



ISSUED BY THE INTERNATIONAL TRANSPORT WORKERS' FEDERATION.

CROSSLAND FOSSE
BOX END
KEMPSTON
BEDFORD
England

Affiliated Unions in :

ALGERIA
ARGENTINA
AUSTRALIA
BELGIUM
CANADA
CHINA
DENMARK
DUTCH EAST INDIES
DUTCH GUIANA
ESTONIA
FINLAND
FRANCE
GREAT BRITAIN
HOLLAND
HUNGARY
ICELAND
INDIA
INDO-CHINA
IRELAND
KENYA
LUXEMBURG
MADAGASCAR
MOROCCO
NEW ZEALAND
NORWAY
PALESTINE
RHODESIA
RUMANIA
SOUTH AFRICA
SWEDEN
SWITZERLAND
TRINIDAD
TUNISIA
YUGOSLAVIA

Relations with unions in :

CHILE
CUBA
ECUADOR
EGYPT
MEXICO
UNITED STATES

Other relations in :

AUSTRIA
BRAZIL
BULGARIA
CZECHOSLOVAKIA
GERMANY
GREECE
ITALY
JAPAN
LATVIA
POLAND
PORTUGAL
SPAIN
and other countries

WELFARE PRODUCTION INSTEAD OF WARFARE PRODUCTION

A SLOGAN FOR THE NEW WORLD

HUMANITY at war threatens to succumb under a contradiction so destructive of the social fabric as to be without parallel in history. It is the contradiction of ever-growing production on the one hand, and ever-greater destruction on the other. This contradiction gives birth to the greatest paradox of all times—production on a vast scale of the means of destruction becomes a prime condition of survival. That is the grip in which total war holds the foes locked in mortal combat. That is the pass to which the world has been brought by the social contradictions inherent in the capitalist system.

Enormous productive power, with its brilliant technical achievements and great scientific and organizing skill, is applied to the wholesale slaughter of lives and destruction of material and moral values. Never before was the degree of employment of both men and equipment so high, not even at the peak of capitalist prosperity. The enforced idleness of men and equipment which marked the periods of economic depression is an economic luxury which can no longer be allowed. As if by magic these factors have become indispensable to the productive apparatus now that this has been converted into an efficient apparatus of slaughter. Economic calculation, once complicated to an irrational extreme, has been reduced to an astonishingly simple formula: so much material resources plus so much man-power equal a modernly equipped armed unit. Thus functions the all-embracing war economy, the pith in the backbone of a society engaged in a total war.

This folly promoted to supreme wisdom can only result in something salutary if under the blows of fate the peoples demand a socialistic society. The simple economic lessons of the war confront them with the obvious question: What prevents that marvellous productive apparatus that supplies so perfectly the all-demanding needs of war from functioning equally well for ordinary human needs? Or to put it in terms now familiar: Why is welfare production impossible if warfare production is such a simple and universally realized possibility?

The answer to this question, which presents itself to the peoples ever more forcefully, is given by the productive process itself to which they are harnessed to-day in larger numbers than ever and for longer hours than in normal times. They are no longer systematically led to disinterest themselves in the functioning and the result of the labour process in which they are engaged. The contrary is the case. In the interests of the war effort such emphasis is laid on the decisive importance of the productivity of their labour, that shortcomings for which they are not to blame are as it were forced upon their notice. They are the shortcomings inherent of necessity in a productive process whose ultimate purpose is to produce not the greatest possible satisfaction of needs but the widest possible margin of profit. These shortcomings, in other words,

are inseparable from a productive system based upon private property in land and means of production.

With the exception of the Soviet Union, warfare production is at present still everywhere conducted according to principles allowing play for the profit motive. It is true that under the impact of war more or less effective limits are placed upon the size of profits; in Britain and the United States, for example, the limits are still wide, in Australia narrow. But profit is maintained as the motive of production. As long as this remains the case, the productive process, as part of the war effort, will continue to reveal fundamental shortcomings; the workers will continue to find themselves hampered in the full use of their powers; society will lack the basis upon which alone the promise of post-war freedom from want can become reality.

As long as profit remains decisive for the volume and the structure of production, freedom from want will remain an unattainable end; economic life will run its fateful cycle of boom, crisis and slump; improvements in the material conditions of the masses gained in one period will be lost in the next; widespread unemployment will at intervals ravage society; and the insecurity of existence of the great majority of the people will compel the states to use in their national and international policies the same means which have brought about the present war. And

ultimately some or other group of big powers will, in their economic harassment, again resort to warfare production in peace time and thus render a third world war inevitable.

There is only one way out for humanity: to take in this critical phase of social development the step from warfare production to welfare production. If this war does not cause the step to be taken, there will be witnessed after it a single cycle of warfare production, beginning in a state of depression, then an upward movement culminating in a boom period, after which society will be seen to plunge into the crisis of a new world war, compared with which the present will seem to have been mere child's play.

Humanity now has its opportunity of building a new world by a complete revision of the foundations of society. It could have no grimmer, harsher teacher than the iron necessity of warfare production. If he is to be banned for ever from the school of humanity, proof will have to be given that his lessons have been learnt. Then the inevitable outcome of the contradictions of the capitalist system, warfare production, will have to be replaced by its opposite in principle and object, welfare production.

Capitalism or Socialism, war or peace—never in history has the alternative presented itself so peremptorily. The slogan of our time is:

WELFARE PRODUCTION INSTEAD OF WARFARE PRODUCTION!

THE FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM IN DISTRESS ANXIETY ABOUT ITS CONTINUANCE AFTER THE WAR

It began at the recent International Labour Conference in New York, where the Acting Director had to defend himself, on 4th November, against criticism of his Report from the employers' delegates of the United States and the British Empire. The criticism was directed against "the absence in the Report of any trumpet call to free enterprise." The American spokesman of Big Business said: "I do not find anywhere in the Report a statement that the world also needs the widest extension of the free enterprise system which has been so largely responsible for the progress of the last century." In his plea for the continuance—without mentioning the word—of Capitalism he exclaimed, though no one present had expressed any such intention: "Let us not kill the free enterprise system and substitute for it the dead hand of State Socialism."

