

McCarthy Curb Decided by GOP High Command

By Daniel Roberts

NOV. 22 — A sizeable majority of the Senate favors censuring McCarthy. This fact emerges clearly after ten days' debate in the Senate. The leading censure proponents are conservative Senators, Southern Democrats and Eisenhower Republicans. In addition, such authoritative voices of Big Business as the N. Y. Times and the N. Y. Herald Tribune are firmly opposed to any compromise of the censure resolution. It is evident that the most decisive sections of the American capitalist class speaking through these conservative politicians and editors have decided to curb McCarthy.

In the Senate, with the exception of Sen. Case (R-S.D.), the members of the censure committee did not collapse when McCarthy accused them of being "unwitting hand maidens" of Communism. On the contrary, they demanded that even more stringent measures be taken against him.

Sen. Watkins (R-Utah) asked that his committee's recommendation to censure McCarthy be broadened to include a new count — namely that of smearing the committee in the debate. And Sen. Ervin (D-Miss.) advocated that the fascist Senator be expelled from the Senate. A number of other conservative Senators, highly indignant over McCarthy's charge that "the Communist Party . . . has now extended its tentacles to . . . the United States Senate," spoke in a similar vein.

That doesn't mean that the pro-McCarthy Senators can't

(Continued on page 4)

Fanatic McCarthyite



Fascist Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy (R-Wis.) enters Capitol building in Washington to be greeted by a joyful shrill from a woman admirer (left), who ran up and kissed him. She was one of several thousand frenzied McCarthyites who went to Washington to put pressure on the Senate against the censure of McCarthy now being debated.

Laborite Right-Wingers Meet Stiff Resistance

NOV. 22 — The right-wing of the British Labor Party faces strong resistance in its drive to silence the insurgent Bevan wing of the party. The Attlee leadership, spokesman for the union bureaucracy and other conservative labor forces, wants to establish "unity" in the party for the forthcoming elections by disciplining the left-wing.

The Bevanites showed their strength in the debate and vote in the House of Commons over the Paris accords to rearm Germany. The right-wing leaders favored the pact, and the parliamentary fraction of the Labor Party voted by a narrow margin to support the accords. But, despite speeches in Parliament by Clement Attlee and Hugh Gaitskell, the fraction decided to abstain on the vote.

The N. Y. Times, Nov. 19 reports, "It may be that Mr. Bevan emerging from the shadows with a long, bitter speech in the House of Commons against the accords and the government and demanding negotiations with the Soviet Union turned minor reservations into major ones and contributed to this decision."

What the conservative leaders of the British Labor Party mean by "unity" is revealed in a story in the N. Y. Times, Nov. 30 which sets forth the thinking of the Attlee group. "It will be difficult to unite the party, which means disarming Mr. Bevan until the Attlee group disciplines . . . ten unrepentant rebels." These rebels include four M.P.'s who voted against German rearmament and the three editors of The Tribune, the Bevanite weekly. In a fake show of impartiality the Attlee group also proposes to discipline one right-winger who voted with the Conservatives.

Last month the editors of The Tribune, Michael Foot, Jennie Lee and J.P.W. Mallalieu denounced the strike-breaking policy carried on by Arthur Deakin, head of the Transport and General Workers Union, during the recent dockworkers strike. The At-

Build a Labor Party Now!

THE MILITANT

PUBLISHED WEEKLY IN THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING PEOPLE

Vol. XVIII — No. 48

267

NEW YORK, N. Y., MONDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 1954

PRICE: 10 Cents

Ruling Big Business Circles Make Cold War Policy Shift

ASR Strikers Issue Call For Boycott

By Tom Denver

BROOKLYN, Nov. 23.—Last Wednesday the American Safety Razor strikers launched a campaign to boycott the products of the union-busting run-away corporation. Hundreds of strikers, aided by relatives and sympathetic workers, marched in front of Borough Hall to publicize their case in downtown Brooklyn. At the same time a motorcade of strikers' cars toured the centers of the city.

The demonstrators carried placards calling for the boycott of the following ASR products: Gem, Pal, Personna, Treet, Blue Star and Silver Star razors and blades, Eveready brushes and Ascot cigarette lighters.

THE wide participation of the ASR workers in these actions, in addition to their continued day-to-day slugging on the picket line, shows what tenacity and determination they have in their struggle to win the contract agreed on by the company last August.

At that time the company agreed to guarantee jobs until March 1955 and provide \$1,000,000 in pensions and severance pay when the company completed its plans to move to Staunton, Va.

DELIBERATE RUN-AWAY

The ASR management broke off contract negotiations at the last moment when the union refused to sign a "silence pledge," over what turned out to be a deliberate run-away.

Despite the heroic efforts of the rank and file, the danger is growing that the company will come out on top in its effort to smash Local 475 of the United Electrical Workers (independent). The main weakness of the strike is that the ASR workers are forced to rely solely on their own limited resources.

CAN STOP ATTACK

New York's labor leaders could stop this union-busting attack if they would come to the aid of the ASR workers. This action would strengthen the entire labor movement in the area. New York unionists should demand that their officials break their silence and help the ASR strikers.

New York workers should join the ASR picket line, 315 Jay St. and send money for strike relief to Local 475, UE, 160 Montague St., Brooklyn, N. Y.

Reuther's Strategy Banks on War Boom

By Art Preis

There is one question raised in the past few months that the labor leaders have persistently evaded: Can American capitalism maintain full employment and an expanding economy without war preparations and war? At first glance it seems amazing that the union officials twist and squirm and duck on this question. They have expressed even more confidence in the capitalist system than the capitalists themselves. Why should they hesitate to answer this question in the affirmative?

On Labor Day, 1953, CIO and United Automobile Workers President Walter Reuther, amidst growing mass unemployment in the auto industry, actually declared "dangerous and reckless talk of depression" and called such talk "false communist propaganda . . . being bolstered by the prophets of doom in the American business community." It was the capitalists, you see, who were "prophets of doom." The following New Year's Day, Reuther still chided the "men of

Can They "Co-Exist"?



NAACP Pushes Fight To Save Walter Irvin

In its last-ditch battle to save Walter Lee Irvin, victim of a Jim-Crow frame-up, lawyers of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on Nov. 20

filed a petition with the U. S. Supreme Court. The petition asking for a hearing on its request for a new trial charged that Florida officials had used perjured and fabricated evidence to obtain the conviction of Irvin who for five years now has been in the Florida death house.

These charges were the NAACP's follow-up on the legal move which saved Irvin's life on Nov. 7, the day before he was scheduled to be executed.

FAKED EVIDENCE

The NAACP told the Supreme Court that Florida authorities did not deny faking and suppressing evidence in the "Little Scottsboro Case" earlier this month when the Florida Supreme Court was asked to grant a new trial. The Florida court refused to stop Irvin's execution nonetheless.

One of the faking-of-evidence charges was that Florida officials took a shoe from Irvin's home after his arrest and made a footprint with it at the scene of the crime. Indeed, it is not known if the crime, an alleged rape, ever took place. The woman who cried rape was examined by a white doctor a few hours later. This doctor was never called to the witness stand by the Florida prosecutor, although the defense repeatedly asked that he be called. The prosecution's refusal to allow testimony from this doctor is part of the suppression

PROTESTS MOUNT

In the meantime, it is reported that Governor Johns' office in Tallahassee has been flooded with telegrams protesting his attempt to rush Irvin to the chair. Such telegrams were requested by the NAACP. Individual protests and resolutions from unions and other organizations are still important. Should the Supreme Court refuse a new trial, Irvin's life will be solely in the hands of the Florida officials.

8 CONTEMPT CITATIONS HIT CIVIL RIGHTS OF ALL

DETROIT AUTO WORKERS AID URW PICKETLINE

DETROIT, Nov. 18 — CIO United Automobile Workers members, including several prominent local leaders, this week mobilized picketline aid for a sister union, CIO United Rubber Workers Local 452, at the Midwest Rubber Co. plant in Warren Township of nearby Macomb County.

