



INTERNATIONAL TRANSPORT WORKERS JOURNAL

VOL. V. No. 56

MAY-JUNE 1944

Published by the
International Transport
Workers' Federation,
Bedford, England.

Affiliated Unions :

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

Relations with unions in :

CUBA
ECUADOR
EGYPT
MEXICO

Other relations in :

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

On the Eve of Europe's Liberation

TRANSPORT workers in Europe have long been waiting for the battle that began on 6th June, 1944, on the beaches of Normandy. The immense majority of them—and that majority includes a good many transport workers of Germany and of Hitler's vassal States—yearned for that major second front as ardently as any other foe of Hitler. The élite among them did not wait passively for this event, but began a war of their own, perfected an old method of warfare—transport sabotage. As the enemy's precautions against sabotage became more and more efficacious, and repression more and more savage, the army of saboteurs grew in size and its soldiers in skill. They grew in heroism too, for the saboteur must court dangers more difficult to face than swift death in the heat of battle.

Transport sabotage is undoubtedly more effective at certain times and places than at others. It is highly effective when a battle is raging and when loss of time in the movement of men and material to the battlefield means losses of men, material and ground. Transport sabotage is likely to reach its maximum efficacy when several major battles are taking place simultaneously. The saboteur's morale is highest when he positively knows that he is doing paratroopers' work.

The I.T.F. has repeatedly exhorted European transport workers to make ample use of the weapon of sabotage. On the occasion of the opening of the second front, this exhortation has been repeated at the request of the American Broadcasting Station in Europe. Here is the text of an appeal broadcast on 8th June in most Western and Eastern European languages :

European Transport Workers. The obstinate resistance of the European peoples against their oppressor is bearing fruit now visible to all. This resistance has made possible the assault from the West upon Hitler's fortress, an assault which, combined with blows from East and South, must and will bring about Europe's liberation.

With the opening of the new battlefield in the West the weapon of transport sabotage, which you have used so courageously and efficiently, acquires a new and still greater significance. Every effective sabotage of transport anywhere in the Nazi rear contributes to bring death to the enemy, to save lives of combatants in the liberating forces, to advance victory by hours and days. The accumulated effects of widespread sabotage can precipitate the enemy's defeat.

Once more, the International Transport Workers' Federation appeals to the transport workers and, indeed, to all workers of Europe to do everything in their power to throw the whole Nazi transport system into utter confusion. We appeal to you to help thus to achieve victory for the sake of the future of the Labour Movement and for the sake of the ideals for which our Movement has fought for more than half a century. Destruction of the Nazi tyranny means to us a new opportunity for the workers of Europe to rally under the banners of international socialism, and to join forces to bring into being a Europe united by the association of its peoples in freedom and equality, co-operating for the promotion of their common welfare, and making Peace at last secure. For these ends which you, transport workers, hold in common with all organized workers of enslaved Europe, we urge you to intensify to the utmost the action of the workers' great army of sabotage.

BEYOND UNRRA—A EUROPEAN RECONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY

By P. TOFAHRN

The United Nations' collective care for the future has given birth to UNRRA. It is an instrument which has the defects inevitably flowing from the state of mind of its creators, who are in the main capitalist and conservative minded Governments. What is probably the major criticism that we must level against UNRRA has been put in a nutshell by a Study-Committee of the Fabian Society: "Although it was perhaps inevitable, the constitution of UNRRA places great power in the hands of the United States and Great Britain, and our criticism springs from a mistrust of any scheme which, in the main, is controlled by those who serve and are trained in the preservation of privilege and vested interest."¹

The purposes of UNRRA are strictly limited. The preamble of its constitution states that immediately upon the liberation of any area "the population thereof shall receive aid and relief from their sufferings, food, clothing and shelter, aid in the prevention of pestilence and in the recovery of the health of the people, and preparation and arrangements shall be made for the return of prisoners and exiles to their homes and for assistance in the resumption of urgently needed agricultural and industrial production and the restoration of essential services." This limitation was emphasised at the first session of the UNRRA Council held at Atlantic City in November, 1943. Paragraph 1 of Resolution No. 13, dealing with housing, reads: "Any general rebuilding policy for the areas to be liberated is in the sphere of long-term reconstruction and does not, therefore, come within the purview of the administration."

Within whose purview, then, does "long-term reconstruction" come? President Roosevelt, in his message to Congress on November 15th, said that "other machinery and measures would be necessary to solve long-range problems of reconstruction, but UNRRA could lay the foundations for reconstruction." (*The Times*, London, November 16th, 1943).

Not a word has been heard yet of the United Nations' "other machinery" for the solution of the long-range problems that would follow up the work of UNRRA. If all goes well long-term problems may become topical in Europe within a relatively short space of time. President Roosevelt said that the liberated peoples themselves would have to assume the greater share of the tremendous job of aiding war-victims. Is it contemplated that each people will do its rehabilitation and reconstruction work according to its own plan and by its own means (control of its foreign trade, currency, raw materials, colonies, merchant navy, civil aviation, etc.) with such outside help as sympathy, investment, security and expectation of profits will secure? This method is certainly most appealing to those who are eager to preserve all the prerogatives attached to formal national sovereignty.

But it is also the surest way to create an unbalanced international order bound to produce a host of sources of new trouble. With this method those who have suffered least would be the speediest in accomplishing reconstruction and among the first in the scramble for the world's markets.

An alternative method is that described by the United States Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, as a "practical and purposeful application of sovereign powers through measures of international co-operation." This method would call for a collective effort of the European peoples to repair the devastations of war by pooling all their material and human resources and working according to a plan that would put first things first, cottages in Russia and Poland before sumptuous hotels on the beaches of the Atlantic, dairy cattle before race-horses, tractors and other agricultural implements before luxurious automobiles, schools and hospitals before palatial bank and insurance buildings, good roads to remote rural districts before motor-roads to fashionable holiday resorts.

The Europe of the future includes the present enemy countries. A European reconstruction plan must provide for reconstruction work in these countries. A European effort includes also their contribution in materials and man-power and in more or less prolonged deprivations—to the repairing of all that was devastated by war in the whole of Europe, including the invaded Soviet Republics. The needs of the enemy countries would be attended to by the impartial application of the principle of first things first, that is to say priority for the most sorely tried sufferers.

A collective effort would quicken the pace of reconstruction if well planned and impartial. The editor of the "Economist," Sir Walter Layton, says: "Reconstruction will be unduly prolonged if it is left entirely to the efforts of individual countries. It will be much more rapid and based on a sure foundation if it is carried out in co-operation" (See *Trade Union World*, April, 1944). But we see the greatest merit of a collective effort in the fact that it would be a step on the road to equality of standards of life in the European countries. The Fascist war has levelled all these standards down and has established near-equality in hunger and misery. The German standard of life, too, will by the end of the war or shortly after come very near to that prevailing in Nazi-occupied Europe. A collective effort of reconstruction would supply to the European peoples the means of lifting all standards simultaneously to higher levels instead of re-establishing the harmful inequalities that existed up to 1939, or establishing new inequalities that would be no less harmful.