We do not know with certainty whether the Director's Reports of earlier periods contained the statement of which the absence was deplored by Big Business, nor, consequently, whether it could be regarded as a traditional passage in the Report and one whose omission this time could therefore not pass unnoticed. It is nevertheless significant that on this occasion explicit reference should be made to the matter from two such influential quarters, which thereby applied, as it were, for a certificate of good

behaviour for the capitalist system in case it should be needed to stake out a claim in the future.

What we do know is that in the meantime there has been great activity on both sides of the Atlantic designed to ensure the continuance of free enterprise after the war. In the United States the National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce have launched a campaign against alleged labour proposals for taking over the management of industry. The Automobile Manufacturers' Association ran a full-page advertisement as if the big Automobile Workers' Union was trying to "obtain control" of industry and take away its management from "the men who know how to make things."

On the European side of the Atlantic the General Council of British Shipping has declared that it "has made its primary objective the maintenance of private enterprise as the first essential to a prosperous and efficient mercantile marine during and after the war." The Council already has grounds for satisfaction. A scheme for the ultimate disposal of government-built tonnage to shipowners, offered by the British Government, guarantees the actual transfer of such vessels to private ownership after the war.

But if you give these gentlemen an inch they want a yard. At the annual meeting of the Chamber of Shipping of the United Kingdom at the end of

February a resolution was passed on the beloved theme of post-war reconstruction—read restoration. The sponsor said, among other things, that “one of the mistakes of the last peace had been that we were not prepared for it. . . . We (the shipowners) have to think out the ways and means of restoring private enterprise in shipping, after the present intense State control. . . . We definitely want re-establishment of private enterprise at the earliest possible moment”

That these vested interests should present such claims need not perturb us. They have always shown themselves deft at looking after their affairs. But a question that may preoccupy us is their attitude towards the war if things should not go to their liking. Their statements sometimes seem to imply that they might be reluctant to carry on the struggle for victory. Thus a spokesman of British shipping, writing under the editorial pseudonym of “Look-out Man” in *Fairplay* of 8th January last, moaned: “When the rest of the world is brought into the picture the outlook is even less promising for our industry, unless, by the grace of God, not years but only months, are to be required to bring this war to an end.”

But let us suppose—to take again the case of shipping—that at the end of the war no one dared to take over the property of “the men who know how to ship things,” then British and American and other

shipping interests would remain undisturbed. They would continue to be promoted in accordance with the time-honoured principles of free enterprise. This we do not wish to deprecate here, for as an interested party we feel ourselves suspect of bias—whereas the shipowners alledgedly have only progress in view. But when it is Captain H. L. Vickery of the U.S. Maritime Commission who draws a very realistic picture of a post-war world in which the capitalist character of shipping and other business enterprise is retained, we cannot be blamed if the picture is not a very attractive one. This spokesman of American shipping interests said at the end of last year: “When the war ends, we will control nearly all of the merchant shipping in the world, and should be in a position to secure a just share of the world trade. While no one expects altruism among shipping men, there will be an opportunity to achieve stability for a period of a few years, at least, if our maritime rivals are willing to do business.”

Then we shall again have a business world, even a Big Business World, a world with a number of inherent contradictions, which must inevitably lead to another world war. Then again we shall . . . but shall we? The gentlemen who rule the world to-day are not so confident about it.

SOCIALIST TESTIMONY ON THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF CAPITALISM

. . . That capitalism has been the carrier of the greatest economic progress ever witnessed in the history of the human race the socialists are the last to deny. Indeed, there has scarcely ever been a more enthusiastic eulogy of the revolutionizing achievements of the capitalist system than that contained in the Communist Manifesto.

The bourgeoisie, states the Manifesto, “has been the first to show what man's activity can bring about. It has accomplished wonders far surpassing Egyptian pyramids, Roman aqueducts, and Gothic cathedrals; it has conducted expeditions that put in the shade all former exoduses of nations and crusades. . . . The bourgeoisie, by the rapid improvement of all instruments of production, by the immensely facilitated means of communication, draws all, even the barbarian, nations into civilization. . . . The bourgeoisie, during its rule of scarce one

hundred years, has created more massive and more colossal productive forces than have all preceding generations together. Subjection of Nature's forces to man, machinery, application of chemistry to industry and agriculture, steam navigation, railways, electric telegraphs, clearing of whole continents for cultivation, canalization of rivers, whole populations conjured out of the ground—what earlier century had even a presentiment that such productive forces slumbered in the lap of social labour?”

The question arises, however, whether the institutions of private property of the means of production and of private enterprise will continue indefinitely to foster economic progress, or whether, at a certain stage of technical development, they turn from being promoters into becoming shackles of further advance. The last is the contention of the socialists. . . .

(From “On the Economic Theory of Socialism,” by Prof. Oskar Lange).

AMERICAN LORRY DRIVERS ON BURMA ROAD

Seventeen hundred American lorry drivers were driving on the Burma Road, keeping as long as possible the lifeline of liberty open to the gallant defenders of China and daily defying death from Japanese bombers.

This was revealed by a member of the Pennsylvania Utility Commission, who said these union workers volunteered to give up their comparatively safe jobs at home at the call of the Government to take up the dangerous duty of keeping supplies rolling to China.

The men were working under the leadership of Clarence Bowman, a former Philadelphia truck driver. American drivers were needed for the job because they were tough enough to keep going under punishing conditions.

The Japanese raiding planes exacted a heavy toll of death on the Burma Road. More drivers are on the

way to the Orient to take the place of their comrades who have fallen and still more are ready to go and do their bit toward smashing the new imperialists.

U.S. RAILS' PROFITS IN 1941 VERY LARGE

The *Wall Street Journal* of Mid-January devoted three columns to an optimistic review of railroad profits for 1941.

The Santa Fe earned \$11.44 on its common stock, after paying interest on its bonds and dividends on its preferred stock. In 1940, it netted only \$2.69 per share on common stock.

The Baltimore and Ohio, after paying “all fixed and contingent charges” boosted its profits by almost 400 per cent.

So it went down the line, to the Southern Railway, which reported that after paying interest on its tremendous bond issues, it had “the largest net income since 1929.”

