatest mistake, "its failure to launch a broad educational program aimed at arousing the membership to McCarthyism as an economic threat."

Nossiter takes sections of the labor leadership to task for joining in the witch hunt. He correctly shows that their half-hearted way of combatting McCarthy is responsible for the alarming strength of pro-McCarthy sentiment in the unions.

Nossiter's criticism is valuable because he is the first liberal to indict the labor leadership for its failure in the anti-McCarthy struggle and because he forcefully warns the labor leaders that their necks are on McCarthy's chopping block.

However, his criticism does not go to the root of the matter. He does not show that the central failing of the labor leaders in the fight against McCarthyism is their attachment to the Democratic Party, to whom they look for the solution of all basic problems confronting

Incident off Hainan

Why did U.S. fighter planes shoot down two Chinese aircraft 13 miles from the Chinese island of Hainan?

Was it an act of "red barbarism" as the American press charged, echoing the Eisenhower administration's protest to the Chinese government?

The French capitalist press does not think so. An editorial in the conservative Le Monde denounced "American nervousness" and had no criticism of the Chinese.

Le Monde contrasted the coolness of the British reaction to one of their planes being shot down accidentally with the "development of force by the United States Navy" in allegedly searching for survivors of the British plane. It quoted the Manchester Guardian, liberal British newspaper, which asked why U.S. carrier planes were still searching the sea three days after the accident. It suggested that the U.S. action might have been a provocation.

Another French capitalist newspaper, Paris-Press, emphasized the Chinese acceptance of responsibility for the attack on the British airliner and their willingness to make financial reparation.

These papers strongly suggest that the Eisenhower administration is seeking to precipitate new conflicts with its belligerent attitude.

They link it with Eisenhower's refusal to recognize the Chinese Peoples' Republic as the legitimate government of China or to negotiate with it in any way.

Free Enterprise -- 18 Jewels and Over

Free Enterprise is the great slogan of the American capitalists and their government spokesmen. It is the source of all liberty, they claim.

Free Enterprise, they say, is worth going to war over against "tyrannical Communist slavery" based on production for use instead of for profit.

But is it Free Enterprise when profit-hungry capitalists like those that own the American watch industry run to the government for higher tariff rates on watches made by their Swiss competitors?

The Swiss watchmakers are the best in the world, and their watches are the cheapest for the quality. The Swiss watch workers have, according to the N. Y. Times of July 28, the highest living standards in Europe — higher than those of the American watch workers, even if their money wages are less.

The American people have been buying Swiss watches on an increasing scale, while American watch production has declined.

Now this is all in accord with Free Enterprise which says, "Build a better mouse trap and the world will beat a path to your door."

Negroes in the Postwar World
By ALBERT PARKER
16 pp. . . 10 cents

The Struggle for Negro Equality
By SAUNDERS & PARKER
48 pp. . . 10 cents

PIONEER PUBLISHERS
116 University Place New York 3, N. Y.
Catalogue on Request

How State Dept. Knifed Guatemala in Back

By Joseph Keller

When a few hundred hired adventurers operating from Honduras under Col. Castillo Armas invaded Guatemala and were handed the country by its quickly capitulating and cooperating government leaders, the U.S. State Department hailed the transfer of power as a "popular" uprising against "communism."

The State Department confessed, not without pride, that it naturally encouraged and welcomed the overthrow of one of the few legally elected governments in Latin America by a group operating from foreign soil. The American capitalist press, which had been freely "predicting" the "revolution" months in advance, saw in the establishment of the Armas counter-revolutionary dictatorship the "triumph of democracy."

Both the press and the State Department were very insistent, however, that the "revolution" — which suspended the land reforms, jailed the union leaders, put 4,000 in concentration camps and denied the right to vote to three-quarters of the people — was an expression of the will of the Guatemalan "people." The State Department denied that the U.S. had directly organized the whole overtaking, as has been widely charged, particularly throughout Latin America.

U.S. ROLE CONFIRMED

We now have confirmation from an extremely authoritative U.S. capitalist source that, in fact, the State Department did more than merely encourage the overthrow of the Arbenz government. This source reveals that the U.S. Ambassador to Guatemala, John E. Peurifoy, actually organized the entire affair from the U.S. embassy in Guatemala City. The "revolution" proceeded according to a precise blueprint drawn up in Washington before Peurifoy was sent as ambassador to Guatemala.

