



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
UNITED STATES
YUGOSLAVIA

Relations with unions in :

CHILE
CUBA
ECUADOR
EGYPT
MEXICO

Other relations in :

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

REPROVISIONING AFTER THE WAR

FOOD AS A MEANS OF POLITICAL BLACKMAIL

AT a conference held in London in April last the secretary of one of the numerous national reconstruction committees which have been set up under a variety of authorities drew an extremely gloomy picture of the position of the preparations for the first and most urgent task with which those authorities may be expected to be confronted at the close of the war: the reprovisioning of the wide regions which will be in the grip of famine and disease. He revealed that the St. James Conference of the Allied Governments held on 24th September, 1941, "has not produced any practical results. It has not even been able to prepare a practical scheme for supplying the occupied countries with food products and raw materials."

In these circumstances the danger is far from imaginary that in default of a general plan to which the emigrated or emigré governments are subordinated, political advantage may be taken of conditions of famine prevailing at the end of the war to the benefit of reactionary social tendencies. Already on the occasion of the above-mentioned St. James Conference one of the representatives of an exiled government made an express reservation about carrying out under their own responsibility their own arrangements for provisional relief. This reservation was then sanctioned by the British chairman with the words that "the first responsibility should lie with individual governments themselves." It is indeed a procedure calculated to bring back the pre-1939 conditions, conditions for the outcome of which the first responsibility lies with the individual conduct of the governments. It would mean that at the end of the war those who control food supplies, shipping facilities and funds would be able to re-assert themselves. There would be, in face of the general menace of famine, discrimination based upon differences of property. And it will again be a question of every nation for itself and God for us all, who then would in the days of the last Judgment only appear to the world in the form of the God of War.

If it is true that nothing has yet been achieved by the Allied Governments in the way of the plans which were the subject of discussion at St. James's Palace—and we see no reason to doubt the accuracy of a spokesman so intimately connected with the question—then a repetition of what happened with reprovisioning after November, 1918, is not ruled out. H. N. Brailsford made some amazing revelations on this subject in his booklet *Across the Blockade*, a record of travels in enemy Europe, published in 1919. Apparently entertaining no high expectations of the outcome of the Allied Governments' Conference, which at the time had only taken place six weeks previously, Brailsford at the beginning of November, 1941, uttered the following serious warning:

"I remember my own experience in Europe at the end of the last war during the period of quasi-famine and incipient revolution, when one did not know from one week to another whether a Social-Democratic, a Soviet or a reactionary or a feudal government was going to emerge in Hungary, Austria or Bavaria. One of the decisive factors was the distribution of American aid in the form mainly of foodstuffs. This was so managed by the Americans as to bring back feudal reaction in Hungary, and to render the problem of social reconstruction very much harder than it need have been, both in Germany and in Austria. American help was then in the hands of conservative and capitalistic agents who deliberately and confessedly used it as a political lever. It was in their power to help movements or to withhold their help. They were, I think, very much aware of the tendencies swinging from left to right that were struggling together in Central Europe. The same kind of thing will happen at the end of this war and the forces controlling this American help may have it in their power to decide the political direction in European countries which they are trying to help."

Whether what exactly happened behind the scenes in the organization of relief in 1918 and later years will ever be disclosed, is for the present an open question. But the technical side of this organization alone gave sufficient scope for measures calculated to have far-reaching political consequences. One example may suffice. The official American relief organization in the charge of the later President of the United States, Herbert Hoover, handled the bulk of the food supplies. One of his biographers, Vernon Kellogg, mentions one fact about the organization of this relief work, and adds a significant comment: "One of Hoover's rules was that food could only go into regions where it could be safeguarded and controlled. That counted against Bolshevism."

Food was only one aspect of the drama which was enacted in Europe in that period. The importance of this factor naturally declined as more food became available. Now the other factor came to the fore, that of the revival of economic life. No one less than the British Director of Relief, Sir William Goode, reported very candidly to his Government on the subject. "At this time (a few months after the close of hostilities—Ed.), food was practically the only basis on which the Governments of hastily created states could be maintained in power. More than half of Europe, including Germany, hovered on the brink of Bolshevism. . . . In October, 1919, I visited most of the countries in receipt of relief. The impression left on my mind as a result of this journey round Europe and of the conferences I had with the Presidents and Ministers of the respective governments is akin to despair. . . . Of one thing I am absolutely convinced, and that is that to continue to provide food without at the same time providing raw materials on which to re-establish industry is merely to aggravate the problem of Europe."

It is very evident that the forces which controlled the supplies of foodstuffs and raw materials had at their disposal ways and means in abundance for putting the screw upon peoples who were following a political course which was regarded as undesirable. The

murderous intentions harboured with regard to the declared peace aim of national self-determination has been put in quite polished language, for example, by the then American Secretary of State, Robert Lansing, who in his "Personal Narrative of the Peace Negotiations," writes: "A restoration of commercial relations and of normal industrial conditions through the medium of a Treaty of Peace appeared to offer the only practical means of resisting these movements (i.e. revolutionary developments—Ed.), and of saving Europe from the horrors of proletarian despotism. . ."

Now no restoration of commercial relations and normal (i.e. capitalist) industrial relations is possible without finance as the almighty overlord. The picture would therefore not be complete if it could not be shown that the domination of finance was indeed established from the start, i.e. immediately after the cessation of hostilities. For it might be innocently assumed that the indescribable distress which then prevailed throughout wide regions of Europe could not be substantially relieved because the necessary means, food and ships, were not available, at least not to a sufficient degree. True, without a hand you cannot ball a fist. But that was not the position. The hand was only deficient in so far it lacked the dimensions for handling the situation completely. But the all-powerful factor which determined to what extent the distress should be relieved lay elsewhere. That factor was finance, as is borne out by an unimpeachable commentator.

J. A. (later Sir Arthur) Salter, who in 1917 was Director of Ship Requisitioning in Great Britain, in 1918 Secretary of the Allied Maritime Transport Council and the following year of the British Department of the Supreme Economic Council in Paris, in 1920 wrote a book *Allied Shipping Control*. In this book, published by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, this distinguished writer states:

"But although after the first pause between war and peace shipping long remained inadequate to the demands upon it, it ceased immediately on the conclusion of hostilities to be the main factor in the general economic position. From that moment, difficulties of money became more important than difficulties of shipping. Half of Europe had no money to buy the necessities of life; the rest of the world had lost its impelling motive to lend; finance resumed its normal position, more indeed than its normal position, of dominance over the supply system."