TRANSPORT IN GREAT BRITAIN DURING THE WAR

GOVERNMENT CONTROL OF THE RAILWAYS

by John Marchbank, General Secretary of the National Union of Railwaymen

With Great Britain at total war the question of an efficient transport system by land and sea assumes, possibly for the first time, in the minds of most of those in authority, a sense of real importance. It has now become apparent that the success of our whole war effort will depend more upon an efficient transport system than upon any other thing, because without it neither troops, foodstuffs, guns nor ammunition can be transported from place to place in this country, nor from this country to other parts of the world where they are required. It has, of course, been well known to us that an efficient transport system is a country's soundest asset in peace time, but it has taken a world war to emphasise the importance of creating this asset. Equally it has been well known to us that one of the most important pre-requisites of an efficient transport system is to have the sympathy and wholehearted co-operation of the staffs employed in the various forms of transport, whether by rail, road or sea. It has also been established that such sympathy and co-operation can best be obtained when men and women are organized voluntarily within their respective trade unions, nationally and internationally, and when they work under agreements governing their rates of pay and conditions of service which have been freely negotiated between their employers and their trade unions. In this connection, our transport workers have been particularly fortunate in that their trade union organization has been in advance of any industries, especially during the past twenty years. During that period great progress was made in this country, the British Empire and in America.

Immediately the war commenced the Government assumed control of the railways of Great Britain, as they did in the war of 1914-1918, operating them through the medium of a Railway Executive Committee upon which sat the former General Managers, and a representative of the Minister of War Transport who has appointed this Executive as his agent for the purpose of giving directions under the Control Order. Without going into a detailed explanation it will be sufficient to say that certain financial arrangements have been approved by Parliament for meeting the cost of operating the railways, the last agreement setting down an annual figure of £43,000,000 which is to be paid to the proprietors, as a rental.

The railway staff are well organized, and since 1920 there has existed a number of agreements governing the rates of pay and other conditions of service of the half million employees. In addition, there is an agreed scheme of negotiating machinery, having statutory authority, which has functioned satisfactorily, even under war conditions. It is generally admitted that the scheme of negotiating machinery is extremely efficient and democratic, consisting as it

does of Local Departmental Committees, Sectional Councils, a Railways Staff Conference composed of a small number of representatives of the companies and the trade unions, a Railway Staff National Council and, finally, a Railway Staff National Tribunal composed of an independent Chairman, a representative from a panel nominated by the Railway Companies, and a representative from a panel nominated by the Railway Trade Unions. To meet the requirements of industry under war conditions the Government, shortly after the outbreak of war, set up a National Arbitration Tribunal, with power to give decisions which were binding upon the parties involved. The railway industry, however, retains its peace-time machinery of negotiation, the only real change being the fact that the Railway Staff National Tribunal now gives Awards which are binding.

Naturally, railway work in war-time differs vastly from that performed in the piping days of peace. In the first place, more than eighty thousand railway employees are serving with the armed forces and, as a consequence, a large number of women have been brought in to fill certain posts formerly occupied by men. Secondly, there are the difficulties, and they are many, of working during the black-out period, and during enemy activity. Already hundreds of railwaymen have received decorations and awards, recommendations and commendations arising from courageous acts performed during aerial bombardments, such as extinguishing fires in buildings and wagons containing food and explosives, and in rescue work. Thirdly, there have been difficulties incidental to food rationing, because of the need to make exceptional arrangements to meet the requirements of men who work on the continuous shift system, or who work lodging turns which, owing to the urgent and complicated nature of war transport, have increased. In addition, the companies' premises and property have to be protected against fire caused by enemy action, and employees are under a legal obligation to share in the work of firewatching. The men have similar obligations in regard to their own homes. The rationing of clothing, also, created a problem for those members of the staff who are supplied with uniform. However, the many problems which have arisen have been tackled by direct negotiation with the companies through the negotiating machinery.

The movement of troops and material is not always regular, and cannot always be foreseen, and at times prodigious demands have been made on the resources and ingenuity of the railway staffs. An example was the evacuation from Dunkirk, when thousands of men were moved with great speed to various centres throughout the country. The organization of freight trains has, also, been a heavy responsibility, especially

SETTLEMENT OF THE RAILROAD WAGE CONTROVERSY IN THE U.S.A.

Wage increases of 9½ cents an hour for railroad employees engaged in operating trains and of 10 cents an hour for all other railroad workers were agreed upon by nineteen railroad labour organizations and the Nation's railroads on December 1st, 1941. The agreement also raised the basic minimum hourly rate of pay for the railroad industry from 36 to 46 cents and provided annual vacations with pay for specified groups of workers.

The negotiations, which affected approximately 1,250,000 workers, followed the entire procedure outlined by the Railway Labour Act of 1926. This procedure calls first for conferences between the parties; Federal mediation, if conferences fail; and, finally, if mediation is unsuccessful and arbitration is rejected by either or both parties, for the appointment by the President of the United States of a special emergency board to ascertain and report the facts in the controversy and make recommendations for a settlement. The law further prescribes that no strike or lock-out or change in working conditions shall take place during the thirty days the emergency board considers the case nor for thirty days following the report of the board's findings or recommendations. At the expiration of this waiting period, however, either party, if it so chooses, may reject the recommendations of the emergency board and take such action as it feels warranted.

In the current controversy, attempts to reach a settlement by joint conference and by Federal mediation were unsuccessful, and after the unions declined arbitration, President Roosevelt appointed a five-man emergency board on September 10th, 1941. Their report was made on November 5th, but the unions declined to accept the recommendations of the board, and formulated plans to strike after the termination of the thirty-day waiting period. However, they finally agreed to a compromise settlement, which was reached with the aid of the members of the President's emergency board serving as mediators.

Transport in Great Britain—Continued from page 4.

in regard to coal, but despite the shortage of staff and the congested lines, the problem has been handled with wonderful expedition.

Recently, the Government have scheduled the railways of this country under the Essential Works Order. The power of dismissal of employees is limited to misconduct, and the men cannot leave the railway service without first obtaining the permission of the Ministry of Labour. The railway trade unions were consulted in connection with the terms of the Order and by normal negotiation, dealt with the problems which emerged from it.

The articles and notices published in this journal are not copyrighted. They may be freely quoted provided the source is mentioned.

Background of Case

Because of differences in their wage demands, the nineteen railroad unions, whose membership covers nearly all railroad workers, were divided into two groups. One group comprised the five railroad brotherhoods representing workers employed in the actual movement of trains—engineers, conductors, firemen, trainmen, and switchmen. The other group was composed of fourteen unions, usually referred to as the "nonoperating" labour organizations, and included such groups of railroad workers as clerks, telegraphers, maintenance-of-way workers, signalmen, the shop crafts employed in building and repairing locomotives and cars, and marine and dock workers employed by the railroads.

