

LABOR ACTION

Independent Socialist Weekly

AUGUST 20, 1951

FIVE CENTS

IN SEARCH OF A FORMULA:

Civil Liberty and Stalinism

... page 6

Point Four's Achilles-Heel

... page 2

Why U. S. Controls Europe's Economy

... page 3

National Labor Daily Paper Is In Sight

Labor may have its own national daily paper soon.

With the opening of offices in four important Midwestern cities, the drive for 30,000 subscription pledges for a labor daily is now in full swing.

"We should know by early fall whether there is sufficient demand on the part of union officers and union staff representatives to justify the publication of a daily newspaper," according to Sam B. Eubanks. He recently declined to run for re-election after ten years as executive vice-president of the American Newspaper Guild, in order to direct the campaign for the labor daily full-time.

Both AFL and CIO internationals are taking the initiative in urging locals to sign pledges to subscribe for their officers. State and city central labor bodies and individual unionists are also taking part in the drive.

The campaign is financed out of profits made in Pittsburgh last fall, when 12 AFL newspaper unions and the Newspaper Guild joined for-

(Continued on page 2)

AFL Heads Deliver Stab-in-the-Back To Labor Unity, Pull Out of ULPC

By LARRY O'CONNOR

The top leadership of the American Federation of Labor has driven a knife into the back of the American labor movement. The Executive Council of the AFL at its recent meeting in Montreal decided by an overwhelming majority to break up the United Labor Policy Committee which has united most of the labor movement in its relations to the government.

The ULPC was formed last December as a reaction to the wage freeze, to the complete domination of the mobilization agencies by big business, and to the contempt with which the labor leaders were treated by war mobilizer Charles Wilson and others when they tried to influence policies.

The ULPC organized the dramatic walkout of the labor leaders from all mobilization agencies, a walkout which threw the wage-price stabilization machinery into crisis. At that time they organized a United Labor Conference in Washington, D. C., which brought together representatives of city and state AFL and CIO bodies, as well as those from the International Association of Machinists and some of the most powerful railroad brotherhoods.

That meeting and the actions of the ULPC were widely hailed throughout the labor movement as first steps toward the unification of the labor movement in America. Every mention of labor unity drew cheers from the labor bureaucrats assembled in Washington. And all over the country, city AFL and CIO bodies joined to form local United Labor Policy Committees for the purpose of organizing the local battle for a better Defense Production Act and other measures.

Now the AFL bigwigs propose to break up this whole progressive development.

The first news reports on their action; as we go to press, do not give their detailed excuses—if they have any as yet—but it is quite clear that their reasons are the old, hoary, narrow, selfish and

(Turn to last page)

"Haired Over"



William Green

All N. Y. Candidates on the Spot As City Bans CIO Police Union

By L. G. SMITH

A big union battle is shaping up in New York City over the attempt of the Transport Workers Union (CIO) to organize the city police force.

The importance of the battle is twofold. On the one hand, it involves the right of policemen to organize themselves for the purposes of collective bargaining. In addition, it involves the political relations between the labor movement in New York City and the political machines which dominate city politics. This aspect takes on special importance in view of the election for president of the City Council which takes place this fall.

The TWU started its drive among the city cops some time ago. The then police commissioner, Thomas J. Murphy, who made his way to fame in the Hiss trial, made a public statement to the effect that he was against the organization of the cops into a union, and urged the policemen not to join.

Mike Quill, president of the TWU, attempted to bring Murphy's action before the National Labor Relations Board as a violation of the right to organize, but the NLRB turned down the complaint on the ground that it has no jurisdiction over municipal employees. Murphy was later promoted when Truman nominated him to a federal judgeship.

On Tuesday, August 7, Quill announced that he is ready to charter a policeman's local of the TWU. He claimed that some 4,500 cops had already paid a month's

this order was issued, Monaghan put out with essentially the same reasoning voiced by Murphy before him. "In my opinion," he said, "the Police Department is very much akin to the armed forces of this nation. No one should be in a position to have his loyalty divided..."

Blast Monaghan

And later he stated "I am in sympathy with anything the policemen may wish to offer me and my door is always open for anything they want to talk to me about."

Both the AFL and CIO in New York City have reacted unitedly and vigorously to the edict prohibiting police organization. This unity is most gratifying in view of the fact that the TWU is in an active struggle with the AFL's American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees which has already organized policemen in 62 American cities.

A joint letter to Monaghan, signed by the heads of the AFL and CIO central labor bodies states: "While you pretend to take this action

When asked on what basis

(Turn to last page)

Why Don't You Read Your Own Paper?



From the prospectus for the National Reporter

AFL Leaders Knife Unity — —

(Continued from page 1)

reactionary reasons which have prevented labor unity for the past fifteen years.