A company official announced yesterday the plant would be closed "until further notice" after several company executives got into clashes Tuesday with the reinforced picketline. Union spokesmen charged Midwest's president tried to run down pickets with his car and attacked them with a 14-inch wrench.

FOLLOWS SQUARE D

The demonstration of union solidarity is the second within recent months to reveal the determination of militant auto workers here not to allow strike-breaking and scab-herding in this area. In September, UAW and other CIO union members came to the aid of the independent United Electrical Workers strike at the Square D plant here after police used force and violence to herd scabs through the picketline. The UAW is not affiliated with the CIO and is under attack as allegedly "Communist-infiltrated."

The same UAW locals and leaders who took the lead in the Square D action were in the forefront of the present battle, which, however, involves a sister CIO union, Ford Local 600. Detroit Steel Products Local 351, Plymouth Local 51, Chrysler Body Local 212 and Local 490 were among the more than a dozen auto locals represented in the picketline Tuesday. Local 600 President Carl Stellato, 361 President Paul Silver, 51 President William Manley and 212 President Kenneth Morris led their members on the line.

Two pickets have been arrested and arraigned on charges growing out of the picketline skirmishes on Monday. Robert Young pleaded innocent today to assault and battery charges brought by Edward Kurt, a company director and brother of W. A. Kurt, company president. Young was released on personal bond for jury trial on Jan. 6.

Alexander Barbour, secretary-treasurer of the Wayne County CIO Council, also was arrested on an assault and battery charge arising from the same picketline incident on Monday. He voluntarily surrendered himself at the plant Tuesday. The charge was brought by the company president.

On Tuesday, W. A. Kurt, Z. A. Crider, plant manager, and Eugene Wieszorek, maintenance engineer, got the worst of an affray that resulted when Kurt "tried to run us down" with his car, jumped from his car and started swinging a 14-inch wrench at pickets, according to Ray Lisicki, Local 212 member and picketline captain. Kurt admitted he and the other two company officials had armed themselves with wrenches.

REFUSED CONTRACT

The labor struggle began when Midwest Rubber refused to renew the union contract last April at its old plant at 17277 Comant. It had operated non-union for seven years and its first contract expired in July. The strike began with opening of negotiations on April 23. The Warren Township picketline was set up at a new plant the company tried to open up without a contract last week.

See 'Armed Truce' in New Turn

By Joseph Keller

"Co-existence" — Moscow's propaganda term for enduring peaceful relations between the Soviet bloc and the capitalist powers — was treated like a dirty word in the American press until a few weeks ago. Now it is practically a household phrase, fit even for use before the children. This change is more than literary. It marks a major decision of the ruling capitalist circles to lessen the tensions engendered by the "cold war" against the Soviet Union and to come to some sort of formal agreement with the Soviet bloc for what Eisenhower calls a "modus vivendi" — a way of "living together" despite sharp antagonisms and differences.

The degree of the turn was demonstratively indicated by Eisenhower on Nov. 10 at his press conference following the shooting down of an American military plane over Russian-claimed islands north of Japan. Instead of the fire-breathing declarations we had come to expect under such circumstances, Eisenhower maintained a "moderating view" (N. Y. Times) and a "calmer, quieter attitude" (Christian Science Monitor). In Moscow, Ambassador Charles E. Bohlen attended a Soviet social reception only one hour after the plane incident occurred.

WHAT IS NEW

It is nothing new for the Administration to express pious hopes and wishes for peace. What is new is that the White House is publicly adopting a policy which is bitterly opposed by the extreme right-wing of the Republican Party, including elements like Senator Knowland of California and Senator McCarthy of Wisconsin. The administration, at least in its public pronouncements and formal attitude toward the Soviet peace proposals, had previously appealed the right-wing and expressed a "tough" attitude toward Moscow and Peiping.

When Knowland, on Nov. 15, sharply attacked the Administration's foreign policy and called the "peaceful co-existence" proposal of Moscow a "Trojan horse," Eisenhower the very next day replied by again publicly advancing a plea for a "modus vivendi." That same day Secretary of State Dulles also favorably employed the same term and Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson said that the U. S. and USSR had to live in "peaceful co-existence" or "look forward to war." He said, "We are all on the same planet" and "it must be done." Sen. Wiley, Republican chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, on Nov. 19 attacked the "loose talk" of the critics of Eisenhower's "modus vivendi" policy.

MORAL SCRUPLES

Similarly, Bernard Deutch, student at the University of Pennsylvania, allegedly admitted membership in the CP but refused to finger associates or meeting places because of moral scruples.

John T. Watkins, a CIO United Auto Workers official, refused to name Communist Party members or former members, though denying past membership himself. He contended the committee had no right to expose individuals publicly.

The government proposes to punish these witnesses and MIT Professor Lawrence Baker Arquinbeau as well for refusing to inform on their fellow-men.

Democrats — under whose administration the "cold war," "containment" policy and Korean war were instituted — have also come around to the "co-existence" point of view. Sen. Estes Kefauver of Tennessee, said in an article in the Nov. 21 Newark Sunday Star-Ledger: "In this new Congress things will be different. The new majority leader won't be harassing the administration into an 'Asia First,' 'preventive war,' 'massive retaliation' and 'agonizing re-appraisal' approach . . ."

SENTIMENT ABROAD

This attitude of American imperialism's chief political agents of both parties is but a faint echo of the fervent advocacy of "peaceful co-existence" abroad. Churchill on Nov. 9 reiterated his belief "that the powers of the West and East should try to live in a friendly and peaceful way

week to the 40-hour norm. This didn't hamper production. On the contrary, as everyone knows, automation and improved technology generally are increasing man-hour output at a tremendous rate. There are hundreds of thousands of auto workers laid off and increasing hundreds of thousands of school graduates and women workers who would be available to raise total production by increasing the working force under a shorter work week.

Besides, Reuther well knows that the 30-hour week does not refer to the number of hours workers would be permitted to stay on the job. It simply means that 30 hours becomes the maximum hours the workers can be employed without PAYMENT OF OVERTIME. Instead of paying overtime after 40 hours a week, as is the case generally at present, overtime would be required after 30 hours.

It wasn't so long ago that we had a 48-hour week generally, and it was the fight of the CIO in the Thirties which played a great role in reducing the work-

(Continued on page 4)

Watson.

(Continued on page 3)

American Way of Life

Fugitive from Chain Gang

In Philadelphia Edward Brown, a native of the "land of the free," sits in jail waiting. The courts of Pennsylvania have said he must be extradited to Georgia. Sympathizers of Brown have petitioned the Governor to refuse extradition. What follows will be more readily understandable if it is stated here that Brown is a Negro. Here are excerpts of his story as related in a Nov. 12 Memoranda by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People's Legal Defense and Educational Fund.

On April 24, 1937, at Macon, Ga., Brown, having a severely cut finger, hailed a taxicab to take him to the hospital. A woman, under the influence of liquor, hailed the same cab and insisted that she wanted it. Her husband, Julius Kemp, drew a switch-blade knife and attempted to cut Brown. Brown pushed Kemp away, but as he did so, Kemp was cut in the neck while still holding the knife.

The cab driver then drove both men to the hospital, but they were ignored by the attendants for two hours. While waiting, Kemp bled profusely and evidently died from the loss of blood.

The authorities arrested Brown and charged him with murder despite his plea of innocence and self-defense in the accident.

A lawyer was obtained and received from Brown's family between \$150 to \$200. He complained that this sum was not enough and advised Brown to change his plea of not guilty to guilty with the assurance that he would get off with a light sentence. Brown followed his lawyer's advice and was convicted and sentenced to life imprisonment on the chain gang.