The facts are disclosed in a special article in the Sunday magazine section of the July 18 N. Y. Times, generally regarded as the most authoritative news-

A French Conservative Looks at Banana Lands

By Ralph Carlton

In June and July, Le Monde, the leading conservative paper of the French bourgeoisie, published a series of articles by its special correspondent in Central America, Marcel Niedergang. These informative pieces report the appalling misery of the peasants, the power of the monopolist United Fruit Company, the anti-democratic regimes through which it dominates the Central American republics, the awakening labor movement, and the big banana strike in Honduras. For a bourgeois journalist, Niedergang is surprisingly frank. Here are a few gems from two of his reports:

"The policy followed by the North American companies in Central America has naturally favored the expansion of the anti-Yankee movement. Necessarily the anti-imperialism that grows every day is directed against the United States. . .

"The first (French) Renault car commissioned by Nicaragua arrived at the Esplanade of Managua in front of the President's palace on a day of diplomatic reception. President Somoza was delighted and courteously invited the ambassadors and ministers who were present to admire his new acquisition. When the United States Ambassador saw this 'foreign' vehicle, he grew pale and could not restrain from expressing his indignation to the President. (1)

"Juan Jose Arevalo, who was President of Guatemala from 1945 to 1951, said: 'We do not have an American Ambassador but a representative of the United Fruit Company' after his stormy talks with Mr. Patterson. . .

"The too obvious contradiction between the affirmation of democratic principles and the use of force at the service of Big Business explains this latent and profound hatred of the 'gringos,' of which they (the Americans) certainly have not yet measured the extent and all the consequences. United Fruit has ruled and still rules in Central America. . .

The strike of the Honduras banana workers spells for the United Fruit Company a drop in profits of \$20 million annually. Mr. Scott, United Fruit representative in Tegucigalpa (Honduras), thinks the half-starved plantation workers are just plain lazy. He "is still convinced all the workers of the north coast soon would have been able to buy television sets if they had not been drink-

... Senators Stall on McCarthy

(Continued from page 1)

tion from July 20 to July 30 (partly because McClellan didn't want to vote on it before July 27, the day of the Arkansas primary election in which McClellan was engaged).

After Flanders had complied with McClellan's request, the Arkansas Democrat gave further evidence of his coolness to the resolution, saying on July 20: "The Flanders resolution would undoubtedly result in lengthy debate and possibly a filibuster in the Senate. This would delay action on vital legislation of national importance on which action is needed prior to adjournment. The McCarthy matter is not of such importance that it should be permitted to block action on these important matters."

If Margaret Chase Smith and McClellan, both of whom have been lauded by the liberal press as staunch anti-McCarthyites, are afraid to take a stand even on the mild resolutions submitted by Flanders, then it is obvious that Hoffman's fears about a bipartisan deal to pigeonhole the resolution are well grounded.

Hoffman and 22 other persons tried on July 22 to apply pressure against the tabling of the Flanders resolution. Their telegram to all members of the Sen-


ate except McCarthy pleaded for them to "disregard party and other lesser considerations and meet this issue squarely" and "show by your vote on this issue that the Senate of the United States is prepared to assume responsibility and deal resolutely with an abuse of power or contempt of its traditions, within its own ranks, which threatens the orderly and equitable processes of our constitutional system."

The signers were mainly Eisenhower Republicans, including several businessmen, and two labor leaders, Walter Reuther of the CIO and Albert J. Hayes of the AFL Machinists.

The editors of the N.Y. Times said that "if Mr. McCarthy were a sensitive person he would quail before a rebuke from citizens such as these. . . Senators who value the Senate's good name. . . will listen to this testimony."

But the Senators will also listen to McCarthy, who possesses voluminous dossiers that can be used to blackmail many of them; and they will listen to the GOP leadership, including Knowland, who consider support of the Flanders resolution as evidence of a plot to turn control of the Senate over to the CIO and the ADA; and they will listen to the White House and be impressed by the

Oppose U.S. State Department



Honduran demonstrators shouting anti-U.S. slogans in solidarity with Guatemalan people are attacked by police who injure seven. This was one of many demonstrations throughout Latin America which protested the U.S. State Department-sponsored counter-revolution that set up a dictatorship in Guatemala.

government — which was reappropriating lands of the United Fruit Co. and refusing to conduct a witch hunt against "communists" — to carry out the dictates of the U.S. State Department or be thrown out by elements financed and armed by Wall Street's government.