As reported by Louis Stark for the New York Times (August 15), they can be summed up in the statement that the CIO has been profiting by the AFL-CIO collaboration, and the AFL has not. As one unnamed AFL official

Not in the Headlines

Who Gets the Gravy?

It's not the ordinary farmer who'll be hurt by a rollback of prices on meat. As Iowa's *Des Moines Register* explained editorially on July 11:

"Except for a short period in 1949, the margin between the purchase price of stocker and feeder cattle and the sale price of cattle for slaughter has been extremely high since the war. . . .

"The big feeder has been hurt most by the rollback, because in many cases he had a large inventory of high-priced calves and thin cattle in his lots when the rollback became effective. But he had also made the biggest profits during recent years of wide margins.

"The ordinary farmer neither realized these extraordinary profits—nor is he taking a serious beating from the rollback."

Coincidence

During August the Senate Agricultural Committee headed by Gillette put in a report on its series of hearings held last year. The report goes into proving in detail that it is not the farmer but the food processors (large companies) that benefit from price-gouging. It takes a slap at the Food and Drug Administration's failure to look out for the consumers' interests and at the Justice Department's "lack of diligence" in permitting bakery combines to fix bread prices. It singles out the District of Columbia itself as one spot where flagrant price-fixing to raise the price of milk (by the Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association) has been successful and not countered.

The investigating committee was also planning to look into the cost of sugar when it was suddenly abolished by the chairman of the full committee, Senator Ellender, Democrat of Louisiana. By coincidence, Louisiana is the state where the big sugar interests are most powerful.

Expert

"It is refreshing these days to read a book about Russia and the Russians by someone who is not . . . a member . . . of one of the former resistance movements within the Communist Party like the Trotskyites or the Mensheviks."—Drew Middleton, one of the N. Y. Times' Russian "experts," reviewing a new book by Edward Crankshaw, Aug. 12.

For those who don't know, we should explain that the Mensheviks split from the Communist Party about the same time as Drew Middleton.

Interested? For information about the INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE

Write to 114 W. 14th Street
New York 11, N. Y.

put it, "The CIO has utilized its advantage in recent months because of our cooperation to strengthen itself in various ways and in certain government organizations. We persist in our desire for real organic unity of the two organizations and we reject functional unity." This leader further described the ULPC as a "fake united front."

These statements, it should be noted, do not charge that the CIO has benefited in organizational or jurisdictional struggles at the expense of the AFL, or that it has taken some "unfair" advantage of the ULPC for jurisdictional purposes. It may seem that what is involved most immediately—is some kind of jealousy by the AFL bureaucrats over government posts or influence acquired by CIO leaders. Stark mentions specifically that the AFL top hierarchy "is also rather irked at what it considers the prominent activity of CIO representatives in the Economic Cooperation Administration."

SQUABBLERS

From the information available, it is clear that the AFL leadership is motivated only by the narrowest considerations. What difference can it possibly make to the workers in either AFL or CIO whether the bureaucrats from the one or other organization hold down the most influential government posts?

A squabble over such matters only emphasizes once more the futility of the whole idea that the labor movement can achieve important gains by placing some of

its leaders in government offices under the over-all control of the businessmen and capitalist politicians who run the two big parties and hence the government.

The AFL Executive Council voted eleven to two for the proposal to break up the ULPC. The two against were Daniel J. Tracy of the Electrical Workers, and George M. Harrison of the Railroad Clerks. Voting for were Meany, Tobin, Green, Woll, Winter, Harry C. Bates, Birthright, Doherty, Petrillo, McFetridge, and David Dubinsky (of the Ladies Garment Workers Union).

The action of the AFL Executive Council is quite typical of the "thinking" of this "neck which just grew and haired over." They showed once more that they are incapable, except under the extreme and direct pressure of political and economic events, of acting in the broad interests of the working people as a whole.

LIBERAL PARTY HURT

Among them, perhaps only David Dubinsky is worth special mention. Dubinsky is the real leader of the Liberal Party in New York. The greatest single organizational weakness of this party has been its inability to unite the whole labor movement in New York behind it. By voting with the rest of the AFL bureaucrats on this question, but not only aided in knifing labor unity as a whole, but at the same time stabbed his own political organization in the back. The chance of getting real CIO support for the Liberal Party has certainly been greatly set back by this action.

NY Bans Police Union—

(Continued from page 1)

in the interests of public policy . . . you actually are no different than any other anti-union employer who says: 'Unions are fine, but not in my industry.'

The papers in the city state that the reaction of the cops to Monaghan's order range "from amazement to bitterness." According to the TWU, no withdrawals of applications for membership have been received since the union-busting order went out, and numerous new applications have come in. Union officials refer to Monaghan as "Quill's secret weapon."

Turn to Court

The only "labor" opposition to the TWU's drive comes from the Patrolmen's Benevolent Association, the "line organization" which has traditionally lobbied for policemen's benefits, but it is a well known fact that this outfit has always been under the thumb of the high brass in the department.