Shortly after his imprisonment, Brown testified that double shackles were placed on his feet; his legs were chained together with a twenty foot chain and a fifteen pound ball at the end of it. Also, picks were placed on his legs which impeded his walking and which would hit him on the buttocks whenever he walked. He was beaten constantly with black-jacks and rubber hose; liniment was poured into his rectum, and he was placed in a sweat box, a small structure too small for anyone to stand or lie down in and which was exposed to the heat of the sun with no ventilation, except a two-inch opening leading to the tin roof.

What Is Economics?

By John Thayer

WHAT IS ECONOMICS? by Rosa Luxemburg. Pioneer Publishers, New York, 1954. Price \$1.00 (mimeographed, stiff cover).

Now for the first time the English reader has available Luxemburg's stimulating lectures on Economics. These lectures were given at a school conducted by the German Social Democratic Party every winter from 1903 to 1913. While in prison during World War I she prepared these lectures for publication. Unfortunately some of the chapters were lost at the time of her murder when police ransacked her rooms.

Nonetheless this first installment of those lectures is a treat in itself and it is hoped that the remainder of the extant lectures, that were to have composed a book entitled "Introduction to Economics" will soon be translated for English-speaking students.

What we have here are some 50 pages of Luxemburg's opening lectures. In an inimitably witty and erudite fashion she takes up the question of determining exactly what the science of economics is. To do this she takes

Notes from the News

EINSTEIN IN PLUMBERS LOCAL 130. Following his remark that for a life of intellectual independence he would choose, if he were young today, to become a plumber rather than a scientist, Local 130 of the AFL Plumbers in Chicago made him an honorary member. Einstein thanked the local and wrote that its act "shows me that you did not mind my sharp remark and it might even be that you are in agreement with my motive for it."

RUMORS PERSIST of a coming merger of the International Fur and Leather Workers Union (Independent) into the AFL Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen. Last month Ben Gold, former National Committee member of the Stalinist Party, who for 17 years was president of the Fur Union, resigned. Patrick Gorman, president of the AFL meat workers said that a struggle over organization of leather workers in Peabody, Mass. recently lead to conferences between the two unions over a no-raiding pact on tannery workers. The reports indicate that the proposed merger plan would stipulate acceptance of full membership of Fur Workers into the AFL union without the elimination of any of the present officers and representation on the executive board of the combined union.

IF YOU ARE A NEGRO your chances of losing your life from fire is three times greater than if you are white, government figures on accidental deaths show. Other studies show that this figure is not accidental. The ratio of Negro residents in overcrowded, rickety, firetrap slums is very high as a result of the system of segregation in housing.

"\$180,000 WALL" is the name union workers at the American Sugar Company refinery in Baltimore gave the partition separating Negro from white in the women's dressing room. The figure of \$180,000 was arrived at because that was the sum the company saved every year by paying workers in its segregated Baltimore plant 10 cents an hour less than workers in its non-segregated Philadelphia plant. The wall was

His job was to dig ditches which were waist-high in water and in swamps, infested with poisonous snakes, without any protection.

Brown escaped on December 19, 1937, but was captured June 21, 1940. He did not contest the extradition then because he was assured by the authorities that the entire Georgia penal system had been modernized. But the moment he was taken back to Georgia he was mercilessly beaten, shackled again, and placed in a sweat box with picks, ball and chain.

This time, when Brown was not in a sweat box, he had to carry 14-foot long stringers weighing 175 to 200 pounds and was beaten constantly by guards when he did not walk fast enough. While carrying a stringer, he broke his leg and was denied medical treatment for two days. As a reprisal for telling the doctor how his leg was broken, he was ordered back to work immediately. The guards, as further reprisal, rubbed the soles of his feet with corn cobs and then dipped them into a strong liniment solution.

On September 22, 1940, Brown again escaped and remained at liberty until 1947, when he was recaptured. Although the Georgia prison authorities swore that such treatments did not exist anymore as the chain gang had been abolished and a new system installed, Brown received the same treatment as before. One time he was hung up to a tree by the wrists and beaten until blood dripped from his body. Another time he was staked to the ground and molasses poured over him to attract insects and animals. On this occasion the warden's son urinated in his face. Still again he was stretched in a device resembling the medieval "rack." His back was injured and he spat blood for a week thereafter.

Brown escaped again in 1950. This time he made his way to Philadelphia. He was arrested on March 31, 1952, upon the request of the authorities of Georgia. On April 23, upon requisition of Gov. Talmadge, a warrant for Brown's arrest and extradition to Georgia was issued by Gov. John S. Fine of Pennsylvania.

At the extradition hearings it was revealed that during the periods when he was free, Brown obtained legitimate and gainful employment and conducted himself as a law abiding citizen...

the definitions given by the outstanding capitalist professors of the subject. These she examines closely revealing their shallowness and contradictions. After demolishing the bourgeois definitions she gives a historical sketch and Marxist definition of economics.

In the course of her exposition, Luxemburg calls up for testimony such diverse figures as the Holy Roman Emperor, Charlemagne, and the founder of evolution, Charles Darwin. Her whole treatment of the subject is remarkable for its unshackled style and original illustrations.

No matter how well versed in the subject the reader may be he will learn much from this book. Not only about economics but about Rosa Luxemburg, herself. The personality of this remarkable revolutionist shines forth clearly from these pages. Here is the gaiety, insight, originality and love of truth that so endeared "Red Rosa" to the German workers and to all the internationalists who came to know her. Every class conscious worker should acquire What Is Economics? for his or her library.

established by the company during the war when it first started hiring Negro women. Local 392 of the CIO Packinghouse Workers Union has agitated for years for the destruction of the Jim Crow barrier and the lower wages it symbolizes. The union won its fight this month and the wall has been torn down.

BRYANT BOWLES, head of the racist National Association for the Advancement of White People, has turned to anti-semitism in his fight for segregated schooling. Bowles told a crowd at Jacksonville, Florida: "I'm not fighting the Jews; they are fighting me. They jumped on me first and I am retaliating. They are the people who are telling you (and the Negroes) to mix. The National Association for Colored People is not a Negro organization. The bosses are Jews... I'm willing to help the Negro see that all his descendants will be Negroes." Bowles, who has been convicted of passing bad checks, and is in trouble over \$1,200 in unpaid taxes, faces a hearing January 5th for slugging a Negro postman in the Capital.

TIME IS TAXES. The Kentucky Tax Research Association has figured that it takes the average man two hours and 35 minutes of each day to pay both his direct and indirect taxes.

AGRICULTURAL WORKERS recruited from Mexico are about to be subjected to new persecutions in the Chicago area according to persistent rumors. Many of these workers are technically illegal immigrants. Their "illegal" entry was often accomplished with the aid and connivance of U.S. border officials and big farm interests greedy for cheap, defenseless labor. Some of these Mexican workers have made their way north but the authorities want to keep them in the Southwest as a cheap labor force. The Illinois Division of the American Civil Liberties Union has prepared for the expected drive against these workers by publishing in Spanish and English a pamphlet explaining their legal rights and listing defense agencies to get in touch with in case of arrest.

"\$180,000 WALL" is the name union workers at the American Sugar Company refinery in Baltimore gave the partition separating Negro from white in the women's dressing room. The figure of \$180,000 was arrived at because that was the sum the company saved every year by paying workers in its segregated Baltimore plant 10 cents an hour less than workers in its non-segregated Philadelphia plant. The wall was

"Rags-to-Riches" Rise of Texas Oilman

By John G. Wright

HUGH ROY CULLEN, A Story of American Opportunity, by Ed Kilman and Theon Wright. Prentice-Hall Inc., 1954. 376. viii pp. \$4.00.

This book is about H. R. Cullen, a Texas oil tycoon, one of the richest men in this country, and by this token in the world. As the subtitle indicates it is a rags-to-riches story, a modern biographical version of the once popular Horatio Alger fables. As a success story, despite the somewhat breathless writing of the two biographers, the book limps a little. It is, however, of considerable importance as a political document of our times.