If the principle of a collective reconstruction effort by the European peoples is accepted, two things are required: a European plan and a European authority for making the plan and carrying it out. What has been and will be

¹ Memorandum on Relief and Rehabilitation, Fabian Society, London, 1s.

done for relief can be done for reconstruction and can be done by the same people. Those who created UNRRA can create ERA (European Reconstruction Authority). Though its field of action would be Europe, the authority would not be exclusively European in composition. Its success would very much depend upon extra-European help and those whose help is required must be represented on ERA. The USSR, too, would be there to secure an equitable order of priority for its claims and to share in the effort and its results.

The possible material results, and the necessity, of such comprehensive planning and action demand endeavours to secure support for the idea. But that is not all. The carrying out of a ten-year plan on the basis of co-operation and mutual assistance would diminish if not destroy the fertility of the soil on which international antagonisms grow. It is bound to facilitate and hasten the reconciliation of the European peoples which is indispensable for the maintenance of peace. The incorpora-

tion of the enemy peoples in the European community of nations, factually and in spirit, can be achieved thus and only thus. It will also contribute to create those "conditions from which will arise a Europe united by democratic associations of all its peoples in freedom and equality, co-operating for the prevention of wars and of the abuse of economic power and for promoting their common welfare" (Emergency International Trade Union Council, March 30th, 1944).

The promotion of the common welfare will become the practice in European life either on the very morrow of the war or not at all. At the moment that the decision is taken to adopt such practice or to reject it, it will also be decided whether Europe—and the World—is setting foot on the road to peace or to the next war.

I suggest that this is a subject requiring urgent consideration by the Trade Unions of all the countries concerned.

From Trade Union World.

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT IN JAMAICA

Its history and its present condition and structure

By **RICHARD HART**

President, Jamaica Government Railway Employees' Union.

Labour in Jamaica has had a long and bitter struggle to reach even the low standard of wages and working conditions which now exist. We have behind us many years of bloody struggle in which our ancestors fought to free us from the shackles of chattel slavery.

In December, 1831, a great uprising of the slaves of the western parishes was organized by our great slave ancestor Sam (Daddy) Sharpe. With the greatest cunning and secrecy he organized cadres of the most militant slaves on each estate under cover of the religious meetings which his master allowed him to conduct. His plan was that all the slaves should stage a sit-down strike after the Christmas holidays and refuse to work except for wages. If the planters would not accede to this demand they were then to rise in open rebellion. The latter course proved necessary, and with great courage our ancestors went into battle, unarmed and ill-disciplined, against the white troops and the militia.

The rebellion was drowned in blood and thousands were hanged and shot. But this uprising contributed more than any other single factor to the emancipation of our ancestors from the yoke of the slavery in 1834 and the abolition of the apprenticeship system in 1838.

The traditions of struggle personified in Samuel Sharpe were reborn on the 106th anniversary of his execution. On 23rd May, 1938, the general strike commenced, out of which the organized trade union movement took shape. That strike, which lasted for one week, came to an end with the release of Bustamante and Grant. Upon their release the task of organizing a trade union movement commenced in earnest.

Very soon, however, Bustamante began to exhibit

traits which seemed to mark him down not as a genuine working class leader, but as a demagogue concerned with the promotion of himself. His methods were completely dictatorial and he patterned himself faithfully on the fascist dictators, Hitler and Mussolini.

Nevertheless, the Bustamante Industrial Trade Union (B.I.T.U.) stood until the year 1941 as the sole hope of the trade union movement in Jamaica. Our people had no tradition of trade union organization dating back prior to its formation, and the masses at that time understood the need for unity mainly through their personal loyalty to the picturesque figure of Alexander Bustamante.

With the growth of the People's National Party, however, and its extending influence on the workers, a new movement arose in the ranks of labour—a movement for democratic industrial unionism. This movement, at first a persecuted minority inside the B.I.T.U., eventually resulted in the breaking away of various sections to form their own unions. First among these were the Tramway and Transport Workers, and the printers. Other smaller sections also broke away and, together with the independent but semi-dormant Jamaica United Clerks' Association, formed the Trade Union Council.

The new movement was, however, slow in getting on its legs, and for some time failed to draw in the mass support which is necessary to make the Labour Movement a strong and vital force. Bustamante had by the early part of 1942 passed into open collaboration with the colonial government to thwart the national aspirations of the people for self-government expressed through the People's National Party (P.N.P.). He was also

carrying out a vigorous campaign for the destruction of the new unions.

In March, 1942, through the efforts of Arthur L. Henry and Richard Hart, both of whom had formerly been arrested for their activities to obtain the release of Bustamante, the Jamaica Government Railway Employees' Union was formed. In June, 1942, the Postal and Telegraph Workers' Union was organized by Ken Hill, Jamaica's foremost labour organizer and a former vice-president of the B.I.T.U. transport section. In October, 1942, the Public Works Employees' Union was organized by Arthur Henry and Frank Hill.

This put new life into the movement towards democratic industrial unions. For the first time the new movement began to gain a real mass basis. The rapid organizational success of the Railway Union was the writing on the wall which, when translated, showed the coming collapse of fascist tendencies in the Labour Movement and the establishment of a strong united class-conscious workers' federation.

The formation of these unions also contained another threat. It was the first serious attempt to organize subordinate employees of the Government on a sound basis. This was something which very much disturbed the Governor and his heads of departments, who were unaccustomed to deal with their employees collectively and accord them the respect and equality which collective bargaining entails.

At about the same time the influence of the People's National Party, of which Ken Hill, Frank Hill and Richard Hart were executive members, was gaining ground at a tremendous rate. Despite the express statements of the Colonial Office that they desire the colonies to achieve self-government, the action of the officials on the spot make a complete mockery of all such declarations. The growing clamour for a new constitution was, therefore, very discomfiting to the Government.

For several contemporaneous reasons, therefore, the Government decided to take repressive measures. On 4th November, 1942, Arthur Henry, Ken Hill, Frank Hill and Richard Hart were thrown into the internment camp. The trade unions of Government employees were declared illegal and the seven most active field organizers of the People's National Party were placed under restrictions forbidding them to attend public meetings or engage in political propaganda, and were confined to their own parishes and made to report their movements to the police.

