

The Potters Herald

OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF
THE NATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF OPERATIVE POTTERS
and
EAST LIVERPOOL TRADES & LABOR COUNCIL

Published every Thursday at East Liverpool, Ohio, by the N. B. of O. P., owning and operating the Best Trades Newspaper and Job Printing Plant in the State.

Entered at Post Office, East Liverpool, Ohio, April 20, 1902, as second-class matter. Accepted for mailing at Special Rates of Postage provided for in Section 1109, Act of October 13, 1917, authorized August 29, 1918.

GENERAL OFFICE, N. B. of O. P. BUILDING, W. SIXTH ST., BELL PHONE 575
HARRY L. GILL, Editor and Business Manager
One Year to Any Part of the United States or Canada \$2.00

President: James M. Duffy, P. O. Box 752, East Liverpool, Ohio
First Vice President: E. L. Wheatley, Room 215, Broad Street, National Bank Building, Trenton 5, New Jersey
Second Vice President: Frank Hall, 6111 Pacific Blvd., Huntington Park, Calif.
Third Vice President: James Slaven, Cannons Mills, East Liverpool, Ohio
Fourth Vice President: Charles Zimmer, 1045 Ohio Avenue, Trenton 5, New Jersey
Fifth Vice President: George Turner, 130 W. Drury Lane, East Liverpool, Ohio
Sixth Vice President: T. J. Desmond, 625 E. Lincoln Way, Minerva, Ohio
Seventh Vice President: Joshua Chadwick, Grant Street, Newell, W. Va.
Eighth Vice President: Chas. F. Jordan, P. O. Box 752, East Liverpool, Ohio
Secretary-Treasurer: _____

GENERAL WARE STANDING COMMITTEE
Manufacturers: M. J. LYNCH, W. A. BETZ, J. T. HALL
Operative: CHAS. F. JORDAN, FREDERICK GYNN, ERNEST TORRENCE

CHINA WARE STANDING COMMITTEE
Manufacturers: E. K. KOOS, H. M. WALKER, W. A. BETZ
Operative: BERT CLARK, DAVID BEAVAN, CHAS. JORDAN

DECORATING STANDING COMMITTEE
Manufacturers: ROBERT DIETZ, Sr., W. A. BETZ, RAY BROOKER
Operative: JAMES SLAVEN, OSCAR SWAN, ROSE STEWART

Thunder In The East

Collapse of the Chinese nationalist regime and the "retirement" of President Chiang Kai-shek, undemocratic as his government was, are a tragic setback to the forces striving for international peace and progress. With victorious Communist armies pressing forward and the formation of a Communist government only a matter of time, starving and torn China may soon take its place in the power bloc ruled by Moscow. What this means in terms of new strains and worldwide friction needs hardly an explanation.

In any event the nationalist leadership, while hoping for the best, is preparing for the worst. Though ostensibly engaged in peace negotiations, nationalist government headquarters has been shifted from Nanking 700 miles south to Canton. Anti-Communist military resistance throughout the whole of China may continue, thus indicating the possibility that the country might again be split up, as it was before the Chiang Kai-shek regime, into regions run by rival war lords and political bosses disdainful of the needs of the people.

But the Far-Eastern picture is not entirely black, or shall we say red. While the Chinese tragedy again unfolds, beaten Japan, yesterday's Prussia of the East, emerged with a new parliament representing a sharp swing to the right. The Democratic-Liberal (in reality ultra-conservative) party won a clear majority with 264 seats. The Democrats and Social-Democrats lost heavily, while the Communists elected 35 representatives as against 4 in the old parliament.

The results of Japan's political upheaval remain to be seen. Gen. Douglas MacArthur, head of the occupation super-government, welcomed it as a "decisive mandate for the conservative philosophy of government." If it is a victory won at the expense of the Japanese people slowly emerging from feudalism and a crushing war defeat, the world may have cause to regret it.

False Fronts For Labor Baiters

The Taft-Hartley debate has brought out a rash of full page ads, hand bills and radio blasts opposing repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. Congressmen and the American voters should not be fooled into thinking this well-financed propaganda campaign represents more than a handful of professional labor baiters.