In the course of the last war and the postwar boom years, a new segment has been added to America's ruling families, which numbered three score in the prewar years. Among these newcomers the fabulously wealthy men of the South, in par-

ticular Texas, play a key role. Behind McCarthy and the incipient fascist movement he heads are many of these Texas millionaires. The extent to which Cullen himself has backed McCarthy is a moot question. But it is unquestionable that Cullen's political views and the role he has sought to play are characteristic of this new crop of Southern multi-millionaires. Of Cullen, his biographers say that "he had assumed a kind of benevolent protectorate over the political affairs of his state and country." We shall presently see what is the essence of this "benevolent protectorate."

SUCCESS STORY

A few words about Cullen's success story. He married a rich merchant's daughter, and entered the cotton brokerage business through his brother-in-law in the cotton-pressing business and spent more than 12 years in it, but he ended up as a comparative failure. "I work like hell... but the banks get all the money." He therefore decided to switch to the real-estate busi-

ness, moving from Oklahoma to Houston, Texas.

After seven years he found the real estate business "not so thriving" and decided "to return to the cotton business." But he found himself again stymied and accepted an offer to enter the oil lease business because "he (Cullen) was not doing too well in real estate and cotton."

There followed, in the words of his biographers, "three years of hard and unrewarding effort." In brief, Cullen was still floundering when others of his generation, with his background and connections (he comes from a family of Southern aristocrats) had long since made their fortunes in the course of World War I and the fabulous boom of the Twenties. For 12 years Cullen continued to flounder in oil fields. The break came in 1927 when he entered into a partnership with multi-millionaire Jim West, who had made millions in cattle and lumber and wanted to make some more millions in oil, "to make a success of that, too."

This partnership was the essential ingredient in Cullen's rise to fame and fortune. By 1929 there were "huge oil reserves for Cullen & West," a combine that "had become an established oil operator." Many a wildcatter made far richer strikes than Cullen ever did in his own wildcating days but died a pauper for lack of "opportunity," that is, for lack of a millionaire partner.

From a millionaire in 1929 Cullen went on to become a multi-millionaire in the depression years. He has since "given away" hundreds of millions, that is, instead of waiting till he died, he formed the Cullen Foundation, while still alive, a "charitable foundation... exceeded only by the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations."

BEHIND THE SCENES

Cullen's biographers openly boast that their hero is a "behind-the-scenes power in national politics" and that over the years "he had built up an indefinable but nonetheless effective group of political leaders, chiefly in Congress, who were loyal to him and his ideals." Senator Dirksen of Illinois is mentioned as one of this group.

Cullen was one of the chief promoters of the Tideland Bill. Among other political feats accredited to him by his biographers are: helping the Dixiecrats in 1948; selecting Eisenhower as Republican candidate as early

as 1949; getting Stassen "to get in the Presidential race to stop Taft;" engineering "the revolt of the Texas Republicans which paved the way" for Eisenhower's nomination in July 1952; and, more recently, all-out support for the Bricker amendment.

A Republican since 1928, Cullen has been an avowed opponent of "creeping socialism" in Washington. He abominated Roosevelt; and after initial illusions about Truman and his bunch of socialists in Washington, "Rugged individualist" Cullen, like his colleagues, discovered socialism even in individuals such as Stassen. "Mentally," Cullen told Stassen, "you are a conservative, but at heart you are a socialist." Stassen had once flirted with the idea of "World Union," and this branded him forever as a "socialist emotionally" in Cullen's eyes. And not in Cullen's eyes alone.

The power wielded by the new Southern tycoons is illustrated graphically by the pilgrimages made to Texas by every likely candidate for the 1952 Republican presidential nomination. Eisenhower went to Houston (Dec. 7, 1949) so did Taft, MacArthur, Stassen, even the "dark horse" Dirksen. "He (Cullen) talked it over with the Senator, suggesting that he (Dirksen) should keep in line for the Vice

Presidential nomination. Dirksen agreed . . ."

"KING-MAKER"

In March 1951, Cullen wrote a letter to Eisenhower then in Europe: "I feel certain that you will be offered the Republican nomination for President in 1952 . . ." When Taft came to Houston in March 1952, he asked Cullen to visit him, cleared the hotel room when the "oil man" entered, and asked "How does it look to you, Roy?" "I admire you, and I believe in you Senator — but I don't think you can win, even if you are nominated," Cullen answered.

These heart-to-heart talks with presidential candidates, the snatches, quite revealing, from the "Dear Ike" — "Dear Roy" correspondence, the details about Cullen's maneuvers in Texas and on the national scene disclose a king-maker in action. Perhaps the biographers exaggerate Cullen's role, perhaps not. Here again, we are not dealing with an individual aberration. Cullen is one of the new draft of the men of wealth and power in the South who really rule this country, make important decisions and seek to impose them. Like Cullen, they are reactionary to the core. If Cullen is any indication, they really intend, as they already have done, to throw their weight around.

THE MILITANT ARMY

Literature Agent Janet MacGregor reports good sales of recent issues of the Militant in Detroit. She writes, "Bob and Dot sold nine copies of the Nov. 1 Militant at the Wayne County Council meeting. Then Sherry, Rita and Dot went to the NAACP meeting here and sold 13 Trumbull Park pamphlets and one paper. Six Militants were sold at the Ford meeting.

BEHIND THE SCENES

Cullen's biographers openly boast that their hero is a "behind-the-scenes power in national politics" and that over the years "he had built up an indefinable but nonetheless effective group of political leaders, chiefly in Congress, who were loyal to him and his ideals." Senator Dirksen of Illinois is mentioned as one of this group.

Cullen was one of the chief promoters of the Tideland Bill. Among other political feats accredited to him by his biographers are: helping the Dixiecrats in 1948; selecting Eisenhower as Republican candidate as early

ASR picket line. 30c donations was given to comrades distributing the paper.

Seattle Literature Agent Helen Baker writes, "Jack, Ann and Clara broke new ground again in Militant sales. In one apartment house they sold six copies to old age pensioners and received an eight cent donation. They sold at four homes in the block and then stood on a street corner there and sold eight more copies. They received a donation of one dollar from a young soldier who stopped with them. He had never seen the paper before. Also they met a former subscriber on the corner and he gave them a six months renewal.

"All together they sold 18 papers, received a dollar and eight cents in donations and sold one six months renewal. A very successful afternoon. They feel that we can open that area up with a new route. We have so many route possibilities that we are going to have to get our customers in to help us sell to other customers.

"Charlie B. took his usual six copies. He tells me that any time he doesn't show up at work with the paper there is a general complaint from his customers. Frank and I combined three of the old routes into one Sunday's work. We sold nine papers and two copies of Fourth International."

Many thanks to C. S. of Cleveland, Ohio for his donation of \$2 to help print the Militant.

NEW YORK CHRISTMAS BAZAAR

Hand-made leather belts — Enamel over copper jewelry — Guatemalan hand-strung & knotted beads — Children's toys and books — Women's & children's clothes — Hand-made aprons, hats & purses — Appliances — and many other articles.

Sat. Dec. 11, from Noon on

Militant Hall
116 University Place
(near Union Square)

REFRESHMENTS

For only \$1.25 you can get a one-year subscription to the Marxist quarterly, Fourth International, 116 University Pl., New York 3, N. Y.

First English Translation

WHAT IS ECONOMICS?

By Rosa Luxemburg

54 pages (mimeographed, stiff cover)

\$1.00

Order from
Pioneer Publishers 116 University Place
New York 3, N. Y.

Subscription \$5 per year;
\$1.50 for 6 months. Foreign:
\$4.50 per year; \$2.25 for 6
months. Canadian: \$3.50 per
year; \$1.75 for 6 months.
Bundle Orders: 5 or more
copies \$6 each in U.S., 7c
each in foreign countries.