"STRATEGY PLANNED"

Even before Peurifoy arrived in Guatemala, "the strategy for the campaign had already been planned," writes Flora Lewis, whose source of information could have been none other than Peurifoy himself.

"It was to be a squeeze. Gradually mounting pressure was to be applied. At each step, according to State Department theoreticians, one of two things would happen. Non-Communists in Guatemala would rise to wipe out the festering source of their troubles, or the Communists would be forced to clutch more desperately, more openly, for brute power. Every single battle the Communists might win would only recruit and strengthen the forces working for their defeat."

But the "strategy for the campaign" to overthrow the Arbenz government was based on something more substantial than the "theory" that the more "brute power" the "communists" "clutched at," the greater likelihood that the "non-Communists would rise." The article reveals:

"On the tactical level, and as the ultimate reserve, rebel leader Carlos Castillo Armas secured the money to buy weapons and start building up an army over a year ago."

In short, the State Dept. hand-picked a "revolutionary" leader based outside of Guatemala and gave him money and arms to recruit an army of mercenaries who would move at U.S. command.

After setting up Armas in business, the State Department required a real general on the scene, since "the manipulation of the various tools of pressure and their effectiveness had to depend largely on the man on the spot."

An admirably chosen word, "manipulation," for that is what

the Guatemalan "revolution" was in every respect: calculated manipulation by the U.S. State Department.

"Peurifoy had his timetable fairly well mapped out before he ever got to Guatemala. His first three months were to be quiet ones, spent observing and calculating. The climax of this first period came one night last December when the Ambassador and his pretty wife, Betty Jane, went to the Casa Presidencial to dine alone with Jacobo Arbenz and his astute wife, Maruca. The dinner lasted for six hours."

According to Peurifoy, he then "bluntly" told Arbenz to get rid of the "communists" from the Guatemalan government — or else. Peurifoy denies that the expropriation of United Fruit Co. lands had anything to do with the issue, even though the State Department itself handed the company's claims for compensation to Guatemala. At any rate, the second part of the State Department's plan came into play when Arbenz refused to knuckle under to Peurifoy and let the U.S. dictate to Guatemala the kind of government it must have.

"THE PLAN OF ACTION"

"Shortly after the dinner party, Peurifoy went home to Washington to report and to settle the plan of action. He said then that he expected it would take him another three or four months to do the job. Two days after Arbenz resigned, Peurifoy said jokingly, 'People are complaining that I was forty-five minutes off schedule.'"

The State Department and its Wall Street banker head were more than willing to forgive Peurifoy for being "forty-five minutes off schedule" in "manipulation" of a counter-revolution organized against a popularly-elected government of a country of less than three million people by the greatest military and financial power in the world.

Flora Lewis reports that Secretary of State John Foster Dulles telephoned down to Guatemala to personally congratulate Peurifoy, American imperialism's newest hero, on his "magnificent job."

World Events

By Fred Hart

THE PURGE SYSTEM continues under the Malenkov dictatorship in the Soviet Union. On June 23, Pravda announced that M. D. Ryumin had been executed. Ryumin was described as a former aid of Lavrenti Beria, former head of the secret police, who took over the reigns of power together with Malenkov and Molotov upon Stalin's death, but was executed last December. Ryumin figured as one of the script writers in the frame-up trial of nine doctors, six of them Jews, which was going to be staged on Stalin's orders in 1953. One of Beria's first acts after Stalin's death was to release the doctors and arrest the promoters of the trial, including Ryumin, charging them with anti-Semitism. Then Beria was purged and now Ryumin.

UNDER CAPITALISM

the end of war sooner or later brings economic calamity. This point was brought home again by Michael Hoffman in an article on the French economy in the N. Y. Times of July 23. "In terms of real wealth there always is a saving when fighting ceases. . . In terms of money, however,

things are not so straightforward. France has been receiving aid for Indochina at the rate of about \$1,000,000 yearly. This will now stop." The consequence will be a "massive falling off in France's supply of dollars." The chain reaction that can follow is regarded with foreboding by the French capitalists.

INDIAN NATIONALISTS

have taken over the village of Dadra, part of the Portuguese settlement of Damao on India's West Coast. The Executive Committee of Prime Minister Nehru's ruling Congress party declared on July 23 that the liberation of India would not be complete until all foreign territory in India is merged with the Indian Republic. To that end the Indian government has been negotiating with the French and has sought negotiations with the Portuguese. But the Portuguese have refused, arguing that the territory they seized 300 years ago is now part of Portugal.