Here's how one false front works:

An organization which piously calls itself "National Wage Earners League, Rm. 528, 333 No. Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Illinois" has been distributing by the tens of thousands post cards already addressed to Senator Thomas, Chairman of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, urging that the Taft-Hartley Act be retained. There is space left for an individual signature. This is an amateur technique since courageous liberals such as Senator Thomas are never fooled by form cards.

One of our Chicago LLPE leaders did a little private investigating and found out that the address given by this phony front is actually the office of the "Telephone Secretarial Service Inc. . . . Representing National Firms." The telephone directory lists ten telephone numbers on six different exchanges but they all lead into the same office at 333 No. Michigan Ave. The impression that the service has 10 branch offices in Chicago is obviously false. The girl who answered the phone said she knew nothing about the "Wage Earners League" but was only to take names and addresses in response to the propaganda releases. She said a T. D. O'Toole (maybe he should be called "Too") was the individual who is running this labor baiting front. Rather than a mass organization of Wage Earners, this so-called League hasn't even got an office of its own.

As long as LLPE stays on the job no Congressman need worry about the bullying threats of Mr. O'Toole. Votes . . . not threats . . . win elections, and the working people of this country have the votes.

Moral For Today

A \$33-a-week clerk was arrested in New York recently on a charge of dipping into his employers' cash box to the tune of \$200,000 during the past 20 years. Temptation proved too much for another working stiff struggling along on peanuts.

In this case the man had worked for 26 years as book-keeper, cashier, accountant and general manager for two storage companies. A job with a lot of titles and responsibilities but almost no pay.

Maybe the man would have lifted the cash regardless of his take home pay, but there is the possibility that had he made an adequate salary he would not have succumbed to temptation the first time he found a pile of bank notes sticking to his fingers.

Perhaps if he had been given a bigger pay check—a union pay check—on pay day the story might have been different. Maybe his employers would have saved themselves money in the long run. Belonging to a union is no guarantee of lavish living, but earning wages sufficient to cover expenses lessens the possibility of any self-appointed "raises."

WHAT NEXT?

Navy Seebies in Alaska are testing a prefabricated Arctic barrack of honeycomb paper and sheet aluminum; its sponsors say it can be put up in 2 hours, will withstand gales of 150 miles and hour and support 13 feet of snow on its roof.

Washington Lobbies Spend Record Amount In '48

The Machinists' Union and Senator Kilgore are right . . . the Washington Lobbies should be investigated. Six Million Dollars were spent to "influence" Congress in 1948. Of the organizations which spent more than \$100,000 last year for lobbying, none were labor organizations and most were avowed enemies of labor-liberal legislation. A few examples:

Committee for Constitutional Government was top spender with \$450,000. This semi-fascistic organization demands that unions be made criminal conspiracies and calls collective bargaining "collective bludgeoning". They oppose all housing, education, social security and fair tax measures. National Association of Home Builders and National Association of Real Estate Boards together spent \$430,000 to oppose housing legislation and rent control.

National Association of Electric Companies spent \$304,386 to kill public power and rural electrification legislation. Transportation Association of America spent \$273,194 to exempt railroads from anti-trust laws.

National Small Business Men's Association spent \$165,000 to represent BIG business. This is the organization which last week ran full page ads directed to "Attention . . . Mr. Green and Mr. Murray" and lauding the Taft-Hartley Act.

These are just a few examples of why LLPE must work the year around to keep men in office who will resist the lavishly financed pressure of those who would place vested interests ahead of public welfare. Labor's enemies may have the money, but the working people have the votes.

Goodbye, Taft-Hartley

The Thomas Bill, now being studied in the Senate Labor Committee, should sound the death knell for the Taft-Hartley Act.

It's what the papers have been calling a "one-package" bill. T-H repeal, enactment of the Wagner Act, and Wagner Act amendments covering jurisdictional disputes, secondary boycotts and national emergency disputes are all wrapped up in the package.