THE MILITANT

Published Weekly in the Interest of the Working People
THE MILITANT PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION
116 University Pl., N. Y. 3, N. Y. Phone: AL 5-7460
Editor: JOSEPH HANSEN
Business Manager: DOROTHY JOHNSON

Vol. XVIII — No. 48

Monday, November 29, 1954

A Stalinist Hangman Dies

Andrei Y. Vishinsky, who dropped dead from a heart attack Nov. 22, will not be mourned by class-conscious workers who know his real record. He was one of the infamous executioners of the Bolsheviks who led the November 1917 revolution that overthrew capitalism in Czarist Russia.

During the revolution, Vishinsky, as a right-wing Menshevik, fought on the side of the capitalists against the workers and peasants. He remained on the side of the counter-revolution throughout the bitter civil war period when the young workers state was assailed from all sides.

It was not until definitive victory was won under the guidance of Lenin and Trotsky, that Vishinsky finally decided that a career under the capitalist foes of the revolution no longer looked promising. He then switched sides. So far as can be ascertained, that was some three years after the revolution that he helped try to crush.

Things did not begin to look up for this careerist until after the death of Lenin. Then, as a member of the bureaucracy that began to take on more and more of a counter-revolutionary coloration he found his natural place as a follower of Stalin.

It was in the Thirties, when Stalin reached the point of making counter-revolution a deliberate policy, that Vishinsky came into his own. He was assigned the butcher's job of helping to liquidate the entire generation of Bolsheviks who had made the revolution. Here his true talents found monstrous expression.

He was the chief prosecutor in that series of macabre frame-ups that have gone down as the greatest of all time — the Moscow Trials. His role in the script prepared by the GPU was to denounce such figures as Zinoviev, Kamenev, Radek, Bukharin, etc. He made no effort to really prove them guilty of the crimes charged against them. He simply screamed at them as they "confessed," according to the demands

placed on them by Stalin's secret political police, calling them "mad dogs," "cursed vipers," and so on. Although he was an expert in Soviet law, he denied the defendants the most elementary rights, and they with a pistol at their heads, after having been broken and demoralized, cooperated with him in this foul performance.

Vishinsky's most strenuous vituperations were reserved for Leon Trotsky and his son Leon Sedov, the main victims of the Moscow Trials. He accused them of masterminding an alleged plot to "overthrow" the Soviet state and murder its principal figures, above all Stalin.

Trotsky succeeded in exposing the trials as flimsy frameups even while they were being held. But this did not change anything for Vishinsky or Stalin. The victims were shot just the same or sent to a living death in the concentration and slave-labor camps.

A distinguished impartial commission headed by John Dewey, the well-known philosopher and teacher, made an exhaustive examination of the Moscow Trials and proved them to be deliberate frameups. That too was disregarded by Vishinsky and Stalin.

The answer of the GPU to this exposure was to push forward with their plans to kill Trotsky and his son. They succeeded in both projects. Sedov died under mysterious circumstances in 1938 while in a Paris hospital for an ordinary operation. Trotsky was murdered by a Stalinist agent two years later in Coyoacan, Mexico.

Vishinsky's reward was a series of high posts, the most well-known of which was his assignment to the United Nations as head of the Soviet delegation.

Now he departs from the scene having succeeded as a Stalin careerist. He will be known in history for his principal achievement — participation in the murder of a whole series of the Soviet Union's greatest and most devoted revolutionary leaders.

Apologist for International Thievery

According to the Nov. 21 N. Y. Times, Rep. Emanuel Celler (N.Y.) — a liberal Democrat, no less — took a "critical look at Morocco and found it not yet ready for independence." What were his complaints? The Moroccan people, said Celler, can not be trusted to protect U.S. military bases or to protect the Jewish minority.

Both the American people and the Jewish minority in Morocco should repudiate Celler's attack on Moroccan independence. He performs a tremendous disservice to both people by endorsing continued French colonial rule in their name. That rule is so brutal that any one who supports it can only win the undying enmity of the Moroccan people and millions of other North Africans.

U.S. Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas presents a graphic picture of that oppression in Look Magazine, Oct. 19.

"The Moroccan program . . . of the French is mostly a curse and burden to the Moors," says Douglas. "The French have fastened a milking machine on Morocco and operated it for the benefit of the French."

He then gives the details. The Moors are serfs in their own land. Farmhands get no

more than 50 cents a day. The disease rate is so high the French keep it a secret. Malnutrition is rife. Slums are the order of the day. "Child labor appears in a vicious form." Repression is savage.

Justice Douglas describes his visit to a rope-making plant, one of a number run by a French syndicate. "Most of the workers were Moorish children from 6 to 12. They worked by the piece, making 20 cents to 50 cents a day. A French foreman or overseer stood over them with a long leather lash, using it with fervor on the laggards. The lash is, indeed, the symbol of French rule in Morocco.

"The French know how to use terror in Morocco. It is part and parcel of their political rule."

But here is what gives the lie to Celler's claim that he is concerned with the Jews. "Moors doing the same work as Frenchmen get a lower wage," says Douglas. "A similar discrimination is made against the Jews [by the French]."

In the name of the Jewish, Arab, French and American people, demand that the French troops get out of Morocco. Let the Moroccan people determine their own fate.

The McCarthyite Intellectuals

Informed political circles in New York believe that James Burnham, renegade from the socialist movement, wrote McCarthy's speech which opened the fascist Senator's side of the debate on censure. In that speech McCarthy charged the Watkins Committee members with being "unwitting handmaidens" of the Communist Party. The arguments and the manner of presentation closely parallel those developed in Burnham's writings and speeches since he became a spokesman for the fascist Senator.

Burnham is not the only intellectual to join the McCarthyite camp. On Nov. 16, the N. Y. Times published a letter attacking the Watkins Committee recommendation to censure McCarthy. In addition to Burnham the letter was signed by a number of other formerly prominent liberal and radical intellectuals, including Frank Hanighen, George Schuyler and Eugene Lyons. They were joined by William F. Buckley Jr., who represents a younger generation of McCarthyite intellectuals.

The defense of McCarthyism by these writers shows a significant trend among middle-class intellectuals. The intellectuals in the era when capitalist rule was stable upheld the institutions of capitalist democracy, defended civil liberties, and wished to harmonize the conflict between the capitalist class and the working people by means of enlightened reforms.

But the stability of U.S. capitalism is coming to an end. Since World War II, Wall Street has suffered one defeat after another at the hands of the colonial revolution. A depression is again brewing in the U.S. This points to a social crisis and a show-down struggle between Big Capital and the working people in the years ahead.

A feeling of insecurity about the future of the country already grips large sections of the middleclass. The Utopian dream of the liberals

is exploding. There is no way of achieving a middle-of-the-road solution that provides freedom and universal well-being under capitalism. Fascism or workers' power, are in the long run the only real alternatives shaping up for the country.

In anticipation of the irreconcilable struggle ahead, a section of the capitalist class is pushing forward the fascist movement headed by Joseph McCarthy. In tune with this development, Burnham and other intellectuals are rejecting the traditional concepts of liberalism. They step forward as ideologists of fascism.

Burnham in particular has been prepared to play this role for many years. In 1940 he deserted the socialist movement and its program of democratic rule of the working people through a workers and farmers government. But he did not return to the illusions of liberalism.

Instead he rapidly became a propagandist of unbridled reaction, as Joseph Hansen, who reviewed Burnham's degeneration, showed in the magazine, *Fourth International*, Sept.-Oct., 1946. Hansen predicted that should native fascism gain strength in the U.S., Burnham might well show up in that camp. That prediction has now been confirmed to the hilt.