In addition to the large class I railroads, which operate about 95 per cent of the total railroad mileage in the country and employ over 90 per cent of all railroad workers, the dispute also involved the smaller or the so-called "short-line" railroads. It likewise included the Railway Express Agency, a wholly owned subsidiary of the large railroads.

Higher wages and vacations with pay were the major issues in the dispute. The five unions of operating employees asked for a 30 per cent increase in basic daily wage rates, with a minimum increase of not less than \$1.80 per day. The fourteen unions representing the nonoperating employees sought an increase of 30 cents an hour and the establishment of a minimum hourly wage rate of 70 cents for the railroad industry. The non-operating unions also requested two weeks' vacation with pay for all regularly employed railroad workers and shorter paid vacations for those employed irregularly or only during certain seasons of the year.

Major Arguments

Representatives of the unions and the railroads presented their arguments to the emergency board at public hearings held in Chicago, Ill., between September 16th and October 22nd, 1941. The unions argued that the railroad industry was now enjoying a high level of prosperity and could well afford to pay increased wages. They further contended that rates of pay in the railroad industry were generally lower than those prevailing in similar occupations in other industries. Rapid increases in the cost of living were cited as an additional reason justifying higher wages. Considerable stress was also laid, especially by the five operating brotherhoods, on the greater productivity of various groups of railroad employees in recent years. All of these arguments were buttressed by statistical data presented by the research staffs of the unions.

Position of Employers.—The railroads declared that the proposals of the unions were excessive, both from the standpoint of the prevailing rates of pay for railroad workers as compared with other industries, and as measured by the ability of the industry to pay

higher wages. The increased productivity and efficiency of railroad operations was acknowledged, but the carriers insisted that these gains were due almost wholly to large expenditures for modernization of railroad equipment. In response to the employees' contention that the present operation of trains and railroad equipment involved greater skill, responsibility, and danger, the railroads declared that the use of improved tools and better safety devices had made the tasks of railroad workers easier rather than more difficult or dangerous.

The carriers recognized the validity of many of the arguments of the employees concerning the desirability of vacations with pay. They questioned, however, the advisability of inaugurating vacation plans during a grave national emergency.

Findings of the Board

Several extensions in time were granted the emergency board to review adequately the voluminous record of the hearings and to formulate its recommendations. The major proposals of the board, as submitted to President Roosevelt on November 5th, 1941, were :

1. The board believes that the many uncertainties besetting any analysis of the economy of this country for the duration of the existing national emergency makes it unwise to recommend changes in basic wage rates at this time except for minimum rates hereinafter suggested for the railroads. Therefore, all wage increases recommended by the board are proposed as temporary additions to wages, effective as of September 1st, 1941, and to terminate automatically on December 31st, 1942, unless the parties extend the arrangement by agreement.

2. The employees in the five operating brotherhoods should receive a wage increase of $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent over their present wage rates.

3. The employees in the fourteen co-operating railroad labour organizations should receive an addition of 9 cents per hour—equivalent to an average increase of $13\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

4. A week's vacation of six consecutive working days, effective January 1st, 1942, should be granted during the year of 1942 and each year thereafter to those employees of the fourteen co-operating railroad labour organizations who were regularly attached to the railroad industry during the year preceding their vacation.

The board also recommended a wage increase of $7\frac{1}{2}$ cents an hour for employees of the Railway Express Agency and a basic minimum hourly rate of not less than 45 cents for all railroad workers except those employed on the so-called "short lines."

In recommending higher wage rates and vacations with pay the board stated that low wage standards for railroad labour could not be justified on the ground that existing freight and passenger rates might not be

sufficient to enable railroads to pay wages commensurate with those paid in comparable industries. It therefore declared that "if the financial conditions of the railroads do not make it possible for them to make sufficient profits on the basis of present traffic rates and still pay such wage increases, then traffic rates should be increased."

All the five operating brotherhoods and the fourteen nonoperating unions rejected the major recommendations of the emergency board. They found the wage increases inadequate, and were particularly opposed to the suggestion that the increases be considered as but temporary additions to basic wage rates. The five operating brotherhoods announced their intention to strike on December 7th, after the expiration of the thirty-day waiting period; and the nonoperating unions, although not setting a strike date, insisted that the recommendations could not be accepted by them.

In view of this impasse, President Roosevelt decided to reconvene the emergency board and give the unions an opportunity to state their objections to the board's recommendations, and to present new evidence to the board. Two days were allowed for reargument, and at the close of the second day the chairman of the board stated that the parties to the dispute had the choice of awaiting the findings of the board's supplementary report to President Roosevelt or using the services of the board to mediate the dispute. Both parties accepted the mediation offer of the emergency board, and after nearly forty-eight hours of practically continuous discussion, the representatives of the workers and of the railroads reached an agreement on the basic issues in the controversy.

Final Settlement

By the terms of the agreement, both the operating and the nonoperating groups of railroad employees obtained slightly larger increases in wages than provided in the original recommendations of the emergency board. Moreover, the agreement stipulated that the increases in pay were to be permanent additions to basic wage rates. The principal provisions were :

1. An increase of $9\frac{1}{2}$ cents per hour in the basic hourly wage rates for operating employees. This amounts to an increase of 76 cents a day, or an average increase of $10\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

2. An increase of 10 cents an hour in the basic rates of nonoperating railroad employees and employees of the Railway Express Agency. This amounts to an increase of 80 cents a day, or an average increase of about 15 per cent.

3. A minimum basic hourly rate of pay of 46 cents for railroad and express employees.

4. Provision for somewhat longer vacation periods for several groups of railroad workers, notably telegraphers and clerks.

From *Labour Information Bulletin*.

IMPROVING THE WAR EFFORT OF TRANSPORT IN THE U.S.A.

Labour is contributing to the war effort of the various branches of transport in the U.S.A. by putting forward many suggestions to increase production. We summarize below a number of suggestions intended for utilizing to the full the rolling stock of the railroads, sea ports and merchant navy.