\$800,000 COMPENSATION

has been offered by the U.S. Government to Japan for direct damages caused by the hydrogen bomb tests at Bikini. Japan also seeks \$6,000,000 more for indirect and secondary damages, such as contamination of fish. The Eisenhower administration announced recently that the H-bomb tests in the Pacific will be continued despite wide-spread protests.

BRITISH TROOPS

murdered 39 Mau-Mau nationalists in Kenya, and more than 1,500 Kikuyu, Embu and Meru tribesmen were rounded-up last week, according to the July 26 N. Y. Times. The tribesmen will probably be placed in concentration camps, as British imperialism seeks to hold on by force and violence to the colony against the mounting aspirations of the Kenyan people for national independence.

TWO MAJOR STRIKES IN MEXICO

began July 23 in the movie and textile industries. 20,000 movie workers walked out, causing 1,200 of the country's theaters to close. 50,000 workers in about half of Mexico's textile plants went on strike. The workers are fighting for higher wages to offset higher prices due to the government's devaluation of the peso last April.

A One-Year Subscription to THE MILITANT Only \$3
116 University Pl. N. Y. 3, N. Y.

The Negro Struggle

By Jean Blake

For Equal Rights in the Unions

Union members in two Cleveland AFL locals face an important test this week. On August 3, Electrical Workers Local 38 will have the opportunity to end its shameful policy of relegating colored workers to second-class status by granting them full membership cards in place of the temporary permits they have held for over four years. On August 6 "lily-white" Local 55 of the Journeymen Plumbers Association will vote on the membership applications of six Negro plumbers.

It should not be too difficult for the present membership of the plumbers union to understand why the colored workers want to join the union. They want the "right to work" that the AFL and other unions are always talking about — the right to work under union conditions and pay scales.

The Negro plumbers have worked at their trade for 6 to 14 years, and some of the colored plumber journeymen and contractors who employ them have more than 35 years experience. But the colored plumbers are employed at from \$2.25 to \$3 an hour, while the union scale calls for \$3.17 an hour plus 10 cents welfare pay.

The labor movement nationally has protested long and loud against the phoney "right to work" bills passed this year in a number of southern states, correctly exposing them as union-smashing bills protecting only the "right to work" for scabs, not union men.

But here is a case where colored plumbers are knocking at the gates of the union, un-

daunted by the stiff initiation fees of \$246 for journeymen and \$146 for apprentices. Some of these men have tried before to gain admission to the union, only to be given a run-around instead of an application. Recently, some of them saw white plasterers walk off a job, refusing to work with them because they were not union members. But these men are not scabs; they are workers, painfully aware of the value of union membership.

The situation in the electricians union is only slightly different. There Negro electricians have been working with temporary cards, paying the union \$2 a month since 1950. Two colored journeyman electricians have traveling union cards from other locals, yet the Cleveland local will not recognize them. These men want only their workers rights to full union membership.

By voting acceptance of their colored brothers as full union members, the Cleveland electricians and plumbers will protect their own pay scale and working conditions, strengthen their unions, help break down the disgraceful and tragic Jim Crow set-up which permits the bosses to pit worker against worker, and arm themselves for better defense against the national drive to smash or housebreak the labor movement.

How union men vote on this question, far more than how they vote in the congressional elections and state elections in November, will determine the fate of the present labor organizations.

"Creeping Socialism"

Attention has been drawn to the growth of government financial aid to special groups by the recent administration attempts to cut agricultural subsidies. The farmers, of course, have been taking a beating in the past couple of years and have been forced to rely on government aid to maintain their economic status. But the Big Business newspapers have been complaining about the "high cost" of subsidizing the farm industry, although this is the one industry where most of the proprietors themselves actually do some real work.

In a column published in the July 19 Farmers Union Herald, Drew Pearson refers to some significant figures on subsidies in the last few pages of the gigantic book containing the complete federal budget. "What may surprise some people," he writes, "is that the subsidy paid to businessmen is about twice as much as that paid to farmers. Farmers got \$523,000,000 for soil conservation, price supports and other government help in 1953; whereas businessmen got \$1,216,000,000."

This form of "creeping socialism" did not extend to small businesses. On the contrary, Pearson points out, it went to "helpless little groups" like U.S. Steel Corp., the big utilities and shipping companies.