The situation expected to result from these repressive measures was :

- (a) the weakening of the new trade union movement, thereby lessening the threat to Bustamante, who contributes so much to keeping labour divided and weak ;
- (b) the smashing of the attempt to organize Government employees ;
- (c) the destruction of the labour elements in the P.N.P. and the wrecking of its self-government campaign which was scheduled to commence in November, 1942.

But the determined spirit of the people who constitute the vanguard of the new Jamaica had not sufficiently been

taken into account. The plan was a dismal failure. At the end of four and a half months it was clear that the new unions, led by the Railway Union, stood solid and firm. The P.N.P. campaign, despite the absence of its best field workers, was an overwhelming success. The Colonial Office called the Governor to London. When he returned, a new policy was announced, a policy of recognition and conciliation.

By 18th March, 1943, all political prisoners were released, including S. C. Marquis and W. A. Dornings who had been detained in the internment camp many months before. The Unions were made legal and recognized by the Government. The P.N.P. organizers were soon freed from all restrictions, and a new constitution was being offered to Jamaica.

The Jamaica Government Railway Union now has a membership of over 1,700, the Public Workers Employees' Union over 1,900, the Postal and Telegraph Workers Union 500. Other unions of Government employees have been formed, including the Government Auxiliary Workers' Union (for nurses, revenue runners, messengers, marketing department employees), the Government Printing Office Employees' Union, and the Relief Workers' Union. These are now united in the Federation of Government Employees' Organizations, which was formed on 15th September, 1943.

The Trade Union Council is being re-organized and now has twenty-seven organizations affiliated. Some of these are small and weak and no doubt in the future a certain amount of reorganization and amalgamation will be necessary. Another weakness is that although the principle of proportionate representation has been accepted for the Council as a whole, some of the original officers are attempting to retain the old structure of the Executive, i.e. two representatives per union. This would mean an Executive Committee of fifty members which, in addition to being unwieldy, would not represent in fair proportions the numerical strength of the affiliated unions.

These are matters, however, which can be straightened out in the near future. The important point for the present is that the unions affiliated to the T.U.C. represent the greatest organized strength of the Jamaican Labour Movement. It is the foundation upon which the strong, undivided working-class federation of the future will be built.

The Bustamante outfit has received a mortal blow recently in the formation of the Port Workers' League, which has already won some 20 per cent of Bustamante's longshoremen. With this stronghold of his so seriously threatened, there is only one field of labour where he is still undisputed master, and that is among the cane cutters on the sugar estates. These workers are the largest numerical group, but they are seasonal unskilled workers, working only five months in the year. During the off season they pay little or no dues.

Bustamante still has a mass following among the unemployed in the city of Kingston, but this following is not enrolled in his union and pays no dues. Several of his branch offices in the country have been closing down over recent weeks. Nevertheless, this is not to say that

Bustamante is already beaten. He has a lot of kick left and will only fall when his hysterical support in Kingston and the sugar workers in the country have had their eyes completely opened to the advantages of democratic unionism.

The future is extremely bright but not without its dangers, and many a long battle lies before us on the road to victory over the forces of fascism here in Jamaica.

Recently there have been indications that the Government is going back on its promise to improve the lot of the workers in its employment and recognize their organizations.

(1) The Committee to which all the unions forwarded memoranda dealing with wages, hours, conditions of work, leave, promotion, pensions, suddenly decided that its terms of reference covered only the question of wages.

(2) The Manager of the Railway, who at a conference with union officials and the labour adviser had agreed to set up a joint union-management appeal board to hear disciplinary charges in cases of disagreement, and in all cases had agreed to the presence of a union representative at all disciplinary hearings, took no steps to set up the board and then issued instructions banning the union representative from attending the hearings.

(3) The manager of the Railway and the Director of Public Works have made recent attempts to recognize Bustamante as a representative of labour. This is particularly serious in the case of the railway where the manager had agreed, in the presence of the Labour Adviser, to

recognize the Railway Union as the sole bargaining agent of Railway Employees and where Bustamante's supporters do not number ten out of 2,000.

(4) The wage increases which had been promised to Government employees have been delayed now for five months by the Regrading Committee. Other committees considering matters affecting Government employees were also long in reporting.

(5) The railway manager went back on his agreement made before the Labour Adviser to allow union dues collectors passes to enter the premises to collect dues and investigate complaints.

These and other provocative actions and omissions of the Government led to great dissatisfaction among Government subordinate employees. Strong resolutions were passed at mass meetings, but the official policy of provocation continued, led by the Colonial Secretary, Major Flinn, a vicious anti-labour official.

The culmination of all this was a three-day unauthorized strike of employees at the Railway, Post Office and Public Works, which was quite definitely provoked by Major Flinn. That this strike ended successfully for the workers in such a short time is due to the willingness of the union leaders to stake their own reputations on a satisfactory settlement.

But so long as Flinn remains in Jamaica one can see no prospect of smooth relations between Government and the unions. One of his first acts was to make a ruling that the unions could not take up disciplinary matters. We have only just succeeded after five months in getting this ruling reversed (presumably by the Colonial Office in London).

CANADA'S RAILWAY PROBLEM

By J. R. KAY

The two great railway systems are hands and feet to Canada. Without them our economic life would be utterly paralysed. And this fact will not be altered for many years to come. Yet, before the war, the Canadian railway problem had reached the proportions of a national nightmare. We had too many railways, we could not afford them; but, of course, we could not afford anything in those days. We had too many schools and too many teachers, too much food and lumber and fuel and clothing, too many workers—and, heaven forgive us! too much poverty. The railways shared the general sickness.

That was in the good old halcyon days, the "Hungry Thirties," when the captains of Private Enterprise were in unrestrained control of the Body Economic. Each had put a tourniquet on a limb and was carving out his pound of flesh. The pounds of flesh did not matter so much: but the tourniquets did. The whole system withered; and the railways suffered along with the rest.

"Too much railway." "Too much railway!" people said. It makes us shudder to-day to think how production would be strangled if we had entered the war with less. What the engine needed, of course, was a full head of steam. It was meant to run at 300lb. pressure, but the

engineers were economizing: we could not afford more than fifty. Naturally it ran a bit sluggish. Now that our national economy has risen to over eight billion dollars, we find ourselves short of railway facilities; and we wonder, rather dazedly, what has become of the twenty-year-old migraine headache that we had almost grown to endure.

The national attack of pernicious anaemia from which all industry suffered does not, of course, tell the whole story about our railway problem. The railways were being pushed to the wall, or at any rate severely pushed about by competition from other forms of transport; and the situation was not materially helped by boards of directors with imaginations a little less flexible than a 90lb. rail. They failed to see the necessity for co-ordinating the railways with new types of transportation most of which could have been made usefully complementary instead of harmfully competitive.