Railroads. (1) Pooling of car-shop facilities, so that if a shortage of men and material develops in one shop and there is a surplus in another, a prompt shift could be made to perform a particular job. (2) Provision for the best possible handling of available freight cars. This also involves rapid transfer of unused cars to shortage points, or pooling of freight cars and locomotives. (3) Inventory of men available on the various roads for special work. This would help in parcelling out men and jobs. (It is assumed that seniority and all other labour standards would be properly protected). (4) Maintenance crews can see that the most is made of machines and materials on hand and can make suggestions for bettering the work. (5) Freight-car utilization should be increased so that idle time is cut to a minimum. Terminal operations are said to consume 90 per cent of car time and line hauling only 10 per cent. (6) Bettering the daily forward movement of freight cars, which move only an average of two and a half out of every twenty-four hours. (7) Examination of the possibility of increasing the effective use of locomotives as an alternative to awaiting delivery of new units. (8) Standardization among car-builders. Such a programme was to begin February 1st. Its possibilities are clear from the estimate that one car-builder could produce forty cars a day of identical specifications, or an order of 10,000. The same shop could make only eighteen a day on a random order for 200 of the various types now in use.

Sea Ports. The International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union has presented a detailed plan for operating the national maritime industry and that of the West Coast so as to insure adoption of the most efficient, economical and rapid loading and discharging of all vessels engaged in war effort. It calls for creation of a longshore council composed of representatives of the union, the Waterfront Employers Association and the U.S. Maritime Commission.

This council would: (1) Provide for introduction and full use of various types of labour-saving machinery. (2) Arrange for best docking facilities and use of unused Pacific ports by having full cargoes assembled at such ports. (3) Study present costs of loading and discharging ships and recommend most economical of plans now used. (4) Insure availability of adequate numbers of efficient and trustworthy longshoremen. (5) Survey and recommend best methods of insuring continuous operation during air raids and blackouts, and of protecting terminals, docks, and ships and cargoes from fire, theft and sabotage. (6) Recommend and aid in putting into effect through existing collective bargaining agreements changes in or suspension of

working rules that interfere with maximum production. And (7) assist in prompt adjustment through existing machinery of any disputes that may interfere with maximum production.

The Waterfront Employers Association of the Pacific Coast first accepted the plan and praised it, but quickly renegaded. They balked at provisions for examining their costs and profits, re-opening of shut-down ports and official government representation on the council.

Merchant Navy. The National Maritime Union has asked the C.I.O. to comb all industries for ex-seamen in order to man the rapidly expanding merchant fleet of the U.S.A. The N.M.U. has also informed the United Automobile Workers (C.I.O.) that it will take on all men who lose their jobs in the period of conversion from automobile to plane production, even though they may not be trained sailors.

Inland Waterways. A joint programme of the A.F. of L. and C.I.O. unions to expedite transport on the midwest rivers so that it may play a major role in the carrying of raw materials demands: (1) the establishment of a joint river-rail rate; (2) the interchange of barges between the companies in the same way as the railroads interchange cars; (3) common use of terminal and dock facilities by all companies involved.

MANNING NEW U.S.A. SHIPS

Under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 the U.S. Maritime Commission were authorised to establish a training scheme for seamen. This has now been taken over by the coastguards.

This training scheme may be divided into three parts: first the training of apprentice seamen— young men from all over the United States who are inexperienced in seafaring and who can, by going to one of the training schools, secure better initial positions as seamen in American ships; second the training of programme for experienced seamen who have served at sea for three years and who desire to become officers in the Mercantile Marine; and, third, the cadet training programme requiring higher educational standards which takes men of little or no experience at sea and trains them to become officers.

It is estimated that to man the 8,000,000 tons of new merchant shipping which the American yards have been asked to build this year will require over 20,000 seamen. The apprentice training schools at various places have been enlarged and from these schools it is hoped to obtain 19,000 new men who have had six months' intensive training to qualify them for positions as able seamen and members of the engine department. The last three months of the course are to be spent working at sea. The schools for experienced seamen who wish to become officers have also been enlarged and it is estimated that this year they should supply 3,500 new third mates and their assistant engineers. As for the cadet system, this has also been greatly expanded and it is expected that 3,000 men will be in training towards the end of the year. Every opportunity is given to the cadets to qualify as deck or engineer officers.

From *The Journal of Commerce*.

WORKERS MUST CONTROL A NEW SOCIAL ORDER

A new social order must include an economic system in which such use will be made of the economic resources that everyone will be freed from want, and the mass standards of living will be considerably raised. Unemployment must disappear; leisure must be lengthened and changed; a new education system will not merely be free and equal in the opportunities for development that all are given, but will develop such minds that standards of artistic and scientific appreciation will be revolutionised. Co-operating in such a new order will be the people who will be enjoying increasing and active control over everything that affects their lives from political government to industry, from their art to their health, from their homes to their hospitals.

Included in such a new order must be greater control over industry by the workers. No new social order means anything unless it includes self government in industry by the employees, beginning in the workshops, extending to the industrial unit, and culminating in an industrial parliament, which, as an expression of the political parliament, will decide the main trends of economic development. There must be an end to the system which permits dismissal of employees without an impartial trial, which encourages victimisation of workers, and which places all major industrial decisions in the control of a few individuals, who have greater power in their sphere than any military Brass Hat.

That is, they would have—if men did not have the strike weapon. The power of trade unionism is the only force which mitigates to-day the authoritarian discipline of the factory—and only where the demands of the union can be backed up by strikes will the worst examples of victimisation and tyranny be ended.

We know from experience the injustice and tyranny of control, even in a State industry. There is an appeals board which acts as an instrument of justice—but only a partial one, since many a man is punished in such a way that he has no right of appeal. The

Commissioner has a power of veto, which, because he exercises seldom, the injustice to the victim of his arbitrary behaviour, is all the greater. There are many cases of arbitrary treatment in our railway service which, if they occurred in private industry, would have led to stoppages of work and generally a remedying of the situation. We in the railway industry are not without our power, but we also know that if full justice is to be done to the employees, then either full and free machinery must be established or the workers exert their right to strike. And this, of course, means that if strikes are to be avoided, then co-operation must be so extended that no decision affecting the industrial conditions of groups or of an individual should be made without the agreement of the employees, given through their organization.

We are not encouraging strikes in war-time—nor are we stating an academic theory of no practical value to the "battle of industry."

We are stating the facts of industrial history, which will be revealed again in this war—namely, that unless co-operation is developed rapidly and completely, then industrial unrest will continue; or, if unrest does not express itself by direct action of strikes, it will break out indirectly in absenteeism, accidents, ill-health, labour turnover, apathy, and political hostility.