An example of the subsidies to Big Business are the quick tax write-offs for depreciation allowed corporations. In the next 17 years this tax subsidy will cost the U.S. Treasury \$40

billion, according to Randolph Paul, Former General Counsel of the Treasury.

Just before the end of the Truman administration, certain tax write-offs were run through with exceptional speed so as not to embarrass George Humphrey when he took over later as Secretary of the Treasury. Humphrey was the chief owner and operator of the M. A. Hanna iron and steel holding company. Shortly before he entered the cabinet his company got more than \$22 million in tax subsidies, through 70% and 75% depreciations allowed in five years instead of 25 years to two of the Hanna company's subsidiaries.

One of the biggest recipients of government handouts is the airlines industry. Some lines get between \$70 million and \$95 million annually for carrying mail, plus additional scores of millions paid by the taxpayers for radar, lighting beacons and other safety aids and personnel to operate them.

Pearson does not mention the biggest subsidies of all. One of these is the interest on the public debt which the government pays out annually to the banks and corporations holding most of the government loans. For the fiscal year 1955, ending next June, this interest is estimated in the budget to total \$6.8 billion.

But that's just hay compared to the biggest subsidy of all — the scores of billions paid out each year to the war industries.

Notes from the News

"UNEQUAL PAY IS STILL THE RULE where no strong union or no union exists," Rep. Frances P. Bolton of Ohio said in Congress July 19 in speaking for a bill she introduced, "the overall purpose of which was to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers." Rep. Bolton admitted that both the Republicans and Democrats "have had equal planks in their platforms" which so far "have but gathered dust." And now Rep. Bolton's bill "dies at the adjournment hour" of the 83rd Congress. She asks that the next session of Congress give the matter "thoughtful consideration," since "the exigencies of living continue to force women into the labor market."

TAKE TO THE BANK PAY for 171 of America's super-rich men, after taxes, averaged nearly \$800,000 each, according to figures recently published by the Treasury Department. The July 17 issue of Labor reports that the figures, based on 1951 tax returns, show these "171 individuals" had "adjusted gross incomes" of one million dollars or more in that year, although they paid an average of only 62% in taxes by using "the many loopholes in the tax laws to make deductions." With the 10% cut in income tax rates last January, these super-rich will get an extra ladle of gravy.

DOWRIES MADE THE DIFFERENCE in organizing an electrical plant in Philadelphia, says Les Finnegan in the July 19 IUE-CIO News. The union had met with only fair success in its effort "by explaining to the girls that if they joined the IUE-CIO they could win the same benefits enjoyed by 8,000 IUE-CIO Philco workers at a plant only a mile away." Then somebody remembered that Philco had "a severance pay clause in its contract." At the next organizing meeting the girls were told that "Under a union contract, such as the one at Philco," they would "all receive dowries if they quit their jobs to get married." It was explained that at Philco "they happen to call it 'severance pay,' in the contract, but the fact is that if you leave your job at Philco you get \$104 for each year of service. Say a girl at Philco works five years and then decides to get married; she automatically collects \$420 — and that's certainly a nice dowry. If she works 10 years and leaves she gets \$1040." Within two days every unmarried girl in the plant had signed up.

AND YOU FOOT THE BILL. Because the "Government has to take one of every two pounds produced," dried milk processors "keep turning the product out twice as fast as it can be sold to

normal users." Some factories that "never processed dried milk before . . . now turn out large quantities" and some "produce solely for sale to the Government." The July 27 Wall Street Journal reveals that "Government buying clips along at between two and five million pounds daily." This dried milk is then unloaded at "cut-price sales to livestock feed mixers" — "nearly half a billion pounds" since early May.

"CUSTOM-TAILORED KILLING" is Gen. William Creasy's specialty. An NEA staff writer, Douglas Larsen, reported on July 17 that Gen. Creasy, new chief of the Army's Chemical Corps, "could come closer to wiping civilization off the globe than anyone attempting the feat with all the hydrogen and atomic bombs in existence." His job is to "constantly improve the efficiency of killing in the field of radiological, bacteriological and gas warfare." Gen. Creasy says: "Actually our weapons are the most humane there are. We can tailor them to the exact needs of the situation. We can kill the enemy or we can just make him sick and knock him out for a fixed period of time. And we don't destroy property." Lucky for property.