Competition from the Truck. Except for short haul traffic within a radius of approximately one hundred miles, truck transportation cannot compare in efficiency with rail haul. Compelled to bear its share in the upkeep of the railroad, to carry adequate insurance, to provide proper warehousing, communication systems and other

expenses that the railways must bear, the truck cannot stand up against the railway for a minute on a reasonably long haul. The trucks raised hob with the railways for two reasons: they, the trucks, were heavily subsidized, more heavily than ever the railways were, by free highways, swept and cleared summer and winter, free signal systems and an endless string of perquisites; also, they managed to get away with murder in the matter of labour conditions, tariffs, insurance and a dozen other things, because they had not been brought under Federal control. Many of them were fly-by-night concerns, ready to fold up after the first bad accident and bob up again somewhere else after the clouds of litigation had rolled away.

The private motor car was, and is, shamelessly and hilariously inefficient. Who wanted efficiency? We wanted to go places! Any excuse would do; and so long as the actual outlay in gasoline was less than a railway ticket our consciences were clear. I am not condemning the car. It constitutes a great improvement in the standard of living and I am all for it. But it is far more expensive than rail travel; and it did hurt the railways on short haul. This is a situation that calls for adaptation on the part of the railways; and adaptation that they can easily achieve.

The aeroplane skims the cream. If the truck is a cream-skimmer, what shall we say of the aeroplane that attracts passengers from the four-hundred? Airline executives are even now taking stock of first-class travel by train or boat and marking it down: 5 per cent to us this year; 10 per cent next; 15 per cent; 20 per cent. The railways sweat and the airlines exult. They are both wrong.

The airlines will get their 20 per cent, but the railways will not lose it. If our national industrial machine is kept moving at anywhere near its present pace, the number of people demanding first-class travel will be doubled or tripled. As a result of that higher standard of living more people will travel, and a larger percentage will travel first class.

The railways will have to re-equip to meet this demand. The way has already been shown. Fast, light, clean, smooth, airy trains, moving at speeds that, for short distances, will keep the aeroplane at bay, have already been designed and to some extent placed in use. The use of diesel or diesel-electric power will free the train from the ever present curse of noise and grime.

To each its best role. The chaotic cut-throat competition that created such havoc in the pre-war years, naturally cannot be permitted to continue. Each mode of transportation must be assigned the role for which it is best suited: to the aeroplane, long, fast hauls of perishable goods, first class mail and urgent passenger traffic; to the trucks, short hauls away from the rail lines and in co-operation with them. This will mean some new legislations and a little intelligent planning. The welfare of our transportation systems, on which our very civilization is built, cannot be left to the whims of chance or greed. All forms of transportation must be co-ordinated by and under one central authority in the interests of the state and for no other reason.

But we have yet another question to settle in Canada. The two patients have, for the time being, recovered; but the doctors are still arguing darkly in the back parlour. There are two schools of thought, both involving surgery. One, the amalgamation school, wants to take the two great railway systems, with their myriad subsidiaries and ramifications, and fuse them together by a process of drastic surgery to produce a pair of colossal synthetic Siamese twins. But more grotesque than Nature at her cruelest, the creature would have two bodies with only one head.

Maintain a healthy rivalry. These two systems should not and must not be compelled to go in lock-step. They need not be competitive in the old implacable cut-throat manner. One can be made to complement the other. Each is a perfectly developed entity; efficient, and, what is vastly more important, conscious of itself as a unit organization. Canada can well afford to keep them both if for no other reason than that one provides a perfect basis of comparison for the other. There is a healthy rivalry between them that will dispel any tendency toward stagnation. If we want efficient service we had best keep them apart.

The other school of thought simply wants to carve out what it regards as unnecessary bits. They call themselves Rationalists. We have had a lot of rationalization, pooling of trains and elimination of useless duplicate services, and it has all been to the good. But, given a free hand the boys feel that they could do a lot more. They could and would cut a lot of pay and a lot of jobs.

A national problem. Rationalization is a two-sided proposition. If it is to take a man from one job in the interests of national economy, it must place him in another where he is more needed, otherwise it is a tragic farce. The Rationalists do not see this: they want to turn the man out to pasture. They are not thinking of national economy, but of dividends. Anyone thinking of national welfare realizes that you cannot turn a man out to starve. At the moment, the most hard-boiled advocates of this school do not consider it ethical to more than half-starve a fellow being. But bitter experience has taught us that keeping a man in enforced idleness on the verge of starvation is vastly more expensive than keeping him employed even in a task that may not take all his effort.

Rationalization does not begin or end with the railways or any other industry considered by itself. Rationalization (which simply means using our resources, men and material to the best advantage) is a national problem and must be made to cover all industry. When Canada's industrial life is so planned that it is possible to release a man from one job in the knowledge that we can offer him another one in which he can serve to better advantage, there will be no feather bedding either in the railways or any other industry.

The objectives before us are clear: the control and co-ordination of all forms of transportation under Federal direction; no amalgamation; the latest and best equipment for the railways; and no more banking the fires in the interests of a childish, topsy-turvy economy of scarcity—full steam ahead!

From the *Canadian Railway Employees' Monthly*.

THE I.L.O. CONFERENCE—WHAT NEXT?

By JOHN PRICE

Secretary of the International and Educational Department of the British Transport and General Workers' Union.

Mr. Price, temporarily on the staff of the London Office of the I.L.O., attended the second war-time International Labour Conference held in Philadelphia at the end of April. We reproduce the following article from the "Transport and General Workers' Record," although we had hoped to be able to publish an article by the Acting General Secretary of the I.T.F., J. H. Oldenbroek, who also attended this Conference (as he did the first war-time one) as a workers' delegate appointed by the Netherlands Government in London. Unfortunately Mr. Oldenbroek had not returned at the time our Journal was sent to press.

It would not have been surprising if a gathering such as the International Labour Conference at Philadelphia had failed to come to any decisions at all.

Imagine a conference attended by representatives of the Governments of 43 countries and by representatives of the employers and workers as well—meeting at a most difficult stage of the war to discuss some of the most complicated problems of our time. Governments, employers and workers approach those problems with very different interests in mind, and that in itself might have been enough to make agreement impossible.

But consider also that the delegates and advisers came from all parts of the world, from countries and continents whose needs and possibilities varied considerably, from Britain, the Dominions and the United States of America, from the occupied countries of Europe, from India and China, from Latin America, and from colonial territories in Africa and the Pacific.

Altogether there were over 350 delegates and advisers. Their task was to seek a common line of policy on the great problems of social security, employment in the transition from war to peace, and the social standards to be applied in dependent territories; to make recommendations on the present and post-war social policy of the United Nations; to restate the aims and purposes of the I.L.O. itself; and to map out the place of the I.L.O. in the international organisation of the future. Would it have been strange if they had failed?