Labor argued for a "two-package" approach; we wanted the amendments to come after T-H was out of the way and the Wagner Act back on the books.

But the most important thing is to get T-H quickly off the law books; and as labor told the Senate, the Thomas bill now offers "the only practicable method" of repealing T-H.

But labor must be on guard. Amendments will be offered to the one-package bill—just as they would have been offered to the two-package bill.

The job now for labor is to get the Thomas bill speedily enacted—without Trojan horse amendments.

Union Security Proves Its Value

We hope that plenty of Congressmen, plenty of radio commentators, plenty of industrial relations men will read the story about 30 years of good labor relations at the Hickey-Freeman Co. in Rochester, N. Y.

The Amalgamated Clothing Workers organized Hickey-Freeman in 1918. It's been a happy relationship ever since. The union and the company both deserve a lot of praise; and we're glad to see that the National Planning Association has issued a fine study on union-management relations at the company.

We like the mutual respect, the improvements for workers and management, the attitude of cooperation that the NPA study so clearly reveals.

A lot of people owe it to themselves to read the Hickey-Freeman story. In particular, we hope that those politicians who are so prone to blame all the ills of the world on the closed shop—or on any other form of union security—will read it with particular attention.

For it shows that union security is the strong foundation of good relations at Hickey-Freeman. And that's what unions have been saying for a long time.

Price Outlook Better

The living cost outlook for workers is much better now than at any time since the war. Production is catching up with demand and competition is coming back—not in just a few industries here and there, but in many industries throughout the country. The shortage of consumer buying power is being felt; consumers are resisting high prices. Consequently prices are beginning to come down; wholesale prices are weakening or declining in such basic items as foods, cotton and rayon textiles and clothing, lumber, heavy fuel oil, chemicals, paper, soap, and rubber.

Many price declines are already being passed on to consumers. Workers are beginning to find lower prices for foods made from grains (cereals, bread, etc.) milk, butter, dairy products, house furnishings, men's and women's cotton and rayon clothing, second hand automobiles. We may expect better quality in furniture even if prices do not decline at once. Shoes are still high because Argentina is asking top prices for hides on which USA depends for leather, but better quality shoes are coming on the market.

Planning And Control

In his breezy and "off-the-cuff" chat with the National Planning Association, President Truman must have given comfort to many of our citizens by showing his familiarity with the great depressions which have from time to time laid low our productive system. It is a fine thing for the occupant of the White House to have these tragedies in mind and to be set against any return engagements. He is correct in saying that prevention can be accomplished only by such national planning as is contemplated in the Employment Act of 1946.

The President objects to using the term "control" in this connection. How we can plan without some degree of government control is a little difficult to figure out. But the problem, after all, is not one of semantics. If President Truman is able to forestall, evade, prevent, get on without a depression, the people of this country will not be inclined to worry over much either about the means or the words which he employs.

Governor Warren Speaks Out

California's Governor Warren speaks right out in public when he adopts a policy. He doesn't use weasel words. In his address to the opening of the California legislature he bluntly declared for a change in the unemployment compensation act to bring it under its coverage all of the rural and so-called agricultural workers. He said: "I have always believed that, if unemployment insurance is sound government policy for some employees, it is equally good for all."

Governor Warren also advocated the enactment of many improvements in the state's compensation laws for the benefit of the workers. His recommendations followed closely those of the State Federation of Labor.

California is a long step ahead of Washington in many of its laws beneficial to working people.

TROJAN HORSE



NEWS and VIEWS

By ALEXANDER S. LIPSELL (An ILNS Feature)

Though coming from a non-labor source and voicing a viewpoint not shared by the leaders of the American trade union movement, organized labor will do well to ponder some recent editorial observations in the New York Times. Under the heading "National Emergency Strikes," the paper, after discussing the permissive power of the President to take action in the case of strikes in basic industries when such strikes threaten national health or safety, has this to say: "President Truman has chosen to invoke this permissive power on no fewer than 7 occasions. The choice was his to make. And since he judged these sections of the law to be of sufficient value to be worth using 7 times, why should he now wish to dispense with them?"