However, although the ideology of liberalism is inevitably becoming bankrupt, the fascists will not be the sole, nor even the principal gainers. The working class movement will win its share of young intellectuals, repelled by the decay of capitalism and disgusted with the support given to the witch hunt by a big section of the liberals.

These intellectuals will step forward as genuine defenders of democratic rights and will link the struggle for freedom with the workers' struggle for a socialist society.

THE MILITANT

You'll Be Safe after Mere 5,000 Years

Entered as second class matter March 7, 1944 at the Post Office at New York, N.Y., under the act of March 3, 1943.



VISCOUNT HINCHING-BROOKE (South Dorset, Cons.) asked whether the Prime Minister would be prepared to make clear, at some suitable time, his attitude on the question of a treaty or pact of renunciation by the leading world powers on the first use of the atomic or hydrogen bomb.

SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL said he considered that should be considered along with all other proposals to lift the cloud of peril from the world.

MR. PHILIP NOEL-BAKER (Derby South, Lab.) asked whether that suggestion had not been embodied in the Anglo-French memorandum which the United Nations Commission was now considering.

SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL: That is very good.

MR. PAGET (Northampton, Lab.) asked how many of those explosions it would take to make the atmosphere lethal, and whether they were cumulative.

SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL said he believed they were cumulative, and certainly an undue number of them might have very serious effects. He was informed, however, that 5,000 years was about the limit of the time during which the atmosphere would be afflicted. [four emphasis.]

There was some laughter at this, and Sir Winston Churchill


added that he did not mean to ask certain of its citizens to run special risks on behalf of all. This is the principle behind compulsory military service.

He adds sardonically: "Americans who were hurt would doubtless be properly indemnified. All the same, the taxpayer would benefit greatly, since the lowering of costs of the test operation would pay for any probable casualty list many times over."

In Washington, civil defense officials instructed the Senators before heading for shelters in a bombing to turn out all lights, close windows and doors, place classified documents in safes, etc.

"That's all very fine," said Sen. Kilgore (D-W.Va.), "but what makes civil defense think anything or anyone will be left to lock up if the Capitol is hit by a nuclear bomb?"

Paris Mailmen Strike



Staging a demonstration for higher wages, some 3,000 postal workers cause a traffic tieup at the Place Vendome as they march in Paris. They struck for 24 hours in protest against domestic wage policy of Premier Pierre Mendes-France, who has been in U.S. recently to work out plans for German rearmament deal.

...Cold War Policy Shift

(Continued from page 1) with each other." If the Prime Minister didn't use the phrase "peaceful co-existence," commented the N. Y. Times, "he said what amounted to the same thing."

Attlee, head of the British Labor Party and former Prime Minister, didn't shun the word. He said the choice is "between co-existence and co-death." Nehru of India said the alternatives are "co-existence and co-destruction."

NO SUDDEN DECISION

The new openly declared policy to seek a formal "modus vivendi" with the Soviet Union is no sudden decision by America's top rulers. As far back as Jan. 12, 1953, in an article by Joseph Hansen, the Militant suggested the possibility of a turn in U.S. diplomatic policy because of the logic of the position of U.S. imperialism as the outgrowth of the unpopular Korean war, a position that would impel Eisenhower to "make up for the bad diplomatic position he inherits" from the Truman administration.

Ever since the stalemate in Korea, when U.S. military might was unable to smash the colonial revolution in the Far East, the leading capitalist circles have been considering the question of "co-existence." But, as Joseph C. Harsch, special correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, wrote on Nov. 4, "the story really begins with August of 1953 when the western world learned that the Soviet Union had succeeded in setting off a thermonuclear explosion, a hydrogen bomb."

We are told by the leading capitalist papers that, as the Nov. 16 N. Y. Times put it, "Peaceful co-existence" does not mean in Washington what it seems to mean in Moscow." It adds: "All it means is that the principal protagonists in the world agree not to murder each other. In fact, co-existence in this sense has been in operation between the United States and the Soviet Union ever since they emerged as the principal powers in the world."

According to R. H. Shadford of the Scripps-Howard newspapers, writing from Washington on Nov. 22, the capitalist powers see the possibility only for "a 'cool' peace—something less dangerous, if not perfect, than the continuous threat of atomic and hydrogen-bomb war." While Thomas L. Stokes, in the Nov. 19 N. Y. Post, writes: "We face perhaps a long period of a sort of armed truce, which is what 'peaceful co-existence' likely would mean . . ."

DID KREMLIN "SHIFT"? The turn in the U.S. policy is represented as a result of some sort of shift in the Kremlin's position. Max Lerner of the N. Y. Post, on Nov. 14 speaks of "what has shifted the Russian position" and says "all peoples can live together provided none are aggressive."

This is the childish view that wars are the result of some people just being plain mean, ornery and "aggressive"—"bad guys" versus "good guys." But what material reason is there for the Soviet Union to start a war at all—at any time? She has no economic incentive—no pressure of unsold goods, no weight of amassed capital seeking profitable investment, no army of unemployed or the threat of one if it does not maintain war production.

It is the U.S. which reveals all the material factors driving to war and it is capitalism as a system that breeds war.

This is the childish view that wars are the result of some people just being plain mean, ornery and "aggressive"—"bad guys" versus "good guys." But what material reason is there for the Soviet Union to start a war at all—at any time? She has no economic incentive—no pressure of unsold goods, no weight of amassed capital seeking profitable investment, no army of unemployed or the threat of one if it does not maintain war production.

It is the U.S. which reveals all the material factors driving to war and it is capitalism as a system that breeds war.

FOR ENDURING PEACE There can be no lasting peace under capitalism—only an armed truce that will sooner or later be broken under the pressure of capitalist economic and social crisis. This truth must be brought home to the workers everywhere. The road to permanent peace is through the socialist revolution, the struggle of the workers to end capitalist anarchy and to establish a decent cooperative, planned economic order.

Anything that weakens that class

struggle or impedes it helps to

destroy the one weapon that can

forever wipe out imperialist war.

Civil Liberties Group To Hold Meeting

The Emergency Civil Liberties Committee has announced a meeting on "Your Stake in the First Amendment" for Thursday, Dec. 2 at 8:30 p.m. at the Biltmore, 2230 Church Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y. The meeting will be chaired by J. Raymond Walsh, former Harvard professor, CIO economist and radio commentator. Speakers will be Corliss Lamont, philosopher and defendant in a contempt of the Senate case of Frank Serri, president of the New York City chapter of the National Lawyers Guild.

A FRAME-UP of Major General Mohammed Naguib is apparently under way in Egypt. On Nov. 14, the ruling military junta headed by Colonel Abdul Nasser removed Naguib from the presidency. Nasser charges Naguib with a conspiracy to overthrow the junta and replace it with a regime of the Moslem Brotherhood. He also charges that Naguib has the support of the "Communists." Last February the junta ousted Naguib as President of Egypt but restored him in April. Naguib is feared by the Army for the demagogic appeals he has made to workers and peasants. Since April he has been virtually a captive of the junta. Nasser's recent coup follows friendly agreements between the Egyptian and U. S. governments. It recommends a "period of marking time in the advance towards self-government."

THE CHURCHILL GOVERNMENT IN BRITAIN has accepted the recommendation of the British Guyana Constitutional Commission not to reinstate elections in this colony. "The argument is simple," says the Manchester Guardian, Nov. 4. "Any election held in the near future would be won again by the People's Progressive party." In 1953, the British government ousted the legally elected PPP government headed by Dr. Cheddi Jagan, on the charge that it was pro-Communist. Since the commission believes that no changes in the constitution would keep the PPP from being elected, it recommends a "period of marking time in the advance towards self-government."

By George Lavan

The recent elections demonstrated what was already well known. The Negro people — like the rest of the working class — voted overwhelmingly Democratic. However, there was an interesting exception to this in Maryland. There the Negro vote decisively defeated the Democratic candidate for governor, H. C. Byrd, and re-elected Republican Governor McKeldin. How unusual this is may be gathered from the fact that McKeldin is the first Republican to be re-elected governor in Maryland's history.