Yet they took decisions which will make the Philadelphia Conference a landmark in the history of social progress. Some matters, it is true, were reserved for further consideration. Some simply could not be dealt with in the available time. But enough was done to make the conference a memorable event.

There were handicaps to be overcome at the start. All the delegates and advisers who travelled from this country arrived late—the whole British party and most of the delegates from the occupied countries. Consequently, the usual meetings and consultations could not take place before the conference, and time had to be found for them after the opening session. Moreover, this was the first full conference since 1939. The continuity had been broken and there were many newcomers.

At the beginning it was impossible to say whether such a gathering would develop enough unity of purpose to enable agreement to be reached. And, indeed, it was not till towards the end that we could see through the forest of proposals and amendments to the open country beyond.

It was clear that representatives of each of the groups,

and of every country, had ideas and wanted to express them. In all parts of the world the problems of social security, full employment, international co-operation and the future of the I.L.O. had been under consideration. The problem was to combine the views of so many different interests and nations into policies that would be worthy of world-wide support.

For three days the conference heard a general debate on the whole position of the I.L.O. and the problems with which it must deal. From country after country the delegates put forward the views of the Government, or of the employers, or of the workers. The process was repeated when the conference broke up, as usual, into committees so that all the items of the agenda could be examined simultaneously. In each committee there was a general debate on the subject under discussion.

Only after this exchange of views could the committees begin to seek agreement on specific recommendations. It was not until the last week of the conference, indeed, that agreement was seen to be possible. Then, by a supreme effort, the texts were completed in time for the final votes in full conference.

Meaning of Decisions. Under such conditions it is remarkable that so much was achieved. The decisions themselves will be widely circulated in the coming months and their terms can then be studied in detail. Meanwhile it would be well to reflect on their significance.

In the first place, there was no disagreement on the need for international policies in relation to employment, social security, the dependent territories, and so on. That, in itself, was important. The problem was not whether international solutions were possible, but what specific suggestions could be made at this time. In the end, the conference agreed on far-reaching recommendations. The fact that it was able to do so shows that there is a definite trend of opinion in favour of full employment, social security and rising standards throughout the world.

Secondly, in all the discussions on the future organisation of international co-operation it was evident that the place of the I.L.O. was fully recognised. This is of the utmost importance for the Trade Union Movement, since the I.L.O. is, so far, the only official international body in which the workers are specifically represented. It was generally agreed, in fact, that whatever new bodies are formed, the I.L.O. has justified itself and will be needed in the future more than ever. There is no longer any likelihood that it will be relegated to a few minor activities in the background.

The Declaration. One of the most striking decisions was the adoption of a new Declaration concerning the Aims and Purposes of the International Labour Organisation. This "Declaration of Philadelphia" will be quoted for years to come as an international charter for the peoples of the world. The future activities of the I.L.O. will be guided by the principles laid down in the document, and the Trade Union Movement will find it an inspiration to further endeavour.

These are the fundamental principles which it affirms :

Labour is not a commodity.

Freedom of expression and of association are essential to sustained progress.

Poverty anywhere constitutes a danger to prosperity everywhere.

The war against want requires to be carried on with unrelenting vigour within each nation, and by continuous and concerted international effort in which the representatives of workers and employers, enjoying equal status with those of Governments, join with them in free discussion and democratic decisions with a view to the promotion of the common welfare.

Then the Declaration sets out the conditions for achieving social justice. Amongst other things it declares that :

All human beings have the right to pursue their material well-being and spiritual development in conditions of freedom and dignity, of economic security and equal opportunity.

To make this possible should be the aim of national and international policy.

All national and international policies should be accepted only in so far as they promote and do not hinder the achievement of this fundamental objective.

It is also laid down that the I.L.O. has a solemn obligation to promote programmes for achieving such objects as full employment, facilities for the training and transfer of labour, wage policies calculated to ensure a just share of the fruits of progress to all, the effective recognition of collective bargaining, a basic income and medical care for all, protection for the workers' life and health, provision for child welfare and maternity protection, adequate nutrition, housing and facilities for recreation and culture, and equality of educational and vocational opportunity.

Not the least significant point about the Declaration is that it was adopted unanimously.

Another impressive decision was that the suggestions worked out for dealing with employment during the transition, social security and dependent territories should be adopted in the form of Recommendations. These matters might have been deferred for fuller consideration by the Governments, or the suggestions might simply have been expressed in resolutions. But the conference found itself able to go the length of adopting formal Recommendations—which means that the Governments have to submit the proposals to their Parliaments for legislation or other action.

The position of the I.L.O. itself is being worked out by

a special committee of the Governing Body, which contains representatives of the Governments, employers and workers. The committee is considering how to strengthen the I.L.O., how to improve its methods and machinery, and how to settle its relations with other international bodies. Representatives of the three groups—Governments, employers and workers—have also been appointed to negotiate with other bodies on behalf of the I.L.O. if the need should arise before the next conference.

International Joint Industrial Committees. A new development with great potentialities was the decision to set up special committees for the main international industries, such as coal, iron and steel, textiles and transport. There is to be a special section of the Office to organize the work of the committees, which will include representatives of the employers and workers, and the committees themselves will be able to promote international measures for the well-being of their respective industries. The suggestion was made by the British Government delegates and adopted unanimously. It is an idea that has been strongly advocated by Bro. Ernest Bevin.

In the light of the Philadelphia Conference it can be said that the I.L.O. is now entering upon a new period of expansion and increased responsibility. Its Budget, though still modest, has been doubled, its staff is to be expanded, its machinery is being overhauled, its place in the world is being consolidated, and it has before it an ambitious programme of work.

Unions must provide the drive. And now, what next? That is a question to be considered very earnestly by the trade unions. Without the support of the Trade Union Movement the I.L.O. would be a feeble thing. If it is to realise its objects with vigour and courage it needs the drive, the inspiration and the enthusiasm which the unions can provide.

Let us not overestimate the importance of the I.L.O., for exaggerated hopes can only lead to disappointments. But on the other hand it would be foolish to neglect the opportunities which it provides for establishing a lasting peace based on social justice. The "Declaration of Philadelphia" is a challenge as well as an inspiration. It is above all a challenge to the Trade Union Movement. What will the unions do next?

At all events the full decisions of the Philadelphia Conference should be studied with all their implications. They should be read and discussed in every trade union branch. The Declaration alone would provide ample material for several discussion group meetings. What do those principles mean? How can they be put into practice? How long will it take?

But it is not enough for the trade union members themselves to be informed. The general public, too, needs to be told the meaning of these decisions and why they are necessary. It is not only a question of improving conditions of labour. It is the whole problem of how to establish the peace, so that we and our children may live useful and happy lives. That great task can only be accomplished with the active support of public opinion throughout the world.