We began this account of a piece of all too soon forgotten early post-war history by introducing an insider who spoke of the negative outcome of recent discussions conducted by Allied statesmen on the question of the reprovisioning which will be necessary after this war. In view of what happened from the end of 1918 on there are well-founded reasons for fearing that when the fighting ceases the generally prevalent distress will once again be exploited for political ends. Of any guarantee that in the great contest for power to be staged at the end of this world war decisive action will be taken to prevent such a repetition there is so far no question.

Only the Labour Movement could offer such a guarantee

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE SHIPOWNER

“ . . . the sailormen owe everything, or practically everything, to the owners who design the ships, pay for them and must manage them so efficiently that they make ends meet after disbursing large sums in wages. The seamen, officers and men, are giving fine service—none finer—but where would they or the United Nations have been if owners in this country had not built up and managed successfully such large and efficient fleets, which they placed immediately at the service of the Government, receiving inadequate interest on the capital invested in the ships.”

The above title and text are provided by *Shipping World* of 17th June, 1942, a British periodical which describes itself as “The Oldest Weekly Journal devoted to Shipping, Shipbuilding, Marine Engineering Shiprepairing, Insurance, and Finance.”

One can imagine a mouthpiece of the shipowners using such language in 1842. In 1942 it sounds like a voice from the grave.

We would be content with reproducing the text as a quiz at people who believe, or try to make others believe, that but for the shipowners there would be no ships, no seamen and no efficient and successful management. But the passage was written in all seriousness in a discussion on the future of the merchant shipping of Britain and, at the same time, of the world. As the above allegation was meant to be serious, let us strike a different note as regards “the importance of the shipowner.”

The seafarers owe no debt of gratitude to the shipowners. If shipowners have spent “large sums in wages,” seamen have never received more than a miserable pittance for a hard job of work done often under physical conditions of great hardship and always under social conditions which were abnormal and, on the whole, repulsive. “Successful and efficient management” have never meant stability of employment or security of existence for a seaman’s family in case of unemployment, or death or invalidity resulting from an accident or an illness contracted in inhospitable climes. A debt indeed exists, but it is the shipowners who owe everything, or practically everything, to the seafarers.

Ability to own ships is not enough. Where would the United Nations have been if the shipowners had been left, in war, to their own devices face to face with the capable organizers of the totalitarian powers?

If it must be conceded that the right to earn profits may never be questioned, even when “there’s a war on,” it may well be that the present return on the capital invested in ships is inadequate. But however onerous the calls on their property may be at a time when everybody is being asked to make sacrifices, the shipowners are being offered, besides a return on their capital, the fullest assurances of the future restoration of their rights, claims, properties and everything that counts in this sublunary world. The seafarers invest their lives in the war effort on terms which are far more advantageous to the State Exchequers and far less so to their own dependents.

The advocate of the shipowners wanted to establish

the past and present importance of his principals to justify their claims as to their future role. Even if he had used up-to-date and serious arguments, he could not have succeeded, for:

(1) As organizers of world transport, the shipowners have never shown the slightest initiative.

(2) As organizers of the seafarers’ work, they have cut a sorry figure. Cases of bad and extremely bad working conditions are much more numerous than those of passable or good conditions. For many seamen, the owners have merely been the dispensers of unemployment.

(3) As a social force, the shipowners have failed lamentably in their mission to promote and achieve such progress as was possible in the industry. The progress made during the war is no achievement of theirs, and their traditional methods even jeopardize that progress. “Heroism, and its recognition to-day, provide no guarantee that improvements in conditions won during the war can even be maintained, much less advanced, when peace is gained.” (*Economist* of 28th March, 1942).

Bitter though these reproaches may be, they are not directed at any shipowners personally. Whatever may be the qualities of the individual shipowners, whatever talent undoubtedly exists in their ranks, in the mad world of capitalism there was no possibility for them to fill these three roles. No one can serve two masters, Mammon and Society. What was not possible yesterday will not be possible to-morrow unless we eliminate the claims to loyalty of the first of these two masters. The thesis that the interests of these two masters do not conflict but merge with one another, that the prosperity of the one automatically assures that of the other, is a fallacy which the experience of the past century has exposed completely and irrevocably.

The advocate of the shipowner further says: “Those who raise the capital, design the ships, and build and manage them, fill an important role, and only by co-operation with them can officers and men afloat hope to get a square deal.”

This passage will command the unqualified assent of every trade unionist. But co-operation can only become effective and bear fruit for the seafarers and those whom the merchant navies serve if “those who raise the capital, etc.” cease to own the ships or any other industrial instruments and cease to be trustees of private interests and the providers of unearned incomes. Shipping is a world-wide public interest and needs to be organized and operated as such. P. T.

The U.S.A. and World Labour

A DECLARATION AND A RESOLUTION OF THE C.I.O.

Sir Walter Citrine, general secretary of the British Trades Union Congress, acting on the instructions of that organization, recently sought to bring about participation of the central trade union bodies of the United States in the Anglo-Soviet Trade Union Committee. The American Federation of Labour is affiliated to the International Federation of Trade Unions; the Congress of Industrial Organizations has not yet entered into international attachments. Its willingness to enter into international co-operation on the broadest possible basis finds expression in the following declaration published recently under the above title in C.I.O. News:

American labour in the past has tended to separate itself from the rest of world labour. This has not been a matter of conviction so much as a reflection of the general separatism of a largely self-contained country, divided from Europe and Asia by the broad Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

But the present war has shocked American labour—and the rest of the American people—into a vivid awareness that geographical distances do not isolate a country from the military menace, and still less from the political contagion of fascist imperialism.

The United States is now one of the United Nations. Her troops fight side by side with our allies in a world battle for freedom. American workers know that they are part of a common production front that stretches all around the world.

The C.I.O. cast aside all remnants of isolationism at its Detroit convention last year. It pledged itself to the world struggle against Hitlerism, in alliance with all freedom-loving peoples, before even the United States became engulfed in the war.