It is indeed a fact that President Truman, unmindful of labor's objections, has seen fit to use the injunctive powers of the Taft-Hartley Act in a number of cases. Last spring the government also invoked a 1916 war-time measure to seize the railroads; then, with the roads under control, it obtained an order which forbade the railway unions altogether from striking. It was this tricky device which created resentment among railroad workers and gave rise to the demand that the government take over the railroads permanently—not merely as a subterfuge to crush labor's right to strike.

Nor must we forget that President Truman himself, during the congressional debate of the Case bill, asked for and received from a stampeded House the authority to draft striking workers, and that it was Senator Taft who nipped this attempt at labor regimentation in the bud.

Needless to say, organized labor's insistence on removal of the injunctive processes of the Taft-Hartley Act, somewhat reminiscent of the yellow dog injunctions of the 1920's, is fully justified. But while the union rightly demanded an end to these obstructions to labor's progress, we might as well realize that the President, like anybody else, is playing politics. In other words: He is by no means opposed to drastic anti-union measures if they suit the political interests of the administration. The sooner the organized working men and women of America recognize that grasping politicians and bureaucrats will grant them only as much as an aroused labor movement can command by the exercise of its political strength, and not an ounce more, the better for the future course of the trade union movement.

In a recent discussion on what to do with America's aging labor force, U. S. Labor Commissioner Ewan Clague raised the interesting question: "Can industry find jobs for the growing bloc of older workers or will they push the pension age downward?" He also warned that the older elements of the American people will soon constitute a voting force powerful enough to get anything they want at the polls, particularly in the event of a depression. Commissioner Clague, while appealing to industry to keep the working age up, also pointed to the comparatively low absenteeism rate among workers between 50 and 60 years of age. In 1945 one-third of the people of voting age were 50 or over, but this percentage, according to Clague, is expected to rise to 42.2 in 1960 and to 45 percent in the year 2000. Voters in these age brackets are likely to erect a powerful political and economic influence in the coming decades.

These facts are important. They make it necessary for labor, too, to readjust its thinking and lay greater stress than before on the use of older workers. Obviously, plans for compulsory retirement at 65 must be abandoned; emphasis must be laid on the worker's mental and physical conditions, not his age. Efforts to push the retirement age back to 60 or even less simply mean that the taxpaying public will have to assume additional responsibilities in carrying the increasing burden of an aging population.

Washington Labor Report

TAFT WORKS HARD TO PROVE HE'S BEHIND TRENDS OF THE TIMES

By BRADFORD V. CARTER, LPA Columnist

The most disturbing fact apparent after two months of the new Congress and three weeks of hearings on the new labor bill is that Sen. Robert A. Taft (R., Ohio) has learned nothing from the political events of the past year. His blindness will affect Democrats and Republicans alike, as well as the whole nation, because Taft is holding tenaciously to his job as the maker of GOP policy in Congress, and if he persists in his stubborn refusal to make intelligent compromises on any legislation at all, it will kill a great part of that legislation and do his own party much harm. Although some Republicans have made attempts to put new ideas into effect—simply to keep the GOP alive for future elections—Taft has fought down every move to unseat him in his leadership and every attempt to move his party forward.

And while he asserts in statesmanlike manner in the Labor Committee hearings that he wants to give labor a fair break, he makes speeches in public that go even farther than ever before into arch-conservatism. He says in the Committee hearings, for instance, in that statesmanlike manner, that he is willing to make some changes in the Taft-Hartley law. He is willing to do away with the vote on the closed shop, and willing to admit that his law actually promoted and encouraged strikebreaking in some instances—like the Pipe Machinery case—and that there "might be instances where a union's secondary boycott was justifiable." But he asserts with vehemence that he wants these instances carefully specified in any new law.

The same day Taft addresses a group of Republican women in Washington and says that his firmest belief in life is to fight federal control over American life everywhere!