THE VIA CRUCIS OF THE HUNGARIAN WORKER

(From a Hungarian correspondent)

The workers in Hungary have never been pampered. From the very moment when they began to organize for the struggle against the 14 and 16 hour day, low wages and dangerously insanitary workshops and to demand decent working conditions and their political rights; from that moment they suffered persecution by the authorities and employers, made the acquaintance of the black list, Black Maria, prisons and ill-treatment by the police and gendarmerie, and learned to know the pangs of hunger. When they demonstrated publicly in support of their claims, and for their rights, the police attacked them unmercifully, arms in hand. The spilled blood of innumerable workers stained the pavements, and many of them gave their lives to the cause.

But what was all this suffering and persecution compared with what they had to bear after the suppression of the revolutions of 1918 and 1919. Police and gendarmes were let loose upon them like wild beasts, and they arrested and tortured hundreds of workers entirely on their own account, without any warrant from the courts. Workers were thrown from the second floor of the Police Headquarters in Budapest upon the pavement of the courtyard; the police then announcing that they had jumped down to commit suicide. Some of them succumbed to the ill-treatment or spent months in the prison hospital, only to leave it crippled for life. Stranded army officers collected groups of other unemployed officers and men, out of which they formed irregular armed "detachments." For years these desperados perpetrated against the workers atrocities that could only have been conceived by sadistic minds, instituting a regime of terror throughout Hungary. One of these chieftains, Iván Héjjas, a former subordinate bank employee at Kecskemet, a largish town on the Hungarian plain, dragged the political prisoners out of prison and into the forest near Orgovány. One of them, a secondary schoolmaster, was flayed alive. The others were forced to dig their own graves and stand at their edge; they were then shot down, falling into the graves, which were immediately filled in, without any attempt to see if any were still alive. Héjjas later became a member of Parliament, and after a few years was appointed Permanent Secretary of a Ministry. A few months ago he retired on a "well-earned" pension.

Other Detachment commanders made a practice of seizing workers who had played a prominent part in the revolution, and taking them to barracks, or to the Britannia and Gellert hotels. There they were barbarously maltreated, and many of them died under the most frightful torture. Their bodies were then thrown into the Danube. Post mortem examinations showed that some of them had had their hands and feet hacked off, and their arms bound with wire behind their backs. Legal proceedings were started against the culprits, but after being dragged out for four years the Police Prosecutor stopped them in some cases on the pretext that the men who had been found in the Danube had committed suicide, while in other cases he discovered that the

culprits had fled to Turkey or Morocco, though in reality they were walking about unmolested in Budapest.

One of the secretaries of the Social Democratic Party, Nikolaus Cservenka, who took notes of the evidence about the atrocities of the Detachments, was carried off, and all trace of him was lost. Béla Somogyi, the chief editor of the Social Democratic Party newspaper *Népszava*, wrote a series of articles exposing these atrocities. A number of leading army officers raised the matter at Horthy's headquarters—Horthy was then only Commander-in-Chief and Führer; he had not yet been appointed Regent. Horthy exclaimed: "In such matters one does not talk, one acts!" And they acted. On the evening of 16th February, 1920, after Somogyi had left his office, he and a young journalist, Béla Bacsó, who was accompanying him, were overpowered in the Circular Road in front of the National Theatre and forced into a waiting motor car which thereupon tore out of the city at full speed. A gendarme fired a shot after it and noted the number. Somogyi and Bacsó were taken to an embankment of the Danube, where Somogyi's eyes were put out and his belly ripped open. The bodies of the two victims were weighted with stones and sunk in the river, where they were found a few days later. The Prime Minister, Karl Huszár, declared in Parliament that he would resign if he failed to hunt down and punish in the most exemplary manner the authors of the crime. Somogyi's watch was found in the possession of a certain Lieutenant Soltész, one of the murderers. The police investigations were stopped after two days, as the clues led directly to Horthy as the instigator. It may be mentioned in passing that on 1st March, 1920, fourteen days after the murder of Somogyi and Bacsó, Horthy was unanimously elected—under pressure from the Detachments, who had surrounded the Parliamentary building—as Regent of Hungary. But Huszár resigned his post as Prime Minister on 15th March.

When it became generally known who were responsible for the atrocities, and the judicial authorities were forced to take proceedings, the authors were let off very lightly. After one of the mass murderers, Mihály Francia-Kiss, a former sergeant-major, had been heard, the examining magistrate dismissed him with the words: "Isten vele, Mihály" (God keep you, Michael), which later became a catch-phrase in Hungary. When it became absolutely necessary to sentence the criminals the penalties inflicted were, without exception, very mild, the excuse given being that the accused had acted "on patriotic grounds." After a few months they were all granted an amnesty by Horthy.

The police and law-courts also inaugurated a reign of terror. The 1914-1918 prisoner-of-war camp at Hajmáskér, and later that at Zalaegerszeg, became concentration camps, in which thousands of "politically unreliable" and "socially dangerous elements" were condemned by the police—administratively, and without process of law—to internment for indefinite periods, in the course of which they were put to torture. Anybody who even

approached the barbed-wire fence of the camp was shot down without ceremony.

In violation of the established penal law and procedure the Government set up special tribunals, each composed of five judges, which sentenced many honest revolutionaries to death by hanging, or imprisonment for life or periods of fifteen years, to say nothing of the "milder" sentences. Against the sentences of these special tribunals there was no appeal, and they were executed without delay. Some of the sentences pronounced later, however, in 1921, were not carried out, as the Soviet Union entered a protest against them, and threatened that Hungarian prisoners-of-war still in Russian hands—largely officers and persons of noble families—would be treated in a similar manner as the political prisoners in Hungary. The result was that several hundreds of the political convicts were exchanged for Hungarian prisoners-of-war.

Practically all the accused who were acquitted by the special tribunals for lack of evidence were handed over to the police, who interned them, though not all reached the camp. Many were shot by their guards on the way for "attempting to escape."

The reign of terror initiated by the Detachments lasted until 1927, after which it gradually flagged. But the special tribunals still went on with their work. Two Hungarians, Fürst and Sallay, who had been exchanged for Hungarian prisoners-of-war in Russia, later returned to Hungary to carry on Communist propaganda. Before they had done anything at all they were arrested and sentenced to the gallows; and the sentence was duly carried out, in spite of an appeal to the Prime Minister, Count Bethlen, by Longuet. As both the accused were Jews the President of the Tribunal, Géza von Töreký, insisted that they should be hanged before sundown on the day they were sentenced, a Friday, as Jews might not be hanged on Saturdays. Another typical case was that of two refugees who returned to Hungary from Vienna in 1934. Both were arrested and sentenced to imprisonment, one for life and the other for fifteen years, for "political crimes" committed during the Revolution.