Through its Committee for Allied War Relief, the C.I.O. has demonstrated in practical fashion its solidarity with the working people of Britain, China, the Soviet Union and the other United Nations.

As the war goes on, every day brings a clearer realization of the close kinship and common interests of labour in all countries. Just as the joint effort of the workers of all lands (including those under Hitler's heel) is necessary to win the war, so, too, is their close association and common endeavour necessary to win a democratic peace.

The labour press can aid greatly in promoting better understanding between the peoples of the United Nations, by regularly printing news of labour's efforts in other countries, as *The C.I.O. News* is now doing.

All such efforts will further the basic principles of organized labour and bring closer the day when labour will stand united, both nationally and internationally, for brotherhood, democracy, economic betterment and social progress throughout the world.

The Resolution of the Executive Board of the C.I.O. runs as follows:

WHEREAS, the organized trade union movements of the world are engaged in a united struggle against the common enemy and can strengthen the unity within and among the United Nations through greater co-operation with each other in accordance with the experience of the united action which has already

been achieved between the British and Soviet Union trade unions; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the C.I.O. Executive Board authorize its national executive officers to take steps toward securing closer co-operation and unity of action between the organized workers of America, including the A.F.L. and Railroad Brotherhoods, and the trade unions of the United Nations, including the Latin American Nations, to the end that a united world labour movement may be the basis for winning the war against the Axis and securing a peace which will establish for all the people freedom of speech and assembly, freedom of religion, freedom from fear, and freedom from want.

Labour Relations in Canada—I—continued from page 29.

is worded, it provides practically no protection against discrimination, as has been shown in court proceedings taken under it.

It is to be noted that in July, 1918, the Government then in power passed an Order-in-Council embodying certain policies and principles. These included the right to organize in trade unions; in fact, the workers were to be permitted and encouraged to do so, but the adoption of the principles were merely urged upon workers and employers, and they were ignored. The same procedure was followed by an Order in June, 1940. This Order contained a preamble and a declaration of principles. A portion of the preamble reads as follows:

"It is clear that any differences that might arise (between employers and workers) would extend beyond wage-scales or hours of labour, and include the right of association in labour bodies and the right of organized workpeople to enter into collective agreements through which they may be expected to exercise a more organic influence on the processes of industrial life; all of them aspirations which, under wise direction, will make for the removal of prejudice and for full co-operation between employers and employed."

The principles of special concern to the workers declare "that employees should be free to organize in trade unions, free from any control by employers or their agents," and "that employees, through the officers of their trade union or through other officers chosen by them, should be free to negotiate with employers or the representatives of employers' associations concerning rates of pay, hours of labour or other working conditions, with a view to the conclusion of a collective agreement."

to be continued.

Labour Relations in Canada—I

By A. R. MOSHER

President of the Canadian Congress of Labour and of the Canadian Brotherhood of Railway Employees.

Canada and the U.S.A. One of the most striking characteristics of the Canadian Labour movement is its close association and, in some respects, its virtual identification with the Labour movement in the United States. Approximately three-fifths of the organized workers of Canada are members of Canadian branches of international unions¹. This situation is unparalleled anywhere else in the world, and it arises, in part at least, out of the unique relationship between Canada and the United States. Canadian industry operates inevitably within the orbit of American industry; much American capital is invested in Canada; many industries in Canada are owned and operated by subsidiaries of United States corporations. The development of industry in the United States was, in the beginning, considerably in advance of that in Canada; it has been enormously more extensive, as might be expected from the ratios of population, and since Labour organization follows and is conditioned by industrial organization, the Labour movement in the United States has always been more highly developed than in Canada.

Canadian Labour Organizations. At the present time, there are two central Labour bodies in Canada which operate on a national scale: (1) The Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, which has in affiliation the Canadian branches of international craft unions, as well as a number of national and federal unions; and (2) the Canadian Congress of Labour, which similarly has among its affiliates the Canadian branches of international industrial unions and organizing committees, whose membership in the United States are affiliated with the Congress of Industrial Organizations, purely national unions, and a large number of directly chartered local unions. One important distinction between the two Congresses is that the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada is primarily a legislative body², so far as the international craft unions are concerned, all matters of organization and jurisdiction³ being retained by the American Federation of Labour, whereas the Canadian Congress of Labour is a wholly autonomous body, having full jurisdiction in both the legislative and organizing fields; in other words, it is not subject in any manner to control by the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

In order to complete the picture, it is necessary to refer to the Confederation of Catholic Workers of Canada, which embraces local unions or syndicates in the province of Quebec and a certain number of workers in Ottawa and district. This body has not

been a strong factor in the fight for collective bargaining in Canada, but some protection has been obtained for its members by codes established under Quebec legislation. There is also a substantial group of railway workers, probably over 20,000, who are members of the four international railway Labour unions covering the running trades.⁴ These unions are not affiliated with any central Labour body either in the United States or Canada.

Labour in Great Britain, the U.S.A. and Canada. In Great Britain, where Labour organization began, there is a general acceptance of the principles of union recognition and collective bargaining. The system of negotiation is a voluntary one, which has slowly developed over a long period. In the United States, the government some years ago passed the National Labour Relations Act which states specifically that "employees shall have the right to self-organization, to form, join, or assist Labour organizations, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in concerted activities, for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection." Further, it provides penalties for interference with these rights, and establishes a National Labour Relations Board which has power to deal with disputes and enforce respect for the principles involved.

In Canada, however, there is neither the general acceptance of union recognition and collective bargaining which obtains in Great Britain, nor the legislation which has been adopted in the United States. The Canadian Government has not been influenced by the example of either country; it takes a neutral attitude toward both parties in Labour disputes, although certain legislation has been definitely injurious to the interests of the workers. The Department of Labour has been in existence since 1900, and the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act was passed in 1907, while other legislation has necessarily referred to trade or Labour unions, but there has been no adequate protection for the right to organize.

Canada's Labour Policy. The attitude of successive governments has apparently been that, if the workers want to get organized, they may do so at their-peril. However, reference should be made to the fact that, in 1939, a section was added to the Criminal Code. This provides penalties for an employer who refuses to employ or dismisses from his employment any person for the sole reason that he is a member of a lawful trade union, or seeks by intimidation, etc., to compel workers to abstain from belonging to such a trade union, but because of the manner in which it

Continued on page 28.