And the foremost expert on labor law in the country, Dr. William Leiserson, has said that the one thing that rendered the Taft-Hartley thing unworkable and chaotic was its maze of legal rules over every conceivable happening in labor-management relations.

Though he is as sincere as any man can be in his beliefs of rights and wrong, Sen. Taft is apparently incapable of making up his mind just what he does believe.

Even worse is his inability to recognize anything that the American people indicated at the polls last November—indications which other Republicans have considered seriously.

It is safe to say it wasn't a vote for socialism. It was a vote for doing something. The American people want houses now, and better

'CAVIL-CADE'

By LES FINNEGAN

Sen. Robert Taft and other reactionary Republicans on the Senate Labor Committee, which is now holding hearings on Taft-Hartley repeal, have conducted one of the most flagrant filibusters within a Congressional committee that anyone can remember. Case-hardened newspapermen are appalled at the fact that every so often a bell on the wall of the hearing room will ring and the Republican senators will dash for the Senate floor. When they arrive they make long emotional speeches demanding passage of the pending anti-filibuster bill.

In exactly the same vein of unwitting irony Taft one afternoon requested permission to leave the labor bill hearings for an hour because he had an appointment. From Capitol Hill the senator rushed downtown in a cab to address a Republican women's meeting. The theme of Taft's speech was that we've got to wage a constant fight to keep government from interfering with our liberties. Then he jumped into a cab, rushed back to the Capitol and into the hearings to renew his demand that the Taft-Hartley law be retained and that additional shackles be placed on the nation's workers.

Taft's filibuster technique is to ask a labor witness a question that takes five minutes or more to read. The labor man will give a "yes" or "no" reply whereupon Taft will take up the next 10 or 15 minutes defending the particular part of the Taft-Hartley law in question. Taft's declamations got so bad that at one point Sen. Pepper interrupted to ask the labor witness, "I suppose you concur in the testimony of the Senator from Ohio?" And in fact Taft seems to have developed an inferiority complex, behaving as though he were on trial for his life and he was his only defense witness. At other times he has the frustrated look of a bloodhound who's been following a scent for two weeks only to discover he's been following himself.

Whenever a labor witness objected to some section of the Taft-Hartley act Sen. Taft arched his eyebrows in surprise and exclaimed, "Why, that language was a compromise!" And indeed it was! There's not a single clause in the Taft-Hartley Act that wasn't a compromise between Taft and Hartley and between the NAM and U. S. Chamber of Commerce.

Sen. Donnell, a Missouri Republican, took up the filibuster whenever Taft stopped for a breath. At one point Labor Secretary Tobin was on the witness stand for a solid hour without a question being asked him; Donnell was orating. Midway during Donnell's screed one Democratic senator turned to another and said in a barely audible voice, "This is one instance in which half an oaf is not better than none."

Former War Labor Board Chairman William Davis assailed the Taft-Hartley law as unfair and rigged against labor. He illustrated his argument with the old story of making elephant-mouse stew by a 50-50 formula—one elephant and one mouse. Liberal Sen. Elbert Thomas thought for a moment and remarked that it would make more sense if it were one elephant and one donkey.

Republican senators on the Senate Labor Committee professed great indignation over last year's west coast maritime strike. It was their consensus that the longshoremen's union has grown too large for its bridges.

It took a labor editor to set Sen. Taft rocking back on his heels for the first time. Lew Herrmann, editor of the New Jersey Labor Herald, testified that organized labor in Ohio would "take care" of Taft in 1950. Taft said in effect that Herrmann didn't know what he was talking about and muttered a crack about "dirty Democratic politics." At this point someone told him that Herrmann was a Republican member of the New Jersey state legislature. Taft's mouth fell open, he gaped at Herrmann and looked as though he had stooped to pet a rabbit and the rabbit had hauled off and broken both his legs.