ALARM OVER COMIC BOOKS is evident among California parents. The L. A. Times reports that the Parents Teachers Association "Sixth District which includes San Benito and Santa Clara counties has requested the State board of managers to study the possibility of legislative action to outlaw the books that depict sadistic crime, perversion and vulgar sex and horror themes." A civic group, the Co-ordinating Council Committee, in Monterey Park "will recommend that merchants in the city ban the sale of any comic books found detrimental to the youth."

THE INCREASE IN JUVENILE DELINQUENCY can be blamed in large part on comic books dealing with sadistic crime. This is the estimate of Dr. Frederic Wertham, psychiatrist and author of "Seduction of the Innocent," as reported in the July 28 N. Y. Post. Addressing the N. Y. State Assn. of Chiefs of Police, Dr. Wertham referred to a recent tragedy where teen-age boys in Brooklyn kicked a victim in the face, fatally injuring him. He pointed out that comic books stress three actions — tying hands behind the back, kicking a victim in the face, injuring the eyes deliberately. "Fifteen years ago," Dr. Wertham said, "it was unknown for a boy of 12 or 13 to commit murder or rape, or practice torture. But now, you know as well as I do, it's common."

VOLUME XVIII

MONDAY, AUGUST 2, 1954

NUMBER 31

Another Victim of McCarthy



Boston worker Charles Wojchowski (left) is forcibly removed from a Senate caucus room in Washington after fascist Sen. Joseph McCarthy, reopening his smear hearings, ordered his latest victim ejected. Wojchowski, who lost his job with Allis-Chalmers after being subpoenaed, angered McCarthy when he denounced "stool pigeons" and "paid informers."

St. Louis Hate Sheet Peddles Racist Poison

By Special Correspondent

ST. LOUIS — In this era of intimidation and suppression when the very existence of labor, Negro and radical publications are endangered, the journalist jaguars at work in the underworld of American journalism, unabated, continue to grind out their fascist sheets of hatred and bigotry.

Here at the gateway to the great American West, for just two dollars a year you can subscribe to a monthly dose of the most un-American ideology being published in the country today.

A recent addition to the shabby side of American journalism, the White Sentinel, as it is called, serves as the official mouthpiece of the anti-Negro gang—the National Citizens' Protective Association. Edited by the former Boston Communist, turned fascist, John W. Hamilton, the hate outfit's organ is dedicated to "racial integrity—not amalgamation" and printing "the truth that should be printed." It specializes in crude accounts of alleged crimes committed by local Negroes.

Started in August 1951 as a mimeographed bulletin of the Citizens' Protective Association, the Sentinel soon developed into the voice of the national organization and today consists of eight typewriter-paper size pages cheaply printed on poor paper and stapled together at the top left hand corner. Originally carrying two columns to a page, the hate sheet last May instituted

a new format featuring three column pages.

The editorialized columns of the White Sentinel sell Hamilton's pirated theory that the great civilizations recorded in history were achieved and perfected by the white race but were weakened and eventually destroyed by the "curse of race-mixing."

At times the publication acquires something of a pseudo-religious tone with Hamilton declaring that "Separation of the races is the law of God" and a recent contribution from a Protestant minister warning "God will punish anyone who is guilty of violating his strict law regarding inter-marriage."

Members of the NCPA at one time claimed a circulation of more than 2,000 for the Sentinel. A subscription to the anti-Negro paper, incidentally, is included in the five dollar a year membership dues of the organization.

An indication of the extent to which the White Sentinel is circulated throughout the country is revealed in a recent issue which carried contributions by eight bylined bigots representing seven states: Texas, South Carolina, Missouri, California, Tennessee, Mississippi and Arkansas.

Stand of SWP Outlined To N.J. Women Voters

NEWARK, July 27 — George Breitman, Socialist Workers Party candidate for U.S. Senator, today sent the following answers to questions directed to him and other candidates by the League of Women Voters of New Jersey:

Question A: Please indicate the aspects of U.S. foreign policy with which you are most in agreement; those of which you are most critical.

Answer: I oppose the U.S. government's plans to remilitarize Germany and Japan in preparation for war against the Soviet Union and China; its support of reactionary despots and fascists like Chiang Kai-shek, Syngman Rhee and Franco; its aid to the British and French imperialists and its opposition to the colonial struggles for independence in

Asia and Africa; its brutal counter-revolutionary intervention in Guatemala; its refusal to recognize the government of China; its restrictions on trade with Stalinist-dominated countries. In short, I oppose all major aspects of current U.S. foreign policy, which promote war and counter-revolution.