¹ Throughout this article the term "international" denotes organizations with branches in the United States and Canada.

² In North American trade union terminology "legislative" is applied to bodies whose function is to secure through representations to governments and parliamentarians the enactment of laws and regulations beneficial to labour.

³ "Jurisdiction" here means constitutional power to give rulings in questions of demarcation between affiliated bodies, particularly in cases of dispute as to which of two or more organizations certain workers should belong to.

⁴ The "Big Four" are the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers with headquarters in Cleveland, Ohio; the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Cleveland; the Brotherhood of Railway Conductors, Cedar Rapids, Iowa; and the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Cleveland.

BRITAIN'S TRANSPORT PROBLEM

Socialisation its Solution

The Annual Conference of the British Labour Party discussed a number of political, social and economic problems with the intention of indicating solutions calculated to contribute towards the winning of the war in the shortest possible time. Transport was an important item among them. The debate on this subject concluded with the adoption of the following resolution:

"This Conference urges upon the Government the necessity for co-ordinating all forms of Transport—road, rail, and inland waterways—under National Ownership—with special emphasis on the need to take immediate steps to meet the war-time requirement for an effective Transport System."

This resolution was moved by Mr. Arthur Deakin, Acting General Secretary of the British Transport and General Workers' Union. We reproduce here the main passages of the speech in which Mr. Deakin advocated unified control of all transport now as a war-time necessity and, at the same time, as a beginning of the solution required in peacetime.

"We are not asking for the immediate establishment of a National Board of Control for the Transport Industry. The resolution suggests that the Government be urged to accept the principle of the socialisation of the Transport Industry, and that consideration be given to the immediate needs for an effective Transport System in war-time. At the present moment transport is largely under the control of the Ministry of War Transport. This resolution asks that there shall be established a co-ordination of all forms of transport—road, rail, and inland waterborne transport. So far as the railways are concerned, the Railway Executive, working under the authority of the Ministry of Transport, are dealing with railway transport in war-time. Passenger and commercial road transport is largely regulated by the licensing system operated by the Regional Transport Commissioners.

Under the present arrangement we have an opportunity, through the Inland War Transport Council, to express our point of view in regard to transport problems. Unfortunately, however, that body is only of an advisory character. We should like to see it much more definite in relation to its administrative responsibilities, giving direction rather than advice. We realise very definitely that in dealing with transport we are dealing with a finely balanced organism. You cannot speedily change over from one form of control to another. For that reason we do not ask that a radical change of the character implied by the socialisation of the industry should suddenly be embarked upon under conditions such as we are facing to-day. In dealing with the railway side, it is true to say that the only interest represented on the Railway Executive is the Railway Companies. If the Trade Union point of view was put forward on that body it would make for the more effective organisation of the railway system.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of War Transport said recently that the nation most capable of organising transport in war-time would probably win the war. It is a war of movement, and all forms

of transport must plan an important part in the economic life necessary for the maintenance of the nation in war-time, and above all in the movement of supplies necessary for our war-time production. For the war period there should be a development freed from the restricting influences of the post-war interests of the present owners. As a member of the War Transport Council I have from time to time seen specious arguments put forward designed to protect the long-range interests of the present owners, and a good deal of our difficulty has been conditioned by that consideration.

So far as the inland waterways are concerned, there should be a full acceptance of financial responsibility by the Government. The inland waterways have fallen into a condition of disuse, and it is impossible under the stress of war-time circumstances to develop and make the fullest possible use of that means of transport. Dealing with the commercial transport side, the Ministry of War Transport should more fully develop the idea of directly controlling heavy goods transport.

In the post-war reconstruction the national planning of transport is essential, and co-ordination is only possible under a system of national ownership, taking the broadest possible view of the needs of the community nationally."

American Workers' Income

In 1939, the 38,322,420 wage and salary workers in the United States had the shockingly low "median" income of \$800. The median income of 27,458,200 men workers was \$967, and of 10,864,220 women workers was \$540.

"Median" income simply means that half the workers get incomes above that amount and half get incomes below it. In other words, half of all American workers received less than \$800 a year in 1939.

Those are some of the unpleasant facts in a report published in June by the Census Bureau. The bureau obtained the facts, for the first time in history,

JUNGLE ON THE WATERFRONT

A Picture of the Conditions on the Atlantic Coast of the U.S.A.

There are many things wrong on the waterfront. The tropical forest that breeds them and conceals them is the hiring system itself, the notorious and long outmoded shape-up. Let this jungle growth itself be demolished and corruption will stand revealed where it can be met. So long as the shape-up prevails there will be, undetected, the hideout of men whose purpose on the waterfront is malignant. For the shape-up itself draws great numbers of surplus men of unknown character to the waterfront, gives them a legitimate excuse for hanging about or gathering in nearby bars and poolrooms with every opportunity to learn sailing dates, cargoes and destinations of the ships.

The institution of the shape-up dates back to the days when cargo was carried on a man's back between dock and hold, when it had a definite function and therefore a certain validity. For the foreman, emerging at a fixed hour to select the men he wanted, could pick the biggest and brawniest from the *shape*, or rough semi-circle, in which they stood in the street before the dock. Now that machinery does the actual lifting, agility and experience count more than mere muscle, and there is no legitimate excuse for a system which holds the men in subjection and perpetuates a virtual slave market.

During the boom times of the twenties men gravitated to the docks, for the harbours were busy and the work steady and well paid. In the slack times that followed, they were lured and held there by the artificial stimulus of high rates; for the shape-up system is predicated upon a surplus of manpower in good times and bad. To-day it is only a small proportion of all the men who pay dues in this completely unionized industry who have steady work.

The longshoreman who earned 30 cents an hour in 1912, earns to-day for the same work—when he gets it—\$1.20 an hour, with \$1.80 for overtime. If he

handles a dangerous or noxious cargo he will earn \$2.40 an hour for eight hours and \$3.60 for overtime. But he gets along rather like the donkey which is kept going by the carrot dangled before his nose, for he is cursed by chronic part-time employment.