Töreký was duly rewarded for his services: this former judge at a provincial court, without any particular legal qualifications, was raised to the position of President of the Supreme Court. Some judges found it profitable to resign their judgeships and set up as legal advisers. They then took steps to secure the reopening of cases in which they had acted in a judicial capacity, and the acquittal of persons whom they had themselves condemned to long sentences of imprisonment. Very substantial fees were often netted for a successful defence in a case of this sort.

Little by little the inmates of the concentration camps were set free again, but mostly continued under police supervision. Prosecutions gradually became less severe, but the sword of Damocles still hung over the heads of members of the Social Democratic and trade union movements.

Koloman v. Darányi, who was Prime Minister of Hungary from 6th October, 1936, to 13th May, 1938,

cherished plans to dissolve the Social Democratic Party, but neither he nor his successor could summon up courage enough to carry them out, as according to the opinion of university professors this would have been a violation of the Hungarian Constitution. The system of advance censorship which was instituted proved to be a serious hindrance to the Social Democratic and trade union press, while the authorities also instituted controls and checks on the activities of the trade unions. Everything was always found to be in order, but in spite of this the Minister for the Interior in Count Paul Teleki's Government started a comprehensive inquiry into the affairs of the Confederation of Trade Unions and the 39 trade unions and federations affiliated to it. The inquiry lasted for months, and during that time the autonomy of the organizations was suspended. The results did not confirm the pretext given for the inquiry, i.e. that the trade unions had made over a part of their income to the Social Democratic Party; but they were, nevertheless, required to amend their rules and insert a clause to the effect that the authorities must be given eight days notice of all committee and other meetings, at which they should further have the right to be represented. On top of this at the end of 1939 the publication of trade union journals was prohibited, except for those of the printing and bookbinding trades workers. During 1940 the ban was lifted in the case of the Confederation of Trade Unions and the Metal Workers' Union.

The second anti-Jewish law, Law No. 4 of 1939, the Bill for which was laid before Parliament by Prime Minister Béla Imrédy two days before Christmas, 1938, and which was later taken up by his successor, Count Teleki, forbids Jews to become trade union officials, notwithstanding the fact that, at the time it was put forward, out of a total of 4,045 trade union officials only 4.1 per cent of the chairmen, 5.1 per cent of the vice-chairmen, 5.7 per cent of the secretaries, 4.4 per cent of the treasurers, 2.4 per cent of the auditors, 7.1 per cent of the committee members and 7.7 per cent of the trustees were Jews.

But in spite of all obstacles and persecution, the labour movement continued to grow. Artisans, clerks, agricultural labourers, professional men, actors and artists of all kinds flowed into the Party in 1933 and 1934, until the Party Executive found it necessary to reserve the right to decide who might and who might not be admitted to membership. The number of subscribers to *Népszava* grew rapidly, until a single rotary press no longer sufficed to print the whole issue.

As a result of the initiative of the Social Democratic Party agreement was reached for co-operation between the working class, the party of the small landowners and the progressive intellectuals. This co-operation was directed at the withdrawal of Hungary from participation in the war—into which she had been drawn as a result of the ill-conceived policy of her successive governments—and the struggle for a free and independent Hungary. It seemed on the point of bearing fruit when the country was suddenly occupied by German troops on the night of 19th March, 1944.

The Minister for the Interior in Horthy's quisling

THE RAILWAYS OF FRANCE A BATTLEFIELD

By I. T. BERGERET

The express—one of the rare passenger trains of the depleted French railway service—headed south through the Rhone valley. Like all trains, it was crowded. In one of the third-class carriages, the only free space unencumbered by baggage was the forward vestibule—a wet and draughty spot where rain beat in through a broken pane. A passenger stood there, wedged in the corner by the door. The ticket-collector who had just elbowed his way through the corridor, stopped for a moment to take breath before passing on to the next carriage.

"Bad news," said the passenger as he held out his ticket. "I see that forty *cheminots* were arrested yesterday. . . ."

The *controleur's* face froze stonily.

"So the papers say," he remarked in a cautious voice. Then gruffly, with a sidewise glance at his interlocutor, "It's what they have to expect . . . those fellows. . . ."

The passenger gave a short laugh and, leaning forward, said something in a low voice. The railwayman's face cleared.

"Sorry, I might have known . . ." he muttered. "But you understand, we cannot be too careful. The Boche have spotters on every train. Yes . . . they've jailed forty of our men—but it's not going to get them anywhere. For every forty they arrest, forty others stand ready to carry on. We're in this war to stay—every *cheminot* worthy of the name. They'd have to put every man Jack of us in jail . . . and then where would they be?"

* * *

That incident—related in London by a resistance leader—dates back months ago when organized French resistance was only just beginning. But even then, the words of the railway man voiced the conviction of

government is Andor Jaross, a former member of the Republican Parliament of Czechoslovakia, who has never even been elected a member of the Hungarian Parliament, but was drawn in when the southern part of Czechoslovakia was incorporated in Hungary. For many years he drew a monthly salary of 2,000 marks from the *Voelkische Beobachter* and the German Ministry of Propaganda. This man has dissolved the Social Democratic party in violation of the Hungarian Constitution; has arrested the Social Democratic members of Parliament in violation of the Parliamentary Immunity Act, as well as a number of the Party officials; has closed down the Party's daily paper *Népszava*, and has put a National Socialist commissioner in charge of each trade union. The Világosság Printing Works, the property of the trade unions, was also closed down for a fortnight. The four trade union journals and that of the Confederation of Trade Unions are being issued still—or again—and the names of the former responsible editors and publishers appear on them. It still remains to be seen whether this is or is not a plot to deceive the members of the trade unions.

thousands of his comrades. They were a sober statement of fact.

Already in the first weeks following the Armistice, French *cheminots* were "in the war." At the outset a spontaneous reaction on the part of individuals, the demand for resistance spread rapidly through the ranks of the corporation. Within an amazingly short time, it took shape as a definite, organized movement.

In the Occupied Zone, it made itself felt almost at once—when communications were cut between the two zones, when all mails stopped, when every traveller and every pound of freight had to pass through the meshes of the German net drawn taut across the map of France. For through that barrier, the trains still ran. . . . From the summer of 1940, their crews formed the only category of Frenchmen (except for the "collaborators") who still passed in and out of the restricted areas in the North, and who circulated regularly between the western seaboard and the Centre, and between Paris and the Mediterranean.

By the very nature of their calling, the great body of railway workers became an important factor in the organization of resistance. They passed from the Occupied Zone (where direct contact with the invader acted as a powerful spur to the growing movement) into Vichy France where that stimulus was lacking and men were slower to grasp realities. Under such circumstances, each *cheminot* could be—and in hundreds of cases, was—a travelling propagandist for resistance.