The plea, therefore, that working class participation expand progressively is a plea that the new social order begin in war-time, both as evidence that there will be a new social order after the war, and as an assurance that the workers will give their best willingly—and safely.

This brings me to another reason why working class participation is important—as a guarantee that when the war is over, the losses in conditions suffered by the workers will be instantly returned. Unless workers increase their influence to-day then the employer will attempt to cling to the advantages that war economy has given him.

From *Railroad, journal of the Australian Railways Union*.

THE WAR AND PEACE AIMS OF THE FREE NORWEGIAN SEAMEN

Free Norwegian seamen are solidly behind their own and the Allied Governments in the fight against Nazism. At the same time in their ranks the question is often asked, what are we fighting for? In an article in the monthly journal published by the New York branch of the Norwegian Seamen's Union, *Norsk Sjomannsforbund Medlemsblad*, Harald Eriksen answers this question and explains the Norwegian seamen's conception of the struggle.

Norway has undergone the same fate as other countries overrun by the Nazi hordes. The people have been robbed of the rights and freedoms they knew for so many years; the workers have witnessed the complete destruction of their trade unions. Foremost among the seamen's reasons for joining in the anti-Nazi struggle is the determination to free their

country from foreign tyranny and to come to the rescue of those they have left behind and who are at the mercy of the invaders and their hirelings and all the horrors of firing squads, gaols, concentration camps and forced labour. To bring back conditions in which trade unions can exist once more as effective instruments for the defence of workers' interests is one aspect of this war aim of the Norwegian seamen. "The rights and freedom of the workers of Norway depend entirely upon the freeing of our country from the Nazis, and that is where the Norwegian seamen and the merchant navy make their big contribution". It has been said that the contribution of the 25,000 Norwegian seamen in exile is equivalent to that of a million soldiers.

The Norwegian shipping and allied industries provided a livelihood to an important part of the population, and seamen had attained to a status, both as regards working conditions and rights, which bore comparison with other occupations. Under the Nazi order, as expounded by the Nazis themselves, Norwegian shipping is to be subordinated to German interests. "The shipping and seafaring classes," writes Harald Eriksen, "are to become serfs under a new Hanseatic League centred on Hamburg. We should be pressed down to the wages and working conditions which suit the masters, so-called." Another obvious war aim of the Norwegian seamen therefore is to regain control of their country and to re-establish the freedom of the seas on which depends the industry in which they earn their living.

Whilst fully conscious of the need of settling accounts with the Nazis and Quislings, as the first condition for the attainment of their objectives, Norwegian seamen ask themselves what are the prospects of fulfilment of their aspirations once the first condition is satisfied. In the last war Norwegian seamen sailed in ships at deadly risks to keep open the life-lines of their country. Warm tributes were paid to the devotion and courage shown by the seamen, who were promised all sorts of rewards at the end of the war. Seamen know what became of these promises when the time came for keeping them.

To-day seamen are again rendering invaluable service to their countries, and once again praise and promises are lavished upon them. Not unnaturally

they view these promises with some doubt and look around for something more tangible. Now it is true that since the war improvements of various kinds have been conceded to the seamen. In the economic sphere these take the shape of increases in wages and improvements in conditions generally. Socially also much has been done to improve the seamen's position when ashore by providing centres where they can get lodgings, meals and recreation at reasonable prices. "These are not intended as merely temporary measures, but are to be retained in the future." The strengthening of the organization during the war may be considered a guarantee that this will be so. Branches of the Norwegian Seamen's Union have been established in all important ports touched by Norwegian ships. Joint committees exist to ensure co-operation between officers and men of the merchant navy on the one hand, and between seamen of Scandinavian and other nationalities on the other.

The improvements achieved during the war represent a substantial instalment of the programme of demands which Norwegian seamen have been pursuing for many years. The maintenance of this progress and the prospect of securing, under the better order of society which they expect to come about at the end of the war, the fulfilment of the outstanding part of their own and other workers' programmes, is the peace aim of Norwegian seamen. These war and peace aims together represent what the Norwegian have always lived for, and want to go on living for.

The Secret of Russian Resistance

Let us pay a well-deserved tribute to the heroism of the Russian working class, which is defending with such indomitable tenacity the mother earth which is its own. We say the working class because in the Soviet Union it is the workers who have determined the destiny of the Nation, and who are guiding it towards that brightest of aims, the emancipation of the exploited throughout the world.

When the fascists started this war nobody in capitalist or bourgeois circles had any faith in the ability of the Russians to hold out. The prevailing estimate of the value of their armies was that formed in 1915 and 1916, when the great masses of soldiers commanded by Rennenkampf and Brussiloff were swept away, by the strategy of the numerically inferior armies of the Kaiser, on the battle-fields of Tannenberg and the Masurian lakes, in the fortified triangles of Warsaw and, further to the south-east, in the passes of the Carpathians through which a Russian irruption into the fertile plains of Hungary would have been possible. The campaign in Finland in 1939 gave further food to the scepticism of those saloon bar critics who never see below the surface of things, and who were unable to perceive the real causes which prevented the Soviet generals from throwing the whole of their military power against that little country.

Adolph Hitler and all his camarilla of counsellors and flatterers, including some of the more inept army officers, were convinced that the Soviet army would not hold out for more than a fortnight. They seem to have formed a very low estimate of the morale of the Russian army and people, to the extent of scorning the advice of those few of the Reichswehr generals who were courageous enough to foresee and announce that the campaign on the eastern front would be a very hard one. It can, however, be said in their defence that the governments of the countries already at war with Germany held no better an opinion than they of Russia's military strength or the staying-power of its population.

A time-schedule was drawn up for the capture of Leningrad, Odessa, Moscow and Kharkov, but the times fixed scarcely concealed the hope that within a fortnight the whole of Russia would have risen against the ruling system, and that almost without a fight, and after little more than a military pleasure-trip, Germany would have opened up the Siberian routes and the way to the long-coveted oil-fields of Baku.