Question B: Do you recommend any changes in the procedures of Congressional investigating committees?

Answer: Yes, changes that would protect witnesses in the exercise of their constitutional and democratic rights, including their rights to think, speak and write freely, associate with whom they please, and to refrain from testifying against themselves or informing against others. But more is needed than the reform of committee procedures. If elected, I would also move to disband the McCarthy, Jenner, Velde and similar committees, whose real aim is not to investigate but to smear, intimidate and suppress liberal, labor, radical and independent political opponents and to prepare the atmosphere in which fascism thrives.

Question C: What specific changes would you recommend in our federal tax structure?

Answer: I recommend ending taxes on all families earning less than \$150 a week. Tax the rich, not the poor. I would raise taxes sharply on all corporations, monopolies and coupon-clippers in order to provide adequate funds for unemployed and farm relief, housing, education, hospitals, free children's nurseries and socially useful public works. (If the capitalists refused to produce because of such taxation, then their

industries should be taken over by the government and operated under the democratic control of committees of workers and technicians.) The tax structure will never be satisfactory, however, until the huge military expenditures are discontinued.

Question D: In what legislation are you especially interested? Please state support or opposition.

Answer: I favor legislation to establish the 30-hour week at 40 hours' pay; unemployed compensation equal to trade union wages; a guaranteed annual wage; government action to reopen idle plants and prevent union-busting by runaway industries; repeal the Taft-Hartley, Smith, McCarran-Kilgore, McCarran-Walter and all other repressive laws and executive orders; deny funds and congressional authorization to all witch hunt committees; outlaw racial and religious segregation and discrimination in all spheres of life; pass AND ENFORCE fair employment practices legislation; reduce salaries of all public officials to the level of wages received by skilled factory workers.

(Answers were limited to 100 words each.)

When a white soldier took his Negro buddy swimming in a segregated pool in Jefferson City, Mo., they were ordered out by a guard, according to the July 9 Call. William Schulten, chairman of the park board, then made a formal announcement that the city officials intended to keep up the segregated set-up "until told to change the pattern by some higher authority."

EXPECT SAFETY RULE CHANGE TO INCREASE AIR CRACK UPS

Airplane crack-ups can be expected to increase as a direct consequence of a June 15 ruling by Civil Aeronautics Board to dump a long-standing safety rule.

American Airlines has been advertising non-stop flights from New York to Los Angeles. However, they have rarely been able to meet the schedule within the required safety limit of eight hours flying time for the pilot. So the CAB voted three to two to extend maximum flying time to ten hours a day per pilot. The Air Line Pilots Association pointed out that it was safer and more sensible to require American Airlines to change schedule than for the CAB to change safety regulations. But the Republican-dominated board thought otherwise.

The CAB argued that an extension of flight time was all right because "flying was less dangerous than taking off and landing." This is ridiculous. No matter how long a pilot keeps his plane in the air he must come down some time, and if he is

drugged by fatigue, the result can be fatal.

Since the CAB refuses to maintain its own safety regulations to protect the public and its pilots, the Air Line Pilots Association will take the matter to court.

The public can help by (1) refusing to travel by air until the CAB reinstates the safety rule, by (2) writing to the CAB Safety District Office, La Guardia Field, Queens, N. Y., and insisting on the eight-hour limit.

The 1955 convention of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People will be held in Atlantic City, N. J., at the end of June.

This will be the first general meeting held in the North since 1950 when the NAACP met in Boston.

Our Readers Take the Floor

Advocates a Law To Protect Homes

Editor:

I've been reading the Militant for almost a year, but this is the first time I've written you. It has to do with a problem facing my sister, the danger of losing her home.

She and her husband dreamed for years about owning their own home, with a big backyard for the kids, and all the trimmings that make for good living. Three years ago they bought a house, put in a lot of their own labor, scrimped on some things and finally came up with their dream.

With three young kids, my sister must stay home and the family is completely dependent on her husband's income. In June he was laid off, and they are rapidly going through their meager savings; unemployment insurance doesn't foot the bill.

They checked around and found some of their neighbors in the same boat. Some of them belong to unions (my brother-in-law doesn't have one at his former job), but most of them feel it's no use taking this problem to their union because unions only deal with conditions of employment.

They talked it over in their local home-owners organization, but nobody had any answers.