The TWU is going ahead full blast with its union drive. Policemen's working conditions and pay are notoriously poor and, perhaps even more important to many men on the force, without union protection they have been and continue to be subject to completely arbitrary disciplinary action by the higher-ups.

As we go to press, the TWU has asked the courts for a restraining order against Monaghan's action.

In this it is being supported by the American Civil Liberties Union, which has filed a brief as "friend of the court," urging that the right to organize should not be denied to municipal employees any more than to any other workers.

Where's Halley?

The political aspect of this struggle may well turn out to be even more important than the strictly trade-union question. Mayor Impellitteri, who represents a strong section of the Democratic machine in New York, is backing Monaghan to the hilt. The Republican candidate for president of the City Council has also issued a statement backing Monaghan, and it is hardly to be expected that the Democratic candidate will take a different stand.

That leaves the Liberal Party as the only other major contender for the office. To date, neither the party nor its candidate, Rudolph Halley, has taken a stand on the issue. Yet the outcome of the campaign may very well be vitally affected by this issue.

In the past the New York City labor movement has been notoriously split in its support of different parties and factions in city politics. And even though organized labor is unitedly against Monaghan's action, it is not guaranteed that the union leaders will permit this question to determine their stand in the election.

The AFL council's action is in the form of a recommendation to the AFL's national convention to be held in San Francisco starting September 17. With the top leadership overwhelmingly in favor of breaking up the ULPC, there is little likelihood that the officials who represent the AFL unions at this convention will overturn the decision. Yet such has been the strength of the united-action sentiment throughout the ranks and the leadership of the labor movement, that it is quite possible that a strong sentiment of dissatisfaction if not open revolt will make itself felt at the convention.

It is of the utmost importance that this feeling be expressed as strongly as possible. Central Labor Councils and even local unions could shower the convention with resolutions opposing this action. A strong expression of such sentiment would go a far way to expressing the solidarity of the ranks of the labor movement, and of their desire to continue and expand the areas of joint action, even if it fails to reverse the reactionary decision of the top AFL bureaucracy.

And It Will

The CIO-PAC has endorsed a labor party.

It was the CIO-PAC of Ontario, Canada, and it endorsed the Commonwealth Cooperative Federation (CCF), the Canadian sister of the British Labor Party.

We're working so that it can happen here.

S-x Shall Not Rear Its Etc.

On May 7 the *Ceylon Daily News* published a letter about the Stalinist attitude to love:

"Love has passed through three historical stages. In feudalism, the relation between the sexes is the master-slave relation, with the woman always listening to the man and sticking to him like a piece of property. In capitalist love, affection is bought and sold. The woman sells her beauty, youth and flesh for luxury and comfort offered by the man. Finally, comes the new Democratic Love. Man and woman have no mercenary relations, and therefore the highest form of love is reached. . . . This love is sombre, intellectual and definitely revolutionary. . . . Under the trees on moonlit nights, small groups of schoolmates argue serious problems. You will never see a boy and a girl pair off to look at the moon or whisper to each other in typical bourgeois manner. If enemy agents try to engage us in amatory affairs, they are quickly rebuffed. . . . When we look up at the sky, we can only think how happy the moon must be to shine on Stalin. . . ."

You're Invited

to speak your mind in the letter column of L.A. Our policy is to publish letters of general political interest, regardless of views. Keep them to 500 words.

Documentary On a Documentary

The State Department last year made one of those 15-minute documentaries on the little village of Bridgehampton, L. I., purporting to show democracy in action in a "typical American village," for foreign consumption.

It showed the people fund-raising for a new flagpole, arranging to maintain a lifeguard at the beach, and similar very democratic activities.

Last Friday, August 10, the film was shown at the Bridgehampton town meeting.

At the same meeting, a special committee of the village council made a report. It had been appointed to investigate the housing conditions of the migratory farm workers in the area, after a shack fire killed two children a year ago.

The committee, headed by the Presbyterian minister, found that the several hundred farm workers who come in annually to pick the potato crop were forced to live in sub-standard accommodations, characterized by lack of sanitary facilities, ramshackle construction, fire hazards and general dirt. President Thayer

read it and it was filed.

Nothing is going to be done about it by either state or county.

But the State Department's film about democracy in action in the typical American village didn't have any room for the migratory workers and their problems, since first things (lifeguards, flagpoles) must come first.

Council President Thayer, like a good American, opined that maybe the government knew best what it was doing: "The picture left out many things of importance but I don't feel qualified to pass judgment. The film was made to be shown abroad and there may be propaganda aspects I don't understand."

Obviously not. "Others," adds the N. Y. Times, "reluctant to be quoted by name in this village of 1500 persons," [democracy in action] "asserted flatly that the film failed to give a true picture but glossed over the main problems—that of the migrants among others."

The film was not a howling success—in Bridgehampton.