Instead of this Hitler has found himself face to face with the same enemy who vanquished the ogre of Corsica. And to-day, as in 1812, there is also a Kutuzov prepared to burn behind him everything that

could be of use to the enemy. But it is the conscious power of a people in arms, and not merely the mechanics of history, which is rising against those who dare to trample under foot the sacred soil of Russia. It is true that Odessa and Kharkov, together with Kiev, White Russia and a part of the Ukrainian granary, are now in the hands of the descendants of Siegfried; but how far off still the dream of a Soviet collapse, the fair and industrious towns hidden behind the spurs of the Urals, the white roads of Siberia and the oil-wells of the Caucasus!

And Adolph Hitler, his flatterers, the rigid marshals of the Panzer divisions, the governments of the other countries, the journalists, the critics and the armchair strategists, all cross themselves in astonishment at the extraordinary power of resistance of the Russian people. And they are unable to find the key; they have not yet grasped the fact that the regime enthroned in Russia since 1917 has given the land to those who till it; has abolished the exploitation of man by man; has built up a real order governed by principles which make all men equal; has raised the dignity of woman and guided youth along paths of culture and enlightenment; has released millions of children from the darkness of illiteracy; has built great cities and vast industrial plants in the desert and on the paramos where the Grand Dukes formerly relieved the tedium of their life by beating their moujiks; has

established justice and brotherhood among a hundred and eighty million people who knew no better than to submit to the whip of the cossack.

That is the secret of Russian resistance: a mysticism that was lacking in the armies of Rennenkampf and the Grand Duke Nicholas during the days of Przemysl, of Tarnov, of Novo-Radomsk and of Grodno, in 1916. They were no more than flocks of men marching submissively and in resignation to offer themselves up to the German machine-guns, knowing not what they defended nor why they were sent to death by their generals, many of whom were later proved to have been in league with the enemy.

To-day it is otherwise: the people and the army of the Soviet Union know why they are fighting and what they are defending. They do not want to lose a world they have won for themselves by twenty years of unceasing struggle. And to their credit be it said—and for this they deserve the thanks of the workers of all countries—that in defending their world they are also defending ours. That is why they can count on the deep and steadfast sympathy of the working class throughout the world, and of all men who wish to see the survival of those values which are of the spirit, rather than the sanguinary principles of brute force incarnated in the hordes of the mechanized Attila.

(From *El Obrero Ferroviario*, journal of the Argentine Railwaymen's Union.)

Fascists and Nazis in Mexico

By Francisco Frola of the Mexican National University

Mexico is a strange country. Believing in freedom in the fullest sense of the word, it judges events in other countries with a broad tolerance which, in times like these, might seem to many people to be carried to excess.

Until quite recently the Mexican people—and not only such of them as are the direct descendants of those who enjoyed the dictatorial patronage of Porfirio Díaz, but also the revolutionary Mexicans, those who with rifle in hand fought the almost invincible power of the great landowners and the clergy, and built the new Mexico which has set its face against all totalitarian violence and has opened its arms wide to the refugees of all creeds; these Mexicans who are the very negation of the ultra-authoritarian regimes of Hitler and Mussolini followed with sublime indifference, until quite recently, all that was happening in the totalitarian camp. Momentous happenings have been needed to convince them of the nazi-fascist danger.

In the interests of accuracy, however, it should be pointed out that there were circumstances favourable to the position taken up by the Fascists and Nazis. From the point of view of its economic structure Mexico, like nearly all the Latin-American States, is a semi-colonial country; and as such it was—and still is—a subject of exploitation by foreign powers. It is well known that its oil—one of the most important

elements of the Mexican economic system—was in the hands of North American and British companies. When in March, 1938, President Lazaro Cardenas decreed the expropriation of their properties, and these foreign companies took up an aggressive and offensive attitude towards the country that had enriched them, all the sediment of hatred that had accumulated for decades in the soul of the reviled and exploited Mexican Indian burst forth into an ever-swelling torrent directed against the North American and British capitalists.

The nazi-fascists, and more particularly the propaganda of the Nazis, took the fullest possible advantage of this hatred. They asked the Mexicans: "Who are your real enemies? We, who have never taken anything from you, or the British and Americans, whose plans spell your ruin? It is true that the British and Americans claim to be democrats, but in what does this democracy consist? In exploiting all the peoples of this Earth, perhaps? No; believe us; the British and Americans are full-blooded imperialists!"

This line of argument undoubtedly had its effects, and convinced not a few Mexicans. But since then things have gradually changed. The Mexicans have come to realize that if the nazi-fascists have not exploited Mexico it was not because they did not want to, but because they were unable. The eyes of many have been opened by certain publications which

have revealed German and Italian views with regard to Latin-America. Briefly, the nazi-fascist thesis is the following: "The Latin-American peoples are inferior both racially and in constructive ability. But these inferior and incapable peoples have been illogically and unreasonably placed in possession of enormous supplies of raw materials and wealth of all kinds, while the elect, the peoples created by God for the salvation of Humanity, such as the Germans and Italians, are struggling in a narrow cell, deprived of a sufficiency of living room. Have we Fascists and Nazis not the right to take this wealth from this conglomeration of lazy half-breeds, and convert it into the means of power, to the greater glory of Germany and Italy?"

So the Mexicans little by little began to realize that in opposition to this Anglo-American imperialism, of the economic type, there was arising, thanks to Hitler and Mussolini, a much more dangerous imperialism, of the enslaving and totalitarian type. And as a result public opinion has reacted profoundly against both Fascists and Nazis.

The Fascists in Mexico are a negligible quantity. The number of Italian immigrants is less than two thousand. Most of them are concentrated in an agricultural settlement near Puebla: the rest are dispersed—a few professional men, a small number of merchants, two or three hundred working men. During the last few years the atmosphere has been poisoned by the arrival of a number of professional agitators who set out to establish—here of all places—a branch of the *Fascio*, with all its attendant subsidiary organizations. But the great mass of the Italians showed little enthusiasm. Most of them are poor devils, generally illiterate, whose only thought is to work for their living, and who have no idea what to do about the Duce's commandments.

Mexico is not like Brazil and the Argentine Republic, where the Italians are counted by millions. Here the raw material is lacking, and the *Fascio* has always been a poor thing, a tiny stage upon which four of five "leaders" strut about, and even they more interested in making their fortunes than in defending the Fascist creed.