Some people already have been forced to sell their homes at a considerable loss, in order to keep body and soul together. If this happens to my sister's family, it will mean the shattering of their lifetime dream and all sorts of miserable little problems — the uprooting of the children from

their established community, and so on.

It seems to me there should be a law guaranteeing every citizen the right to his home. There's a big scandal in Washington over FHA loans to contractors who swindled both taxpayers and home-owners. But nothing is being done to protect the elementary right to a home.

A law should be passed declaring the right to a moratorium on payments by unemployed home-owners, without penalty of any kind. What do you think of the idea of a union labor home-owners league, organized around this program, as a means of uniting all home-owners who work for a living to fight for such legislation? Or do you have some other suggestion?

Mrs. G. L. R.
Brooklyn, N. Y.

Hits Persecution Of Carl Skoglund

Editor:

The witch hunt going on since 1947 has been responsible for many cruelties. During my present lecture tour I have learned about some new cases, told me in confidence, about completely innocent people, not even interested in politics, who have been victimized or fired merely because they said things not acceptable to McCarthy or Brownell, or because their relatives said something.

But few of these cases match in vindictiveness and savagery the treatment that is being given to Carl Skoglund, who has been held on Ellis Island since a few days after I started on my tour last May.

I have had the privilege of knowing Carl the last few years that he has lived in the east. A finer, more upright and principled man I have never met, and am sure I could not meet today in any Washington office.

It makes me grit my teeth to hear that this 70-year old labor leader, who is seriously ill, is incarcerated and threatened with deportation from the country whose best traditions he has upheld for 43 years.

And why? Because he believes that the American working men and women can, should and will build a society free of depression, war, fascism, race hate and insecurity. Because he refused in 1941 to become an informer for the FBI against his friends and fellow workers in the Minnesota labor movement.

I know that the Brownells and McCarthys have no pity. Neither age nor illness moves them one whit. They want not only to deport the foreign-born, but to strip of their citizenship thousands of native-born, old and young, sick and healthy.

But I want to remind them, as I protest their treatment of Carl Skoglund and demand his release from Ellis Island, that they are setting terrible precedents in their handling of political opponents. The crueler they act today, the less compassion they can expect in the future when their political power will be ended and they will have to stand before the bar of judgment to pay for their crimes. As they sow, so shall they reap.

James Kutcher
Ed route from
Seattle to Los Angeles

Effects of Supreme Court's Decision

Editor:

If anybody thought that the Supreme Court decision against school segregation was going to "satisfy" the Negro people or get them to slow up their fight for full equality, they've got another think coming.

New York is one proof of that. If school segregation is bad and unconstitutional in the South, it's bad and unconstitutional in New York too. And as a result the school segregation that exists in the country's largest city because of residential segregation has come under attack here. And I've heard from a friend in Los Angeles that the Supreme Court decision is being used there effectively in the fight to break down the Jim Crow units in the fire department.

Whatever the Supreme Court meant by its decision, and no matter why it reached that decision, the Negro community is going to use it in a serious way to break down Jim Crow barriers.

W. S.
Harlem, N. Y.

Colonial Wars Still Continue

Editor:

An editorial in the N. Y. Times says the Indo-China truce "ends the last current 'hot war' and establishes peace around the world for the first time in 20 years." Prime Minister Nehru says "for the first time (in the post-war era) there will be no war anywhere in the world." And

the Daily Worker editorially talks about "the last shooting war of any proportions." All this will come as news to the people of Malaya who have been fighting for about seven years against British domination and to the people of Kenya whose casualties at the hands of their British oppressors run into the thousands.

N. W.

New York City

On Bishop Oxnham And Free Thought

Editor:

I'm sorry, but I can't go along with the statement in your July 5 editorial that "America needs more men like (Methodist Bishop) Oxnham willing to stand up and boldly defend freedom of thought."

I know that the Bishop has issued some good and powerful attacks on the witch hunters, and I too want to give him credit for that. But I also remember that when he appeared before the House Un-American Activities Committee about a year ago, after it had smeared him personally, he made a number of unpardonable concessions of principle to the premises of the witch hunt.

I'll go along with your statement after Bishop Oxnham defends freedom of thought not only for persons FALSELY accused of harboring and expressing "dangerous thoughts" but also for persons JUSTLY charged with such an "offense," whatever their politics may be. That's the real test so far as I am concerned.

"Dangerous Thinker"
Reading, Pa.