Why did this take place when the Negro vote was being cast 70 to 80% for Democratic candidates in the rest of the country?

The mask of liberalism, that the Democratic Party wears outside of the Deep South in the effort — still successful — to capture the working class and Negro vote, slipped in Maryland.

Democrat Byrd and his supporters — especially in the rural sections — in the heat over school integration and the Baltimore school demonstrations lost the mask of liberalism and revealed their ugly Jim Crow features.

The anti-Negro propaganda of the Democrats and Byrd's statements against school integration — all Maryland except Baltimore has Jim Crow school-going — convinced the Negro people.

Republican McKeldin rolled up a 94,000 plurality in Baltimore. Some Negro districts that normally vote three-to-one Democratic were reported voting as high as ten-to-one Republican. Statewide McKeldin won by a margin of 62,000.

This stunning defeat of the Democratic white supremacists undoubtedly gave great satisfaction to the Negro people and to all enemies of Jim Crow. But what perspective for political action does it open? Actually none.

In the struggle for equal rights the Republican Party is no alternative to the Democratic, nationally, or in the South and border states.

This was demonstrated by the political conniving that went on back in 1948 between the Dixiecrats and the Republicans. Again in 1952 Eisenhower's use of such racists as Governor Byrnes of South Carolina showed how deep any Republican "principles" on Jim Crow went.

Regionally the case is proved by the action of the Republican Party in neighboring Delaware. There a situation similar to that in Maryland existed. The activity of the National Association for the Advancement of White People around Milford brought the issue of school segregation into the election campaign. Did the Republican politicians conduct themselves more honorably than the Democrats?

At the height of the Milford fight the Delaware Attorney General told the court that both parties were pledged to the enforcement of the law and that if the court ordered integration resumed in Milford both U. S. Senators from the state (one a Republican, the other a Democrat) would lead the ten Negro children by the hand back into Milford High School.

Unfortunately he had failed to consult the "honorable" Senators. Both of them indignantly repudiated any such idea. In fact the Republican Senator was even more violent in repudiation than his Democratic opposite number.

No, the Republicans are no alternative in the fight of the Negro people against Jim Crow. Only the creation of a new political party — built by the Negro people and the labor movement — can open a real avenue for effective political warfare against Jim Crow.

Racial Terror at Trumbull Park

By Howard Mayhew

16 pages 10 cents

Order from
PIONEER PUBLISHERS
116 University Place
New York 3, N. Y.

Subscribe!

Start your subscription now. Clip the coupon and mail it today. Send \$1.50 for six months subscription or \$3 for a full year to The Militant, 116 University Place, New York 3, N. Y.

Name _____ Street _____ Zone _____

City _____ State _____

\$1.50 Six months \$3.00 Full year New Renewal

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 1954

NUMBER 48

VOLUME XVIII

Dewey, Lucky Luciano And the Tresca Killing

Patient following of clues in the case of Carlo Tresca, the working class leader murdered in New York in 1943, strongly indicates an official cover up or wilful refusal to solve the case.

A recent example of this was demonstrated in the exchange between magazine writer Michael Stern and George M. Shapiro, attorney for Governor Dewey.

Michael Stern not long ago told how "Lucky" Luciano, racketeer, had offered in 1943 to give Governor Dewey the names of Tresca's slayers in exchange for freedom. Dewey freed Luciano in 1946 without any reference to this offer of three years earlier. The Tresca case continues in police files as "unsolved."


Stern's statement about Luciano's offer of information on the Tresca case was attacked by George M. Shapiro, attorney for Governor Dewey, as "wholly false statements."

In the October Socialist Call Michael Stern replied to Dewey's attorney: "Luciano told me voluntarily of his offer in an interview in Rome (I had not mentioned the Tresca case to him), and his statement was subsequently confirmed by high-ranking law enforcement officials who knew about the offer when it was made."

LUCIANO PARDON
Involved in the controversy also were details about Dewey's mysterious pardoning of Luciano. Dewey cut forty years from the sentence of the now deported racketeer. The explanation that this was in return for secret aid rendered by Luciano to the war effort have now been thoroughly exploded.

Also raised in the Stern-Shapiro controversy was the question of why Dewey did not testify at the Kefauver hearings when one of the subjects which Senator Kefauver wished to question him about was the Luciano release.

Dewey's attorney has made much of the fact that last year



CARLO TRESCA

Pay-off on Stalinist Support to Harriman

By Harry Ring

Since Nov. 5 the Daily Worker has been making an extensive analysis of the election returns. The main purpose of this analysis is to prove that the Stalinist policy of supporting the Democratic Party was vindicated by the results.

The analysis boils down to these principal points: Labor played a decisive role in the Democratic victory, particularly with its solid bloc votes in such key industrial states as Michigan and Pennsylvania; this vote expressed labor opposition to McCarthyism and the Big Business policies of the Republican Party; the Democratic victory was not as decisive as it could have been because the Democrats failed to put forward a program for peace and jobs, and in fact permitted the Republicans to appear as the "peace" party.

The analysis boils down to these principal points: Labor played a decisive role in the Democratic victory, particularly with its solid bloc votes in such key industrial states as Michigan and Pennsylvania; this vote expressed labor opposition to McCarthyism and the Big Business policies of the Republican Party; the Democratic victory was not as decisive as it could have been because the Democrats failed to put forward a program for peace and jobs, and in fact permitted the Republicans to appear as the "peace" party.

The conclusion drawn from

this by the Stalinists is that the unions must organize for the 1956 elections so that they will become a strong enough force within the Democratic Party to compel it to adopt a program for peace and social progress.

According to Stalinist reasoning, the Democratic leadership simply doesn't understand on which side their bread is buttered and it is Labor's job to bring them to their senses.

George Morris explains in the Nov. 14 Worker, "The truth is that the gains were small compared to what was possible. They came despite the stupid campaigning (our emphasis) of the Democrats who countered the demagogic 'peace' cries of the Republicans with attacks on the administration as not warlike enough."

This is followed in a Nov. 16 article by John Blumberg on "Why No Landslide" for the Democrats. The answer lies, he says, "above all in the stubborn refusal of the Democratic spokesmen and nominees to budge


from their adherence to the Stalinist line, deeper penetration into the Democratic Party by the unions is required to force the capitalist leaders of the party to change their course."

Down through the years, one of the persistent illusions prevalent in the American radical and labor movement, has been the utopian scheme that "due to the peculiarities of our two-party system," with its direct primary device, Labor will some day capture the Democratic Party. This is one idea that the Stalinists do not share. Even if it were a realizable goal the Stalinists would want no part of it. Their objective is not to dislodge the capitalists from control of the Democratic Party but to establish an alliance with them.

This was explained last May in the Stalinist magazine, Political Affairs, which declared that a progressive new administration would be established "by an exceedingly broad class alliance — the working class, the poor and middle farmers, the urban middle class, non-monopoly groupings of capital, and the less reactionary circles of Big Business."

Stripped of its "theoretical" pretensions, this is identical with the policy of the labor leaders who have in effect already achieved such a political alliance by their successful efforts to date in keeping the workers harried to the Democratic Party.

If this alliance is maintained



Copyright 1954 — THE MACHINIST

From The Machinist (IAM-AFL)

... Reuther's War-Boom Strategy

(Continued from page 1)

connection with his opposition to the shorter work-week.

But doesn't Reuther's demand for the guaranteed annual wage for auto workers with more than two years' seniority imply a real struggle? Not necessarily, from Reuther's point of view.

It is evident that Reuther thinks he can sell the GAW plan to the employers and avert a serious battle. He has already assured the corporations that his plan would not cost them a "red cent."