The Nazis, on the other hand, are both more numerous and more influential. A great part of the country's trade is in their hands; they have powerful and well-organized businesses, with a thousand tentacles spreading all over the country. The Nazis are a real danger, partly because—in accordance with Fifth Column principles—they have sent to Mexico, as they have to all the Latin-American countries, a nucleus of enterprising agents, fully trained in the work of propaganda and disintegration. But Nazism is lacking in intelligence: it did not realize that in a free country like Mexico such conduct and activities, far from creating an atmosphere favourable to its views, would arouse a strong current of opposition. And so events have proved. In the course of a few days we have seen the beginning of the *débâcle* for totalitarianism in Mexico.

First came the Anti-espionage Bill, put forward by General Avila Camacho, the President of the Republic, himself. It will be an instrument to castigate those Nazis and Fascists who become too enterprising. Then there has been set up an Anti-Fascist Parliamentary Committee, which will take charge of anti-totalitarian propaganda throughout the country. And even the Senate decided, in a memorable session, to ask the Government to break off relations with Germany and Italy, and also with Vichy, which is regarded as an annex of the Hitler Government.

Mexico is a strange country. All these momentous and decisive measures have been taken in an atmosphere of the greatest calm, and without hesitation. The country's life goes on in its usual tranquil way. One would hardly think the Mexicans were a people who had made a bloody revolution, and thereby established the most advanced principles of political and economic freedom. Mexico has understood that it is no use arguing with Nazis and Fascists: they must be struck hard, like any bandits who assault our homes.

(From *La Otra Alemania*, Buenos Aires.)

NOTE.—This article was written before the United States entered the war.

Co-operative Stevedoring—Continued from page 12]

economic security and a fair living standard for the work they perform. They can only obtain this by playing the game, by showing that they have the ability and the organization and job comradeship among themselves to do the job to-day that was a few years ago regarded as being solely the privilege of the high and mighty to manage. To show to the farmers, for instance, that they can handle their produce and ship it cheaper than the stevedoring contractor ever did or ever would, to show to the remainder of the people of New Zealand that ships can be loaded and discharged and get a quicker turn-round under this system of working than under the old system with all its evils and exploitation of the men in the industry.

Co-operation, a sound and rational basis

"I think the Chinese Industrial Co-operatives are a very important factor in China's war of defence. They provide the best form of relief by giving work to tens of thousands of refugees and helping them to keep their independence and their self-respect. At the same time, they help to relieve the markets of Free China of the shortage of the commonest articles due to the blockade and the uprooting of industries in the coastal provinces. They increase the production and help restore the normal economic life of the nation. But their significance lies also in the future when these co-operatives will become the sound and rational basis for the growth of Chinese industries after the war."
Lin Yutang.

Co-operative Stevedoring in New Zealand

A co-operative contract system of loading and discharging vessels has been in operation at some ports in New Zealand for more than twelve months, while at others the experience of the waterside workers of this method of work has not been so long. The experience gained by the men engaged in the industry has been very valuable indeed, for many of them to-day suggest new methods of handling cargo, new methods of organizing the job, and nearly all of these suggestions are worthwhile not only to the men concerned but to the industry itself.

Much remains to be done, however. It is only when the workers undertake to perform a job on their own behalf that they realize their lack of knowledge of management and control of industry. That has been a guarded secret of the employers of labour in all industries. The worker was asked merely to carry out some particular piece of work. In many cases he did not know why he was working, except that he got a wage for it; in short, he was more or less an automaton who worked for sufficient to buy food to keep him a valuable profit-producer and enable him to reproduce more workers for the fields, factories and workshops.

Work Without Boss

We find that on the waterfront there are many men to-day who do not realize the important progressive step that has been made. They still believe that they must have a boss to control them. There are others who would prefer to be pannikins for a contracting stevedore for a day than to be industrial co-operators for a lifetime. Fortunately these are but few. The great majority of waterside workers are, we believe, willing to extend the fullest co-operation if they are given free opportunity to do so. Like every other new venture, co-operative stevedoring must be expected to progress slowly. It will meet with some reverses from time to time, and, although the reverses have not been many, it must be admitted that there is a lack of co-operation at many ports which is not helpful to the waterside workers or to the industry. Shipowners and shipping interests are not favourable to any system of working which takes from them the control of labour, and the waterside workers should get that fact into their heads and remember it. They should remember also that if this system is not successful the opponents of the men will proudly declare in a year or two that the working men have not the ability to manage industry, even the labour side of it.

That is something the workers of to-day should realize, and if they realize it the workers of to-morrow will profit. There must in every new venture be a period of training. The waterside workers should have sufficient experience to know that they can organize the job much better, that they can perform it more efficiently than ever it was done previously. In many ports they are doing this, and great credit

must be given to the men who are performing the job and the workers who have been appointed as overseers, for it is this type of man that ensures the future for Labour and not the blatant talkers who say a lot and do little.

Supervision

One of the most serious troubles in co-operative contract work is that of supervision. The present complex system cannot be allowed to remain. The workers take a contract and are paid so much for doing the job. The foremen who supervise the work at most ports have no direct interest in the job. They are not partners in the contract. Thus complaints are sometimes made that proper supervision is lacking, but the workers themselves should see to it that the job is done efficiently despite any attempt on the part of others to delay it.

The time has arrived now when the workers should consider doing the whole of the job themselves, appointing their own supervisors, selecting their own gangs to do the work, and showing to the people of New Zealand what can be done by co-operative labour and how the workers can undertake the responsibility of performing this important section of transport work for the people of the country. At two ports only is the supervision controlled solely by the workers' organization, and the results of the system at these ports are excellent in every way. We trust that this will be extended to other ports in the near future and that when it is extended the men who load and discharge ships will respond to the opportunity given to them.

Hold-ups

It is surprising to hear men talking about holding up the job for increased wage payment of dirt money or something of that kind, or stopping on the job and making a demand for higher rates of pay. This is not necessary under the co-operative contract system. It is simply an indication that the workers concerned do not understand fully what co-operative contract means. If the price of the contract is not sufficient, then there is only one remedy and that is to increase it. It must be admitted that, although the shipowners have performed this work for years, they have not been able to supply any reliable figures to the Waterside Workers' Union as to the rates of work as a general average, and as a result the real contract price cannot be fixed except by experience. That experience is now available in many ports, and all that is required is for the men to organize the job and show to New Zealand that they can do it.

The New Zealand Waterside Workers' Union does not want the old system back. It does not want the waterfront to be the dumping ground for the unemployed and unemployable of other industries. It wants to see the men engaged in the industry enjoying

[Continued on page 11]