Greenwich House published in 1939 a study of typical longshoremen's households which revealed that 39 per cent. of them had an average income of \$15 a week, and that only 11 per cent. averaged more than \$30 a week. A hiring hall, placing the men in impartial rotation as they applied for work, would automatically measure the manpower needed in each port at its busiest times, thus draining off the surplus and releasing them to take steady work elsewhere.

The most vicious feature of the shape-up is the fact that it happens simultaneously on every busy dock. At exactly five minutes before 8 a.m., 1 p.m. and, when the work is heavy, again before 7 p.m., the foreman selects his men. There is in peacetime a certain routine on the docks of coastwise lines which keep regular schedules. The men work in gangs at each hatch, and some men work regularly together as a gang. There is no guarantee, however, that a man employed at eight will be employed again at one. The whole system works to keep the industry casual, for no dock is busy all the time, and the foreman has infinite scope for favouritism, bribery or discrimination. Paying the foreman for the chance to work—the so-called "kickback"—is a common practice.

In normal times the men read the shipping news and knew where to apply for work. Now that the papers publish no ship movements, they rely on the grapevine gossip of bars and poolrooms. And between the shape-up hours they wander from dock to dock. It is a system made to order for spies.

The New Republic.

American Workers' Income—continued from page 30.

when its "enumerators" went from door to door in 1940 asking a question they had never asked before. That question was: "How much wage or salary income did you receive last year?"

The low income figures revealed by this careful nation-wide canvass by the experienced Census Bureau convincingly confirm the facts disclosed by many other government and non-government surveys.

The report contains several detailed tables of figures. One table shows the percentages of the 38,322,420 workers who received incomes of various amounts.

Only 1 per cent received \$5,000 and over, only 0.5 per cent received from \$4,000 to \$5,000, only 1.9 per cent from \$3,000 to \$4,000, and only 2.1 per cent from \$2,500 to \$3,000. Adding these figures, only 5.5 per

cent, or about 1 of each 20, had a wage or salary income over \$2,500.

Incomes from \$2,000 to \$2,500 were received by 5.4 per cent of the wage and salary earners. Adding this group to the 5.5 per cent over \$2,500, we find that only about 11 per cent of the total are earning the \$2,000 minimum required to support a family on a decent standard of living.

In the income groups from \$2,000 down to \$1,000 are 30 per cent of the wage and salary earners, and the remaining 59 per cent range from \$1,000 down to the unemployed who had no incomes whatever.

In other words, practically 6 of each 10 wage and salary workers earned less than \$1,000 in 1939, which was more prosperous than most of the other years in the depression.

Labor.

PLAN INDUSTRY ON A WORLD SCALE Under Democratic Control

By J. P. M. MILLAR -

General Secretary, National Council of Labour Colleges in Great Britain.

We are living in a dark and dangerous period in human history. There are still many who believe that the cause of the terrible struggle in which nearly the whole of the world's population is now engaged is a man called Hitler. Hitler, however, is merely the froth on the foaming current of the history that is being made to-day.

If a better world is to come out of the present struggle, it is essential that people should understand what has given rise to the current that is sweeping country after country into war, slavery, and disaster.

Those who say that it is the rise of Nazism or Fascism that is the cause are much nearer the truth. But even the rise of Nazism is something that has to be explained. Men do not suddenly, without any powerful causes, give their support to a new movement or new social theory.

Turning Point in History. The fact of the matter is that we are now at a turning point in history that has been produced not by politicians or Fuehrers, but by the same vast economic developments that were responsible for the last great war and for the economic crises that followed that war.

In other words, the root cause of the struggle lies in the changes that have been brought about in industrial development by the capitalist system.

While that system has much to its discredit, it has to its great credit the fact that it has been responsible for the growth of the wonderful productive power of modern industry. In recent years, however, that productive power has become so great that it is beyond the powers of individual groups of capitalists to control it. In consequence, the world has been a pained witness of countries producing millions of tons of wheat for which they could not find markets, and of other countries producing enormous quantities of coffee which they had to throw into the sea or burn in locomotives, and in which other countries have had to pay farmers for *not* rearing pigs and for *not* growing crops.

This failure to find markets for wheat or coffee, or for coal, or the products of our iron and steel industry, lay at the root of the vast armies of unemployed for which even the richest capitalist State in the world, the United States, could not find employment. In fact, it was during the last few years, when States started to prepare to make war on each other, that unemployment began seriously to fall.

It was fundamentally the terrible problem of unemployment, of failure to find markets for the products of industry, and general economic disasters that had been responsible for the rise of Nazism in Germany and the similar movement in Italy. The remedy advocated by the Nazi Movement was to bring the

German economic system under the control of a totalitarian political party and to find markets for its goods by dominating or annexing the countries round about it, particularly agricultural countries, like the countries in the Balkans, which could provide Germany with agricultural produce and raw materials, and offer a market for manufactured goods.

In order to carry out that policy, Germany deprived her own people of freedom to think as they liked and to organise as they liked, and brought them under the iron heel of a dictatorship, backed by a tyrannous secret police. The Nazi policy also involved the creation of a fierce nationalist spirit that would "justify" the expansion of Germany's power at the expense of other countries, and "justify" the populations of these other countries being treated as subject and inferior peoples.

Democratic Collective Control. The productivity of modern industry is now so great that, to avoid crises, unemployment, and other great disasters, it has to be brought under collective control. In other words, it has to be planned on the basis of collectivism. There is, however, a vast difference between the collective control advocated by the Labour Movement and the collective control advocated by the Nazis. The collective control advocated by Labour is one under which the people would retain their democratic rights and not be at the complete mercy of dictatorial political bosses.

The Labour view goes even further, however. It is convinced that collective control must be on an international basis, and is utterly opposed to the Nazi idea that one country is entitled to tyrannise over and exploit the peoples of other countries.

In other words, Labour stands for planned industry—planned not only on a national, but an international scale, under democratic control and with equal rights for all peoples. It is only when the world is prepared to accept that policy that the peoples of the world can get the best out of industry, can obtain economic security and freedom from disastrous wars and the terrible cruelties that immediately arise when one people tries to subjugate another.