By that he means that the employers will be able to avert an economic crisis and mass unemployment, thus reducing to a minimum any outlays under the GAW program.

What is his reasoning for this assumption? He doesn't believe that capitalism needs to face an inevitable crisis, IF IT RESORTS TO BIGGER AND BIGGER WAR-PRODUCTION.

But the union bureaucrats like Reuther, tied to the capitalist profit and war system, don't dare to say openly that their program for solving the capitalist unemployment problem is to support Wall Street's war program and its aims for world domination. They pretend that they are for war preparations for "defense" and that this is purely coincidental with their efforts to put forward some solution to the unemployment problem.

WHO SIDETRACKED IT?

"Now comes Mr. Stern's reply.

As the Tresca Committee's chairman, it is my business simply to stress one point: Since we have confidence that Mr. Stern reported the Luciano interview correctly, and since we can see no reason why Luciano should have lied to him in his voluntary, unsolicited declaration about the Tresca matter, the question remains: To what higher-up was Luciano's offer made? Or, as Mr. Stern worded it in his first statement, 'If the Governor did not receive and reject that proposal who did sidetrack it and thus block the course of justice?'

WHO SIDETRACKED IT?

"Now comes Mr. Stern's reply.

As the Tresca Committee's chairman, it is my business simply to stress one point: Since we have confidence that Mr. Stern reported the Luciano interview correctly, and since we can see no reason why Luciano should have lied to him in his voluntary, unsolicited declaration about the Tresca matter, the question remains: To what higher-up was Luciano's offer made? Or, as Mr. Stern worded it in his first statement, 'If the Governor did not receive and reject that proposal who did sidetrack it and thus block the course of justice?'

WHO SIDETRACKED IT?

"Now comes Mr. Stern's reply.

As the Tresca Committee's chairman, it is my business simply to stress one point: Since we have confidence that Mr. Stern reported the Luciano interview correctly, and since we can see no reason why Luciano should have lied to him in his voluntary, unsolicited declaration about the Tresca matter, the question remains: To what higher-up was Luciano's offer made? Or, as Mr. Stern worded it in his first statement, 'If the Governor did not receive and reject that proposal who did sidetrack it and thus block the course of justice?'

WHO SIDETRACKED IT?

"Now comes Mr. Stern's reply.

As the Tresca Committee's chairman, it is my business simply to stress one point: Since we have confidence that Mr. Stern reported the Luciano interview correctly, and since we can see no reason why Luciano should have lied to him in his voluntary, unsolicited declaration about the Tresca matter, the question remains: To what higher-up was Luciano's offer made? Or, as Mr. Stern worded it in his first statement, 'If the Governor did not receive and reject that proposal who did sidetrack it and thus block the course of justice?'

WHO SIDETRACKED IT?

"Now comes Mr. Stern's reply.

As the Tresca Committee's chairman, it is my business simply to stress one point: Since we have confidence that Mr. Stern reported the Luciano interview correctly, and since we can see no reason why Luciano should have lied to him in his voluntary, unsolicited declaration about the Tresca matter, the question remains: To what higher-up was Luciano's offer made? Or, as Mr. Stern worded it in his first statement, 'If the Governor did not receive and reject that proposal who did sidetrack it and thus block the course of justice?'

WHO SIDETRACKED IT?

"Now comes Mr. Stern's reply.

As the Tresca Committee's chairman, it is my business simply to stress one point: Since we have confidence that Mr. Stern reported the Luciano interview correctly, and since we can see no reason why Luciano should have lied to him in his voluntary, unsolicited declaration about the Tresca matter, the question remains: To what higher-up was Luciano's offer made? Or, as Mr. Stern worded it in his first statement, 'If the Governor did not receive and reject that proposal who did sidetrack it and thus block the course of justice?'

WHO SIDETRACKED IT?

"Now comes Mr. Stern's reply.

As the Tresca Committee's chairman, it is my business simply to stress one point: Since we have confidence that Mr. Stern reported the Luciano interview correctly, and since we can see no reason why Luciano should have lied to him in his voluntary, unsolicited declaration about the Tresca matter, the question remains: To what higher-up was Luciano's offer made? Or, as Mr. Stern worded it in his first statement, 'If the Governor did not receive and reject that proposal who did sidetrack it and thus block the course of justice?'

WHO SIDETRACKED IT?

"Now comes Mr. Stern's reply.

As the Tresca Committee's chairman, it is my business simply to stress one point: Since we have confidence that Mr. Stern reported the Luciano interview correctly, and since we can see no reason why Luciano should have lied to him in his voluntary, unsolicited declaration about the Tresca matter, the question remains: To what higher-up was Luciano's offer made? Or, as Mr. Stern worded it in his first statement, 'If the Governor did not receive and reject that proposal who did sidetrack it and thus block the course of justice?'

WHO SIDETRACKED IT?

"Now comes Mr. Stern's reply.

As the Tresca Committee's chairman, it is my business simply to stress one point: Since we have confidence that Mr. Stern reported the Luciano interview correctly, and since we can see no reason why Luciano should have lied to him in his voluntary, unsolicited declaration about the Tresca matter, the question remains: To what higher-up was Luciano's offer made? Or, as Mr. Stern worded it in his first statement, 'If the Governor did not receive and reject that proposal who did sidetrack it and thus block the course of justice?'

WHO SIDETRACKED IT?

"Now comes Mr. Stern's reply.

As the Tresca Committee's chairman, it is my business simply to stress one point: Since we have confidence that Mr. Stern reported the Luciano interview correctly, and since we can see no reason why Luciano should have lied to him in his voluntary, unsolicited declaration about the Tresca matter, the question remains: To what higher-up was Luciano's offer made? Or, as Mr. Stern worded it in his first statement, 'If the Governor did not receive and reject that proposal who did sidetrack it and thus block the course of justice?'

WHO SIDETRACKED IT?

"Now comes Mr. Stern's reply.

As the Tresca Committee's chairman, it is my business simply to stress one point: Since we have confidence that Mr. Stern reported the Luciano interview correctly, and since we can see no reason why Luciano should have lied to him in his voluntary, unsolicited declaration about the Tresca matter, the question remains: To what higher-up was Luciano's offer made? Or, as Mr. Stern worded it in his first statement, 'If the Governor did not receive and reject that proposal who did sidetrack it and thus block the course of justice?'

WHO SIDETRACKED IT?

"Now comes Mr. Stern's reply.

As the Tresca Committee's chairman, it is my business simply to stress one point: Since we have confidence that Mr. Stern reported the Luciano interview correctly, and since we can see no reason why Luciano should have lied to him in his voluntary, unsolicited declaration about the Tresca matter, the question remains: To what higher-up was Luciano's offer made? Or, as Mr. Stern worded it in his first statement, 'If the Governor did not receive and reject that proposal who did sidetrack it and thus block the course of justice?'

WHO SIDETRACKED IT?

"Now comes Mr. Stern's reply.

As the Tresca Committee's chairman, it is my business simply to stress one point: Since we have confidence that Mr. Stern reported the Luciano interview correctly, and since we can see no reason why Luciano should have lied to him in his voluntary, unsolicited declaration about the Tresca matter, the question remains: To what higher-up was Luciano's offer made? Or, as Mr. Stern worded it in his first statement, 'If the Governor did not receive and reject that proposal who did sidetrack it and thus block the course of justice?'

WHO SIDETRACKED IT?

"Now comes Mr. Stern's reply.

As the Tresca Committee's chairman, it is my business simply to stress one point: Since we have confidence that Mr. Stern reported the Luciano interview correctly, and since we can see no reason why Luciano should have lied to him in his voluntary, unsolicited declaration about the Tresca matter, the question remains: To what higher-up was Luciano's offer made? Or, as Mr. Stern worded it in his first statement, 'If the Governor did not receive and reject that proposal who did sidetrack it and thus block the course of justice?'