The railway men did much more . . . as those who know the full story can testify. That early chapter, like much of their subsequent activity, is obviously not for publication. We can only say that the cause of liberation owes an incalculable debt to the *cheminots* for their aid and initiative during the months when the Resistance movement extended its organization throughout France and gathered body and momentum.

The Germans were not blind to this. They deported great numbers of *cheminots*. They brought in German railway workers (50,000 according to the latest reports) and installed them in all key points. They took over the stations and patrolled the trains with troops and Gestapo. Their spies were everywhere. They tried out all their customary tactics: threats, provocation, repressive measures. To no avail. "For every forty arrested, forty others stood ready . . ."

No doubt the *cheminots*, like any large body of Frenchmen, had their quota of capitulars; older men, for the most part, near-candidates for the retired list and concerned about their pensions. Men convinced that the Germans had won the war and who backed the Vichy regime, doggedly hopeful of its integrity. Other men who preferred to play safe, to "wait and see"—and who while waiting, kept themselves clear of "compromising" activities. A negative minority . . . so small in comparison with the number of fighting *cheminots* as to justify the latter's proud claim: "We are *l'Armée du Rail* 250,000 strong."

The valiant action of the French railway unions in the fight for freedom is quite in line with their history and traditions. A powerful body, highly organized, with a past that for the last twenty years has been closely linked with the history of the nation. Every phase, every change of national policy, whether political or social, found a corresponding echo in their ranks. So true it was, that the railway unions came to be regarded as a highly sensitive barometer of public opinion. This has never been more clearly apparent than to-day.

To-day the railways of France are a battlefield. "Resistance," says one of the *cheminots'* clandestine bulletins, "... is the German train that goes tumbling into the ravine, the loaded waggons for Germany set afire, the hopeless congestion of marshalling yards. . . . Resistance on the railways means this: organized destruction of tracks and rolling stock."

For a time, the Allied air-offensive struck at French trains and locomotives. To-day Allied planes bomb other targets: the *Armée du Rail* has taken over the task. . . . Thirty-three locomotives destroyed or seriously damaged during one week in January; eighty during a second seven-day. The period figures are typical.

Together with the destruction of locomotives goes that of munition, supply and troop-trains—blown up or derailed. This is generally the work of carefully trained resistance groups, operating in close collaboration with

men of the railways. ("Resistance . . . means passing on valuable information; helping our fellow-fighters to carry out their task.") The *cheminots* may not be among those who attack the trains but they run the trains that are ambushed. . . .

"When you destroy a train, are the train-crews German?" a resistance leader was asked recently in London.

"No," came the answer. "They are French *cheminots* . . . the very ones who notify our sabotage squads."

The men of the *Armée du Rail* do more than sacrifice their means of livelihood. They are giving their lives.

They also save lives. . . . In December, 2,000 railway men of Dijon, by a prompt and well-timed strike, forced the Germans to free seven of their comrades—sentenced to death for "intelligence with the enemy, possession of fire-arms and sabotage."

And so the struggle goes on. Fifty-eight blows struck at the railways in one week; sixty-four more in the space of ten days. The *Armée du Rail* is in the thick of the fight. The *cheminots* of France are "in the war to stay"—until Victory when, to quote the prophetic words of the *Bulletin*:

"La France blessée se lèvera pour embrasser leurs mains noires."

From *Tricolore*.

Read, Reflect and Write to Us

The purpose of this column is to provoke thought on world problems and those of our own movement, and it 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. Matter will be selected because it shows evidence of perceiving a problem, because it is calculated to provoke thought, and because it may contribute towards a clarification of thought.

Our first quotation is from "The Antioch Review" (Ohio, U.S.A.), in which W. Herberg concludes an article on "Bureaucracy and Democracy in Labour Unions," as follows:

What is most needed? A profound transformation in the moral atmosphere. What is needed is the creation of a labour conscience.

Among the masses, a labour civic morality must come into being. To-day there is virtually no such thing. Improper conduct, even corruption, meets with no special resentment or indignation in the labour movement; as long as the union leaders "deliver the goods" in terms of protection and service, wages and hours, anything goes. There is no labour public opinion on the alert to rebuke excesses and check abuses, as there is, for example, in some religious communities. There are no moral sanctions or restraints emanating from the masses of workers operative in the labour movement. This lack is but an aspect of labour's general social immaturity and absence of self-consciousness.

We take our next quotation from an editorial in the New York "New Leader," entitled "Old Models for New Worlds":

What is actually in preparation (for the post-war world.—Ed.) is perfectly clear. No Detroit engineer can guess the outline of the cars to be turned out by Ford and General Motors with greater accuracy than that with which a man of sense can foresee the shape of things to come in the field of international relations. Details may be hard to fill in. But one thing is clear. The old model will be pushed out of storage to take the same old road again. The old model of imperialism, of power politics, of spheres of influence, will rattle on with the same old jolts and squeaks and ultimate wrecks, along the highway to further disaster.

Every great power that aspires to count in the international set-up is working out its plan and staking its claims. The British Government is planning to preserve and extend the Empire under the new conditions. Russia has truly vast dreams of extended

power and is moving toward their realization with speed and realistic toughness. Here in the United States, the people as a whole have no territorial ambitions and the government as a whole is not consciously moving in the direction of expansion. But our industrial and financial powers have solidly-laid schemes. They are proceeding methodically to extend their areas of control. More than one government department or bureau is serving their purposes. Our imperialism is now, as in the past, disguised, unofficial, but it is nonetheless real.

In the field of domestic economy, an enormous—and thus far successful—campaign is being carried on in favour of sticking to the old model. It is glossed over with fair phrases, "Free enterprise," "individual initiative," "a chance for everyone to take a chance," "get the government out of business." But what it means is clear enough to penetrate the dullest wit. The plain purpose is to sidestep planning, to carry on in the old way.

There is no special tragedy involved in reverting to a slightly aged model of a Ford or Chrysler car. But, in the fifth year of this war, in America's third year, to face a reversion to the old world out of which this inhuman carnage grew—that is the greatest tragedy which the human mind can picture. And it is in the midst of this tragedy—in nothingness—that we find ourselves to-day.

The automotive engineers have the plans and designs ready for a streamlined, inexpensive car, efficient in the use of gas (petrol). But technical considerations and the profit-motive hinder the mass production of such cars in the immediate post-war future. Likewise social engineers, political economists, statesmen with vision, have plans ready for a society of abundance, and one that will not produce World War III. But the realities of power politics threaten to hinder the realization of any such plans, perhaps to wreck them beyond repair.

Such is the road ahead—unless the people wake up!