World Planning. It is foolish to think that, after this war is over, Britain, France, or Germany can go back to what some comfortably-off people think were the good old days, when industry was almost entirely under the control of individuals or groups of individuals, and each country muddled along. To attempt to do that will bring another catastrophe upon us similar to the present. Men have now to think of planning their economic life, not only on a national but on a world scale, and to realise that the productivity and world-wide nature of modern industry has made each man his brother's keeper.

BE PREPARED TO DEFEAT THE UGLY OLD ORDER

A BRITISH VOICE

We have never underrated the strength and influence of those who are opposed to social and economic change. They are powerfully entrenched, and when they do sally forth with their weapons of half-truths, falsehoods and fallacies, sharpened by their own hatred of change and fears of the consequences to themselves, the Labour Movement will have all its work cut out to prevent a stampede back to the ugly old order of booms and depressions, unemployment and misery, great contrasts of wealth and poverty, and the sordid scramble for world trade stirring up hatreds and jealousies amongst the nations and driving them to war.

How can they be defeated?

By the ordinary people arming themselves with facts and arguments, learning how to use their knowledge and having the courage to apply it.

Men and women who understand the money racket, will not be frightened by those who point to an estimated National Debt of £20,000,000,000 and its annual burden of £600,000,000 interest and ask: Where is the money for the new social order to come from?

They will tell those financial bogey-men that the money, or if you like, credit, which started the war machine in motion has not been destroyed by being spent. Guns, shells, planes and warships may be destroyed, but not the money which financed the effort to bring them into being. It still exists. It is used over and over again to keep the war machine running, functioning as a medium for the circulation of commodities and also as a commodity itself to be lent at so much per cent.

In the nation as a whole, there is not, and never has been, any shortage of money. A great deal of our unemployment in the past was due to the fact that those who control the monetary system followed a policy, which hampered schemes for industrial expansion. That must not be allowed to happen in the future. People who understand that their social needs can be adequately satisfied only by the fullest possible production and equitable distribution of goods and services will not be ignorant of the part which money must be made to play in the process.

Nor will they be side-tracked or discouraged by those who argue that because we have lost a great part of our overseas capital investments the idea of a better Britain after the war is only a pipe-dream.

We have Sir Ernest Benn arguing on these lines in an article in the *Daily Telegraph* for May 7th. He accuses what he calls "New Worldmongers" of raising hopes that can never be realised.

"I have yet to learn from any of them," he says, "how they propose to feed us."

We are not scared by Sir Ernest Benn's spectre of hunger.

Neither he nor anyone else will go hungry when food is not only grown, *but made available to the people*. And that, surely, is one of the objects of the new social order.

This is not to suggest, of course, that Great Britain can, or should even try to grow all the food she needs, although, in passing, it might be of interest to Sir Ernest Benn, who believes we can produce only a quarter of the food we need, to mention that many people, from Robert Blatchford forty years ago to Lord Addison in 1938, have proved that by the adoption of a wise agricultural policy Great Britain could have produced a great deal more food than she has been able to do by the policy she followed.

But that is by the way. While Great Britain can make a useful contribution to the solving of the food problem, no one outside of a lunatic asylum expects her to try to feed herself. Any attempt to do so would destroy at the start all prospects of the New World Economy which is essential for real peace and social security.

The social and economic problem of Great Britain is part of a world problem and must be examined as such.

No one country can be made self-supporting, but all nations by pooling their knowledge and resources, by co-operation, by each contributing according to its ability and receiving according to its needs, can adequately feed, clothe and house all the people in the world and provide them with all the amenities of a decent and well-ordered life.

There is enough in the world for all. No one, not even the "Old Worldmongers" will deny that, but these people, either because of their vested interests, or fear or hatred of change, or because they are simply incapable of seeing economic problems as world problems, will put all sorts of difficulties in the way of creating the confidence and the international organisation and machinery necessary for the achievement of the world order that all reasonably-minded people desire.

To-day the "Old Worldmongers" are muttering and murmuring and sneering at "Utopian dreams," but after the war we may have to meet much stronger opposition. Our job, the job of ordinary people everywhere is to be prepared.

The organising of the world order which will make available to the people the goods they have produced is not impossible. It has long been the aim of the Trade Union Movement, wherever trade unions have been allowed to exist, and the ideal of all people of good will.

The Record, Journal of the British Transport and General Workers' Union.

GERMAN STATE RAILWAYS IN WARTIME—II

By H. KRAMER, of the former German Railwaymen's Union.

Organization of the Railways for War

In time of war military commands are set up at the divisional offices, which are twenty-six in number, and at the Central Traffic Control Office. These are responsible to the supreme army command. The requirements of the military commands have priority over other traffic. The normal schedules and timetables are only carried out to the extent practicable. This has repercussions on highway and inland waterway transport, and the country's entire transportation system is seriously disorganized and becomes highly vulnerable to factors such as enemy action, sabotage or accidents. Intensive utilization of personnel and equipment can not remedy the situation.

In 1933 75 per cent of the established staff of the State Railways was over the age of 40. The introduction of Nazi elements into the railway personnel has not changed this age composition. Of the non-established grades 12 per cent were up to 30 years of age, 38 per cent up to 40 years of age, and 50 per cent 40 to 65 years of age. At present the age limit has been officially raised to 70 years, in practice it has been abolished altogether. The calling up of younger age groups of railwaymen to the armed services and the transfer of experienced staff to the occupied territories have also greatly reduced the efficiency potential of the State Railway personnel.

Excessive Utilization of Personnel

The emergency conditions prevailing on the railways necessitate a re-arrangement and extension of service hours and a corresponding reduction and upsetting of the hours of rest. To-day brakemen have to be employed again because the use of vehicles with varying types of brakes makes it impossible to employ automatic brakes. In spite of shifts as long as 16 hours, it is estimated that some 10 to 11,000 additional men are employed by the State Railways on brakemen's duties. In view of the increased requirements, and the general shortage of man-power, it was necessary to lower the qualifications for appointment as commissioned official. Although sick leave is harder to obtain, absences due to illness are on the increase. Wages have been legally stabilized, working hours are unlimited, the speeding up of work relentless. These are the blessings of dictatorship, which began with the destruction of the trade unions.