Militant young Sen. Hubert Humphrey, of Minnesota, told the Senate Labor Committee that there is not much of free speech in labor-management relations when a company can dip down into hundreds of millions of dollars (like A&T) for advertising and propaganda while a union's funds are distinctly limited. Both the Republicans and union officials sat bolt upright when Humphrey proposed to give the union and the company each \$15,000,000 each year for advertising campaigns. The secretary treasurers of two unions almost swooned and the vice-president of a rubber company started tearing his copy of "NAM News" into paper dolls.

NLRB General Counsel Robert Denham wasn't too sure of himself when he appeared before the Senate Labor Committee. To help him answer questions Denham was flanked by five assistants—enough to start a mass picketline which Denham recently outlawed.

Denham tried desperately to assure skeptical Democratic senators of his impartiality. Instead of assuring them he astounded them when he boasted that he was a registered Democrat but voted Republican. The crowning proof of his impartiality came when he discussed the Lincoln Electric Co. of Cleveland. "There," declared Denham, "is the ideal we can reach." What Denham carefully refrained from adding is that the "ideal" is a non-union company that recently handed its employees a wage cut.

Former Rep. Fred Hartley, who like Martin Dies refused to run for re-election in the face of certain defeat, is Congress' forgotten man. Reporters covering the Senate Labor Committee hearings are amused at Sen. Taft's constant reference to it as the "Taft Act." It's true that Taft never thought much of the New Jersey union hater but we think that maybe there's another reason for Taft wanting to keep Hartley's name out of it. He's never forgiven AFL President William Green who, twice in a nationwide broadcast last year, referred to it as "the Taft-Hart bill."

On Feb. 7 the newspapers reported that the NAM had appeared before the House Labor Committee and testified against the administration's bill to increase the 40c an hour minimum wage. The same papers on the same day reported briefly on the financial status of two of the NAM's heaviest contributors. General Motors' net profit for 1948 is expected to be well over \$400,000,000 compared with \$213,000,000 in 1947—an 87% jump in 12 months. Johns-Manville netted \$15,000,000 last year compared with \$9,000,000 the year before—a jump of more than 60%. If labor persists in jeopardizing the free enterprise system by demanding more than 40c an hour GM will probably stop making autos and start manufacturing stream-lined chromium-plated barricades.

Westbrook Pegler's column on Feb. 5 made the flat statement that "Most American workers are Fascists under the skin, too." Then there's the story of the skunk who was made ill when he smelled fresh air.

school systems now, and social security now, and better health for everybody now—not sometime in the future when Sen. Taft's lobbies can get around to them.

That one of those political miracles the issue was clearly drawn. Communism and all that it stood for was available for the voters in the "Progressive" Party—and it was resoundingly slapped down. But the traditional Republican arch-conservatism, represented by Sen. Taft's 80th Congress, was also available to the voters and it was rejected.

And yet—six months after this was plain to everyone—Taft made a speech in Ohio last week in which he asserted that the failure of the Republican Party was not its principles but in the way that those principles were presented to the country. A rather incredible statement.

He used the same—precisely the same—pat phrases that Dewey used so glibly in the campaign without effect. Listen to these:

We are concerned that the government keep the economic machine running at high speed with a little friction and intermission as possible. We believe this can be brought about by sound fiscal policies, by balancing the budget, by a sound currency and proper control of credit.

"We are interested in promoting better education, better health, better housing, better security for our people and equality of opportunity, particularly for the children."

"I am opposed to a tremendous burden of taxation because it takes from the people the right to spend their money which they have earned and spend it for something which the government thinks is good for them."

These are words. He wants better housing, but he's opposed to the government helping private industry. He is for foreign aid, but he is opposed to the government supervising the way that foreign aid money is spent. On the other hand he wants to make a matter of law everything that can happen to them, thereby making impossible the harmony that might come from working inside a general set of rules.

And yet, Taft is now ready to start a fight for more power. He is going to spend three months this fall campaigning for re-election in 1950. And if he wins then over the opposition of organized labor in Ohio, he will certainly be working hard for the Republican presidential nomination in 1952.

There is little chance that he will get it, fortunately for the Republican party. But today in Washington Taft is coming to appear more and more like a modern day Hamlet—"This is the tragedy of a man who couldn't make up his mind."