The Condition of the Material

Germany was as regards the safety of the railway industry at the top of the list of countries with a comparable density of traffic. This has drastically changed. The demands of rearmament and the war have brought about a redistribution and intensification of railway traffic. The rolling stock and equipment can in the long run not cope with these demands. The neglect of the railways in favour of the motorways is avenging itself. Between 1933 and 1938 the total

number of vehicles of all kinds fell from 632,000 to 594,000. There is a severe shortage of loading space. An attempt is made to overcome it by "borrowing" rolling stock from Belgium, France and other countries and by raising the permissible loads.

The condition of the locomotive stock is still worse. The locomotive department is clearly a central factor in railway operation, and here the necessity of using inferior metals, lubricants and fuel makes itself particularly felt. It is true that under the second Four Year Plan for the years 1940 to 1944 three and a half milliard marks have been earmarked for the re-equipment of the State Railways, but so far the industry has only been able to obtain a loan of 500 millions. Even if with the general readiness of the German money market the total sum should be raised without too much difficulty, that does not mean that the building of 6,000 locomotives, 10,000 passenger carriages and 112,000 goods wagons will prove an easy matter. Locomotive and wagon factories are working all out for the war machine and the shortage of skilled labour becomes more and more acute.

The same factors operate in the case of the permanent way. Under normal conditions at least 6 per cent of rails and switches are renewed or exchanged annually. To-day with a much denser traffic and a friction factor one half to one and a half tons per axle higher the proportion should be substantially greater. During the past eight years, however, the permanent way programme, far from being carried out fully, has been reduced to the renewal of 3 per cent of the installation. Although the permanent way of the German State Railways is one of the strongest in Europe, such neglect cannot fail to affect the safety and the speed of traffic. It suffices to recall the biggest accident in German railway history which happened at Genthin near Berlin in 1938; the numerous reports of long delays of trains all tell their tale.

To be concluded.

THE WAYS OF PROFIT ARE INSCRUTABLE

"What appears a distinct possibility is the appearance of some rubber from the Malay Peninsula, now controlled by the Japanese. The plantations there were in no sense scorched by the retreating British and conceivably Japanese commercial agents could get them into production without too much delay. Such rubber then might be sold to interests in this country by way of an intermediary or broker in, say, Brazil. The Japanese would like to get the money or credit, which rubber could supply; and we would like to get the rubber, principally for our military needs. Essentially this would amount to trading with the enemy, but there is plenty of support for the belief that such rubber will find its way into this country before too long."

Steel Magazine, U.S.A.

A NEW ERA IN NATIVE POLICY IN SOUTH AFRICA General Smuts' Statement and its Implications

By JULIUS LEWIN

Lecturer in Native Law and Administration at the University of the Witwatersrand.

A new era has opened for Native policy in South Africa. Those who watch the signs of changing times had noticed it before. Now General Smuts in his speech "The Basis of Trusteeship" at the beginning of this year in Cape Town to the Institute of Race Relations has made it clear to all.

Six long years have gone by since Parliament passed General Hertzog's Native legislation. The passage of that legislation drove many friends of the Native near to defeatism. Until that time, liberal Native policy had been very much on the defensive: its champions were always busy saying what should not be done to the Native, since discussion centred mainly around political rights. Once the Act of Disfranchisement was passed, those who had never succumbed to despair, adjusted themselves to the resulting situation. Slowly through the dark years, during which "liberal" became an epithet of abuse, discussion turned away from the franchise to economic and social things—to wages and education and the health of the Native.

Recognizing the Facts. Those who maintained their effort and belief through that period are now justified in their faith. What is remarkable about General Smut's speech is not its actual content; much of what he said is, indeed, almost platitudinous. The remarkable thing is that the Prime Minister of South Africa should have said what he did in these grim days. That segregation has failed, that the Natives are deeply detribalized, that their education and their health must be our urgent concern—these are elementary facts that everyone who has paid any attention to Native affairs, has grasped long ago. Unfortunately, the man in the South African street, whether in town or country, has no real knowledge of conditions where Natives are affected. That is why recognition of the facts has rarely been the basis of public discussion in this field. Now, almost in a night, General Smuts, by making solid facts the ground on which he begins to define his attitude to Native rights and wrongs, has lifted the whole subject to a political plane incomparably higher than it has ever reached since the establishment of the Union.

Whether one agrees or disagrees with General Smuts' personal theory of trusteeship, is not of particular importance. It is seldom profitable to debate Native policy in terms of metaphor. This idea of political trusteeship, about the origin of which General Smuts speculated, has a long history, going right back to Edmund Burke's views on Britain's role in India, and even further back to John Locke. Moreover, it is significant that at this very moment men like Lord Hailey are saying in England that the theory of trusteeship is of small practical value in colonial administration.

What is of great importance, however, is the warm recognition of the essential humanity of the African, of his need of the very same things that the poorest of the poor need everywhere—decent housing, good health, primary education, and an opportunity to rise in the economic scale. It is, of course, the process of urbanisation that has made these needs daily more clamant. This process, and the detribalization that inevitably accompanies it, General Smuts rightly regards as a great revolution. "What is taking place in our midst," he declared, "is as great a revolution as has ever happened on this continent." In the past a genuine desire to maintain Native culture often disguised this process, and sometimes offered politicians an argument against recognizing the thing at all. Now, happily, we are nearly done with that form of intellectual dishonesty.

To-day, the big growth of secondary industry, with its call for more and more labour, makes the Natives in the towns a welcome asset, and no longer a dangerous influx. Hitherto, the urban Natives were popularly regarded as tribesmen whose proper place was on the land; now they are being recognized as an essential factor in modern industry, whose willing labour it would be foolish to waste. Indeed, the question will soon be how to bring them to town and how to settle them there—not how to keep them away. This economic realism lies behind the broad hints of better things to come for the Natives, that formed so conspicuous a feature of General Smuts' pronouncement.

Colour Prejudice and Racism. If segregation has failed to solve the problem, it is equally certain that no other catchword will. The stubborn fact is that there can never be a simple solution to the problems we have created after a century of inter-racial contact and conflict. The best we can do is what the Prime Minister now bids us do—make facts our guide, not elaborate theories nor unrestrained racial feelings.

And it is notable that it was in this context that General Smuts referred to the most pernicious form of racialism in our time, the idea of the *Herrenvolk*. In plain words, colour prejudice in Africa is a first cousin of Nazism in Europe. One should note with special care that General Smuts came-pretty close to saying that racialism is all of a piece. The man who wants to keep the African down is also the man who dislikes the Englishman or the Afrikaner (as the case may be), and who hates the Jew. That is the reason why a victory in one sector of the front for racial freedom is a victory for the whole. When General Smuts dealt a blow to reactionary Native policy, he also struck a blow on behalf of human rights, regardless of race, colour or creed.

Read, Reflect and Write to Us

We are still awaiting contributions from our readers!

In these days thinking is not only done at the top, among the experts, leaders, etc., but also to a great extent at the bottom, among "common men and women." This fact, that people are thinking anew, is one of the important features of the present period. Many things which hitherto were accepted unthinkingly are now critically examined. This thinking, evoked by the world events, constitutes a force which will help to shape the future. To think has become the supreme duty of all who realize that indifference about the future is little short of a crime. The immediate future may be decisive for the future of humanity. The possibilities of development of our society are at stake. Who now in his blindness refuses to think supports the forces which attack the very foundation of his existence; that foundation is our society. The present period is teaching us all that the form of our society determines not only how we may live but also how we shall live. It teaches us also that we have to decide the form of our society ourselves.

The purpose of this column is to provoke thought on this subject, and will contain matter from all parts of the world. This matter will be presented as it was served up, whether you or we like it or not. We are not responsible for the views expressed, and for the present pass no comment thereon. It will be selected because it gives evidence of perceiving a problem, because it is calculated to provoke thought, and because it may contribute towards a clarification of thought.

Readers are invited to write to us, briefly and clearly, their views on the matter we publish. Their contributions will be published if they are in their turn calculated to foster and clarify thinking. But it should be borne in mind that the column is intended for an international forum where local aspects are not in their place. Where a local colour does creep in, it should be excused, as to some extent it is unavoidable.

We reprint from "The New Zealand Transport Worker," official organ of the New Zealand Federated Waterside Workers' Union (I.T.F. affiliate), parts of an editorial entitled: "Organise for the future":

ULTIMATE OBJECTIVE. It is right that the trade unions should have an every-day or immediate objective. This is mainly concerned with wages and conditions of employment, but we should always bear in mind the ultimate objective of industrial and political Labour, and that is Socialism. Those who glibly talk about the New Order cannot very well turn back. They cannot advocate Fascism or Nazism or dictatorship. There is only one road which they can go, and that is in the direction of Socialism.

It should be the duty of our industrial and political organizations of Labour to plan now to shape the economic course for the future. The New Order will not be delivered to the workers like a good meal on the table. They will have to play their part in bringing it about and building it up. Otherwise, the forces of reaction will be at work to direct the course this new order will take. We do not want any failures. We want to make the change successful, first, in ensuring international peace; second, in giving economic and social equality to the people of the nations, and these things can be done only by fair distribution of the goods produced and by commodities being manufactured, produced and distributed for use and not for the profit of individuals.

RESPONSIBILITY. We have said in these columns over and over again in the past quarter of a century that if the workers were given access to the machinery of wealth production and the natural resources, they could produce goods and render service in abundance for all, and they must be prepared to undertake that responsibility in the days to come.

We want to see, first of all, the workers realise their responsibility to society as the producers of goods and services. We want, above all, to see them realise the fact that they can practically control and organise production at least equally as well as and better than the other fellow if they are given the opportunity. No good purpose can be served by making high-falutin speeches about Socialism or about the New Order and what it should be unless we are prepared to organise and shape the economic course for the future.

IDEALISM. High wages and good conditions of employment are all-important to the trade union movement under the capitalist system. They are not nearly so important, however, as social ownership and the production and distribution of goods for use instead of for profit.

We cannot achieve that ideal or objective until we recognize our responsibility as working men and women to render social service to the people of the nation. Once that service is rendered, we can rest assured of social and economic security, higher living standards and peace and prosperity for all.

After the foregoing we should like to reproduce from "The Canadian Unionist" of the Canadian Congress of Labour an article entitled "Preparing for Peace" which covers, though from

a somewhat different point of view, much the same ground:

... The chief reason why little or nothing is being done with regard to the post-war period—even in Great Britain—is the general unwillingness to attempt anything of a difficult nature. It is so much easier to drift along, and that attitude is largely responsible for present conditions. The word "complacency" has been overworked, but that is because it has it had so much to do. . . .

What is to be done about the competitive economic system known as capitalism? The British are looking forward to a new order after the war—peace, happiness, security; it has been promised to them by the Labour leaders at least; the hope of a better world has inspired and sustained them during one blitz after another. . . . Does anyone think that can be obtained under capitalism? And if, as a great many people believe, the war is the result of international competition in the fields of finance and industry, how can one hope for enduring peace as long as the competitive system is allowed to govern economic relationships?

The argument that the only thing we should be thinking about now is the winning of the war is specious; we could not all concentrate on that subject if we wished to do so. The people who should think about the war are the experts; those who know something about fighting; those who design the tanks and planes and ships; those who give the orders. But the vast number of the rank and file who have to obey, and all those whose daily occupation demands action rather than thought; those who have a chance to study the depressing record of the last twenty-five years and reach some conclusion about it—there must be many people who could give some attention to the post-war world without in any way lessening their usefulness in the war-effort.

And what about the effect of a generally-acceptable plan upon all the allied peoples and the populations of the conquered nations? "Something tangible," writes Peter F. Drucker, "will have to be offered to 350,000,000 people on the European continent in order to incite them to rebellion against totalitarian conquerors." The morale of the fighters for democracy would be tremendously stimulated if there could be drawn up some fairly clear picture of the world as it might be made. . . .

There is need for cleaning up the fuzzy ideas of multitudes of people with regard to collective security, the bases of international organization, the use of military force anywhere in the world to restrain or prevent aggression. . . . The way to avoid the mistakes of the past is to find out why they were made and the conditions under which the opportunity for mistakes arose. Now is the time to look ahead, to use one's constructive imagination on the possibilities that lie before us. The problems will be difficult at best, but a little foresight now may save an awful lot of headaches later on.